



King County

Charter Review Commission

September 26, 2018

Attendance:

Louise Miller (Co-Chair), Ron Sims (Co-Chair), Tim Ceis, Elizabeth Ford, Ian Goodhew, David Heller, Sean Kelly, Linda Larson (via telephone), Clayton Lewis, Marcos Martinez, Nat Morales, Jeff Natter, Toby Nixon (via telephone), Rob Saka, Alejandra Tres, Kinnon Williams and Sung Yang.

Excused:

Joe Fain, Michael Herschensohn, Will Ibershof, Nikkita Oliver, Brooks Salazar and Beth Sigall.

Council and Executive Staff:

Kelli Carroll, Director of Special Projects, Patrick Hamacher, Interim Director of Legislative Analysis, Callie Knight, Executive Program Assistant, and Mac Nicholson, Director of Government Relations.

Call to Order

Co-Chair Louise Miller called the meeting to order at 6:06 p.m. and asked those at the table to introduce themselves.

Approval of Minutes

Kinnon Williams moved approval of the minutes of the July 24, 2018 meeting. The motion was seconded. There being no objections, the minutes were approved.

Outreach Committee Report

DEMOGRAPHICS: Rebecca Maskin, King County Demographic Planner, provided data related to demographic and economic growth trends in King County from 1980 through 2017.

Findings included:

- Growth has been steady over the past 40 years with 70% growth in the past 37 years.

- 2018 population estimate was just under 2.2 million
- There has been a gain of more than 400,000 person in the past 17 years, about half of that within the City of Seattle, and a large percentage of that comes from people born overseas
- Job growth has remained relatively flat due to double recession, but that trend is starting to reverse.
- Five key trends that have been observed:
 - Economic Diversification
 - In the past, aerospace provided one in seven jobs and most households had one worker.
 - Since then our economy has greatly diversified with employment growing in the corporate, service and retail arenas (while aerospace employment has remained relatively flat) and most households now have two workers.
 - Currently there are about three times as many jobs as there were in the 1970s, with much greater diversification.
 - Increasing Race and Ethnic Diversity
 - In 1990 the majority of minority populations were concentrated within central and south Seattle. Over time these populations have dispersed along the I-5 corridor, particularly to the south, and into the eastside and neighboring counties.
 - Multiple dynamics in play including migration and displacement, however, immigration and inmigration has had a clear impact
 - Most of the growth that has occurred over the past 20 years is attributed to people of color, many who have migrated from overseas, while the non-hispanic white population have remained relatively stable.
 - About half of the population growth over the past 20 years is due to people having children; the other half is due to migration, out of that 50% is due to immigration.
 - As of 2016, about 22% of the people living in King County were born outside of the United States.
 - One in four people living in the County speak a language other than English at home.
 - Dividing the County into three subareas (Seattle-Shoreline, Eastside and South King County) the data shows that each area has diverse populations.
 - Asian and multi-racial populations were broadly represented in all three areas
 - Black, Latinx and other populations are more concentrated in specific areas
 - In 2010 a majority of south King County kids are kids of color
 - Increasing Income Inequality
 - Washington and King County have historically trended above the median household income in the U.S.
 - Income growth has not been shared across the County in terms of geographic areas and demographics.
 - Median income is 63% higher and growing much faster (2008 – 2015) on the eastside than it is in south King County.

- Household income is increasingly polarized - A lot of growth has been seen at the lower and higher ends of the spectrum, but flat or declining growth has been seen in the middle income brackets.
- Over the past 15 years, only a quarter of new households are in that middle income bracket.
- The number of people below poverty level are primarily in the suburbs, and further concentrated in south King County.
- People of color (particularly the Latinx population) are disproportionately affected by income polarization, experiencing poverty at twice the level of the rest of the County.
- Changing Age and Household Characteristics
 - All areas are trending a bit older, with those over 65 spread across the County.
 - Women entering the workforce has driven the long-term increase in employment.
- Shifting Locations of Growth
 - The shift in growth has been notably away from the edges of the County and unincorporated areas, both rural and urban, and toward the cities.
 - King County has grown by 260,000 people in the past eight years, with about half of that being within the City of Seattle.
 - The Growth Management Act and Vision 2040 have both been factors in that shift towards cities.
 - Approximately 98% of permits every year are happening inside the urban growth area

Discussion/Comments:

- A significant number of those working in King County live outside the County
- Population data for the diversity portion is from the decennial census
- Location of immigration and refugee communities – primarily in the south end. The east side has a large growing immigrant population.
- Rebeccah will follow up on information regarding how growth compares to other major urban areas across the US, particularly on the west coast.
- Why is poverty more prevalent in suburbs? As Seattle has become more expensive to live, there may be a shift of lower income people throughout the region.
- Question about Harvard study of Seattle/King County regarding the influence of transportation, particularly buses, on housing location and economic opportunity. Interest was expressed in seeing a transit overlay to showing where people moved for their housing opportunities and employment.
- There are all kinds of ways this information would affect services that the County provides. A question was posed regarding how Commissioners are feeling about how this information would affect the Charter and how it would be used in the context of this Commission.
- I want to gain as much information as I can as it might impact how we approach things. We have a lot of multiculturalism and language issues. Immigrant communities have substantially different needs. If we are going to continue to

serve them affectively we may need more robust language in the Charter. Don't know yet, good information and part of the public outreach may hone that in a bit.

- Is there a way to combine data, e.g., greater number of jobs and persistent income and equality. If there a way to know what those additional jobs are. Nationally there is this xx that compares the changes in productivity with the changes in median income – could we do that for King County (Ford)? RM – I think we could.
- Is there a data point that tracks the number of dual (or multiple) income households? What about military services verterans – where do they fall into these categories? Rebecca will follow up on these.
- The current number of people per household now varies across the County. Over 2 for King County as a whole, but less than 2.5. Seattle is about 2, but in Duvall or Covington it is trending above 3. Rates are changing, household sizes have increased in the past five or so years. Rebecca will find out specifically what it is for King County.
- Would like to know how many adults and kids are in the household. Also, who speaks English primarily or another language primarily.
- Overlay of the areas of poverty and relative wealth, with available social services and quality of life indicators (e.g., hospitals, fire stations, parks, green spaces, food deserts, etc.). We have reports down to the census tract level regarding even life expectancy. The County has acknowledged that place really matters. There is a lot of that data available.
- One change with this growth of immigrant/refugee, people of color populations there has also been a increase of organizations that are artfully developing the leadership of those communities. We will have that in mind as a Commission but will also be looking at organizations that have been around for a long time.

OUTREACH: Alejandra Tres, and Kinnon Williams, provided an overview of the proposed outreach plan for the Charter Review Commission (CRC), to include the following:

- Goal: Establish a base of information from interested parties, including those parties not typically included in civic decision-making.
- Phase one will involve the solicitation of information from a broad range of organizations.
 - A list of outreach groups has been started, looking to Commissioners to provide additional organizations to contact and volunteering to take the lead on making contact with a number of organizations.
 - The solicitation materials will include a letter with background information regarding the CRC, a list of Charter FAQs, notification that they will receive direct contact from a CRC member, directions to the CRC website for more informational materials (demographics, Charter 101 presentation, etc), and a list of questions for each group to respond to. The latter will elicit input while also documenting the Commission's outreach efforts.
- Phase two will involve telephone follow-up to assigned organizations by each commissioner.
 - The phone call provides the opportunity for direct feedback, with the Commissioner taking detailed notes.

- Once assignments have been made, contact should be made within two weeks. If the holidays are an issue for timing, try to set up a special meeting to address.
- Phase three will involve CRC staff compiling and categorizing the input received to assess areas of common interest. Under this proposed timeline, it is very tight timeframe for them to work within.
- Phase four will involve the CRC evaluating the represented populations and addressing whether more outreach is necessary to be more inclusive.
- Following review of the input obtained from the outreach efforts, a draft report with recommendations for potential amendments would be created (by the end of March under the proposed timeline).
- Three town hall meetings will be held throughout the County for public input on the proposed recommendations within the report.
- Input from the town hall meetings would be utilized to draft the final report to the County Council.
- The goal is to get the information packets out by October 24, 2018, to allow about two months to gather responses, prior to drafting and submission of the initial outreach report on January 23, 2019. Availability of initial feedback by late December or early January would be ideal.

All of this is based on the assumption that any changes to the Charter would be placed on the November ballot.

Discussion/Comments:

- Public disclosure concerns and the potential of misrepresentation of what was said during interviews. The need to be aware of potential listener bias and be true to what is being said. Follow up with questions that will obtain clarification when needed. Is it feasible to protect the identity of an organization that wants to provide input but is hesitant to have it attributed to them. Simplicity and honesty are the best approach – let the organizations know straight up that this will be part of the public record.
- Given the timeline, are the efforts that we are asking organizations to go to reasonable? Who makes the determination regarding what feedback is provided and how it is provided, will likely be unique to each organization and interview.
- The Outreach Committee has drafted a consistent set of questions to be used for all interviews so the data collection is consistent. It is not unreasonable to ask people to fill out the questionnaire to eliminate any potential for misrepresentation.
- We need to have translations of whatever material we put out there available. We also need to respect an organization's size, resources and time needs in communicating with their clients. The nuances needed to accommodate these organizational differences.
- Concern regarding people who don't have time or energy to read the Charter. We have these problems but don't know how changing the charter will help us. It would be helpful if we could get feedback about proposals that might be made – how would you feel if this change were made? Or, go out and get their input and once we have that, ask how they would feel if a certain change were made? If this Commission had a process to come up with some proposed changes, and

get feedback on them, it might be very effective. What if we did initial outreach, then the three public meetings. Would it be something we add after we have our draft report done. Send out those draft reports to all of the groups we have contacted in addition to having the public forums. That would be a way, would rather get feedback early on. One problem with town meetings is that there is only a certain group of people that show up there. Acknowledge that this is a much more accelerated time line than the last Charter Review Commission,- we could do smaller groups in different geographic areas, groups drawn from specific ethnicities, have mini town halls on issues that people are interested in.

- Have Commissioners preview the letter before it is sent out along with the list of who it is being sent to. The initial list of letter recipients can be found on pages 11 to 13 of the meeting materials. The appropriate person to communicate with may be someone other than the executive director.
- What will actually be included in the packet that is mailed out?
- How realistic it is to expect Commissioners to complete their interviews in the allotted time and keep up with the responsibilities of their regular jobs? Perhaps we need to look at the list and reduce it to a representative sample and do an interview by phone.
- The option of a digital survey as an online platform for people to do the questionnaire was proposed.
- Look at where we can aggregate.
- Concern regarding timing and process - can this be done well in a nine month period and how you determine what is a representative sample?
- Along with the formal public hearings, add informal opportunities that involve a subset of the Commission where people can come and ask questions and get information. If they want further information we can follow up with them.
- Ask for help from Sound Cities Association to make their members aware that this process is going on.
- Put the initial thoughts for proposed amendments that the Commission comes up with out there for feedback. This may lead to other proposals from the community.
- The process of gathering input is bound to be imperfect, but the key is being mindful of being inclusive.
- What about having a parallel process, perhaps a sub-committee, that would start developing and organizing ideas the Commissioners have about possible Charter amendments. Put those ideas in a separate letter. The first letter solicits general input, and the second letter asks for feedback on specific ideas.
- Would be helpful to know what the Executive and the Council would like to see amended.
- Would also be helpful to have comments from the separately elected areas who would like to provide input. Let them know that if they would like to make a comment, they can.
- Proceed with planning for the mass communication with as many organizations as possible as quickly as possible. Then take a look at list and divide it up by institutions that are well established and won't need any assistance in responding and those smaller organizations that represent underrepresented communities that may need specific outreach. We should acknowledge that and do that work.
- Maybe we can refine the process as we go. The Committee gets the initial communication out, then we come back and look at where we go from there.

- Approval at October 24th meeting of the list, the letter and materials that will go out and the timeline.

Action:

- The outreach sub-committee will work on drafting the letter to be sent out. Once it is approved within the sub-committee, it will be circulated to the full Commission.
- A list of the Commissioners will be included with the letter.
- Commissioners should submit the names of organizations they feel should be included in the Outreach group along with pertinent contact information.
- Commissioners should submit any questions they feel should be included as part of the Outreach questionnaire.
- Commissioners should submit to staff any ideas they have for possible Charter amendments.
- Time will be set aside at the next meeting to start looking at the actual Charter.
- The list of Executive priorities should be available at the October 24 meeting.
- Meeting minutes will be posted to the website.
- Commissioners should let staff know if they want anything added to the Charter Review Commission website.

Next meetings will be October 24, November 28 and December 19, 2018, in rooms 121/123 of the Chinook Building.