



**King County
Charter Review Commission
Agenda**

King County Chinook Building

1st Floor Executive Conference Room 128

401 5th Ave. Seattle, WA 98104

March 14, 2019

6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.

Purpose:

- Finalize meeting and process protocols for the Charter Commission
- Review options for and agree on categories of topics for subgroup discussions
- Review draft and determine approach and expectations for each subcommittee discussion and products
- Review scenarios for different timelines for completion of Commission objectives

Agenda Topic	Lead	Time	Attachments
1. Welcome and Review Agenda	Co-Chairs	5 min	
2. Public Comment	Co-Chairs	As needed	
3. Approve 2-19-19, 2-20-19 and 2-26-19 Town Hall Meeting Minutes	Co-Chairs	5 min	2-19-19, 2-20-19 and 2-26-19 Draft Meeting Minutes
4. Confirm draft meeting and process protocols	Co-Chairs	15 min	Updated Draft Commission Protocols
5. Determine subgroup categories And topics	Facilitator and County Staff	30 min	Draft Subgroup Categories and Topics
6. Approach and expectations for subgroups	Facilitator and County Staff	30 min	Draft Guidelines for Charter Review Subgroups
7. Consider different timeline scenarios for Completion of Charter Review	Facilitator and County Staff	20 min	Handout to be provided at the meeting
8. Other Business:	Facilitator and County Staff	10 min	
9. Adjourn	Co-Chairs		

[Blank Page]



King County

Charter Review Commission

February 19, 2019
The Officers Club at Magnuson Park
Community Outreach Meeting

Meeting Minutes

In Attendance:

Louise Miller (Co-Chair, Tim Ceis, David Heller, Sean Kelly, Michael Herschensohn, Sean Kelly, Clayton Lewis, Jeff Natter, Rob Saka, Brooks Salazar, Alejandra Tres, and Kinnon Williams.

Excused:

Joe Fain, Elizabeth Ford, Ian Goodhew, Linda Larson, Marcos Martinez, Nat Morales, Toby Nixon, Nikkita Oliver, Beth Sigall, Ron Sims and Sung Yang.

County Councilmembers, Council and Executive Staff:

Councilmember Rod Dembowski, Patrick Hamacher, Director of Legislative Analysis, Calli Knight, External Relations Specialist, and Mac Nicholson, Director of Government Relations.

Also in Attendance:

Meeting facilitator Betsy Daniels, Co-President, Triangle Associates Inc., and Mishu Pham-Whipple and Kizz Prusia, Project Associates, Triangle Associates, Inc.

Welcome and Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 7:10 p.m. and the Commissioners made self-introductions. Councilmember Dembowski welcomed all in attendance and provided some historical background in regard to the King County Charter.

Overview of Agenda/Meeting Protocols

Ms. Daniels explained the process for the evening.

Charter Review Overview

Patrick Hamacher provided a presentation regarding the history of the Charter and the Commission, an overview of prior changes to the Charter, an outline of the Charter process, and a summary of the primary topics that the current Commission is addressing.

Small Group Instruction

Attendees were asked to break into two groups consisting of both the public and Commission members to address the topics listed on the handout provided along with any other relevant topics of interest.

Small Group Report Out

Group 1:

- Civilian oversight of law enforcement: Potential union pushback related to civilian law enforcement oversight.
- Which County officials should be elected? Generally in favor of more elections.
- Public financing of campaigns: Mostly pro public financing although there were concerns regarding how it would be paid for and some taxation concerns were expressed.
- Surplus land for housing: The County should have the power to sell land for affordable housing. These would be considered on a case-by-case basis using developed criteria.
- Representation of the family of the deceased in inquests: All should have representation.
- Ranked-choice voting: More confusing and would require more voter education. It would, however, bring a more equitable structure to the voting process.
- Size of the County Council: Yes with the County's population growth, more members would provide more direct contact for constituents.
- Meeting the demand: Get light rail done sooner.

Group 2:

- Civilian oversight of law enforcement and surplus land for housing were both important to the group.
- Ranked-choice voting had some interesting pros, but overall it is probably more complicated than it is worth.
- There were a lot of questions about how each of these would be implemented.

Public Comment

Members of the public commented on what brought them to this meeting.

Wrap Up

The meeting was adjourned at 8:54 p.m.



King County

Charter Review Commission

February 20, 2019
Chief Kanim Middle School
Fall City, WA
Community Outreach Meeting

Meeting Minutes

In Attendance:

Louise Miller (Co-Chair), Tim Ceis, Elizabeth Ford, Sean Kelly, Jeff Natter, Toby Nixon and Brooks Salazar

Excused:

Joe Fain, Ian Goodhew, David Heller, Michael Herschensohn, Linda Larson, Clayton Lewis, Marcos Martinez, Nat Morales, Nikkita Oliver, Rob Saka, Beth Sigall, Ron Sims, Alejandra Tres, Kinnon Williams and Sung Yang

King County Councilmembers, Council and Executive Staff:

Councilmember Kathy Lambert, Patrick Hamacher, Director of Legislative Analysis, Calli Knight, External Relations Specialist, and Mac Nicholson, Director of Government Relations

Also in Attendance:

Meeting facilitator Betsy Daniels, Co-President, Triangle Associates, Inc., and Mishu Pham-Whipple and Kizz Prusia, Project Associates, Triangle Associates, Inc.

The meeting was called to order at 7:15 p.m.

There was no one present to provide public comment.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

[Blank Page]



King County

Charter Review Commission

February 26, 2019

Federal Way Community Center
Community Outreach Meeting

Meeting Minutes

In Attendance:

Louise Miller (Co-Chair), Ron Sims (Co-Chair), Joe Fain, Elizabeth Ford, David Heller, Michael Herschensohn, Toby Nixon, Rob Saka, Brooks Salazar and Sung Yang

Excused:

Tim Ceis, Ian Goodhew, Sean Kelly, Linda Larson, Clayton Lewis, Marcos Martinez, Nat Morales, Jeff Natter, Nikkita Oliver, Beth Sigall, Alejandra Tres and Kinnon Williams

Council and Executive Staff:

Kelli Carroll, Director of Special Projects, Patrick Hamacher, Director of Legislative Analysis, and Mac Nicholson, Director of Government Relations

Also in Attendance:

Meeting facilitator Betsy Daniels, Co-President, Triangle Associates Inc., and Mishu Pham-Whipple, Project Associate, Triangle Associates, Inc.

Welcome and Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 7:03 p.m., and the Commissioners and staff introduced themselves.

Overview of Agenda/Meeting Protocols

Ms. Daniels explained the process for the evening.

Charter Review Overview

Patrick Hamacher provided a presentation regarding the history of the Charter and the Commission, an overview of prior changes to the Charter, an outline of the

Charter process, and a summary of the primary topics that the current Commission is addressing.

Small Group Instruction

Attendees were asked to break into three groups, consisting of both the public and Commission members, to address the topics listed on the handout provided along with any other relevant topics of interest.

Small Group Report Out

Group 1:

- Workers' Bill of Rights – built into the framework of the Charter. Most of the work has been done. A lot of the framework has been passed, just a matter of protecting it. Could be a model for cities that don't have the framework.
- Project labor agreements being the preferred method of contracting with King County should be written into the charter. This will ensure timely completion of projects without labor unrest. Adding a community workforce agreement would allow access to employment for people living within those communities, and that money would cycle back into the same community.
- Elected positions – feel that we have done quite well with the currently elected positions.
- Size of County Council – no definitive outcome to discussions.
- Ranked-choice voting – Would be interesting to hear what the King County Elections department thinks about this.
- Civilian oversight of law enforcement – OLEO is doing a good job. Not a great deal of input on this.
- Surplus land for housing – Do long-term leasing; agree to keep affordable, then sell for profit when aged out on those built by the Housing Consortium; things that are kept in King County housing, we can control them so they are not lost.
- Changing King County Demographics – Economically disadvantaged being pushed south; services have remained north but the populations are moving south – how to get them to match up with each other.

Group 2:

- Senior issues – Don't seem to be well represented in King County. Would like to see a senior council or commission; public utility discounts; limit taxes on seniors – particularly property taxes; and update qualifications for senior benefits.
- Section 840 related to anti-discrimination – one individual felt that it doesn't include protection for political affiliation, veteran status or caretaker status – that should be remedied.
- Veteran council or commission – one individual expressed a desire for such an entity to deal with King County veteran issues.

Group 3:

- Distribution of services and resources throughout King County – south King County seems to be the dumping ground; disparity between north and south King County with the allocation of resources and with affordable housing Federal Way

gets a huge amounts of 100%, 30% AMI housing projects with large families and it floods the school district and the funding is not provided for the schools or police; a little bit of school impact fee but overall is taxing the community.

- Public financing of campaigns – Seattle program has helped individuals feel like they can be part of a campaign and support a campaign, but we do not like the idea of being taxed.
- Having an elected Sheriff and Director of Elections – has direct effect on citizens and government participation and direct influence. Director of Elections may have an appearance of malfeasance or ill intent when they make decisions during an election year for themselves. For the Sheriff, how running once every four years when overseeing an entire agency that is responsible for constitutional policing, that might not be enough accountability for the top law enforcement officer in the county. Equity training would be good for the police force across King County. Some areas that are more diversified may get it on the job, but other areas may need more training. Some wanted Sheriff's term to be shorter so they have to be accountable to the voters more often.
- Priority hiring – talked about its importance.
- Civilian law enforcement oversight – discussed need for proper tools to get and share documents through subpoena power or other means.
- Representation of deceased family in inquests – it is important.
- Affordable housing - Accountability within the affordable housing programs - County should have more accountability to start investigating the companies who build and make sure they are doing things the way they should be. Equity and balance across the County.
- Size of Council – More members would provide better opportunity for more representation.
- Ranked choice voting – some support for this.
- Prosecutorial discretion – re-offenders, do something with behavioral health and substance abuse disorders, how are victims involved and what are their rights. It's a big priority.
- Inquest representation of deceased victims – helps more for police accountability.
- Workers bill of rights – cost of services would go up so cities wouldn't be able to use those services.
- Accountability – when offenders go to the hospital make sure that they get the services they need (e.g., mental health, housing, etc.) so they aren't released back into the community to reoffend.
- Affordable housing – provide housing that people can actually buy instead of rent.

Public Comment

- More timely communication and outreach was requested for any further public forums.
- Questions about excess land:

It was explained that the County owns thousands of pieces of land, some were purchased but never used for their intended use so they may become surplus. Recent changes in state law allow us to sell it for less than fair

market value for certain uses like affordable housing. The money would stay with whatever agency originally purchased it. Currently, if the general fund owned it, we could not sell it for less than fair market value, but the proceeds could be used for affordable housing. This would allow more options for all of the other county funds that actually own the land.

What stops builders from building the higher end affordable housing in the higher end areas and the lower end affordable housing in the lower end areas – we want to focus on equity and social justice.

Is there any kind of oversight to make sure there are no sweetheart deals coming along with this program? Should be fair market value for the land, regardless of what the use is.

In the Growth Management Act, in incentivizing affordable housing, if the developer gets the property for below market value and they don't have to pay property taxes for 6-12 years that doesn't help the community that needs the services.

- Ranked-choice voting and multi-member council districts – it seems as though a lot of people feel they aren't being adequately represented by their King County Councilmembers and that services are not necessarily being directed towards them to the same degree that they are needed. Ranked-choice voting and multi-member districts could potentially help alleviate that. Our current system is the top two, which doesn't necessarily reflect the full spectrum of beliefs, philosophies and desires of our citizenry. Gives people more options and information.

Ranked-choice voting could really help sort through the strengths and weaknesses when you have numerous truly good candidates.

- How do we get more people running for office?

The year there were only four candidates for County Executive, there was a very strong incumbent.

- As a veteran, I came home to my community in 2013. I wanted to become a paramedic but there was no institution in Western Washington that afforded that opportunity. I used my GI Bill to get that training in Michigan. When I came back to King County I realized that it does not provide reciprocity to paramedics. Would like to see changes within the County to recognize and take care of its veterans.

Wrap Up

There will be a report that will go to the County Council which will provide recommendations for amendments to the Charter. The Council will consider the recommendations and vote to determine which will move forward to a vote of the people. There will be another public outreach component prior to the Council vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:52 p.m.



King County

Metropolitan King County Council

Charter Review Commission

Process and Meeting Protocols

Draft v.3-8-19

ARTICLE I: GENERAL

Section 1: Purpose

This document is intended to establish the process and meeting protocols for the King County Charter Review Commission to discharge its duty under Section 800 of the King County Charter.

The King County Charter is the basic governing document for King County government, which was created by the people of King County “in order to form a more just and orderly government, establish separate legislative and executive branches, insure responsibility and accountability for local and regional county governance and services, enable effective citizen participation, preserve a healthy rural and urban environment and economy and secure the benefits of home rule and self-government, in accordance with the Constitution of the State of Washington.” King County Charter, Preamble.

Section 800 of the Charter requires a decennial review of its provisions by a citizen commission:

Section 800 Charter Review and Amendments.

At least every ten years after the adoption of this charter, the county executive shall appoint a citizen commission of not less than fifteen members whose mandate shall be to review the charter and present, or cause to be presented, to the county council a written report recommending those amendments, if any, which should be made to the charter. Appointees shall be subject to confirmation by a majority of the county council. This citizen commission shall be composed of at least one representative from each of the county council districts. The county council shall consider the commission's report and recommendations and decide at an open public meeting how to proceed on each of the commission's recommended charter amendments, as provided by ordinance.

The county council may propose amendments to this charter by enacting an ordinance to submit a proposed amendment to the voters of the county at the next general election occurring more than forty-five days after the enactment of the ordinance. An ordinance proposing an amendment to the charter shall not be subject to the veto power of the county

executive. Publication of a proposed amendment and notice of its submission to the voters of the county shall be made in accordance with the state constitution and general law. If the proposed amendment is approved by a majority of the voters voting on the issue, it shall become effective ten days after the results of the election are certified unless a later date is specified in the amendment.

The 2018-2019 Charter Review Commission has begun the process of reviewing the King County Charter and making recommendations for amendment. This document is designed to set out the process that the Commission will use.

Section 2: Structure

The Commission is made up of up to 22 members appointed and confirmed as required by Section 800. The Council also appointed two members to serve as Co-Chairs of the Commission. The co-chairs are Louise Miller and Ron Sims.

The Commission is supported by staff from both the King County Council and the King County Executive.

The work of the Commission will be supported by an independent facilitator and project manager (“project management team”).

ARTICLE II: OBJECTIVES AND WORK PRODUCTS

Section 1: Objectives

The Commission will, with the support of King County staff and the project management team:

Review Charter review history and the current Charter to determine recommendations for amendments, if any, to be considered by the King County Council;

Consider the perspective of King County Councilmembers and other King County Officials regarding elements of the Charter that need to be amended and for what purpose;

Consider the perspective of members of the public, urban and rural residents and other interested communities regarding elements of the Charter that need to be amended and for what purpose; and

Develop recommended amendments to the Charter, in consultation with county staff and advice from the King County Prosecutor’s Office.

Section 2: Process to Develop Recommendations

The Commission will strive to follow these general guidelines for developing amendment recommendations. A draft timeline and work plan for implementing this process will be included as Appendix A once finalized.

- I. **Information Gathering:** Commissioners will gather information from the County Council, other King County officials, and the public. Commissioners will also have the opportunity to request relevant background and historical information from staff.
- II. **Charter Amendment Categories:** The Commission will group the amendments into categories.
- III. **Draft Charter Amendments for each Category:** The Commission will organize into sub-committees to evaluate each Category or a group of Categories, with membership based on each Commissioner’s interests. The sub-committees will develop draft recommendations for the full Commission to review and discuss. The sub-committees will be supported by the project management team and will have access to policy analysis as necessary.
- IV. **Recommendations:** Once the sub-committees have completed their recommendations, and the Commission as a whole has discussed each option, the Commission will determine which recommendations to include in its report to Council using its decision-making protocol described in Article IV, Section 4.

Section 3: Work Products

- I. Staff will produce meeting minutes for each meeting that is open to the public.
- II. Commission sub-groups will be responsible for drafting products for consideration by the full Commission, with support from King County staff and project management team.
- III. Staff will assist the Commission in drafting proposed recommendations for amendments and the final recommendations report for Council.

ARTICLE III: MEMBERSHIP

Section 1: Commission Members, Alternates, Vacancies and Attendance

The table below lists the members of the Commission appointed by the King County Council. It is expected that each Commission member make every attempt to attend each meeting of the Commission.

In the event that a Commissioner cannot attend, Commissioners are expected to notify the County Clerk Sharon Daly by email Sharon.Daly@kingcounty.gov as soon as possible. It is the responsibility of each Commissioner to review the minutes of any meetings where they are not in attendance.

Member	Affiliation	Title
Tim Ceis	Ceis Bayne East Strategies	Partner
Joe Fain	Bellevue Chamber of Commerce	CEO
Elizabeth Ford	Seattle University School of Law/ Fair Work Center Legal Clinic	Distinguished Practitioner in Residence Legal Director
Ian Goodhew	University of Washington Medicine	Director of Government Relations
David Heller	Heller Law Firm	Attorney
Michael Herschensohn	Queen Anne Historical Society	President
Sean Kelly	City of Maple Valley	Mayor

Linda Larson	Nossaman, LLP, Seattle	Partner
Clayton Lewis	Arivale	CEO and Co-Founder
Marcos Martinez	Casa Latina	Executive Director
Louise Miller	King County Council	Former Councilmember
Nat Morales	US Senator Patty Murray	King County Outreach
Jeff Natter	Pacific Hospital Preservation and Development Authority	Executive Director
Toby Nixon	City of Kirkland Washington Coalition for Open Government	Councilmember President
Nikkita Oliver	Creative Justice	Advocacy Director
Rob Saka	Microsoft	Attorney
Brooks Salazar	State of Washington	Judicial Clerk
Beth Sigall	Eastside Education Network	Founder
Ron Sims	HUD	Former Deputy Secretary
Alejandra Tres	Municipal League of King County Foundation	Executive Director
Kinnon Williams	Inslee Best Doezier and Rider, PS	Attorney/Shareholder
Sung Yang	Pacific Public Affairs	Principal

ARTICLE IV: MEETINGS

Section 1: Meetings

The Commission shall meet on a schedule determined by the Co-Chairs. The Co-Chairs will coordinate with the Commission to select the date, time, and location of any meeting. King County Council staff will email Commission members at least five business days in advance of a meeting to confirm the time and location of the meeting and to provide any materials for that meeting.

Section 2: Methods of Meeting Participation

Commission members may participate in person, via conference call, or other supported audio and/or audiovisual medium.

Section 3: Public Participation in Commission Meetings

The Commission meetings are open to the public and time for public comment will be made available at the start of each meeting. Commission members will participate in the meeting proceedings at the table. All other interested parties may observe the meetings.

Section 4: Decision-Making Protocol

The Commission is encouraged to work toward consensus whenever possible. Roberts Rules of Order will be used to determine areas of agreement and disagreement and to serve as the model for voting if

needed. If consensus is not possible, the recommendations as presented to the Council will indicate areas of disagreement and include divergent perspectives.

The Commission will reach consensus on an issue when it agrees upon a single alternative and each Commission member can honestly say “Whether or not we prefer this recommendation, we support it because it was arrived at openly and fairly, and it is the best decision for us at this time.”

Section 5. Meeting Protocols.

In the spirit of achieving the Commission’s objectives, Commission members will:

- I. Participate regularly (as many meetings as possible) and arrive on time
- II. Provide notice to designated staff in a timely manner if attendance at a meeting is not possible
- III. Come to meetings prepared to contribute to discussions and to listen to others with an open mind
- IV. Share the air time and advocate for all Commission members having a voice in the process
- V. Listen attentively when others are speaking and demonstrate respect for the opinions of other members
- VI. Seek to understand before seeking to be understood
- VII. Let the facilitator know if another participant is behaving disrespectfully or preventing full participation
- VIII. Serve as a conduit of information between the Commission and their constituencies or organizations
- IX. Work to identify paths to consensus on recommendations and other decisions

Section 6. Sub-Committee Protocols.

To be added once approved.

[Blank Page]

Possible CRC Sub-Committees*

Draft v. 3-8-19

Equity for All	Transparency & Accountability	Access	Regional Coordination	Other
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Civilian oversight of KCSO (OLEO) • Representation for families in inquests • Workers bill of rights (from town halls) • Project Labor Agreements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues related to initiative and referendum process • Issues related to the charter review process itself (including language regarding inclusiveness) • Which positions should be elected • Should there be a removal process for elected officials 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes to non-discrimination language • Public financing of campaigns for office • Ranked Choice Voting • Meeting the demands of population growth • Size of the County Council • Election of Public Defender 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues related to the regional committees • Issues related to affordable housing and selling county property below market • Issues related to economic development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes to the budgeting process proposed by Exec and Councilmembers • Changes to Personnel system requested by Exec.

*In addition, Staff will prepare an appendix for the report to Council that contains, technical, grammatical and non-substantive changes that can be forwarded to the Council for consideration and follow-up.

[Blank Page]



King County Charter Review Commission

DRAFT v3-8-19

GUIDELINES FOR CHARTER REVIEW SUB-COMMITTEES

A. Charter Review Sub-Committees will:

- Assign Sub-Committee Co-Chairs to help keep discussions moving forward
- Follow the protocols of the Charter Review Commission to ensure that the process allows for all participants to feel heard and all can contribute to the conversation
- Include both new voices and experienced voices in its membership
- Be expected to operate with less than a quorum to ensure efficiency of public resources
- Be assigned a King County staff member or consultant team member to assist with documenting discussions and deliverables
- Be provided staff support for scheduling meetings and locations
- Develop draft recommendations for consideration by the full Commission in a timely manner
- Report the findings of the sub-committee at all Commission meetings regarding the status of the sub-committees efforts

B. Each topic will be evaluated by the Sub-Committee to communicate the following:

- Purpose and intention of the amendment is to either modernize, simplify, clarify, or clean up language in the charter.
- What outcome is the proposal or recommended amendment intending to achieve?
- Type of amendment being considered?
 - New language
 - Amended language
 - Removal of language
 - Some combination of the above
 - Considered but not a Charter issue
- Legality review outcome by Prosecuting Attorney
- Budget impact score
- Feasibility/Implementation
- Any remaining questions or uncertainty

C. Steps for each Sub-Committee:

1. Purpose Meeting(s) (1-3 meetings):

- a. What is the purpose and intention for each topic?
- b. What is the intended outcome for each topic?
- c. What are the areas of agreement and disagreement on these for each topic?

2. Legality Meeting (1 meeting):

- a. Input from the prosecuting attorney on all the topics being considered and whether the intended outcome is legal within the Charter

3. Report out to Full Commission

- a. Review proposals that are legal to pursue with full Commission and determine (by vote if needed) if there is full or a majority in support of the Commission to proceed with amendment development

4. Budget and Feasibility Meeting(s) (1-2 meetings):

- a. What is the likely budget or fiscal impacts of the proposed amendments?
- b. What are the potential challenges or barriers to implementing the amendment?

5. Finalize an Updated Draft meeting (1 meeting):

- a. Update proposals based on budget, feasibility and feedback from Commission
- b. Review and choose proposed language options from the Prosecuting Attorney

6. Present Recommendation for Amendments to the Full Commission

- a. Report will include a summary of all findings as outlined in Part B