

July 22, 1991
jem

Introduced by: NORTH

Proposed No.: 91-552

ORDINANCE NO. **10030**

1
2 AN ORDINANCE adopting site selection criteria, a
3 siting process and a site specific environmental
4 review of reasonable alternative land sites for a
5 Regional Justice Center as outlined in the Siting
6 Process Summary document.

7 BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF KING COUNTY:

8 SECTION 1. Definitions. For the purpose of this
9 ordinance:

10 A. "Site Criteria" shall refer to specific technical and
11 community screening elements for evaluating potential land
12 sites. These criteria are recommended by the executive and
13 contained in the Citizens' Site Advisory Committee's Site
14 Criteria Report (Attachment A) which will be used to evaluate
15 all identified sites for their suitability as reasonable
16 potential locations for a Regional Justice Center.

17 B. "Siting Process" shall mean the process by which
18 potential sites are identified, evaluated, narrowed and final
19 recommendations are made. The siting criteria are one
20 evaluation element of the entire site selection process.

21 C. "Siting Process Summary" shall refer to the Siting
22 Process Summary document (Attachment B) which outlines the
23 siting process to be used, including the site criteria, for
24 recommending locations for a regional justice center and
25 inclusion in the site specific environmental review process.

26 D. "Citizens' Site Advisory Committee (CSAC)" shall refer
27 to the executive's appointed 12 member citizens' group
28 responsible for identifying, evaluating, and recommending
29 potential and reasonable sites to the King County executive for
30 a regional justice center.

31 E. "Regional Justice Center" shall mean a structure or
32 group of structures which, in order to operate efficiently and
33 provide convenient access for the users of the system,

1 accommodates a full-service jail and space for other agencies
2 of the law, safety, and justice system at a single site.

3 F. "Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)" shall refer to
4 the Phase 2 site specific environmental analysis and review of
5 reasonable site alternatives recommended by the King County
6 executive for a regional justice center.

7 SECTION 2. The siting process summary document, as
8 revised, is hereby approved and adopted. In doing so, the
9 County Council approves the site screening criteria and a
10 process for identifying, evaluating and recommending potential
11 reasonable alternative sites for a regional justice center.

12 SECTION 3. Environmental Review. A. The executive's
13 selection of three to five reasonable sites (as outlined in
14 Stage 2 of the Siting Process Summary) shall be evaluated in a
15 site specific environmental review. This Phase 2 site specific
16 EIS shall discuss the environmental impacts as determined by
17 the EIS scoping process, including mitigation, associated with
18 the possibility of placing a regional justice center on one of
19 between three to five alternative sites.

20 INTRODUCED AND READ for the first time this 1st
21 day of July, 1991.

22 PASSED this 22nd day of July, 1991.

23 KING COUNTY COUNCIL
24 KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON

25 Lois North
26 Chair
27

ATTEST:

28 Gerald A. Peter
29 Clerk of the Council

30 APPROVED this 31st day of July, 1991.

31 Jim Dillo
32 King County Executive

10030

SITING PROCESS SUMMARY

for

**Executive's Proposed
Regional Justice Center**

July 1991

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Siting Process Overview.....page 2
Schedule for Siting Process.....page 3
Stage 1 Siting Process,
 Citizens' Site Advisory Committee (CSAC)....page 4
Stage 2 Siting Process,
 King County Executive/EIS Process.....page 9
Stage 3 Siting Process,
 King County Council.....page 11

Appendix A, Recommended Site Criteria.....page 12
Appendix B, Site Criteria Definitions.....page 19
Appendix C, Site Criteria Scoring.....page 22

SITING PROCESS OVERVIEW

The Citizens' Site Advisory Committee (CSAC), appointed by the King County Executive, have recommended a site criteria and a process for using the criteria to evaluate potential sites. The CSAC's recommendations for criteria and siting process were included in a March, 1991 report to the Executive. The Executive approved the CSAC's recommendations and forwarded the report to the King County Council for review and approval.

On July 15, 1991 the King County Council approved construction and siting of a Regional Justice Center in Phase I (to open in 1995) and site identification, evaluation, recommendation and selection for a future Regional Justice Center in Phase II (to open in 2000). The siting process for both Phase I and Phase II will be conducted at the same time.

This document does not replace the CSAC's report but serves to further detail the entire siting process. This document also describes the County's role in assisting the CSAC, reviews the CSAC's role, and outlines further site selection process steps to be taken by the Executive and the County Council after the CSAC has recommended 3 to 5 reasonable sites, for both Phases, to the Executive.

This document divides the site selection process into three distinct stages. Stage 1 includes the King County Council's adoption of a siting process and site evaluation criteria to be used by the CSAC to identify, screen, evaluate, and recommend sites to the County Executive. Stage 2 includes the decision making process to be used by the Executive and the implementation of the environmental review. Stage 3 includes the County Council's final site selection.

The following page contains a rough outline of these three stages and a tentative schedule for each stage of the siting process.

SITING PROCESS SUMMARY

**SCHEDULE
FOR SITING PROCESS**

MAJOR TASK/DECISION	EARLIEST COMPLETION DATE
STAGE 1	
King County Council approval of the OMP (Need), and the FMP (Facility Alternative) to build and site a Regional Justice Center and select a site for Phase II	July 15, 1991
King County Council approval of the Siting Process Summary document, including the site criteria	July 22, 1991
CSAC reviews, evaluates all identified, reasonable sites and recommends 3 to 5 each for Phase I & Phase II to the Executive	July thru October, 1991

STAGE 2

Executive recommends 3 sites each for Phase I & II to be studied in the site specific EIS	October 1991
Site specific EIS Completed	March, 1992

STAGE 3

King County Council selects final sites (for Phase I & II)	April, 1992
--	-------------

(NOTE: all dates are approximate)

STAGE 1
SITING PROCESS

for

New Law, Safety, Justice and Detention Facilities

The King County Council has approved the need for new law, safety, justice and detention facilities, and selected construction of a Regional Justice Center to meet these needs through the year 2000 (Phase I). The County Council also approved the acquisition of a second site for Phase II construction.

The following is a summary of how the Citizens' Site Advisory Committee (CSAC) and the Executive staff propose to find, evaluate and recommend potential sites.

I. IDENTIFYING AND ADVERTISING FOR LAND SITES

- A. A **40-day land search period** to identify available public and private sites will begin the day after the King County Council approves of a site selection process.

- B. King County Real Property Division will assist in the identification of potential land sites for the CSAC by contacting brokers, contacting those who have submitted sites and researching all available County owned property. Real Property will also supply various maps and assistance in reviewing all properties identified through all land search activities.

- C. King County Department of Adult Detention (DAD) will assist the CSAC in identifying land by:
 - 1. Notifying Seattle/King County Board of Realtors
 - 2. Advertising for land sites through mailings and newspapers
 - 3. Preparing a Request for Site Alternatives for local jurisdictions to propose site alternatives for consideration

SITING PROCESS SUMMARY

- D. CSAC will send a letter and Request for Site Alternatives to all city mayors and councilmembers, informing them of the land search requirements and requesting proposed sites for consideration.
1. The request will solicit interest on the part of local jurisdictions to obtain a Regional Justice Center in Phase I (1995) or in Phase II (2000) and will request that respondents identify:
 - a. Planning constraints
 - b. Surrounding land use issues
 - c. Potential mitigations which may be requested
 - d. Incentives and opportunities for cooperation, operations and efficiencies
 2. The proposals will be utilized differently at each stage of the siting process.
 - a. Stage 1; the CSAC will use the proposals to assist in identifying potential land sites.
 - b. Stage 2; the Executive will use the proposals in considering local jurisdictions' needs, costs and mitigation.
 - c. Stage 3; the County Council will use the proposals in considering local jurisdictions' needs, costs and mitigation.

II. EVALUATING POTENTIAL LAND SITES DURING THE LAND SEARCH

- A. Once land sites are identified; DAD staff and Real Property Division together with the environmental consultants and King County's; BALD, Surface Water Management Division, and Environmental Division will:

SITING PROCESS SUMMARY

1. Use the approved Technical Criteria to pre-screen property to ensure mandatory requirements are met.
 2. DAD staff will report to the Citizens' Site Advisory Committee on all properties identified, including those not meeting mandatory requirements. The report will include all preliminary information used in pre-screening the sites, including maps and photographs.
- B. The CSAC will review, modify as necessary and approve all reports on those properties that have been identified and pre-screened, to include:
1. Evaluation of scores on technical and community criteria.
 2. Review of all maps, photographs, and other preliminary information on sites presented by DAD staff.

III. NARROWING LAND SITES

- A. At the end of the 40-day land search period, the CSAC will:
1. Visit those land sites ranking highest based on both criteria scores and other information gathered (to refine preliminary evaluations) for these land sites.
 2. Narrow the list of potential sites down to eight (8) each for Phase I & II construction using the site criteria and professional expertise and judgement.
 3. Conduct up to five public meetings for discussion on the narrowed list of sites to gather any additional information or initiate further staff research for the final report.

SITING PROCESS SUMMARY

- B. The CSAC will conduct up to five public meetings before making its final recommendation to the Executive. These meetings will be held to gather any additional information or initiate further staff research on any of the top sites for the final report.**
- 1. Arrangements for five public meetings will be made in advance of the CSAC's announcement of the top sites. The meetings will be located in such a manner as to evenly distribute travel time so most King County residents could reasonably attend at least one meeting.**
 - 2. These meetings will be advertised in the appropriate local newspapers no less than two times prior to the meetings including at least once within two weeks of each meeting. In addition, notices will be mailed to mayors, city councilmembers and to relevant community groups interested in the siting decision particularly those potentially affected by each of the site alternatives.**
 - 3. The purpose of the CSAC's public meetings are to:**
 - a. Allow citizens the opportunity to ask questions about the planned facility, its anticipated impacts and land use;**
 - b. Obtain, clarify or gather any additional information which the community believes should be examined by the committee in its final recommendation on any of the potential land sites under consideration;**
 - c. Receive and document any requests or comments regarding potential mitigation for use of a particular land site.**

4. All information gathered at these meetings will be noted, verified where possible, and used where appropriate to finalize the CSAC site recommendation process.
- C. Department of Adult Detention (DAD) staff will work with Real Property Division to obtain options on any private sites included in the CSAC recommendation prior to publication of the CSAC report.

IV. CITIZENS' SITE ADVISORY COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION

- A. The Citizens' Site Advisory Committee (CSAC) will recommend to the Executive three to five site alternatives for Phase I and Phase II Regional Justice facilities. This recommendations will be presented in a report which identifies the process used to narrow the sites and a description of the judgements, information and rationales applied in making the final recommendation. This report will be made available to the public.

SITING PROCESS
STAGE 2
for
New Law, Safety, Justice, and Detention Facilities

After the Citizens' Site Advisory Committee (CSAC) recommends three to five reasonable alternative sites each for Phase I & II construction to the King County Executive, the County can initiate Stage 2 of the siting selection process.

In Stage 2, the King County Executive makes his Phase I & Phase II site recommendations for inclusion in the site specific Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The Executive may or may not identify a preferred site among the potential sites studied in the EIS.

I. KING COUNTY EXECUTIVE'S SITE RECOMMENDATIONS

- A.** The Executive will select three final potential sites each for Phase I & II which will be the focus of the site specific Environmental Impact Statement. The Executive may or may not identify a preferred site among the potential sites.
- B.** The Executive will consider the following issues when selecting potential sites:
 - 1.** Recommendations by the Citizens' Site Advisory Committee
 - 2.** Costs associated with development of the site including:
 - a.** Excavation
 - b.** Supplying infrastructure (water, sewer, roads, public transit)
 - c.** Environmental mitigation measures
 - d.** Other mitigation issues

3. Impacts, efficiency, effectiveness and cost of operations to the County's operating agencies.
4. Impacts to local jurisdictions, citizens and communities.
5. Citizen and local officials' opinions and concerns as expressed in public hearings, correspondence, negotiations, and other documented written forms.
6. Public safety needs of the citizens of King County.

II. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (EIS)

- A. Based on the Executive's site recommendations, site specific EIS will evaluate the environmental impacts of the facility on three potential sites for Phase I & II. Cost issues associated with developing each land site will not be included in the EIS.
- B. The EIS consultant will publish a scoping notice and will hold public meetings to obtain public comments on the adequacy of the proposed scope of the EIS. These meetings will be advertised to all neighborhood and community groups in areas potentially affected by any of the alternative sites, as well as others who have generally expressed interest, by mail and in the newspaper.
- C. After the Draft EIS (DEIS) has been published, Department of Adult Detention (DAD) will sponsor public meetings to receive comments on the DEIS. These meetings will be advertised through mailings and local newspapers. All comments will be responded to in the Final EIS.

III. EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

SITING PROCESS**STAGE 3***for****New Law, Safety, Justice, and Detention Facilities***

After the site specific Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is complete, the King County Council will make the final site decisions.

I. KING COUNTY COUNCIL'S SITE SELECTION

A. The King County Council will make the final site decisions for Phase I & Phase II Regional Justice Center facilities based upon the information available, including but not limited to the Executive's recommendation, at least one public hearing and Council staff analysis. The Council will consider the following issues in making their final decision:

1. Adequacy of the Phase 1(programmatic) EIS and Phase 2 (site specific) EIS.
2. Costs including mitigation.
3. Operational efficiency.
4. Public safety needs of the citizens of King County.
5. Written and oral comments from local elected officials and from citizens.
6. Other reports or information which would assist the Council in selecting an appropriate site for the facility. Any such information would also be made available to the public.

APPENDIX A

Technical and Community Criteria Recommended by the CSAC

**CITIZEN SITE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS
EXECUTIVE'S PROPOSED REGIONAL JUSTICE CENTER**

Appropriate scores should be circled in each category. The higher the score the better, M = Mandatory.

- | | | | |
|----|---|-------------|--------------|
| 1. | LAND SIZE | = | M |
| 2. | SHAPE OF LAND | = | 1 or 0 |
| 3. | TOPOGRAPHY | = | 1 or 0 |
| 4. | CURRENT ZONING, (circle only one)
Current Zoning (Commercial, Industrial, manufacturing)
Requires Zoning Change | =
= | 3
0 |
| 5. | SITE MUST OFFER GREATEST AMOUNT OF ACCESSIBILITY TO THE REGIONS WITH THE HIGHEST ANTICIPATED USE OF THE FACILITY. (circle only one)
High accessibility to regions with the most use
Average accessibility to regions with the most use
Low accessibility to regions with the most use | =
=
= | 3
1
-1 |
| 6. | AVAILABILITY AND ADEQUACY OF PUBLIC WATER TO THE SITE. (circle only one)
Needs extension more than 1 mile to site
Water within 1 mile or needs some alteration
Water to site, needs no alteration | =
=
= | -1
1
3 |
| 7. | AVAILABILITY AND ADEQUACY OF PUBLIC SEWER SYSTEM TO THE SITE. (circle only one)
Needs extension more than 1 mile to site
Sewer within 1 mile or needs some alteration
Sewer to site, needs no alteration | =
=
= | -1
1
3 |
| 8. | ACCESS TO SITE. (circle only one)
Inadequate road service, extensive alterations
Adequate road service, some alterations needed
Adequate road service, little or no alterations | =
=
= | -1
1
3 |
| 9. | SITE MUST MEET GENERAL ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR BUS ROUTE AND FREQUENT BUS STOPS AT THIS LOCATION. | = | M |

(continued)

10. AVAILABILITY OF EMERGENCY SERVICES.

FIRE: Under 5 minutes response time to site = M
HOSPITAL: Within 5 miles of site (Mandatory & circle one) = M
Complete Emergency Facilities within 15 minutes one way = 1
Complete Emergency Facilities within 5 minutes one way = 2

11. POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONSTRAINTS, using sensitive map folios & direct observation (-1 for each item checked)

Wetlands _____ Seismic _____
Coal Mines _____ Landslides _____
Shorelines _____
Animal Habitats, Migration Routes _____
Other (Specify) _____ Total for #11 _____

TOTAL POINTS FOR TECHNICAL = _____

CITIZEN SITE ADVISORY COMMITTEE COMMUNITY CONSIDERATIONS EXECUTIVE'S PROPOSED REGIONAL JUSTICE CENTER

Appropriate scores should be circled in each category. The higher the score the better.

1.	CONFORMITY WITH APPLICABLE COUNTY OR LOCAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN. (circle only one)	=	1 or 0
		N	E
		W	S
2.	PROXIMITY OF SITE TO SCHOOLS. (circle one for each direction)		
	At or less than 1,000 feet	-1	-1
	At or less than 2,500 feet, more than 1,000 feet	1	1
	More than 2,500 feet	3	3
3.	PROXIMITY OF SITE TO RESIDENTIAL HOUSING. (circle one for each direction)		
	At or less than 1,000 feet	-1	-1
	At or less than 2,500 feet, more than 1,000 feet	1	1
	More than 2,500 feet	3	3
4.	DENSITY OF NEARBY HOUSING UNITS. (circle one for each direction)		
	Homes/Apartment Units (0 to 25)	3	3
	Home/Apartment Units (26 to 100)	1	1
	Homes/Apartment Units (over 100)	-1	-1
5.	PROXIMITY OF SITE TO OTHER IDENTIFIABLE SENSITIVE USES. (circle one for each direction)		
	At or less than 1,000 feet	-1	-1
	At or less than 2,500 feet, more than 1,000 feet	1	1
	More than 2,500 feet	3	3
6.	NATURAL/PHYSICAL BARRIERS THAT SEPARATE THE SITE FROM SENSITIVE USES AT OR WITHIN 2,500 FEET OF SITE. Such as freeways, overpass, steep cliff (30%+ slope and > 30 feet high), etc. (circle one for each directions)		
	None exists	0	0
	Barrier present (specify _____)	2	2
	Total Points for each direction	_____	_____
		N	E
		W	S
	TOTAL POINTS FOR COMMUNITY CONSIDERATIONS	=	_____

APPENDIX B

Definitions of Site Criteria Terms

DEFINITIONS

Definitions for each criteria recommended by the Citizens' Site Advisory Committee (CSAC) are included in their March, 1991 Site Criteri Report. Terms which required further clarification are listed below.

Minimum Land Size: Any facility alternative selected by the King County Council will dictate some basic land size requirement which provides for parking, set-backs and additional local land use requirements. Although, sites may be larger, any site not meeting the minimum size will be eliminated from further consideration by the CSAC.

For estimating purposes only; the a single suburban Regional Justice Center could be placed on as little as 6.5 acres if the facility were up to four stories. However, as the number of stories exceeds three, resulting costs for the structure will go up.

Highest Anticipated Use: The CSAC made the assumption that a Regional Justice Center, located outside of Seattle, should be located in or near those areas of the County who would use it the most. To do this, each sites accessibility to the areas which have or are projected (by the year 2000) to have the greatest need for law, safety, justice and detention services will be evaluated.

The CSAC expects Department of Adult Detention (DAD) staff to use information on the number of bookings, arrests, crime stats, etc. in each region studied in the County's Facility Masterplan; plus any other information available on the origination of Law, Safety and Justice workloads. Priority will be given to the workloads of the Corrections and law enforcement elements.

Public Transportation/Frequent Bus Stops: The requirement for adequate public transportation to and from the facility is mandatory. However, more than existing service will be measured. A potential site could also meet this criterion if service expansion, shuttles or other means can be employed when the facility is operational to ensure adequate public access.

For public transit service to be adequate the site should be full-service (7-days a week) and make frequent stops nearby, particularly during peak working hours. Bus stops across the street are sufficient. Metro Transit will work with the CSAC, DAD staff, and the County to determine the feasibility of transportation service.

Environmental Constraints: This criterion is preliminary screening of environmental issues using map folios and onsite, direct observation. This preliminary screening will identify those sites with obvious or significant environmental issues. This review does not replace or supersede the analysis of the Environmental Impact Statement.

If any one or combination of environmental constraints reduces the buildable land size so that the site would no longer meet the minimum land requirement, it would be eliminated from further consideration.

APPENDIX C
Site Criteria Scoring

SITE CRITERIA SCORING

Using a numeric weighting system provides an objective means to pre-screen all potential sites. This weighting system is not intended to formally rank sites. It is used only as a means to narrow a larger pool of sites which meet basic requirements into a smaller group.

The Citizens's Site Advisory Committee (CSAC) tested its recommended site criteria and weighting system on example sites to ensure it would distinguish sites in conformance with the intent of overall criteria elements.

The criteria's intent is to favor sites in commercial/industrial type areas which have existing infrastructure, and have adequate transportation systems. Sites more removed, such as in rural or very residential areas, would score very poorly as compared to sites which meet the aforementioned criteria.

The following offers further explanation on the recommended criteria's weighting system.

1. Some elements of the criteria establish minimum requirements to ensure the site is adequate both for the land use and the structure. These criteria elements receive a "Mandatory" designation. Any site which can not initially meet all the mandatory criteria, will be eliminated from further consideration by the CSAC.

Example: Land Size Requirement = M

Any facility alternative selected by the King County Council will dictate some basic land size requirement which provides for parking, set-backs and additional local land use requirements. Although, sites may be larger, any site not meeting the minimum size will be eliminated from further consideration by the CSAC.

SITING PROCESS SUMMARY

2. All non-mandatory criteria were given a range of points. How each site meets every criterion can be roughly described as good (1 pt.), better (2 pts.), best (3 pts.). The more adequately the site meets a specific criterion the more points it receives. No site can receive more than 3 positive points on a specific criterion.

Example: Access to the Site (roads)

Inadequate road service, extensive alterations	= -1
Adequate road service, some alterations	= 1
Adequate road service, little or no alterations	= 3

3. Criteria included in the Community Considerations are scored in each direction from the site. North, South, East, and West all receive an individual score.

Example: Proximity to Schools

	N	E	W	S
At or less than 1,000 feet	-1	-1	-1	-1
At or less than 2,500 ft., > 1,000 ft.	1	1	1	1
More than 2,500 ft.	3	3	3	3