



## AGENDA SHORELINE CITY COUNCIL SPECIAL MEETING

Monday, October 1, 2007  
6:30 p.m.

Shoreline Conference Center  
Mt. Rainier Room

	<u>Page</u>	<u>Estimated Time</u>
<b>1. CALL TO ORDER</b>		6:30
<b>2. FLAG SALUTE/ROLL CALL</b>		
<b>3. REPORT OF THE CITY MANAGER</b>		
<b>4. REPORTS OF BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS</b>		
<b>5. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT</b>		6:45
<i>This is an opportunity for the public to address the Council on topics other than those listed on the agenda, and which are not of a quasi-judicial nature. The public may comment for up to three minutes; the Public Comment under Item 5 will be limited to a maximum period of 30 minutes. The public may also comment for up to three minutes on agenda items following each staff report. The total public comment period on each agenda item is limited to 20 minutes. In all cases, speakers are asked to come to the front of the room to have their comments recorded. Speakers should clearly state their name and city of residence.</i>		
<b>6. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA</b>		7:05
<b>7. CONSENT CALENDAR</b>		7:05
(a) Motion to Authorize the City Manager to Execute a Contract with HDR for Design Services for the Aurora Corridor Project, N. 165 <sup>th</sup> Street to N. 205 <sup>th</sup> Street	<u>1</u>	
<b>8. NEW BUSINESS</b>		
(a) Regional Jail Update	<u>9</u>	7:10
<b>9. ADJOURNMENT</b>		8:00

*The Council meeting is wheelchair accessible. Any person requiring a disability accommodation should contact the City Clerk's Office at 546-8919 in advance for more information. For TTY service, call 546-0457. For up-to-date information on future agendas, call 546-2190 or see the web page at [www.cityofshoreline.com](http://www.cityofshoreline.com). Council meetings are shown on Comcast Cable Services Channel 21 Tuesdays at 12 noon and 8 p.m., and Wednesday through Sunday at 6 a.m., 12 noon and 8 p.m. Council meetings can also be viewed on the City's Web site at [cityofshoreline.com/cityhall/citycouncil/index](http://cityofshoreline.com/cityhall/citycouncil/index).*

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM  
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON**

<b>AGENDA TITLE:</b>	Authorize the City Manager to execute a contract with HDR Engineering, Inc. for Design services for the Aurora Corridor Project (N 165 <sup>th</sup> Street to N 205 <sup>th</sup> Street)
<b>DEPARTMENT:</b>	Public Works
<b>PRESENTED BY:</b>	Kirk McKinley, Aurora Corridor/Interurban Trail Project Manager Kris Overleese, PE, Capital Projects Manager

**PROBLEM/ISSUE STATEMENT:**

The purpose of this report is to request Council's authorization to execute a contract with HDR Engineering, Inc. for the design phase of the Aurora Corridor Project (N 165<sup>th</sup> to N 205<sup>th</sup> Street). The maximum, not to exceed, contract amount is \$4,200,000 plus a 10% contingency (\$420,000) for a total of \$4,620,000.

The purpose of this phase of the project is to complete the preliminary engineering (to the 30% level) for the project from 165<sup>th</sup> to 205<sup>th</sup> Streets and then to complete final design including right of way acquisition support from N 165<sup>th</sup> to N 185<sup>th</sup> Street.

Later this fall, staff will submit more detail on how the City might fund and phase the last two miles of Aurora. This contract with HDR is proposed to be the initial phase for the design of the last two miles of the corridor (100% next mile, 30% last mile). This will allow for the timely utilization of our existing funding and begin construction in 2009 of at least the next mile.

This HDR contract is to provide:

- Electrical underground design
- Field survey
- Right of way acquisition support services
- Typical street design services including: illumination, signal improvements, channelization, signage, pole bases, walls, curb/gutter/sidewalk, conventional stormwater systems, walls
- Landscape and urban design
- Design of natural stormwater system elements
- Geotechnical services including borings and potholes for subsurface condition and utility location verification
- Permit assistance and traffic control plan development


Please see Attachment A for a proposed schedule of the design process.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that Council authorize the City Manager to execute a contract with HDR Engineering, Inc. for design and right-of-way acquisition support work for the Aurora Corridor Improvement Project (N 165<sup>th</sup> to N 205<sup>th</sup> Street) for an amount not to exceed \$4,200,000 plus a 10% contingency (\$420,000) for a total of \$4,620,000.

Approved By:

City Manager



City Attorney



## **BACKGROUND**

On May 2, 2005, Council authorized staff to initiate the Public Outreach and Pre-Environmental phase of the Aurora Corridor Improvement Project (N 165<sup>th</sup> to N 205<sup>th</sup> Street). The purpose of the work was to compile baseline environmental information, develop alignment concepts, discuss project concerns with businesses, property owners, and the community, develop a photo log of the corridor, create a private property access and parking inventory, and traffic analysis. The first open house for the project was August 17, 2005. The process included staff one-on-one meetings with all property owners along Aurora Avenue N between N 165<sup>th</sup> Street and N 205<sup>th</sup> Street. Staff met with approximately 90 property owners representing 103 properties and discussed the project and its timeline, specific property concerns, and answered development related questions.

Staff worked with the Aurora Business Team (ABT) in 2006 and they developed the build Alternative A. In addition to the ABT work, staff developed two draft alignment alternatives in 2006 (Alternatives B and C), performed an east/west traffic analysis, and created a business sign inventory.

In the fall of 2006, the City hired Jones & Stokes to complete the environmental analysis for the project. As part of the environmental process, two public meetings were held (November 30 and December 6, 2006) to receive public feedback before the environmental analysis began. There was also a comment period that ended January 16, 2007 to receive feedback on items to analyze in the environmental process.

Early in 2007, the twenty-three member Aurora Business and Community (ABC) Team was created to assist staff with: environmental analysis, update of the "32 Points" which were previously adopted to guide project design (now called Implementation Strategies), and development of natural stormwater system concepts. The ABC Team also gave staff feedback from construction of the first mile and had many ideas on how to improve construction conditions for businesses, motorists and pedestrians.

On June 20, 2007, a public open house was held to show the community the Draft Recommended Flexible Alternative and preliminary environmental analysis results. This meeting was attended by over 200 people. On June 27, 2007, the ABC Team recommended unanimously to the City Manager that this alternative be adopted by Council as the Preferred Alternative for the project, along with the Implementation Strategies.

On July 16, 2007 a public hearing was held for Alternatives A, B, C, Draft Recommended and Do Nothing Alternative. Testimony was received from twenty-five people and the feedback overwhelmingly supported adoption by Council of the Draft Recommended Flexible Alternative. Organized Shoreline groups including Forward Shoreline, Vision Aurora, the Shoreline Chamber of Commerce, and the ABC Team sent Council documentation supporting the Draft Recommended Flexible Alternative.

On July 23<sup>rd</sup>, Council adopted the Draft Recommended Flexible Alternative and Implementation Strategies. The environmental process continues and is anticipated to be completed in December 2007. It is appropriate to move forward with design and preparation for the right-of-way acquisition phase of the project.

Staff has also advertised, interviewed and selected Universal Field Services as the right-of-way acquisition/property services team for the project. Their contract was awarded on September 10, 2007.

**Phasing and Schedule:** Staff proposes this contract with HDR would provide final design for N 165<sup>th</sup> to N 185<sup>th</sup> and 30% design for N 185<sup>th</sup> to N 205<sup>th</sup>, instead of final design for the entire two miles. Staff is recommending the City take this approach to meet our current commitments for funding and having the project under construction by the second quarter of 2009; the City has project funding for construction which is due to expire in June 2009. In addition, the City currently has not received enough funding to construct the entire two miles. Should funding be available via Regional Transportation Investment District or other sources, we will have the flexibility to initiate final design for the remaining mile. Staff will submit more detail on how we might approach this phasing and funding for the remaining two miles later this fall. Having HDR under contract for 30% design for the N 185<sup>th</sup> to N 205<sup>th</sup> piece will allow field surveying to develop a pre-design base map which may be used for future developments to locate their buildings, grade their driveways, etc. relative to the planned horizontal and vertical alignments for the roadway.

**Design Consultant Selection:** HDR's team was chosen as the design consultant for the Aurora Corridor Improvement Project (N 165<sup>th</sup> to N 205<sup>th</sup> Street) through a competitive process. Staff published a request for consultants to provide their qualifications for design, right of way acquisition experience, survey, and construction management. Four RFP submittals were received from the following firms: CH2M Hill, HDR, HNTB, and KPG. All four proposals were reviewed by City and WSDOT staff and all four teams were interviewed. The interview team was also made up of Shoreline and WSDOT staff. Staff initially chose KPG as the project consultant. However, late in scope/fee/schedule negotiation, it became clear that KPG's team was not able to commit the resources to completing the project in a timely manner. Staff then began negotiating with HDR. Staff checked three references, all of which were very positive. HDR was selected based on their team's experience with the design of transportation projects.

**HDR's Team Experience:** HDR has extensive experience working on transportation projects including the Southcenter Parkway Access Improvement Project, SR 527 widening in Mill Creek, and the 522 HOV Enhancement Phase 2 in Kenmore. Their in-house design team will perform civil and electrical engineering design. HDR has included Otak on their team to assist with urban design and landscape architecture. At the City's request, HDR will utilize KBA for construction management. KBA was the construction management firm on the North City Project and they are experienced, qualified, and respected construction managers. KBA will be involved during design as a member of HDR's team to provide constructability review. Staff will come to Council prior to construction to request an amendment to HDR's contract to add KBA's construction management services.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT:** The Aurora Corridor Improvement Project (N 165<sup>th</sup> to N 205<sup>th</sup> Street) is a Council Goal and this project is identified in the 2008-2013 Capital Improvement Program. Funds from federal grants and City contributions from the Roads Capital Fund will be utilized to pay for this scope of work that is estimated not to exceed \$4,200,000 plus a 10% contingency (\$420,000) for a total of \$4,620,000. Funding exists to

finish preliminary design (design to 30%) between N 165<sup>th</sup> and N 205<sup>th</sup> Streets. Funding exists for right-of-way acquisition, final design and construction for N 165<sup>th</sup> to N 185<sup>th</sup> Street as this contract reflects. As additional project funding is secured, staff will return to Council to amend HDR's contract for the final design for the N 185<sup>th</sup> to N 205<sup>th</sup> Street segment. The Funding Source Table below provides a summary of the funding sources for the Aurora Corridor Project (N. 165<sup>th</sup> – N. 205<sup>th</sup> Street).

<b>Funding Sources</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Roads Capital Fund	\$10,490,599
Federal STP – C	\$7,393,631
Federal STP Funds	\$3,600,000
Federal - STP –U	\$525,361
Federal - SAFETEA – LU	\$855,472
Federal - SAFETEA – LU	\$1,368,755
Gas Tax Funding	\$10,000,000
Nickel Gas Tax Funding	\$2,100,000
King County	\$2,401,742
Regional Mobility Transit Grant	\$2,500,000
Surface Water Funds	\$1,000,000
Future Funding RTID	\$40,000,000
Future Funding Other	\$11,171,988
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$93,407,548</b>

The utility costs of \$12,355,000 are handled through the City's franchise agreements with Seattle City Light, Seattle Public Utilities, Ronald Wastewater and telecommunication companies. The following table summarizes the project budget:

# 1. Project Costs

## Engineering

Contracted Services <sup>1</sup>	\$1,500,000
<b>HDR Contract</b>	<b>\$4,200,000</b>
<b>HDR Contract Contingency</b>	<b>\$ 420,000</b>
Future design amendment (N 185 – N 205)	\$1,500,000
Overhead <sup>2</sup>	<u>\$3,346,201</u>
<b>Subtotal Engineering</b>	<b>\$10,966,201</b>

## Right-of-Way

Right of way agent and appraisers	\$917,312
Future ROW acquisition amendment	\$449,931
Property purchase	<u>\$15,670,037</u>
	<b>\$17,037,280</b>

## Construction

**\$59,780,512**

<sup>1</sup> Contracted Services: includes environmental costs for Jones & Stokes contract, the Public Outreach and Pre-Environmental process, and technical studies such as the electrical engineering feasibility studies for Seattle City Light coordination.

<sup>2</sup> Overhead includes: staff related costs (including finance, legal, public works), building utilities and maintenance, supplies, etc.

Contingency<sup>3</sup>

\$17,978,555

Total Project Cost

\$105,762,548

2. Project Revenue

Budget Aurora (N 165 - N 205)

\$93,407,548

Budget Utility Improvements (N 165 –N 205)

\$12,355,000

Total Project Revenue

\$105,762,548

Please note that the construction costs include the Aurora Avenue N Utility Improvements (undergrounding of utilities) and construction management costs. HDR's contract includes design of underground utilities. The industry standard for design services is 12% of construction costs. HDR's contract (including contingency) and future design amendments (estimated at \$1,500,000) add to \$6,120,000. These design costs would be 10% of a \$59,780,512 future construction contract. Therefore, staff believes the HDR contract design costs are reasonable.

**STAKEHOLDERS:**

The City has funding from many partners to complete this project: Federal Highway Administration, the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), and King County Metro. HDR staff will ensure we meet the requirements of our funding partners and will work with staff to keep them informed of project progress.

Staff will continue to pull regional stakeholders together at key milestones to review the project's progress (King County METRO; Cities of Seattle, Edmonds, Mountlake Terrace, and Lake Forest Park; WSDOT; Seattle City Light and Public Utilities; and the State Departments of Ecology and Fish and Wildlife).

Staff will continue to actively work one on one with property and business owners as design progresses.

**SCHEDULE:**

Attachment A shows the design, right of way acquisition and construction schedule for the project. Design and right of way acquisition for N 165<sup>th</sup> to N 205<sup>th</sup> Streets is expected to be completed the first quarter of 2009.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that Council authorize the City Manager to execute a contract with HDR Engineering, Inc. for design and right of way acquisition support work for the Aurora Corridor Improvement Project (N 165<sup>th</sup> to N 205<sup>th</sup> Street) for an amount not to exceed \$4,200,000 plus a 10% contingency (\$420,000) for a total of \$4,620,000.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment A: Proposed Project Schedule

---

<sup>3</sup> Includes HDR contingency

# Aurora Corridor Improvement Project - N 165th Street to N 205th Street - Schedule

Attachment A

Tasks	2007				2008				2009			
	January	April	July	October	January	April	July	October	January	April	July	October
<b>Environmental (165-205)</b>												
PSRC Exec Board Conditional Approval (Oct)				X								
SEPA Approval (Nov)				X								
NEPA Approval (Dec)				X								
<b>Final Design (165-185)*</b>												
HDR Contract award (Oct)				X								
<b>Right of Way (165-185)**</b>												
Universal Contract Award (Sept.)			X									
Right of Way Manual Council Adoption (Dec)				X								
Condemnation Ordinance (Jan)					X							
<b>Construction Begins (165-185)*</b>										★		
*Final design and row acquisition will begin on 185-205 when funding is secured.												
** Assumes negotiated sale or voluntary possession and use agreement for all properties.												



This page intentionally left blank.

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM**  
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

<b>AGENDA TITLE:</b> Regional Jail Update
<b>DEPARTMENT:</b> City Manager's Office
<b>PRESENTED BY:</b> Julie Modrzejewski, Assistant City Manager

**PROBLEM/ISSUE STATEMENT:**

King County cities are facing the difficult challenge of providing jail bedspace for our cities in the future. Currently, the jail model for meeting the incarcerated misdemeanor population in King County is a complex system of county and municipal jails and multiple contracts. In 2001, King County and its contracting cities, including Shoreline, negotiated a new contract that substantially reduced cities' use of the King County jail facilities. This contract established a timeline and population caps to remove the cities' misdemeanor population from county facilities by 2012.

In the same year, cities, which included Shoreline, agreed to contract with Yakima County, located in eastern Washington, in order to secure jail beds needed in excess of the King County caps until 2010. With approaching contract expiration dates of 2010 and 2012, it is imperative that King County cities address the jail bedspace needs within the near future and beyond.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

No action is required. However, the purpose of this presentation is informational and provides to the Council an update on the jail planning efforts of the Jail Task Force. In addition, members of the Jail Task Force are seeking input from their City Councils on whether planning efforts are on the right track.

## BACKGROUND:

Following the newly negotiated contract with King County, in 2003, a group of 37 King County cities, which includes Shoreline, negotiated an interlocal agreement with each other to coordinate jail services and to plan for long-term jail capacity and facilities. As a result of this interlocal agreement, in 2005 the consortium of cities initiated a long-range jail planning process. In order to oversee contract administration, coordination, and the progression of the strategic planning process, the city consortium established the following groups:

- Jail Oversight Assembly (JOA): Also commonly referred to as “the Assembly” or the “Jail Assembly,” is made up of one elected representative of each of the 37 cities that decided in 2002 to collaborate on solutions to the cities’ jail bed access. The two cities that chose not to join the collaborative effort are Kent and Enumclaw.
- Jail Administration Group (JAG): JAG was formed to represent the 37 cities; the official members of the JAG are policy-level and law enforcement leadership representatives of the largest users of the King County jail, plus three members appointed by the Suburban Cities Association (SCA). Julie Modrzejewski, Assistant City Manager, is one of three alternates for SCA.
- Jail Task Force (JTF): The Jail Task Force is the newest of these groups and the members were appointed by both the Assembly (the elected officials) and the JAG (policy/law enforcement representatives) and their charge is to develop a region-wide jail bed solution for all JAG cities. Members come from 11 of the JAG cities, of which Mayor Bob Ransom is an actively participating member. The cities directly represented are:

Auburn	Federal Way	Renton
Bellevue	Issaquah	Seattle
Burien	Kirkland	Shoreline
Des Moines	Redmond	

### Timeline: 2001 to the Present

The following is a general timeline of significant events that have taken place since King County notified the cities regarding their insufficient bedspace for cities in 2001.

- 2001: ○ King County informs cities that there is no room; find other jail options
- 2002: ○ Cities negotiate a new contract with King County, which caps beds to 220 (cities are able to use up to 330) - Contract Expires - 2012
- Cities negotiate a contract with Yakima County for a total of 440 beds - Contract Expires - 2010
- 2003: ○ JAG/Assembly formalized by interlocal agreement
- 2006: ○ Consultant (Ricci Greene) hired to advise on needs assessment and future options
- Ricci Greene presents final report in December
- 2007 ○ Assembly appoints Jail Task Force in March
- Task Force and JAG evaluating options currently

The two large jail contracts will expire within the next five years: the Yakima County contract ends in 2010; the King County contract ends in 2012. These contracts represent over three-fourths (3/4) of the jail bedspace the cities rely on now.

- Yakima County Contract: Yakima County is currently undertaking a population projection study to inform them of their bed needs and whether they will have beds available for contracting after 2010. The study should be completed in mid-2008. Based on current use, Yakima officials have indicated there should be some beds available for contract (potentially 200 beds).
- King County Contract: King County's own growing need for felony jail beds will max out all of the available beds in King County facilities by 2015. The County projects that its needs alone will exceed the capacity of the downtown jail and the Regional Justice Center (RJC) in Kent by over 500 beds by 2024. If the County is able to expand the RJC, this may address their future needs. In early July, King County's Department of Adult and Juvenile Detention expressed an interest in partnering with the JAG cities. Clearly, this option makes the planning effort more complex and it will need to be further explored.

#### **JAG Cities Current Jail Bed Needs**

There are roughly 1,000 jail beds available through various contracts and municipal jails:

<u>Agency</u>	<u>No. of Jail Beds Available to the Cities</u>
King County	330
Yakima contract	440
Issaquah municipal	62
Renton municipal	50
Auburn municipal	51
Kirkland municipal	12
Other contract beds	55
Total	1,000

Approximately a third (1/3) of the jail beds are located in King County jails - the downtown correctional facility and the Kent Regional Justice Center and nearly half (1/2) are in Yakima County. Other jails are used both by the cities that operate them and by other cities either on a "reserved bed" contract, or as an as-needed basis. For all the JAG cities, Seattle is the biggest bed user needing approximately a third (1/3) of the total beds followed by Auburn, who is considering a potential annexation.

The chart below provides Shoreline's average daily population (ADP) from 2004-2007:

City of Shoreline Jail Population from 2004-2007				
	2004	2005	2006	2007*
Average Daily Population (ADP)	20.6	31.7	37.6	28.5

\*Annualized using Jan - July data

### JAG Cities Future (20-Year) Jail Bed Needs

In 2006 the Jail Advisory Group retained a consulting firm, Ricci Greene Associates, to complete the following:

- o A needs assessment to establish future misdemeanor bedspace capacity requirements. The study included an analysis of misdemeanor population characteristics and growth trends, and jail bedspace projections were generated by also assessing system practices impacting jail use, including alternatives to incarceration.
- o Several strategic options for meeting future bedspace requirements, which were generated through workshops with the JAG and city consortium and based on identified goals, planning assumptions, and criteria.

The report was completed in December 2006. The report estimates that for all JAG cities by 2011, approximately 1,175 beds will be needed and in 20 years, in 2026, an estimated 1,450 beds will be needed. Programs that provide alternatives to incarceration, such as electronic home detention that reduce jail bed need, have already been factored into the projected bed need (alternatives reduce the need by about 10%).

The chart below provides Shoreline's ADP projections from 2011 to 2026, in five-year increments:

City of Shoreline Jail Population Projections from 2011-2026				
	2011	2016	2021	2026
Average Daily Population (ADP)	41	44	46	49

### Preliminary Findings of the Jail Task Force

The primary charge for the Task Force is to examine all options provided by the Ricci Greene report; update the options taking into account events that have happened since the report was delivered, and narrow all the options to one or two that best address the cities' needs.

The Task Force has been meeting since early May. Several important agreements have been reached on what will be recommended to the Assembly:

- Contract beds are not an option to fulfill all of the cities' needs. As a practical matter, this option is not available for the long-term because of the limited availability of contract beds. Some beds may be able to be secured through contracts; however, the availability would be much less than the total needed.
- Limited contract beds are available for female inmates. In addition, King County currently detains the majority of city inmates with serious medical or psychological conditions.
- In the case of Yakima, there are also transport and inmate access issues due to the geographical distance of the jail. Likewise, there is limited availability of beds for female inmates and Yakima cannot detain inmates with serious medical or psychological conditions.
- Contracting limits control of availability, cost, and quality of services for cities.

Therefore, the Task Force is looking at options that build new jail(s). What remains unanswered at this time is for what entities, how many beds, and how many facilities.

The Task Force is scheduled to make a recommendation to the Assembly in early December for the options analyzed and a draft scope work for a feasibility study, and subsequently, the Assembly is to review and provide approval of the scope of work.

### **Parallel Jail Planning Efforts**

Other jail planning efforts are underway by cities in addition to the planning of the Jail Task Force. The Task Force is monitoring the progress of these efforts because they affect the options under review by the Task Force.

- Four Cities in South King County: Renton, Tukwila, Federal Way and Des Moines, under the acronym "SCORE," are planning for a new jail in south county. They are planning to spend \$175,000 for a "feasibility study," which will include analysis of specific sites, construction costs and operational costs, as well as a facility plan and programming for a 500-600 bed facility. Non-SCORE south county cities have been invited to join SCORE and would need to contribute financially to the planning work to join (the cumulative bed need of these non-SCORE cities is less than 50 beds, which could be accommodated in a new jail).
- Auburn: Auburn is studying replacement of their jail with a 150 bed jail to serve their own needs.
- Seattle: Seattle projects a bed need of 440 beds within 20 years. They are discussing whether or not they want to build their own jail or partner with cities and/or King County to meet their bed need. It is anticipated that Seattle will make a decision in October about which option to pursue.
- Kirkland: Kirkland is reviewing their bed need and replacement of their 12-bed jail, concurrent with their annexation work. Kirkland's bed need is not large enough to impact the options being reviewed by the Jail Task Force.

## **Feasibility Study**

The Assembly has provided some funding (\$100,000) for a feasibility study; however, it is anticipated that the cost will be much higher. The study will analyze the recommended options, acreage, site requirements, and locations that meet these requirements, capital cost, operating cost, and the cost of services that will make a new jail system work, as well as how to best provide booking and medical-psychiatric care services.

Capital and operating costs have seen a very dramatic escalation over the past years. It has been estimated that the capital cost of building a new jail increases by as much as 12% per year; making the old adage, "time is money," ring true. More concretely, the Ricci Greene report estimates that the capital cost per bed is between \$225,000-250,000.

Variables Impacting the Feasibility Study: The variables that impact the options being reviewed by the Task Force are:

- SCORE and Auburn Planning: SCORE cities are beginning a feasibility study for a new 500-600 bed jail to accommodate the majority of the bed need in south King County excluding Auburn. Auburn is reviewing replacement of their jail with a 150 bed jail.
- Seattle: Seattle needs to inform the Task Force if options that meet their bed need of 440 beds should be analyzed in a feasibility study. These options could include one jail (632 beds) to meet the needs of Seattle and the north/east cities or could include two jails, one in Seattle (440 beds) and one in the north or east (192 beds).
- King County Needs: King County has expressed an interest in partnering with cities to meet the county and cities' bed need. Further discussion is needed to clarify this option. King County may need up to 511 beds; however, they may be able to meet their needs by expanding the RJC and expanding the use of alternatives.

The Task Force anticipates having more information on these variables in October. The Task Force will need to know which cities and how many beds to plan for, and thus narrow the options and draft a feasibility study for Assembly review.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

No action is required. However, the purpose of this presentation is informational and provides to the Council an update on the jail planning efforts of the Jail Task Force. In addition, members of the Jail Task Force are seeking input from their City Councils on whether planning efforts are on the right track.

Approved By:                      City Manager  City Attorney \_\_\_\_\_