

16

Proposed No. 2002-0434.1

KING COUNTY

1200 King County Courthouse 516 Third Avenue Seattle, WA 98104

Signature Report

September 10, 2002

Motion 11519

Sponsors Patterson

1 A MOTION adopting policies in accordance with 2 Ordinance 14374, Section 13, relating to proposed changes 3 in district court operations and facilities. 4 5 6 WHEREAS, King County Ordinance 14374, Section 13, directs the executive and 7 district court to submit proposed policies and criteria that will form the basis for any 8 proposed changes in district court operations and facilities to the King County council, 9 and 10 WHEREAS, Ordinance 14374 also indicated the King County council's intent 11 that the proposed policies and criteria be reviewed by the regional policy committee, and 12 WHEREAS, a process was initiated by the district court, whereby the district 13 court invited executive staff, cities and King County council staff to participate in 14 developing criteria for potential closure of district court facilities in 2003 and to 15 recommend accompanying policies;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT MOVED by the Council of King County:

A. It is in the best interest of all the citizens of King County to have an integrated
court system that accommodates superior, district and municipal courts and that
maximizes efficiency, effectiveness, customer service and accessibility, while
minimizing cost. Wherever these needs are not met, it is the duty of the county and other
stakeholders of the court system to work cooperatively in seeking viable solutions.

- B. Recommendations for court facility closures in 2003 will be guided by the criteria contained in Attachment A to this motion, which were developed cooperatively between the cities, King County and the district court. These criteria shall be used to determine which court facility closures are of maximum benefit to the citizens of King County. These criteria include such factors as customer service, legal issues, workloads, facility conditions and geographic distribution of the facilities.
- C. Recommendations for court facility closures beyond 2003 shall be developed utilizing a cooperative process involving the county executive, district court, and cities.

 Criteria governing future facility and operational changes should consider such factors as: customer service, legal issues, workloads, facility conditions and geographic distribution

of the facilities, as well as any other factors determined to be appropriate by the participants.

34

Motion 11519 was introduced on 9/3/2002 and passed by the Metropolitan King County Council on 9/9/2002, by the following vote:

Yes: 11 - Ms. Sullivan, Mr. von Reichbauer, Ms. Lambert, Mr. Phillips, Mr. Pelz, Mr. McKenna, Mr. Constantine, Mr. Gossett, Ms. Hague, Mr. Irons and Ms. Patterson

No: 1 - Mr. Pullen

Excused: 1 - Ms. Edmonds

KING COUNTY COUNCIL KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Cynthia Sullivan, Chair

ATTEST:

Anne Noris, Clerk of the Council

Attachments A. King County District Court Facility Evaluation Criteria and Data - 8-19-02

King County District Court Facility Evaluation Criteria and Data -- 8/19/02

ų,																			Γ	
SHORELINE	Yes	N		က		o <u>N</u>		Š		2		Yes	Yes	2	w	Yes/1	Yes	ON N		
SOUTHWEST	Yes	Yes/Yes		က		N		2		2		Yes	Yes	No	8	No	Yes	O _N		
SEATTLE	×	×		×	ON N	×		×	ient.	0		×	×	×	×	×	×	×		
RENTON	Yes	<u>8</u>	ıtion	0		SN SN		S S	icipal Departm	0		Yes	Yes	o Z		Yes/1	Yes	o Z		
NORTHEAST	Yes	Yes/No*	* new video installation	8		No	9 2	No	City of Issaquah is set up as a Municipal Department.	5		Yes	Yes	No	2	o _N	Yes	Yes		
ISSAQUAH	No	ON.		2		Yes		Yes*	* City of Issaqual	4	ter 2002	Q.	ON.	9	ю	Yes/1	Yes	o Z		
FEDERAL WAY	Yes	N S		0		N _O	3	No		0	e in Bellevue aft	Yes	Se),	o _N	-	No	Yes	o Z		
BELLEVUE	Yes	OZ Z		2		O Z	*Lease w/ City of Kent through 6/03	No		3*	*Newcastle will file in Bellevue after 2002	Yes	Yes	No ON	0	Yes/2	Yes	Yes		
AUKEEN RJC	Yes	Yes/Yes			2		Yes*	Lease w/ City of	N _O		+		Yes	Yes	Yes	N	No.	N _O	Yes	
Are there ADA issues involved with the facility or access to the facility?		Does the facility house any Specialty Courts? If yes, can the Specialty courts be relocated with minimal impact?		Are there parking, transportation (Metro routes), or other access difficulties? 0=problems with all of these, 3=no problems in these areas.	Does closing the facility meet the boundary requirements of the Districting ordinance?	Is there a lease or bond payment or income associated with the facility?		Are there any city ordinances to be considered?		Number of contract cities in the division,		Is there a minimum of 2 judges (excluding portability) housed in the facility?	Is there a minimum of 10 clerks housed in the facility?	Would a jail courtroom be impacted by the closure?	Are there any structural or mechanical problems with the facility? 0=problems with all of these, 3=no problems in these areas.	Is there excess capacity (unassigned courtrooms), and if so, how many?	Is there excess clerical space?	Is there another buyer or opportunity for use for this facility or property?	Geographical Distribution?	
	-	8		ო	4	ນ		ဖ		7		α	თ	10	=	5	55	4		
	Customer Service				Legal							Workload		Facilities				Other		