SCA Public Issues Committee
AGENDA
June 12, 2019 – 7:00 PM
Renton City Hall

1. **Welcome and Roll Call** – Christie Malchow, Sammamish, Vice Chair  2 minutes

2. **Public Comment** – Christie Malchow, Sammamish, Vice Chair  10 minutes

3. **Approval of Minutes – May 8, 2019 Meeting**
   Page 4  2 minutes

4. **Chair’s Report** – Christie Malchow, Sammamish, Vice Chair  5 minutes

5. **Executive Director’s Report** – Brian Parry, SCA Policy Director  10 minutes

6. **Regional Transit Committee Appointment**
   ACTION  5 minutes
   Page 13
   Ross Loudenback, North Bend, PIC Nominating Committee Chair

7. **King County Charter Review**
   DISCUSSION  15 minutes
   Page 14
   Brian Parry, Policy Director

8. **Homelessness Response Governance and System Recommendations**
   DISCUSSION  15 minutes
   Page 25
   Christa Valles, Senior Policy Analyst

9. **VISION 2050**
   DISCUSSION  10 minutes
   Page 28
   Brian Parry, Policy Director

10. **King Conservation District Proposed 2020-2024 Rates and Charges**
    UPDATE  5 minutes
    Page 33
    Christa Valles, Senior Policy Analyst
11. **Levies and Ballot Measures in King County**

**DISCUSSION**

Page 43
Brian Parry, Policy Director

12. **Potential Upcoming SCA Issues**

**UPDATE**

Page 44
Brian Parry, Policy Director

13. **Upcoming Events**

a. SCA Public Issues Committee – Wednesday, July 10, 2019 – 7:00 to 9:00 PM (6:00 PM Pre PIC Workshop- VISION 2050 Update) – Renton City Hall

b. SCA Networking Dinner (Greater Seattle Partners CEO Brian McGowan) – Wednesday, July 31, 2019 – 5:30 to 8:00 PM – Renton Pavilion and Event Center

14. **For the Good of the Order**

15. **Adjourn**
Sound Cities Association

Mission
To provide leadership through advocacy, education, mutual support and networking to cities in King County as they act locally and partner regionally to create livable vital communities.

Vision
Capitalizing on the diversity of our cities to lead policy change to make the Puget Sound region the best in the world.

Values
SCA aspires to create an environment that fosters mutual support, respect, trust, fairness and integrity for the greater good of the association and its membership.

SCA operates in a consistent, inclusive, and transparent manner that respects the diversity of our members and encourages open discussion and risk-taking.
1. **Welcome and Roll Call**
PIC Chair Council President Ed Prince, Renton, called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.
28 cities had representation (Attachment A). Guests present included Councilmember Angela Birney, Redmond (PIC Alternate); Alison Bennett, City of Bellevue staff; Colleen Kelly, City of Shoreline staff; Lyman Howard, City of Clyde Hill staff; Jenny Huston, King County Executive staff; Doug Levy, City of Renton consultant; Kate Henry, City of Bellevue Staff; Simon Farretta, King County Council staff; Kelly Rider, King County staff.

2. **Public Comment**
Chair Prince asked if any member of the public would like to provide public comment. Seeing none, Chair Prince closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

3. **Approval of the April 10, 2019 PIC Minutes**
Chair Prince asked if there were any amendments to the April 10, 2019 PIC minutes. Councilmember Hank Margeson, Redmond, moved, seconded by Councilmember Janie Edelman, Black Diamond, to approve the April 10, 2019 minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

4. **Chair’s Report**
Chair Prince reported that the PIC traditionally does not meet in the month of August unless an emergent issue arises necessitating a meeting. Members agreed with this approach for 2019. Chair Prince noted it can be difficult for members to hear speakers during PIC and asked that members limit side conversations to ensure everyone can hear and participate in the meetings.

5. **Executive Director’s Report**
SCA Executive Director Deanna Dawson reported that there will be an SCA Networking Dinner on Wednesday, May 22, from 5:30 to 8:00 PM at the Renton Pavilion and Event Center. The event will feature a panel of legislators providing their perspective on the 2019 legislative session. The sponsor for the event is Gordon Thomas Honeywell.

Dawson said SCA would be receiving the Organization of the Year award from the Municipal League Foundation at their annual Civic Awards ceremony on Thursday, May 9.

6. **Affordable Housing Committee Appointment**
PIC Nominating Committee Chair, Councilmember Ross Loudenback, North Bend, reported that the PIC Nominating Committee met on April 29 to review nominations to serve on the King County Affordable Housing Committee. He said there were many qualified applicants who
would have been excellent representatives of SCA on the committee, but the PIC Nominating Committee was limited to recommending four members and four alternates.

Councilmember Ross Loudenback, North Bend, moved, seconded by Councilmember Chris Roberts, Shoreline, to recommend the SCA board of directors appoint Mayor David Baker, Kenmore; Mayor Debbie Bertlin, Mercer Island; Councilmember Claude DaCorsi, Auburn, and Councilmember Nancy Tosta, Burien, as members; and Mayor Ken Hearing, North Bend; Councilmember Marli Larimer, Kent; Councilmember Ryan McIrvin, Renton; and Deputy Mayor Lynne Robinson, Bellevue, as alternates to the King County Affordable Housing Committee with a term ending December 31, 2020.

Councilmember Chris Roberts, Shoreline, said that at least one of the proposed nominees would be retiring at the end of 2019, which would make a seat available for another person to join the committee.

Councilmember Hank Margeson, Redmond, questioned why the PIC Nominating Committee was recommending appointing a member who would be retiring at the end of 2019 for a position that doesn’t expire until the end of 2020. He also said there was a lack of diversity among the proposed appointees and asked whether the PIC Nominating Committee had taken that into consideration.

SCA Executive Director Dawson said that both issues were raised and discussed by the committee. She said the committee determined that the retiring member would bring continuity to the Affordable Housing Committee based on their participation on the Regional Affordable Housing Task Force, whose recommendations spurred the creation of the committee. Chair Prince added that the PIC Nominating Committee strives to balance a variety of goals to ensure equitable representation for SCA on regional boards and committees.

Chair Prince asked if there was further discussion on the motion. Seeing none, he called for a vote. The motion passed with 27 cities voting yes, and the city of Redmond voting no.

7. 2019 State Legislative Session
Briahna Murray, Vice President of Gordon Thomas Honeywell Government Affairs, reminded members that they had been contracted by SCA to monitor legislation during the 2019 session and to provide weekly updates to PIC members on key legislative priorities. The final legislative report for the 2019 session can be found on the SCA website.

Murray reported that this session was the first year of the two-year biennium. She noted that in the first year of the biennium, the primary task of the legislature is developing the capital, transportation, and operating budgets. The legislature adjourned on-time on April 28.

Murray stated that SCA prioritized housing and homelessness in the 2019 SCA legislative agenda. She said that the final budget included $175 million for the Affordable Housing Trust Fund. She said that the cities that would like to apply for these funds will need to coordinate with the Department of Commerce quickly. She noted that the legislature also passed the
Condominium Liability Act in an effort to spur the development of more affordable homeownership options in the form of condominiums.

Murray reported that the legislature passed House Bill 1406, which allows local jurisdictions to impose a credit against the state sales tax to fund affordable or supportive housing. As this is a credit against the state’s sales tax it results in no increase to the consumer. To collect the tax, a county or city legislative authority must adopt a resolution of intent within six months of the effective date of the bill and legislation to authorize collection within one year. The tax expires 20-years after the jurisdiction first imposes it. The bill includes a formula where a portion or the full amount of the proceeds may be collected by a city or county depending upon whether the other party has implemented the tax or if they have adopted a separate local housing or mental health levy. Detailed information on this formula can be found on the AWC website. SCA staff said they would provide additional information at an upcoming PIC meeting.

Councilmember Chris Roberts, Shoreline, asked if there was a resource that shows how much funding for affordable housing would be generated through the sales tax credit. Murray said that the AWC has developed a chart showing potential annual collections for cities.

Councilmember Hank Margeson, Redmond, asked about House Bill 1923, which incentivizes rather than mandating cities adopt measures to increase density. Margeson said that many cities would like to update their land use planning, but that doing so is expensive. He asked what incentives were included in the bill to assist cities. Murray said that if cities choose to implement policies described in House Bill 1923 then they are eligible for planning grant funding of up to $100,000.

Murray reported that a proposed statewide transportation funding package did not pass. She said the Legislature did not significantly increase revenue to local governments to meet transportation needs, and that the Joint Transportation Committee is tasked with making recommendations to the 2020 Legislature regarding local transportation revenues. She reminded members that the last transportation package was developed over several years.

She said that Representative Pollet sponsored legislation to remove the 1% limit on increases to property taxes, but it received very little traction.

Murray said that state-shared revenues were fully funded in the final operating budget with the exception of the Public Works Assistance Account, which was swept of $160 million. SCA Executive Director Dawson noted that the availability of funds in the Account has a direct nexus to the ability of cities to fund infrastructure projects without adding greater costs to new development and exacerbating the housing affordability crisis.

Murry reported that funding was provided for nine additional classes through the Basic Law Enforcement Academy as requested by cities. The final operating budget also included $16.4 million to continue streamlined sales tax mitigation payments to impacted jurisdictions through 2021.
Councilmember Janice Zahn, Bellevue, asked about House Bill 1219, which allows real estate excise taxes to be used to fund affordable housing. Murray said that this legislation passed, and it allows cities to use a portion of REET 2 funds for affordable housing until 2026.

8. Homelessness Response System Governance
SCA Senior Policy Analyst Christa Valles presented a power point describing work underway between the City of Seattle and King County to consolidate their investments and efforts to combat homelessness into a unified regional agency. Valles walked through several background slides, including a King County Auditor’s report written in May 2018 noting the region’s homeless system is fragmented with not clear authority and consultant recommendations from December 2018 which were previously discussed at the January 2018 PIC.

Several significant issues associated with consolidation need to be resolved before consolidation can occur, including forming a legal entity, resolving staffing and labor issues, designing an organizational structure, and identifying a governance structure and board to oversee the work of the unified agency. Valles noted that the Seattle Mayor and King County Executive have begun to engage their respective Councils and are hoping to have an Interlocal Agreement in place by fall 2019. The King County Executive is keen to engage SCA member cities, and the consultants have offered to hold a workshop for interested SCA members to brainstorm options for a governance board.

Councilmember Traci Buxton, Des Moines, asked whether the new body will be a policy-setting body or a resource for cities and county. Valles said that it will be more than a resource, it will be a policy-setting body with the intention of creating a regional system that provides a consistent level of services across the county. Buxton said the system should be data-driven and based on results, and that cities that are meeting standards for success shouldn’t be mandated to change their approach.

Chair Prince said the new entity’s board needs to include elected officials because they are the people who are ultimately accountable to the public.

Councilmember Chris Roberts, Shoreline, agreed with the need to have elected officials on the board. If local funds are to be used for a regional response, there should be local involvement from elected officials. He said that if the Executive Director of the new entity would be reporting to the Seattle Mayor and King County Executive, the SCA President should also be included.

Councilmember Sue-Ann Hohimer, Normandy Park, asked if mental health and addiction responses would be part of the new agency’s role. Valles replied that she didn’t think these funds would specifically run through this agency, but that everyone recognized the need to create a more cohesive system that provides effective mental health and addiction services for the homeless population. Hohimer also noted the importance of services being accessible to residents throughout the county and the role of access to transportation options.

Dawson asked whether we knew what funding sources the new agency would be responsible for managing or setting policy related to. Valles said that this was currently under discussion
but that she was not privy to the details of which specific funds were under consideration by the City of Seattle and the County.

Councilmember Janice Zahn, Bellevue, said that it will be important to see the geospatial analysis of homeless services and their relationship to the homeless population. She noted that the needs of individuals experiencing homelessness are not the same. She said she agreed that we need to look at how the transportation system connects people to services. Zahn also asked how existing policy bodies and service providers would work with the new structure.

Valles explained the region’s Continuum of Care, All Home, is currently working on a new board structure that would be subsumed under the governance structure of the new agency. Valles noted that All Home oversees approximately $40 million in annual funding and these dollars already come with a lot of requirements imposed by HUD.

Zahn said that SCA needs to have a seat at the table. Having only Seattle and King County leaves a lot of the region’s population out of the process.

Councilmember Tola Marts, Issaquah, said that he was concerned about a recent court decision, referred to as the Boise decision, and what impacts it will have on cities and how they address a range of issues. He said that if consolidation is to occur, then it should result in a unified system not another organization on top of others that only adds to current fragmentation. He also noted the scale of the challenge and that the financial costs of addressing it are extremely high.

Dawson asked if the PIC would be interested in a future workshop on the Boise decision and members affirmed that they would.

Councilmember Pam Fernald, SeaTac, said that the system does need to be under one umbrella and not split up. She said there needs to be a connection with drug addiction and mental illness services, but also services available that may be able to more quickly assist those without those concerns. She said how clients would be connected to services also needs to be considered.

Councilmember James McNeal, Bothell, noted that homelessness is a national issue and there are many different forms of homelessness, including children who are couch surfing. He said SCA cities collectively need to have a voice and that elected officials need to be involved.

Councilmember Hank Margeson, Redmond, said that some SCA communities may have programs in place that are having better success and we need to look at what is working. He said he is concerned this is simply an opportunity to pursue funding. He said the region should find solutions first and let those solutions drive the governance structure.

Councilmember Kate Kruller, Tukwila, encouraged people to go out and talk to homeless people in their communities to better understand their needs. Kruller indicated she would be interested a future workshop on the governance issue.
Councilmember Pam Fernald, SeaTac, mentioned the pre-PIC workshop with consultants in October 2018. At the workshop, several people said they thought faith-based and philanthropic groups have better results than government. Valles noted that most homeless services are provided by non-profits, but the majority of funds flow through government.

Councilmember Tola Marts, Issaquah, said that he is interested in ongoing work internationally to improve public service delivery through the use of artificial intelligence, machine learning, and better understanding what systems work.

9. Initiative 976
SCA Policy Director Brian Parry reported that Initiative 976 (I-976), which was certified as an initiative to the legislature, will appear on the November 19 general election ballot. The legislature had the option of either adopting the measure, taking no action and it would appear on the ballot, or to propose a competing measure that would also appear on the ballot. In April, PIC discussed the impacts of I-976, particularly the impact to city Transportation Benefit District funding. SCA staff said they would come back in May with information about activities that are allowed under state law for public entities.

Parry said that Washington State law (RCW 42.17A.555) broadly prohibits the use of any public facility or resources from being used in support or opposition to a ballot proposition with three limited exceptions:
- Local elected bodies, including city councils, may vote on a motion or resolution supporting or opposing a ballot proposition if the meeting is properly noticed and both sides are given equal opportunity to express their position.
- Elected officials may make a statement at an open press conference in support or opposition to a ballot proposition.
- Local offices or agencies may engage in activities that are part of their normal and regular conduct, which may include preparation of objective and neutral presentation of facts concerning a ballot proposition.

Parry said that Sound Cities Association has not previously taken positions for or against any ballot initiative, and that it is not clear that the exception allowing such a position to be taken would apply to an organization such as SCA. He said SCA has historically considered its role to provide members with factual information and educational materials that can be shared with elected officials, staff, and the community and that SCA staff recommends this type of neutral activity continue to be the role of SCA with regard to I-976.

Parry encouraged members to share moving forward if their city decided to take a position on the measure for informational purposes. Parry noted additional resources are available from MRSC, AWC, and the Public Disclosure Commission for cities that choose to consider taking a position on any ballot measures about the procedures that must be followed under state law.

Councilmember Austin Bell, Burien, said the Burien City Council is considering taking a position related to I-976.
Councilmember Tola Marts, Issaquah, said the Issaquah City Council is also considering taking a position related to I-976.

### 10. King Conservation District Proposed Work Plan and Rates

SCA Senior Policy Analyst Christa Valles provided an update on the April PIC discussion regarding a King Conservation District request to increase rates for the 2020-2024 rate period. KCD is proposing an average rates and charges increase of $3.70 per parcel per year, generating $2.8 million per year over and above current rates and charges revenues, which would bring KCD’s total rates and charges budget to $8.9 million per year for the 2020-2024 period. Valles also noted that KCD receives other revenues for its programming, mostly grants but in recent years, it has also used approximately $2 million of its reserves and $1.6 million from a lawsuit settlement.

Valles said that following the April PIC meeting, the KCD Advisory Committee met and decided that it would be more appropriate to send a letter to the King County Board of Supervisors than a resolution endorsing the rate increase. The current language in the draft letter simply forwards the proposal on for “review and consideration.” It notes the components they believe will be funded with the rate increase should it be adopted, including inflation through 2024. The letter also calls on KCD to not use one-time funds to pay for ongoing program commitments or staff, as had occurred during the 2015-2019 rate period, and to improve its financial planning and reporting.

Councilmember Hank Margeson, Redmond, said it sounded like the KCD Advisory Committee reflected some of PIC’s concerns in the draft letter, but asked if KCD planned to move forward with their proposal regardless. Hank noted that there is a lack of transparency in how things business is conducted at KCD, including transparency of their meetings and election process. He also asked whether KCD considered phasing-in a rate increase.

Valles said that if member cities continued to have concerns, it might be best to contact King County Councilmembers at this point in the process since there was not sufficient consensus among PIC members to approve a formal SCA statement.

Margeson encouraged his colleagues to share concerns with King County Council.

### 11. Levies and Ballot Measures in King County

SCA Policy Director Brian Parry reported on the results of the April 23 special election and upcoming measures in King County. Parry said the bond measure proposed by Evergreen Hospital fell short of the 60% yes vote required for passage with 58.5%. Other funding measures fared better, including a levy proposed by the Lake Washington School District, and fire district benefit charges proposed by Woodinville Fire and Rescue and Fire District 40 in Renton.

Parry reminded members that the countywide Parks Levy will be on the ballot in August. In addition, the EMS levy renewal is anticipated to be on the November ballot. The County Council is currently reviewing the proposal that was developed by the EMS Advisory Task Force. In addition to being approved by the County Council, it must also be approved by 9 of the 11 cities...
in King County with populations above 50,000 (Auburn, Bellevue, Burien, Federal Way, Kent, Kirkland, Redmond, Renton, Sammamish, Seattle, and Shoreline).

Additional information about the EMS levy renewal proposal can be found in the June 2018 PIC packet. (Note: Based on the updated King County financial forecast, the levy rate transmitted by the King County Executive is proposed to be 26.5-cents per $1,000 of assessed value rather than 27-cents per $1,000 recommended by the EMS Advisory Task Force. Total planned expenditures under the levy are unchanged from what was recommended by the Task Force; however, reserves are adjusted upward slightly.)

Councilmember James McNeal, Bothell, noted there was a question at the Regional Policy Committee meeting earlier in the day about why local Native American Tribes are not included in the levy or the process for developing the levy. He said that it is important to ensure that everyone’s voices are included in the effort.

12. Potential Upcoming SCA Issues
SCA Policy Director Brian Parry reported that in June there will be a pre-PIC workshop with a presentation from Metro General Manager Rob Gannon to talk about Metro’s regional service planning and funding needs.

Executive Director Dawson said that SCA would also begin planning a future pre-PIC workshop on a recent federal court decision related to homeless camping known as the Boise decision and what cities have to do to ensure they are in compliance.

13. Informational Items
Chair Prince noted that an informational item is included in the PIC packet related to the update to the King County Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan.

14. Upcoming Events
Chair Prince said there will be an SCA Networking Dinner on Wednesday, May 22, from 5:30 to 8:00 PM at the Renton Pavilion and Event Center. The event will feature a panel of legislators providing their perspective on the 2019 legislative session. Event sponsor is Gordon Thomas Honeywell.

Chair Prince said the next PIC meeting will be held on June 12, 2019 at 7:00 PM at Renton City Hall. A Pre-PIC Workshop on Metro’s Regional Service Planning will be held at 6:00 PM.

15. For the Good of the Order
Councilmember Hank Margeson, Redmond, said that a local business person held the first Cinco de Mayo celebration in their new downtown park. The event attracted people from all around the region.

16. Adjourn
The meeting was adjourned at 8:42 PM.
### Public Issues Committee Meeting
#### May 8, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algona</td>
<td>Dave Hill</td>
<td>Bill Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>Nancy Backus</td>
<td>John Holman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaux Arts Village</td>
<td>Tom Stowe</td>
<td>Aletha Howes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>John Stokes</td>
<td>Janice Zahn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Diamond</td>
<td>Janie Edelman</td>
<td>Tamie Deady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bothell</td>
<td>James McNeal</td>
<td>Davina Duerr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burien</td>
<td>Austin Bell</td>
<td>Nancy Tosta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnation</td>
<td>Dustin Green</td>
<td>Kim Lisk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clyde Hill</td>
<td>Barre Seibert</td>
<td>George Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington</td>
<td>Fran Hollums</td>
<td>Joseph Cimaomo, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines</td>
<td>Traci Buxton</td>
<td>Matt Mahoney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duvall</td>
<td>Michelle Hogg</td>
<td>Jennifer Knaplund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enumclaw</td>
<td>Anthony Wright</td>
<td>Mike Sando</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Way</td>
<td>Lydia Assefa-Dawson</td>
<td>Martin Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunts Point</td>
<td>Joseph Sabey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issaquah</td>
<td>Tola Marts</td>
<td>Chris Reh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenmore</td>
<td>David Baker</td>
<td>Nigel Herbig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Bill Boyce</td>
<td>Toni Troutner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland</td>
<td>Toby Nixon</td>
<td>Jay Arnold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Forest Park</td>
<td>Catherine Stanford</td>
<td>Tom French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Valley</td>
<td>Sean Kelly</td>
<td>Linda Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>Sheree Wen</td>
<td>Alex Morcos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer Island</td>
<td>Benson Wong</td>
<td>Tom Acker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>Shanna Styron Sherrell</td>
<td>Mary Tompkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>Allen Dauterman</td>
<td>Carol Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normandy Park</td>
<td>Sue-Ann Hohimer</td>
<td>Jonathan Chicquette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Bend</td>
<td>Ross Loudenback</td>
<td>Ken Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>Leanne Guier</td>
<td>David Storaasli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redmond</td>
<td>Hank Margeson</td>
<td>Angela Birney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renton</td>
<td>Ed Prince</td>
<td>Armondo Pavone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sammamish</td>
<td>Christie Malchow</td>
<td>Karen Moran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SeaTac</td>
<td>Erin Sitterley</td>
<td>Pam Fernald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline</td>
<td>Chris Roberts</td>
<td>Keith Scully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skykomish</td>
<td>Henry Sladek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snoqualmie</td>
<td>Katherine Ross</td>
<td>Matt Larson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tukwila</td>
<td>Kate Kruller</td>
<td>Zac Idan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodinville</td>
<td>James Evans</td>
<td>Elaine Cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarrow Point</td>
<td>Dicker Cahill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA</td>
<td>Deanna Dawson</td>
<td>Christa Valles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brian Parry</td>
<td>Cynthia Foley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Voting members are highlighted. Cities represented are bolded.
Item 06:
Regional Transit Committee Appointment

ACTION

SCA Staff Contact
Cynthia Foley, SCA Policy Analyst, cynthia@soundcities.org or 206-495-3020

SCA Appointees to the Regional Transit Committee
Members: Councilmember Dave Asher, Kirkland; Councilmember Bruce Basset, Mercer Island; Councilmember Claude DaCorsi, Auburn; Mayor Leanne Guier, Pacific; Councilmember Kathy Hougard, Tukwila; Councilmember Hank Margeson, Redmond; Councilmember John Wright, Lake Forest Park; Alternates: Mayor John Chelminiak, Bellevue; Councilmember Dennis Higgins, Kent; Councilmember Ryan McIrvin, Renton; Councilmember Susan Chang, Shoreline

Action
The PIC Nominating Committee met on June 4, 2019 to consider nominations to fill a vacant member position on the King County Regional Transit Committee for recommendation to PIC. If approved by PIC, the recommended candidates will be considered for formal appointment by the SCA Board of Directors at its next meeting on June 19.

The PIC Nominating Committee recommends the following action:
PIC recommends the SCA Board of Directors appoint Regional Transit Committee alternate Dennis Higgins, Kent, to the vacant member seat, and Mayor Kim Lisk, Carnation, to fill the vacant alternate seat on Regional Transit Committee.

Regional Transit Committee Background
The Regional Transit Committee (RTC) reviews and makes recommendations to the King County Council on policies for public transportation services operated by King County. The committee’s responsibilities include the Strategic Plan for Public Transportation, which is the blueprint for establishing guidelines for allocation of transit service throughout King County; long range planning; and the structure for transit fares. SCA has eight member seats on RTC and four alternates.

Next Steps
Recommendations from PIC will be considered by the SCA Board of Directors at its meeting on June 19, 2019. For more information, contact SCA Policy Analyst Cynthia Foley at cynthia@soundcities.org or 206-495-3020.
**Item 07:**
King County Charter Review

**DISCUSSION ITEM**

SCA Staff Contact
Brian Parry, SCA Senior Policy Analyst, [brian@soundcities.org](mailto:brian@soundcities.org), 206-499-4159

**Discussion**

In July of 2018, King County formed a Charter Review Commission to consider potential recommendations to amend the [King County Charter](https://www.kingcounty.gov/government/charter-89/about/charter-review-commission.aspx).

Among the potential amendments under consideration by the Commission is a proposal from members of the County Council to reform or consolidate the regional charter committees (the Regional Transit Committee, Regional Policy Committee, and Regional Water Quality Committee) to which SCA appoints city representatives. As part of the Commission’s review, the Commission has requested input from SCA.

In response to the request for feedback on possible consolidation of the charter regional committees, SCA has formed a working group including the SCA caucus chairs from each of the three committees. At the June PIC meeting, PIC members will be updated on the discussions of the working group and have the opportunity to provide feedback to guide future discussions with the Commission. PIC may also consider advancing a formal position related to the regional committees and the importance of including city representation in decisions affecting the region.

**Background**

The [King County Charter](https://www.kingcounty.gov/government/charter-89/about/charter-review-commission.aspx) provides that at least every ten years the County Executive appoint a citizen commission to review the Charter and present to the county a council a report recommending amendments, if any. The County Council may then elect to place recommended Charter amendments on the next general election ballot.

The Commission recently decided to divide its recommendations into two phases: “early action” amendments recommended for placement on the November 2019 general election ballot; and an additional set of potential amendments that will be reviewed over the summer and transmitted to the County Council in a final report in November. Among the possible charter amendments that will be considered by the Commission further over the course of the summer is a proposal to consolidate the charter regional committees.

**Proposal to Consolidate the Charter Regional Committees**

The County’s three regional committees – the Regional Policy Committee, Regional Transit Committee, and Regional Water Quality Committee – are required by the King County Charter
and the rules pertaining to their administration are defined in the King County Code (Attachment A). Each committee is composed of representatives from the King County Council, the City of Seattle, and elected representatives appointed by SCA. The Regional Water Quality Committee also includes elected official representatives of local sewer districts.

King County’s three regional committees were first established by charter amendment in 1994 as the governing structure that would allow the King County Government to assume the transit and water quality duties of Metro (aka the Municipality of Metropolitan Seattle). The purpose of the committees to ensure better regional coordination and equal representation for all city and county residents in making decisions that were previously under the authority of the Metro Council, where city officials had seats at the table. Suburban city representatives played an integral role in developing the structure and role of the committees in the charter amendment that was ultimately approved by voters (a contemporaneous article from the Seattle Times provides additional background on the formation of the committees).

Each committee is authorized to propose, review, and recommend action on ordinances and motions to be considered by the King County Council in their respective subject matter areas. The Regional Policy Committee further has the authority to engage in any countywide plan or policy, regardless of subject matter area, if a majority of Committee members vote to include the plan or policy on the Committee’s annual work plan.

SCA members have consistently viewed the regional committees as playing an important role in ensuring regional collaboration by requiring that cities and their residents have a voice in regional decision-making.

During its solicitation of public comments on the Charter, the Charter Review Commission received letters from two County Councilmembers expressing interest in reforming the charter regional committees. County Councilmember Jeanne Kohl-Welles suggested that the Commission “consider having the Regional Policy Committee absorb the work of the Regional Transit and Regional Water Quality Committee and that this new committee meet twice a month – the same as other standing [County] Council Committees.” She said the intent is to “give cities a more effective voice in County operations” than the current regional committee structure.

County Councilmember Dave Upthegrove letter states that “his personal experience has been that the Regional Committee process has been inefficient and ineffective,” and he encouraged the Commission to “look at different strategies to improve coordination and communication between King County and our city partners.”

In May, the Commission decided to review the proposal to consolidate the regional charter committees further and to solicit input from SCA.

In response to the request for feedback on possible consolidation of the charter regional committees, SCA has formed a working group including the SCA caucus chairs from each of the
three committees. That group will consider areas of potential improvement to the operation of the regional committees, and specific challenges with individual committees. An example of a specific issue that has been raised to the Commission is a concern raised by the Cascade Water Alliance over the lack of authority of the Regional Water Quality Committee over wastewater system plans, rates, and connection charges.

At the June PIC meeting, PIC members will be updated on the discussions of the working group and have the opportunity to provide feedback to guide future discussions with the Commission.

**Early Action Amendments**

The Commission is recommending the County Council consider three potential amendments for placement on the November 2019 general election ballot:

- Adopting language consistent with state law stating the county may lease or sell property at less than fair market value for affordable housing purposes.
- Adding language to the charter providing that the Office of Law Enforcement Oversight (OLEO) has subpoena powers when investigating the conduct of county law enforcement officers subject to a complaint or otherwise related to use of force. The County Council adopted Ordinance 18500 in April 2017 authorizing the OLEO to subpoena any person in matters associated with the authority granted to the office.
- Adding language to the charter providing that the county will assign an attorney to represent the family of the decedent during an inquest into the cause and circumstances of any death where a member of any law enforcement agency’s actions may have contributed to an individual’s death. The County Council adopted Ordinance 18652 in January 2018 requiring the Department of Defense to provide legal representation to the family participating in an inquest regardless of the income level of the family.

Additional information related to each of these proposed amendments can be found in the May 22, 2019 Charter Review Commission meeting packet.

The County Council was briefed on the proposed early action amendments at its meeting on June 3. No decision was made at that meeting regarding whether the County Council will place the proposed early action amendments on the November 2019 general election ballot.

**Next Steps**

The Charter Review Commission is expected to continue soliciting feedback and developing recommendations through August. A draft final report of the Commission, including any recommended amendments under consideration, is planned to be finalized in time to present for public comment in mid-October with final action by the Commission anticipated in November. SCA will continue to engage in discussions related to the regional committees and provide future updates to PIC. Questions or feedback can be provided to SCA Senior Policy Analyst Brian Parry at brian@soundcities.org or 206-499-4159.
King County Charter  
Section 270 Regional Committees.

270.10 Regional Committees.

Three regional committees shall be established by ordinance to develop, recommend and review regional policies and plans for consideration by the metropolitan county council: one for transit, one for water quality and one for other regional policies and plans. (Ord. 10530 § 1, 1992).

270.20 Composition of regional committees.

Each regional committee shall consist of nine voting members. Three members shall be metropolitan county councilmembers appointed by the chair of the council, and shall include councilmembers from districts with unincorporated residents. Each county councilmember vote shall be weighted as two votes. The remaining six members of each committee except the water quality committee shall be local elected city officials appointed from and in proportion to the relative populations of: (i) the city with the largest population in the county and (ii) the other cities and towns in the county. Committee members from the city with the largest population in the county shall be appointed by the legislative authority of that city. Committee members from the other cities and towns in the county shall be appointed in a manner agreed to by and among those cities and towns representing a majority of the populations of such cities and towns, provided, however, that such cities and towns may appoint two representatives for each allocated committee membership, each with fractional (1/2) voting rights.

The special purpose districts providing sewer service in the county shall appoint two members to serve on the water quality committee in a manner agreed to by districts representing a majority of the population within the county served by such districts. The remaining four local government members of the water quality committee shall be appointed in the manner set forth above for other regional committees. The council may by ordinance authorize the appointment to the water quality committee of additional, nonvoting members representing entities outside of the county that receive sewerage treatment services from the county. Allocation of membership of each committee’s members who are city and town representatives shall be adjusted January 1 of each even-numbered year beginning in 1996 based upon current census information or, if more recent, official state office of financial management population statistics.

In the event any areas are annexed pursuant to powers granted to metropolitan municipal corporations under state law, the populations of any cities and towns in such annexed areas shall be considered as if they were within the county for purposes in this section with regard to regional committee participation on policies and plans which would be effective in such annexed areas.

Members representing six and one-half votes constitute a quorum of a regional committee. In the absence of a quorum, the committee may perform all committee
functions except for voting on legislation or a work program. Each committee shall have a chair and a vice-chair with authority as specified by ordinance. The chair shall be a county councilmember appointed by the chair of the county council. The vice-chair shall be appointed by majority vote of those committee members who are not county councilmembers, in accordance with voting rights that are apportioned as provided in this section. (Ord. 16205 § 1, 2008: Ord. 10530 § 1, 1992).

270.30 Powers and Duties.

Each regional committee shall develop, propose, review and recommend action on ordinances and motions adopting, repealing, or amending transit, water quality or other regional countywide policies and plans within the subject matter area of the committee. The subject matter area of the regional policies committee shall consist of those countywide plans and policies included in the committee's work program by a majority of the members present and voting, with no fewer than three and one-half affirmative votes.

The county council shall refer each such proposed ordinance or motion, except those developed and proposed by a regional committee, to a regional committee for review. The regional committee shall complete review and recommend action within one hundred twenty days or such other time as is jointly established by the county council and the committee, which shall be confirmed in the form of a motion by the metropolitan county council. If the committee fails to act upon the proposed ordinance or motion within the established time limit, the county council may adopt the proposed ordinance or motion upon six affirmative votes. The committee may request, by motion to the county council, additional time for review.

A proposed ordinance or motion that has been reviewed and recommended or developed and proposed by a regional committee may be adopted, without amendment, by the county council by five affirmative votes. If the county council votes prior to final passage thereof to amend a proposed ordinance or motion that has been reviewed or recommended or proposed by a regional committee, the proposed ordinance or motion, as amended, shall be referred back to the appropriate committee for further review and recommendation. The committee may concur in, dissent from, or recommend additional amendments to the ordinance or motion. After the regional committee has had the opportunity to review all county council amendments, final action to adopt any proposed ordinance or motion that differs from the committee recommendation shall require six affirmative votes of the county council.

Each regional committee may develop and propose directly to the council an ordinance or motion adopting, amending or repealing a countywide policy or plan within the subject matter area of the committee. Such proposals must be approved by a majority of the members present and voting, with no fewer than three and one-half affirmative votes. Within one hundred twenty days of introduction or such other time as is jointly established by the county council and the committee, which shall be confirmed in the form of a motion by the county council and the committee, which shall be confirmed in the form
of a motion by the county council, the council shall consider the proposed legislation and
take such action thereon as it deems appropriate, as provided by ordinance.

The council shall not call a special election to authorize the performance of an
additional metropolitan municipal function under state law unless such additional function
is recommended by a regional policy committee, notwithstanding the provisions of
Section 230.50.10 of this charter. Such recommendation shall require an affirmative vote
of at least two-thirds of the membership of each of: (1) metropolitan councilmembers of
the committee; (2) members from the city with the largest population in the county; and
(3) other city or town members of the committee. Nothing in this section prohibits the
metropolitan county council from calling a special election on the authorization of the
performance of one or more additional metropolitan functions after receiving a valid
resolution adopted by city councils as permitted by RCW 35.58.100(1)(a) and RCW
35.58.100(1)(b), or a duly certified petition as permitted by RCW 35.58.100(2). (Ord.
16205 § 1, 2008: Ord. 14767 § 1, 2004: Ord. 10530 § 1, 1992).

King County Code
1.24.065 Rule 7: Regional committees.
A. Establishment. Three regional, standing committees are established as
provided under the King County Charter to develop, recommend and review regional
policies and plans for consideration by the council: the regional transit committee, the
regional water quality committee and the regional policies committee.
B. Membership.
1. Composition of committees.
a. The regional policies committee and regional transit committee are to each
have nine voting members. Three members of each committee, including the chair of
each, must be county councilmembers appointed by the chair of the council and must
include councilmembers from districts with unincorporated residents. Each county
councilmember vote shall be weighted as two votes. The chair of the county council shall
also appoint the chair of each committee. The remaining members of each committee
must be local elected city officials appointed from and in proportion to the relative
populations of the city of Seattle and the other cities and towns in the county. Cities and
towns other than the city of Seattle may appoint two persons for each of their allocated
memberships in each committee, each person with one-half vote. A vice-chair of each
committee shall be elected by majority vote of the committee members who are not
county councilmembers.
b. The regional water quality committee is to have nine voting members. Three
members of the committee, including the chair, must be county councilmembers
appointed by the chair of the council, and must include councilmembers from districts with
unincorporated residents. The chair of the county council shall also appoint the chair of
the committee. Each county councilmember vote shall be weighted as two votes. The
remaining members of the committee must be local elected city officials appointed from
and in proportion to the relative populations of the city of Seattle and the other cities and
towns in the county, and two members from special purpose districts providing sewer
service in King County. Cities and towns other than the city of Seattle may appoint two
persons for each of their allocated memberships, each person with one-half vote. Special
purpose districts located outside of the county that receive sewerage treatment services
from the county may jointly designate one nonvoting representative to serve on the
committee. A vice-chair of the committee shall be elected by majority vote of the
committee members who are not county councilmembers.

2. Alternating memberships. Each appointing authority may alternate members
in accordance with the procedures established by the authority. The appointments must
be announced at the beginning of each regional committee meeting to the committee
chair or vice-chair and committee secretary by a person authorized by the appointing
authority. Each appointing authority shall identify those members to receive mailings and
notices of meetings.

3. Powers and duties of the chair. The chair of the committee has the following
powers and duties:
   a. The chair shall:
      (1) call the committee to order at the hour appointed for meeting and, if a
          quorum is present, shall cause the minutes of the previous meeting to be approved;
      (2) proceed with the order of business; and
      (3) adjourn the committee upon a motion to adjourn approved by a majority of
          members present;
   b. The chair shall preserve order and decorum and in the interest of efficiency
      may impose time and subject matter limits for testimony and comment given by the public
      and members of the committee;
   c. The chair shall promote efficient operation of the committee. The chair’s act
      of adding to, removing from or taking out of order an item on a distributed and posted
      agenda may be appealed to the full body by members whose cumulative voting power is
      at least two votes. The chair shall discourage activities that are dilatory or disruptive. The
      chair shall endeavor to facilitate the will of the majority of members present at all times;
   d. The chair may speak to points of order, inquiry or information in preference to
      other members. Upon a ruling of the chair on a point of order, the chair shall allow any
      members whose cumulative voting power is at least two votes to immediately request that
      the decision be placed before the body. If a majority of votes present agrees to the ruling
      of the chair, the business of the committee must proceed without further debate. If a
      majority of the votes present does not support the ruling of the chair, the chair shall
      immediately allow a procedural motion to dispense with the issue in question, proceeding
      until a decision of the committee is secured and the business of the committee is allowed
      to proceed; and
   e. The chair shall provide copies to all committee members of all official
      communications and requests for committee action addressed to the chair.

4. Powers and duties of the vice-chair.
a. There shall be one vice-chair of each committee.

b. At committee meetings, the vice-chair shall exercise the duties, powers and prerogatives of the committee chair in the chair’s absence.

5. Chair actions, vice-chair consultation.
   a. The chair shall consult with the vice-chair in:
      (1) developing a draft work program for consideration by the full committee;
      (2) setting a schedule for carrying out the committee’s work program; and
      (3) cancelling or changing the date, time or place of committee meeting.
   b. If the vice-chair disagrees with a chair’s proposed decision regarding the matters under subsection B.5.a. of this rule, the chair shall not take unilateral action and shall refer the matters to the full committee.

C. Quorum, notice and voting. Members representing six and one-half votes constitute a quorum of a regional committee. In the absence of a quorum, the committee may perform all committee functions except for voting on legislation or a work program. Notice of all regular and special meetings must be provided as specified in the Open Public Meetings Act of 1971, chapter 42.30 RCW, and notice must be given to members of the committees, including members who at any time during the calendar year have served on the committee or have been designated by their appointing authority to receive notice. All recommendations of a regional committee on council-referred ordinances or motions must be approved by a majority of the members present and voting, with no fewer than three and one-half affirmative votes. All recommendations must be signed only by members who were present and voting on the matter and be made on a committee report form supplied by the council. There may not be voting by proxy.

D.1.a. Referral to the regional transit committee. The chair of the council shall refer to the regional transit committee countywide policies and plans related to the transit services formerly provided by the municipality of metropolitan Seattle. If a standing committee of the council is considering an issue that, upon the standing committee’s subsequent review, the standing committee believes should be considered as a countywide policy or plan related to transit, then the standing committee shall so inform the chair of the council. The chair of the council may then determine whether the policy or plan is to be referred to a regional committee.

   b. Referral to the regional water quality committee. The chair of the council shall refer to the regional water quality committee countywide policies and plans related to the water quality services formerly provided by the municipality of metropolitan Seattle. If a standing committee of the council is considering an issue that, upon the standing committee’s subsequent review, the standing committee believes should be considered as a countywide policy or plan related to water quality, then the standing committee shall so inform the chair of the council. The chair of the council may then determine whether the policy or plan is to be referred to a regional committee.

2. Regional policies committee work program. The regional policies committee shall establish its subject matter through a work program adopted by a majority of those committee members present and voting, with no fewer than three and one-half affirmative
votes, though the work program shall be limited as provided by charter or ordinance, including but not limited to, subsection K. of this rule. Once the work program is adopted, all regional policies and plans related to the subject matter must be referred to the committee by the council.

3. Provisions applicable to referrals by council chair and rereferrals. Referrals by the council chair or rereferrals are subject to the procedures, rights and constraints of Rules 13, 17 and 26, K.C.C. 1.24.125, 1.24.165 and 1.24.255.

E. Time for review -- committees. A regional committee shall review legislation referred to it by the county council within one hundred twenty days of the legislation's referral or such other time as is jointly established by the council and the committee, which shall be confirmed in the form of a motion adopted by the council. However, the committee may request, and the county council may grant by motion, additional time for review. If the committee fails to act upon the proposed policy or plan within the established time limit, the county council may adopt the proposed policy or plan upon six affirmative votes.

F. Time for review -- council. The council shall amend, adopt or defeat the legislation referred to a regional committee within ninety days after receipt of an initial regional committee recommendation. However, upon receipt of the council chair's written request for an extension of the time limit, the committee may approve the request in writing by a majority vote at a special meeting or the next regular meeting of the committee.

G. Adoption.
1. A proposed policy or plan recommended by a regional committee may be adopted, without amendment, by the county council by five affirmative votes.

2. A proposed policy or plan that differs from the policy or plan recommended by a regional committee may be adopted by the county council by six affirmative votes after the regional committee has had the opportunity to review all county council amendments.

H. Amendments and rereferral.
1. If the county council votes before the final passage to amend a proposed policy or plan that has been reviewed or recommended by a regional committee, the proposed policy or plan, as amended, must be referred to the appropriate regional committee for further review and recommendation.

2. The timeline for the committee's review after rereferral may not be greater than sixty days. However, the committee may request, and the county council may grant by motion, additional time for review. The committee may concur in, dissent from or recommend additional amendments to the policy or plan.

3. The council shall amend, adopt or defeat the legislation within sixty days after receipt of a regional committee recommendation following rereferral by the council.

I. Regional committee consideration of other regional issues. The chair of the council may request that one or more regional committees examine and comment upon other pending issues that are not countywide policies or plans but would benefit from interjurisdictional discussion. The issues may include, but are not limited to, operational,
organizational or implementation measures for countywide plans and policies. This type of regional committee analysis and comment is not subject to the mandatory procedural requirements of Section 270.30 of the King County Charter and the county council may need to act on such issues before comment from the regional committee.  

J. The regional committee is governed by the King County Charter, the King County Code and, except to the extent expressly provided otherwise, the rules and procedures established for standing and special committees in this chapter.

K. Role of regional committees.

1. A regional committee shall focus on planning and policy setting in program areas where it has been determined that regional service or facility planning is required and in areas where it is agreed the opportunity and need for the planning exist. A regional committee is not responsible for routine review and recommendation on operational and administrative matters such as contracts, budgets, appropriations, and fares and rates, formerly performed by the council of metropolitan Seattle. A regional committee may, however, deal with policies to develop fares and rates within the committee’s subject matter area.

2. The regional transit committee shall develop, review and recommend countywide policies and plans related to the transportation services formerly provided by the municipality of metropolitan Seattle. Plans and policies that must be assigned to the committee include, but are not limited to, the long-range transit system and capital improvement plans, service design, development and allocation policies, financial policies, fare policies, facility siting policy and major facilities siting process, and review and comment upon Regional Transit Authority plans.

3. The regional water quality committee shall develop, review and recommend countywide policies and plans related to the water pollution control functions formerly provided by the municipality of metropolitan Seattle. Plans and policies that must be assigned to the committee include, but are not limited to, water quality comprehensive and long-range capital improvement plans, service area and extension policies, rate policies, and the facility siting policy and major facilities siting process.

4. The regional policies committee shall review and recommend regional policies and plans, other than transit and water quality plans, that are within the subject matter area for the committee. Also, the committee may develop proposed policies and plans on issues of countywide significance but, unless referred to the committee by the county council, the policies and plans are not subject to the procedural requirements of Section 270.30 of the King County Charter. Issues that may be referred to the committee or be the subject of the committee’s policy development include, but are not limited to, public health, human services, open space, housing, solid waste management, regional services financial policies, criminal justice, jails and district court services, and regional facilities siting. In addition, the regional policies committee may consider major regional governance transition and consolidation issues, particularly those involving potential changes in organization and responsibilities with other county, city or regional organizations.
L. Policies or plans proposed by regional committees. A regional committee may develop and propose directly to the council, an ordinance or motion adopting, amending or repealing a countywide policy or plan regarding regional transit, water quality or other countywide policies and plans within the subject matter area of the committee. The proposals must be approved by a majority of the committee members present and voting, with no fewer than three and one-half affirmative votes. For purposes of this subsection, "the subject matter area" of the regional policies committee includes matters in the committee’s adopted work program. Within one hundred twenty days of introduction by the committee, the council or a standing committee shall consider the proposed legislation and take such action on the proposed legislation as the council or standing committee deems appropriate, including approval, rejection, amendment and rereferral, postponement or any other action of record during a council or standing committee meeting. Within five calendar days following council or standing committee action, the clerk of the council or the standing committee shall notify the vice-chair of the committee of the action taken. If the council amends the proposed legislation, the procedures described in subsection H. of this rule shall be followed, except that the council’s duty to act on the legislation under subsection H.3. of this rule shall be satisfied by approval, rejection, amendment and rereferral, postponement or any other action of record taken during a council or standing committee meeting within sixty days following receipt of the legislation from the regional committee.

**Item 8:**
Homelessness Response Governance & System Recommendations

**UPDATE**

SCA Staff Contact
Christa Valles, Sr. Policy Analyst, christa@soundcities.org, (206) 495-5238

Executive Leadership Group Members
Mayor Nancy Backus, Auburn; Mayor John Chelminiak, Bellevue; Council President Ed Prince, Renton

Regional Policy Committee members
Deputy Mayor Austin Bell, Burien; Council President Angela Birney, Redmond; Mayor Dave Hill; Algona; Councilmember James McNeal, Bothell; Councilmember Bill Peloza, Auburn; Councilmember John Stokes, Bellevue

Update

With the goal of making homelessness rare, brief and one-time, government, philanthropy, business, and people with lived experience are working towards improved regional coordination. Efforts are underway to consolidate the current governance structure, assess existing investments, and develop a regional action plan.

Both the Mayor of Seattle and King County Executive aim to transmit legislation to their respective Councils by August 2019 to approve an Interlocal Agreement (ILA) related to consolidation of homeless functions. It is not yet known how detailed this ILA will be. At the June PIC meeting, SCA staff will update members on recent developments related to these activities.

Background
Between October and December 2018, an “Executive Leadership Group” (ELG), which included King County Executive Dow Constantine, Seattle Mayor Jenny Durkan, Bellevue Mayor John Chelminiak, Auburn Mayor Nancy Backus, and Renton City Council President Ed Prince, along with representatives from the business and philanthropic community, convened three times to discuss regional homelessness governance.

On December 14, 2018, the consulting firm National Innovation Service (NIS) released a multi-media website identifying actions to improve the region’s response to the homelessness crisis, including a recommendation to consolidate the region’s investments and efforts to address homelessness into a new agency (See Attachment A for a summary of NIS’s recommendations).

Following the NIS release in December 2018, Mayor Durkan and Executive Constantine expressed support for moving ahead with consolidation. SCA’s ELG representatives, however, indicated SCA
would need more information about a new agency and governance board before it could support consolidation.

SCA staff presented the NIS findings at the January 2019 PIC meeting, which can be found in the January 9, 2019 PIC packet, and also provided an update on related activities at the March 13, April 9, and May 8, 2019 PIC meetings.

Update
The King County Executive and Seattle Mayor anticipate transmitting legislation to their respective councils in August 2019 for approval of an Interlocal Agreement (ILA) to create a unified entity to oversee the region’s homeless response. In addition, this item is on King County’s Regional Policy Committee (RPC) mandatory referral calendar, so the RPC will also be asked to consider and approve the ILA once it is transmitted.

It is not yet clear how detailed the ILA will be or what issues it will address but discussions between the City of Seattle and King County (and others depending on the issue) are currently underway to resolve the following:

- Appropriate legal structure of a consolidated homeless entity.
- Funding streams to be allocated in what amounts by whom as well as how they will be appropriated to and dispersed by the new entity.
- Board structure overseeing new entity- roles, responsibilities and composition.
- Structure and organization of new entity- key staff roles and responsibilities, salary schedules, and other benefits.
- Scope of the consolidated entity’s powers and authority.
- Executive Director selection process and future hiring and firing authority for the position.

King County Executive staff have scheduled a meeting with SCA’s three Executive Leadership Group members in June to discuss this issue. In addition, SCA has been told the entire ELG will be brought back together for a meeting this summer with the intent of discussing progress since the last ELG meeting in December 2018.

Regular briefings on homeless governance are being scheduled in the King County Council’s Health, Housing, and Human Services (HHHS) committee, as well as RPC. The third HHHS committee briefing on this topic is scheduled for June 4. The first RPC briefing on homeless governance is scheduled for June 12, with additional briefings scheduled through September in anticipation of an August ILA transmittal. The Seattle City Council will also hold committee discussions of this issue over the course of the summer.

All Home Board Reconfiguration
The Federal Office of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) requires communities to create a Continuum of Care (COC) to coordinate homeless services and receive federal funding for homelessness. King County’s COC is called All Home and its staff are housed in King County’s
Department of Community and Human Services. The All Home Board includes two SCA members (Mayor Nancy Backus, Auburn, and Councilmember Keith Scully, Shoreline), along with representatives from King County, the City of Seattle, non-profit providers, and the Seattle Public Housing Authority.

Over the next few months, the All Home Board will be asked to consider options to reconfigure the current All Home board in response to consolidation efforts. Current discussions assume the All Home Board will be restructured and subsumed under the larger governance board that will be created to oversee a newly consolidated agency, but no decisions have been made yet.

Next Steps
SCA staff are being briefed on these items by County staff on a regular basis and will continue to provide on-going briefings to PIC.
Item 09:  
VISION 2050  
UPDATE  

SCA Staff Contact  
Brian Parry, Policy Director, brian@soundcities.org, (206) 499-4159  

SCA Members of the PSRC Growth Management Policy Board  
Councilmember Jay Arnold, Kirkland (Caucus Chair); Councilmember Nancy Tosta, Burien (Caucus Vice Chair); Councilmember John Holman, Auburn; Councilmember Hank Margeson, Redmond; Councilmember Paul Winterstein, Issaquah; Councilmember Traci Buxton, Des Moines  

Discussion  

The PSRC Growth Management Policy Board is engaged in ongoing work to extend the region’s plan for growth – VISION 2040 – out to the year 2050. Between now and 2050, the four-county region that makes up the Puget Sound Regional Council region is projected to grow by 1.8 million people and 1.2 million jobs. The updated VISION 2050 plan will set expectations for how the region will accommodate that growth while maintaining and improving quality of life.  

In February, a Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS) was released for public comment. The DSEIS reviewed three unique growth patterns for their performance and environmental impacts through 2050: Stay the Course, Transit Focused Growth, and Reset Urban Growth. Many SCA cities provided comment letters expressing their preferred growth pattern and priorities for regional planning.  

The GMPB will be working over the course of June and July to develop a preferred regional growth pattern as well as implementing policies (the Multicounty Planning Policies, or MPP’s) to include in a full draft updated VISION 2050. The draft plan is currently scheduled for release for a 60-day public comment period beginning on July 19.  

In addition to setting a regional vision for growth, the selected growth pattern and policies will directly impact the growth targets and policies that cities will be required to implement in their next comprehensive plan updates.  

In June, PIC will be briefed on comments provided by SCA cities and the status of the work of the GMPB. In addition, members will be asked to weigh-in on whether SCA should work to submit formal comment upon release of the draft VISION 2050 and the substance of any comments.
Background
On February 28, PSRC released for public comment the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (Draft SEIS) as part of extending the region’s adopted plan for growth – VISION 2040 – out to the year 2050.

VISION is the adopted plan for growth for the four-county region that makes-up membership to the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) - King, Snohomish, Pierce, and Kitsap counties. The plan was adopted in 2008 and sets a framework for a region-wide approach to guiding sustainable growth.

The plan includes overarching goals for regional growth; a Regional Growth Strategy that provides numerical guidance to counties in setting targets for accommodating growth; multicounty planning policies (MPP’s) as required under GMA that support implementation of the growth strategy; and implementation actions.

A draft of the full update to VISION 2050, including any changes to the multicounty planning policies to support the selected growth alternative, is projected to be released in July 2019. Final adoption of the updated plan is slated for the Spring of 2020.

Regional Growth Strategy
Under GMA, counties, in consultation with cities, are responsible for adopting 20-year population and employment growth targets that form the basis of local comprehensive plans. The Regional Growth Strategy provides a region-wide framework to inform the countywide growth target-setting process. Growth targets set at the county level will be expected to be consistent with VISION 2050 following its adoption.

The Draft SEIS reviewed the potential environmental impacts that may occur upon implementation of three Regional Growth Strategy alternatives: Stay the Course; Transit Focused Growth; and Reset Urban Growth. The PSRC Growth Management Policy Board (GMPB) is currently working to select one of the alternatives or a hybrid of more than one alternative that will form the basis of any changes to the Regional Growth Strategy in VISION.

Regional Growth Strategy Alternatives
Stay the Course: The Stay the Course alternative is a direct extension of the VISION 2040 Regional Growth Strategy and assumes a compact growth pattern, focused in the largest and most transit-connected cities in the region within the region’s 29 designated regional growth centers. This alternative serves as the required no action alternative that must be evaluated in accordance with SEPA.

Transit Focused Growth: The Transit Focused Growth alternative considers a compact growth pattern based on the VISION 2040 Regional Growth Strategy that assumes accelerated growth near the region’s existing and planned transit investments. This alternative analyzes the impacts of setting an explicit regional goal of having 75% of added population and employment
from 2017-2050 occur within a quarter to a half mile from current and planned high-capacity transit (up from the 48% of such growth analyzed under Stay the Course).

**Reset Urban Growth:** The Reset Urban Growth alternative assumes a more distributed pattern throughout the urban area. This alternative would continue to allocate the largest shares of growth to Metropolitan Cities and Core Cities, although the overall growth to these geographies and High Capacity Transit Communities would be less compared to Stay the Course or Transit Focused Growth due to the more dispersed overall pattern of growth. Growth allocations for Cities & Towns and Urban Unincorporated areas are based on land use capacities identified in currently adopted comprehensive plans.

**SCA City Comment Letters**

Comment letters were submitted by 15 SCA cities providing feedback on the three Regional Growth Strategy alternatives being considered by the GMPB.

SCA cities providing comments during the DSEIS comment period broadly offered their support for the Transit Focused Growth alternative at the regional level. Most noted that the alternative leverages ongoing transit investments and performs best in modeling of environmental impacts, climate change, increases in transit usage, access to jobs, air quality, health, and increasing the supply of moderate density housing – the housing type most associated with affordability. Some also noted that the Transit Focused Growth alternative carries with it the greatest risk of displacement due to redevelopment and encouraged a strong focus in VISION on mitigation measures.

Many cities also stressed the need for clarity around how the growth shares ultimately included in the Regional Growth Strategy will be implemented. While growth targets that cities will be required to plan for in their comprehensive plans are set at the countywide level (in King County this is through the Growth Management Planning Council), those targets are required to be consistent with the policies and growth shares included in VISION 2050.

Members generally expressed that the proposed growth shares are regional and should be aspirational while allowing flexibility at the local level and encouraging additional planning to ensure growth targets are realistic on a jurisdiction-by-jurisdiction basis.

At its meeting on June 6, the GMPB reviewed a proposed Preferred Alternative that uses the Transit Focused Growth alternative as a baseline with two primary changes.

The first would set a regional goal of directing 65% of population growth and 75% percent of employment growth in walkable proximity to transit. This is a reduction from the Transit Focused Growth alternative, which analyzed 75% of all growth being directed to these areas. This change was proposed in response to analysis of peer regions and what can reasonably be achieved. As noted by PSRC staff in materials presented to GMPB, the “numeric goal is a regional statement and would not be a standard applied to individual counties, cities, or stations.”
The second would increase the share of regional growth expected to occur in urban unincorporated areas in Snohomish and Pierce Counties. Pierce and Snohomish Counties have both expressed concerns that the Transit Focused Growth alternative did not adequately account for historical trends and vested property rights in the urban unincorporated areas and rural lands within those counties. The GMPB is also considering new regional policies to ensure those counties are managing and reducing rural growth and to encourage annexation or incorporation of urban unincorporated areas.

**Multicounty Planning Policies and Actions**

In addition to selecting a preferred pattern of future growth, the GMPB is also updating the policies and actions that will implement the Regional Growth Strategy and VISION 2050.

The Growth Management Act requires city comprehensive plans to be consistent with their respective Countywide Planning Policies and Multicounty Planning Policies (MPP’s) that are contained in VISION. In concert with these policies, actions are identified in VISION identifying specific steps for PSRC, countywide organizations, local governments, and others that will be necessary to implement the plan and regional goals. These actions include tasks such as developing strategies and studies, and working with jurisdictions to develop local plans.

The full text of draft actions and MPP amendments under consideration by the GMPB can be found on the [PSRC Vision 2050 Policy Review webpage](#). The GMPB is continuing to work toward finalizing a draft set of policies and actions for release of the full plan in late July. A pre-PIC workshop is scheduled for July 10, which will provide an opportunity for members to ask questions and better understand the full plan.

The draft MPP changes and new actions under consideration by the GMPB include updates to several priority focus areas:

- **Equity.** New policies underscore equity as an overarching issue that should be considered in planning that spans policy topics. PSRC, in coordination with member jurisdictions, is directed to develop a regional equity strategy to support future updates to local comprehensive plans.
- **Focusing Growth in Centers and Near Transit.** New policies call for optimizing the development potential of urban lands, especially near transit. This includes a new policy explicitly calling for the region to plan for 65% of population and 75% of employment growth to be located in proximity to transit.
- **Environment.** New policies support implementing the [Regional Open Space Conservation Plan](#), expand access to parks and trails, and reduce the impacts of stormwater pollution.
- **Climate Change.** The draft policies include a new, separate chapter highlighting state, regional, and local actions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and prepare for climate change impacts.
• **Affordable Housing.** New policies call for expanding capacity for moderate density housing to provide opportunities for affordable housing, and for better coordination between transit access and affordability. PSRC is directed to work with jurisdictions and housing professionals to develop a comprehensive regional housing strategy. The strategy as proposed will include a regional needs assessment, best practices, and guidance for developing local housing targets - including affordable housing targets. It is the understanding of SCA staff that guidance related to affordable housing targets is intended to support cities that choose to set such targets rather than to mandate affordable housing targets for all cities.¹

• **Economic Development.** New policies and actions incorporate the [Regional Economic Strategy](#) into the regional plan.

• **Transportation.** New policies are proposed to require preparing for new technologies and mobility patterns, support cleaner fuels, and reduce single occupancy vehicle travel. New policies also call for coordinated planning and effective management of the regional airport system while minimizing the impacts to the health and well-being of surrounding communities.

• **Regional Coordination.** New policies call for improved regional coordination, including with counties and cities in setting growth targets, with local tribes, and with local utility service providers.

**Next Steps**

The GMPB will continue deliberating on the draft policies and Preferred Alternative at their next meeting on June 13, from 1:00 to 3:00 PM. The current schedule of GMPB calls for release of the full draft update to VISION 2050 on July 19 for a 60-day public comment period. A pre-PIC workshop is scheduled for July with a presentation from PSRC to coincide with the release of the draft plan. For more information, contact SCA Policy Director Brian Parry at [brian@soundcities.org](mailto:brian@soundcities.org) or 206-499-4159.

---

¹ Regional actions, such as studies and coordination by PSRC, are not required elements of local comprehensive plans. Counties and cities are required under the Growth Management Act to ensure their comprehensive plans are consistent with policies included in VISION as Multicounty Planning Policies (MPP’s). The draft MPP’s do not include a requirement for local housing affordability targets.
Item 10:
King Conservation District Proposed 2020-2024 Rates and Charges
Update

SCA Staff Contact
Christa Valles, Sr. Policy Analyst, Christa@soundcities.org, (206) 495-5238

SCA KCD Advisory Committee Members
Councilmembers Brenda Fincher, Kent (member); Mark Phillips, Lake Forest Park (member); Wendy Weiker, Mercer Island (member); Amy McHenry, Duvall (alternate); Victoria Hunt, Issaquah (alternate); Susan Boundy-Sanders, Woodinville (alternate).

Other SCA Elected Official on KCD Advisory Committee
Councilmember John Stokes, Bellevue

Update
The King Conservation District is in the fifth and final year of its 2015-2019 work plan, which SCA’s Public Issues Committee endorsed in 2014. Over the past year, the King Conservation District has worked with its Advisory Committee, including SCA representatives and City of Seattle and King County staff, to develop a new 2020-2024 work plan and an accompanying rates and charges budget to support it.

The King County Executive is currently discussing various options with KCD for a one-year extension of its current rate but negotiations for what this may look like are still underway. SCA staff will share the latest developments at the June 12 PIC.

Background
The King Conservation District (KCD) provides a variety of voluntary programming to 34-member cities¹ and King County, providing education, technical assistance, and grants to private landowners and urban stakeholders to achieve its conservation goals.²

At a March 2019 pre-PIC workshop, KCD staff presented a proposal to increase the maximum annual parcel rate from $10 to $13.85 with an average parcel increase of $3.70. This increase would generate approximately $8.9 million annually, which is $2.8 million more than the $6.1 million generated by current rates³. At the April and May PIC meeting, SCA staff provided additional background and information about the proposal, which can be found here and here respectively.

¹ Enumclaw, Federal Way, Milton, Pacific and Skykomish are not members
² Additional information about KCD’s current various programs and initiatives can be found here.
³ Some KCD documents show current rates generate $6.1 million, while others show $6.4 million.
Update
At the April 17 KCD Advisory Committee meeting, committee members reviewed various rate options provided by KCD staff. Advisory members discussed whether to support a resolution to the KCD Board of Supervisors endorsing a program of work that would require an average per parcel rate increase of $3.70 per year, generating $8.9 million annually (up from $6.1 million currently generated). Committee members decided a letter that simply forwarded the proposal on to the KCD Supervisors for consideration was more appropriate. The letter and accompanying transmittal packet are attached to this memo.

Recently, the King County Executive has determined that KCD’s rate proposal would benefit from additional review. Consequently, the Executive is discussing a one-year rate extension option with KCD. It is not yet clear at this time what a rate proposal for a one-year extension will look like. Initially, the Executive envisioned a “status quo” rate but KCD is now requesting a “maintenance rate,” presumably so that it can cover on-going expenditures incurred during the 2015-2019 rate period using one-time funds. Thus, it’s possible a one-year rate extension could include a rate increase that is higher than the current rates but less than what KCD is seeking for 2020-2024. KCD has until August 1 to hold a public hearing and transmit a proposal to King County.

Next Steps
SCA staff will continue to keep PIC members informed as this process unfolds.
Friday May 10, 2019

Dick Ryon, Chair,
KCD Board of Supervisors

Dear Chair Ryon,

On behalf of the KCD Advisory Committee, I am transmitting our comments on the recommendations for the KCD 2020-2024 Proposed Program of Work. Also included in an Appendix A which sets forth the full description of the Program of Work. We look forward to working with the KCD staff and the Board as we move forward through the process for final approval of the rates and charges by the King County Council.

Respectfully,

John Stokes
Councilmember, City of Bellevue.
Chair, KCD Advisory Committee
KCD 2020-2024 Proposed Program of Work

Dear King Conservation District Board of Supervisors,

On behalf of the Advisory Committee of the King Conservation District (AC) we recommend the Executive Director forward the attached program of work (Exhibit A) to the King Conservation District Board of Supervisors for further review and consideration.

Key Elements of the Proposed Program of Work

The Proposed Program of Work detailed in Attachment A would:

- Continue key programs that were identified in the 2015 Interlocal Agreement (ILA) and funded through rates and charges, including Urban Forest Stewardship, Community (Urban) Agriculture, Regional Food Program, Marine and Freshwater Shoreline Landowner education and technical assistance, Rural Small Lot Forest Stewardship and Rural Land Stewardship.

- Continue to provide a funding pool (Member Jurisdiction Grants) that jurisdictions can utilize to implement conservation activities in their communities - and grow that pool approximately proportionate to the KCD rate increase.

- Provide funding from rates and charges for programs that stakeholders have identified as valuable (Agricultural Drainage Assistance Program and Firewise wildfire preparedness planning) that were previously funded by grants and one-time funds.

- Provide new funding for a community agriculture grant program.

- Provide new funding for adding inland lakeshores to the riparian work with landowners.

- Provide for the addition of three (3.0) FTEs, including a forester, education specialist, and program evaluator position.

- Provide enhanced capacity so that KCD can deliver conservation services to different cultural and geographic audiences.

- Provide funding for a program evaluator and increased emphasis on program evaluation to maximize conservation impacts, efficiencies, and alignment with other conservation efforts including those at the local, county, state, regional and national level.
Key Assumptions

Through the planning process and review of the current KCD proposal, the Advisory Committee (AC) identified several key issues and assumptions that are important to highlight for the Board of Supervisors:

- The proposed 2020-2024 rates and charges revenue is understood to be $8.9M, with a maximum per parcel rate of $13.85 and an average per parcel rate of $13.32.

- The proposed rates and charges structure does not fully fund the total cost of the Proposed Program of Work ($9.8M). The attached Proposed Program of Work identifies the programing funded by rates and charges and the programming dependent on supplemental revenue sources.

- The AC encourages KCD to continue to seek supplemental and leverage funding where appropriate, but work funded in this way should not be considered guaranteed into the future with revenue from rates and charges.

- The rate proposal covers inflation through 2024, and projected increases in program costs through 2024.

- The AC recognizes the need for KCD to improve programmatic evaluation to better measure conservation outcomes and to adjust programming accordingly. The proposed program of work includes funds for programmatic evaluation, which should include consideration of third-party evaluation.

- The AC identified financial reporting as an area of needed improvement and recommends that KCD identify and implement best practices for financial planning and reporting.

- The AC will continue to provide guidance to ensure that KCD programs effectively reach our unique constituencies and align with and add value to the regional ecosystem of natural resource protection efforts.

Background

Over the past 18 months, the Advisory Committee has convened monthly with KCD staff to receive information and engage in strategic planning sessions related to KCD programming. This engagement included receiving the results of a survey completed by over 800 KCD stakeholders, and hearing from focus groups, program beneficiaries, and KCD staff on Urban and Rural Forestry, Community Agriculture, Regional Food, Rural Agriculture and Marine and Freshwater Shoreline programs.
The Advisory Committee recognizes that virtually all of KCD’s programs help build resilience to counter the effects of global warming. With some programs, like fire prevention, stream and lakeshore improvements, and forest health, this link is very direct. Other programs like those aimed at agriculture and food systems also contribute to sustainability of land and water resources and are important for expanding access to healthy food and teaching natural resource stewardship. Many KCD programs are aimed at member jurisdictions, and the KCD county-wide scope of work recognizes that our individual jurisdictions do not exist in isolation and allows member jurisdictions to benefit from conservation practices spread over the larger geographical area.

Respectfully, for the Advisory Committee,

John Stokes  
Councilmember, City of Bellevue  
Chair of the KCD Advisory Committee
Proposed Program of Work

Clean Water

KCD educates, provides technical assistance to, and helps implement best practices for landowners to affect water quality that impacts us all. The three programs move landowners through the arc of education: Riparian Land Stewardship’s classes, workshops, and tours and technical assistance; Rural Land Stewardship- KCD’s legacy work of working with rural landowners to develop plans for stewarding their natural resources; and Riparian Restoration & Improvement- action through bringing on-the-ground projects and financial assistance to natural resource challenges.

Riparian Stewardship- Landowner engagement and education make up the bulk of this program. KCD has learned that due to smaller lots and greater density and diversity, urban audiences require more, and different types of engagement to achieve the desired conservation outcomes. Because shoreline properties have the greatest potential to realize impact from conservation improvements, KCD proposes to continue this work and to add lakeshore properties to the portfolio.

Rural Land Stewardship- Rural Land Stewardship (Farm Conservation Planning) is a hallmark program for KCD. This program supports landowner compliance with Critical Areas Ordinance and the Livestock Ordinance and qualification for Public Benefit Rating System current use taxation. KCD currently serves an average of 150 customers annually, developing and average of 70 plans a year. KCD also offers an equipment loan service which provides access to equipment for an average of 60 landowners a year.

Riparian Restoration and Improvement -This program is the follow on for Riparian Land Stewardship. This program provides technical assistance, cost share, and work crews to help landowners implement best management practices such as removal of invasive species, planting natives, and installing buffers. This program also houses Discovery Farms, KCD’s on-farm research program. Through this program, qualified landowners may also access federal funds for buffer improvement through the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program. In 2020 KCD anticipates continuing to implement an average of 10 projects a year, impacting an average of 10 acres or 1.5 miles per year.

Forest Stewardship

As KCD built its Forest Stewardship Programs, we heard from our member jurisdictions that developing capacity to reduce risks from wildfires is important and an unmet need. In addition, member jurisdictions requested more KCD assistance in greening the built environment through its Urban Forest Stewardship program. In the rural areas of King County, KCD works with privately-owned parcels of 5 acres and under – representing a combined forested area of over 40,000 acres.

Wildfire Preparedness- Stakeholders are increasingly aware of the need to modify landscaping and land management practices to mitigate wildfire risk potential. Programs exist at the state and federal level to support planning and preparation on public lands and on large acreage holdings. There is an identified niche for KCD in engaging landowners and home owners’ associations to assist in this type of planning. In 2020 KCD proposes to continue this work, funding staffing and technical support through rates and charges. KCD anticipates engaging with 5-7 communities annually to develop and implement alternative landscape and management practices in those communities.
**Urban Forest Stewardship** - This program focuses on partnerships with jurisdictions (as opposed to individual landowners within jurisdictions). In 2020 KCD proposes to continue working with cities to identify and develop projects to maintain and improve canopy on public and private property. KCD anticipates working with an average of 6 cities a year. KCD will prioritize projects based on potential conservation impact as opposed to geographic diversity.

**Small Lot Forest Health** - This program will continue in 2020 as it is currently run. As a complement to work done by the County and the State, KCD will focus its efforts on small lot landowners (5 acres or less). KCD will continue to partner with WSU Extension to deliver planning and stewardship classes to interested landowners. Nearly 100 King County landowners receive support from this program annually.

**Agriculture and Local Food**

KCD will continue to serve as the primary organization responding to King County’s Local Food Initiative funding innovation in food production, demand, and access. A second task will be continuing to work with farmers to bring non-functioning drainage ditches back into production. Finally, a key component of improving food access and equity will continue to be KCD’s Community Agriculture program, working with CBOs to develop urban sites into production gardens for immigrants, refugees, and other underserved residents.

**Regional Food Systems** - This program will continue to award $900,000 annually to support the Executive’s Local Food Initiative. In 2020 the program will make larger, longer term sustained investments in 4 key areas: Infrastructure; Scaling Up; Farmland Access and Institutional Demand. The program will utilize a competitive RFP process to award funds for these strategic initiatives. The program will continue to offer smaller competitive grants to support local food economy actors and organizations.

**Agricultural Drainage Assistance** - In 2020 KCD will continue its collaboration with the King County ADAP program. KCD will focus its efforts on landowner engagement and providing consultation and subject matter expertise to assist in the development of planting plans. KCD will engage in project management as requested by the County ADAP team, and as funds are available. Currently averaging the reclaiming of 2.5 miles of ditch and restoring or improving 300-400 new acres each year.

**Community Agriculture** - In 2020 KCD will continue to partner with Continue working with community-based organizations, faith institutions, and refugee and immigrant resettlement agencies to site and develop urban food production gardens and facilitate access to healthy soil, culturally-appropriate seeds, and technical assistance. In addition, at the request of stakeholders, KCD proposes to implement a Community Ag focused grant program (in the amount of $150,000 annually) with priority given to underserved communities and community-based organizations. KCD anticipates working with an average of 3-5 cities to develop 5-8 gardens per year.

**Member Jurisdiction**

The Member Jurisdiction program has been a component of KCD’s approach to partnering with cities since 2006. In response to stakeholder feedback, the 2020 plan expands the pool of dollars available to cities, while also strengthening the guidelines for use of funds.
## Proposed Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Current FTE</th>
<th>Current Total Program Cost</th>
<th>Proposed FTE</th>
<th>Proposed Total Program Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clean Water</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riparian Land Stewardship</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>$517,500</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>$557,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Land Stewardship</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>$1,891,800</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>$1,992,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riparian Restoration/Improvement</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>$1,709,000</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>$1,787,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clean Water TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>21.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,118,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>22.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,337,100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forest Stewardship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildfire Preparedness</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>$262,900</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>$337,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Forest Stewardship</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>$701,000</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>$725,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Lot Forest Stewardship</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>$513,300</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>$678,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forest Stewardship TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,477,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,741,600</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agriculture and Local Food</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Food System</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>$1,147,200</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>$1,192,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Drainage Assistance</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>$385,600</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>$353,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Agriculture</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>$233,900</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>$397,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agriculture &amp; Local Food TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,766,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,943,400</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Member Jurisdiction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Jurisdiction TOTAL</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>$1,495,900</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>$1,870,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>$8,858,200</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>$9,892,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member Jurisdiction, Regional Food, Landowner Incentive Cost Share, and the Urban Forestry and Community Ag grant pools are fully funded through rates and charges revenue.


---

1 The 2020 proposal anticipates $8.9 million in revenue from rates and charges. KCD anticipates that the remaining $1 million will be secured through grants obtained in partnership with stakeholders.
## PROPOSED RATE STRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Classification</th>
<th>Current Structure (established in 2015)</th>
<th>Proposed Structure (2020-2024)</th>
<th>Projected Change per Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of Parcels²</td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>Projected # of Parcels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>580,469</td>
<td>$9.45</td>
<td>602,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional/Public</td>
<td>2,799</td>
<td>$9.25</td>
<td>2,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>19,187</td>
<td>$9.23</td>
<td>18,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>2,343</td>
<td>$8.92</td>
<td>2,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant/Undeveloped</td>
<td>44,705</td>
<td>$7.69</td>
<td>42,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>47,860</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9.62</strong></td>
<td><strong>45,624</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The KCD rate is a static annual per parcel rate. It is not tied to inflation or property value and does not fluctuate over the period of the Interlocal Agreement.

The proposed rate structure will remain in place from 2020-2024 and at the average, will cost a parcel owner approximately thirty cents ($0.30) per month.

- ~$2.00 of the average $3.70 increase covers inflation for the period 2015-2024.
- ~$0.85 of the average $3.70 increase supports shifting programs onto a sustainable revenue stream
- ~$0.85 of the average $3.70 increase supports new work called for as part of the 2018-19 stakeholder engagement process

RCW 89.08 provides the legal authority for conservation districts to fix rates and charges to recover district costs. Section 89.08.405(3)(a).

A rate is intended to cover the cost of public programs based on services received or negative impacts imposed. In a ‘rate construct’ the services received, and the impacts charged may be indirect. Further, the rate may show consideration for “services furnished, to be furnished or available to the landowner”, or “benefits received, to be received or available to the property” in addition to other factors.

The King Conservation District rate structure features distinct rates by land use, based on the services/benefits received from District program. The cost of each District program, or natural resource priority, is subject to a two-step allocation process to establish unit costs, the building blocks of rate development. Each priority cost is first allocated between direct and indirect service/benefit provided. Cost recovery is then allocated among customer classes based on the comparative amount of service/benefit enjoyed by each customer class from the resource priority.

---

² Land classifications and numbers of parcels in each land classification are developed and provided by King County Assessor as of 1/29/2019.
**Item 11:**
Levies and Ballot Measures in King County

**UPDATE**

**SCA Staff Contact**
Brian Parry, Policy Director, brian@soundcities.org, (206) 499-4159

**Discussion**
This is a monthly item on the PIC agenda to share information on recent and upcoming local levies and ballot measures in King County. Items identified as “potential future ballot measures” are under consideration or reflect potential renewal of an existing levy but have not been approved to be placed on the ballot and may not ultimately move forward.

### Potential Future Ballot Measures – SCA Cities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kirkland</td>
<td>Fire Services and Capital Levy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Future Ballot Measures – Countywide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>August</td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>Regional Parks Levy. Six-year, $810 million levy. Estimated at 18.3-cents per $1,000 of assessed value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>August</td>
<td>Seattle Public Library</td>
<td>Operations Levy. Seven-year, $213 million levy to fund operations and maintenance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>August</td>
<td>Evergreen Health</td>
<td>Capital Bonds. $345 million, 30-year bonds to fund enhancements to the medical center campus. Estimated at 18-cents per $1,000 of assessed value.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>August</td>
<td>Puget Sound Regional Fire</td>
<td>Levy for fire protection and emergency medical services. Authorizes levy of $1.00 per $1,000 of assessed value.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Requires 60% yes vote and a minimum turnout of 56,283 voters

### Potential Future Ballot Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Nov.</td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>Medic One/EMS Levy. Six-year, $1.1 billion levy. Proposed levy rate of 26.5-cents per $1,000 of assessed value beginning in 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>King County Library System</td>
<td>Operations Levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Transportation Benefit District Renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td></td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>Best Starts for Kids Renewal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Next Steps**
Please share this information with your city and provide information on upcoming elections in your city to SCA Policy Director Brian Parry at brian@soundcities.org or 206-499-4159.
Item 12: Potential Upcoming SCA Issues

UPDATE

SCA Staff Contact
Brian Parry, Policy Director, brian@soundcities.org, (206) 499-4159

Update
This is an ongoing, monthly PIC item noting issues that SCA members have asked to be brought to the PIC.

Potential Issues
Throughout the year, issues brought forward by SCA members are tracked in this ongoing, monthly agenda item and may be taken up by the PIC through workshops, briefings and discussion items, and as action items.

The following issues have been identified as topics for potential workshops or briefings in 2019:

- PSRC VISION 2050 Update (July)
- Homelessness and the impacts of the Martin v. City of Boise decision
- Sales tax credit for affordable or supportive housing
- Addressing toxic social media
- Equity and inclusion

If you or your city has additional items to be added to the list of potential upcoming SCA issues, or items to suggest for future trainings or workshops, please contact SCA Policy Director Brian Parry, brian@soundcities.org or 206-499-4159.