



King County

Charter Review Commission Agenda King County Chinook Building

1st Floor Executive Conference Rooms 121/123
401 5th Ave. Seattle, WA 98104

Wednesday, September 25, 2019 | 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.

Purpose:

- Review staff proposed amendment language for reach item
- Review materials for October Town Hall meetings

Agenda Topic	Lead	Time	Attachments
1. Welcome and Review Agenda	Co-Chairs	5 min	
2. Public Comment	Co-Chairs	As needed	
3. Approve 6-26-19 Meeting Minutes	Co-Chairs	5 min	6-26-19 Draft Meeting Minutes
4. Discussion of public comment letters received by Commission	Facilitator	10 min	Public Comment Letters
5. Review Commission decisions to date and discuss remaining proposals for charter amendments	Facilitator	20 min	CRC Proposed Amendment Language Handout
6. Review and approve amendment language and/or justification for each charter amendment.	Facilitator and KC Staff	40 min	
7. Review outreach strategy and materials for October Town Hall meetings	Facilitator and KC Staff	30 min	CRC Town Hall Flyer and Media Advertisement
8. Scheduling and next steps <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review Fall calendar and deliverables	Facilitator	10 min	CRC Meeting Calendar
9. Adjourn	Co-Chairs		

[Blank Page]



King County

Charter Review Commission

June 26, 2019

Meeting Minutes

In Attendance:

Louise Miller (Co-Chair), Tim Ceis, Joe Fain, Elizabeth Ford, David Heller, Michael Herschensohn, Sean Kelly, Linda Larson, Clayton Lewis, Marcos Martinez, Toby Nixon (via telephone), Rob Saka, Beth Sigall, Alejandra Tres (via telephone), Kinnon Williams and Sung Yang.

Excused:

Ian Goodhew, Nat Morales, Nikkita Oliver, Brooks Salazar and Ron Sims.

Council and Executive Staff:

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

Also in Attendance:

Mike Sinsky and Mari Isaacson, Senior Deputy Prosecuting Attorneys, King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office.

Welcome and Call to Order

Co-Chair Miller called the meeting to order at 6:20 p.m.

Public Comment:

There was no one present to provide public comment.

Approval of Minutes

Commissioner Williams moved approval of the minutes of the May 22, 2019 meeting. There being no objections, the minutes were approved.

Review and approve selected proposals from sub-committees

Transparency and Accountability

- Language related to the initiative and referendum process was agreed upon by the Elections Department, Executive staff and Prosecuting Attorney's Office (PAO). Primarily the change brings the Charter into line with state law and the County Code. Section 270.75 is new. This item will move forward to the second round of public engagement.
- Budgeting system proposal: Waiting for clarification from the Executive's office regarding the origination of appropriation ordinances by the County Council outside of the budget process. This item will be deferred for discussion at the commission's September meeting.
- Removal process for elected officials: The subcommittee has agreed on language for the removal of elected officials (except judges) from office. The Courts definition of malfeasance and misfeasance, is it an objective legal standard or have the courts left it up to the legislative body, will be provided. This item will move forward with the understanding that more information is to come.
- Sheriff as an appointed position: The sub-committee is recommending that the position of sheriff be changed to an appointed position. The PAO will provide feedback regarding how things would work if the election of sheriff and the change to the Charter making it an appointed position were on the same ballot. The Executive's thoughts on this will be provided. This item will move forward to the second round of public engagement. (There were two objections.)
- Increase independence of the Public Defender: Additional information was provided in the meeting materials regarding increasing the independence of the public defender. This information will be discussed in conjunction with the public engagement comments. The King County Public Defense Advisory Board will be invited to give a brief presentation regarding the recent letter they sent to the commission concerning their proposed amendment to the charter.

Equity for All

- Changes to Charter Review Commission process: Change the time frame for the convening of the Charter Review Commission from every ten years to every five years. This item will not move forward.
- Commission membership: Change the membership of the Commission to require inclusion of specified representation for various groups. It was agreed that the following sentence would move forward: "The Charter Commission shall be reflective of the County in terms of its racial and ethnic diversity, age, socioeconomic class, sexual orientation, language, and geography." This item will move forward to the second round of public engagement.
- Additions to the non-discrimination language were proposed. This item will move forward to the second round of public engagement pending further information from staff.
- Add the following concept to section 550, Career Service Positions, of the Charter: "such other leadership positions as determined by ordinance". This item will move forward to the second round of public engagement.

- The sub-committee will meet again to refine their remaining recommendations and bring them back to the full Commission in September.

Scheduling and next steps

- Next meeting – September 25, 2019
- Other meeting dates – October 9 and 23, November 6 and 20, 2019

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

DRAFT

[Blank Page]

From: Rich Stolz <rstolzster@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 20, 2019 12:24 PM
To: Review, Charter
Cc: eric@entrehermanos.org; Lilliane Ballesteros
Subject: Feedback on the Charter Review
Attachments: June 18 Comments on King County Charter.docx

Dear Charter Review Commission:

Please find attached comments submitted on behalf of OneAmerica, Latino Community Fund and Entre Hermanos on various aspects of the King County Charter. Given the importance of this process, we hope that these comments will lead to robust discussion on topics that are of importance to the broader community, including immigrant and refugee communities, communities of color and members of the LGBTQ community in King County. Please feel welcome to reach out with any questions you may have.

Sincerely,

Rich Stolz
OneAmerica

Sent with [Mixmax](#)

June 18, 2019

To: King County Charter Commission

Recommended Changes to the King County Charter

Thank you for this opportunity to provide recommendations that would modernize the Charter and ensure that the Charter fully reflects a series of initiatives across King County to strengthen the County's commitment to racial and social equity. The recommendations included in this memo are provided sequentially, following the content of the Charter.

Preamble. We recommend adding to the Preamble language that defines the term "racial equity" being used by the County. Of particular value would be language describing the County's commitment to end disparities in health outcomes based on race and zip code.

We also recommend replacing the term "citizen" with "resident" throughout the document, except where using the term resident may not be consistent with requirements under the State constitution (e.g., voting).

Section 260 – Office of Citizen Complaints. This provision raised questions about what the "Office of Citizen Complaints" is, how it functions in the County Government, and what efforts have been made to make this Office accessible to the broader community.

Instead of an "Office of Citizens Complaints" we recommend establishing a new agency in County Government that would be a "Community Advocate" modeled after the Public Advocate position that exists in New York City, an elected position. This recommendation is touched on later in this memo under sections where such a recommendation appears to be appropriate.

Section 265 – Office of Law Enforcement Oversight. It is not entirely clear that the language in the Charter is consistent with the duties and functions of the Office as it currently exists. We recommend reviewing this language to ensure that it reflects the intent of the existing ordinance related to this office.

Section 270.10 – Regional Committees. We recommend that the County Charter establish additional regional committees:

Regional Committee on Criminal Justice Reform. The criminal justice system reflects a lion's share of the County Budget, and while there are multiple efforts across the County to address racial disparities in the criminal justice system, establishing a Regional Committee would serve as a new center of gravity at a higher level of authority that would squarely examine reforms to the system. We also recommend that the Charter expressly include and define as the mission of the Committee to transition the mission of the system to adopt a transformative justice framework that prioritizes rehabilitation and accountability over punishment, and adopts the County's goals with regard to zero youth detention.

Regional Committee for Housing Affordability and Displacement Prevention. Separate jurisdictions across the County are engaging in efforts to protect lower-income communities, businesses and non-profit organizations, and residents from being displaced due to rising property values. But a regional framework is critical to addressing these issues, including the location of “workforce housing” and other affordable housing options.

Regional Committee for Climate Resiliency and Pollution Prevention. The Charter Commission also has the opportunity to establish a Committee charged with exploring regional strategies – building on multi-jurisdictional commitments to reducing greenhouse gas emissions – that would reduce greenhouse emissions and related airborne pollutants, mitigate the impact of climate change causing pollution on environmental justice communities, and examine strategies for climate resiliency and adaptation.

Section 270.20 – Composition of Regional Committees. The Charter should further “democratize” the Regional Committees. Each Regional Committee should also have an advisory commission comprised of local residents, particularly focused on centering the voices of impacted communities and residents. If the Charter includes a Community Advocate, per our recommendation, that position should also serve on the Regional Committees.

Add to Section 350 a new sub-section that establishes the Office of the Community Advocate as an Executive Department, with an elected Director. The Office, which can be modeled on a similar office that exists in New York, should have the following functions: an inspector general role that can investigate County Government, responsibility for shepherding and coordinating the various Boards and Commissions in County Government, and responsibility for coordinating and supporting culturally competent public and community outreach efforts for King County Government.

Add to Section 470 a new sub-section that authorizes the County to establish by ordinance an infrastructure bank in order to generate capital and investment to advance County priorities.

Section 510 (Under Article 5 – The Personnel System) insert language clarifying that legal permanent residents are eligible for all County positions, and include the prioritization of qualifications related to life experience reflective of communities served (e.g., race, income, etc.) in addition to professional qualifications. We also recommend including language placing a priority on bilingual staff, authorizing the County Executive to incentivize the hiring and retention of individuals fluent in more than one language.

Article 6 – Elections. In Section 630, clarify that the County strives to ensure that elected representation is proportionally representative of the total population (not just registered voters), and authorize the County Council to enact legislation to lead to this outcome.

We also recommend that the Charter include language that asserts that citizenship is not a requirement for voting, running for office or holding office, subject to limitations under state or federal law.

We also recommend a new section 600 that adopts language from the WA Voting Rights Act affirming the right to vote.

Section 650.30 – Districting. We recommend adding language drawn from the WA Voting Rights Act that prohibits racially polarized voting and adopts mechanisms to adjust district lines and election systems that can generate greater voting rates and ensure proportional representation.

Section 690.10 – Limits on Campaign Contributions and Expenditures. We recommend inserting language directing the Council to enact legislation creating a publicly funded election system that includes mechanisms, like “Democracy Vouchers”, that can democratize campaign finance.

Section 800 – Charter Review and Amendments. Instead of reviewing the Charter every 10 years, we recommend that the review take place every 5 years in order to allow for more consistent community engagement.

We also recommend language in the Charter that clarifies that the Commission be a resident commission that reflects the diversity of King County.

We further recommend that lobbyists and County government contractors not be allowed to serve on the Commission, in order to ensure that seats on the Commission go to community residents and to prevent any potential conflicts of interest.

Section 815 – Contracts and Procurement. Insert language that a) requires a tangible community benefit to all County-funded projects, including pre-apprenticeship and apprenticeship mechanisms, affordable housing and equitable development strategies, and that all contractual requirements include language upholding worker rights, protections, wages.

We also recommend language that asserts that the County, within state requirements, has the authority to gift property or sell property at below market value for the purpose of equitable economic development and preservation of affordable residential and commercial property.

Section 830 – Public Inspection of Public Records. Either add to this section or create a new section that establishes privacy requirements related to data on residents collected by the county, taking into consideration the role of video, facial recognition and other forms of surveillance where data may be used for purposes other than intended.

Seattle recently enacted an ordinance that established a public review process intended to establish greater public accountability for expenditures made by the jurisdiction to ensure that certain surveillance technologies be analyzed through a racial equity lens, that the technologies

(and data gathered through the technologies) are not used for purposes beyond their intended use.

Section 840 – Antidiscrimination. We recommend that the Commission include “immigration status” and “criminal history” as protected classes.

Section 895 – Mandatory Inquests. We support recommendations from the community to reform the inquest system. Please contact us for further information.

Section 897 – High Conservation Value Properties. Include language that applies the principle of land conservation to both natural resources and for the purpose of preventing displacement. This section should also allow for the equitable development of land conserved for the purpose of addressing displacement and economic inequity.

[Blank Page]

King County Public Defense Advisory Board

Kimberly Ambrose, Chair
PDABB10@kingcounty.gov

Louise Miller, Co-Chair, Charter6@kingcounty.gov
Ron Sims, Co-Chair, Charter9@kingcounty.gov
King County Charter Review Commission

SENT BY EMAIL

RE: Proposed amendment to King County Charter Section 350.20.60

Dear Commrs. Miller and Sims,

I write on behalf of the Public Defense Advisory Board to request an amendment to the King County Charter. The Public Defense Advisory Board (“PDAB”) was established in 2014 to advise the Department of Public Defense (“DPD”), a newly created County Department, and to make recommendations to the County Council and Executive on matters of equity and social justice related to public defense. King County Charter Section 350.20.65; K.C.C. 2.60.031. The Board consists of 11 [members](#) with substantial experience and expertise relevant to the work of DPD, including familiarity with advocating on behalf of accused individuals who are indigent.

Independence of the public defense function is critical to ensure the constitutional rights of poor defendants.¹ Public defenders have both a constitutional and ethical duty² of undivided loyalty to their clients, when representing them against accusations brought by the government. The King County Charter and the Ordinance enacted to implement the Charter recognized this unique relationship between public defenders and the government.

King County Charter Section 350.20.60 currently provides as follows:

Elected officials shall not interfere with the exercise of these duties by the department; however, the enactment of appropriation ordinances does not constitute interference. The department shall not have its duties, as established in this section, decreased by the county council or the county executive.

The King County Ordinance strengthens the independence of DPD by proscribing the duties of the Public Defender to include:

Ensuring that the American Bar Association Ten Principles for a Public Defense Delivery System, as approved by the American Bar Association House of

¹ “[A] defense lawyer best serves the public not by acting on the State’s behalf or in concert with it, but rather by advancing the undivided interests of the client,” *Polk Cty. v. Dodson*, 454 U.S. 312, 318–19, 102 S. Ct. 445, 450, 70 L. Ed. 2d 509 (1981). The Supreme Court concluded in *Polk County* that “a defense lawyer is not, and by the nature of his function cannot be, the servant of an administrative superior” *Id.* at 321.

² These ethical duties are proscribed by the Washington Rules of Professional Conduct.

Delegates in February of 2002,³ guide the management of the department and development of department standards for legal defense representation... of the county public defender's efforts in that regard.

KCC 2.60.026A.4

The Board recommends additional language be added to the Charter to provide consistency with the Ordinance and to clarify that appropriations will not be used as a mechanism to interfere with DPD's constitutionally and ethically required duties:

Elected officials shall not interfere with the exercise of these duties by the department; however, the enactment of appropriation ordinances does not constitute interference. The department shall not have its duties, as established in this section, decreased by the county council or the county executive- If such ordinances do not impair the department's ability to comply with the American Bar Association's Ten Principles of a Public Defense Delivery System (2002), the Washington Rules of Professional Conduct, or any other obligation imposed upon the Department by law. The department shall not have its duties, as established in this section, decreased by the county council or the county executive.

We believe that this minor addition to the Charter will help ensure that DPD retains the independence required to perform its critical function protecting the constitutional rights of accused individuals in King County who are indigent.

Thank you for your consideration and for all of your work on behalf of the residents of King County. Please do not hesitate to call or email if you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,



Kimberly Ambrose
Chair, King County Public Defense Advisory Board
PDAB10@kingcounty.gov
206.245.5285

Cc: Patrick Hamacher, Patrick.Hamacher@kingcounty.gov

³ The Ten Principles were adopted by the ABA in 2002 as a practical guide for government officials, policymakers and other parties to set forth the fundamental criteria for designing and maintaining an effective, efficient and high quality public defense delivery system for indigent defendants. The principles can be found at: https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/legal_aid_indigent_defendants/ls_sclaid_def_ten_principlesbooklet.authcheckdam.pdf.

To: King County Executive
King County Council
King County Charter Review Commission

From: George Cheung, More Equitable Democracy

RE: Reforming the King County Charter Review Process

Date: August 27, 2019

Each generation, people who are governed by a core set of rules and structures ought to be able to kick those proverbial tires and reform them if they aren't working. This is the rationale for why, in 1968, the framers of the King County Charter included a provision for an official charter review process every 10 years. At a minimum, this process should educate the public about how we govern ourselves, provide a space for dialogue on what's at stake, and encourage thoughtful deliberation that leads to meaningful reforms. The charter has been altered several times over the past decade, including a shift to an elected Elections Director, and a nonpartisan government. How are these reforms working?

The charter review process is also an opportunity to examine our structures from a racial equity perspective to ensure that government is working for all of us, not just those with power and privilege. The trends with regard to elections in King County are troubling. Races for county council are generally characterized as uncompetitive and low turnout, particularly in the primary when electorate is disproportionately richer, older, and whiter. The result is a highly undiverse body; in fact, only three people of color have ever been elected to that body.

That is why I am deeply disappointed in the work of the King County Charter Review Commission and ask that you, our county leaders, take immediate action to engage our communities, particularly communities of color, in a meaningful process.

The following is a partial articulation of the shortcomings of the current process:

1. **No translations.** King County is about 40% people of color, of which a large number are immigrants and refugees. Section 203 of the Voting Rights requires that any election-related materials in this county be translated into Chinese and Vietnamese; subsequent action by the King County Council extended these protections to Korean and Spanish. Though much of the current agenda set by the commission includes important election reforms, not a single document has been translated. Under a strict reading, these laws may only pertain to the work done by King County Elections, but the intent is clear - everyone should have a say in elections and the burden is on the county to make language accommodations.

2. **Virtually no publicity.** There is very little evidence that the county has publicized this process. Its website includes a “social media toolkit” that encourages individuals to post graphics or videos on Facebook and Twitter. However, a search on those platforms brings up only a dozen posts and about the same number of tweets.
3. **Lack of public participation.** The county hosted three “community meetings” in Magnuson Park (2/19), Fall City (2/20), and Federal Way (2/26). I was informed by a charter review commissioner that a total of eight members of the general public (not elected, staff, or consultants) attended the first and last meetings; no one attended the Fall City meeting. I also understand that advocacy groups, including FairVote Washington, which is advocating for ranked choice voting, were never consulted to provide input or answer questions. (I also serve on FairVote Washington’s board.)
4. **Little information about the process.** As of August 27th, though there is a date set for the next meeting, there is virtually no information about what happens from here. In fact, for the last meeting on June 26th, there are no posted minutes (as there are with previous meetings). There is an audio clip of the meeting lasting well over 2 hours. Further, there is no staff person in the county that is accessible to the public. The current webpage only lists a generic email address (CharterReview@kingcounty.gov) - no name or phone number.

It is clear that, with regard to the charter review process, King County has failed to live up to the rhetoric it uses about equity and civic engagement. Part of the problem is lack of leadership and willingness to do the hard work of public engagement. The other part is structural. A charter review commission established and controlled by current elected leaders is highly unlikely to result in reforms that could threaten those in power. This creates an inherent conflict that we must avoid.

I therefore ask the King County Council to pass a resolution for a charter amendment that would do the following:

1. **Create an engagement process using deliberative democracy.** Using a random selection similar to the jury process, the county should create a “community assembly” of 50 or more delegates that are a true reflection of King County’s diverse communities. This group would meet several times over the course of 3-6 months in order to learn about the charter, what are contemporary challenges, what are the range of options, and then deliberate on solutions. Participants should be offered interpreting services and monetary stipends to cover their time and expenses. This methodology is well established in [Canada](#) and Europe with recent pilot projects in [Minnesota](#).
2. **Empower this body to refer amendments directly to the ballot.** Right now, the charter review commission can only recommend reforms to the county council, which is

free to ignore them. If we believe in the democratic process, then we must trust the work of the deliberative body and empower them to refer whatever they decide directly to the ballot for a vote of the people.

The charter review process is a critical part of establishing legitimacy for our local representative government. I ask that you take this opportunity to learn from this shortcoming and take a big step towards racial equity and participatory democracy.

[Blank Page]

Proposed Charter Amendments

Initiative and Referendum Process Updates and Clarifications: The CRC's proposals regarding the initiative and referendum process are mostly technical. The proposed changes align timelines in the Charter with those expressed in state election law and include other clarifications to the Charter's initiative and referendum process.

This proposed ordinance is summarized as follows:

- §230.40 – Clarify that it is the *intent to file* a referendum that must be submitted before the original effective date of an ordinance, not the *signed petitions*.
- §230.40 – Specify that referenda should appear only on general election ballots to avoid the cost of a countywide special election, unless the Council specifies an earlier date. .
- §230.40 – Change the number of days before an election by which the referendum must be referred to the ballot to match the state election timeline (which is now three months before the election instead of 45 days). The deadline for submission of signed petitions should be far enough ahead of the referral date to allow adequate time for signature verification.
- §230.40 – Simplify the language in this section to use the term “emergency ordinance” defined in §230.30, instead of the full description “an ordinance necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health or safety or for the support of county government and its existing public institutions”.
- §230.50 – Clarify that if the council adopts a submitted initiative, it may not immediately amend the ordinance in order to avoid having to put both the original language and the alternative language on the ballot.
- §230.50 – Specify that initiatives should appear only on a general election ballot to avoid the cost of a countywide special election, unless the Council specifies an earlier date.
- §230.50.10 – Clarify that when the Council “take(s) action” on an initiative proposed by cities it has the option to approve, amend and approve, or reject the initiative.
- §230.75 – Clarify that, if the Council adopts an ordinance submitted as an initiative, it cannot amend it before the two-year window that would have applied if the voters had approved the ordinance at the ballot.

Addition of Leadership Positions to the Exemptions from Career Service: The Career Service System is intended to insulate day-to-day employees from political pressure and patronage. Also known as a civil service system, King County's Career Service System covers most non-executive level employees who work for King County. The County's exclusions from Career Service coverage are individually defined by the Charter. While they are not included in the Charter's list of exemptions, positions like Division Directors and their confidential secretaries are excluded by county code. Thus, there is a risk that these exemptions could be viewed as being inconsistent with the Charter.

The Commission wanted to recognize the need to conform the Charter to the reality of modern day management, where positions like Division Director, Deputy Director, Chief Financial Officer or Chief of Staff may be outside of the traditional scope of career service.

The Commission recommends that Section 550 of the Charter be amended to include “other leadership positions as defined by ordinance.” This will afford the Legislative and Executive branches of County Government sufficient flexibility to determine the particular leadership positions that are appropriate for civil service coverage.

Removal Process for Elected Officials: The Charter Review Commission recommends a Charter amendment that would provide a process to remove elected officials for cause. The possibility of removal of an elected official is an extremely serious issue and the Commission believes there should be a very high standard for conduct justifying removal. As such, the Commission recommends that misfeasance, malfeasance or violation of the oath of office should be the standard for removal. This standard parallels that which applies to the recall of elected officials pursuant to Chapter 29A.56 RCW

The Commission recommends the following section be added to the Charter.

Any officer holding an elective county office may be removed from office, and the office shall be deemed vacant, when the council determines, and an ordinance with that determination is approved by an affirmative vote of at least seven councilmembers, that the officer has committed an act or acts of malfeasance or misfeasance while in office or has violated the officer's oath of office. A councilmember shall not vote on the councilmember's own removal. The council shall provide the officer with due notice setting forth the charges upon which the proposed removal is based and indicating the time and place of the council's consideration. The officer has the right to be present, to be assisted by counsel, to offer evidence and to be heard in the officer's own defense. The council shall adopt by ordinance rules of procedure governing the time, place and conduct of hearings held under this section. An ordinance directing removal is not subject to the veto power of the county executive or to referendum.

County Sheriff as an Appointed Position: The Charter Review Commission recommends a Charter amendment that would reestablish the office of County Sheriff as an Executive appointed position. The Commission believes that an appointed sheriff would better serve the county at this time because:

- Integrity, impartiality, and professionalism are promoted by removing politics from the office of sheriff.
- Current laws foster transparency and access to information in a manner that was not true when concerns about corruption led to an elected sheriff.
- The candidate pool would be national rather than restricted to registered King County voters. Experienced, qualified law enforcement professionals would be more likely to apply for an appointed position.
- The sheriff could be removed for cause if needed; currently there is no process for doing so other than a contested election.

- The sheriff's department would avoid internal negative effects from an election between two internal candidates.

Anti-Discrimination Language: The Commission recommends that additional antidiscrimination language be added to Section 840 of the King County Charter. The antidiscrimination language would apply to King County as an employer and as a contract party and would prohibit discrimination based on a) status as a family caregiver; and b) honorably discharged veteran or military status. Note that the Commission was generally in favor of this approach but exact language has yet to be agreed upon by the Commission.

Inquests (previously recommended as an Early Action Item): The Charter Review Commission recommends that the King County Charter be amended to add the following two provisions: 1) guarantee the right to counsel (at County expense) to families of the decedent for an inquest; and 2) require an inquest to be held where a death might have resulted from a member of any law enforcement agency's action, decision, or possible failure to offer the appropriate care. "Member of any law enforcement agency" includes noncommissioned staff and agents of detention facilities or corrections facilities, to encompass deaths relating to a person's in-custody status. The Commission felt that understanding in-custody deaths, learning from each death, and using information to make positive changes to the system outweighed any concern about cost or having too many inquests.

Affordable Housing language (previously recommended as an Early Action Item): Washington state law changed in 2018 to allow local governments, in some circumstances, to sell publicly owned land for less than full value for affordable housing purposes. The Charter Review process affords the County the opportunity to revise the Charter to reflect this change in State statute, and to remove a charter-based impediment to such sales. Thus, the Commission recommends eliminating the existing Charter language that prohibits such an action. While there may still be a number of other restrictions preventing such sales at below market rates, removing the prohibition will allow the County to have that option should it be otherwise legally allowable. The Commission recognizes the importance of County access to all the options under the law to address the affordable housing shortage facing the County. A report from the Regional Coordination subcommittee is also included as Attachment [X] and contains a number of additional considerations the Council should resolve prior to undertaking actual land sales, should this amendment pass.

Office of Law Enforcement Oversight (OLEO) Subpoena Power (previously recommended as an Early Action Item): The Charter Review Commission recommends that the Office of Law Enforcement Oversight (OLEO) have explicit Charter-based subpoena power as one item in a toolbox to make sure that OLEO can effectively carry out its mandate. The CRC understands that inclusion of this item in the Charter doesn't immediately create the authority; however, there was no compelling reason to not provide the office with this power that other county agencies currently possess. While OLEO subpoena authority currently exists in County Code, the Commission determined that inclusion of subpoena power in the Charter itself sends a strong signal that this important office should have all the investigatory tools necessary to complete its work, even though it is our hope and expectation that a subpoena would rarely need to be used.

KING COUNTY CHARTER REVIEW

The Charter governs our County and is reviewed every 10 years.



The Charter Review Commission wants to hear from you about the changes it is considering!



IN PERSON: Participate in one of three Town Hall meetings across the County.



ONLINE: Provide feedback by emailing us at CharterReview@kingcounty.gov or visit the online Town Hall at kingcounty.gov/independent/charter-review-commission

WHAT IS A CHARTER AND WHY DOES IT NEED TO BE REVIEWED?

Under Washington State law, counties can become “Home Rule” by enacting a charter, which sets forth how the government should be structured and run.

A “charter” is similar to a “constitution” for local governments. The King County Charter was first adopted in 1970.

Every 10 years, the charter requires a “Charter Review Commission” to review the charter and recommend changes. The Commission is an independent body, appointed by the Executive and confirmed by the Council.

WHAT IS BEING CONSIDERED?

- Removal process for **elected officials**
- Strengthening rights to **inquests**
- Adding to current **antidiscrimination language**
- Reestablishing the **County Sheriff** as an appointed position

(See reverse side for more)



King County

For questions and comments, contact CharterReview@kingcounty.gov

PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENTS INCLUDE

INITIATIVE AND REFERENDUM PROCESS



Technical changes related to aligning the timelines in the Charter with changes in State election law, plus other clarifications to the process.



OFFICE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OVERSIGHT (OLEO)

Provide OLEO with subpoena power as one way to make sure OLEO can effectively carry out the mandates of the office.



ADDITION OF LEADERSHIP POSITIONS TO EXEMPTIONS FROM

CAREER SERVICE Clarify which senior leadership positions are exempt from the career service system.



REMOVAL PROCESS FOR ELECTED OFFICIALS

Provide a process to remove elected officials that includes defining the standard of misconduct for removal, as well as the hearing process and voting procedures.



COUNTY SHERIFF AS AN APPOINTED POSITION

Reestablish the Sheriff as an appointed position and promote integrity, impartiality, and professionalism by removing politics from the office of the Sheriff.



ANTIDISCRIMINATION LANGUAGE

Specify non-discrimination against a) the use of a trained service animal; b) the status as a family caregiver; and c) honorably discharged veteran or military status.



INQUESTS

Guarantee the right to counsel to families of the decedent when going through inquest process and clarify that an inquest should be done in the cases where a decedent has died in County custody.



AFFORDABLE HOUSING LANGUAGE

Eliminate the existing language that prohibits the sale of publicly owned land for less than market value. In 2018, WA state law changed to allow local governments to sell publicly owned land for less than market value for affordable housing purposes.

The Charter Review Commission wants to hear from you!



IN PERSON: Participate in one of three Town Hall meetings across the County.



ONLINE: Provide feedback by emailing us at CharterReview@kingcounty.gov or visit the online Town Hall at kingcounty.gov/independent/charter-review-commission

For questions and comments, contact CharterReview@kingcounty.gov

You're invited to a

TOWN HALL MEETING

to talk about the **King County Charter**



King County

The King County Charter Review Commission invites you to provide input on changes to the King County Charter that they are recommending to the King County Council. The King County Charter is similar to the constitution for King County government. Visit kingcounty.gov/charter for more information.

Let's talk about...

- ✓ Returning the King County Sheriff to an appointed position.
- ✓ Protecting family care givers and honorably discharged military veterans from discrimination.
- ✓ Providing a removal process for elected officials who engage in improper behavior.
- ✓ Providing attorneys to families going through the inquest process.
- ✓ Providing subpoena power to the Office of Law Enforcement Oversight, the body that investigates misconduct in the King County Sheriff's Office.

Bellevue

Tuesday, Oct. 15
6:30 p.m.

Bellevue City Council Chambers
450 110th Ave NE
Bellevue, WA 98004

Shoreline

Wednesday, Oct. 16
6:30 p.m.

Shoreline City Council Chambers
17500 Midvale Ave N
Shoreline, WA 98133

Federal Way

Thursday, Oct. 17
6:30 p.m.

Federal Way City Council Chambers
33325 8th Ave S
Federal Way, WA 98003

Seattle

Wednesday, Oct. 23
6:30 p.m.

King County Chinook Building
401 5th Ave, Room 121
Seattle, WA 98104

The ad will be placed in the following publications:

The Stranger

NW Asian Weekly

International Examiner

El Mundo

La Raza Newspaper (Sound Publishing)

Korea Times Seattle

The Facts Newspaper

Seattle Medium

South Seattle Emerald

Runta News (East African)

Bellevue Reporter

Federal Way Mirror

Bothell/Kenmore Reporter

KC-CRC SCHEDULE PLANNER 2019-2020

PROJECT	CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION	Calendar for Charter Review Commission Sub-Committees, full Commission Meetings and Final Report development.
VERSION	6 MONTH EXTENSION V3-20-19	

PROJECT PHASE	STARTING	ENDING	SUB-COMMITTEES:
1. SUBC: PURPOSE + LEGAL	March 27 to	May 21	EQUITY FOR ALL
2. CRC EARLY ACTION PROPOSALS	April 24	April 24	TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY
3. CRC DETERMINE AMENDMENT PROPOSALS	May 22 5:30-8:30PM	May 22 5:30-8:30PM	ACCESS
4. SUBC: BUDGET+FEASIBILITY +OUTREACH	May 23 to	June 25	REGIONAL COORDINATION
0. CRC STATUS REPORT OUT MEETING	June 26 and	September 11	
5. SUBC FINALIZE AMENDMENT TEXT	June 27 to	September 11	
6. CRC DRAFT AND FINAL REPORTS	Sept 25, Oct 9	Oct 23, Nov 6, Nov 20	OUTREACH - TOWN HALLS

MARCH							APRIL							MAY							JUNE							JULY							AUGUST							
M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	
				1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5	6	7			1	2	3	4	5						1	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7					1	2	3	4
4	5	6	7	8	9	10	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
11	12	13	14	15	16	17	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	
18	19	20	21	22	23	24	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	
25	26	27	28	29	30	31	29	30						27	28	29	30	31			24	25	26	27	28	29	30	29	30	31					26	27	28	29	30	31		
SEPTEMBER							OCTOBER							NOVEMBER							DECEMBER							JANUARY							FEBRUARY							
M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	
						1		1	2	3	4	5	6					1	2	3						1			1	2	3	4	5							1	2	
2	3	4	5	6	7	8	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
9	10	11	12	13	14	15	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	
16	17	18	19	20	21	22	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	
23	24	25	26	27	28	29	28	29	30	31				25	26	27	28	29	30	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	27	28	29	30	31			24	25	26	27	28	29			
30																					30	31																				

Key Dates:

- April 24th** Vote on proposals that would be sent to Council for consideration for this year's Ballot.
- May 22nd** (Extended Meeting) Vote to determine proposals that will move forward for further consideration by the Commission.
- June 26th** Status report from Sub-Committees on budget, feasibility and outreach results for each proposal. Deadline for proposals from subcommittees to staff to develop amendment language.
- September 11th** Review staff proposed amendment language for each topic.
- September 25th** Materials for town hall meetings in October.
- October 9th** CRC discussion of full Draft Report and preparations for Town Halls.
- October 23rd** CRC discussion of feedback from Town Hall regarding full Draft Report.
- November 6th** Final Draft Report reviewed and completed by Commission.
- November 20th** Final Report completed by Commission.