Council Meeting Date: November 28, 2005 **Agenda Item: 9(a)**

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Municipal Court Services Analysis Part 2
DEPARTMENT:	City Manager's Office
PRESENTED BY:	Julie Modrzejewski, Assistant City Manager Bernard Seeger, Management Analyst Ian Sievers, City Attorney

PROBLEM/ISSUE STATEMENT:

By what means should the City provide municipal court services? The City's current contract with King County for the provision for District Court services expires on December 31, 2006 and the City is required by state statute to provide these services. Prior to renewing this contract Council asked staff to study two other systems of providing municipal court services to ensure the City is pursuing the most effective and efficient delivery of these services.

ALTERNATIVES ANALYZED:

At the June 27, 2005 City Council meeting, the Council directed staff to study three alternatives for the provision of municipal court services. These alternatives are:

1) Continue with King County as the service provider;
2) Develop a City owned and operated municipal court system; and
3) Contract with another municipality for the provision of services.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

The financial impacts for the three alternatives range from no changes by continuing with King County (Alternative 1), whereby the City has historically received a small annual "profit" in its contract, to potentially a required annual general fund transfer to Court services of $153,000/year, if the City pursued Alternative 2.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Council direct staff pursue Alternative 1 to complete contract negotiations with King County and bring the extended/new contract to their attention for review.

Approved By: City Manager ____ City Attorney ___

INTRODUCTION:

According to state law, the City is required to provide for the timely adjudication of infraction and misdemeanant cases committed within the city's jurisdiction. Furthermore, state law provides for three methods of providing municipal court services. The City can either petition for a Municipal Department of District Court under Chapter 3.48 RCW, or the City can unilaterally establish a stand alone municipal court under Chapter 3.50 RCW; or the city can provide for adjudication through an interlocal agreement (RCW 39.34.180). Since incorporation, Shoreline has provided these services through an interlocal agreement (ILA) with King County using the Shoreline District Court facility.

At the June 27, 2005 City Council meeting, the Council directed staff to study three alternatives for the provision of municipal court services. These alternatives are:

1) Continue with King County as the service provider;
2) Develop a City owned and operated municipal court system; and
3) Contract with another municipality for the provision of services.

This staff report reviews the three alternatives above and provides a staff recommendation for the provision of court services. Likewise, this report addresses Council questions that were raised at the October 17 Council meeting.

BACKGROUND:

At the October 17 Council meeting, the Council reviewed the range of services provided for through the current King County District Court contract, including the level of service and costs. Likewise, King County District Court representatives were present to answer questions and provide additional information. The representatives included:

- Corinna Harn, Chief Presiding Judge
- Tricia Crozier, Chief Administrative Officer
- Rochelle McKenzie, Division Director
- Donna Brunner, Budget Director

The City's current contract with King County for the provision for District Court services expires on December 31, 2006. The City is in the process, along with thirteen (13) other contracting cities, of negotiating a new agreement with King County. This negotiation has recently concluded and a tentative agreement has been referred to the contracting cities for ratification. This agreement is scheduled for Council's review at the December 12 Council meeting.

DISCUSSION:

Since Alternative 1 was initially addressed at the October 17 Council meeting, discussion of this alternative will follow the discussion of Alternative 2 and 3.

Alternative 2: Develop a City owned and operated municipal court system

One of the most significant concerns around whether or not to own and operate a court is around start-up and ongoing costs. In order to gain a better perspective of the costs involved in owning and operating our own municipal court, staff examined nearby municipal courts with similar case filings or population: Bothell, Seatac, and Kirkland Municipal Courts. In this review, it would have been ideal to have a perfect "apples to apples" comparison between the City of Shoreline's current workload and other independently operated municipal courts; however, seeing that this was not feasible, staff has tried to make as close a comparison as possible.

The table below provides a comparison of infractions and criminal case filings for 2004. It is helpful to examine the breakout of the criminal filings from infractions due to the significant resources required in processing criminal cases. Traffic and parking infractions are less demanding on resources and help to off-set the cost of other more resource intensive filings. Also included is the median of our case filings in these two categories; the median provides a benchmark for what we could expect in the way of projecting annual caseload. Later in this analysis, the median is used to determine revenue and expenditure projections (the median is derived from case filings of 1995/1996 to 2004).

City (Population)	2004 Infractions	2004 Criminal	2004 Total
SeaTac (25,140)	4,211	1,100	5,311
Bothell (31,000)	2,235	922	3,157
Kirkland (45,740)	26,085	2,083	28,168
Shoreline (53,000)	**4,585**	**906**	**5,491**
Shoreline -Median of Case Filings	4,305	1,565	5,870

For analysis of Alternative 1, we will be using Bothell, Kirkland, and SeaTac as a guide to help us determine operations, levels of service, and rough ongoing cost estimates. In addition, we have looked to these cities as well as our own needs to try to determine one-time, start-up costs.

Bothell Municipal Court:
The Bothell Municipal Court provides services related to all infraction-criminal misdemeanor incidents as well as civil protection orders to victims of domestic violence. The office is open from 8:00am to 5:00pm, Monday through Friday, with one day a week in court. Contested/mitigation hearings and jury selection are performed one day per month. In addition, they process passport applications on Monday and Thursday from 10:00am to 2:00pm (in 2004, they processed approximately 1,200 passport applications-the fee charges for this service helps to off-set costs). Civil marriage ceremonies are also performed by the court. They have 3.0 FTE operating the court and one judge, by contract at 15 hours per week or .35 FTE. The Bothell Police Department provides security only when court is in session; this involves a metal detector monitored by a police officer. Bothell's court facility, which is approximately 6,000 square feet, is owned and operated by the City of Bothell and also serves as the City Council Chambers.

Kirkland Municipal Court:
The Kirkland Municipal Court provides services related to all infraction-criminal misdemeanor cases, traffic and parking citations, and no contact orders. They also provide civil marriage ceremony services. Passport applications are processed at City hall. The court is open Monday through Friday 8:30am to 4:30pm, and has been in existence for 10 years. They have 10.74 FTE, three high school interns, and the judge works on contract 34 hours per week or .85 FTE. The court is a separate leased facility with 10,746 square feet of space. Their security consists of one contract security guard ($31,505/year) and a magnetometer. Kirkland Municipal Court also provides court services for the Cities of Clyde Hill, Medina, Hunts Point and Yarrow Point (these cities have a total case filing of 2,526).

SeaTac Municipal Court:
The SeaTac Municipal Court provides services related to all civil and traffic infractions, criminal misdemeanors and civil orders for protection for victims of domestic violence. The court is open Monday through Friday, 8:00am to 5:00pm, with two court days per week. Contested/mitigation hearings are performed twice per month. They have 5.4 FTE with one contract judge providing approximately 28 hours per week or .70 FTE. Currently security is not available; however, in their 2006 budget, they have included a magnetometer and a private security guard at 40 hours per week ($40,000/year). The court is part of their city hall complex; however, they have a courtroom chamber separate from the council chambers.

	2004 Total FTE / Judge FTE	2004 Expenditures	2004 Revenue	Revenues-Expenditures
SeaTac (25,140)	5.4 / .70*	$440,000**	$420,056	($19,944)
Bothell (31,000)	3.0 / .35*	$290,636**	$579,268	$288,632
Kirkland (45,740)	10.74 / .85*	$1,042,706	$1,827,045	$784,339

*Does not include the contract security guard/police officer.
**Does not include facility costs.

Estimated One-time/Start-up Costs for Shoreline Municipal Court:

Costs associated with starting a court operation would need to come from either a reduction in another program area or from one-time funds from the General Fund. The most significant portion of the start-up costs is the facility. The City would need to either lease a facility or purchase/build a facility. There are pros and cons to all of these options and there is a wide range when it comes to the costs for these options. Staff would need to do additional analysis to pinpoint these costs more precisely. Nevertheless, it is estimated that with our given workload, we could operate a court using approximately 7,000-7,500 square feet of space. The Shoreline District Court is 11,895 square feet with three courtrooms. We would only need one courtroom, a customer service counter, restrooms, three to four offices and/or cubicle space, one to two conference rooms (at least one for a jury room), and perhaps a holding cell. It is also likely that the court would house the city prosecutor and domestic violence advocate as the current facility does. Assuming the City leased its required space, the one-time cost associated with facilities is related to tenant improvements, which we

estimate at $75 to $80 per square feet or $600,000. The most significant tenant improvement is the courtroom, which is considered "specialized" space.

Other additional costs include equipment and furniture for each employee. For hardware/software as well as printers and telephones, we estimate approximately $3,500 per employee. Other technology needs include the fiber optic to connect to the state's DISCIS-case management system, which we estimate costing $25,000-$50,000. The state would provide a basic level of computer support and equipment to allow cases to be managed in the statewide system.

Summary of Estimated Start-up Costs:	Amount
Facility (includes tenant improvements)	$600,000
Equipment/Furniture/Technology	$67,500
Total	**$667,500**

Estimated Ongoing Costs and Revenue for Shoreline Municipal Court:

Using our own caseloads and our comparison cities, staff estimates that we would need to administer court three days per week (this is the same level of service currently provided in our contract with King County). Likewise, we would need staff to manage the court and be available to customers 8:00am to 5:00pm, Monday through Friday, to reflect the same business days and hours as city hall. Future ongoing court operations would be funded partially from revenue generated from city case filings; however, there will be a lag between case filings and receipt of revenue.

It should be noted that operating a court is a considerable undertaking. Staffing a court with experienced staff will be critical to the success or failure of such an endeavor. It is estimated that the Shoreline Court would need the following positions and FTEs (annual salary and benefits are included):

Position(s)	Amount
Court Administrator (1 FTE)	$92,829
Clerks (3 FTE)	$174,936
Probation Officer (.35 FTE)	$26,126
Total	**$293,891**

In addition to the above personnel costs, we would need to factor in annual costs related to training, supplies, and utilities (e.g., phone), we estimate $5,000 per employee for a total of $25,000. These costs do not include indirect costs such as administrative/overhead costs such as payroll, human resources, and financial oversight—this would be absorbed within our current staffing levels.

Probation services could be provided by using in-house staff or by private contract. In this projection, we have included it as in-house staff. Shoreline is a heavy user of the County's probation services program. For instance, the City has 141 active cases and 140 monitor compliance cases as of the month of August.

It is likely that the Council would appoint a judge through a contract. To determine the judge costs, staff used the 2004 FTE estimate provided by the District Court (.66 FTE or 26 hours per week) and estimates that it would cost $72,600 annually ($54 per hour).

Staff believes that the City could contract with a private security company to provide a security guard while the court is in session; 24 hours per week at $22 per hour for a total contract of $27,456.

Our facility costs after the court is established would range from $15.60 to $18.00 per square foot per year, based on the latest appraisal study and depending on whether the space was Class A or Class B. At 7,500 square feet, we estimate annual facility costs ranging from $117,000 to $135,000. This may or may not include custodial services/utilities (e.g., water/sewer, electric, etc.) depending upon what is negotiated in the lease agreement.

Below are the total estimated ongoing costs, which we have cautiously projected.

Personnel (includes benefits, training, supplies, etc.)	$293,891
Judicial Officer (contract)	$72,600
Security (contract)	$27,456
Facility	$135,000
Total Estimated Ongoing Costs	**$528,947**

To determine a revenue estimate we used the 2004 gross revenues as supplied by District Court and divided by the total number of case filings to determine a revenue amount per case and then we multiplied it by the case filing median ($353,939/5,870=$64 per case filing). While probation services are paid for by the individuals placed on probation, staff cannot determine a revenue projection until further study (the County retains all revenues generated; and therefore, we would need to work more closely with the County to determine revenues specific to Shoreline). Therefore, it is possible that the City could receive additional revenue to help off-set probation costs.

Total Case Filings (Median)	Estimated Revenue	Estimated Expenditures	Revenues-Expenditures
5,870	$375,680	$528,947	($153,267)

Undoubtedly, it is possible to find ways to reduce ongoing cost; nevertheless, what the City needs to be prepared for is the potential that costs may need to be supplemented using the general fund much like the City of SeaTac.

If the Council would prefer to establish the City's own municipal court; staff would need to receive this direction immediately. Experts and peers advise that it takes 12 to 18 months to plan for the establishment of a municipal court.

Alternative 3: Contract with another municipality for the provision of services

Staff has discussed this alternative with the City of Lake Forest Park, City of Bothell and the City of Seattle. In our discussions with Lake Forest Park (2,058 total case filings)

and Bothell (3,157 total case filings) these cities did not express a clear desire to prepare a proposal for contracting with us. Acquiring Shoreline as a contract would likely require these cities to hire significant new staff and perhaps even expand their current facilities. If these cities could merely "absorb" our case filings using their current staffing levels, perhaps they would be more inclined to consider contracting with us.

The City of Seattle (583,752 total case filings) would be a better candidate for contracting with due to their ability to "absorb" us into their current staffing levels and they have expressed an interest in this type of arrangement. Shoreline would be increasing their workload by about 1%. City of Seattle does not contract with any other cities, but has been recently approached by Lake Forest Park as well. Staff is still pursuing conversations with the City of Seattle to determine the feasibility of such an arrangement.

It is important to note that there is currently a case pending in the Washington State Court of Appeals challenging a municipality's authority to contract with another city to deliver municipal court services in a building located outside of the contracting city's corporate boundaries. In Primm V. Medina, defense counsel sought to overturn a misdemeanor conviction by challenging lack of subject matter jurisdiction. The City of Medina contracts with the City of Kirkland for court services and delivers these services in a building located within the corporate boundaries of Kirkland. The King County Superior Court upheld the conviction and specifically recognized Medina's right to enter into a contract for judicial services with Kirkland under the Interlocal Cooperation Act. This case has been appealed to the Washington State Court of Appeals and briefs were filed in late October 2005.

Follow-up Questions to Alternative 1: Continue with King County as the service provider

The Council had several questions that they wanted staff to follow-up on when the current contract with King County was discussed on October 17.

Why Have Criminal Case Filings Declined From 2003?
The table below shows the top three category drops from 2003 to 2005.

Case	2003	2004	2005 (projected)	Change (2003-2005)
DWLS – 3	342	123	36	(306)
DUI	203	174	90	(113)
Theft	205	125	128	(77)

Reviewing these numbers, staff found three reasons to explain these declines:

1. In June 2004, the State Supreme Court ruled that the Driving While License Suspended (DWLS) statute was invalid, and the number of cases decreased drastically to 123 in 2004 and 36 in 2005.

2. With the DWLS ruling, DUIs also declined due to the fact that individuals stopped for DWLS were often then found to be driving under the influence. Without the DWLS stops the linked DUIs also decreased.
3. Finally, theft cases (which are primarily shoplifting) decreased due to the City's initiation of its Theft Detection Program in May 2003. Under this program, store owners were encouraged to report apprehended, non-violent shoplifters directly to the Police Department without calling an officer to the scene. This program most likely led to more retail owners handling the situation internally instead of reporting them immediately to the Police Department.

What Resulted from the County's Development of the District Court Operational Master Plan (OMP)?

The city representatives serving on the steering committee felt the process went very well and resulted in solid recommendations. They are as follows:

OMP Recommendations:

1. Court of Choice: Retain for the long-term, the aspiration to be the court of choice for limited jurisdictions in the County.
2. Quality of Service Standards: Develop and apply quality service standards and measures for District Court operations.
3. Problem Solving Courts: Continue to support and improve access to Problem Solving Courts.
4. Unification and Centralization: Continue the strategy of improving efficiency through unification and centralization where appropriate.
5. City Contracts: Continue to support the Court's function to serve cities through contracts.
6. Service and Facility Flexibility
7. Facilities:
    - Continue to support a unified, countywide court system utilizing existing facilities to provide for a more equitable and cost effective system of justice
    - Ensure that court facilities promote system efficiencies, quality services and access to justice.
    - Consolidate district court facilities that exist in the same city.
    - Reconsider facilities if there are changes with contracting cities or changes in leases.
    - Work with cities to develop a facility master plan.
8. Technological Improvements: Continue to develop and implement technological improvements.
9. Study Court Integration: Study the integration of District Court, Superior Court and the Department of Judicial Administration assuring that the needs of District Court are met; considering the best practices.
10. Work with Stakeholders: To gain state and local cooperation and assistance to meet the needs of the judicial system.
11. Additional Resources: Recognize that implementation of these strategic and operational recommendations may require reallocation or commitment of additional resources.

City staff is now serving on the County's steering committee to develop the Facilities Master Plan (FMP). The County aims to complete the plan by mid 2006.

Does the District Court have Statistics Regarding Customer Service?
While the District Court does not currently have service standards or adopted performance measures, this is an area they plan to address as stated above in the OMP recommendations (#2). Currently, the District Court conducts monthly phone tests for the call center to determine the length of time a customer is on hold. According to a sample, from a week in the month of June 2005 (Appendix A), the test involved 99 phone calls. Approximately 45% of those calls were answered immediately and 55% of the calls were answered within a range of one minute to up to 20 minutes, with an average of four minutes per call. In the District Court's 2006 budget, additional staff has been added to the central call center to handle the demand in a timely manner.

Can Shoreline Contract with Another City in a Different County (e.g., Snohomish)?
While the pending *Primm V. Medina* case involves a conflict between the Interlocal Cooperation Act and municipal court statutes on the location of the municipal court within the county, consolidating with a city in another county raises a different problem. A municipal court judge must be a resident of the county in which the city is located. Therefore a judge serving in City in Snohomish County would have to be a resident of Snohomish County and therefore would not meet the residency requirement for a Shoreline municipal court judge.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

Alternative 1: Continue with King County as the service provider

With the existing contract the City pays for municipal court services by allowing the County to retain .86 cents of every dollar in fines, forfeitures, and fees received for each case processed. The remaining .14 cents is provided to the City as General Fund revenue. Likewise, the current contract requires a reconciliation process which determines if the local court revenue is less than the city case costs, Shoreline will pay the difference to the County. On the other hand, if the reconciliation indicates that local court revenue was more than the city case costs, the County will pay the difference to Shoreline. This contract allows the County to move away from a model of "marginal cost recovery" to "full cost recovery." For the 2004 year, the percentage of revenue necessary to be retained by the County to cover city costs is 99.8%. Thus far, the first quarter of 2005 show city case filings and revenues continue to decline and if this should continue throughout the year, it may not be sufficient to cover the expected costs. The table below shows the costs from the last three years of case filings.

Year	Total Case Filings	Total Revenues Produced by Cases*	Cost of Court Services to Shoreline	Revenue-Expenditure
2003	8,692	$503,583	$330,440	$173,143
2004	5,491	$353,939	$234,805	$119,134
2005**	4,696	$262,926	$222,480	$40,446

*These revenues do not include the assessments that are automatically deducted by the State.

**Projected based on actual revenues from Jan-Sep and a straight line projection through the end of the year.

Though the City has received revenues from the County during each year of the existing arrangement, it is anticipated that the City may eventually incur an expenditure to the general fund for municipal court services to supplement the District Court's revenues. Given this, it is understood that continuing services with King County would no longer result in a revenue generating operation for the City as in years past. Nevertheless, this contract is structured so that if revenues decline, costs do as well; or in other words, the less staff time/resources used, the less we pay, and conversely.

Alternative 2: Develop a City owned and operated municipal court system

Costs associated with starting a court operation would need to come from either a reduction in another program area or from one-time funds, all from the general fund. The most significant portion of the start-up costs is the facility. Other additional costs include equipment, furniture, and technology investments. These one-time costs are estimated at $667,500. Ongoing costs which include personnel, contracts for a judicial officer and security, and facility leasing are estimated at $528,947. Clearly, these costs are rough estimates and we may find ways to reduce them if we move forward with this option.

Alternative 3: Contract with another municipality for the provision of services

At this time there are no proposals from other cities to contract with Shoreline. Without this financial data, there is no way of determining the financial impact.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the City continue contracting with King County District Court for the following reasons:

1. Contracting is part of our service delivery philosophy and where possible the City has looked to contracting to provide services. We believe this helps us provide services at a competitive price by saving the City from direct management of this service (overhead, facility, etc.). Likewise, there are no start-up costs for the City. It is also worth noting that the legal risk for the operation of the court falls upon the service provider.
2. King County provides numerous value added services in its service package such as domestic violence protective orders; civil action and small claims; legal name changes; performing marriages; passport acceptance services; vehicle impound; and false alarm hearings. Likewise, this is their business; they are experts and have a widespread interest in "providing an accessible forum for the fair, efficient, and understandable resolution of civil and criminal cases; and maintaining an atmosphere of respect for the dignity of individuals" (King County District Court mission statement).
3. The District Court is centrally located within the city at a well-maintained facility, which includes plenty of parking availability. This location is also convenient for our police officers who need to appear in court. There is one concern that if the

City should move its court operations to another facility and the King County District Court facility remains in Shoreline is that this may cause confusion with our and District Court's customers by having essentially two courts in the city.

4. Customer service has improved dramatically in the last few years and is a high priority with the District Court leadership. As outlined in the OMP recommendations, District Court will establish service standards and performance measures. To help develop these, District Court has expressed a commitment to work with contracting cities.
5. Shoreline is a heavy user of the County's probation services program which is paid for completely by the individuals placed on probation as managed by the County. As an active user of probation services, the Shoreline has 141 active cases and 140 monitor compliance cases as of the month of August. This program has proven effective in reducing judicial administrative costs. Additionally, if the City were to pursue its own probation services we would be assuming a substantial liability risk exposure.
6. Operational strengths include having a larger jury pool, which reduces demand on citizen jury duty and in-custody jail calendars occur every Saturday and holiday.
7. The City always has a future option to establish its own municipal court or potentially contract with another entity if costs, circumstances, or service levels change dramatically.

Clearly, one disadvantage with contracting for this service is our limited ability to influence cost controls. To help influence this, staff participates on the District Court Management Review Committee (includes the Chief Presiding Judge, Chief Administrative Officer, a County Executive Office representative, and contracting cities' representatives), which meets quarterly, and this is the appropriate forum for raising issues around customer service, efficiency improvements, and cost impacts.

The City's current contract with King County expires on December 31, 2006. The City is in the process, along with thirteen (13) other contracting cities, of negotiating a new agreement with King County. This negotiation has recently concluded and a tentative agreement has been referred to the contracting cities for ratification. This agreement is scheduled for Council's review at the December 12 Council meeting.

Approved By: City Manager ____ City Attorney ___

Phone Test for June 2005 (6/1-6/8/2005)

Date	Time called	Wait time
Wed. 06/01/05	9:32 AM	2 min
	10:33 AM	1 min
	10:57 AM	6 min
	11:08 AM	1 min
	11:24 AM	0
	11:49 AM	3 min
	1:28 PM	0
	3:17 PM	15 min
	3:40 PM	3 min
	4:11 PM	0
Thurs. 06/02/05	8:32 AM	2 min
	8:56 AM	0
	9:47 AM	0
	10:07 AM	0
	10:57 AM	0
	11:12 AM	1 min
	11:38 AM	0
	11:52 AM	3 min
	1:19 PM	0
	2:10 PM	12 min
	2:34 PM	5 min
	3:40 PM	1 min
	3:54 PM	2 min
	4:07 PM	0
Fri. 06/03/05	8:40 AM	2 min
	8:57 AM	3 min
	9:44 AM	0
	9:54 AM	8 min
	10:16 AM	2 min
	10:40 AM	4 min
	11:20 AM	0
	11:27 AM	0
	12:57 PM	0
	1:33 PM	0
	2:05 PM	2 min
	2:51 PM	4 min
	3:11 PM	10 min
	3:56 PM	2 min
	4:08 PM	6 min

Mon. 06/06/05	8:40 AM	6 min
	9:12 AM	5 min
	9:45 AM	7 min
	10:01 AM	6 min
	10:56 AM	2 min
	11:16 AM	2 min
	11:42 AM	0
	1:04 PM	3 min
	1:32 PM	2 min
	2:10 PM	recording advised wait time was over 20 min.
	2:27 PM	9 min
	3:15 PM	1 min
	4:21 PM	0
Tues. 06/07/05	8:36 AM	1 min
	8:48 AM	0
	9:07 AM	0
	9:57 AM	0
	10:38 AM	0
	11:27 AM	0
	1:03 PM	0
	1:35 PM	0
	2:15 PM	4 min
	2:42 PM	0
	3:04 PM	1 min
	3:44 PM	2 min
	4:03 PM	0
Wed. 06/08/05	8:37 AM	0
	8:54 AM	2 min
	9:50 AM	0
	10:00 AM	0
	11:04 AM	1 min
	11:21 AM	1 min
	11:38 AM	6 min
	1:06 PM	4 min
	1:44 PM	0
	2:04 PM	0
	2:30 PM	4 min
	3:01 PM	0
	3:36 PM	0
	3:52 PM	0
	4:09 PM	0

This page intentionally left blank.