

**Unincorporated King County Retailer Cash Requirement  
Implementation and Enforcement Plan**

November 27, 2024



**King County**

**I. Contents**

- I. Contents .....2
- II. Proviso Text.....3
- III. Executive Summary.....4
- IV. Background.....7
- V. Report Requirements.....8
  - A. Analyze Implementation and Enforcement Mechanisms..... 8
    - 1. Review of Jurisdictions Implementing Similar Ordinances ..... 8
    - 2. Lessons Learned from Other Jurisdictions' Implementation and Enforcement of Similar Laws 17
    - 3. Analysis of Implementation ..... 18
  - B. Implementation and Enforcement Plan Recommending an Enforcement Mechanism and Implementation Measures..... 20
    - 1. List of Potential Implementation and Enforcement Mechanisms ..... 20
    - 2. Recommended Implementation and Enforcement Plan ..... 22
  - C. Analysis and Determination of Whether Legislation is Needed to Implement the Recommended Actions ..... 22
- VI. Conclusion .....22
- VII. Appendix.....24
  - A. Estimated Cost of Implementation and Enforcement Options ..... 24

## II. Proviso Text

Of this appropriation, \$50,000 shall not be expended or encumbered until the executive transmits an unincorporated King County retailer cash requirement implementation and enforcement plan to enforce Ordinance 19639, per this Proviso. To ensure effective implementation and enforcement of Ordinance 19639, the executive shall analyze implementation and enforcement mechanisms and shall transmit to the council an implementation and enforcement plan recommending an enforcement mechanism and implementation measures, as well as any legislation needed to implement the recommended actions.

The executive shall electronically file the implementation and enforcement plan and any associated legislation no later than December 1, 2024, with the clerk of the council, who shall retain an electronic copy and provide an electronic copy to all councilmembers, the council chief of staff, and the lead staff for the local services and land use committee or its successor.

Ordinance 19712, Section 64, Department of Local Services, P3.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> [Link to Ordinance 19712](#)

### III. Executive Summary

In the United States, the recent trend for businesses and consumers has been to increasingly use credit cards, debit cards, and Internet-based mobile applications to complete financial transactions, rather than cash.<sup>2</sup> When considering socioeconomic differences, this move to cashless purchasing is not evenly distributed. Those with less means may not have access to traditional financial services such as bank accounts, credit cards, or personal checks, which could inhibit the ability to obtain basic food and consumer goods if cash were not accepted. To address the concerns of unbanked and underbanked people, the King County Council enacted Ordinance 19639 establishing King County Code which requires retail establishments in unincorporated King County (UKC) to accept payment in cash for food and consumer goods for single transactions up to \$200.<sup>3</sup> This is the first consumer protection law enacted for UKC residents.

King County does not have consumer protection staff to implement and enforce the acceptance of cash at food and consumer goods retail establishments. Although responsible for King County Code enforcement, the Permitting Code Enforcement Unit Section in the Department of Local Services (DLS) investigates complaints regarding violations of the King County Code as it relates to zoning, building, property maintenance, shorelines, and critical areas.

The Department of Local Services conducted a review of jurisdictions currently implementing laws like Ordinance 19639 to understand implementation and enforcement mechanisms. The following jurisdictions were approached for information:

- City of New York, NY
- City and County of San Francisco
- City of Philadelphia
- Washington, District of Columbia
- Commonwealth of Massachusetts

These jurisdictions were asked a series of questions to understand the successes and failures of each program. This information, augmented with information found on the jurisdiction websites, was used to inform the implementation and enforcement mechanisms proposed for King County. For San Francisco, Washington, D.C., and the City of Philadelphia, this inquiry consisted of a phone call interview with staff. City of New York staff responded to a list of questions via email. Massachusetts was not able to respond due to pending litigation. Most jurisdictions reported that cash acceptance requirement laws have helped to guarantee cash acceptance, though no data is currently available to indicate actual success.

Common lessons learned from these inquiries were:

- All jurisdictions have existing staff and programming to address multiple consumer protection laws.
- No jurisdictions have staff solely dedicated to implementing and enforcing cash acceptance requirement laws.

---

<sup>2</sup> Link to [Share of Americans who go 'cashless' in typical week continues to grow | Pew Research Center](#), accessed on August 5, 2024.

<sup>3</sup> Link to [Ordinance 19639](#), accessed on August 5, 2024.

- All jurisdictions use complaint-based education and enforcement systems, whereby consumers report potential violators to the jurisdiction upon which further action is taken.
- No jurisdiction is proactively identifying violators.
- Ongoing education is considered largely effective at obtaining compliance.
- Increased resources are needed to implement new consumer protection laws when they are enacted.
- Unless field officers have the authority to impose fines, applying monetary penalties is complicated or not possible.

By analyzing information gathered from the abovementioned jurisdictions and King County’s internal capabilities and resources, implementation and enforcement options were developed. These options build upon each other and are:

- Building awareness
- Targeted, complaint-based education
- Complaint-based enforcement

### **Building Awareness**

Building awareness through a communications campaign would include informing all businesses in UKC of cash acceptance requirements in the seven most used languages. Communications materials would be shared with community-based organizations or chambers of commerce, which would be given small grants to help disseminate cash-requirement information to local retail businesses. The estimated cost of \$360,000 includes funding for a nine-month term-limited temporary employee, a grant program for community-based organizations to assist in disseminating information about the Ordinance, consultation with the Prosecuting Attorney’s Office to interpret the Ordinance, focus groups to identify questions, and materials translation and production. Ongoing annual estimated expenses of \$10,000 would cover updating and translating the frequently asked questions (FAQ) document and website information as questions arise.

### **Targeted Education**

This level of implementation would include targeted education sent in the form of a letter and educational materials to businesses that are reported as being out of compliance. In addition to the costs for “building awareness,” “targeted education” includes the cost of adding a full-time Administrator I to triage and respond to complaints with education materials and to update those materials as more questions and scenarios are identified. The total start-up cost is estimated at \$360,000 with an ongoing annual cost of \$190,000 to fund the Administrator position.

### **Enforcement**

An enforcement process could include visiting the retail business to explain the requirements and assess penalties if corrective action was not taken after targeted education. Setting up a new consumer protection unit or office within the Department of Local Services, Permitting Division is estimated to cost \$490,000 with an ongoing annual cost of \$770,000. In addition to all the costs included in “building awareness” and “targeted education,” “enforcement” includes the one-time implementation of a technical solution or system to track and document enforcement actions and penalties, and the ongoing annual cost of adding two full-time code enforcement officers, a per-visit cost, and system maintenance.

The recommended implementation level is “Building Awareness.” This approach aligns with the King County values of “We focus on the customer” and “We are responsible stewards.”<sup>4</sup> The General Fund faces severe constraints; discretionary funding available for non-mandatory services is increasingly limited. This option is the most cost-effective given the General Fund constraints. The additional options of adding focused complaint-driven education and enforcement would require additional funding.

---

<sup>4</sup> Link to [True North and Values - King County, Washington](#)

## IV. Background

### Department Overview – Department of Local Services:

King County is the local service provider for the estimated 250,000 people who live in the unincorporated areas of King County.<sup>5</sup> The Department of Local Services (DLS), created in 2018 by Ordinance 18791, is dedicated to improving local services for unincorporated areas by strengthening coordination and collaboration between County agencies, communities, and other entities.<sup>6</sup> The mission of DLS is to promote the well-being of residents and communities in UKC by seeking to understand their needs and delivering responsive local government services.<sup>7</sup>

DLS has two divisions:

- The Permitting Division (Permitting) provides infrastructure and land use planning services; land use, building, and fire regulatory and operating permits; code enforcement; and a limited number of business licenses in unincorporated areas of the county.
  - The Permitting Code Enforcement Section investigates complaints regarding violations of the King County Code related to zoning, building, property maintenance, shorelines, and critical areas.
- The Roads Services Division (Roads) is responsible for all County-owned roads, bridges, and related infrastructure in the unincorporated areas of the County.

### Key Historical Context

In the United States, the business and consumer trend has been to increasingly use credit cards, debit cards, and Internet-based mobile applications to complete financial transactions rather than cash. This trend continued through the COVID-19 pandemic.<sup>8</sup> This move towards cashless purchasing is not evenly distributed throughout the population, varying when income and race are taken into consideration. According to a 2022 survey by the Pew Research Center, 59 percent of American consumers with an annual income at or above \$100,000 per year indicated they did not use cash; this was compared to only 24 percent of consumers who have an annual income under \$30,000 per year. There are racial disparities as well; 26 percent of Black and 21 percent of Hispanic adults stated that they used cash for almost all purchases, compared with 12 percent of White adults.<sup>9</sup> A person may also be using cash for purchases based on personal choice or due to a lack of access to credit and banking services.

Advocacy organization Bank On Washington estimates that three percent of Washington state residents are unbanked, meaning that they do not use or have access to traditional financial services such as bank accounts, credit cards, or personal checks. More than 17 percent of Washington residents are underbanked, meaning that they may have a bank account but rely on other services like money orders, check-cashing services, or payday loans.<sup>10</sup> If these statewide averages are applied to UKC, 7,400 unincorporated residents could potentially be unbanked and 42,000 could potentially be underbanked.

---

<sup>5</sup> Link to [Demographics - King County, Washington](#), accessed on July 30, 2024.

<sup>6</sup> Link to [Ordinance 18791, p. 25](#), accessed on July 30, 2024.

<sup>7</sup> Link to [2023-2024 Budget Book](#), accessed on Oct. 10, 2024

<sup>8</sup> Link to [Share of Americans who go 'cashless' in typical week continues to grow | Pew Research Center](#), accessed on August 5, 2024.

<sup>9</sup> Link to [Share of Americans who go 'cashless' in typical week continues to grow | Pew Research Center](#), accessed on August 5, 2024.

<sup>10</sup> Link to [bankonwashington](#), accessed on August 5, 2024.

## Key Current Conditions

On June 27, 2023, the Metropolitan King County Council enacted Ordinance 19639, establishing King County Code which requires retail establishments in UKC to accept payment in cash.<sup>11</sup> King County Code (KCC) 12.26 prohibits retail establishments selling food and consumer goods in UKC from refusing to accept cash for transactions less than \$200.<sup>12</sup>

## Report Methodology

This report was developed by DLS between May and October 2024.

Information from the following jurisdictions is reflected in the document:

- City of New York, NY;
- City and County of San Francisco, CA;
- City of Philadelphia, PA;
- Washington, D.C., and
- State of Massachusetts.

These jurisdictions were selected because they have implemented similar or related retail cash requirement laws. These five jurisdictions vary in size and number of businesses. They also have varying consumer and worker protection laws.

To obtain information from these jurisdictions, each representative was given a set of standard questions to respond to and return to DLS. A qualitative analysis was then conducted by DLS staff synthesizing the interview results to understand lessons learned. The data, information, and experiences provided by these jurisdictions helped guide the development of implementation and enforcement recommendations within this report.

## V. Report Requirements

### A. Analyze Implementation and Enforcement Mechanisms

This section consists of a review of information from the jurisdictions are currently implementing laws that require retail businesses to accept cash. This review includes the results of virtual interviews and email responses from representatives of the programs that implement these laws in each jurisdiction.

#### 1. Review of Jurisdictions Implementing Similar Ordinances

King County's Ordinance 19639 implemented KCC standards such as those adopted by other local and state governments in the United States. The laws implemented by each jurisdiction are listed in Table 2 and are described below.

---

<sup>11</sup> Link to [Ordinance 19639](#), accessed on August 5, 2024.

<sup>12</sup> [King County Code 12.26](#)

Table 1: Retailer Cash Requirement Laws and Enforcement Agency by Jurisdiction

Jurisdiction	Retailer Cash Requirement Law	Year Enacted	Enforcing Agency
New York	Local Law 34 of 2020	2020	Department of Consumer and Worker Protection
San Francisco	Article 55 of the San Francisco Police Code	2019	County Agricultural Commissioner-Sealer of Weights and Measures
Philadelphia	Law 9-1132	2019	Philadelphia Commission on Human Relations
Washington, D.C.	Law 23-187 of 2020	2020	Office of Enforcement in the Department of Licensing and Consumer Protection
Massachusetts	General Law Part III, Title IV, Chapter 255D, Section 10A	1978	Consumer Protection Division of the Attorney General's Office

### City of New York, NY

In early 2020, the City Council of New York City adopted Local Law 34 of 2020, requiring businesses such as food stores and retail establishments to accept cash or to provide a device on the business premises to convert cash into a cashless form of payment.<sup>13</sup> This law does not apply to phone, mail, or Internet transactions. This law does not apply to foreign currencies or payments made with bill denominations greater than \$20. The law prohibits retailers from charging a higher price to a customer paying cash. The department enforcing this law is the Department of Consumer and Worker Protection (NYC DCWP), which supports businesses and consumers through equitable enforcement of multiple consumer protection and worker protection laws.<sup>14</sup>

### City and County of San Francisco, CA

In 2019, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors approved Article 55 of the San Francisco Police Code, which requires the acceptance of cash by any “brick and mortar business,” meaning any business operating at fixed permanent physical premises if the customer is physically present in the place of business. Internet stores, vehicles, temporary business locations such as pop-ups and food trucks, or professional services are not included in the application of this law.<sup>15</sup> Enforcement of the law is done by the County Agricultural Commissioner-Sealer of Weights and Measures, within the San Francisco Department of Health.<sup>16</sup>

### City of Philadelphia, PA

In 2019, the City Council of Philadelphia adopted Law 9-1132, a requirement to accept cash that applies to consumer goods or services offered at retail establishments.<sup>17</sup> It applies to retail transactions conducted in person but excludes telephone, mail, or Internet transactions; parking lots and garages; transactions at wholesale clubs or other retail stores that use a membership model and require payment through a membership application; transactions for the rental of goods, services, or accommodations,

<sup>13</sup> Link to [LOCAL LAWS OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK FOR THE YEAR 2020, No. 34](#), accessed on July 30, 2024.

<sup>14</sup> Link to [DCWP - About - Overview \(nyc.gov\)](#), accessed on July 30, 2024.

<sup>15</sup> Link to [ARTICLE 55: ACCEPTANCE OF CASH BY BRICK-AND-MORTAR BUSINESSES \(amlegal.com\)](#), accessed on July 30, 2024.

<sup>16</sup> Link to [Weights and Measures Program \(sfdph.org\)](#), accessed on July 30, 2024.

<sup>17</sup> Link to [§ 9-1132. Cashless Retail Prohibition. \(amlegal.com\)](#), accessed on July 30, 2024.

for which a security deposit is often required; and goods or services provided exclusively to employees. The law requires that U.S. currency be accepted, and that the retailer may not charge a higher price for cash payments. The law is enforced by the Philadelphia Commission on Human Relations (Philadelphia CHR).<sup>18</sup>

### **Washington, District of Columbia**

In 2020, the Council of the District of Columbia adopted Law 23-187, the Cashless Retailers Prohibition Act of 2020, which applies to any retailer holding a basic business license engaged in retail sales.<sup>19</sup> The law does not apply during a declared public health emergency; to sales made by mail, phone, or Internet; at parking facilities that did not accept cash as of December 1, 2020; or at establishments that provide a device on premises that converts cash into a prepaid card. Implementation of this law falls under the Office of Enforcement in the Department of Licensing and Consumer Protection (DC DLCP).<sup>20</sup> Washington, D.C. has temporarily ceased to enforce this law.

### **Commonwealth of Massachusetts**

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts has the oldest cash requirement law of the jurisdictions contacted. Enacted in 1978, General Law Part III, Title IV, Chapter 255D, Section 10A applies to most retailers with a physical store.<sup>21</sup> The law is implemented by the Consumer Protection Division of the Attorney General's Office.<sup>22</sup> The Division Chief of the Consumer Protection Division of the Massachusetts Attorney General's Office declined to discuss the law and its implementation in any detail due to pending litigation.

### **Interview Results**

All five of the abovementioned jurisdictions were contacted for interviews. The interviewees were presented with a standard set of questions to yield comparable results. The responses ranged from brief emails providing links to web pages, to an hour-long free-flowing conversation with an appointed commissioner. The questions posed were:

- *What is the process of addressing Ordinance violations?*
- *How many staff are dedicated to enforcing this Ordinance? What other standards are they enforcing?*
- *What do you estimate is the additional cost of enforcing this Ordinance? (A rough estimate or range is acceptable and will be noted as such in King County's report.)*
- *Has enforcing this Ordinance helped guarantee the acceptance of cash in transactions throughout your jurisdiction?*
- *Were there any unanticipated issues with implementing a cash requirement Ordinance?*

---

<sup>18</sup> Link to [Philadelphia Commission on Human Relations | Homepage | City of Philadelphia](#), accessed on July 30, 2024.

<sup>19</sup> Link to [D.C. Law 23-187. Cashless Retailers Prohibition Amendment Act of 2020. | D.C. Law Library \(dccouncil.gov\)](#), accessed on July 30, 2024.

<sup>20</sup> Link to [dlcp \(dc.gov\)](#)

<sup>21</sup> Link to [General Law - Part III, Title IV, Chapter 255D, Section 10A \(malegislature.gov\)](#), accessed on August 12, 2024.

<sup>22</sup> Microsoft Teams interview with Yael Shavit, Division Chief, Attorney General's Office, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, conducted on August 9, 2024.

- *Is there anything you would add as worthy information for a fellow jurisdiction that will be implementing and enforcing a new cashless Ordinance soon?*

The section below summarizes the interview results from the four responding jurisdictions, organized by question. As mentioned above, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts declined to participate.

**What is the process of addressing Ordinance violations?**

Most of the jurisdictions interviewed do not have the resources to proactively look for violations. This means the process is complaint-based as shown in Table 2 below.

*Table 2: Summary of Enforcement Processes and Penalties*

Jurisdiction	Enforcement Process	Penalties
New York City	Complaint-based, private right of action	First violation: \$1,000 Second and subsequent violations: \$1,500
San Francisco	Complaint-based, warning letters then fines	First violation: \$50 to \$100 Second violation within 12 months: \$100 to \$200 Third violation within 12 months: \$500 to \$1,000
Philadelphia	Complaint-based	First violation: \$0 Second violation: not more than \$2,000
Washington, D.C.	Complaint-based	Undecided at the time of the interview

In New York City, the DCWP utilizes an education-first approach with businesses. Its enforcement focuses on businesses that have received complaints and/or prior violations for any number of consumer concerns. Enforcement is done through complaint-based enforcement, through which consumer complaints can be filed online, by mail, or by fax.<sup>23</sup> In response, NYC DCWP investigates and then imposes penalties, as shown in Table 2, where violations have been verified.

In San Francisco, the Agricultural Commissioner/Sealer of Weights and Measures receives a complaint and then provides a notice of violation to the business through a letter.<sup>24</sup> If after 30 days the business is still violating the cash acceptance requirement law when an officer visits the business, the officer sends a second violation letter. After the second violation, the Commissioner involves the City attorney because it does not currently have the authority to assess fines.

In the Philadelphia model, potential violations are received through complaints from consumers.<sup>25</sup> If an individual is denied the ability to purchase with cash, they can file a complaint with the Philadelphia CHR.<sup>26</sup> The Philadelphia CHR allows the violating business to correct its error; the business must then

<sup>23</sup> Link to [DCWP - Consumers - File Complaint \(nyc.gov\)](https://www.nyc.gov/dcwp/consumers-file-complaint), accessed on July 30, 2024.

<sup>24</sup> Phone interview with Cree Morgan, Agricultural Commissioner/Sealer of Weights and Measures, City and County of San Francisco, conducted on June 24, 2024.

<sup>25</sup> Phone interview with Pamela Gwaltney, Deputy Director, Commission on Human Relations, City of Philadelphia, conducted on July 25, 2024.

<sup>26</sup> Link to [Philadelphia Commission on Human Relations | Homepage | City of Philadelphia](https://www.phila.gov/philadelphia-commission-on-human-relations/homepage), accessed on July 30, 2024.

inform the Philadelphia CHR when it has added the ability to accept cash. If another complaint is filed, violations can lead to fines of not more than \$2,000, or imprisonment for not more than 90 days.<sup>27</sup>

In Washington, D.C., when a cash acceptance complaint is received, it is triaged and assigned to an investigator.<sup>28</sup> The investigator visits the location where the complaint originated and attempts to buy something using cash, documenting everything that occurs during the visit. If the store does not accept cash but refers the investigator to an alternative like a reverse ATM, which turns cash into a card that can be used to purchase the item, that is acceptable. If a store does not accept cash and does not have an alternative for accepting cash, the investigator explains the law to the manager and/or owner of the business. Washington, D.C. is currently using an education-only model through the end of 2024. Starting in January 2025 there will be a mechanism for issuing civil infractions, with an option for the violating business to contest the infraction through a hearing process.

**How many staff are dedicated to enforcing this Ordinance? What other standards are they enforcing?**

None of the jurisdictions interviewed have staff solely dedicated to implementing and enforcing their cash requirement laws, but most have a team of labor and/or consumer protection law enforcement officers who address such laws in addition to a suite of other existing laws, as shown in Table 3. Response data does not suggest a correlation between the number of laws and staff nor the number of staff and population.

*Table 3: Number of Laws, Staff, and Population per Jurisdiction*

Jurisdiction	Number of Consumer and Worker Protection Laws	Staff Dedicated to Implementing Consumer and Worker Protection Laws	Population <sup>29</sup>
New York <sup>30</sup>	20	33	8,804,190
San Francisco <sup>31</sup>	3	13	873,965
Philadelphia <sup>32</sup>	11	7	1,603,797
Washington, D.C. <sup>33</sup>	16	33	689,545

For the NYC DCWP, enforcement is conducted by the 33 enforcement staff dedicated to general enforcement operations across the five boroughs, along with assistance from some of the attorneys in

<sup>27</sup> Link to [§ 9-1121. Penalties. \(amlegal.com\)](#), accessed on July 30, 2024.

<sup>28</sup> Phone interview with Anisah Crosby, Acting Chief of Compliance & Christopher Johnson, Consumer Protection Program Manager, Office of Enforcement, Department of Licensing and Consumer Protection, City of Washington, D.C., conducted on July 2, 2024.

<sup>29</sup> Link to [2020 Census](#). The population for UKC was calculated from 2020 Census data. Link to [Demographics - King County, Washington](#).

<sup>30</sup> Number of laws and dedicated staff was obtained by an email from Karlene Jung, City of New York Department of Consumer and Worker Protection, received on July 18, 2024.

<sup>31</sup> All data except population was obtained during a phone interview with Cree Morgan, Agricultural Commissioner/Sealer of Weights and Measures, City and County of San Francisco, conducted on June 24, 2024.

<sup>32</sup> Worker and law data was obtained during a phone interview with Pamela Gwaltney, Deputy Director, Commission on Human Relations, City of Philadelphia, conducted on July 25, 2024.

<sup>33</sup> All data except population was obtained during a phone interview with Anisah Crosby, Acting Chief of Compliance & Christopher Johnson, Consumer Protection Program Manager, Office of Enforcement, Department of Licensing and Consumer Protection, City of Washington, D.C., conducted on July 2, 2024.

the General Counsel division.<sup>34</sup> Enforcement officers have an inspection checklist they use when visiting brick-and-mortar businesses, which covers 20 separate consumer protection laws, including laws that cover price listing, pricing of goods, signs, receipts, price accuracy, layaway plans, and expired over-the-counter medication.<sup>35</sup> These laws are in addition to their prohibition of cashless establishments.

In San Francisco, the Agricultural Commissioner/Sealer of Weights and Measures has a program that tests and approves cash registers and scales, as well as other measurement tools.<sup>36</sup> Because the program inspectors are already visiting businesses to test and approve equipment, the San Francisco Board of Directors assigned the implementation of its cash acceptance requirement law to this team, which consists of eight inspectors and five supervisors.

The Philadelphia CHR has no staff dedicated to enforcing its cash acceptance law but currently has five investigators and two supervisors enforcing 11 human relations laws.<sup>37</sup> The Philadelphia CHR recommends that if King County anticipates receiving many complaints, funding and dedicating staff for enforcement would be beneficial.

The D.C. DLCP enforces 16 consumer and worker protection laws, including laws that pertain to auto repair services, unlicensed businesses and businesses that operate outside of their licensed scope, cashless retailers, certificate of occupancy, electronic smoking devices, flavored tobacco sales, gas-powered leaf blowers, home improvement services and warranty claims, COVID-19, motor vehicle sales, occupational and professional licensing, rental property, tow trucks, trash noise, unfair and deceptive trade practices, and vending.<sup>38</sup> The DC DLCP has 33 employees: 27 investigators, four program managers who manage the investigation team, and two administrative employees who triage cases.<sup>39</sup> There is a separate team that processes and serves notices of infractions.

***What do you estimate is the additional cost of enforcing this Ordinance? (A rough estimate or range is acceptable and will be noted as such in King County's report.)***

Most jurisdictions that implement and enforce cash acceptance requirement laws also implement other laws relating to consumer protection, making it difficult for the jurisdictions interviewed to estimate the cost of implementing cash acceptance laws alone. For example, NYC DCWP inspectors cover a total of 20 consumer protection laws when visiting brick-and-mortar stores.<sup>40</sup> This is also the case with Philadelphia and San Francisco.<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> Email from Karlene Jung, City of New York Department of Consumer and Worker Protection, received on July 18, 2024.

<sup>35</sup> Link to [DCWP - Consumers - File Complaint \(nyc.gov\)](#), accessed on July 30, 2024.

<sup>36</sup> Phone interview with Cree Morgan, Agricultural Commissioner/Sealer of Weights and Measures, City and County of San Francisco, conducted on June 24, 2024.

<sup>37</sup> Phone interview with Pamela Gwaltney, Deputy Director, Commission on Human Relations, City of Philadelphia, conducted on July 25, 2024.

<sup>38</sup> Link to [Consumer Protection Complaint Request \(kustomer.help\)](#), accessed on July 30, 2024

<sup>39</sup> Phone interview with Anisah Crosby, Acting Chief of Compliance & Christopher Johnson, Consumer Protection Program Manager, Office of Enforcement, Department of Licensing and Consumer Protection, City of Washington, D.C., conducted on July 2, 2024.

<sup>40</sup> Email from Karlene Jung, City of New York Department of Consumer and Worker Protection, received on July 18, 2024.

<sup>41</sup> Phone interview with Pamela Gwaltney, Deputy Director, Commission on Human Relations, City of Philadelphia, conducted on July 25, 2024.

In November 2020, Washington, D.C. published a fiscal impact statement on the Cashless Retailers Prohibition Act of 2020, by the Washington, D.C. Office of the Chief Financial Officer.<sup>42</sup> The statement assigned the cost of \$171,000 in fiscal year 2021 and \$685,000 over the four-year financial plan (2021 through 2025). This cost assumed 720 shops would be visited per year, at \$42 per visit. Enforcement of the law ceased on March 11, 2024, due to an increase in robberies of businesses, but is expected to continue again in 2025 potentially with new administrative rules aimed to support businesses.<sup>43</sup>

***Has enforcing this Ordinance helped guarantee the acceptance of cash in transactions throughout your jurisdiction?***

In general, the jurisdictions interviewed indicated that their cash acceptance laws have helped guarantee the ability to use cash in transactions, but none has supporting data. For Philadelphia CHR, staff concluded that the law has generally helped guarantee the acceptance of cash as they no longer receive many complaints, but some outlier cases contradict this conclusion.<sup>44</sup> For example, one business refuses to accept cash despite repeated warnings and enforcement actions. Most businesses are aware of and in compliance with the law in Philadelphia. Initially, there was pushback, specifically from business establishments like fitness centers. This group of businesses successfully advocated to amend the law and no longer needed to comply.

In San Francisco, officers find that often when businesses do not accept cash, they are simply not aware of the cash acceptance requirement law.<sup>45</sup> According to the San Francisco Agricultural Commissioner/Sealer of Weights and Measures, most new businesses in San Francisco do not want to handle cash because it is uncommon and comes with added risks and costs in terms of safety, such as registers, safes, and services from armored vehicles. However, staff indicated that overall San Francisco's cash acceptance requirement law has helped with cash acceptance, but implementation has not been comprehensive.

Washington, D.C. does not have any concrete data, but the staff's impression was that cashless businesses were amenable to compliance.<sup>46</sup> Some businesses obtained cash registers, safes, and other means for accepting cash. Overall, they concluded that there was a positive effect on businesses and people who want to use cash. To date, the primary implementation of the law has solely been education.

***Were there any unanticipated issues with implementing a cash requirement Ordinance?***

---

<sup>42</sup> Link to [FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT \(dcccouncil.gov\)](https://dcccouncil.gov), accessed on July 30, 2024.

<sup>43</sup> Phone interview with Anisah Crosby, Acting Chief of Compliance & Christopher Johnson, Consumer Protection Program Manager, Office of Enforcement, Department of Licensing and Consumer Protection, City of Washington, D.C., conducted on July 2, 2024.

<sup>44</sup> Phone interview with Pamela Gwaltney, Deputy Director, Commission on Human Relations, City of Philadelphia, conducted on July 25, 2024.

<sup>45</sup> Phone interview with Cree Morgan, Agricultural Commissioner/Sealer of Weights and Measures, City and County of San Francisco, conducted on June 24, 2024.

<sup>46</sup> Phone interview with Anisah Crosby, Acting Chief of Compliance & Christopher Johnson, Consumer Protection Program Manager, Office of Enforcement, Department of Licensing and Consumer Protection, City of Washington, D.C., conducted on July 2, 2024.

Some unanticipated issues were mentioned by the jurisdictions interviewed. Philadelphia’s cash acceptance law was adopted quickly, and from this experience, Philadelphia CHR recommended determining enforcement mechanisms before complaints begin to arrive.<sup>47</sup>

One issue with the cash acceptance requirement law in Philadelphia and San Francisco is that both jurisdictions have a small group of community members who file most of the complaints.<sup>48, 49</sup> Twenty percent of all the complaints in San Francisco have come from one individual.

The officers within the City and County of San Francisco Agricultural Commissioner/Sealer of Weights and Measures Program do not have citation authority, unlike a police officer in parking enforcement who has the power to conduct a self-executing court judgment in the form of a parking ticket.<sup>50</sup> An officer can visit a business after receiving a complaint but cannot issue a citation. This lack of authority was not considered when the legislation was developed. The City and County have thus determined that a new position, such as a transaction inspector, should be created on this team.

There were unanticipated issues reported for some businesses in San Francisco. For example, there are complexities with implementation in such venues as stadiums, concert halls, and ballparks that have gone cashless because entities such as Major League Baseball decided to no longer accept cash.<sup>51</sup> Businesses without stationary locations, such as temporary events like fairs and festivals, as well as door-to-door salespeople, have also presented challenges for the enforcement of San Francisco’s cash acceptance requirement law. In these cases, the lack of location created difficulties with enforcement. Additionally, there are chain stores in San Francisco that do not accept cash as a business model, where the Commissioner worked with the company to change their protocols to accept cash. Washington, D.C. had a similar issue where a system is being figured out to address those who patronize with only cash.<sup>52</sup>

Other companies have chosen to remain non-compliant. One business in San Francisco decided to become non-compliant with the cash acceptance requirement law because its bank had merged with another bank and no longer provided free courier service for cash. A well-documented example of noncompliance with a cashless ban law in New York City and an ice cream franchise, where a legal settlement was needed to obtain compliance (more details on this settlement are in the following section).<sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup> Phone interview with Pamela Gwaltney, Deputy Director, Commission on Human Relations, City of Philadelphia, conducted on July 25, 2024.

<sup>48</sup> Phone interview with Pamela Gwaltney, Deputy Director, Commission on Human Relations, City of Philadelphia, conducted on July 25, 2024.

<sup>49</sup> Phone interview with Cree Morgan, Agricultural Commissioner/Sealer of Weights and Measures, City and County of San Francisco, conducted on June 24, 2024.

<sup>50</sup> Phone interview with Cree Morgan, Agricultural Commissioner/Sealer of Weights and Measures, City and County of San Francisco, conducted on June 24, 2024.

<sup>51</sup> Phone interview with Cree Morgan, Agricultural Commissioner/Sealer of Weights and Measures, City and County of San Francisco, conducted on June 24, 2024.

<sup>52</sup> Phone interview with Anisah Crosby, Acting Chief of Compliance & Christopher Johnson, Consumer Protection Program Manager, Office of Enforcement, Department of Licensing and Consumer Protection, City of Washington, D.C., conducted on July 2, 2024.

<sup>53</sup> Link to [Consent Order - Van Leeuwen Icecream \(nyc.gov\)](#), accessed on July 31, 2024.

A major unanticipated issue noted in Washington, D.C. was a notable increase in robberies after their cash acceptance requirement law was enacted.<sup>54</sup> For this reason, enforcement of the law ceased on March 11, 2024, but it will continue again in 2025. In the meantime, Washington, D.C. is exploring ways to reduce this risk. The nexus of cash acceptance requirement laws and increased robberies was mentioned by other local governments but under varying contexts. In Philadelphia, there was no demonstrable link between the law's adoption and increased crime, although crime was cited as a reason to not accept cash by businesses that did not want to comply.<sup>55</sup> In San Francisco, there was one business that got robbed three times after the cash acceptance requirement law was adopted, but it is unclear whether the law led to these crimes or if there was an increase in robberies overall.

***Is there anything you would add as worthy information for a fellow jurisdiction that will be implementing and enforcing a new cashless ordinance soon?***

There were a variety of considerations and ideas mentioned by the jurisdictions interviewed when asked this final question.

- Washington, D.C.:
  - Be aware of potential links between cash acceptance requirements and safety.
- Philadelphia:
  - Develop a compelling problem statement, backed by location-specific data.
- New York:
  - Consider the size and scale of violating businesses when enforcing the ordinance.
  - Consider penalties of different sizes for different-sized businesses.
- San Francisco:
  - Focus efforts on new businesses and let them know the requirements when they open.
  - Because most businesses have annual fire inspections, fire departments could be asked to check for cash acceptance, since staff will be visiting these businesses routinely anyway.
  - Consider how fees would be collected if violations occur.
  - Explore ways for unbanked community members to get cash cards.

Philadelphia CHR mentioned the need to have data that demonstrates why a cash acceptance requirement law is important for a jurisdiction.<sup>56</sup> It advised that a compelling problem statement, backed by location-specific data, needs to be articulated by those who would benefit from such laws because, in their staff's experience, most of the businesses that don't accept cash are places unbanked community members rarely visit. In Philadelphia, the two main violators of its cash acceptance law are an expensive salad franchise and a high-end coffee shop franchise.

Staff from the DC DLCP found that the size and scale of the business should be considered during enforcement investigations. They found many businesses are under the same ownership and the same payment model or are part of a franchise, so staff try to conduct due diligence on such connections

---

<sup>54</sup> Phone interview with Anisah Crosby, Acting Chief of Compliance & Christopher Johnson, Consumer Protection Program Manager, Office of Enforcement, Department of Licensing and Consumer Protection, City of Washington, D.C., conducted on July 2, 2024.

<sup>55</sup> Phone interview with Pamela Gwaltney, Deputy Director, Commission on Human Relations, City of Philadelphia, conducted on July 25, 2024.

<sup>56</sup> Phone interview with Pamela Gwaltney, Deputy Director, Commission on Human Relations, City of Philadelphia, conducted on July 25, 2024.

before exploring violations. By being more comprehensive in their investigation, they hope to lessen redundancy.<sup>57</sup> They also mentioned considering enforcement penalties relative to the scale of the businesses; small stores generally comply because of the cost of a violation, whereas bigger retailers easily ignore violations because the fine is relatively insignificant to them. The issue is being explored further by DC DLCP.

NYC DCWP experienced an extreme example of noncompliance by a large-scale business. NYC DCWP and Van Leeuwen Ice Cream entered a settlement agreement in 2022 after Van Leeuwen repeatedly refused to comply with the City's cashless ban, adopted in November 2020.<sup>58</sup> Van Leeuwen has 19 locations in New York City.<sup>59</sup> In response to dozens of consumer complaints, NYC DCWP brought more than 90 violations against Van Leeuwen for violating the cashless ban law. NYC DCWP was preparing to pursue a court order to force the ice cream company to comply, which prompted Van Leeuwen to finally pay \$33,000 in outstanding civil penalties and comply with the cashless ban law at all New York City locations.

## 2. Lessons Learned from Other Jurisdictions' Implementation and Enforcement of Similar Laws

Lessons that consistently came up during jurisdiction interviews included the following:

- All jurisdictions have existing staff and programming that address some form of consumer protection.
- No jurisdictions have staff solely dedicated to implementing and enforcing cash acceptance requirement laws but have added this law to the suite of laws their office/department already implements.
- No jurisdictions are proactively looking for violations.
- All jurisdictions feel increased resources are needed to implement new consumer protection laws when they are enacted.
- Unless field officers have the authority to impose fines, applying monetary penalties is complicated or not possible.
- In general, the jurisdictions indicated that cash acceptance requirement laws have helped guarantee cash acceptance, though no data is currently available to showcase such successes.

All the jurisdictions interviewed have existing programs involving field officers dedicated to enforcing suites of consumer protection laws; however, no jurisdiction is proactively looking for violations. These programs are complaint-based, meaning a consumer filing a complaint initiates a field visit by jurisdiction staff. Common resources include the following:

- A system through which consumers can file a complaint.
- Administrative staff dedicated to reviewing and triaging complaints.
- Field staff dedicated to visiting potentially violating businesses.
- A set procedure or checklist for examining potential violations while at businesses.
- Management staff to oversee the program.

---

<sup>57</sup> Phone interview with Anisah Crosby, Acting Chief of Compliance & Christopher Johnson, Consumer Protection Program Manager, Office of Enforcement, Department of Licensing and Consumer Protection, City of Washington, D.C., conducted on July 2, 2024.

<sup>58</sup> Link to [Consent Order - Van Leeuwen Icecream \(nyc.gov\)](#), accessed on July 31, 2024.

<sup>59</sup> Link to [DCWP Settles With Van Leeuwen Ice Cream as Company Agrees To Comply With the Cashless Ban Law | City of New York \(nyc.gov\)](#), accessed on July 31, 2024.

Some jurisdictions noted equity concerns with having a complaint-based system because they have experienced large numbers of complaints coming from a small group of people who were not those intended to benefit from the laws. For example, San Francisco noted that 20 percent of their complaints come from one person, and the person has the means to purchase goods and services regardless of retail cash acceptance requirements.<sup>60</sup>

The mechanism by which the interviewed jurisdictions apply fines varies, with some having set systems with procedural and financial elements. Some jurisdictions often start with a warning and then apply escalating monetary fines for every subsequent violation. Others are either not set up for fining businesses and are in the process of creating procedures, need to involve an attorney's office to implement fines, or have yet to create and implement a system to penalize violators. Unless a system is already in place to fine businesses for violations of various consumer protection law infractions, creating one requires additional technology and staffing.

Interviewed jurisdictions were unable to identify the cost of implementing and enforcing their cash acceptance requirement laws in terms of technology, staffing, and communications because they also implement other consumer protection laws under the same program with field officers investigating multiple potential violations in a single visit. Washington, D.C. does have a fiscal impact statement from 2020, which estimates the cost of their cash acceptance law and is detailed in Table 4.

In general, the interviewed jurisdictions indicated that cash acceptance laws have helped guarantee cash transactions, although there are outliers. The outliers are mostly franchise businesses with existing payment models that accept only non-cash payments. Some exceptions to cash acceptance law compliance include experience- or service-based businesses such as stadiums, concert halls, and gyms, and areas where robberies are common.

### 3. Analysis of Implementation

The findings outlined in this subsection reflect feedback from other jurisdictions' experience. This section explores:

- Actions that led to effective implementation
- Mechanisms that were successful in obtaining compliance from businesses
- Unintended consequences
- Approximate costs of implementing and enforcing such laws

An effective approach to implementing a cash acceptance requirement law is to start with education and warnings to violating businesses, subsequently issuing violations to businesses that remain non-compliant. Both New York and Washington, D.C. found this education-first approach effective for achieving compliance.<sup>61,62</sup> Staff from these jurisdictions observed that education of the business community is largely effective as a mechanism to obtain business compliance, though some businesses

---

<sup>60</sup> Phone interview with Cree Morgan, Agricultural Commissioner/Sealer of Weights and Measures, City and County of San Francisco, conducted on June 24, 2024.

<sup>61</sup> Email from Karlene Jung, City of New York Department of Consumer and Worker Protection, received on July 18, 2024.

<sup>62</sup> Phone interview with Anisah Crosby, Acting Chief of Compliance & Christopher Johnson, Consumer Protection Program Manager, Office of Enforcement, Department of Licensing and Consumer Protection, City of Washington D.C., conducted on July 2, 2024.

need penalties or legal action to comply.<sup>63</sup> As noted above, proactively searching for violators is not common among jurisdictions with similar statutes. Analysis for this report finds that addressing complaints uses fewer resources to administer as staff work only with businesses that have been reported to the agency.

If issuing violations is part of the enforcement strategy, experience in San Francisco shows that giving field officers the authority to do so is considered the simplest approach.<sup>64</sup> For most businesses in noncompliance with cash acceptance requirement laws, in particular the smaller businesses, fines worked to encourage and achieve compliance.<sup>65</sup> However, for larger businesses, where fines could be more easily absorbed, more enforcement work was necessary.<sup>66</sup> Some businesses needed to work with the jurisdictions to develop systems for cash-only customers, as was the case in San Francisco.<sup>67</sup> In the most extreme case, litigation was needed to gain compliance.<sup>68</sup>

Some unintended consequences of implementing cash acceptance requirement laws as conveyed by the jurisdictions interviewed include:

- A small group of community members reporting most violations. Often these community members were not the intended beneficiaries of the law, meaning enforcement resources might not reach the businesses serving the intended beneficiaries of the law.
- The complexity of bringing businesses and venues that are associated with larger organizations, or which have no fixed location, into compliance.
- The inability to issue citations due to the lack of authority.
- The need to create new processes and tools to accept cash in new businesses and franchises whose business models are cashless.
- Increased crime.

It was not possible for the jurisdictions interviewed to provide a cost analysis of solely implementing their respective cash acceptance requirement laws, since implementation and enforcement of such laws are intertwined with the business processes of implementing other consumer protection laws. A basic qualitative summary of the cost of implementation is that the more resources available, the higher business compliance will be.

One available data point, specific to the implementation of a cash acceptance requirement law, is the table below from a fiscal impact statement created by Washington, D.C. in 2020.<sup>69</sup>

---

<sup>63</sup> Link to [Consent Order - Van Leeuwen Icecream \(nyc.gov\)](#), accessed on July 31, 2024.

<sup>64</sup> Phone interview with Cree Morgan, Agricultural Commissioner/Sealer of Weights and Measures, City and County of San Francisco, conducted on June 24, 2024.

<sup>65</sup> Phone interview with Pamela Gwaltney, Deputy Director, Commission on Human Relations, City of Philadelphia, conducted on July 25, 2024.

<sup>66</sup> Phone interview with Pamela Gwaltney, Deputy Director, Commission on Human Relations, City of Philadelphia, conducted on July 25, 2024.

<sup>67</sup> Phone interview with Cree Morgan, Agricultural Commissioner/Sealer of Weights and Measures, City and County of San Francisco, conducted on June 24, 2024.

<sup>68</sup> Link to [Consent Order - Van Leeuwen Icecream \(nyc.gov\)](#), accessed on July 31, 2024.

<sup>69</sup> Link to [Fiscal Impact Statement \(dccouncil.gov\)](#), accessed on July 30, 2024.

Table 4: Washington, D.C. Cashless Retailers Prohibition Act of 2020, Fiscal Impact Statement Costs

	2021	2022	2023	2024
<b>Enforcement Staff (1 FTE) *</b>	\$140,000	\$141,000	\$141,000	\$142,000
<b>Proactive Investigation Compliance**</b>	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$30,000
<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>\$171,000</b>	<b>\$171,000</b>	<b>\$172,000</b>	<b>\$172,000</b>

\*Assumes Manager Grade 13 midpoint salary and fringe (Washington D.C. labor rates)

\*\*Estimated 720 shops reviewed per year for \$42 per visit.

This is the additional cost to Washington, D.C. of adding one code enforcement officer to implement a new consumer protection law to an already-established Consumer Protection Assistance program.<sup>70</sup>

## B. Implementation and Enforcement Plan Recommending an Enforcement Mechanism and Implementation Measures

Although King County has a Code Enforcement Section in DLS, this agency mainly enforces building and land-use codes, which are fundamentally different from consumer protection laws. Building and land-use code enforcement addresses unpermitted structures or uses and nuisances, such as noise, pollution, and excessive quantities of stored garbage, that are considered to be incompatible with neighboring properties within the land-use zone. Consumer protection laws are oriented more toward the protection of the individual, in this case the individual’s access to goods and services.

Adding consumer protection enforcement would create a new body of work for the Department. This new body of work requires funding, as DLS has no established or funded consumer protection program.

### 1. List of Potential Implementation and Enforcement Mechanisms

Possible mechanisms for implementing and enforcing the KCC statutes of Ordinance 19639 in UKC include building awareness, targeted education after implementation to businesses reported as non-compliant (complaint-based targeted education), and complaint-based enforcement. These elements are outlined below in Table 5.

Table 5: Summary of Potential Implementation and Enforcement Mechanisms

Implementation levels	Building Awareness	Targeted Education	Enforcement
Basic pre-implementation awareness/communications campaign	Yes	Yes	Yes
Community-led awareness/communications campaign (grant program for community-based organizations/chambers of commerce)	Yes	Yes	Yes
Complaint response	None	Complaint-based educational response	Complaint-based enforcement and penalty system

<sup>70</sup> Link to [Consumer Protection Assistance | dlcp](#), accessed on August 2, 2024.

Implementation levels	Building Awareness	Targeted Education	Enforcement
Estimated one-time startup cost (see Appendix) <sup>71</sup>	\$360,000	\$360,000	\$490,000
Estimated ongoing annual cost (see Appendix)	\$10,000	\$180,000	\$770,000

For a detailed cost breakdown, refer to the Appendix.

These levels of implementation build upon each other. Building awareness is foundational for implementation so that retail businesses are aware of the law. Education before enforcement was emphasized in the interviews with jurisdictions as being largely effective in obtaining business compliance.

### Building Awareness

Building awareness through a communications campaign would include informing all businesses in UKC of cash acceptance requirements in the seven most used languages by developing and releasing:

- Answers to frequently asked questions (FAQ)
- A website with information for both UKC retail businesses and customers
- A video emphasizing the need for cash acceptance to support unbanked customers
- Advertising in languages other than English
- Press releases
- Flyers
- Newsletter postings
- Paid social media posts

These materials would also be shared with community-based organizations and chambers of commerce. Small grants would be available to help disseminate cash-requirement information to local retail businesses. The estimated cost includes funding for a nine-month term-limited temporary (TLT) employee to develop educational materials and provide businesses with education on the Ordinance; a grant program for community-based organizations to assist in disseminating information about the law; consultation with the Prosecuting Attorney’s Office to interpret the Ordinance; focus groups to identify questions; and production and translation of materials. Ongoing expenses include updating the FAQ and website information as questions arise.

### Targeted Education

This level of implementation would include targeted education sent in the form of a letter and educational materials to businesses that are reported as out of compliance. In addition to the costs for building awareness, targeted education includes the cost of adding a full-time Administrator I to triage and respond to complaints with education materials and to update those materials as more questions and scenarios are identified.

### Enforcement

Complaint-based enforcement could be implemented after targeted educational materials have been sent out. An enforcement process could include visiting the retail business to explain the requirements and assess penalties if corrective action was not taken. In addition to all the costs included in building awareness and targeted education, enforcement includes the cost of adding two full-time code

---

<sup>71</sup> All cost estimates in this report are estimated in 2024 dollars, unless otherwise noted.

enforcement officers, a per-visit cost, and the implementation of a technical solution or system to track and document enforcement actions and penalties.

## 2. Recommended Implementation and Enforcement Plan

Implementing the cash requirement Ordinance by focusing on building awareness of the requirement is the lowest cost, and therefore the recommended, option to support implementation of the Ordinance. Other jurisdictions indicated that educating businesses on the requirement to accept cash in retail establishments was effective at gaining compliance. The General Fund faces severe constraints because of Washington state's one percent annual revenue growth limit for property taxes. Additionally, much of the General Fund goes to services mandated by the State, such as courts, property assessments, public defense, and corrections. Consequently, discretionary funding that can be put toward non-mandatory services is increasingly limited. Building awareness of Ordinance 19639 is possible with some cost, but creating an enforcement program for this Ordinance would require a significant financial investment.

DLS estimates the communications campaign to build awareness to cost \$360,000, which includes \$100,000 in small grants to local chambers of commerce and community-based organizations that support small businesses to help disseminate information. The grants would cover staff, marketing, and materials reproduction costs. Ongoing expenses for this option would be roughly \$10,000 per year to update the FAQ and website with new questions and answers. See the Appendix for a detailed cost breakdown. Building initial awareness of the Ordinance amongst retail businesses is the most important step leading to compliance.

## C. Analysis and Determination of Whether Legislation is Needed to Implement the Recommended Actions

Because education to build awareness is the only element of implementation and enforcement of Ordinance 19639's King County Code statute and the Executive is not recommending additional actions, no legislation is necessary to be provided with this report. Notably, if funding is made available to support enforcement activities beyond awareness, further code changes would be necessary to provide the code enforcement staff with the authority to enforce this law and issue monetary penalties. In addition, an appeal process established, and policies developed through coordination with multiple agencies for such tasks as creating a fund to house the revenues collected from citations.

## VI. Conclusion

Providing education to build awareness is the cost-effective way to implement this Ordinance. Enforcement of this Ordinance would involve the creation of a small consumer protection enforcement program with three staff and a system to track complaints and enforcement actions. The current DLS Code Enforcement Section solely focuses on building, land use, and zoning violations. If King County determines that compliance is not being met after raising awareness about the Ordinance and that an enforcement program would be beneficial, resources to support the development of a consumer protection program would be needed.



## VII. Appendix

### A. Estimated Cost of Implementation and Enforcement Options

All cost estimates in this appendix are estimated in 2024 dollars unless otherwise noted. The estimated totals are rounded up to the nearest \$10,000. Where no dollar amounts are given, the deliverable is considered to have no added expense.

*Table 1: Estimated One-Time and Ongoing Annual Cost of Building Awareness*

<b>Deliverable for Building Awareness</b>	<b>Scope</b>	<b>One-Time Expense</b>	<b>Ongoing Annual Expense</b>
Communications plan and implementation management	Develop a communications plan and all associated content such as an FAQ document, website text, newsletter text, etc. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Manage implementation.</li> <li>• Escalate additional questions to The Prosecuting Attorney's Office (PAO) as needed.</li> <li>• Run small grant program for chambers of commerce.</li> </ul> Estimated at a nine-month TLT.	\$170,000	
Phone, supplies, mileage, etc.		\$1,000	
Prosecuting Attorney Consultation (PAO)	Code interpretation for FAQs	\$20,000	\$5,000
Translation	Translation of FAQ and other materials into seven top languages. Estimated at 10 pages of text x seven languages x \$150/page	\$10,500	\$1,000
Focus Groups for FAQ Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facilitate two focus groups with businesses to identify FAQ.</li> <li>• Develop FAQ responses with PAO.</li> <li>• Layout.</li> <li>• Printing.</li> </ul>	\$2,500	

## Estimated Cost of Implementation and Enforcement Options

Deliverable for Building Awareness	Scope	One-Time Expense	Ongoing Annual Expense
	Estimated at two focus groups x ten participants x two hours x \$50/hour		
Business Support (community partners to spread the word)	Grants for ten or more chambers and community-based organizations to support communication to businesses.	\$100,000	
Postcard/mailer	Send postcards to all UKC businesses, to ensure word is spread to retail businesses. Estimated at \$1/postcard.	\$45,000	
Posters/flyers	Develop and print posters for community gathering spaces and business districts.	\$1,000	
In-language advertising	Paid ads in chosen four primary languages (translation).	\$5,000	
Video	Video production costs.	\$3,000	
Social media and social media advertising	Create and post creative content on multiple platforms.	\$2,000	
Email Announcement	GovDelivery email to all retail businesses provided through a paid vendor service.		
Graphics	Develop branding and graphics.		
Website page for retail business owners	Develop layout, text, and graphics.		
Website page retail business customers	Develop layout, text, and graphics.		
Newsletters	Create content for sharing with multiple newsletters (King County and non-profits, chambers, etc.).		
Press release	Develop and release press releases.		
<b>Estimated total cost</b>		<b>\$360,000</b>	<b>\$10,000</b>

**Appendix**  
**Estimated Cost of Implementation and Enforcement Options**

*Table 2: Estimated One-Time and Ongoing Annual Cost Targeted Education*

<b>Deliverable for Targeted Education</b>	<b>Scope</b>	<b>One-Time Expense</b>	<b>Ongoing Annual Expense</b>
Building awareness		\$360,000	\$10,000
Targeted education	Tracking complaints, sending out educational letters, answering questions (1 FTE Administrator I)		\$170,000
<b>Estimated total cost</b>		<b>\$360,000</b>	<b>\$180,000</b>

*Table 3: Estimated One-Time and Ongoing Annual Cost of Enforcement*

<b>Deliverable for Enforcement</b>	<b>Scope</b>	<b>One-Time Expense</b>	<b>Ongoing Annual Expense</b>
Building awareness and targeted education		\$360,000	\$180,000
Enforcement system	Enforcement system modifications or implementation and integration of a new system with ongoing system maintenance expenses.	\$125,000	\$20,000
Enforce retail cash requirement	Visit locations based on complaints, educate, and assess penalties for repeat violators (2 FTE Enforcement Officers) <sup>72</sup>		\$540,000
500 investigations	\$53.31 per investigation x 500 investigations <sup>73, 74</sup>		\$27,000
<b>Estimated total cost</b>		<b>\$490,000</b>	<b>\$770,000</b>

<sup>72</sup> Wage assumed for both positions as Code Enforcement Officer III, mid-step Range 64, using the Office of Performance, Strategy and Budget’s Benefit Rate Calculator on October 10, 2024.

<sup>73</sup> In Washington, D.C.’s fiscal impact statement, the cost of a single visit was assigned \$42 in 2020. With inflation, this is \$53.31 in 2024. Inflation was calculated using the 12-month percentages between 2020 and 2024 from the [Consumer Price Index, Seattle area — June 2024 : Western Information Office : U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics \(bls.gov\)](https://www.bls.gov). The regional price parity of King County and Washington, D.C. are similar.

<sup>74</sup> In Washington, D.C.’s fiscal impact statement an estimation of 720 shops were reviewed per year. Unincorporated King County has approximately 70 percent as many businesses as Washington, D.C., thus a multiplier of 0.7 was applied to the 720 visits used in Washington, D.C.’s fiscal impact statement. That number was then rounded down from 504 to 500.