

**SC Targeted FMP Steering Committee
February 24, 2009 Meeting: Compiled Summary of Scenario Comments**

Steering Committee Recommendations	
<p>CONSENSUS:</p>	<p>Following discussion on Scenario 2's approach to dependency cases, Judge Trickey called the question on recommending that particular scenarios be removed from further consideration.</p> <p>By group consensus, the recommendation was:</p> <p>Scenarios 1, 3, and 4 should be removed from consideration.</p> <p>Varying degrees of support for scenarios 2, 5, 5.5 and 6.</p> <p>A Scenario 7, consisting of the cost for one site serving all county juvenile and family case needs, should be considered.</p>

Superior Court Committee Members and Attendees	
<p>Hon. Judge Trickey (voting member)</p> <p><i>Co-Chair SC FMP Steering Committee</i></p> <p>Fmr. Presiding Judge KC Superior Court</p>	<p>The King County Courthouse (KCCH) was built in 1916 and we're still in it. The Alder courthouse will be 40 years old by the time of the project. When we consider the scenarios, we must remember we're building a building for the next 50 years or more.</p> <p>We must build the biggest building, allowing flexibility in the future. This is a bad time to be a visionary, but it is precisely the time we need to be visionary.</p>

Superior Court Committee Members and Attendees	
<p>Hon. Judge Clark (voting member)</p> <p>Fmr. Chief Judge Juvenile Court KC Superior Court</p>	<p>From the start of this process in the Operational Master Plan (OMP), the goal has been to link families with needed services to reduce the load on the court and system. Clif explained the goal well. We need to look forward to the 21st century, not at how we do business today, but at how we will work in the future.</p> <p>The only scenarios to consider are 5.5 and 6. Scenario 5.5 makes little sense. How would we screen families to identify those with needs? Providing screening at two locations is duplicative. We need to deploy resources more effectively. Family Law cases do not arrive in court with obvious problem signs and all issues flagged.</p> <p>We should support Scenario 6 or a Scenario 7 (centralized family law). And we should consider the operational cost in 2032 if we have Family Law operations spread all over the county. My hunch is that Scenario 6 would be cheaper than other options.</p>
<p>Hon. Judge Doerty (voting member)</p> <p>Chief Judge Unified Family Court KC Superior Court</p>	<p>We need to get the Facilities Master Plan (FMP) over to the council as soon as possible.</p> <p>Scenario 6 best meets Superior Court needs over the near and long terms.</p> <p>Scenario 5.5 is confusing.</p> <p>Of all the scenarios, it comes down to Scenarios 5.5 and 6. Scenario 6 is better than 5.5.</p> <p>Scenario 1 is unacceptable and should be eliminated from consideration.</p> <p>Generally likes the FMP Draft.</p>

Superior Court Committee Members and Attendees	
<p>Paul Sherfey (voting member)</p> <p>Chief Admin. Officer KC Superior Court</p>	<p>Getting the building that was envisioned in the OMP is the most important thing. The OMP had a goal of one site co-location of children and family cases. Many of the 11 recommendations in the OMP relate to a new building. The only scenario that comes close to meeting all of the OMP recommendations and realizing the intent of the OMP is Scenario 6.</p> <p>A Scenario 7 could be included to demonstrate what it would take to address the north and south end needs.</p> <p>Operational costs increase if case types are split, with two facilitator groups, two Family Law Information Centers, and the like. Not the efficient service delivery and synergy envisioned in OMP.</p>
<p>Hon. Judge Hilyer</p> <p>Presiding Judge KC Superior Court</p>	<p>On a recent visit to Clark County, Las Vegas, they told us that we would outgrow the building by opening day. Every location our judges have visited has told us that they were out of room and needed additional growth space by the time the facility was built.</p>
<p>Hon. Judge Halpert KC Superior Court</p>	<p>Conceiving of a screening approach is difficult. Screening cannot be done in an efficient or reliable manner.</p> <p>A major number of in-custody Family Law appearances are for contempt of court. Superior Court is considering keeping these appearances downtown.</p>
<p>Hon. Judge Hubbard</p> <p>Chief Judge Juvenile Court KC Superior Court</p>	<p>Co-locating juvenile law and dependency is critical. Treating juvenile law cases holistically by centering on the family is critical.</p> <p>Screening families degrades this mission. While Cliff took no position on a scenario, his statement is really in support of Scenario 6, or a Scenario 7 even more so. We should look to the future and stand with Scenario 6.</p>
<p>Hon. Judge McCarthy KC Superior Court</p>	<p>Scenarios 5.5 and 6 are the only scenarios worth considering. The other scenarios do not accomplish the OMP goal of combining matters in one courthouse effectively.</p> <p>Scenario 6 has a greater potential to accommodate future growth than 5.5. Between 5.5 and 6, 5.5 is “penny-wise and pound foolish.”</p> <p>Generally likes the FMP Draft.</p>

Superior Court Committee Members and Attendees	
<p>Steve Gustaveson (for Bruce Knutson)</p> <p>Juvenile Court Ops. KC Superior Court</p>	<p>This is an opportunity that happens once in a couple generations. We should think long term. We want to do it right.</p> <p>We should support Scenario 6.</p>
<p>Rachael DeVillar-Fox (for Jorene Moore)</p> <p>Family Court Ops. KC Superior Court</p>	<p>We should build for growth because we'll outgrow the facility very quickly.</p> <p>Screening for services is not viable. It is very difficult to determine who needs services and who doesn't, especially at filing. Splitting Family Law between Alder and the KCCH would be difficult.</p> <p>Support Scenario 6.</p>

Executive Department Committee Members	
<p>Kathy Brown (voting member)</p> <p><i>Co-Chair SC FMP Steering Committee</i></p> <p>Director, FMD</p>	<p>We must consider the Alder project in the context of all the other county criminal justice needs. Scenario 6 integrates case types, but does not consider the costs of Maleng Regional Justice Center (MRJC) detention expansion at \$60 million, KCSO evidence storage at \$40 million, reconfiguring King County Sheriff's Office (KCSO) precincts, or the council-directed relocation of Criminal Investigation Division (CID) downtown at \$10 million. We also must move Bellevue District Court out of Surrey Downs, the cost of which is unknown. We need two District Court courtrooms in the south end, space for the Prosecuting Attorney's Office (PAO), and space for Office of the Public Defender (OPD) in the KCCH. KCSO needs a space for their helicopter. We need to consider how to meet all these county needs without breaking the bank.</p> <p>Scenario 5.5 meets as many needs as possible without breaking the bank, or voters' willingness to support the project. It is the best "balancing act" across county needs. It provides treatment services for families needing services, but avoids Family Support impacts to PAO.</p> <p>The Executive recommendation for Scenario 5.5 was 15 courtrooms. We need to check back with the Executive to confirm this number and approach. It probably won't change, but we need to provide the steering committee's feedback before the final recommendation.</p> <p>We should note that the bigger the facility, the less outside revenue possible from private development on the site.</p>

Executive Department Committee Members	
<p>Krista Camenzind (voting member)</p> <p>OMB</p>	<p>Review page 63 of the Draft FMP, depicting the incremental differences in operational costs among the facility scenarios. Costs are very large for last two options – there is over \$1 million in additional operating costs for Scenario 6.</p> <p>We must consider the operational cost to gather support for any scenario, including voter support. We need to ensure our ability to pay the operating costs for the scenario we put before the voters.</p> <p>Scenario 5.5 is the preferred scenario.</p> <p>Scenario 2 is Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) second choice. It allows for growth in Mental Illness / Drug Dependency (MIDD) and other services, meeting the (OMP) goal of connecting families and services, but it's affordable within our existing operating budget. Land banking would provide future flexibility for additional growth and future needs.</p>
<p>Toni Rezab (voting member)</p> <p>Chief of Admin., DAJD</p>	<p>Thoroughly excited at the potential for a new facility.</p> <p>We need to beware unintended consequences in selecting a scenario. Review page 49, paragraph 3 of the Draft FMP, listing the number of adult transports from the KCCF to Alder. Today, 160 adults are transported from the KCCF to Alder annually. That number increases to 960 if all Family Law cases are located at Alder.</p> <p>We must recognize the significant additional operational costs that result from this increase, along with other operational impacts, especially to safety and security.</p> <p>Glad that the process is inclusive.</p>
<p>David Hocraffer (voting member)</p> <p>Director, OPD</p>	<p>Focus on the impacts to attorneys, efficiency, and costs, especially cost impact to the public.</p> <p>We should take Scenario 1 off the table for consideration. Because Scenarios 2 and 4 are almost equal to Scenario 5 in costs, we should also remove Scenarios 2 and 4 from consideration. Scenarios 5, 5.5, and 6 remain.</p> <p>The cost of Scenario 6 will be a tougher sell. We should keep all juvenile matters in one place. Scenarios 5 and 5.5 make sense. Narrow it to 5 or 5.5.</p>

Stakeholder Committee Members and Attendees	
<p>Leesa Manion (voting member)</p> <p>Chief of Staff, PAO</p>	<p>We respect Superior Court’s wish not to have to split Family Law. Similarly, we must include Scenario 5 for consideration with 5.5 and 6 because of the potential impact to the Prosecutor’s Family Support Unit.</p> <p>We do not want to split the Family Support Unit, so Scenario 5 should stay on the table. The vast majority of family law cases involve children tangentially. They do not come to court. We need to examine this in evaluating the scenarios.</p>
<p>Councilmember Lambert (voting member)</p> <p>King County Council</p>	<p>We need best practices to serve kids and avoid cycling through the system repeatedly.</p> <p>In depicting the scenario choices, pictures are most important factor. There should be an all-county option for comparison.</p> <p>The costs of changes in procedures must be considered along with the life-cycle costs. Gains in energy efficiency savings must be considered.</p> <p>Review page 49 of the Draft FMP, addressing transports. We need to fix this problem.</p> <p>We should phase the facility so we’re not just “splitting it anyway”. Bring public-private options into the discussion, including rental space that generates revenue. If we can generate private funding, the cost will be a less bitter pill to swallow.</p> <p>Review page 71 of the Draft FMP. The cost for Scenario 5.5 is \$13.49 annually for a \$400,000 house. It is roughly \$3 more for Scenario 6. Going from \$7 to \$16 (the difference between Scenarios 1 and 6) is a big deal, but an additional \$3 is not.</p> <p>We must also look at outside revenue.</p>

Stakeholder Committee Members and Attendees	
<p>Kathleen Royer (voting member)</p> <p>Private Attorney KCBA Representative</p>	<p>As a family law practitioner, favor the option that is the most long-range forward looking. Scenario 6 encompasses as much as possible.</p> <p>We need a strategy to get different legal systems working in an integrated fashion, with an in-depth discussion and public educational outreach/campaign.</p> <p>Voters will support Scenario 6 if they see the overall value in it, “one stop shopping” for families in crisis. We will need these services even more in the current economy.</p> <p>Operating cost should be considered in the context of creating a tax structure to give King County the money needed to operate the facility</p>
<p>Clif Curry</p> <p>Senior Analyst King County Council</p>	<p>Council approved the OMP including the policy goals for easy family access. The focus should be primarily on the families in the system, and the service partnerships for successful outcomes for those families, and not just the lawyers. We should review the FMP through the OMP lens, the goal of comprehensive family participation in services in mind.</p> <p>The OMP goal was to have all the Family Law operations in a single location. None of the scenarios now address this goal, because there is still a north/south split. We should support whatever scenario benefits King County and families needing services, by making service delivery more efficient overall. With consolidation, in the long run this will reduce case numbers and costs.</p> <p>We know there will be cascading impacts to the criminal justice system, both positive and negative, from the scenarios. We need to examine these in our review. The regular planning approach is “walking backwards into the future,” looking at what past trends are for future planning. We don’t want to recreate 1967 in 2030. We need to also positively look forward – not envisioning our current operations, but what we will need differently for the future.</p> <p>The KCCH was built during a recession, it can be done.</p>
<p>Marcus Hochstetler</p> <p>Library Director KC Law Library</p>	<p>Over 50 percent of visitors to the Law Library are dealing with Family Law issues, so having law library access with Family Law cases is important.</p> <p>We support Scenario 6. We could support Scenario 5.5.</p>