

Compensation for Members of Boards, Commissions, Committees and Task Forces

July 1, 2020



King County

I. Table of Contents

| | | |
|-------|---|----|
| II. | Proviso Text | 3 |
| III. | Executive Summary | 4 |
| IV. | Background..... | 5 |
| | Department Overview: | 5 |
| | Key Context: Boards, Commissions, Committees, Task Forces and Ad Hoc Groups | 5 |
| | Report Methodology:..... | 8 |
| V. | Report Requirements | 9 |
| | A. Two or more options for compensating individuals who serve on ongoing boards, commissions, and committees, as well as ad hoc task forces and other groups as appropriate..... | 9 |
| | B. Estimated biennial cost of each option by fund | 11 |
| | C. Administrative barriers to implementation | 13 |
| | D. A list of all current boards, commissions, committees, and ad hoc groups, including the number of member positions on each, how each is staged, what fund supports staff for each, and any related costs | 14 |
| VI. | Appendix A – List of Boards, Commissions, Committees and Task Forces..... | 15 |
| VII. | Appendix B..... | 17 |
| | Boards, commissions and committees with enabling legislation that does not allow compensation of members | 17 |
| | Boards, commissions and committees that do not allow for compensation of members due to King County Charter, Article 8, Section 870..... | 17 |
| VIII. | Appendix C – List of Boards, Commissions, Committees and Task Forces with Membership Counts, Staffing Agencies, Fund, and 2019 Actual Expenditure..... | 18 |

II. Proviso Text

P8 PROVIDED FURTHER THAT¹:

Of this appropriation, \$50,000 shall not be expended or encumbered until the executive transmits a report on providing compensation to individuals who serve on King County boards, commissions and committees, and a motion that should acknowledge receipt of the report and reference the subject matter, the proviso's ordinance, ordinance section and proviso number in both the title and body of the motion, and motion acknowledging receipt of the report is passed by council.

The report shall include, but not be limited to:

- A. Two or more options for compensating individuals who serve on ongoing boards, commissions, and committees, as well as ad hoc task forces and other groups as appropriate;
- B. The estimated biennial cost of each option by fund;
- C. Any administrative barriers to implementation; and
- D. A list of all current boards, commissions, committees, and ad hoc groups, including the number of member positions on each, how each is staffed, what fund supports staff for each, and any related costs.
- E. The executive should file the report and a motion required by this proviso by May 1, 2020², in the form of a paper original and an electronic copy with the clerk of the council, who shall retain the original and provide an electronic copy to all councilmembers, the council chief of staff and the lead staff for the budget and fiscal management committee, or its successor.

¹ [Ordinance 19021, Section 3, Office of Performance Strategy and Budget, P8](#)

² Extended to July 1, 2020 per [Motion 15620](#).

III. Executive Summary

This report is a response to a proviso in Ordinance 19021, Section 3, Office of Performance Strategy and Budget, Proviso 8. The proviso directs the King County Executive to transmit to the King County Council a report on providing compensation to individuals who serve on King County boards, commissions and committees. This report fulfills the proviso requirements.

As required by the proviso, the report includes:

- A. Two or more options for compensating individuals who serve on ongoing boards, commissions, and committees, as well as ad hoc task forces and other groups as appropriate;
- B. The estimated biennial cost of each option by fund;
- C. Any administrative barriers to implementation; and
- D. A list of all current boards, commissions, committees, and ad hoc groups, including the number of member positions on each, how each is staged, what fund supports staff for each, and any related costs.

Types of Boards, Committees, Commissions, Task Forces and Ad Hoc Groups: In the universe of boards, committees, and commissions, there are those which the county council and county executive have limited authority to effect, such as independent boards like the Museum of Flight Authority Board of Directors or regional boards like the Uniform Plumbing Code Board of Appeals. Should the council or the county executive require board members to fill out a form or do a specific task, members of independent and regional boards members would be exempt. The report focuses on those boards, committees, commissions, task force and ad hoc groups which the county has the most authority over, here referred to as county boards.

Member Classification: Current county practice considers members of boards, committees, commissions, task forces and ad hoc groups as volunteers. This is an important distinction. A volunteer designation establishes a payment ceiling. Per federal law³, volunteers may only be paid a nominal fee for performance of services. In contrast, an independent contractor designation allows compensation in line with expertise and types of duties being asked to perform.

Report Methodology: This report was developed by the Office of Performance, Strategy and Budget (PSB). To inform the analyses, findings, and recommendations in this report, subject matter experts in the Department of Community and Health Services (DCHS), the Executive Office, Finance and Business Operations Division (FBOD), Metro Transit, and the Office of Equity and Social Justice (OESJ) were consulted.

Report Recommendations: This report identifies three options to compensate individuals who serve on ongoing boards, commissions and committees, the associated biennial costs and administrative barriers. Prior to implementing two of the options, the report recommends an internal workgroup convene to develop standard operating procedures and guidance. The internal workgroup should have representatives from staffing agencies and consult with subject matter experts like FBOD and OESJ as needed.

³ Section 3(e)(4)(A) of the FLSA and [29 C.F.R. §553.101](#) and [§553.103](#)

IV. Background

Department Overview:

The King County Office of Performance, Strategy and Budget (PSB) within the King County Executive's Office provides comprehensive planning, management, budgeting, and performance assessment for King County government.

Key Context: Boards, Commissions, Committees, Task Forces and Ad Hoc Groups⁴

Function of Boards, Commissions, Committees, Task Forces and Ad Hoc Groups

King County's boards, commissions, committees, and task forces are established to review, discuss and make recommendations to the King County Council and King County Executive on a variety of issues and subject matters of interest. Most of the boards, commissions, committees, and task forces are established by county legislation, while some are established created or established as required by state law.⁵ For the remainder of this report, boards, commissions, committees, and task forces will be referred to collectively as "boards".⁶

Enabling legislation establishing or calling for a board usually details the specific subject matter knowledge, professional expertise, personal/lived experience, organization, community, or geographic area required to be represented. In many cases, the enabling legislation also specified the number of members for a specific board, as well as the role, duties, or tasks of the group.

Some boards, such as the Personnel Board⁷, have quasi-judicial responsibilities established in its enabling legislation that provide authority for the board to make decisions on behalf of the county, without council or county executive approval.

Ad hoc groups also exist to review, discuss and make recommendations on a variety of issues. Analysis for this report finds that some ad hoc groups document their findings in a report to the Council or Executive, and some do not.

Types of Boards

There are generally three types of boards associated with King County government. The types are determined by the scope of jurisdiction and tasks they are asked to do. Depending on the type board, the county has different levels of authority over said board.

- **Independent boards** fall outside the executive, legislative and judicial branches of county government. Examples of these types of independent boards are the King County Library System Board of Trustees and the Seattle Ferry Advisory Committee.

⁴ The Prosecuting Attorney's Office (PAO) has advised on this section.

⁵ There are two federally mandated boards: Advisory Council on Aging and Disability Services and the Seattle Transitional Grant Area HIV Planning Council. Examples of state mandated boards include the Board of Appeals and Equalization and the Board for Developmental Disabilities.

⁶ The PAO confirmed there is no legal distinction among the terms boards, commission or committees.

⁷ [King County Charter, Article 5, Section 540](#)

- **Regional boards**, where the county has limited purview. If the council or the county executive required board members to fill out a form or do a specific task, regional boards would be exempt from that directive. Examples of these types of boards are Building Code Advisory Board and the Snoqualmie Watershed Forum.
- **County boards** over which the county has the most authority. Examples of county boards are the Transit Advisory Committee and the Children and Youth Advisory Board.

The subject of this report are county boards as defined above. For a list of boards considered in this report, see Appendix A.

Distinction between boards, task forces and ad hoc groups

King County Boards are usually established by legislation that identifies the purpose and purview of the group, its membership composition, appointment methods, and membership terms. Generally, boards are ongoing in duration, or in some cases like the Mental Illness and Drug Dependency (MIDD) Oversight Committee, exist for the life of a funding source being overseen by the board or commission. Of the identified 45 county boards⁸ which are coordinated through the Executive Office:

- 18 have enabling legislation that specifically speaks to compensation. Three allow compensation, 15 do not allow for compensation.
- 22 have enabling legislation that does not specifically speak to compensation; of this group, four are comprised of King County employees. Per the King County Charter, “any county officer or employee who is compensated by salary shall not receive any additional compensation for serving on any board or commission . . .”⁹

The Executive Office performs coordinating functions for the County’s board: coordinates the member application and nomination process for the Executive Office, provides technical assistance to staffing agencies, and assembles the annual King County Citizens Boards and Commissions report.

Task forces often have enabling legislation which, like boards, states the purpose and purview of the group and its membership composition. A task force is usually limited in duration; once its specific task is accomplished it disbands. Currently, there are three task forces.¹⁰ None have enabling legislation that speaks to compensation.

Ad hoc groups are deployed on an as needed basis by departments, agencies, and branches of King County government. Analysis conducted for this report finds that most of King County’s ad hoc groups are formed when community engagement or specific, time limited expertise/feedback is desired or needed on a specific topic. Community engagement may be explicitly called for by a budget proviso, or other legislation; when an entity is considering a service restructure or service improvement; or when an entity seeks community engagement on a specific matter such as a strategic plan update. Like task forces, ad hoc groups are generally limited in duration.

Because ad hoc groups are utilized widely across King County government branches, departments, and agencies, and not centrally coordinated, a current, comprehensive list of ad hoc groups underway in the county does not currently exist.

⁸ A list of boards coordinated by the Executive Office liaison can be found in Appendix A.

⁹ [King County Charter, Article 8, Section 870](#)

¹⁰ Refer to Appendix A for a list of task forces.

Board Member as Volunteer

According to current county practice, members of boards are considered volunteers¹¹ serving in an appointed capacity. Per the Federal Fair Labor and Standards Act¹² (FLSA), an individual is a volunteer, not an employee of a public agency, when the individual meets the following criteria:

1. Offers services freely and without pressure or coercion, direct or implied, from an employer;
2. Is not otherwise employed by the same public agency to perform the same type of services as those for which the individual proposes to volunteer; and
3. Performs hours of service for a public agency for civic, charitable or humanitarian reasons, without promise, expectation or receipt of compensation for services rendered. A volunteer can be (a) paid expenses, (e.g. parking reimbursement), (b) reasonable benefits, (e.g. length of service award) or (c) a nominal fee to perform such services.

King County provides volunteers personal liability protection if the volunteer performed in good faith and within the course and scope of their volunteer activities on behalf of the County.

The FLSA does not define nominal fee; however 29 C.F.R. § 553.106¹³ provides guidance, “A nominal fee is not a substitute for compensation and must not be tied to productivity.” The Department of Labor has stated the regulations are focused on preventing the payment for performance, which is inconsistent with the spirit of volunteerism contemplated by the FLSA. In a 2005 letter opinion, the Department used a three-part assessment to determine if payment to a volunteer school coach could be considered a permissible nominal fee:¹⁴

1. The amount paid does not vary depending on how much time the volunteer spends on the activity;
2. The amount paid does not vary depending on how productive the volunteer is; and
3. The amount paid is 20-percent or less of what would be paid to an equivalent full-time employee to perform the same tasks.

These factors are examples of the elements that may be considered under federal law for the evaluation of payment made to county board members.

Board Member as Independent Contractor

An independent contractor approach allows a county entity to provide remuneration beyond a nominal fee. Some entities, such as Metro and DCHS, use an independent contractor approach for individuals or community based organizations participating in some ad hoc groups. Historically, departments determine the application of the independent contractor model. For example, for Metro, community based organizations do not include:

- Public entities and institutions (i.e. housing authorities, health and human services agencies, public colleges and universities, transportation agencies, municipal entities, etc.)

¹¹ Per Department of Human Resources and the [King County Boards and Commissions website](#)

¹² Section 3(e)(4)(A) of the FLSA and [29 C.F.R. §553.101](#) and [§553.103](#)

¹³ [29 C.F.R. § 553.106](#)

¹⁴ [FLSA 2005-51](#)

- 501c4s¹⁵, although individuals who attend from 501c4s can be reimbursed for expenses such as parking
- Note: Compensation can be provided to 501c5 organizations. It is advised to check with the Office of Labor Relations prior to inviting unions that represent county employees

Unlike volunteers, the county typically does not provide independent contractors personal liability protection, though the county can decide to extend its liability coverage to an independent contractor through the contract.

Report Methodology:

This report was developed by PSB. To inform the analyses, findings, and recommendations in this report, subject matter experts in the DCHS, the Executive Office, FBOD, Metro Transit, and OESJ were consulted.

¹⁵ Per the [Internal Revenue Service](#), a 501c4 can be a social welfare organization or local association of employees. Unlike a 501c3, a 501c4 can engage in substantial lobbying activities. Lobbying may be the 501c4's sole or primary activity.

V. Report Requirements

This section is organized to align with the requirements of the proviso. Please note that individuals are referred to as “members” in the subsequent discussion, referring to those who are members of board, commissions, and task forces.

A. Two or more options for compensating individuals who serve on ongoing boards, commissions, and committees, as well as ad hoc task forces and other groups as appropriate

How members are classified, either as volunteers or independent contractors, determines how much they can be paid. Volunteers fall under a nominal fee ceiling, while independent contractors do not fall under a nominal fee ceiling and can be paid an amount that takes into consideration their expertise and type of duties they are asked to perform.

The following table summarizes how each option classifies members, determines compensation amounts, and the steps needed to operationalize the option.

Table 1: Compensation Options and Steps to Operationalize

| Option | Member Classification | How Compensation is Determined | Steps to Operationalize |
|----------|---|--|--|
| A | Volunteers | Set in enabling legislation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No additional tasks must be completed to operationalize this option. • Entities that provide compensation amounts not set in legislation should consult with the Department of Human Resources or the Prosecuting Attorney’s Office to ensure the compensation amount qualifies as a nominal fee. |
| B | Independent contractors Exceptions: County employees are volunteers ¹⁶ Independent and regional board members are volunteers | Compensation amount based on level of expertise needed and tasks performed | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change enabling legislation for 14 boards and commissions¹⁷ • Allocate funding to funds for member compensation • Develop uniform guidelines that outline: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Compensation rates ○ Examples of minimum member expectations and examples of memorandum of understandings ○ Whether any organizational types are excluded from compensation consideration ○ Whether to extend personal liability insurance to members ○ Consistent instructions staffing agencies can give to members on filling out a W-9, or what to do |

¹⁶ King County Charter, Article 8, Section 870 states “...any county officer or employee who is compensated by salary shall not receive any additional compensation for serving on any board or commission...”.

¹⁷ Refer to Appendix B for the list of boards which will need to have their enabling legislation changed.

| Option | Member Classification | How Compensation is Determined | Steps to Operationalize |
|----------|--|---|--|
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> when a member does not have a social security number or mailing address ○ Reporting and tracking data ● Confirm staffing agencies have capacity to track member participation and process payments ● Provide ongoing training to staffing agencies on procurement and payables process ● Verify with members that they may receive compensation and expected total compensation¹⁸ |
| C | <p>Some members are volunteers and some are independent contractors.</p> <p>Note: County employees are volunteers</p> <p>Independent and regional board members are volunteers</p> | <p>Compensation amount based on level of expertise needed and tasks performed</p> | <p>Option B steps and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Develop criteria to help staffing agencies determine when to classify a member a volunteer and when to classify an independent contractor |

Option A requires no additional steps to operationalize. Entities that provide compensation amounts not set in legislation should consult with the Department of Human Resources or the Prosecuting Attorney’s Office to ensure the compensation amount qualifies as a nominal fee.

Options B and C will require an internal task force to develop consistent guidance, such as the types of organizations which should be included or excluded from compensation. The internal task force could include representatives from staffing agencies who are familiar with the work of boards and the internal resources required to support board work. Subject matter experts from FBOD and OESJ can be consulted as needed.

Option C will require the internal task force to also develop criteria to help staffing agencies determine when members should be classified as volunteers or as independent contractors. Criteria that centers communities of color, communities with language access needs and low-income communities could look like this:

1. Is the purpose of the board, commission, committee, task force or ad hoc group to seek community engagement at a strategic or enterprise-wide level?

¹⁸ A member’s employer or organization may not allow outside compensation. Other members may not wish to receive compensation for personal reasons or because the amount paid would bring the member’s annual income over social benefit thresholds, e.g. Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program.

2. Will the member bring experience as a service provider, a representative of organizations that serve priority populations, and/or a community leader/member from a historically disadvantaged population?

There are two payment process methods which can be used for any of the listed options: agency direct or consultant facilitated.

Agency direct payments occur when the department or agency that supports the board, i.e. the staffing department or agency, is responsible for the payment process, which includes tracking member time, receiving and approving invoices for all members. Payments are made via check and members can expect to receive payment 10 to 30 days after the invoice's receipt and approval.

Please note that FBOD is piloting a new process, a reloadable card, in late 2020 that it anticipates will be more efficient. For example, it expects the reloadable card will reduce the time between services rendered and payment received for members.

Consultant facilitated payments occur when the department or agency contracts with a consultant to facilitate meetings and administer the payment process.

B. Estimated biennial cost of each option by fund

This section reviews the estimated biennial cost of each option outlined in Section A. Data on boards and their membership counts were provided by the Executive Office. PSB budget analysts advised on which fund was most appropriate for each county board.

Option A: Provides compensation only where enabling legislation provides for compensation. This includes the Board of Appeals and Equalization, Personnel Board, and CTV Advisory Board.¹⁹ The forecasted county board member compensation cost for the 2019-2020 biennium is \$211,810. The General Fund bears this cost.

Option B: Provides for all members of all county boards to be compensated except for county officials, employees and separately elected as outlined in Section 870 of the King County Charter. Table 1 shows an estimated biennial cost for this option.

This estimate is limited to the county boards listed in Appendix A. Notably, Appendix A does not include legislative or judicial branch boards nor ad hoc groups. The estimate should therefore be considered as the low end of a yet-to-be determined range, as it does not include the estimated cost to compensate all county boards, commissions, committees, task forces and ad hoc groups due to limited available information.

In calculating this estimate, it is assumed each county board compensates members the same way, has filled every membership slot, and meets eight times in a biennium, i.e. once a quarter. Known member

¹⁹ Washington State Boundary Review Board for King County members also receive compensation at \$50 per person per workday. This board is an independent board and is not included in the biennial cost analysis.

compensation amounts range from \$50 - \$75 an hour.²⁰ This calculation assumes members are paid at the median of that range, \$62.5 an hour, that each meeting is two-hours, and that members perform no board-related work outside of normal meetings.

Table 2: Biennial Cost of Option B and C by Fund

| Fund Name | Fund # | Option B 2021-2022 Biennial Cost Estimate | Option C 2021-2022 Biennial Cost Estimate, 25% of members | Option C 2021-2022 Biennial Cost Estimate, 75% of members |
|--|--------|--|---|---|
| General Fund | 10 | \$214,000 | \$53,500 | \$160,500 |
| Developmental Disability | 1070 | \$15,000 | \$3,750 | \$11,250 |
| Behavioral Health | 1120 | \$15,000 | \$3,750 | \$11,250 |
| MIDD | 1135 | \$26,000 | \$6,500 | \$19,500 |
| Veterans Seniors and Human Services Levy Fund | 1143 | \$30,000 | \$7,500 | \$22,500 |
| Shared Services Fund ²¹ | 1210 | \$11,000 | \$2,750 | \$8,250 |
| Surface Water Management Fund | 1211 | \$37,000 | \$9,250 | \$27,750 |
| Noxious Weed Control | 1311 | \$5,000 | \$1,250 | \$3,750 |
| Community Services Operating ²² | 1421 | \$15,000 | \$3,750 | \$11,250 |
| Parks Open Space and Trails Levy | 1453 | \$9,000 | \$2,250 | \$6,750 |
| Historic Preservation Program | 1474 | \$9,000 | \$2,250 | \$6,750 |
| Best Starts for Kids Levy | 1480 | \$74,000 | \$18,500 | \$55,500 |
| Public Health | 1800 | \$56,000 | \$14,000 | \$42,000 |
| Conservation Futures Sub-Fund | 3151 | \$16,000 | \$4,000 | \$12,000 |
| Solid Waste Operating | 4040 | \$18,000 | \$4,500 | \$13,500 |
| Airport | 4290 | \$12,000 | \$3,000 | \$9,000 |
| Water Quality Operating | 4611 | \$13,000 | \$3,250 | \$9,750 |
| Public Transportation Operating Fund | 4641 | \$18,000 | \$4,500 | \$13,500 |
| Finance and Business Operations | 5450 | \$12,000 | \$3,000 | \$9,000 |
| TOTAL: | | \$605,000 | \$151,250 | \$453,750 |

Option C: This option allows county board member compensation based on a set of adopted criteria. The cost of this option should not exceed the cost of Option B, on the assumption that not all boards nor members will meet adopted criteria. Table 1 above shows two options for this approach, one compensating 25 percent of members, and one compensating 75 percent of members.

²⁰OESJ modeled what resource support for community based organizations could look like in the 2017 Labor Anti-Trafficking Work Group. This ad hoc group provided compensation to community based organizations at \$75 an hour. This model of compensating community based organizations and individuals with lived experience was continued by other ad hoc groups, such as the Open Space Equity Cabinet, the Metro Equity Cabinet and the Renton-Kent-Auburn Area Mobility Board (RKAAMB). In 2019, RKAAMB provided \$50 an hour to its 27 members.

²¹ Fund within the Water and Land Resources Division

²² Fund within DCHS

The payment process method by which members are compensated will also add costs which the funds must bear. These additional costs include:

- **Central rate costs.** Unless central rate entities absorb additional cost for processing transactions, the fund will bear additional central rate costs. Most relevant to independent contractor compensation is the accounts payable portion of FBOD's central rate, which is calculated based on the number of invoices paid.²³ Using 2021-2022 central rate model, each additional invoice costs the fund \$29.²⁴

The central rate burden to funds will vary depending on what payment process is used. In the agency direct method, every member generates an invoice for every payment. In the consultant facilitated method, there is only one invoice generated per payment. Therefore, agency direct payments will have a higher central rate burden than the consultant facilitated method (e.g. for a 20-member board there are 20 invoices in agency direct; in consultant facilitated for a 20-member board there is one invoice). Also, for agency direct payments, groups with higher member counts will have higher central rate costs. The full effect of this central rate increase will not be felt right away because FBOD's central rate calculations use data from two biennium's ago to model rates, e.g. 2021-2022 central rate calculations use 2017-2018 transaction data.

- **Consultant costs.** The consultant facilitated process requires a consultant to be paid some amount for their services. The amount will vary as delineated in the consultant's contracted agreement.

C. Administrative barriers to implementation

Administrative barriers discussed in this section include:

1. Resources: staffing, data, financial support necessary to monitor and compensate members
2. Standard operating procedures: consistent protocols on how to implement, track, and report on board compensation across all branches, departments, and agencies

Resources. Each entity will need to determine whether staffing and financial support necessary to monitor and compensate members exists. For some agencies, the staff resources needed to take on this additional work may be absorbed by existing staff, for others this may not be possible. For example, the Department of Public Defense has one board while the Department of Natural Resources and Parks has 13.²⁵

Standard operating procedures. Several outstanding questions will need to be answered to implement a consistent, countywide approach to member compensation. It is recommended that an internal

²³ [Finance-FBOD Methodology 21-22](#)

²⁴ [FBOD 2021-2022 Master Rate Model](#)

²⁵ Appendix C lists which entity staffs which board.

workgroup comprised of entities that manage boards be formed to consider the questions and develop recommendations. These questions include, but are not necessarily limited to:

- Should personal liability protection be extended to members classified as independent contractors?
- Are there any organizational types that should be excluded from compensation consideration?
- How to handle situations where the recipient does not have a social security number or address?²⁶
- Are there minimum standards for member expectations, memorandum of understandings (MOU), and protocols within staffing agency to handle member non-compliance with MOUs?
- Should partial compensation be provided if total compensation will take a member above their income thresholds for social benefit programs? What happens if a member does not want compensation?
- How should member compensation information be tracked, who should coordinate its collection, and how often should it be reported on and to whom?
- What criteria to use to determine when members should be classified as volunteers and when they should be classified as independent contractors. (Option C only)

Staff will also need to attend training offered by FBOD’s procurement and payables prior to contracting with members or consultants.

While not considered an “administrative barrier” necessarily, legislative action would be required by the Council to allow for compensation of board, commission, task forces, and ad hoc members. A list of the 14 boards, commissions, and committees with enabling legislation that does not allow members to receive compensation are listed in Appendix B.

On May 29, 2020, the county executive proclaimed an emergency budget crisis for the remainder of the 2019-2020 biennium. The proclamation states that “King County revenues are insufficient to fully fund King County agency operations and significant costs savings must be achieved through reductions in service and pay.” For the 2021-2022 biennium, the Office of Performance, Strategy, and Budget forecasts a \$150 million shortfall in the general fund. It will be difficult for agencies to implement new compensation for board members while they are also asked to find budget reductions.

D. A list of all current boards, commissions, committees, and ad hoc groups, including the number of member positions on each, how each is staged, what fund supports staff for each, and any related costs

Please see Appendix C.

²⁶ IRS policy requires businesses submit a 1099-MISC that lists payments of \$600 or more made to individuals or business during a tax year. This requires the individual or business to submit a completed W-9 to the county, which can be difficult to do for those who do not have a social security number or address.

VI. Appendix A – List of Boards, Commissions, Committees and Task Forces

| # | Name | Type | Compensation amount set in enabling legislation |
|----|---|-------------|--|
| 1 | Cultural Development Authority (4Culture) | Independent | |
| 2 | Ferry Advisory Committee – Fauntleroy | Independent | |
| 3 | Ferry Advisory Committee – Seattle | Independent | |
| 4 | Ferry Advisory Committee – Vashon | Independent | |
| 5 | Harborview Medical Center Board of Trustees | Independent | |
| 6 | Housing Authority Board of Commissioners | Independent | |
| 7 | Library System Board of Trustees | Independent | |
| 8 | Museum of Flight Authority Board of Directors | Independent | |
| 9 | Washington State Boundary Review Board for King County | Independent | \$50 per person per workday |
| 10 | Washington State Convention Center Public Facilities District | Independent | |
| 11 | Washington State Major League Baseball Stadium Public Facilities District | Independent | |
| 12 | Brightwater Air Quality Board | Regional | |
| 13 | Building Code Advisory Board | Regional | |
| 14 | Fire Code Advisory and Appeals Board | Regional | |
| 15 | Regional Communications Board | Regional | |
| 16 | Snoqualmie Watershed Forum | Regional | |
| 17 | Uniform Plumbing Code Board of Appeals | Regional | |
| 18 | Deferred Compensation Board | County | |
| 19 | Advisory Council on Aging and Disability Services | County | |
| 20 | Agriculture Commission | County | |
| 21 | Behavioral Health Advisory Board | County | |
| 22 | Board for Developmental Disabilities | County | |
| 23 | Board of Appeals and Equalization | County | \$300 per person per day of hearings |
| 24 | Board of Ethics | County | |
| 25 | Charter Review Commission | County | |
| 26 | Children and Youth Advisory Board | County | |
| 27 | Citizens Election Oversight Committee | County | |
| 28 | Civil Rights Commission | County | |
| 29 | Civil Service Commission | County | |
| 30 | Communities of Opportunity Best Starts for Kids Levy Advisory Board | County | |
| 31 | Community Advisory Committee on Law Enforcement Oversight | County | |
| 32 | Conservation Futures Citizen Oversight Committee | County | |
| 33 | CTV Citizens Advisory Committee | County | \$50 per person per day on day advisory committee meetings |
| 34 | CTV Working Group | County | |

Compensation for members of boards, commissions, committees and task forces

| # | Name | Type | Compensation amount set in enabling legislation |
|----|---|--------------------|--|
| 35 | Economic Forecast Council | County | |
| 36 | Economic Opportunity and Empowerment Program Advisory Board | County | |
| 37 | EEO/AA Advisory Committee | County | |
| 38 | Emergency Management Advisory Committee | County | |
| 39 | Employee Giving Program Committee | County | |
| 40 | Immigrant and Refugee Commission | County | |
| 41 | International Airport Roundtable | County | |
| 42 | Investment Pool Advisory Committee | County | |
| 43 | Lake Geneva Management District Advisory Board | County | |
| 44 | Landmarks Commission | County | |
| 45 | Mental Illness and Drug Dependency Oversight Committee | County | |
| 46 | Noxious Weed Control Board | County | |
| 47 | Parks Levy Citizens Oversight Board | County | |
| 48 | Patterson Creek Basin Citizens Advisory Committee | County | |
| 49 | Personnel Board | County | \$100 per person for a full day of work; \$75 per person for work of 3 hours or less |
| 50 | Priority Hire Advisory Committee | County | |
| 51 | Public Defense Advisory Board | County | |
| 52 | Rural Forest Commission | County | |
| 53 | Ruth Woo Emerging Leadership Fellowship | County | |
| 54 | Seattle Transitional Grant Area HIV Planning Council | County | |
| 55 | Solid Waste Advisory Committee | County | |
| 56 | Strategic Advisory Council | County | |
| 57 | Transit Advisory Committee | County | |
| 58 | Vashon-Maury Island Groundwater Protection Committee | County | |
| 59 | Veterans Advisory Board (Part of VSHSL Advisory Board subcommittee) | County | |
| 60 | Veterans, Seniors and Human Services Levy Advisory Board's Veterans Committee | County | |
| 61 | WaterWorks Grant Ranking Committee | County | |
| 62 | Women's Advisory Board | County | |
| 63 | Children and Families Strategy Task Force | County, Task Force | |
| 64 | Harborview Leadership Group | County, Task Force | |
| 65 | Gender Identity and Sexual Orientation Inclusion Task Force | County, Task Force | |

VII. Appendix B

Boards, commissions and committees with enabling legislation that does not allow compensation of members

1. Agriculture Commission
2. Behavioral Health Advisory Board
3. Board for Developmental Disabilities²⁷
4. Civil Service Commission
5. Emergency Management Advisory Committee
6. Employee Giving Program Committee²⁸
7. International Airport Roundtable
8. Investment Pool Advisory Committee
9. Landmarks Commission
10. Noxious Weed Control Board²⁹
11. Public Defense Advisory Board
12. Rural Forest Commission
13. Seattle Transitional Grant Area HIV Planning Council³⁰
14. Solid Waste Advisory Committee
15. Strategic Advisory Council

Boards, commissions and committees that do not allow for compensation of members due to King County Charter, Article 8, Section 870

1. CTV Working Group
2. Deferred Compensation Board
3. Economic Forecast Council
4. EEO/AA Advisory Committee
5. Employee Giving Program Committee
6. Ruth Woo Emerging Leadership Fellowship

²⁷ State law does not allow compensation for members of the Board for Developmental Disabilities (RCW [71A.14.020](#)) and the Noxious Weed Control Board RCW ([17.10.020](#)). Changing compensation amounts will require amending state law.

²⁸ The Employee Giving Committee is solely comprised of King County employees. Its enabling legislation does not allow for compensation and Section 870 of the King County Charter also applies.

²⁹ See footnote 35.

³⁰ The Seattle Transitional Grant Area HIV Planning Council's member compensation amount is set by the [Ryan White Part A Manual](#). The manual does not allow for member compensation. Changing compensation amounts will require amending the Ryan White Part A Manual.

VIII. Appendix C – List of Boards, Commissions, Committees and Task Forces with Membership Counts, Staffing Agencies, Fund, and 2019 Actual Expenditure

Attached.

Compensation for members of boards, commissions, committees and task forces

Appendix C

| Board | Established by | Enabling Legislation | Type | Number of Members | Department Responsible for Assigning Staff Support | Fund | 2019 Estimated Expenditure Amount |
|---|-----------------------|--|-------------|---|---|------|-----------------------------------|
| Ferry Advisory Committee - Fautleroy | State Law | RCW 47.60.310 | Independent | 3 | Independent Board - WA State Ferries | N/A | N/A |
| Ferry Advisory Committee - Seattle | State Law | RCW 47.60.310 | Independent | 3 | Independent Board - Currently Inactive - WA State Ferries | N/A | N/A |
| Ferry Advisory Committee - Vashon | State Law | RCW 47.60.310 | Independent | 3 | Independent Board - WA State Ferries | N/A | N/A |
| Harborview Medical Center Board of Trustees | State Law | RCW 36.62.010 and K.C.C. Section 2.42 | Independent | 13 | Independent - HMC provides Staff Support | N/A | N/A |
| Housing Authority Board of Commissioners | State Law | RCW 35.82.040; K.C.C. Section 2.88.015 | Independent | 5 | Independent - KCHA provides Staff Support | N/A | N/A |
| Library System Board of Trustees | State Law | RCW 27.12.30 | Independent | 7 | Independent - KCLS provides Staff Support | N/A | N/A |
| Washington State Boundary Review Board for King County | State Law | RCW 36.93 | Independent | 11 | Independent - DES Provides Staff Support | N/A | N/A |
| Washington State Convention Center Public Facilities District | State Law | RCW 36.100; K.C.C. Section 2.300.020 | Independent | 9 | Independent - WSCC Provides Staff Support | N/A | N/A |
| Washington State Major League Baseball Stadium Public Facilities District | State Law | RCW 36.100; K.C.C. Section 2.37.010 | Independent | 7 | Independent - WS Baseball Stadium Provides Staff Support | N/A | N/A |
| Cultural Development Authority (4Culture) | King County Charter | K.C.C. Section 2.49.080 | Independent | 15 | Independent | N/A | N/A |
| Museum of Flight Authority Board of Directors | King County Ordinance | K.C.C. Section 15.90.070 | Independent | 7 | Independent | N/A | N/A |
| Building Code Advisory Board | State Law | K.C.C. Section 16.02.560 | Regional | 9 | DLS | N/A | N/A |
| Fire Code Advisory and Appeals Board | State Law | K.C.C. Section 17.04.300 | Regional | 5 (Fire Marshall is an ex-officio member) | DLS | N/A | N/A |
| Uniform Plumbing Code Board of Appeals | State Law | K.C.C. Section 16.32.170 | Regional | 6 | DLS | N/A | N/A |
| Brightwater Air Quality Board | Interlocal Agreement | Development agreement between Snohomish & King Counties. | Regional | 9 | DNRP | N/A | < than \$5,000 |
| Snoqualmie Watershed Forum | Interlocal Agreement | Interlocal Agreement - King County, the Snoqualmie Tribe, and the cities of Duvall, Carnation, North Bend and Snoqualmie. | Regional | 8 Member Governments + 5 ex officio members | DNRP | N/A | N/A |
| Regional Communications Board | King County Ordinance | K.C.C. Section 2.58.050 | Regional | 5 | KCIT | N/A | N/A |
| Advisory Council on Aging and Disability Services | Federal Mandate | Federal Mandate - Older Americans Act of 1985 | County | 9 | DCHS | 1421 | \$0.00 |
| Seattle Transitional Grant Area HIV Planning Council | Federal Mandate | Federal Mandate - Ryan White Comprehensive AIDS Resources Emergency Act of 1990, most recently reauthorized as the Ryan White HIV/AIDS Treatment Extension Act of 2009 | County | 40 | DoPH | 1800 | \$266.022 (Budgeted) |
| Board for Developmental Disabilities | State Law | RCW 71A.14.020 and King County Code 2.32.020 | County | 15 | DCHS | 1070 | \$11,044 |

Compensation for members of boards, commissions, committees and task forces

Appendix C

| Board | Established by | Enabling Legislation | Type | Number of Members | Department Responsible for Assigning Staff Support | Fund | 2019 Estimated Expenditure Amount |
|---|-----------------------|---|--------|-------------------|--|------|--|
| Board of Appeals and Equalization | State Law | RCW 84.48; enabled by Home Rule Charter under the Board of Appeals, Article III, Section 340.40 and 340.60; Article VII and the K.C.C. Section 2.34 | County | 7 | Council | 10 | \$956,000 |
| Noxious Weed Control Board | State Law | RCW 17.10 | County | 5 | DNRP | 1311 | \$11,000 |
| Solid Waste Advisory Committee | State Law | RCW 70.95.165; King County Code Section 10.28 | County | 18 | DNRP | 4040 | \$2,085.00 |
| EEO/AA Advisory Committee | Executive Policy | Executive Policy PER 22-5-1 (AEP) | County | 22 | DES | 10 | \$385.00 |
| Veterans Advisory Board (Part of VSHSL Advisory Board subcommittee) | Executive Policy | Executive Policy CPM 11-1 (PR) / Ordinance 18785 | County | 10 | DCHS | 1143 | \$1,350 (combined with VSHSL Board) |
| Deferred Compensation Board | Executive Policy | Executive Policy PER 10-3 (AEP) | County | 9 | DES | 5457 | \$320,398 |
| Charter Review Commission | King County Charter | King County Charter, Article 8, Section 800. | County | 15 | Council | 10 | \$0 |
| Economic Forecast Council | King County Charter | King County Charter, Article 4, Section 425.10; | County | 4 | Executive | 10 | \$0 |
| Personnel Board | King County Charter | King County Charter Article 5, Section 540 | County | 5 | DES | 10 | \$350 |
| "Veterans, Seniors and Human Services Levy Advisory Board's Veterans Committee" | King County Ordinance | Ordinance 18785 | County | 30 | DCHS | 1143 | 1350 (combined with Veterans Advisory Board) |
| Agriculture Commission | King County Ordinance | K.C.C. Section 2.40 | County | 15 | DNRP | 1211 | \$30,000 |
| Behaviorial Health Advisory Board | King County Ordinance | K.C.C. 2A.300.050 | County | 15 | DCHS | 1120 | \$1,600 |
| Board of Ethics | King County Ordinance | K.C.C. Section 3.04.080 | County | 5 | DES | 10 | \$3,000 |
| Children and Youth Advisory Board | King County Ordinance | K.C.C. Section 2A.300.510 | County | 40 | DCHS | 1480 | \$82,500 |
| Citizens Election Oversight Committee (Nominated & Appointed by Council) | King County Ordinance | K.C.C. Section 2.53 | County | 16 | Council | 10 | \$0 |
| Civil Rights Commission | King County Ordinance | K.C.C. Section 3.10 | County | 12 | ESJ | 10 | \$275,000 |
| Civil Service Commission | King County Ordinance | RCW 41.14; K.C.C. Section 3.14 | County | 3 | DES | 10 | \$0 |
| Communities of Opportunity Best Starts for Kids Levy Advisory Board | King County Ordinance | K.C.C. Section 2A.300.520 | County | 16 | DoPH | 1800 | \$3,500 |
| Community Advisory Committee on Law Enforcement Oversight | King County Ordinance | K.C.C Section 2.36.050 | County | 11 | Council | 10 | \$3,500 |
| Conservation Futures Citizen Oversight Committee | King County Ordinance | K.C.C. Section 2.36.070 | County | 16 | DNRP | 3151 | \$80,000 |
| CTV Citizens Advisory Committee | King County Ordinance | K.C.C. Section 2.59.110 | County | 4 | KCIT | 10 | \$450 |
| CTV Working Group | King County Ordinance | K.C.C. Section 2.59.110 | County | 7 | KCIT | 10 | \$0 |

Compensation for members of boards, commissions, committees and task forces

Appendix C

| Board | Established by | Enabling Legislation | Type | Number of Members | Department Responsible for Assigning Staff Support | Fund | 2019 Estimated Expenditure Amount |
|---|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--|------|-----------------------------------|
| Economic Opportunity and Empowerment Program Advisory Board | King County Ordinance | Ordinance 17973 | County | 12 | DCHS | 10 | \$0 |
| Emergency Management Advisory Committee | King County Ordinance | K.C.C. 2A.310.050 | County | 50 | DES | 10 | \$0 |
| Employee Giving Program Committee | King County Ordinance | K.C.C. Section 3.36.030 | County | 15 | DES | 10 | \$2,500 |
| Immigrant and Refugee Commission | King County Ordinance | K.C.C. Section 2.78 | County | 13 | Exec | 10 | \$1,200 |
| International Airport Roundtable | King County Ordinance | K.C.C. Section 15.94 | County | 12 | DES | 4290 | \$500 |
| Investment Pool Advisory Committee | King County Ordinance | K.C.C. Section 2.36.090 | County | 10 | DES | 10 | \$0 |
| Lake Geneva Management District Advisory Board | King County Ordinance | KC. Ordinance 18282 | County | 5 | DNRP | 1211 | \$50 |
| Landmarks Commission | King County Ordinance | K.C.C. Section 20.62.30 | County | 9 | DNRP | 1474 | \$75,000 |
| Mental Illness and Drug Dependency Oversight Committee | King County Ordinance | K.C.C. Section 2.130 | County | 37 | DCHS | 1135 | \$27,844 |
| Parks Levy Citizens Oversight Board | King County Ordinance | K.C.C. Section 7.08.090 | County | 9 | DNRP | 1453 | \$4,000 |
| Patterson Creek Basin Citizens Advisory Committee | King County Ordinance | K.C.C. Section 2.36.080 | County | 5 | DNRP | 1211 | \$0 |
| Priority Hire Advisory Committee | King County Ordinance | K.C.C. Section 12.18A.040 | County | 12 | DES | 5450 | \$8,500 |
| Public Defense Advisory Board | King County Ordinance | K.C.C. Section 2.60.031 | County | 11 | DES | 10 | \$0 |
| Rural Forest Commission | King County Ordinance | K.C.C. Section 2.41 | County | 13 | DNRP | 1211 | \$20,000 |
| Ruth Woo Emerging Leadership Fellowship | King County Ordinance | K.C.C. Section 3.12.184 | County | 4 | HRD | 10 | \$0 |
| Strategic Advisory Council | King County Ordinance | K.C.C. 2A.380.300 | County | 19 | KCIT | 10 | \$0 |
| Transit Advisory Committee | King County Ordinance | K.C.C. Section 2.124.010 | County | 18 | Metro DOT | 4641 | \$1,500 |
| Vashon-Maury Island Groundwater Protection Committee | King County Ordinance | K.C.C. 9.14.070 | County | 11 | DNRP | 1210 | \$67,000 |
| WaterWorks Grant Ranking Committee | King County Ordinance | Ordinance 18031 | County | 13 | DNRP | 4611 | \$1,500 |
| Women's Advisory Board | King County Ordinance | K.C.C. Section 2.30 | County | 15 | DCHS | 1421 | \$2,500 |
| Children and Families Strategy Task Force | Motion | Motion 15521 | County, Taskforce | 34 | DCHS | 1480 | \$0 |
| Gender Identity and Sexual Orientation Inclusion Task Force | Motion | Motion 15162 | County, Taskforce | 20 | HRD | 10 | \$0 |

Compensation for members of boards, commissions, committees and task forces

Appendix C

| Board | Established by | Enabling Legislation | Type | Number of Members | Department Responsible for Assigning Staff Support | Fund | 2019 Estimated Expenditure Amount |
|-----------------------------|----------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------|--|------|-----------------------------------|
| Harborview Leadership Group | Motion | Motion 15183 | County, Taskforce | 14 | Exec | 10 | \$0 |