

Women's Commission | Response Plan Brief

Topic: KCPAO Trafficking Presentation Response

Author: Seattle Women's Commission Co-Chairs

Submission Date: 9 February 2026

Attendees: Co-Chair Barr, Co-Chair Mills, Co-Chair Nakamura, Co-Chair Evanoff

Overview

Women's Commission received an email on 28 January 2026 titled **SWC - Survivor Demands re KCPAO Presentation on Sex Trafficking & City Council Complicity**. Attendee and staff at the King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office explained during the [27 January 2026 Seattle City Council Public Safety Meeting](#) (CM Kettle, D7) a Human Trafficking 101 Presentation led by KAPAO depicted graphic language and images of survivors of abuse and domestic violence including graphic survivor stories of rape.

More information: [27 January Public Safety Committee Meeting](#) (Legistar)

Request of Seattle Office of Civil Rights

- 1. Research & Deliver summary** of current city of **Seattle by-laws around data privacy protections for public records** - such as victims or survivors identifiable features, faces, or tattoos in images on public presentations.
- 2. Research & Deliver Audit:** Current policies in place at City, County & City Council offices and Mayor's Offices around submission of evidence or information to public record in regards to Domestic Violence Victim or Survivor Data Protections.
- 3. Office of Civil Rights Investigation into King County Prosecuting Attorney Office (KCPAO)**'s staff policies, data protection rules, training, and assignment process related to Gender-based violence and human-trafficking work.
- 4. Legal Sufficiency Review:** Request of Seattle City Attorney office for legal advisor review of proposed framework for the new Survivor Digital Privacy & Consent Ordinance.
- 5. Request formal statement by SOCR Director Derrick Wheeler-Smith** to publicly call for the **City of Seattle to establish and uphold of strategies** to honor and include

diverse perspectives in all Civil Rights Work - including that for survivors, sex workers, and people in the sex trade in future policy conversations and to resource peer-led community-based organizations that provide outreach, support, and services without requiring that they collaborate or cooperate with the law enforcement.

Women's Commission Outcomes

Outcomes - On Behalf of Full Commission

1. **Develop Ordinance on digital privacy laws** to protect survivor data and privacy in public records in City of Seattle.
2. **Support for Coalition for Rights & Safety Statement** and list of demands at City Council Meeting (Tue 10 February)
3. **Partnership with SOCR** to investigate city and county policy (See: "Request of Office of Civil Rights") to ensure policies are ethical, survivor-informed, and center on non-exploitative uses of survivor voices and stories.
4. **Partnership with SOCR** to request Seattle City Attorney Legal Sufficiency Review to inform development of digital privacy ordinance (See: "Request of Office of Civil Rights")
5. Commission to connect existing **Domestic Violence training & resources** with those City of Seattle on domestic violence and gender-based violence policies, programming, and legislation, especially partners in King County Prosecuting Attorneys Office.
6. **Mandatory Training for KCPAO staff & City Council** in Partnership with API Chaya and Women's Commission. Specific focus on language, bias, and working with underrepresented community groups.
7. Final Outcome: **Advocacy for the City of Seattle to establish and uphold of strategies to honor and include diverse perspectives of survivors, sex workers, and people in the sex trade in future policy conversations and to resource peer-led community-based organizations that provide outreach, support, and services without requiring that they collaborate or cooperate with the law enforcement.**

Commission Partner Engagement

- Coalition for Rights & Safety - *Commissioner Guerro, SWC Co-Chairs*
- City of Seattle: **Ending GBV** team - *Co-Chair Nakamura*
- Mayor's Office MODVSA Working Group -*Co-Chair Nakamura or Commissioner Hitchcock*

Named quote in article on event; Brayla is in King County Prosecutor's Office -Co-Chair Mills

Response to Requested Action

Requested Action	SWC Response
1. Formal acknowledgement by the Office of Civil Rights & Seattle City Council	<p>A. An acknowledgment of the pattern of selective and exploitative uses of survivor stories, voices, and images in policy advocacy by the KCPAO and Public Safety committee.</p> <p>B. Formal agreement & acknowledgement the city must establish and uphold of strategies to honor and include diverse perspectives of survivors, sex workers, and people in the sex trade in future policy conversations and to resource peer-led community-based organizations that provide outreach, support, and services without requiring that they collaborate or cooperate with the law enforcement.</p>
2. An investigation into how the presentation was allowed to take place the way it did: internal cultures of KCPAO regarding the treatment of survivor stories, trainings and policies (or lack thereof) regarding public presentation of survivor stories, and how KCPAO engages with survivors with diverse perspectives in its policy advocacy.	<p>A. Request to Office of Civil Rights to open formal investigation on behalf of Seattle Women's Commission</p> <p>B. Request of Office of Civil Rights to deliver audit of current city and county policies at city, county, mayor's office and City Council on domestic violence training, survivor-informed training, response policies, staff policies.</p>
4. A meeting of Seattle Public Safety committee dedicated to a presentation about human rights-based, non-carceral, pro-sex worker approach to combating sex trafficking, preferably presided by someone	<p>A. Women's Commission to author proposed ordinance on Survivor Digital Privacy & Consent Act.</p> <p>B. Women's Commission to invite KCPOA staff to participate in formal training, such as by community partner</p>

other than CMs that failed to intervene, as a direct remedy for the silencing and personal attacks on subject experts who have advocated for such approach.	APICHAYA
---	----------

Reference Information

Human Trafficking 101 Presentation (Public Record) - broken link.

Public Safety Council

<u>Debora Juarez</u>	Member	1/7/20	12/31/20	Debora.Juarez@seattle.gov
26	27			
<u>Eddie Lin</u>	Member	1/7/20	12/31/20	Eddie.Lin@seattle.gov
26	27			
<u>Maritza Rivera</u>	Member	1/7/20	12/31/20	Maritza.Rivera@seattle.gov
26	27			
<u>Rob Saka</u>	Vice Chair	1/7/20	12/31/20	Rob.Saka@seattle.gov
26	27			
<u>Robert Kettle</u>	Chair	1/7/20	12/31/20	Robert.Kettle@seattle.gov
26	27			

Request of Seattle City Attorney's Office

REQUEST

FROM: Neely Evanoff, Co-Chair, Seattle Women's Commission

DATE: February 9, 2026

SUBJECT: Request for Preliminary Legal Sufficiency Review: Seattle Survivor Digital Privacy & Consent Ordinance

The Seattle Women's Commission is currently drafting the *Seattle Survivor Digital Privacy & Consent Ordinance*. We would like to evaluate these known legal cases for

use in an ordinance to protect extremely sensitive domestic abuse survivor information from public records in the future.

This legislation seeks to modernize the City's redaction standards for digital public records to protect survivors of domestic violence, sexual assault, and human trafficking from secondary victimization and digital stalking facilitated by "data scraping" and AI-reidentification.

We request a formal legal opinion regarding the alignment of this ordinance proposal with the Washington Public Records Act (PRA), RCW 42.56.

Known Legal Precedences

- **Cite WFSE v. Washington (2023):** Use this to establish that survivors have a "fundamental constitutional interest" in their personal security. Argue that by hosting PII and graphic photos of survivors, the City is "disturbing their private affairs" without a compelling government interest.
- **Cite Does v. Seattle Police Department (2025):** This is your "smoking gun" for Seattle specifically. The WA Supreme Court recently clarified that when a constitutional right (like survivor safety) is "clear," the City **must refuse** to disclose or host that data. It shifts the burden from the survivor to the City.
- **Cite Hearst Corp. v. Hoppe (1979):** Use the "Hearst Test." Argue that (1) the disclosure of names and graphic photos of trafficking survivors is **highly offensive** to a reasonable person, and (2) it is of **no legitimate concern** to the public to see the specific faces/names of survivors in a "101" training deck.

Question for attorney's office:

Are these available to use in the ordinance language?

Potential Conflict	Mitigation Strategy
PRA Preemption	Define PII as "Highly Offensive" to trigger existing RCW 42.56 exemptions.
OPMA Conflict	Focus on the "Permanent Digital Record" rather than live-room closure.

SPD Pushback	Frame it as "Officer Protection"—protecting the identities of undercover units or survivors helps the mission.
County Gap	Use "Data Sharing ILAs" to export Seattle's privacy standards.

Additional Argument - for legal feedback

Define the King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office presentation, **Human Trafficking 101**, as a "Work Product."

Under **RCW 42.56.240**, does the City already have the power to redact information in a work product that would "endanger a person's life or physical safety"?

Your ordinance shouldn't just ask them to follow the law; it should **mandate a 90-day "Digital Safety Audit"** of all departmental websites. This moves the burden from the survivors to the IT department.

General Framework: *Survivor Digital Privacy & Consent Ordinance*

Ordinance Framework

AN ORDINANCE relating to the digital privacy and safety of survivors of domestic violence, sexual assault, and human trafficking; establishing protocols for the use of survivor data in public-facing materials; amending data-sharing requirements for interlocal agreements; and creating a ministerial duty for the redaction of non-consensual personal identifying information.

WHEREAS, the Washington Supreme Court in *WFSE v. Washington* (2023) recognized that survivors of domestic violence possess a fundamental constitutional liberty interest in personal security that the government must protect; and

WHEREAS, the court in *Does v. Seattle Police Department* (2025) clarified that when a constitutional privacy right is clear, the City has an obligation to protect that information from public disclosure; and

WHEREAS, the City of Seattle finds that the public disclosure of a survivor's name, face, or graphic survivor-narrative in non-evidentiary materials—such as training

manuals or public websites—is "highly offensive" and of "no legitimate concern to the public" under the test established in *Hearst Corp. v. Hoppe* (1979); and

WHEREAS, the City recognizes that digital permanence creates a unique and ongoing threat to the safety of survivors who interact with the municipal government;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF SEATTLE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Definitions.