

RCW 43.05.030 Technical assistance visit—Notice of violation.

(1) For the purposes of this chapter, a technical assistance visit is a visit by a regulatory agency to a facility, business, or other location that:

(a) Has been requested or is voluntarily accepted; and

(b) Is declared by the regulatory agency at the beginning of the visit to be a technical assistance visit.

(2) A technical assistance visit also includes a consultative visit pursuant to RCW 49.17.250.

(3) During a technical assistance visit, or within a reasonable time thereafter, a regulatory agency shall inform the owner or operator of the facility of any violations of law or agency rules identified by the agency as follows:

(a) A description of the condition that is not in compliance and the text of the specific section or subsection of the applicable state or federal law or rule;

(b) A statement of what is required to achieve compliance;

(c) The date by which the agency requires compliance to be achieved;

(d) Notice of the means to contact any technical assistance services provided by the agency or others; and

(e) Notice of when, where, and to whom a request to extend the time to achieve compliance for good cause may be filed with the agency. [1996 c 206 s 2; 1995 c 403 s 604.]

Findings—1996 c 206: "The legislature finds that many individuals and small businesses who are required to comply with laws and agency rules often do not have access to the Revised Code of Washington, the Washington Administrative Code, the United States Code, or the Code of Federal Regulations. In this case, those informed of violations do not know whether, or to what extent, the cited law or agency rule actually applies to their situation. In order to facilitate greater understanding of the law and agency rules, the legislature finds that those who make the effort to obtain technical assistance from a regulatory agency, and those who are issued a notice of correction, should be given the text of the specific section or subsection of the law or agency rule they are alleged to have violated." [1996 c 206 s 1.]