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What is COO?

**Overview:** Communities of Opportunity (COO) is a community-public-private partnership between King County and the Seattle Foundation that began in 2014 and expanded in 2016 with funding from the Best Starts for Kid tax levy. COO is a Best Starts for Kids investment strategy, fostering community conditions that create equitable opportunities for children, youth, and families. This report summarizes evaluation findings from 2015 through 2021.

**COO’s mission:** to create greater racial, health, social, and economic equity in King County through investments in community-driven solutions and partnerships.

**COO’s Investment Strategies:**

1. **Community Partnerships:** COO invested in nine place-based and cultural community partnerships, supporting multi-year collaborative efforts to improve outcomes and opportunities for the communities in King County experiencing the greatest inequities.

2. **Systems and Policy Change:** Public Health – Seattle & King County, in partnership with the Seattle Foundation, invested in 107 mostly two-year community-driven efforts to transform systems and policies in ways that advanced equity.

3. **Learning Community:** COO invested in a community-based approach to capacity building that supports organizations to strengthen community connections and advance community-driven projects.

**COO’s Community Power-Building Approach:** To create policy, system, and environmental (PSE) changes, COO supported efforts to build and expand the existing power in communities. COO partners (i.e., agencies participating in one or more COO investment strategy) held community events, educated, and mobilized community members, and developed community leaders in efforts to strengthen community power.
How did we evaluate COO?
This report covers the evaluation activities from 2015 – 2021.

Main Evaluation Question
In what ways have COO’s cross-cutting strategies strengthened community connections and increased equity in housing, health, and economic conditions in King County?

Evaluation Sub-Question
How are disparities changing in COO’s four result areas?
How is the lived experience of COO communities in the four result areas changing over time?

Measures
- Headline Indicators
- Performance Measures

Data Sources
- Population-level surveys (BRFSS, ACS, PUMS, APCD, HYS)*
- Mid-year & end-of-year reports, key informant interviews, surveys

How has COO advanced equity?

Community Power-Building
COO supported partners to strengthen existing power in communities. Partners found the longevity, level, and flexibility of COO’s funding helpful in building this power. Specifically, COO’s multi-year funding allowed partners to hire staff and was flexible enough to cover administrative costs and community power building activities. COO, mostly through the Learning Community, provided opportunities for partners to expand their capacity and community connections to build power. Since 2018, COO partners developed 451 new partnerships, 1,119 new relationships, and 2,095 new leaders.

Community Development & Land Ownership
COO partners increased the involvement of community in developing and stewarding spaces in neighborhoods experiencing high levels of gentrification and displacement. Community Partnerships partners in the Central District, Rainier Valley, and White Center developed properties owned and designed by community. COO partners across the investment strategies built community capacity and leadership for equitable land development and stewardship. The Learning Community provided many related resources and opportunities, including two Learning Circle cohorts1 and

1 Learning circles convened community leaders over multiple months to build capacity and relationships to address issues such as community-driven development.
a Commercial Affordability Pilot.

**Housing**
COO partners improved housing opportunities for King County residents by increasing access to affordable housing and minimizing displacement of residents, businesses, and cultural communities. COO partners produced PSE changes that increased tenant protections at the state and local level, funding for and development of affordable housing, and access to culturally responsive housing resources.

**Health**
COO partners improved health opportunities in King County using several strategies, including increasing access to healthy and culturally relevant foods in schools and communities. Partners also improved access to culturally responsive healthcare. Finally, partners improved community health and safety by making PSE changes related to climate action and police reform.

**Economic Opportunities**
COO partners improved economic opportunities by supporting small businesses and entrepreneurs, increasing worker and debt protections, expanding supports for low-income families, and providing workforce development opportunities, especially for immigrants, refugees, and young people of color.

**Leveraging Funds**
COO partners leveraged COO resources and connections to expand the scope and sustainability of their work. They received tens of millions of additional funds to build and sustain the momentum for PSE change. This included funding efforts to develop and expand community development and landownership efforts, provide COVID relief and increase digital access, among others.

**What challenges did COO experience?**
COVID-19, which emerged roughly halfway through the funding cycle, represented the largest challenge to COO. It required all partners to make changes to their work plan and approach. Some Community Partnerships also struggled and experienced conflict when trust had not been established between lead and partner agencies. COO experienced challenges in ensuring that administrative processes like contracting practices aligned with racial and economic equity principles. Finally, some COO partners found the lengthy and detailed evaluation reporting requirements challenging and cumbersome.

---

2 The Commercial Affordability pilot supported four commercial projects and helped develop tools for small businesses and organizations to increase community development and ownership.
Takeaways & Opportunities

**Takeaway 1:** Investing in community-driven work that spans multiple strategies and communities can support measurable benefits in equity.

**Takeaway 2:** Long-term investment in community power-building represents a compelling approach to supporting PSE change.

**Takeaway 3:** The Learning Community, COO’s investment strategy that supports organizations to build capacity and relationships, is an effective model for how funding agencies can support partners beyond providing financial resources.

**Takeaway 4:** COO supports future advancements in equity by contributing to changes to the regional funding landscape.

**Opportunity 1:** COO can advance equity by supporting the development and ongoing maintenance of equitable and productive community partnerships.

**Opportunity 2:** COO leadership, including Governance Group and staff in leadership positions at PHSKC and the Seattle Foundation, can expand the reach and impact of COO by inviting other funders and relevant stakeholders to support the work of COO.

**Opportunity 3:** COO leadership can advance equity by examining their own internal systems and practices to increase alignment with racial and economic equity principles.

**Opportunity 4:** COO can advance equity by investing in COO partners’ capacity to build narrative power.

**Opportunity 5:** COO can advance equity by expanding the scope and reach of the Learning Community and supporting its replication in similar equity initiatives.

Conclusion

The evaluation of COO activities from 2015 - 2021 demonstrated COO's success in supporting community-driven advances in racial, social, and economic equity. The data illustrate ways that COO partners improved opportunities and lived experiences for many King County residents. The data also show how COO can continue to grow and build on these successes to expand its reach and impact for King County communities moving forward.
Communities of Opportunity (COO) began in 2014 as a public-private partnership between King County and the Seattle Foundation. Using data from Public Health – Seattle & King County (PHSKC), this partnership aimed to address racial and economic inequities in the regions of the county most affected by them. Data showed poorer health outcomes in low-income areas of the county with higher proportions of people of color, immigrants, and refugees. In 2016, COO expanded into a unique community-public-private partnership with funding through the Best Starts for Kids levy. An initiative approved by King County voters, Best Starts for Kids supports all children in King County to realize their potential to be happy, healthy, safe, and thriving. COO is a Best Starts for Kids investment strategy, fostering community conditions that create opportunities for children, youth, and families. COO’s mission is to create greater racial, health, social, and economic equity in King County through investments in community-driven solutions and partnerships. COO believes that the most meaningful, just, and sustainable solutions are generated in partnership with communities.

The broader cultural context has changed dramatically since COO began in 2014. Two contentious presidential elections, a global pandemic that amplified anti-Asian sentiment, national protests against anti-Black racism and violence, the #MeToo movement, worsening impacts from climate change, and persistent economic inequality — these events, among others, have drastically altered the landscape in which COO functions. The national and local protests for racial justice, for example, drew attention to how...
persistent racial inequities harm the health and wellbeing of people of color, and Black and Brown people in particular. The protests sparked a renewed focus on the need for structural change led by the communities most impacted. In King County, the protests and the calls for investment in communities led to changes such as the development of the participatory budgeting program in the Seattle Office of Civil Rights and the declaration by King County and PHSKC that racism is a public health crisis. As COO continues to support community partners to mobilize and work towards policy, systems, and environmental (PSE) change, it does so in a cultural context featuring a different level of awareness and commitment to this effort.

This report summarizes qualitative and quantitative evaluation findings from 2015 through 2021 to answer the following overarching evaluation question:

**Evaluation Question**

In what ways have COO’s cross-cutting strategies strengthened community connections and increased equity in housing, health, and economic conditions in King County?

The report concludes with reflections on the strengths and opportunities for growth for COO in the next implementation cycle following the renewal of the Best Starts for Kids tax levy in 2021.
COO aims to increase racial, health, social, and economic equity by implementing three investment strategies: Community Partnerships, Systems and Policy Change, and the Learning Community. Through these investments, COO strives to increase the capacity of COO partners and communities to create policies, systems, and environmental (PSE) changes. Policy changes include changes to laws, ordinances, regulations, and rules. Systems changes include changes to institutions, organizations, or communities. Environmental changes include changes to the economic, social, or physical environment of a neighborhood or region. PSE changes can contribute to greater equity in COO’s four results areas: Community Connections, Housing, Health, and Economic Opportunities. Figure 1 illustrates the connections between these constructs in COO’s Theory of Change.

---

3 In this report, “COO partners” refers to agencies and partnerships participating in at least one of the three COO investment strategies.
COO Investment Strategies

COO supported a diverse group of new and existing partnerships and projects. COO provided funding and other resources so that partnerships could make new connections and leverage their COO work to secure additional funding, expanding the scope and sustainability of their work. Never intending to be a project's sole funding source, COO sought to contribute to the confluence of regional resources and efforts to advance racial, social, and economic equity.

Community Partnerships

The investments in Community Partnerships aim to strengthen community-driven efforts, solutions, and partnerships to advance equity in the geographic and cultural communities most impacted by structural inequities. COO began with an understanding that sustained and transformational PSE change happens through the effort and leadership of many people and organizations working together. After reviewing population health and well-being indicators across neighborhoods in King County — including life expectancy, adverse childhood experiences, and obesity — COO recognized the strong connection
between racial inequities and place. To address these inequities, COO began its community partnership investments. Community partnerships include several organizations and leaders within the geographic or cultural community of focus working collaboratively to advance equity.

In 2015, COO invested in three place-based community partnerships:

1. Rainier Valley
2. SeaTac/Tukwila
3. White Center

In 2018, COO expanded its investment to include six new place-based and cultural community partnerships:

1. Umoja: Replanting Roots, Rebuilding Community – focused on the African American/Black community in Seattle’s Central District neighborhood
2. Comunidad Latina de Vashon – focused on Latinx communities on Vashon Island, South King County, and South King County unincorporated areas
3. Kent Community Development Collaborative
4. Seattle Urban Native Nonprofits (SUNN)
5. Snoqualmie Valley – A Supportive Community for All (SCFA)
6. Transgender Economic Empowerment Coalition (TEEC)

**Systems and Policy Change (SPC)**

With funding from the Seattle Foundation, COO began its investments in the Systems and Policy Change (SPC) strategy in 2014. These mostly two-year investments support community-engaged and community-driven efforts to transform systems and policies to advance equity. With additional funding for this strategy coming from a private foundation, SPC partners, unlike those in the King County-funded Community Partnership strategy, have more flexibility to engage in activities related to policy advocacy. As such, this COO strategy aims to:

1. Increase the readiness and ability of communities to inform, improve and guide implementation of systems and policies;
2. Support community-led efforts positioned to inform, improve, or guide implementation of specific systems and policies that improve community connections, economic opportunity, health, and/or housing; and
3. Increase connection, relationship, and partnerships among SPC partners engaging in PSE change work.
Since 2014, the SPC strategy has awarded 107 grants through six competitive RFP rounds. In 2020, COO, and in particular COO’s community-led Governance Group, recognized the toll that the dual pandemics of COVID-19 and racism were having on communities of color and on organizations and coalitions doing racial, economic, and health equity work. In response, King County and the Seattle Foundation created two temporary grant programs under the SPC strategy. The first was the COVID-19 Resilience and Response grants. These funds supported 16 community-based organizations and coalitions on their immediate responses to and long-term recovery from COVID-19 using a racial equity lens. Recognizing the unique impact of racism on Black people and the historically limited philanthropic investment in Black-led organizations and communities, the second grant program supported the racial equity-focused and community-driven policy change efforts of seven Black-led organizations.

### Learning Community

The Learning Community uses a community-based approach to capacity building that supports organizations to strengthen community connections and advance community-driven projects. Launched in 2019, the Learning Community offers free supports, resources, and opportunities to all community-based agencies in King County working towards racial and social justice. These offerings represent an opportunity for all organizations in the county to benefit from the work of COO and move closer to addressing root causes of inequity. See Table 1 for a list of Learning Community offerings and activities.

The Learning Community’s approach to capacity-building differs from more traditional approaches in several ways. First, the Learning Community provides shared learning opportunities aimed at increasing not just skills and knowledge but also relationships and collaboration opportunities of community-based organizations. As outlined in Table 1, these include offerings such as peer learning cohorts and multi-group trainings. The focus and scale of the Learning Community’s offerings also deviate from more traditional technical assistance approaches. For example, the Learning Community, like COO broadly, prioritizes a focus on racial equity and community development. One of its offerings was a peer learning cohort on community-driven development and land stewardship. This cohort featured 12 representatives from low-income and Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC)-led grassroots organizations that met monthly for nine months to advance their skills and projects relating to community-driven development. After this initial pilot learning circle cohort, the Learning Community implemented a second cycle of the cohort that built on the work of the first.
The Learning Community’s community-based approach also includes its responsiveness to communities; it offers new resources and opportunities based on direct requests and feedback from participants. Finally, the trainers, consultants, and facilitators that provide many of these offerings are representative of and embedded in the cultural and geographic communities prioritized by COO. Many of the COO Learning Community activities amplify and uplift leaders and strategies from within COO-funded partners.

Table 1. Learning Community Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Community Activities</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-group trainings</td>
<td>In-person and online trainings offered for multiple groups to attend</td>
<td>Workshops on logic models, effective collaborations, and equitable facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer learning cohorts</td>
<td>Learning circles that convened community leaders to share and build knowledge, skills, relationships, and capacity over multiple months to address an issue</td>
<td>Puget Sound Sage’s Community Real Estate Stewardship Team (CREST), a 9-month cohort on community-driven development and land stewardship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-on-one coaching</td>
<td>Individualized coaching sessions to work through specific scenarios, challenges, and opportunities</td>
<td>Leadership and Organizational, Finance, and Equitable Development Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical assistance</td>
<td>As needed, usually one-time meetings for PHSKC staff and consultants to support COO partners with emergent issues or questions</td>
<td>Ad hoc consultations with Communities Count staff to discuss evaluation-related questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini-capacity building grants</td>
<td>Small one-time grants provided to COO partners to support their attendance or receipt of a unique capacity building event, opportunity, or resource</td>
<td>Partnership Mini Grants: $20,000 awarded to select COO Partnerships to support partnership infrastructure and relationships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COO’s mission is to support community-driven solutions and partnerships to increase racial, social, health, and economic equity in King County. In this context, “community-driven” refers to “an approach to development and social transformation that emphasizes the insight, leadership, and ownership of the people who are living and experiencing issues at the community level, and their work to create lasting change in the systems and root causes that underlie the critical issues they seek to address.” To achieve this mission, COO supports efforts to build community power, most often by investing in existing power in communities and supporting its growth. This is demonstrated by COO’s community-driven design, the governance of COO by community members, and its ongoing investments in building and strengthening existing power in communities.

**Community Influence of COO**

- **Governance Group**: in 2014, PHSKC and the Seattle Foundation engaged in a community co-design process by partnering with a small group of community leaders to shape everything from COO’s intended outcomes and result areas to its grant-making process and funding priorities. Many of these leaders became members of COO’s original Governance Group. This group continues to provide strategic leadership, direction, and oversight of COO, and the majority of members remain community representatives.

- **Evaluation Advisory Group**: provides ongoing feedback on COO’s evaluation plan, methods, and findings. The group is comprised of representatives from COO’s community organizations and partnerships.

- **COO staff**: most COO staff at PHSKC and the Seattle Foundation reflect and are part of the communities represented in COO. This informs and strengthens their relational approach to working with COO partners, prioritizing trust-building and transparency.

**Community power** is the ability of communities most impacted by inequities to work together to set agendas, shift public discourse, increase opportunities for community ownership, and advance meaningful change.
Investments in Community Power-Building

The process of co-designing COO highlighted the importance of having community lead this work. It became clearer over time that this meant investing in ways to build and support existing power in communities. Community power is the ability of communities most impacted by inequities to work together to set agendas, shift public discourse, increase opportunities for community ownership, and advance meaningful change. At its most basic level, community power is the ability of communities to decide what happens to their own communities.

Building community power represents one way to address racial, social, and health inequities because it can target their root causes. Recognizing that inequities such as those tied to structural racism are a result of imbalances of societal power, efforts to expand existing community power try to shift those power dynamics and transform the inequitable systems they create. Instead of working to create superficial changes to immediate conditions, community power-building approaches seek to strengthen existing power in the communities that have been historically and systematically disempowered, increasing their capacity to shift power dynamics broadly in ways that increase equity.

To strengthen their existing power, communities engage in activities such as increasing and strengthening community connections, community organizing, and developing community leaders. COO supported community power-building efforts across the three investment strategies. It supported partners and agencies to, among other things, spend time mobilizing and educating community members, hire community organizers, hold events to increase community connections, and strengthen relationships with policy- and decision-makers. By investing in community power-building, COO aimed to support sustainable, meaningful, and community-driven policy, systems, and environmental changes that advance equity.
Figure 2. Summary of COO’s strategies and results areas
The COO evaluation addressed the following overarching question:

In what ways have COO’s cross-cutting strategies strengthened community connections and increased equity in housing, health, and economic conditions in King County?

To answer this question, COO focused the evaluation on two main sub-questions:

1. How are inequities changing in COO’s four results areas?
2. How is ‘opportunity’ or the lived experience of COO communities in the four results areas changing over time?

To answer the first question, COO identified the following population-level headline indicators for each of the four results areas:
Table 2. Headline indicators for each result area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result Area</th>
<th>Headline Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Connection</td>
<td>Percent of adolescents who have an adult to turn to for help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Households paying less than 30% or 50% of income for housing; Percent of residents who moved out of a given geography in the year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Self-reported health status among adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Opportunity</td>
<td>Percent of households with income below 200% of Federal Poverty Level (FPL); Percent of adults employed; Percent of youth employed or in school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These indicators are used to track changes and trends in disparities in COO communities and King County overall. These data provide helpful context for COO activities and communities. The methods and findings from the headline indicator data can be found in Appendix B.

To answer the second question, the COO developed performance measures of four different components of community power-building:

1. Relationship and connection building
2. Community and organizational capacity building & leadership development
3. PSE changes
4. Funding and sustainability efforts

COO uses a Results Based Accountability (RBA) approach with its performance measures. RBA uses data to improve the performance of programs by assessing the impact, quality,
and efficiency of services. Applying the RBA approach to the concept of building and supporting power in community, COO assessed how much partners have done (e.g., How many training events were held? How many people participated?); how well they have done (e.g., How many people completed the trainings? What types of capacities did they build?); and whether community participants are better off as a result (e.g., the number of people in leadership roles or placed in jobs). See Table 3 for the list of the quantitative RBA performance measures. Appendix C provides the quantitative performance measure data from 2018 – 2021.

Table 3. Quantitative performance measures for community power-building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power-Building Strategy</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship/Connection Building</td>
<td>Has COO developed and strengthened new relationships, connections, or partnerships?</td>
<td>New relationships developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New partnerships formed to further COO goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community &amp; Organizational Capacities &amp; Leadership Development</td>
<td>Has COO built community and organizational capacities and leadership to promote equity in COO's results areas?</td>
<td>Number/types of capacity &amp; community-building events and participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number/types of leaders developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number/types of people and organizations with capacities built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of people in leadership roles and jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSE Changes</td>
<td>Has COO influenced PSE changes to improve the lives of COO communities?</td>
<td>Number of partners engaged in efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of PSE events and participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number/types of PSE changes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Sources & Analysis

This report summarizes qualitative and quantitative data from the following sources:

1. **Mid- and end-of-year reports**: from partners and agencies in the Community Partnerships and Systems and Policy Change (SPC) strategies and the Community Real Estate Stewardship Team (CREST) Learning Circle cohort

2. **Key informant interviews** conducted in 2020 and 2022 with members of the Community Partnerships and SPC strategies, COO leadership (i.e., Governance Group and staff in leadership positions at PHSKC and the Seattle Foundation), and COO staff from PHSKC and the Seattle Foundation

3. **Prior evaluations** of COO activities and strategies

4. **Supplemental information** gathered by COO program managers through check in meetings, site visits, and communication with individuals, agencies, and partners participating in COO

Descriptive statistics were conducted on the quantitative headline indicators and performance measure data using Excel and R. Qualitative analysis was conducted on report narratives, interview and focus group transcripts, and notes. The qualitative data were coded using the software program Dedoose, and the codes were used to develop themes to answer the evaluation sub-question: how is ‘opportunity’ or the lived experience of COO communities in the four results areas changing over time? At multiple time points, the findings from the evaluation were presented to the Evaluation Advisory Group members to validate their accuracy and help interpret the meaning.

![Figure 3. Connection between evaluation questions, measures, and data sources.](chart)

*See Appendix B for description of population-level surveys*
COO advanced equity and supported policy, systems, and environmental (PSE) changes across the four COO results areas of community connections, housing, health, and economic opportunity. Most of the work that COO supported is intersectional and simultaneously affects multiple results areas. In particular, the work related to community development and COO partners’ ability to leverage COO funds to secure additional funding illustrate successes that transcend individual results areas. Further, building community connections served as both an outcome as well as a strategy for achieving gains in the other results areas.

Community power played an important role in helping COO partners and agencies make gains across the results areas. Many COO partners utilized similar community power-building strategies to engage community members in designing and leading efforts to create PSE changes that advance equity. Community partners explained how many of the accomplishments outlined in this section were possible because of the work and time they committed to building and strengthening existing power in their communities.

Finally, many of the PSE changes outlined in this section are a result of large, coordinated efforts to which COO and its partners contributed. Although the PSE changes may not be solely attributable to COO, all of the changes in this section have been identified by COO partners as being at least in part a result of COO.
Community power-building can support policy, systems, and environmental (PSE) changes that advance equity.

Community power refers to the ability of communities most impacted by inequities to work together to set agendas, shift public discourse, increase opportunities for community ownership, and advance meaningful change.¹ To build community power, COO partners engaged in activities such as strengthening community connections, developing community leaders, and community organizing. Table 4 outlines how building community power can support sustainable PSE changes that advance equity.¹ For example, by hosting community and cultural events, many Community Partnership and SPC partners strengthened critical community connections, expanding the community’s ability to collaborate and to connect with decision-makers. Many partners also brought community members together to identify an issue to address collectively. This helped increase the relevance of the issue and the sustainability of the effort by having more community members invested and able to carry the work forward. Even more broadly, strengthening community power can begin to correct for the way that many COO communities have been disempowered and their demands and needs systematically ignored,¹¹ potentially contributing to the very structural inequities they aim to address.

The work around organizing and talking to people and having people share their stories and building their confidence can build on itself. It can bolster people for the longer-term effort to bring about structural change.

—Systems and Policy Change Partner

We recognize that our vision may take many years. It requires growing and sustaining community power to overcome barriers. By building on our strengths, organizing community, and using our collective power to change policy and systems we can ensure our communities, businesses, centers of faith, and cultural institutions and organizations will thrive in place....

—Community Partnership Partner
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Power-Building Component</th>
<th>Examples of COO Partner and Agency Activities</th>
<th>Examples of COO Staff and Funder activities</th>
<th>How it helps move towards PSE change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community organizing</td>
<td>Bringing community members together to identify an issue to address</td>
<td>Funding community organizer positions</td>
<td>Efforts more likely led by community members, which can increase relevance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building a shared understanding of the issue and strategies to address it</td>
<td>Providing trainings and resources to help organizations restructure and build foundation to community organize</td>
<td>Greater community involvement can increase:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting community members to implement change strategies</td>
<td>Funding the time needed for community organizing</td>
<td>- sustainability because more people can do the work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conducting listening sessions, data collection and analysis, and story-gathering</td>
<td>Providing resources and training on gathering and using community data and stories</td>
<td>- opportunities to develop community leaders &amp; strengthen community connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting community members to share their stories (e.g., public testimony, meetings with policymakers)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gathering stories and data from community members can build community-based evidence to inform PSE change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing community leaders</td>
<td>Leadership development and other capacity-building trainings</td>
<td>Funding community organizer and trainer positions</td>
<td>Increases the sustainability of an initiative or agency because more people can lead the work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Providing opportunities to lead programs</td>
<td>Funding the time and resources for leadership development efforts</td>
<td>Increases likelihood that the effort is community-driven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hiring community members to lead initiatives and projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ways that COO supported partners to expand their capacity to strengthen existing community power

1. Providing shared learning opportunities to increase knowledge, skills, and community connections. Since 2019, the Learning Community provided 63 capacity and relationship-building opportunities attended by nearly 2,400 people (2,393). Many partners appreciated the Learning Community’s cohort and shared learning spaces which provided opportunities for COO partners and community members to expand their knowledge and skills (especially about supporting community-driven efforts and community power-building) while also deepening connections with colleagues working in similar areas.

> Often we don’t know each other very well. Especially as there are newer, smaller grassroots organizations that develop, they’re not necessarily going to be highly networked... So that chance to get together informally through learning or some kind of training opportunities... those are really good. That’s how you develop diverse, inclusive leadership over time in the county as well.

—Systems and Policy Change partner

2. Connecting partners with other relevant groups and institutions. COO staff facilitated connections even outside of the Learning Community. King County and the
Seattle Foundation staff would, for example, recommend or directly connect partners in the Community Partnership and SPC investment strategies with organizations doing similar or related work. These community connections are a central component of community power. Stronger and more expansive networks can improve the capacity to produce change.

“We’ve been able to develop partnerships through...COO. It’s been great establishing relationships with people who are working on the same things and have common goals. It’s also helping us leverage community and organizational resources.”

—Community Partnership partner

“[COO] also wants to see... how to put people together.... [Our project managers] would say ‘Yay, I met this other organization. You might want to talk to them because they also....’ I like that Seattle Foundation is looking more as being a partner than just a funder.”

—Systems and Policy Change partner

3. **Supporting COO partners to make internal organizational changes that increase their capacity to build community power.** With help from COO, many partners in the Community Partnership and SPC investment strategies made large internal changes like moving from being an advocacy to an organizing agency, moving from functioning like a nonprofit to functioning like a collective, or changing organizational policies and practices to be more anti-racist. Some partners talked about COO providing the time and space to finalize models or frameworks they had been working on previously but never completed. For others, COO provided resources and opportunities to gain knowledge and skills to engage in new areas such as community development. As described by the COO partner below, these kinds of changes strengthened the foundation of organizations and increased their ability to build community power.

“How have we built power? Well, we’ve built power by organizing ourselves better.... We’ve made a move organizationally to focus on community organizing as the mission and vision of the [organization]. That’s no small thing. Though the impact is that we’re now built for sustainable change. That’s internal. We’ve changed our practices, the way we meet, our staff is now majority people of color....”

—Systems and Policy Change partner

4. **Providing flexible funding that can support community power building activities that often go unfunded.** Many COO partners in the Community Partnership and SPC...
investment strategies appreciated how COO funding had fewer restrictions than many other government and foundation funding. The flexibility of the funding allowed partners to use it to fund the time for community leaders to meet, to build and strengthen relationships across partners and within communities, and to sit at important decision-making tables. The flexible funds also supported some of the internal organizational work described above, including in some cases the hiring of consultants to help with strategic planning. As several COO partners explained, activities that help build critical connections and support community organizing and power building are rarely funded outside of COO.

The flexibility in what COO provides is very helpful. That’s the way we do our work. It’s not in a pretty package… the work is really emerging because we are trying to figure it out. Having COO understand this… allow[s] us to get to the outcome…

—Community Partnership partner

The traditional grant programs from the state, from the city, all had boxes around which the funding flows through. You must do X number of TA sessions, and Y number of this and that. But who pays [staff member] to sit at the mayor’s office, to sit at the table to negotiate for more police, more sanitation? No one, they had to privately fundraise. It really dawned on me that the COO funding… will buy the executive director time to do the… analysis and the leadership that they do anyway but no one pays them to do…. This kind of unrestricted operating support is rare….  

—Systems and Policy Change partner

5. Providing funding at a sufficient level to support change. Many COO partners in the Community Partnership and SPC investment strategies appreciated that the amount of funding they received was at a high enough level to hire new staff. Often, COO partners described hiring community members most affected by the issue being addressed. Some COO partners described how although COO funds were initially used to hire the new staff member, organizations rearranged their finances to ensure that the position could continue even after their COO funding ended.

We’ve also been able to hire folks who are directly impacted by the issue and who have been able to step up into that leadership position and lead the campaigns.

—Systems and Policy Change partner
6. **Providing funding that spans multiple years.** A consistent theme across the interviews and reports is that PSE changes take time. COO partners in the Community Partnership and SPC investment strategies valued the multi-year aspect of the funding because it supported community power-building activities such as time to build community trust, connections, and relationships. These relationships can provide more opportunities to develop partnerships, collaborations, and cross-sector initiatives. Some COO partners also mentioned that receiving multi-year funding contributed to greater organizational stability. By not having to search for funding every year, organizations had more time to do the work of fostering PSE change.

> Multiple year grants that are at enough of a level to support staffing [are] very important because then you can build some consistency, build some momentum over time. Otherwise, you're scrambling for resources from year to year.

— Systems and Policy Change partner

Ways that COO partners strengthened the existing power of community members and enhanced their ability to engage in PSE change

1. **COO partners strengthened relationships and critical connections.** Since 2018, COO partners reported a total of **451 new partners** (formal relationships with mutually agreed upon outcomes or goals), and **1,118 new relationships** (informal partnerships). COO partners also held many types of events to strengthen critical connections among community members. Common types of community engagement events included civic engagement and public awareness raising, community building, community service, social gatherings (e.g., cultural celebrations), strategy and planning meetings, volunteer/member recruitment, and voter outreach/education. Types of capacity-building events included leadership development, meetings to educate decision-makers, skills building workshops, and workforce development. In total, **COO community partners held over 9,000 community and capacity building events** (9,191).

> Continuing to develop and deepen partnerships with community members, organizations, and groups has been key to increasing our impact, building power for systems change, and better supporting our communities.... Our community is
2. **COO partners increased community leadership.** Since 2018, COO partners have developed or strengthened 2,095 community leaders. Community leaders have assumed leadership roles such as becoming members on non-profit boards, community taskforces, and government advisory groups; providing public testimony during public or government hearings; volunteering on a campaign or initiative; organizing community members around an issue; and becoming a candidate for elected office. For example, in 2021, a community member from Comunidad Latina de Vashon was appointed to the Vashon School Board, increasing opportunities for Latinx perspectives to shape school decisions. In another example from 2021, an affiliated community member from the Muslim Community & Neighborhood Association was appointed to Kirkland's Human Services Commission.

Community members take leadership of and shape much of the work of COO, from identifying the issues to be addressed to deciding on and implementing the strategies to address them. For example, in 2019, SPC partner Open Doors for Multicultural Families, led by the parents they work with, supported the passage of HB 1130. This legislation created a workgroup to advise the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Washington State School Directors’ Association, and the Legislature on ways to improve meaningful, equitable access for public school students and their family members who have language access barriers. Open Doors for Multicultural Families supported the Budget Proviso from 2020-2021 legislative session, which allowed the Language Access Workgroup to reconvene.

Finally, many partners have also focused specifically on building youth leadership. Youth have led campaigns to improve access to healthy foods and mental health services in schools, peer mentorship programs, a community farm stand, training programs to increase technology access, and even a statewide advocacy campaign to ensure that youth have a right to counsel when interrogated by the police.

> We've been able to build up leadership with those who are on the front lines of doing the work in our community, who are trusted.

—Systems and Policy Change partner

As outlined in Table 4, community power-building can support significant steps towards PSE change. Many partners described that their successes and accomplishments were due in large part to their work to build and strengthen community power. Without this
focus, they thought the types of PSE change they achieved would not be able to address root causes. As the next sections list the successes and accomplishments of COO partners in advancing equity, it is important to remember the ways that community power-building undergird many of these successes.
COO partners made gains on several community development and land ownership projects. Led primarily by Community Partnership partners in the Central District, Rainier Valley, and White Center, this work expanded community leadership in the process of developing and stewarding spaces in areas experiencing high levels of gentrification and displacement. These efforts affect all four results areas, creating spaces that can improve access to housing, health, economic opportunities, and community connections.

**Community Development Projects**

*Replanting Roots Rebuilding Communities (RRRC) Community Partnership*

RRRC partners, and particularly Africatown Community Land Trust, successfully secured or are in the process of securing community ownership of several properties in Central Seattle. These were large efforts involving many community partners and funders, including COO. Some of these successes resulted in part from partners’ participation in the Racial and Social Equity Taskforce, a part of the Equitable Development Initiative monthly gathering of community organizations. The properties include:

1. **Liberty Bank Building.** In 2015, RRRC partners began a community-driven redevelopment of the Liberty Bank Building, the first Black-owned bank in the Pacific Northwest. The redevelopment provides affordable housing, commercial space for local businesses, and space for community members to gather. It also prioritizes local and minority hiring and ensures the long-term ownership of the building by the African American community in the Central District. COO began investing in this project in 2018, supporting engagement of and outreach to new residents and the development of culturally relevant resident resources.

2. **Fire Station 6.** RRRC partners helped transfer ownership of the decommissioned fire station to the community. The building will be repurposed and turned into the William Grose Center for Cultural Innovation & Enterprise, a hub for business development and innovation.

3. **Central Area Senior Center.** RRRC partners helped secure community ownership of the senior center.
4. **Surplus Sound Transit properties.** With support from RRRC partners, these properties have transferred to community ownership for the eventual development of affordable housing.

6. **Keiro Building.** RRRC partners acquired the Keiro Building, a community housing project with 150 beds for men. Renamed the BENU Community Home, the project opened in November 2021 and prioritizes services for formerly homeless African American men.

6. **Africatown Plaza.** RRRC partners are creating a mixed-use development featuring affordable housing units and space for community to gather. COO supported staff to convene community planning sessions to engage community in the design and to coordinate community events and activities associated with Africatown Plaza.

**Rainier Valley COO (RVCOO)**

In Rainier Valley, three major ongoing community development projects are underway and supported by partners.

1. **Othello Square.** Spearheaded by RVCOO partner HomeSight, this 3.2-acre, $240 million+ transit-oriented development project aims to provide affordable commercial and housing space for Rainier Valley businesses and residents as well as culturally responsive educational and health facilities. HomeSight broke ground on the Othello Square site in 2019 and have since raised all the capital needed for the Opportunity Center at Othello Square.

2. **Cultural Innovation Center (CIC).** Multicultural Community Coalition (MCC) is leading the effort to build a co-working and shared service-delivery space for community-based agencies serving immigrant, refugees, and people of color in Southeast Seattle and King County. After receiving multiple awards from the Equitable Development Initiative (EDI), MCC purchased a property and continues to move forward with its plan for these spaces.

3. **Graham Street Equitable Transit Oriented Development project.** Led by the Graham Street Community Action Team (CAT), this project aims to build community capacity for locally owned development of the land near the new Graham Street station. The CAT received a $1 million grant from Seattle’s EDI to acquire a site for mixed-use development near the station. The CAT also successfully prevented a 6-year delay in the construction of the light rail station by meeting with stakeholders such as Sound Transit Board members to convince them of the need to preserve the original station timeline.

**White Center Community Partnership**

The White Center Community Development Association and Southwest Youth & Family Services continue to support the development of:
White Center’s Community HUB. The HUB is a community-designed campus that will include affordable housing units; co-working spaces; spaces for community engagement, workforce development, and business incubation; and behavioral health services and an on-site clinic. The community planning process for the HUB began in 2017 and fundraising for the project is ongoing. In 2021, White Center CDA received a Green Globe Award from King County for the project, winning the Leader in Affordable Green Housing award.

Building Community Capacity for Community Development.

COO has also witnessed ongoing work across the COO investment strategies to expand community capacity and leadership on community development and land ownership. For example, the Crescent Collaborative educated and gathered feedback from community members in their successful efforts to relocate and save Earl’s Cuts and Styles, a community and cultural landmark in the Central District at risk of displacement. Further, many COO partners, including Multicultural Community Coalition and Puget Sound Sage, assisted in a successful campaign to begin the process of creating an Equitable Development Initiative (EDI) program for King County. In 2022, King County Council passed Motion 16062 which requests that the King County Executive establishes a county-wide EDI. The King County EDI is modeled off of the Seattle EDI.

Additionally, the Learning Community provided numerous resources on community development and land ownership. COO conducted two Learning Circle cohorts (Equitable Development NOW and Community Real Estate Stewardship Team) that trained representatives from 34 community organizations about housing, real estate, development, and community land stewardship. The Learning Community also held a summit about Equitable Development and funded a Commercial Affordability Pilot. Participants in the pilot helped develop and test tools for small businesses and organizations to increase community development and ownership and to slow the displacement of local businesses. The pilot supported four commercial projects in COO communities, including the SeaTac International Mall & Grocery, which was developed by the East African immigrant community and now provides affordable retail space for two dozen immigrant-owned micro-businesses selling culturally specific clothing, gifts, and groceries. Finally, the Learning Community provided coaching to Equitable Development projects, held a series of multi-day trainings on real estate development and asset management, and held a lunch and learn series on equitable development topics.

It is extremely important for community members and leaders to...learn...what goes into acquiring a property and how to manage and continue to fundraise [it].... Something like this could drastically remove the barrier that community have on owning land and give them better tools to combat displacement.

—Community Partnership partner
COO defines housing as the preservation and development of affordable housing that is in close proximity to transit, jobs, and education. COO partners in the Community Partnership and SPC investment strategies aimed to improve housing opportunities by increasing access to affordable housing and minimizing displacement of residents, businesses, and cultural communities.

Funded through Best Starts for Kids, partners in the Community Partnership strategy were restricted from lobbying. Most of the housing policy work they conducted involved policy education. For example, Rainier Valley COO community partnership partners published a policy brief to educate local government agencies and policymakers about disaster gentrification and the risk COVID-19 posed to housing for BIPOC residents. Funded by the Seattle Foundation, SPC partners did not have the same restrictions on lobbying, and their housing equity work focused mostly on PSE changes to ensure tenant protections, affordable housing, and access to culturally responsive housing resources.

### Passing Tenant Protection Policies.

Seattle Foundation-funded SPC partners supported successful efforts to pass city and state legislation that strengthened tenant protections and reduced evictions.

#### State-Wide Laws

1. **Just Cause Eviction**: passed in 2021 with support from SPC partners Tenants Union and Church Council of Greater Seattle, House Bill (HB) 1236 required landlords to provide just cause for evicting tenants. The law closed a loophole that landlords could use to give tenants 20-day notice to vacate without cause.

2. **Eviction Reform**: In 2021 SPC partner the Tenants Union supported passage of Senate Bill (SB) 5600 which provided eviction protections. It required 14-day notice for non-payment of rent; allowed judges to consider the circumstances surrounding a tenant’s inability to pay rent; allowed judges to order landlords to accept a payment plan from the tenant; and stipulated that tenants can only be evicted for non-payment of rent, utilities, and/or up to $75 in late fees.
3. **Document Recording Fee**: passed in 2021 with support from SPC partner Church Council of Greater Seattle, HB 1277 increased document recording fees from $78 to $100 and establishes them as a permanent funding source for eviction prevention and housing stability services.

4. **Growth Management Act**: passed in 2021 with support from SPC partner Church Council of Greater Seattle, HB 2021 requires local governments to include shelters and affordable housing in their local land use planning, to “plan and accommodate” for housing that is affordable to residents at all income levels.

5. **Right to Counsel**: passed in 2021 with support from SPC partner Church Council of Greater Seattle, SB 5160 established that low-income tenants facing eviction have the right to counsel. Washington State became the first state in the country to guarantee this right for tenants.

**Local Ordinances & Executive Orders**

1. **Eviction Moratorium Extensions**: In 2020, Tenants Union of Washington successfully supported extensions to the statewide eviction moratoriums three times. In 2021, SPC partner Muslim Community and Neighborhood Association supported the City of Kirkland in adopting a temporary moratorium on evictions that exceeded one of the statewide moratorium expiration dates.

2. **Community Preference**: In 2019, Mayor Durkan issued Executive Order 2019-02, which included a policy allowing developers to give preference to residents with a history of living in neighborhoods with a high risk of displacement. SPC partner Crescent Collaborative conducted research and advocacy in support of this policy and of Seattle City Council’s approval in 2020 of $50,000 for its implementation. Seattle Chinatown International District PDA plans to use Community Preference for its new affordable housing development (Yesler Family Housing).

3. **South King County Local Faith Leaders**: Church Council of Greater Seattle supported Burien City Council to invest over $125,000 in hiring a staff member to run the new Rental Housing Inspection Program. In a U-turn, Federal Way invested $25K in joining and funding the new South King County Housing and Homelessness Partnership.

**Funding and developing affordable housing.**

Seattle Foundation-funded SPC partners secured funds and other resources to advance affordable housing and anti-displacement efforts.

1. **Redirecting Hotel/Motel tax dollars**: In 2018, SPC partner Church Council of Greater Seattle was part of a successful campaign to urge King County Council to redirect some Hotel/Motel tax dollars to fund affordable housing.
2. **City of Burien's Comprehensive Plan**: In 2018, SPC partners ensured that City of Burien's comprehensive plan update allowed Mary's Place, a nonprofit providing shelter to women and families, to develop hundreds of affordable housing units.


4. **Strategic Investment Fund Proviso**: In 2019, Puget Sound Sage successfully advocated for Seattle City Council to impose a proviso on the Strategic Investment Fund to Address Displacement. Council put a Statement of Legislative Intent to request development of criteria and community participation for use of the Fund.

5. **State Commerce Department's multimillion-dollar awards**: The State Commerce Department awarded several multimillion-dollar contracts to Native-led agencies. These included awards of $26 million for rental assistance to Native-led agencies and $15.2 million to Urban Indigenous Organizations. These awards made it possible for Chief Seattle Club to pay $8.8 million in overdue rent and utilities to prevent 725 households from being evicted as of December 2021.

6. **ʔálʔal ("Home" in Lushootseed)**: Chief Seattle Club secured a no-compete contract to develop a Health Through Housing (HTH) hotel for American Indian/Alaska Native communities in Pioneer Square. ʔálʔal, an 80-unit apartment building with subsidized rent for majority American Indian/Alaska Native people experiencing homelessness launched in 2022. In partnership with other agencies, Chief Seattle Club pushed King County to expand the qualification criteria for HTH initiative as the original criteria would have screened out all potential BIPOC agencies.

7. **Eastside Local Faith Leaders**: Church Council of Greater Seattle helped a successful campaign to defeat City of Bellevue's ordinance amendment to limit faith community hosting of tent encampments. Defeating this ordinance meant there can be more than one encampment on faith land in the city in a given year.

8. **Seattle Indian Health Board Capital Budget**: Seattle Indian Health Board secured $1 million from the Housing Trust Fund in support of its $46 million capital campaign to renovate its clinical facility and build affordable housing.

9. **Emergency Housing Vouchers**: Chief Seattle Club successfully advocated for and received the largest number of emergency housing vouchers of any agency in King County, responding to the disproportionate rates of homelessness in American Indian/Alaska Native communities.

Community Partnerships often supported affordable housing through their community development projects. Most projects listed in the Community Development and Land Ownership section included plans for affordable housing. Furthermore, partners in the Rainier Valley COO community partnership provided policy education to support the
Multifamily Property Tax Exemption (SB 5287). Passed in 2021, this bill extends and expands a tax exemption for low- and moderate-income families to make housing more affordable.

Expanding access to culturally responsive housing resources.

COO partners in the Community Partnership and SPC investment strategies expanded access to culturally responsive housing resources in several ways, including:

- **Building and sharing knowledge about culturally specific housing needs.**
  - Example: The Transgender Economic Empowerment Coalition (TEEC) conducted a needs assessment survey about housing with trans and gender diverse communities. TEEC used the findings to produce a housing and shelter guide by and for trans and gender diverse communities.
  - Example: The National Coalition to End Urban Indigenous Homelessness successfully advocated to pause the 2021 and 2022 Point in Time counts due to concerns about potential undercounts of American Indian/Alaska Natives.

- **Increasing the cultural responsiveness of existing services.**
  - Example: The Kent Community Development Collaborative provided community feedback to increase the language and cultural accessibility of City of Kent's housing website and resources.

- **Increasing the racial and ethnic diversity of housing governing bodies.**
  - Example: The Coalition to End Urban Indigenous Homelessness increased the representation of American Indian/Alaska Natives on the King County Regional Homelessness Authority board, including by modifying the Board's charter to ensure a minimum number of Native board members.

Community power played a key role in securing many of these housing wins. Often, partners mobilized community members to build a shared understanding of the issues. For example, the Tenants Union organized a Renters Assembly, a two-day event that brought together tenants from across the state to identify leaders and committees to address housing issues. The Church Council of Greater Seattle convened the Eastside Interfaith Gathering of faith leaders and services providers to share lessons and work collectively on the “Keep People Housed” campaign. COO partners also mobilized community members to educate policy- and decision-makers about issues, often through activities such as providing public testimony.

> After years of building relationship with each other, the Somali-led organizations have decided to come together and launch a community development project for the Somali community. This project would not have been possible without the relationship building and leadership development work we have been doing together.

—Community Partnership partner
COO defines health as access to healthy, affordable food and safe places outside to be physically active, especially for youth. Partners who focused on health outcomes aimed to improve healthful opportunities and reduce health disparities among COO communities. Common strategies to achieve this outcome included:

- Increasing access to healthy, affordable, culturally appropriate foods (e.g., farm stand selling produce from local farmers, youth-led efforts to improve school lunch menus)
- Improving community knowledge and skills about healthy lifestyles, public safety, nutrition, and mental health and well-being (e.g., workshops/trainings)
- PSE changes that support community members’ ability to take care of their and their families’ health and well-being (e.g., employment and housing practices, supports for mental and behavioral health)

Outlined below are accomplishments related to some of the most common strategies to improve health: improving access to healthy and culturally relevant foods, access to culturally responsive healthcare, and community health and safety.

**Improving Access to Healthy & Culturally Relevant Foods**

COO partners and agencies in the Community Partnership and SPC investment strategies took different but complementary approaches to improving communities' access to healthy and culturally relevant foods. These included improving options in schools; expanding access through farm stands, urban gardening, and food distribution efforts; and increasing knowledge about gardening and healthy eating.

**Increasing access to healthy & culturally relevant foods in schools**

- **Farm to School Purchasing Grant.** SPC partner FEEST supported efforts to secure $5 million in the 2021-23 Washington state budget for the WA State Department of Agriculture’s Farm to School program. The grant program helps schools to support local farmers and invest in fresh, culturally relevant food for students.
• **Snackbox Program.** FEEST supported youth to design and implement an initiative to distribute weekly free and healthy snacks to 900 6th grade students at Evergreen High School for the 2019-2020 school year. In 2020, youth leaders expanded this program and installed two water stations, increasing access to fresh fruits and vegetables and clean water for 750 students at Rainier Beach High School.

• **School Lunches.** In 2019, youth leaders at FEEST successfully added fresh, culturally relevant menu items to the school lunches in the Highline School District.

**Increasing access to healthy & culturally relevant foods in communities**

• **Spice Bridge.** The SeaTac-Tukwila community partnership developed the Spice Bridge, a global food hall in Tukwila that supports BIPOC, immigrant, and refugee owned food businesses to provide culturally relevant foods to residents.

• **Farm Stand.** Rainier Beach Action Coalition, a member of the Rainier Valley COO community partnership, held a seasonal weekly farm stand to provide access to fresh, affordable, and culturally relevant produce. The youth and East African seniors who run the stand shared their knowledge about produce with customers.

• **Beach Fresh dinner.** Rainier Beach Action Coalition hosted a weekly dinner for youth where the youth also learned to cook, budget, and plan meals.

• **Emergency Food Access System.** Urban Food Systems Pact launched a weekly, community-driven food distribution program in Skyway that provided healthy food boxes specifically designed for indigenous African American cultural relevance. In partnership with the Dare2Be Project and Northwest Harvest, they also educated community and local leaders on addressing food insecurity by systematizing and sustaining food equity. The US Department of Agriculture and Environmental Protection Agency support this work through Local Foods, Local Places, a federal initiative supporting communities to improve access to healthy foods and the local food economy. Urban Food Systems Pact was one of only 13 communities selected to receive this technical assistance in 2021.

• **Gardening and Healthy Eating Education.** Beet Box, another member of the Rainier Valley COO Community Partnership, provided in-person workshops and community events, online videos, garden tours, discussions and cook-alongs to support and encourage Rainier Valley residents to garden and eat healthy.

• **Increased Access to Food Banks.** Comunidad Latina de Vashon worked with a food bank on Vashon Island to offer more Latinx foods and delivery service for Latinx families, and to stop collecting personally identifiable data of food bank recipients.

• **Give2Grow Garden.** White Center Food Bank improved the productivity of its Give2Grow garden and expanded the offerings of culturally relevant produce that reflects the needs of White Center residents.
- **Improved Grocery Store Options.** Comunidad Latina de Vashon worked with the major grocery store on Vashon Island to increase the selection of culturally relevant foods for Latinx families on the island.

- **Food Security Programming.** In 2020, Got Green supported the City of Seattle to invest additional money into food security programming without restrictions based on immigration status.

### Improving Access to Culturally Responsive Healthcare

COO partners in the Community Partnership and SPC investment strategies improved access to culturally responsive healthcare for several cultural communities in King County. To create these changes, some worked directly with healthcare providers and hospitals, others with families and community members. For example, Snoqualmie Valley Community for All launched their Referral and Navigation Program in 2021 to connect and coordinate access to human services in Snoqualmie Valley. Other COO partners, and specifically those funded by the Seattle Foundation, supported passage of state-level legislation to improve the healthcare conditions and access of King County residents most impacted by structural inequities.

- **Doula Medicaid Reimbursement.** SPC partners Surge Reproductive Justice and the Maternal Coalition supported a successful community-driven campaign to establish birth doulas as a profession in Washington State. Senate Bill ESHB 1881 passed in 2022. This designation makes state certified doulas eligible for Medicaid reimbursement, increasing accessibility of birth doula care. Birth doulas can improve perinatal health outcomes for all, and especially for many BIPOC community members who prefer doulas over medical doctors for their perinatal health.

- **Washington Indian Health Improvement Act.** In 2019, COO’s tribal partners, including SPC partner Seattle Indian Health Board, supported passage of SB 5415. The policy reinvests in the continuum of care for Native communities, creating a forum and funding mechanism to improve the health of American Indians and Alaska Natives in the state. It also formalized the Governor’s Indian Health Advisory Council, a group that addresses issues in WA State’s Indian health care delivery system.

- **Indian Behavioral Health Act.** In 2020, SPC partner Seattle Indian Health Board supported passage of SB 6259/HB 2750 which improves the Indian behavioral health system.

- **National 988 System.** In 2021, SPC partner Seattle Indian Health Board supported passage of HB 1477 which implements the national 988 system to enhance and expand behavioral health crisis response and suicide prevention services.

- **Gender Affirming Treatment Act.** In 2021, SPC partner UTOPIA supported passage of SB 5313, the Gender Affirming Treatment Act, which prevents the Health Care
Authority (HCA), managed care plans, and providers that administer gender-affirming care services through Medicaid programs from discriminating based on patients’ gender identity or expression.

- **Tribal public health systems.** COO tribal partners supported the allocation of $500,000 in state funds to a statewide assessment of tribal public health systems as well as $1 million from the Housing Trust Fund for the Seattle Indian Health Board’s capital campaign to renovate its clinical facility and build affordable housing.

- **Gender “X”**. Ingersoll supported a rule passed in 2019 by the Washington Department of Health that creates a non-binary, third gender option on identification cards in Washington state. Ingersoll educated and organized healthcare providers and community members about the issue, explaining how this change can support access to culturally relevant care for trans and non-binary community members.

- **Latinx families**. Para Los Niños supported Latinx moms and families to serve on the King County Open Space Equity Committee, providing the opportunity to push for more equitable access to open space for Latinx families. Para Los Niños also launched Promotoras de Salud, a pilot program to support health, healthcare access, and COVID-19 prevention in the Latinx community.

- **Ancestral Talking Circles**. Members of the Central District’s Replanting Roots Rebuilding Communities (RRRC) community partnership provided multi-week healing and talking circles to address health issues such as grief and generational trauma. Over 20 cohorts of facilitators have been trained to host their own talking circles.

- **Healthcare resources for sex workers**. UTOPIA distributed healthcare resources to sex workers in King County, including a Sex Worker Toolkit and care kits with Personal Protective Equipment (PPE), safer sex supplies, and culturally relevant information on COVID-19 testing and vaccines. With PHSKC and other healthcare providers, they organized to fund portable sinks and handwashing stations with PPE to provide free clean water and basic sanitation to sex workers.

- **Trans people of color**. SPC partner Lavender Rights Project advocated for and secured a line item in the 2021 state budget for trans people of color, with a focus on providing support for Black trans people.

### Improving Community Health & Safety

COO partners in the Community Partnership and SPC strategies used a wide range of strategies to improve communities’ health and safety. Strategies included efforts to improve the climate and public safety (such as through police reform).

#### Climate Action

- **Green New Deal**. In 2019, SPC partner Got Green supported passage of Resolution
31895, Seattle's Green New Deal, a resolution to make Seattle's climate pollution-free by 2030. The resolution prioritizes investments in disproportionately affected neighborhoods, and it includes language about increasing healthy food access, anti-displacement/housing strategies, and green jobs.

- **JumpStart Tax.** In 2020, SPC partner Got Green supported Seattle City Council Ordinance 126108, which called for the establishment of the JumpStart Tax, $20 million of which was earmarked for Seattle's Green New Deal and received by the Green New Deal's Oversight Board in 2021.

### Public Safety & Police Reform

- **Environmental Safety Improvements.** From 2019 - 2021, On Board Othello/HOSTED implemented many of the Crime Prevention through Environmental Design recommendations reported in 2017. These included improving pedestrian right of ways and crosswalks, increasing speedbumps and barriers around a bus stop, and implementing a Home Zone Pilot in the Holly Park neighborhood.

- **Harmful Police Tactics.** In 2021, SPC partner Not This Time supported HB 1054 which banned or restricted harmful and deadly tactics used by law enforcement. This included bans on chokeholds and no-knock warrants, the type of tactics that gained national attention last year through the killings of George Floyd and Breonna Taylor.

- **Police De-escalation.** In 2021, SPC partner Not This Time supported HB 1310 which established a statewide standard for police officers to de-escalate situations, and allowed an officer to use lethal force only when necessary to protect against a life-threatening situation. It established in state law of a duty of care.

- **Deadly Force Investigations.** In 2021, SPC partner Not This Time supported HB 1267 which promoted transparency and accountability by establishing a new civilian agency within the governor's office to handle independent criminal investigations of deadly force incidents.

- **Youth Interrogations.** In 2021, SPC partner Choose 180 supported HB 1140 which ensures that youth have an attorney present when being interrogated by the police.

- **Public Safety Levy.** In 2020, SPC partner Church Council of Greater Seattle supported leaders in Highline to successfully block a planned Public Safety Levy in 2020 aimed at hiring new Police officers.

- **Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls (MMIWG).** In 2019, SPC partner Seattle Indian Health Board supported the implementation of Resolution 31900. This resolution created a partnership between Seattle Police Department (SPD) and the Seattle Indian Health Board to improve police data collection on MMIWG. The resolution created a police liaison to support relationships with Seattle Native communities.
COO defines economic opportunity as workforce development that includes local hires, support of new local businesses, and inclusion of youth. To improve the economic opportunities in King County, COO partners supported both individuals and businesses using strategies such as:

- Skills building, including job skills and leadership training of adults and youth
- Hiring opportunities, e.g., employer/hiring events
- Business supports, e.g., business incubators, business and financial literacy training
- PSE changes, such as expanding worker and debt protections and support for low-income families

**Small Businesses and Entrepreneurs**

COO partners assisted local small businesses and entrepreneurs, prioritizing BIPOC, trans and nonbinary people, and immigrants and refugees. COO partners, especially those in the Community Partnership investment strategy, provided economic opportunities such as business and technology trainings, pop-up market opportunities, business incubator programs, and economic hubs such as **Black Dot** in the Central District which supports African American entrepreneurs and small business owners. COO partners also supported local businesses by reducing systemic barriers through PSE changes, such as:

- **Food Incubator Program and Spice Bridge.** Food Innovation Network (FIN), a partner in the SeaTac-Tukwila community partnership, works with PHSKC Environmental Health to reduce barriers in the complex food business permitting and inspection process. This process creates barriers for small food businesses, particularly those operated by immigrants, refugees, and people of color. FIN is developing a guide that clarifies and formalizes mutually agreed upon steps they have tested with PHSKC. The benefits of this effort are reflected in their Food Incubator Program and launch of Spice Bridge, a facility with a commercial kitchen and food hall, to host businesses from their incubator program.

- **BIPOC Entrepreneur Fellowship Program.** Front and Centered, in partnership with
the People’s Economy Lab, launched the New Frontline Community Fellowship program to support and amplify BIPOC entrepreneurs who are using transformative approaches to achieve a community-centered economy. The program provides capital and a community of support to entrepreneurs leading work in a wide range of sectors and communities.

- **Support for Latino Businesses.** Comunidad Latina de Vashon (CLV) successfully worked with the King County Economic Development Local Services to increase funding for small businesses and for funding applications in Spanish. CLV continues to work with the office to remove ongoing barriers to the business permitting process for Latinos.

- **Gender Inclusive Workspaces.** The Transgender Economic Empowerment Coalition (TEEC) conducted a survey to gauge employers’ competency levels with respect to gender-inclusion policies. They used the survey findings to draft a Model Employment Policy to support gender-inclusive workspaces, in collaboration with transgender nonconforming and LGBTQ partners and area employers.

- **Equitable Recovery & Reconciliation Alliance.** White Center CDA started the Equitable Recovery & Reconciliation Alliance (ERRA), building a partnership with the Seattle Chamber of Commerce to discuss ongoing strategies for workforce development. In 2021, King County Council’s approval of a $1 million request from King County Executive Dow Constantine to support ERRA.

- **Participatory Budgeting.** COO partners such as the Skyway Coalition supported efforts that resulted in the allocation of over $10M in King County’s first Participatory Budgeting community committee in 2021. Other partners such as the Lavender Rights Project participated in the Participatory Budgeting process with City of Seattle and the Black Brilliance Research Project.

- **International Special Review District.** Interim CDA recommended changes to the International Special Review District, including anti-displacement measures for low-income residents and small businesses.

> The impact of this program is evident through increased confidence many small business owners/entrepreneurs have in advocating for themselves, acquiring business loans, the longevity of the business, their ability to grow and sustain their business and sharing the skills they learned here with other small business owners.

—Community Partnership partner

### Worker Protections

COO partners led and supported efforts to increase the protection of workers who are often the most impacted by structural inequities. These include workers such as:
• **Domestic Workers and Day Laborers.** SPC partner Casa Latina supported the 2018 passage of the Domestic Workers’ Bill of Rights. City of Seattle Ordinance 125627 established a Domestic Workers Standards Board to enact additional benefits and protections for domestic workers. Casa Latina supported passage of a resolution in 2021 that informs the City Council that the Office of Labor Standard will work with community stakeholders to draft legislation creating a portable Paid Time Off policy for domestic workers.

• **Formerly Incarcerated Workers.** In 2019, SPC partners Civil Survival and Statewide Poverty Action Network helped to secure passage of The New Hope Act (HB 1041), a bill that allows vacating different types of convictions on criminal records. This reduces barriers to employment and community participation for people who have completed their sentences.

• **Sex Workers.** Multiple COO partners — including SURGE, UTOPIA, and TEEC — advanced efforts to improve worker protections for sex workers, and particularly sex workers of color. These efforts included educating community and policy stakeholders about the movement to decriminalize sex work, participation in coalitions focused on decriminalizing sex work, and creating toolkits and other resources to support sex workers.

• **Trans workers.** Transgender Economic Empowerment Coalition (TEEC) trained hundreds of individual employers around normalizing gender-inclusive hiring practices. TEEC also developed an organizational Model Employment Policy to promote a safer, more gender-affirming workplace for transgender and gender diverse people and LGBTQ people of color. The policy was informed by an employer survey led by GSBA, Washington State’s LGBTQ and allied chamber of commerce.

---

**State-Wide Debt Protections and Support for Low-Income Families**

SPC partners celebrated several successful state-wide legislative campaigns aimed at increasing debt protections and economic supports for low-income families.

**Debt Protection Legislation**

• **Ending Pocket Service for Debt Collection:** In 2019, Statewide Poverty Action Network (SPAN) support passage of HB 1066 ended pocket service – a practice where debt collectors confused Washingtonians by issuing a debt collection summons without filing it in court. Under the previous law, debt collectors were able to obtain and garnish wages from individuals who did not respond.

• **Medical Debt Protections:** In 2019, SPAN supported passage of HB 1531, which lowered the maximum interest rate on medical debt from 12% to 9%, eliminated arrest warrants for medical debts, and required collectors to provide information about Charity Care resources that can cover medical debt.
Legislation Supporting Low-Income Families

- **Expanded Washington’s Working Families Tax Credit**: In 2021, SPAN supported passage and full funding of HB 1297, a tax credit that provides direct cash assistance to the lowest-income households.

- **TANF Cash Grant Increases**: In 2018 and 2021, SPAN supported the passage of legislation increasing the Temporary Aid for Needy Families (TANF) cash grant amount. In 2018, the Washington state legislature increased TANF by 9.3% and in 2021, they further increased it by 15%.

- **Easing TANF Sanctions**: In 2019, SPAN supported passage of HB 2441 which eases TANF’s full-family sanction policy. This allowed families four months to “cure” their sanctions and come back into compliance, and it allowed a total of 12 months to continue receiving a portion of their grant while on sanction status.

- **Expanding TANF access for families who are homeless**: In 2019, SPAN supported passage of SB 6478. This law eases TANF’s time-limit policy for families who are homeless, and it allows WA State Department of Social and Health Services to broaden its definition of homelessness so that families who live in unstable housing situations can continue receiving TANF past the usual 60-month limit.

- **Easing TANF Time Limit Restrictions**: In 2021, SPAN supported passage of SB 5214, which created a time limit extension for TANF recipients when unemployment rates are 7% and above.

- **Child Support Pass-Through Payments**: In 2020, SPAN supported passage of SB 5144, which required the state to disregard a portion of the child support collection paid to families in determining their cash TANF benefit.

- **Updated Economic Assistance Programs**: passed in 2019, HB 1603 updates standards of need for economic assistance programs, revising data requirements and reducing barriers to participation.

- **Prevented Deep Cuts to Washington’s Safety Net**: In 2021, SPAN successfully prevented the state legislature from making an all-cuts state budget. Instead, they persuaded the legislature to make significant new investments in areas related to housing and healthcare.

- **Home Foreclosure Protections**: In 2019, SPAN supported passage of HB 1105, which modifies home foreclosure provisions to increase protections for taxpayers.

Funding Supporting Low-Income Families

- **King County Promise Program**: in 2019, The Washington Bus Education Fund successfully supported King County Council to allocate $112.4 million over 15 years to the King County Promise program. This program provides K–12 and postsecondary supports, and funds CBOs working with students of color, first-generation college
students, and students impacted by poverty.

- **Emergency Assistance.** In 2020, Church Council of Greater Seattle raised and delivered $100,000 in emergency financial and food assistance.

- **Human Services Funding.** In 2020, Church Council of Greater Seattle helped reverse a planned $100,000 cut to the 2020 Human Services budget in Burien. Also in 2020, they supported Bellevue City Council to create an additional funding round for human services.

## Workforce Development

In addition to providing broader economic opportunities through PSE changes, a few COO partners directly provided workforce development opportunities. For example, between 2018 and 2021, COO partners hosted nearly 200 (198) employment and job skills training events, and 1,137 people were hired into jobs. COO partners conducting workforce development activities focused on supporting career opportunities for people of color and especially immigrants, refugees, and young people of color. For example, Partner in Employment collaborated with unions to launch a digital hiring hall for immigrant and refugee workers and to provide trainings on labor standards laws.

### Workforce development opportunities for young people of color

- The Rainier Beach Neighborhood Farm Stand created leadership and employment opportunities to young people in the community who help staff and manage the farm stand alongside seniors.

- Comunidad Latina de Vashon (CLV) hired youth organizers to lead several of its initiatives and efforts, such as a mentorship program for elementary school students and technology trainings for Latinx families and businesses.

- FEEST trained students to become food justice organizers, leading campaigns and implementing programs such as Seattle Public Schools’ first High School Snack Program.

- Rainier Beach Action Coalition’s Young Adults Transitioning to Adulthood program employed young people and supported their growth as leaders in the agency.

- Partners in Employment implemented multiple efforts to provide job training to youth, including a partnership with the Machinist Institute Youth Academy and the Youth Restoration Crew which focuses on employing immigrant and refugee youth.

- YWCA provided several job training and placement opportunities for young people, including career fairs, youth internship opportunities in partnership with Schools Out Washington, and youth employment training in partnership with Starbucks Foundation.
COO partners in the Community Partnership and SPC investment strategies leveraged COO resources and connections to expand the scope and sustainability of their work, receiving additional funds to build and sustain the momentum for PSE change. COO partners successfully leveraged funds in a few ways. Some partners used COO funds to hire for critical positions that then helped with organizational fundraising and communication efforts. Other partners leveraged the connections they made through COO to build stronger networks and relationships, including with funding agencies. Still others leveraged the way COO increased the visibility, scope, and success of their work to create stronger proposals and applications for future funding. Finally, several partners described how they successfully used COO funds as funding matches in grant applications.

“This would not have been possible without the significant investment COO has made that has allowed us to create an enviable track record which attracts funders and donors.”

—Community Partnership partner

**Leveraging Funds for Community Development and Land Ownership Efforts**

COO partners leading community development and land ownership efforts demonstrated particular success in leveraging COO resources to secure additional funds and support for their efforts:

- HomeSight received an award of **$12 million** for the Opportunity Center at Othello Square as well as a **$100,000** neighborhood planning grant from the Wells Fargo Foundation.

- Multicultural Community Coalition received **$1.5 million** for their Cultural Innovation Center project from Seattle’s Equitable Development Initiative, including two land acquisition grants of $842,000 and $658,000. It also received **$200,000** from 4Culture’s Cultural Facilities Fund and a **$75,000** capacity building grant from Seattle’s
Equitable Development Initiative.

- Replanting Roots Rebuilding Community (RRRC) received over a million dollars ($1,000,075) for the development of the William Grose Center for Cultural Innovation and Enterprise from the City of Seattle Equitable Development Initiative. They also received $118,000 in grants and sponsorships for the Midtown Center and $19,000 in grants and sponsorships for the Central District Design Weekend, an event that supported community involvement and leadership in the development process. The Seattle Foundation also awarded Africatown Community Land Trust $135,000 to support residents and small business owners.
- White Center COO partners secured over $6.5 million in support of the White Center Community HUB.
- The Graham Street Community Action Team received $1 million from the Seattle Equitable Development Initiative.

Leveraging Funds for Other COO-Related Efforts

COO partners reported leveraging COO resources, connections, and accomplishments to secure funding and support for other bodies of work. Many COO partners secured additional funding from local and state government agencies and departments such as King County Department of Arts and Culture, Office of Equity and Social Justice, Department of Natural Resources and Parks, and Local Services; Washington State Department of Commerce; and additional funding from Best Starts for Kids. COO partners also received funding from other public funders and private foundations. Some examples of funding that partners leveraged COO to secure include:

- White Center CDA successfully petitioned for $2 million to support businesses affected by fires in White Center. They also received $150,000 from Group Health, a $95,000 grant from Department of Commerce Child Care Partnership, and $5,000 from Chase to support families experiencing economic crises during COVID-19.
- Kent Community Development Collaborative, in partnership with other groups, secured the allocation of $2.4 million across the state for improvements in digital access in 2021.
- Seattle Urban Native Nonprofits received a $1 million, unrestricted grant from the United Way of King County as part of the second round of its Indigenous Fund. They also received $100,000 from King County Office of Equity and Social Justice.
- The National Coalition to End Urban Indigenous Homelessness helped secure $3 million from the WA State Dept of Commerce in federal pass-through COVID-19 funding to Native-led agencies in Washington State, including COO partners Chief Seattle Club and Seattle Indian Health Board.
• Comunidad Latina de Vashon received additional Best Starts for Kids funding ($267,000), Seattle Foundation funds for families ($25,000), and $270,000 from the MIDD Behavioral Health Sales Tax Fund. They also received $237,878 from the Washington State Department of Commerce to deliver community-designed COVID-19 supports, $100,000 from Pacific Hospital Preservation and Development Authority Health Equity Fund to expand mental health supports, and $83,000 in smaller grants to support its programmatic work.

• RBAC used its COO funded work to secure $100,000/year for 3 years to engage young adults in policy and systems change work.

• SCFA received $20,000 over two years from the Norcliffe Foundation to coordinate referrals across social service providers throughout Snoqualmie Valley. Hopelink, SCFA’s backbone agency, received a Rural Food Bank grant, $20,000 of which will support the work of SCFA.

• HOSTED used COO as matching funds for a Seattle Department of Neighborhoods grant of $40,000 to support community engagement and physical improvement efforts. HOSTED also partnered with SDOT Home Zone Community Engagement and received $8,000 from to engage more neighbors in physical improvement efforts.

“We welcome COO continuing to serve as a thought partner and as a vehicle that allows us to leverage the valuable, multi-year investment toward securing other funding sources.”

—Community Partnership partner

“We do often mention our COO funding to existing and potential supporters and it has been universally noted as a sign of important community support which ultimately helps influence others.”

—Community Partnership partner
As COO supported partners to advance equity in the ways outlined above, it also experienced several challenges. COVID-19 represented the largest challenge that COO and its partners faced. However, COO leadership, staff, and partners also identified other challenges, many related to the administration of COO. Section 6 outlines changes that COO made to address many of these challenges as well as opportunities for growth for COO and other racial, social, and economic equity initiatives moving forward.

**COVID-19**

The emergence of COVID-19 created many challenges for COO and its partners. Virtually all COO partners made changes to their work plan or approach because of COVID-19. Partners shifted to online programming and remote work, and some created new programming to respond to emerging or increasing needs in their communities (e.g., grocery/food delivery). COO made some of these same changes. For example, the Learning Community was initially designed to provide many in-person events to facilitate relationship building; however, it shifted to providing only online resources and events.
because of COVID-19. Also, recognizing the compounding impact of COVID-19 and the racial justice protests after the murder of George Floyd, COO created two new grant programs to support agencies’ responses to these events.

### Community Partnership Dynamics

Some Community Partnership partners faced challenges at different times in the health and functioning of their partnership. This was due in part to the structure of the partnerships and the additional resources needed to support partnerships. Following recommendations in the field, COO required applicants for the first round of Community Partnerships to utilize a partnership structure that featured a “backbone agency” (later referred to as the “lead agency.”) This agency served as the fiscal sponsor and was responsible for guiding and overseeing the mission, strategy, activities, and evaluation of the partnership.

The evaluation found that partnerships experienced difficulties when trust had not been established between the lead agency and partners or when decision-making processes were not transparent. Without trust and transparency, a hierarchy emerged in some partnerships where the lead agencies had more power and sometimes played the role of gatekeeper. This caused conflict, weakened relationships, and hurt the functioning of these partnerships. COO staff reported struggling to support partners as they navigated these conflicts, often needing more skills and infrastructure to provide this support. As outlined in more detail in the next section, COO made several changes to address these challenges, including offering more Learning Community resources to support partnerships in building trust and transparency and navigating conflict constructively.

### Contracting Practices

Through regular check-in meetings with program managers at PHSKC and the Seattle Foundation, some COO partners described challenges with common PHSKC contracting practices. For example, for some agencies with smaller operating budgets, PHSKC’s standard funding reimbursement model created obstacles. These organizations did not always have the upfront funds required to be able to wait months for reimbursement. COO staff made several administrative changes to address some of these challenges. To address challenges with the reimbursement model, for example, COO staff changed the policy so that partners could receive up to 20 - 25% of the first year’s budget up front. Although staff successfully made this change for COO partners, they reported their own
challenges in being able to institutionalize these changes in other areas of PHSKC.

**Reporting Requirements**

Aspects of the COO evaluation created challenges for some partners. For example, some COO partners had difficulty completing grantee reports given their length and the level of detail they required. Other partners expressed a desire for more clarity in the beginning of the grant about reporting requirements and expectations. Still others described wanting additional evaluation and research resources and support to help expand their internal evaluation capacity. COO staff and the Evaluation Advisory Group are using the feedback from partners to inform the evaluation plan and requirements for the next phase of COO.
The 2015 – 2021 evaluation of COO examined how COO affected the lived experience of communities related to community connections, housing, health, and economic opportunities. It explored the changes in opportunities, systems, and policies that resulted from COO's investment in community power-building across its three strategies: Community Partnerships, Systems and Policy Change, and the Learning Community.

Below are several key takeaways from the evaluation that can inform not only the future efforts of this community-public-private partnership, but also similar efforts to advance racial, social, and economic equity through community-driven PSE changes.

**Takeaway 1: Investing in community-driven work that spans multiple strategies and communities can support measurable benefits in equity.**

What followed COO's investments in community-driven partnerships spanning multiple strategies and communities was continual progress in the advancement of racial, social, and economic equity. This is one of the largest takeaways and is illustrated by the
extensive accomplishments outlined in the report. Illustrating the benefits of COO is important given the uniqueness of its model. As a community-public-private partnership, COO used an expansive, community-driven approach on a scale not previously seen in funded initiatives in the region. COO made intentional investments across three strategies, including investments in 19 unique organizations and partnerships, who in turn built over 1,500 additional partnerships (1,569) to support COO-related work. Its focus on community power and community-driven solutions to advance racial and economic equity was not only rare among publicly funded initiatives in the region, but it also proved timely. Amidst a global pandemic and uprisings against anti-Black racism and violence, a national discussion emerged about the need for systemic solutions to address structural racism. For many COO partners, these were the very systems and policy solutions they received funding from COO to identify and build the community power to implement.

The data show that COO supported communities across the region to take meaningful actions to reduce racial and social inequities in the areas of housing, health, and economic opportunity. The report outlines the far-reaching PSE changes that partners successfully made. From transferring ownership of multiple properties to communities, to building affordable housing units, to mobilizing communities to support passage of dozens of state and local policies, COO partners made advances in equity that can improve the opportunities and lived experiences of communities in King County. Although there remain continued areas of growth for COO moving forward, the progress made in its first six years points to the value in continuing to fund and support this innovative initiative.

*The changes that we've seen by being involved in COO... [were] really electric.... Working with COO, the funding especially, has allowed this flexibility to do something that other funding sources don't necessarily allow them to do. Being a part of that, for myself, was also really electrifying, it just felt so real.*
—Community Partnership partner

*When covid came up...[we were] very quickly able to find out what supports were needed... and implement them in a way that if we hadn't had the COO funding, probably wouldn't have happened quite as quickly.*
—Community Partnership partner
Takeaway 2: Long-term investment in community power-building represents a compelling approach to supporting PSE change.

COO aimed to advance equity in King County using a community power-building approach. COO supported partners to engage in community organizing. This involved mobilizing and educating communities, developing community leaders, and strengthening community connections. Many COO partners and staff described the investments in community power-building as the linchpin to COO’s success. They explained that COO’s support of the process of power building is what made many of the accomplishments outlined in the report possible. It provided the foundation from which partners could advance equity through PSE changes.

The structure of COO’s support mattered as well. COO made long-term financial investments while providing ongoing capacity and relationship building opportunities through the Learning Community. The combination of financial and relationship support spanning multiple years played a key role in partners’ success. COO partners described how the consistency and longevity of the funding, in particular, made it possible to commit the time necessary to build community power aimed at making sustainable PSE changes. The timeframe in which many of these changes occurred bears this out. COO partners made many PSE changes in the last two to three years of the funding cycle. COO partners often spent time earlier in the grant cycle building and deepening relationships, partnerships, and momentum. The payoff of this upfront investment in time for community power-building were the subsequent PSE-level changes made by COO partners. COO illustrates the importance of making long-term investments in equity. PSE change takes time, as does building and strengthening community power. Part of the success of COO can be tied to its financial and relational support of both over multiple years.

Cultivating partnerships and building authentic relationships and trust with our community have been our key work for the past two years. We alongside our partners are taking a long view approach as we work together toward our vision of building an economy that is rooted in democracy and self-determination, one that is sustainable and equitable, and which creates shared economic well-being. Put more eloquently, ‘If you want to go fast, go alone. If you want to go far, go together.’

—Community Partnership partner
The funding impact of COO has been huge because it allowed us to have a team of organizers to work on that policy and really involve the community. That's where we're strong, we have a base of workers.

—Systems and Policy Change partner

**Takeaway 3: The Learning Community is an effective model for how funding agencies can support partners beyond the provision of financial resources.**

Throughout nearly all elements of the evaluation, partners described the importance and unique value of the Learning Community. From its tailored trainings and technical assistance to its relationship building opportunities, to its intensive cohort learning circles, the Learning Community played a key role in bolstering the work of partners. Partners frequently cited the peer learning and community connection opportunities and the responsiveness to feedback as ways that the Learning Community set itself apart from the capacity-building offered through other grants or programs.

Partners described many of the Learning Community offerings as critical, especially those related to generative conflict and support for particular roles within COO partnerships. Other partners explained that because COO supported PSE change work that was rarely supported in the past, the peer learning opportunities helped them navigate this newer terrain. Through the Learning Community, COO provided the resources, tools, and connections to assist partners in doing the work differently. COO participants’ consistent praise of the Learning Community illustrates the value in continuing to provide this resource as part of COO. It also points to the value in replicating the approach in future social change initiatives.

**COO has been tremendous in that they’ve almost intuited the kind of learning opportunities we would need. I suppose they’re listening to us [laughs]. You know, we put things back to them. So, there’s been all these various trainings on conflict resolution and facilitation... equity trainings, financial oversight for directors. All of it was super super helpful.**

—Community Partnership partner
Takeaway 4: COO supports future advancements in equity by contributing to changes to the regional funding landscape.

As demonstrated by the tens of millions of dollars raised by partners since receiving COO funds, success can beget success. The external accomplishments, internal foundation strengthening, and community connections that COO partners built through their COO work helped them to secure additional funding and resources for their PSE change work. This allowed many partners to not only sustain their work but to expand it. COO’s mission to reduce structural inequities will take many years and require the collective efforts of communities across King County. When partners can leverage their successes and the resources they received through COO to further their PSE change efforts, it can increase the likelihood of COO achieving its ambitious goal.

On a broader level, points of overlap across initiatives and efforts suggest that COO may have influenced and supported changes to the funding landscape in the region. COO’s unique development as a community-driven partnership put its staff, partners, and leadership in positions to advise other planning and advisory bodies in the county on ways to increase and facilitate community leadership of equity-focused initiatives. Through its facilitation of the CREST learning circles, the Learning Community played a particular role in the planning of King County’s Equitable Development Initiative (EDI). The CREST learning circles, with their focus on community ownership, brought together a cohort of community-based BIPOC-led organizations to discuss and build knowledge about equitable development. The learning circles helped to create a network of advocates to advance this work, including through the planning of King County’s EDI program.

COO’s efforts to build and nourish connections among community leaders and agencies created overlap between many COO leaders and the leadership of subsequent equity-focused initiatives and programs in the region. For example, some members of COO’s Governance Group played important roles in Seattle’s Equitable Transportation program and in the development of Seattle’s Equitable Development Initiative. This overlap points to COO’s potential influence on other funding initiatives in the region. Leaders could apply lessons and insights from COO as they helped to shape subsequent racial and economic equity focused efforts. These points of overlap illustrate potential synergy and mutually reinforcing impact that COO can help create with other regional equity-focused programs as it prepares for the next six years of implementation.

When we started this work, there was intention in making sure that racial equity was part of how we were building out what we wanted to do and what our goals were. Both the process of racial equity as well as a goal of racial equity. Now we see a lot more people who are talking about race and equity in their funding, in their work. How community needs to be centered in these things. That was not always the case.
Opportunities for Growth

The first six years of COO also provided many lessons and opportunities for growth. Making the recommended changes outlined below may help strengthen COO and its impacts over time. It may also increase the success of similar community-driven racial and economic equity initiatives in the future.

Opportunity 1: COO can advance equity by supporting equitable and healthy community partnerships.

As outlined in the previous section, some COO partnerships struggled with the structure of having a “lead agency” when that agency had not built sufficient trust with partners or made decision-making processes transparent. To strengthen the collaboration capacity and functioning of partnerships, the Learning Community provided trainings and resources on topics such as community collaborations, partnership development, group facilitation, and generative conflict. COO staff also received additional training and support to help agencies navigate conflict more constructively.

COO has an opportunity to continue finding ways to support the development and ongoing maintenance of equitable and healthy partnerships. For example, COO plans to provide more resources at the start of the next phase of COO to support partnerships as they set out to build trust and create transparent decision-making processes. Equitable, healthy, and functioning partnerships are critical in community-driven equity initiatives, so COO leadership and leaders of similar initiatives should expect to support partners to tend to the health of their partnership throughout the life of the initiative.

Opportunity 2: COO leadership can expand the reach and impact of COO by connecting with and inviting other funders and relevant stakeholders to support the work of COO.

Given the many successes and accomplishments of COO, one opportunity for growth is for COO to find ways to expand the initiative's reach and impact. COO leaders, including funders and the Governance Group, can play an important role in making critical connections that increase opportunities for COO partners. The data consistently illustrate how COO partners across the three strategies benefitted from opportunities that COO provided to build and strengthen their networks and relationships with other COO partners and community leaders. As described earlier, strong relationships in communities are one of the ways to build community power.
To advance the work of partners and increase the sustainability and reach of the initiative, COO leadership should identify other opportunities to make critical connections and invite other relevant stakeholders to this work. This could mean connecting partners with other funding institutions or initiatives, or with leaders and efforts in separate but related fields. By helping to make these connections, COO leaders can support partners in securing additional funding and developing cross-sectoral collaborations and movements. By leveraging their power and connections, COO leaders can beget more opportunities for partners to sustain and advance their work.

*There’s some role clarification that needs to be happening around who’s... bringing these other stakeholders in or sectors. I know there’s this multi-sector emphasis, and I’m just like ‘whose job is that?’*

—COO staff

[Report question: In what ways can COO better support your organization/partnership...?]: **connections to key stakeholders and decision makers that may not otherwise naturally be able to see our grassroots organizations.**

—Community Partnership partner

**Opportunity 3: COO leadership can advance equity by examining their own internal systems and practices to increase alignment with racial and economic equity principles.**

To ensure alignment with COO’s goal of advancing racial and economic equity, COO leadership—including funders and the Governance Group—should continue examining how their internal systems and processes function to promote or reduce equity. As described earlier, COO staff at King County already made several changes to funding and contracting practices to make them more equitable. King County, the Seattle Foundation, and Governance Group members have an opportunity to continue improving the equity policies and practices at King County and their own institutions. COO’s funding institutions could review how their current systems and policies may make it more difficult for BIPOC and other underserved communities to receive and sustain funding that furthers the goals of their communities. Funders, especially large institutions like King County government, could identify equitable policies and practices already being implemented and institutionalize them across departments. As COO supports communities to advance racial and economic equity, leadership has an opportunity to continue examining how the equity goals are reflected in the logistical implementation of this work.
We as a county are one of the powers that can influence the success of communities, and we're also a huge power that thwarts the success of communities. So, we need to change. There's so much that has to change.

—COO leadership

... The internal systems change work that we have done in King County, I think a lot of people look to us and say ‘how did you do this?’.....People are starting to notice that we've made some of these changes, but it's really been hard to figure out how we actually make more institutional level changes, not just these one-offs. There is something in terms of figuring out who with more power...needs to be engaged or involved....that can actually influence more of that internal systems change work.

—COO Staff

I think that COO is finding ways to authentically partner with community, creating opportunity for relational and not just transactional relationship[s]. [T]his has not been a practice in other areas in [King County]

—COO Staff

Opportunity 4: COO can advance equity by prioritizing and supporting COO partners to build narrative power.

Narrative power is a critical component of building community power. It includes the ability to shape the narratives about and the understanding of a topic, issue, or norm. Narrative power also focuses on who is telling the story; it emphasizes the power of storytelling and defining one's own narrative. As COO continues to support partners to build community power, it has an opportunity to prioritize and support partners to build narrative power. Doing so can increase the scope and efficacy of communities' power-building efforts and amplify their impact. Many partners recognize the importance of telling and elevating stories about their community's strengths, needs, and successes. Some supported community members to share their stories and demands in public forums and meetings with policymakers. Others hired communications staff or utilized media outlets to spread their messaging about an issue. These actions can increase the likelihood of creating PSE change by educating policymakers and the public about an issue and by garnering broader support and momentum for change.

However, the evaluation also revealed several challenges that partners faced in building their narrative power. Many described limited organizational infrastructure, capacity, or bandwidth to invest in narrative power-building. Few smaller organizations have
communications staff members, let alone a department, and community-driven strategies to build narrative power require considerable time and resources. Finally, building narrative power was not an initial focus of COO, which meant COO staff provided fewer resources about it. Emphasizing the importance of narrative power and providing resources to support partners and communities to build it represents an important opportunity for COO in the future to expand its reach and impact.

Opportunity 5: COO can advance equity by expanding the Learning Community and supporting its replication in similar equity initiatives.

The largest opportunity for the Learning Community is to expand its offerings and reach. Based on feedback from COO participants, the Learning Community could create more network and connection building spaces, as well as support partners to navigate conflict and changes in relationship dynamics within partnerships. COO staff identified how not having this latter type of support available as the partnerships first launched created challenging dynamics and circumstances for some partners and staff to navigate later. Expanding Learning Community offerings and ensuring their availability at the start of the next implementation cycle can help partners as they address changes to relationships created by the new cycle of funding.

Additionally, the success of the Learning Community model presents an opportunity to assist other initiatives to use a similar strategy to strengthen community capacity. The evaluations of the Learning Community outline the types of capacity that partners gained through their participation as well as important lessons learned and recommendations for ways to improve on the model. The Learning Community is uniquely positioned to shed light on ways to partner with community organizations and leaders to support community power-building and racial and economic equity. The opportunity to share these learnings and information with other initiatives can help foster momentum and increase capacity for community-driven PSE change in the region.

For [COO] to be interested in what we're doing, it tells me that you're part of that effort, and it's not just by giving money. You also want to see why and how you can help in the process, how to put people together.

—Systems and Policy Change partner

Limitations of the evaluation

Several limitations of the evaluation should be noted. The first is that most of the data for the evaluation was self-reported. COO partners self-reported their successes, challenges,
progress, and activities through grantee reports, check-ins, and key informant interviews. Self-reported data can introduce methodological biases such as social desirability, where participants may overreport activities that are more socially desirable and underreport those they think evaluators might view unfavorably. One indicator that the threat of social desirability may have been low was the consistent willingness of COO partners to describe challenges with COO. Partners openly expressed difficulties with their partnerships, projects, and the administration of COO. The data collection tools also directly asked COO partners for this information, aiming to hear what was not going well in addition to what was going well. Another guard against this methodological threat is that many of the successes of COO were public (e.g., acquisition of land, testimonies at public hearings, development of community-owned properties, expansion of local businesses, receipt of grant awards, etc.).

Another limitation relates to the length of the grantee reporting template. Community Partnership and SPC partners completed mid- and end-of-year reports that summarized their activities, successes, and challenges over the prior six months. To gather comprehensive data, the reports were long and asked many detailed questions. Some COO partners completed every question; however, others left some questions blank. This missing data could result in undercounts for some evaluation outcomes, and particularly the quantitative outcomes. Additionally, some partner responses illustrate that not all partners may have understood the questions in the same way. COO staff addressed these issues by following up with many COO partners individually when questions arose about their answers in grantee reports.
In 2021, the community-public-private partnership Communities of Opportunity (COO) completed its first levy funding cycle. One of the Best Starts for Kids investment strategies, COO aims to improve community conditions for children, youth, and families by supporting community-driven solutions and partnerships that increase racial, social, health, and economic equity in King County. To achieve this, COO invested in efforts to strengthen existing power in communities to create policy, systems, and environmental changes that advanced equity.

The evaluation examined COO’s effects on the lived experience of communities related to housing, health, economic opportunities, and community connections. It explored the changes in opportunities, policies, systems, and environmental conditions that resulted from COO’s investment in community power-building across its three strategies: Community Partnerships, Systems and Policy Change, and Learning Community.

Findings revealed that COO’s long-term investments supported agencies, partnerships, and communities across the region to take meaningful actions to reduce inequities in the...
areas of housing, health, and economic opportunity. This report details the PSE changes made by COO partners, changes that can advance equity and improve the opportunities and lived experiences of communities in King County. The evaluation also demonstrated how partners successfully leveraged COO resources and relationships to expand the reach and scope of their work. Further, COO’s investment in community power-building supported partners and communities to take aim at addressing root causes of inequities. COO partners mobilized communities, developed community leaders, and built community connections in ways that strengthened the foundation from which they could address the power imbalances that undergird structural inequities.

The data also illuminated challenges and opportunities for growth. They showed that to ensure the health and functioning of partnerships, greater attention is needed to identify and address issues relating to trust, transparency, and power imbalances in community partnerships. COO funders and leaders must also continue to expand the alignment of their internal processes and systems with racial equity principles. The success of an initiative focused on racial, economic, and social equity will necessarily be affected by the degree of equity with which it is administered and governed. Finally, the evaluation revealed that expanding and deepening the connections between COO partners and other funders represents a promising way to expand and deepen the work of COO itself. These lessons will inform the implementation and evaluation of COO as it moves into the next Best Starts for Kids levy funding cycle.

The evaluation demonstrated COO’s success in supporting the community-driven advancement of racial, social, and economic equity. The data illustrate ways that COO partners improved opportunities and lived experiences for many King County residents. The data also showed how COO can continue to grow and build on these successes to expand its reach and impact for King County communities moving forward.

**Conclusion**

The evaluation demonstrated COO’s success in supporting the community-driven advancement of racial, social, and economic equity. The data illustrate ways that COO partners improved opportunities and lived experiences for many King County residents. The data also showed how COO can continue to grow and build on these successes to expand its reach and impact for King County communities moving forward.

*I appreciate everything that COO is doing and continues to do and will do for community groups. Because there is change happening…. I’m just excited to see where you all will go in this next iteration, and how it’ll be better. Because it’s already really great, so I’m excited to see what you do next.*

—Community Partnership partner
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COO</td>
<td>Communities of Opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREST</td>
<td>Community Real Estate Stewardship Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDI</td>
<td>Equitable Development Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPL</td>
<td>Federal Poverty Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHSKC</td>
<td>Public Health—Seattle &amp; King County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSE</td>
<td>Policy, Systems, and Environmental (used to describe types of structural change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBA</td>
<td>Results Based Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRRC</td>
<td>Replanting Roots Rebuilding Communities (community partnership)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCFA</td>
<td>Snoqualmie Valley – A Supportive Community for All (community partnership)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPC</td>
<td>Systems and Policy Change (used to refer to the SPC investment strategy funded by the Seattle Foundation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNN</td>
<td>Seattle Urban Native Nonprofits (community partnership)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEEC</td>
<td>Transgender Economic Empowerment Coalition (community partnership)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## King County and Original Place-Based Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Expected Direction</th>
<th>King County Average</th>
<th>Rainier Valley (SE Seattle)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-reported health: good to excellent</td>
<td>BRFSS</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>87.8 88.0 88.0 87.9 88.4</td>
<td>81.0 86.3 85.4 85.8 89.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating fruits/vegetables 5+ servings per day in youth</td>
<td>HYS†</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>24.6 22.8 20.6 NA 25.7</td>
<td>19.8 21.7 18.0 NA 26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households paying less than 30% of income</td>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>61.8 65.4 64.7 65.2 65.2</td>
<td>53.0 58.8 60.8 62.4 60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households paying less than 50% of income</td>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>83.7 85.4 83.8 84.1 84.1</td>
<td>77.1 80.0 78.9 79.6 79.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Opportunity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with income below 200% of FPL</td>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>24.4 20.7 19.5 18.4</td>
<td>40.1 34.3 30.3 27.8 24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent employed/in civilian labor force</td>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>92.8 95.0 95.5 95.8 95.7</td>
<td>89.8 92.4 93.5 94.3 95.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth ages 16–24 years in school/employed</td>
<td>PUMS</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>88.5 91.2 91.9 92.6 92.2</td>
<td>88.1 93.5 95.9 96.2 95.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Connection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescents with an adult they can talk with</td>
<td>HYS†</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>74.9 75.4 74.4 NA 66.7</td>
<td>65.6 65.0 63.5 NA 58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COO Composite*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite of eight indicators</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>105.0 98.3 96.3 94.7 93.8</td>
<td>129.1 108.8 104.1 104.7 101.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Migration (Displacement)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of residents moved out during the year</td>
<td>APCD</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>6.9 6.3 6.9 6.6 5.2</td>
<td>6.9 6.4 7.8 6.5 5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GREEN** indicates the rate is significantly higher than baseline.

**YELLOW** indicates the rate is significantly lower than baseline.

Statistical significance for the COO Composite and Residential Migration compared to baseline is not assessed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reported health: good to excellent</td>
<td>BRFSS</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>83.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating fruits/vegetables 5+ servings per day in youth</td>
<td>HYS†</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households paying less than 30% of income</td>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households paying less than 50% of income</td>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>78.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Opportunity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with income below 200% of FPL</td>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent employed/in civilian labor force</td>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>94.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth ages 16–24 years in school/employed</td>
<td>PUMS</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>86.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Connection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescents with an adult they can talk with</td>
<td>HYS†</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>62.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COO Composite</strong>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite of eight indicators</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>153.0</td>
<td>134.1</td>
<td>129.3</td>
<td>138.4</td>
<td>140.2</td>
<td>161.2</td>
<td>147.8</td>
<td>135.9</td>
<td>117.6</td>
<td>126.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential Migration (Displacement)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of residents moved out during the year</td>
<td>APCD</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GREEN indicates the rate is significantly higher than baseline.
YELLOW indicates the rate is significantly lower than baseline.
Statistical significance for the COO Composite and Residential Migration compared to baseline is not assessed.
## Newer Place-based and Cultural Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Expected Direction</th>
<th>Central Seattle</th>
<th>Kent</th>
<th>Snoqualmie/North Bend/Skykomish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-reported health: good to excellent</td>
<td>BRFSS</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>89.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating fruits/vegetables 5+ servings per day in youth</td>
<td>HYS†</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households paying less than 30% of income</td>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households paying less than 50% of income</td>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Opportunity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with income below 200% of FPL</td>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent employed/in civilian labor force</td>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>95.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth ages 16–24 years in school/employed</td>
<td>PUMS</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>96.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Connection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescents with an adult they can talk with</td>
<td>HYS†</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COO Composite</strong></td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>88.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of residents moved out during the year</td>
<td>APCD</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GREEN** indicates the rate is significantly higher than baseline.  
**YELLOW** indicates the rate is significantly lower than baseline.

Statistical significance for the COO Composite and Residential Migration compared to baseline is not assessed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reported health: good to excellent</td>
<td>BRFSS</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating fruits/vegetables 5+ servings per day in youth</td>
<td>HYS†</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households paying less than 30% of income</td>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households paying less than 50% of income</td>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>78.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Opportunity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with income below 200% of FPL</td>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent employed/in civilian labor force</td>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth ages 16–24 years in school/employed</td>
<td>PUMS</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td>85.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Connection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescents with an adult they can talk with</td>
<td>HYS†</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>55.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COO Composite*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite of eight indicators</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>153.0</td>
<td>157.3</td>
<td>165.3</td>
<td>175.5</td>
<td>199.4</td>
<td>203.4</td>
<td>193.1</td>
<td>189.7</td>
<td>162.4</td>
<td>169.8</td>
<td>175.5</td>
<td>181.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Migration (Displacement)**</td>
<td>APCD</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of residents moved out during the year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GREEN** indicates the rate is significantly higher than baseline.  
**YELLOW** indicates the rate is significantly lower than baseline.  
Statistical significance for the COO Composite and Residential Migration compared to baseline is not assessed.
DATA SOURCES

- BRFSS - Washington State Department of Health, Center for Health Statistics, Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, supported in part by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Cooperative Agreements.
- ACS - American Community Survey. U.S. Census Bureau.
- PUMS - The American Community Survey Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) files. U.S. Census Bureau.
- APCD - All Payer Claims Database, Washington State Health Care Authority.
- HYS - Washington State Healthy Youth Survey.

NOTES

COO launched the first place-based partnerships in 2015. For these partnerships and for King County overall, the table includes indicator data for 2014 as the baseline year.

COO established additional place-based partnerships in early 2018. For these partnerships, the table includes data from 2017 as baseline. More information about COO's Place-based and Cultural Communities are found here. https://www.coopartnerships.org/partners

ACS and BRFSS data are based on 5-year rolling averages. For example, the column labeled 2014 is based on 2010-2014 5-year data, and the column labeled 2020 is based on 2016-2020 data.

ACS, APCD, and COO Composite data reported in past Best Starts for Kids annual reports may differ slightly from data presented in this table. This reflect updates to the data and refinements to how geographic boundaries are defined.

*The COO Composite is the sum of eight indicators, including life expectancy, rates of obesity, smoking, diabetes, frequent mental distress, unemployment, poor housing conditions, and living below 200% FPL.

- To maintain data continuity across years, the Composite in this table does not include avoidable hospitalization or uninsured rate among adults, indicators that are included in the Composite map by census tract presented elsewhere.

**The Residential Migration indicator uses data from Washington State's All Payer Claims Database, which includes over 70% of King County residents.

- It is a proxy measure for displacement, as it shows movement out of a given geography over a given period of time (i.e., outmigration).
- We are unable to measure "involuntary" displacement since the data do not reflect reasons for people moving.
- This indicator is standardized for the amount of time a person spent in an area that year. A move is defined as changing zip codes in a given year within Washington state.
- King County average is the weighted mean of neighborhood outmigration. Formula: Number of moves out of a neighborhood in a year/total amount of person time observed in that neighborhood.
- We have included 2015 estimates in the 2014 column, due to APCD data limitations in 2014.

†Healthy Youth Survey (HYS) is conducted in even years, except for 2020. The 2020 HYS survey was postponed until 2021 due to COVID.

^AIAN = American Indian/Alaska Native.
### APPENDIX C: PERFORMANCE MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>COO Strategy</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of capacity building events</td>
<td>PBCC</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>1,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPCs</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1,081</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>2,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning Community</td>
<td>NA*</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workforce Development</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1,442</td>
<td>1,269</td>
<td>1,371</td>
<td>4,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of community events</td>
<td>PBCCs</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>1,221</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>2,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPCs</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1,137</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>2,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1,687</td>
<td>2,087</td>
<td>1,109</td>
<td>5,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of community members engaged**</td>
<td>PBCCs</td>
<td>13,335</td>
<td>24,888</td>
<td>91,980</td>
<td>19,324</td>
<td>149,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPCs</td>
<td>4,545</td>
<td>13,460</td>
<td>86,013</td>
<td>45,319</td>
<td>149,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning Community</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1,731</td>
<td>2,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workforce Development</td>
<td>1,474</td>
<td>1,555</td>
<td>1,145</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>4,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>19,354</td>
<td>39,903</td>
<td>179,738</td>
<td>67,040</td>
<td>306,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of community members with capacities built</td>
<td>PBCC</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2293</td>
<td>1761</td>
<td>3585</td>
<td>7,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPCs</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning Community</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workforce Development</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,293</td>
<td>2,395</td>
<td>3,866</td>
<td>8,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of leaders developed</td>
<td>PBCCs</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>1,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPCs</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning Community</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>264</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>2,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of people in jobs</td>
<td>PBCC</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>?***</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPCs</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning Community</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workforce Development</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of new partnerships</td>
<td>PBCC</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPCs</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of new relationships/connections made</td>
<td>PBCCs</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPCs</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning Community</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>184</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>1,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of new policies</td>
<td>PBCCs</td>
<td>SPCs</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* “NA” indicates that this data was not collected, either because the investment strategy had not started yet (in the case of the Learning Community), or because the strategy did not collect data on the performance measure.

** Number of community members engaged may include duplicates. The increase in 2020 reflects high virtual engagement.

*** “?” indicates that data was collected but not in a way that could be specified by strategy type.
APPENDIX D: EVALUATION ADVISORY GROUP PARTNERS

Global to Local – SeaTac-Tukwila Community Coalition (Community Partnership, COO Governance Group)

HomeSight – Rainier Valley COO (Community Partnership)

Hopelink – A Supportive Community for All (Community Partnership)

King County Housing Authority (COO Governance Group)

Comunidad Latina de Vashon (Community Partnership)

Open Doors for Multicultural Families – (SPC partner)

Potlatch – Seattle Urban Native Nonprofits (Community Partnership)

Puget Sound Sage – Rainier Valley COO (Community Partnership, Learning Circle, SPC partner)

Rainier Beach Action Coalition – Rainier Valley COO (Community Partnership)

Rainier Valley COO Steering Committee - Rainier Valley COO (Community Partnership)

Transgender Economic Empowerment Coalition (Community Partnership)

White Center Community Development Association – White Center COO (Community Partnership)

Public Health – Seattle & King County (Funder)

Seattle Foundation (Funder)
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