King County

Metropolitan King County Council
Budget and Fiscal Management Committee

STAFF REPORT

Agenda Items No.:	3-6	Date:	October 14, 2009
Proposed Ord. No.:	2009-0559.1 2009-0560.1		
Proposed Mot. No.:	2009-0561.1 2009-0562.1	Prepared By:	Rebecha Cusack

SUBJECT

The Committee has before it today four pieces of legislation relating to possible flooding in the Green River Valley[1]. **Proposed Ordinance 2009-0559.1** is a $34.62[2] million supplemental appropriation request which would provide *emergency* funding for planning and mitigation. **Proposed Ordinance 2009-0560** and **Proposed Motions 2009-0561 and 0562** relate to borrowing the funds to pay for the $27.225 million general funds requested. The remaining $7.399 million to fund the requested package would come from Wastewater fund balance. This legislation follows Council action that enabled the Executive to issue a "Local Proclamation of Emergency" on September 10, 2009.

ISSUE

1. *General fund: During a time of difficult financial constraints, is it a reasonable policy and business decision to borrow $27.225 million to implement a planning and mitigation strategy to provide enhanced protection of public safety, public health and property in advance of a possible flood caused by the damage of the Howard Hanson Dam abutment when there is no guarantee of federal reimbursement?*
2. *Wastewater Treatment Construction fund: During a time of difficult financial constraints, is it a reasonable policy and business decision to draw down $7.399 million of fund balance to implement a planning and mitigation strategy to provide enhanced protection of public safety, public health and property in advance of a possible flood caused by the damage of the Howard Hanson Dam abutment when there is no guarantee of federal reimbursement?*

BACKGROUND

The proposed ordinances and motions were before the BFM Committee on October 7, 2009. Please refer to the staff report of that date for discussion on the background, funding requests and revenue sources.

Analysis:

[1] On a separate but complementary track to this proposal the Flood Control District approved $8.4 million for temporary infrastructure to increase the height of the Green River levees.

[2] As transmitted the total requested was $32,225,374 but was requested to be increased by $2,247m as figures were refined by the Wastewater Treatment Division

Proposed Ordinance 2009-0559 would appropriate just over $27.2 million into fund 3141 – building repair and replacement to cover costs associated with the general fund proposals.[3] According the Executive transmittal having costs centralized in one capital project will facilitate consistent accounting costs for FEMA in a format acceptable to them, which is critical for reimbursement purposes. As a best practice the Executive is proposing to separate all flood related expenses from the county's non-flood related costs. This is highly desirable for audit purposes, insurance claims and in preparing for any FEMA or other government disaster funds which may end up being available.

Expenditures – general fund:

Agency	Expenditure	TLT
Elections	$3,219,744	
Facilities Management Division [FMD]	$10,511,993	2.50
FMD – 20% Contingency	$4,537,562	
Office of Information and Resource Management [OIRM]	$4,467,911	11.0
Animal Control	$951,800	
Department of Adult and Juvenile Detention [DAJD]	$1,873,849	
Executive Office - Communications	$530,100	4.0
Scanning/Digitizing Files: *Judicial Administration, Superior Court, Jail Health, Public Health, and Prosecuting Attorney*	$344,501	
Records and Licensing Section [RALS]	$217,700	
Emergency Management	$150,000	3.00
King County Sheriff's Office	$118,317	
Human Resources Division	$102,535	
District Court	$27,720	
Department of Executive Services	$22,500	1.00
Dept. of Judicial Administration	149,142	
Total	$27,225,374	21.50

Non-general fund - Wastewater:

Agency	Expenditure	TLT
Wastewater Treatment Division	$7,399,300	0

This proposed ordinance would further appropriate approximately $7.4 million into the Wastewater Treatment fund 4616, project GRFP03 Green River Flood Preparation. Of

[3] Three capital projects would be created #395009 – DJA Exhibit Space (Evidence) = $149,142, #395929 – Green River Flood Preparation = $22,538,670, 395930 – Green River Flood Preparation Contingency = $4,537,562. As proposed a one year BAN totaling $29,000,000 would be issued in November or December. A 10 year bond would subsequently be issued with annual debt service payments of $3.4 million beginning in 2011.

that request there is a contingency of $1.04 million.

Funding Sources:
These expenditure requests are supported with the following funding sources:

Funding Source	Amount
Sale of Bond Anticipation Notes[4]	$27.225 million
Wastewater fund balance	$ 7.5 million
Total	$34.62 million

The 2009 request for planning and mitigation funds are proposed to be placed in the building repair and replacement fund for "easy" tracking of any FEMA reimbursement. Although he notes that he will be sending a 2010 request before year's end, the Executive has indicated that there are "no requests for 2010" in this proposal, because the request is solely for planning and mitigation efforts that might be compensable from FEMA. Planning and mitigation are the first two steps in emergency preparedness planning; with steps three and four being emergency response and recovery/restoration. There is no certainty that there would be any federal reimbursement of these expenditures.

Excepting the Earlington Building the county mitigation efforts proposed are guided by a 17,600 cfs[5] [cubic feet per second] modeling assumption agreed to by the cities, county, USACE and emergency managers in May 2009. *Due to the dynamic nature of flood planning this proposal for funding has a high degree of plasticity.*

The primary general fund cost drivers in the general fund are directly related to costs that would be incurred if there is a need to <u>relocate or evacuate facilities</u>. *A decision to relocate or evacuate from the Maleng Regional Justice Center [MRJC] alone is the highest cost driver of all, followed by the Earlington Building.*

Elections	$3,219,744

Most flood planning requests for funding were based upon the 17,600 cfs model. Because of the Earlington building's location and Elections' legal mandate to count ballots and certify election results within three weeks of Election Day [November 3] the Executive determined that a higher level of assessment was required. Based upon flood modeling at the 25,000 cfs level it was determined that the facility would be inundated with six to ten feet of water, and the Executive under his Emergency Declaration determined that Elections must be relocated to a more secure site. The King County Airport Operations Center [AOC] was selected as the site, and the agency was relocated there. The lease for the facility is available for about eight months. Tenant improvements were needed as part of the move, such as installation of security cages for storing ballots and equipment, resources for communicating with voters, relocation of specialized industrial equipment used for ballot sorting and tracking, network and telecom equipment, cabling & installation, furniture deconstruction and move preparation. This requested amount in this proposal is $3.2 million. Of the requested amount $1,279,995 was for tenant improvements [capital expenses]. Since transmittal of the request the move has been <u>completed</u> and $2,210,561, or roughly 68% of the funds requested have been expended. The difference

[4] BAN as proposed totals $29 million which includes issuance costs

[5] 17,600 cfs assumes a 100 year event at a pool elevation of 1185. The 17,600 cfs scenario was chosen as a common map for the different entities to begin their planning for emergency response because of its broad geographic,distribution of its impact.

is $1,009,183 or 32%. While the move has been completed all outstanding financial invoices may not have been processed. *However, a key question is whether a range of this amount from $922k to $1m could be recaptured, reprogrammed or eliminated.*

Facilities Management Division	$15,049,555 [$10,511,993 + Contingency $4,537,562]	2.5 TLT

The Facilities Management Division Flood is tasked with facility planning within the Green River Valley flood zone area which includes 10 individual facility site assessments with multiple tenants, facility protection, lease costs, relocation move costs for 1,200 – 1,600 employees, tenant capital improvements, heavy equipment, pumps, and coordinating move management amongst all affected agencies, owned and leased properties, generators and for sheltering in-place functions at the MRJC in the event of a flood. Of the proposed amount $4,108,081 are capital costs such as building perimeter protection, heavy equipment, pumps, and generators. The estimates are dynamic as most recently indicated by an exchange between FMD and the Superior Court over whether to lease space in an alternate facility or at various public and private locations in the county.

To assist with the accomplishment of this body of work FMD has requested 2.5 term-limited temporary staff [annualized] to assist with flood planning and preparation of FEMA reimbursement for flood related costs. This flood planning team is also working with FEMA and King County's accounting system experts to establish reporting mechanisms which will maximize federal reimbursement. The Executive has emphasized the critical nature of this role in the County's ability to recoup costs. In addition they have retained consultant services through Parametrix to evaluate potential flood damage to county facilities and recommend approaches to avoid or militate against facility damage. One of the key components of the consultant's work has been a range of facility perimeter protection options such as the $1.1m proposed for an "ecology block[6]" preventive barrier around the MRJC and $260k around the Aukeen District Court.

The assumptions in this proposal are best professional judgment models based on varying assumptions that a flood will occur during the 2009 flood season. Appropriately for best practices the Division has prepared cost estimates for each element of the proposal and has separately identified a contingency. The affected facilities and planning assumptions are listed on Attachment 1. Recent efforts in looking at possible sites for the Superior Court may be sufficiently refined for the Executive to share a preferred lease alternate. In reviewing the proposed budgets the assumptions between the various facilities options appear to be consistent with those used for the move from the Earlington Building to the AOC. The actual costs as now known are roughly 68% of what was thought as being needed when the proposal was put together. *The key question is whether there is a similar 32% cushion in other move plans within FMD's and OIRM's proposed budgets.* It may be premature to determine that since the Executive branch has been very forthcoming about the plastic nature of the plans. Because neither one lease, nor one site's physical constraints in terms of technology improvements is identical to others, additional analysis and conversations would need to occur to verify the "range" of cushion that may more appropriately be budgeted into contingency.

A 20% contingency totaling $4,537,562 has been requested in a separate project [Project, 395930 – Green River Flood Preparation Contingency], has been identified to account for

[6] Compared to other alternates this yielded maximum protection at the lowest cost

these funds. In understanding the level of "accuracy" assumed in the executive's proposed cost estimates, which also helps inform contingency, staff reviewed the Association for the Advancement of Cost Engineering International (AACEI) guidelines. These guidelines are widely recognized industry standards for classifying cost estimates and expected accuracy ranges. Staff's review yielded that a 20% contingency for projects relating to a potential Green River flooding event is not unreasonable given the stage of planning. This amount would need however to be viewed in light of what "capacity" may also be built into the budgeted planning numbers as noted above.

Office of Information and Resource Management [OIRM]	$4,467,911	11.0 TLT

Costs associated with relocation efforts include server moves, telecom infrastructure installation, *enhancing the capacity of the alternate data center*, ensuring uninterrupted e-mail service, and installing network devices for 1,200 -1,600 employees. Of this amount $2,898,333 is identified as being for at risk site relocation; none of the request appears to be for capital costs. As with the request from FMD these costs are based on various preliminary planning assumptions and come with the same plasticity. As FMD enters into various lease negations OIRM can develop more precise cost estimates. However, embedded in this proposal are three items that staff has identified do not appear as pressing as other items. First is a request for $142,894 for Alternate Data Center network equipment; the county has already invested roughly $4 million on functionality at the Alternative Data Center in Olympia. There seems to be no compelling business case to support this request under the aegis of "flood planning" when it was approved as being able to meet the needs of the county as a back-up site with appropriate capacity. Second is a request of $84,500 which as proposed is needed "if the backend infrastructure at Sabey is unavailable. The Sabey Data Center is heralded as being state of the art, outside the flood zone area and highly secure. Third is a request of $160,000 for an up-date of the Emergency Management Response Plan. From a "reimbursable" perspective while meritorious this planning request appears to be part of what should more appropriately be covered under the normal budget appropriation process.

Similar to FMD for OIRM the Earlington Building relocation move may be a reasonable case study for the proposed budget. Since the actual costs as now known are roughly 68% of what was thought as being needed when the proposal was put together, this requests may be unnecessarily inflated. *The key question is whether there is a similar 32% cushion in other move plans within OIRM's proposed budgets*. Again, it may be premature to determine that since the Executive branch has been very forthcoming about the plastic nature of the plans. Because neither one lease, nor one site's physical constraints in terms of technology improvements is identical to others, additional analysis and conversations would need to occur to verify the "range" of cushion that may more appropriately be budgeted into contingency

To accomplish the body of work that they are tasked with OIRM has identified the need for 11 term limited temporary positions [TLTs] – these are annualized numbers. If the agency need to immediately provide support for 1,200 -1,600 employees, these positions appear to be critical to their success.

Animal Control	$951,800

In his transmittal the Executive stated his intention to close the King County Animal Shelter in Kent because under the 17,600 cubic feet per second [cfs] modeling scenario it would be under 2-to-3 feet of water. He further noted that in his 2010 budget proposal the facility

would closed by June 2010 and during the interim he had directed "King County Animal Control to engage in discussions with contract cities and community organizations to transition to an alternative, fiscally sustainable model". As transmitted the proposal envisioned leasing temporary space from November 1st, 2009 through year's end, followed by a 2010 proposal for funding coming to Council later in the fall. Modular buildings currently at the shelter, cat cages, dog runs and any other removable furniture or infrastructure were to be relocated to a temporary shelter. Sheltering for large livestock was being discussed with Washington State University personnel to determine the feasibility of sheltering small at animals at the Enumclaw and Puyallup fairgrounds during a flood event. These two facilities have already been designated as the facilities for large livestock. Plans were underway with the Red Cross, Animal Shelter and FMD staff to locate pet sheltering facilities close to the human sheltering sites. As initially requested the funds were to increases volunteer coordinators from part-time to full-time to manage higher volumes and a more complex network of sheltering, $500k to cover the cost of temporary fencing, storage, plumbing and electrical infrastructure, $363,900 moving costs and $88,710 in 2009 for lease costs for a location that could serve as a private non-profit service delivery substitute.

Since transmittal the Executive has indicated that the approach has changed and another will be forthcoming. Because a static proposal has not been received at the time of this writing, staff analysis remains on hold.

Department of Adult and Juvenile Detention [DAJD]	$1,873,849

By applying the 17,600 cfs modeling standard it was determined that the detention portion of the MRJC, which houses up to 1,364 inmates, would be under two-to-three feet of water in the event of a flood. According to Executive staff there is currently 800 inmates at the facility. The Executive has proposed a multi-phased approach. First, on November 1st 200 inmates will be relocated from the MRJC detention facility to the King County Correctional Facility[KCCF][7]. These inmates are those with [a] medical problems, [b] on-going behavioral issues or [3] on-going legal matters at the King County Courthouse.

Second, the remaining 600[8] would be evacuated when there is a threat of imminent danger. If no flooding were to occur, these inmates would be returned to the MRJC detention facility. The approximate cost per day to house inmates in other facilities is $55k per day for 400[9] inmates. This cycle of relocation and re-occupancy could reoccur throughout the flood season. Examples of this population are: 25-30 are juveniles who have been sentenced as adults, but must be segregated from the adult population, 120-130 are Department of Correction [DOC] violators, minimum security offenders, sentenced inmates, city/county misdemeanants, 20 are transfer and release inmates. Embedded within the $1.87m request are $988k for additional labor costs such as Juvenile Detention

[7] The Hammer Settlement limits the KCCF population to 1697. According to DAJD the current KCCF population is 1,450. Assuming that population number, the maximum number of inmates that could move to the facility is 247. Populations are not static and there will need to be "capacity" open at the KCCF. By moving in 200 inmates the Executive feels that the population can be managed to the Hammer threshold.

[8] Last week a question was raised by a member regarding the cost per relocation of the "600" inmates from the MRJC detention facility. The response received was that assuming a minimum of 3 days per evacuation the cost would be $137,943 per occurrence.

[9] It is anticipated that a portion of the 600 would be sent back to DOC, Juvenile detention or given early release

Officer overtime to prepare and staff two-to-three units at Juvenile Detention for juvenile's currently housed at the MRJC as well as other adult correctional officer overtime for relocation and other facilities preparation, $430k for refrigerated storage, off-site and warehouse storage so that Pierce County can clear out an 84-bed unit in order to make it available for King County inmates; buses, vans, and trucks for inmate relocation; early relocation of 200 inmates to KCCF; subsequent emergency relocation of 600 inmates to other facilities; $22k for radios & a notification system; $200k for sheltering in place and $233K for leg irons and waist chains and a three day emergency supply that will leverage the existing two days of supplies for a total of five days of emergency supplies on hand should sheltering need to occur.

Executive Office – Communications	$530,100 4 TLTs	$530,100

As transmitted this proposal is consistent with a briefing to the Committee of the Whole. The Executive branch has initiated a communications strategy that is inclusive of relevant King County communications staff, this includes offices of separately elected officials. Under this proposal the goal is to inform every person and every business in the flood risk area about the importance of preparedness and response to a flood. They intend to have this information translated for non-English speakers. Printed and online information will be in six languages with the Spanish and European speaking populations as the main target audience but will also include languages recommended and used by Public health in that geographic area. Proposed for funding are labor costs for four public information officers - TLTs for 30 days, advertising on radio, bus, and television - $332k, and brochure mailings at 198k.

Scanning/Digitizing Files: *Judicial Administration, Superior Court, Jail Health, Public Health, and Prosecuting Attorney*	$344,501

Agencies housed at either owned or leased facilities within the Green River valley have boxes of documents need either to be warehoused or scanned in advance of a flood. A cost benefit review that shows that it is more cost effective than moving hundreds of boxes in and out of storage over a three to five year period. This proposal budgets $185k for DJA, $47.5k for the Superior Court, $35k for Jail Health, $40.7k for Public Health, $10k for the PAO and $26k for DDES.

Records and Licensing Section [RALS] – Records Center	$217,700

In anticipation of the multiple agencies potentially moving from the Green River Valley, the Records Center anticipates an increased volume of materials being transferred for storage. To accommodate the volume they are proposing to purchase and install additional shelving. Of this request $110k is for labor, e.g. movers and installers, $7.6k moving vehicle, coordinator and fuel, $75k for shelving, and $25k for carpenters, electricians and hydraulic lift rental.

The Office of Emergency Management (OEM)	$4,467,911	3 TLTs

At a cost of $50k OEM is requesting 3.0 TLT's; 2 of the positions will be used to implement an Operation Response Plan related to Emergency Support Function 6 (EFS 6) in the County's emergency management plan. As characterized these position are working in companion with two planners provided by the State who have been loaned to the County for 90 days. The State planners will complete the Operational Response Plan required by EFS 6, and upon completion of the plan the two proposed TLT's will be required to

implement it, including defining roles and responsibilities in mass care services including sheltering[10], emergency feeding, first aid and disaster welfare information.

A third TLT at $25k is proposed for a field coordinator who will be in charge of volunteers in the event of a flood. This type of function was identified by Fargo, North Dakota as a key source of their success in responding to the severe flooding of the Red River.

King County Sheriff's Office	$118,317

Funding is proposed that will provide basic water rescue training for 30 first responders who may be needed in the event of a flood. In addition funds are requested for aircraft and hoist accessories to improve the rescue operations, purchasing emergency supplies such as rain gear and two motorize river rafts. Examples of the funding requests are $39k for training, $15k for communication upgrade in the command vehicle, $10.7k for hoist operations, and $47k for emergency supplies such as throw bags, helmets, backboard and floatation devices.

Human Resources Division	$102,535

According to the Executive transmittal the Office of Emergency Management [OEM] is required by state law to register Temporary Emergent Workers [TEWS] for emergency response purposes. In order to accomplish that OEM and the Human Resources Division [HRD] will need to train five teams of 2-3 staff to register the volunteers in the field. When activated, these teams will register volunteers; collect volunteer information and distribute identification badges. These teams will work under a TLT field coordinator that is included in the OEM request. This proposal includes $24k for 2 volunteer coordinators for 21 days, and $79k for supporting supplies such as cell phones, laptops, printers and rain gear.

District Court	$27,720

Should the Aukeen District Court need to be relocated for the duration of the flood season, the District Court is requesting funding to pay mileage reimbursement to their clerks as required by their collective bargaining agreement.

Department of Executive Services	$22,500	1.00 TLT

The Division has requested 1 TLT position in order to hire a business finance officer for the remainder of 2009 to track and seek FEMA reimbursement; the position may be extended in to 2010. This position will be critical in working with all departments & divisions in recouping flood related expenditures and claiming reimbursement.

Department of Judicial Administration [DJA] - evidence storage	149,142

In anticipation of flooding DJA proposes mitigation funding to store evidence that they are legally required to maintain. All exhibits at MRJC must be held there for certain periods of time in the event that there is an appeal of a case. The entire MRJC evidence room must be moved to assure ready access and chain of control of exhibits utilized in court cases.

Non-general fund:

Wastewater Owned facility	$7,399,300

[10] It is anticipated that in the event of a flood the County will need 1-to-2 mega-shelters for general sheltering alone that will be managed by the Red Cross to shelter an estimated 3-5k displaced individuals. Sheltering plans for persons and pets are in progress. Red Cross can provide the cots, blankets, meals, comfort kits and other needed supplies for sheltering of persons according to the Executive's transmittal.

Wastewater Treatment Division (WTD) – South Treatment Plant: The treatment plant is located on the border of the 17,600 cfs modeled flood zone. In a 25,000 cfs scenario it is expected to experience significant high water surrounding the facility. Operation of the plant is essential to the region for public health purposes, and also will serve as an additional drainage point for flood water entering its system. Therefore WTD is preparing to staff and operate the plant at a time when the surrounding area is flooded and available power sources potentially compromised. Executive staff has emphasized the critical nature of this plant during a flood: "The underground facilities contain all the electrical and mechanical equipment that runs the plant as well as all the utilities that move sewage and solids, chemicals, fiber optics, fire suppression systems, etc. If we get any flooding at the plant theses underground corridors and tunnels will flood and the plant will go completely down." A series of questions were raised at the October 7 Committee meeting and are included as Attachment 3.

Plans are to shelter staff including acquiring emergency health and safety equipment and supplies necessary to support treatment plant operations crews in working 16-18 hour shifts for periods of 5-7 days at a time without leaving the plant. This approach also provides for emergency generators to be rented to back-up power equipment and power generators. On October 7 the Executive notified the Council of leasing generators and auxiliary equipment to provide power to the South Treatment Plant at a cost of $2,043 410 [Attachment 2]. .Construction and installation of flood protection barriers along the east perimeter of the Plant, Interurban Pumping Station, several wastewater siphon crossings along the Green River and other miscellaneous wastewater conveyance structures are included in the plan. Examples of funding requests are emergency generators - $2.44m; construction contractor for generator set up - $1.727m, generator transport $90k, 2500 KVA transformers - $228k, staffing at treatment plant preparatory work - $95k, diesel for emergency generators $552k. The notification of leasing generators by the Exeuctive shows a lesser cost than budgeted; the difference between budgeted and actual amounts may be able to be recaptured.

Council staff is continuing to evaluate this proposal to see whether there are alternatives that might have a lessened impact on fund balance.

Next Steps:
Staff is seeking direction from members: [1] Given that the Green River Valley may be in a potential "flood alert status" for the next 3-to-5 years, is this proposal appropriately sized or should the requests be decreased and the contingency increased until there is greater certainty of planning assumptions? [2] Should the staff begin to work on a striking amendment that would include reporting requirements as well as series of provisos or expenditure restrictions that would provide greater transparency and accountability in this proposal? [3] How does the Committee wish to proceed regarding the animal control element of this proposal?

Accompanying legislation

Proposed Ordinance 2009-0560.1, Proposed Motion 2009-0561.1 and **Proposed Motion 2009-0562.2** are the financing vehicles for to support the supplemental appropriation requests provided above in Proposed Ordinance 2009-0559.1. Bans would be sold

Analysis:

Bond Anticipation Notes:
Bond Anticipation Notes (BANs) are issued by the County to serve as a "line of credit" or short-term loan, pending the issuance of bonds to cover long-term debt financing. The use of BANs during the early stages of a project allows the County to be more precise with the aggregate amounts issued when the projects are converted to long-term financing. This short-term financing could also be provided by way of interfund loans. However, BANs are preferred in lieu of interfund borrowing due to lower interest rates. This difference is illustrated below.

Borrowing Type	Estimated Interest Rate	Annual Interest Charge on $27.2 million
BAN	0.70 to 0.80%	$190,400 to $217,600
Interfund Borrowing	1.45%	$394,400

For a $27.2 million loan, a BAN would cost approximately $175,000-$200,000 less in interest than an interfund loan.

Borrowing Type	Estimated Interest Rate	Annual Interest Charge on $29 million
BAN	0.70 to 0.80%	$203,000 to $232,000
Interfund Borrowing	1.45%	$420,500

For a $29 million loan, a BAN would cost approximately $190,000-$220,000 less in interest than an interfund loan. The Executive's proposal calls for the issuance of a BAN for one year with conversion of the borrowing to long-term debt at the conclusion of the BAN period. BANs are typically issued with a one-year maturity. If the short-term financing is needed for longer than one year, the initial series of BANs are retired through a subsequent issuance of BANs. This process can be repeated until the capital project is complete and the limited tax general obligation (LTGO) bonds for permanent financing are sold.

Fixed Interest Rate Debt:
The County typically issues bonds with a fixed interest rate whereby the bonds are issued for an extended period of time. While usually the bond period is 20-30 years, this proposal is for a 10 year period at an interest rate that is fixed at the time of the sale. The clearest comparison is to that of a home mortgage where the homeowner pays equal installments over the life of the loan.

Limited Tax General Obligation Bonds:
LTGO bonds (also known as council manic bonds) are the type of bonds commonly issued by the County. These bonds include a promise of the full faith and credit of the issuing agency. This means that the promise extends only to the taxing authority of the County without a vote of the people. Bonds issued with voter approval are referred to as unlimited tax general obligation bonds or simply general obligation bonds.

Debt Policy

Motion 11196 was enacted in May 2001. This motion enacts practices for the issuance of King County's general fund debt. The motion defines general fund debt obligations ad sets forth the purposes and uses of debt. The motion also states that the county seeks to maintain a bond rating of Aa1 (Lower than our current rating) and sets the debt limit at 5% of general fund revenues. The motion also specifies under what conditions the 5% limit can be exceeded. Last week's staff report indicated that the debt service would be approximately $3.4 million beginning in 2011. *Staff raised the issue that this might drive the debt service expenses in the general fund over the 5% policy limit set by the Council. In response the Executive has developed a way to structure the debt in such a way as to not exceed the policy limit. This will be achieved by structuring a portion of the debt for a longer term and by not borrowing the contingency amount in the initial borrowing. These changes will bring the annual debt service payments down to $2.1 million in 2011. However, this change will extend the lifespan of the debt and lead to higher interest costs.*

Proposed Ordinance 2009-0560 would authorize the issuance and public sale of one or more series of LTGO bonds up to a principal amount of $29,000,000. This amount provides for both the $27.225 million requested as well as issuance costs that the BANs are anticipating. According to Executive staff "the additional amount included in the requested BAN/bond authorization is intended to allow for the final issuance of bonds for 2009 flood expenditures under the program. Since the program contemplates issuing at least 2 series of BANs before the final bonds are issued, the additional amount is intended to allow for not only issuance costs on the initial BAN but also for issuance costs on the subsequent series of BANs and the final bonds, the capitalized interest on the 2 series of BANs, as well as to allow for the possibility that the final bonds may be issued at a discount."

Use of the BAN allows the County to control interest expenses and only convert what is actually used to long-term debt with higher rates. While the county would be borrowing the initial amount, if a portion were unused at the end of the year, that amount would not be converted to long-term debt. This allows for a structuring where the county would pay 70 or 80 basis points in interest for only one year and would not convert the debt to permanent financing. If just a bond were sold, the county would be locked in for longer-terms and at higher rates only on the portion that was actually used.

Proposed **Motions 2009-0561** would accept the bid for the purchase of the BANs and **2009-0562** would approve a bond purchase contract for the BANs. Both are drafts of a typical motion that would accept the winning bid or approve a purchase contract for the sale of the bonds. In the case of an actual sale or sales, a revised motion would be prepared for each sale and presented at full Council on the day of the sale. These motions are typically reported out of committee without recommendation.

INVITEES

Noel Treat, Chief of Staff – Executive Office
Pam Bissonette, Deputy County Executive – Executive Office
Paul Tanaka, Special Projects Manager – Executive Office
Beth Goldberg, Deputy Director, OMB
Kathy Brown, Director, FMD
Sid Bender, Budget Supervisor – OMB
Joe Rochelle, Senior Deputy Prosecuting Attorney - PAO

ATTACHMENTS

Affected facilities and planning assumptions within the Green River Valley and level of proposed protection

General Government owned facilities:

Maleng Regional Justice Center: Houses up to 1,384 inmates through the Department of Adult and Juvenile Detention (DAJD), Jail Health Services (JHS), contains courtrooms serving the Superior [19] and District Courts [2], Department of Judicial Administration staff, Prosecuting Attorney's Office (PAO) staff, Office of the Public Defender staff, and Criminal Investigation Division staff. Applying the 17,600 cubic feet per second (cfs) planning standard the USACE predicts *two to three feet* of water at ground floor elevations in the detention portion of the facility and *five to six feet* in the courthouse portions. Based on recommendations of the County's consultant a protective perimeter wall will be built around the facility at a cost of $1.1 million.

A multi-phased planning approach to relocation is proposed: [a] Currently 800 inmates are housed at the facility. Of these 200 inmates will be relocated to the King County Correctional Facility (KCCF) effective November 1st, the remaining 600 would be relocated to other facilities in the region such as Pierce, Kitsap and Snohomish when there is an imminent flood warning. Inmates in this category would be returned to reoccupy the facility if no flooding occurs. This cycle of relocation/reoccupancy would continue until the risk assessment yields that it is unsafe to reoccupy the facility. Funding for three days of sheltering are included in this proposal, which augments the existing two day capacity thereby providing for a total of five days of sheltering capacity. [b] Jail Health Services will replicate DAJD relocation efforts and [c] all other occupants would remain in the facility until a threat of imminent danger in which case they would relocate. Unlike DAJD, once these agencies leave they will not be returning to the facility until after the end of the winter storm/flood season when risk assessment can be performed. Since the planning process is fluid, there may be changes to this approach.

Because of the dynamic nature of the planning process these will not be one-time expenditures.

Earlington Building – Elections Facility: Elections is legally required to count ballots and certify election results within three weeks of Elections day, which is November 3rd this year [this timeline falls within the heart of the potential flood season]. For that reason the Executive raised the planning standard for elections to a 25,000 cfs[1] model which showed that under that scenario the building would be inundated with 6' to 10' of water. Rather than building a perimeter wall around the building at an estimated cost of from $3-5 million, under Executive authority Elections was relocated from the Earlington Building to the King County Operations Center [AOC]. This move has been completed allowing time for re-certification by the Secretary of State. Examples of work that was required related to the move are heating, installation of security systems, cabling/wiring, information

[1] 25,130 cfs assumes a 100 year event at a pool elevation of 1167

technology infrastructure and heating/ventilation/air conditioning [HVAC].

It was determined that from a cost-benefit perspective, no extraordinary measures to protect the facility would be undertaken as it would be more cost-effect to rely on insurance coverage.

The lease for the AOC is available for about eight months according to the Executive's transmittal. Therefore, this may not be a one-time expenditure.

This move was proposed at $3,219,744, of which $2,210,561 has been expended under the Executive's Emergency Declaration. Some or all of the remaining balance of $1,009,183 reprogrammed, placed into contingency or eliminated.

Black River Building: Houses the Department of Development & Environmental Services (DDES), Public Health – Environmental Health Division, Assessor and Hearing Examiner staff and is located near the Earlington Building in Renton. However, under the scenario proposed by the Executive, the 17,600 cfs standard will be applied to this facility rather than the higher planning standard of 25,000 cfs applied to Earlington. Modeling levels at 17,600 cfs show that the first floor of the building will likely remain dry. Should flooding occur a combination of approaches involving relocation to other existing County space, telecommuting or relocating to other temporary leased space will be pursued. Preventive protection would be limited to installing modest floor protection measures such as backflow prevention valves at a cost of approximately $50k.

If relocation occurs, it may not be a one-time expense.

Animal Shelter: The 17,600 cfs model yields that this facility would be under two-to-three feet of water, and that post flood restoration is cost ineffective. The proposal is to mothball the facility and relocate some of the functions. This issue is embedded in a separate proposal under consideration by the Council. On August 31, 2009 the Council adopted Motion 13050 in which the Executive was to provide a preliminary Animal Care and Control Disaster and Emergency Response Plan to Council by October 1, 2009 outlining a thorough emergency response should the King County Animal Care and Control (KCACC) Shelters be affected by severe flooding related to the Green River. The report was not transmitted, and on October 5 the Executive requested an extension of the report to October 15. The primary reason for the request is that alternative locations for the shelter have not yet been finalized. The Facilities Management Division is working diligently with KCACC and other partners to complete this task.

Aukeen District Court: This facility is owned by the County and houses District Court and Kent Municipal Court. Under an interlocal agreement the city of Kent is in the process of expanding the facility at their expense. King County policy has directed that District Court operations move out of the facility. The interlocal agreement gives the City the right to purchase the building as soon as the County can vacate the site.

One foot of flooding would occur on this site under 17,600 cfs modeling. As a preventive a perimeter wall would be installed to protect the building from floodwaters at a cost of $260,000. In addition to this wall the County is working with the City to provide perimeter protect to the rest of city of Kent's criminal justice complex which is collocated at the Aukeen site. Staff would be moved only if a flood was imminent.

This may not be a one-time expense.

Wastewater Owned facility:

Wastewater Treatment Division (WTD) – South Treatment Plant: The treatment plant is located on the border of the 17,600 cfs modeled flood zone. In a 25,000 cfs scenario it is expected to experience significant high water surrounding the facility. Operation of the plant is essential to the region for public health purposes, and also will serve as an additional drainage point for flood water entering its system. Therefore WTD is preparing to staff and operate the plant at a time when the surrounding area is flooded and available power sources potentially compromised. Plans are to shelter staff including acquiring emergency health and safety equipment and supplies necessary to support treatment plant operations crews in working 16-18 hour shifts for periods of 5-7 days at a time without leaving the plant. This approach also provides for emergency generators to be rented to back-up power equipment and power generators. Construction and installation of flood protection barriers along the east perimeter of the Plant, Interurban Pumping Station, several wastewater siphon crossings along the Green River and other miscellaneous wastewater conveyance structures are included in the plan.

These may all be one-time expenses.

General Government leased facilities within the Green River Valley and level of proposed protection:

The proposed supplemental also addresses relocation of operations in leased facilities:

Data Center (Sabey Complex): There is no plan to relocate operations; this facility is expected to remain dry even under the 25,000 cfs modeling scenario.

Meeker/Gowe Building: Space is leased in this facility for the PAO. At 17,600 cfs there is the likelihood that this facility will flood. The County has encouraged the landlord to take protective measures. If flooding is imminent the staff will be temporarily relocated to a combination of King County Courthouse and leased space.

If this occurs it may not be a one-time expense.

Kent & Renton Superior Court Probation Offices: Approximately 25 probation staff is located in leased space. They may need to be relocated to downtown Seattle along with other Superior Court staff. The Executive is also pursuing short term, co-located lease opportunities for the staff including collocating Kent staff at the probation office in Renton.

These may not be one-time expenses.

Public Health: Public health delivers services at sites in or near the 17,600 cfs inundation area. *Auburn Health Clinic* will not be flooded in this scenario but the proposed supplemental provides funding for an emergency generator in order to counter power outage risk and funding for a back-flow valve to limit water damage. The *Alder Square* facility lies in the area of risk for flood inundation and would remain operational through December 31, 2009 as it is slated for closure under the Executive's 2010 budget proposal. In the event of imminent flooding staff would be relocated to alternate lease space. *Emerald City Warehouse* contains emergency supplies and is relocated to the potential new location for the Radio Shop and EMS/Administration.

These may not be one-time expenses.

Radio Shop: Located in leased space in Tukwila, the Radio Shop is at high risk of flood damage in the 17,600 cfs flood scenario. It is an essential operation facility which supports the public safety operations of the County and most suburban cities, police, fire and utility districts. *Therefore it is being relocated before the flood season.* The Executive has identified potential sites in which EMS/Medic offices and vehicle bays in the flood zone could be collocated with the Radio Shop.

These may not be one-time expenses.

Attachment 2

Cusack, Rebecha

From: Whalen, Caroline
Sent: Wednesday, October 07, 2009 4:05 PM
To: ZZGrp, Council Members; Bristow, Tom; Cusack, Rebecha; Noris, Anne; Hamacher, Pat; Melroy, Mark
Cc: Tanaka, Paul; Cowan, Bob; Bissonnette, Pam; Goldberg, Beth; Fitzthum, Karen; Leach, David; Guy, Ken; Strouse, Michael
Subject: Report required by Motion 13085
Attachments: Emergency Contractor over $1million HHD 10-7-09 (3).xls

Motion 13085 adopted Monday by Council extended the Emergency Proclamation and waiver of procurement requirements through March 31st, 2010. It also required two reporting categories:
Bi-weekly and second business day.

Bi-Weekly reports: Must include **all waived procurements**, including new contract awards, new change orders/work orders. Must include the following:
(1) responsible agency;
(2) type of work;
(3) vendor;
(4) type of contract, for example new or altered scope;
(5) description of the contract;
(6) duration of the contract;
(7) forecasted dollar amount;
(8) if applicable, the dollar amount in excess of appropriation, and
(9) if applicable, any modifications made to previously reported contracts that changes the information provided in prior reports

Second Business Day Reporting: All contractors that receive waived procurement contract work that as an aggregate reach or exceed $1 million must be reported to council by the second business day after it is awarded.

The attached spreadsheet responds to the second day reporting requirement and is provided in two business days following the Council's adoption of Motion 13085.

Please contact Karen Fitzthum at 263-9295 or Caroline Whalen 263-9755 for additional information.

Responsible Agency	Division	Contract Type & Contract #	Contract Amount	Contract Start Date	Estimated Completion Date	Type of work	Description of the contract	Vendor	Amount included in 9-17-09 Supplemental request before council
DNRP	WTD	New Contract # TBD	$2,043,410	10/1/09	3/31/10	secure generators and auxiliary equipment to provide power to the South Treatment Plant	Lease of equipment (Goods)	NC Machinery	$2,043,410

Attachment 3

Cusack, Rebecha

From: True, Christie
Sent: Friday, October 09, 2009 8:53 AM
To: Cusack, Rebecha
Cc: Bissonnette, Pam; Jennings, Theresa; Burns, Bob; Patterson, Lorraine; Mountsier, Beth
Subject: Flood expense questions

Rebecha

The purpose of this email is to provide answers to some of the questions I have heard from you and others. Please let me know if you or others have any additional questions.

What are the impacts to the wastewater system from Green River flooding?

The most significant impacts from flooding come from the potential for the flood waters to enter the plant from the 7th Avenue entrance which is lower than the rest of the plant and from high flows entering the plant through the pipelines. The later could overwhelm the plant because during this event we may not have enough power and pumping capacity to get flow through the structures. Literally, the influent structure lids could be blown off inside the plant or the incoming pipelines could be damaged by the pressure buildup in the pipelines if we do not keep the water flowing through the plant.

Although many of the structures of the plant are visible at the surface and are on high ground, below the plant surface is a series of underground corridors, pump rooms and tunnels. The underground facilities contain all the electrical and mechanical equipment that runs the plant as well as all the utilities that move sewage and solids, chemicals, fiber optics, fire suppression systems, etc. If we get any flooding at the plant theses underground corridors and tunnels will flood and the plant will go completely down. All that we will have left are some life safety systems such as lighting. Employees will evacuate to high ground and either remain in place or be evacuated by boat (which we own and control the use of).

Similarly ,the Interurban pump station will be in the same condition without a flood barrier system and extra power

If we loose the plant and pumping station we will have to do clean-up, then repairs and restart the facilities. This expense could easily run into ten's of millions if not hundreds of millions of dollars and could take weeks even months to complete. Sewage from the majority of our service area would go untreated during this timeframe.

What are we buying to prevent these impacts from occurring?

The county is buying two major components of flood protection with this investment. First the barrier systems at the plant and pump station that will prevent flood waters from getting into the plant. Second, guaranteed power to ensure the pipes and pump stations within the plant will be able to move water through the plant, preventing damage to the incoming pipelines and preventing flooding from the pipelines themselves. The power supply comes from running our cogeneration system with digester gas and/or natural gas and from nine two-megawatt diesel generators. The cogeneration system and diesel generators must be used because the scenario we are working with includes the loss of both power feeds to the treatment plant. The only other source of power at the plant is a small generator used to support the life safety systems if needed.

In addition, by being able to keep the plant moving water through for an extended period it will reduce the amount of sewer back ups and assist in draining flood waters from the valley.

What measures have we taken to ensure employee safety?

We have developed plans to maintain employees at the plants in excess of seven days, providing food and sleeping arrangements for employees who thus far have volunteered for this assignment. If necessary we can bring in more food from areas not flooded at the north or by boat. We have a boat under our own control that we can move supplies and/or people in and out of the plant. Even if the worse happens employees can evacuate to high ground and be removed from the plant.

Will the county be plugging manholes to prevent flood water from entering the system?

At the present time we are not planning to plug county manholes, even though many local governments are doing so in the local systems. The system is designed so that air in the pipelines has a way to escape the system, this venting often occurs through the holes in manhole lids. We are concerned that during a flood siltation that there is potential for air to get trapped in the collection systems. This would lead to secondary consequences; the air pressure could cause manhole lids to actually blow off. This could cause damage or even hurt someone and then we have an open manhole exposed to flood waters. Our engineers are continuing to analyze this situation and we could alter this approach.

Under all circumstances we have told both the local governments and the public to not pop manholes to relieve flood waters. This is extremely dangerous because one could get swept into the manhole. It also can result in more people being flooded downstream.

Can any of the expense be mitigated?

Yes, we want to do what we can the to mitigate the expenses, for example, we will not purchase up front all the the diesel fuel (the appropriation has $1.2 million for fuel). If we do not use the diesel fuel then we will sell the fuel to other county operations or back to the suppliers. We still need the appropriation to purchase all of the fuel so that we can quickly order it and get it delivered if needed.

Christie True, Division Director
King County Wastewater Treatment Division
201 South Jackson, Mailstop KSC-NR-0503
Seattle, WA 98104
206-684-1236
Creating Resources from Wastewater

Attachment 4

Executive Responses to
Councilmember questions

King County

Kurt Triplett
King County Executive
401 Fifth Avenue, Suite 800
Seattle, WA 98104-1818
206-263-9600 Fax 206-296-0194
TTY Relay: 711
www.kingcounty.gov

October 5, 2009

The Honorable Dow Constantine
Chair, King County Council
Room 1200
COURTHOUSE

Dear Councilmember Constantine:

On August 31, 2009, the King County Council adopted Motion 13050, which in Part B requested that the Executive develop and submit to the County Council by October 1, 2009, a preliminary animal care and control disaster and emergency response plan for potential Green River Flooding.

The Records and Licensing Services Division has developed the plan as requested in Part B of Motion 13050. However, the plan is missing a key component, and that is the locations for the emergency animal shelters.

The Facilities Management Division is working hard to secure a replacement location for the Kent Animal Shelter, which is in the potential flood inundation zone, in addition to locations for emergency animal shelters for stray/displaced animals. A group of leaders from the State, King County, affected cities, and the Red Cross is also hard at work finalizing the human shelter locations and the corresponding co-located, owned pet shelter locations. Once these various emergency animal shelter locations have been finalized, we can complete the animal emergency response plan for the Green River flooding and submit it to the Council. Until then, I request an extension until October 15, 2009, to provide this plan to the council.

Thank you for your understanding of our need for the additional time to finalize this plan as requested by Part B of Motion 13050. Should you have any questions, please contact Carolyn Ableman, Director, Records and Licensing Services Division, at 206-296-3185.

Sincerely,

Kurt Triplett
King County Executive

cc: King County Councilmembers
ATTN: Tom Bristow, Interim Chief of Staff
Anne Noris, Clerk of the Council
Frank Abe, Communications Director
Beth Goldberg, Deputy Director, Office of Management and Budget
Bob Cowan, County Administrative Officer, Department of Executive Services (DES)
Carolyn Ableman, Director, Records and Licensing Services Division, DES
Kathy Brown, Director, Facilities Management Division, DES

Cusack, Rebecha

From: Isaacson, Mark
Sent: Thursday, October 08, 2009 6:30 PM
To: Cusack, Rebecha
Cc: Wagner, Nick; Bleifuhs, Steve; Bissonnette, Pam
Subject: FW: Green River levees - eligibility for federal assistance

Overall Issue – Participating in the Corps of Engineers' Public Law (PL) 84-99 Levee Rehabilitation and Inspection Program requires that local jurisdictions adhere to set of federal standards for levee maintenance and inspection. One of these standards requires that local jurisdiction limit the size of all vegetation and trees from the levee system. It is the Corps of Engineers' belief that vegetation growing on levees may restrict the ability to detect defects and distress and may also impair flood-fight activities during a flood event. There are also concerns that decaying tree roots or upturned root balls from fallen trees can lead to levee failures. However, many studies have shown that vegetation can provide important erosion protection for floodplains and levees by stabilizing the river slope and we have not seen levee failures due to vegetation. In some cases, King County has chosen to allow trees and vegetation systems to remain in place along levees therefore resulting in these levees to be ineligible by the Corps.

Conflicts with Federal Mandates – Riparian vegetation provides habitat important to many fish and wildlife species, including some protected by State and federal laws (Endangered Species Act), and provides important recreational and cultural benefits. Due to endangered or threatened species listed under the Endangered Species Act that are present in all King County rivers, including the Green River, removing vegetation from levees conflicts with federal requirements for recovery. As such, King County is caught between two federal mandates over the presence of vegetation on its levees. King County has been working diligently for over a decade with the Corps of Engineers, the National Marine Fisheries Service, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to help resolve this issue. These efforts continue. Additionally, the Green River is a 303(d)-listed water body for not meeting temperature standards by the State of Washington DOE.

Benefits of PL84-99 Program – The benefit of participating in the Corps' PL 84-99 Levee Rehabilitation and Inspection Program is that damaged levees are eligible for federal funding assistance following major flood events. In general, the Corps funds 80% of the costs and the local sponsor funds 20% of the costs. However, *ineligible* facilities under PL84-99 are still eligible for emergency repair and response activities during a flood event.

Currently Ineligible Lower Green River Levees – The four lower Green River levees in question are Desimone-Briscoe, Lower Russell, Upper Russell and County Road No. 8. These four levees are not eligible for PL84-99 federal assistance only because of the presence of vegetation (i.e., blackberrrys and trees) and for no other reason. The remaining eight levees in the lower Green River valley are eligible under the PL84-99 program.

Tree Cutting Efforts Underway – King County is currently undertaking actions with several contractors to cut and remove the vegetation in advance of the flood season so that the four currently ineligible levees (as noted above) will be reinstated in the PL84-99 program for eligibility before flood season. In total, approximately 360 trees are being removed from these levees. This work is being coordinated with the Corps of Engineers, cities, permitting agencies and Native American Tribes. We are also proceeding, as a second priority, with the removal of approximately 30 trees on the Tukwila 205 levee; this levee is still eligible for PL84-99 federal assistance and the work to remove the trees does not need to be completed until May 2010.

Summary – Current efforts to remove the trees along those ineligible levees will be complete prior to flood season. This will result in all levees along the lower Green River to be in compliance with PL84-99 requirements and therefore eligible for levee repair and rehabilitation funding.

Please let me know if you have any additional questions or need more information.

From: Bissonnette, Pam
Sent: Monday, October 05, 2009 12:15 PM
To: Wagner, Nick
Cc: Heahlke, Megan; Isaacson, Mark; Rochelle, Joe; Bissonnette, Pam
Subject: RE: Green River levees - eligibility for federal assistance

Yes, we can provide this information (eligible vs non-eligible levees). Mark Isaacson has been working this issue for quite a while.

I also noted that the Committee was interested in improved coordination over the levees. Mark can provide you with information about who "owns" the levees. The Colonel was correct that the levees are virtually controlled by either the Corps or the County (not the Flood Control Distric, not the cities. Joe Rochelle has been drafting agreements between the county and the cities for coordinated action such as the Colonel suggested. The Committee needs to recognize that the cities have police powers that they can use in an emergency which need to be taken into account. Joe Rochelle can cover this with the Committee.

Finally, what was not asked this morning was ... after the Corps brings all the materials into the region by 10/14, who places them? The Corps has told us they won't. It is up to the county and cities to either place, or have placed, by November 1 or as near to that date as we can. The resources to place these materials are contained in the Flood District Re-Appropriation ordinance which will be reviewed and hopefully approved by the Flood District Board on 10/12.

Do you want this information for a presentation at the next COW, or and when?

From: Wagner, Nick
Sent: Monday, October 05, 2009 11:50 AM
To: Bissonnette, Pam
Cc: Heahlke, Megan
Subject: Green River levees - eligibility for federal assistance

Pam,

During this morning's COW meeting, CM Ferguson requested follow-up on the status of the efforts to make various levees along the Green River eligible for federal assistance. (If you think I have misunderstood the request, please let me know.) Col. Wright of the USACE included in his presentation a table listing the Green River levees and identifying the ones that he considers to be currently ineligible for federal assistance. Can you provide me with information responsive to CM Ferguson's request, or can you direct me to someone who can? I understand that some of the levees in question are not managed by the county, but if you would nevertheless provide me whatever information is available, I would appreciate it. Thanks.

Nick

Nick Wagner | Council Staff | Metropolitan King County Council | 206.296.1679 | nick.wagner@kingcounty.gov

Cusack, Rebecha

From: Wickens, Don
Sent: Monday, October 05, 2009 11:25 AM
To: Cusack, Rebecha
Subject: RE: follow-up

Rebecha,

Once again, sorry for the delay.

Don

From: Cusack, Rebecha
Sent: Monday, October 05, 2009 11:20 AM
To: Wickens, Don; Mountsier, Beth
Cc: Aratani, Tim; Tanaka, Paul
Subject: RE: follow-up

Thank you!

From: Wickens, Don
Sent: Monday, October 05, 2009 6:19 AM
To: Mountsier, Beth; Cusack, Rebecha
Cc: Aratani, Tim; Tanaka, Paul
Subject: RE: follow-up

All,

We had put all of the info into a file. It obviously didn't make it to you. Here is the write up for the three different scenarios. I apologize for the delay.

Don

Operating with Grid Power 24 Mw Maximum Plant capacity - 340 mgd for 5-7 days with all the liquid, solids, odor and reuse processes in operation (expect for dewatering). Plan to divert 125-150 mgd of primary effluent directly to the Effluent Transfer System (ETS), with the remaining 150 mgd receiving secondary treatment. All the primary and secondary effluent would be disinfected and discharged via the ETS to Puget Sound. Both gas turbines will be online and running producing 8MW just in case there are power bumps or a total lose of the power grid. Plant expected to keep up with flow in a 5-year peak flow event, unless major additional inflow (e.g. pipe break, m.h. covers removed, etc). A 20-year peak flow + flooding – will exceed influent and effluent pump capacity. Interceptors will surcharge to above flood level. Backups and overflows will occur.

Operating without Grit Power, i.e., with Cogen Only 8Mw Influent is at 300-mgd, 150-mgd to Puget Sound and 150-mgd to Green River.
IF the Green River water level exceeds 126' we can not discharge from the ETS into the Green River. A diversion of 150 mgd of primary effluent directly to the ETS. This will exceed influent and effluent pump capacity. Interceptors will surcharge to above flood level. Backups and overflows will occur.

Operating with PSE gas / COGEN + 18Mw Gens

Maximum though put with Cogen – 150 mgd through the treatment plant for over the 5-7 day scenario. Three ETS duty pumps can pump about 150-170 mgd depending on the tide. The additional 18MW generators would supply the power for 4 ETS peaking pumps and other electrical equipment bring the plant back to a maximum capacity. Primary and secondary effluent would be disinfected and discharged via the ETS to 340 mgd to the Puget Sound.

From: Mountsier, Beth
Sent: Monday, October 05, 2009 6:05 AM
To: Cusack, Rebecha
Cc: Wickens, Don; Aratani, Tim; Tanaka, Paul
Subject: RE: follow-up

I didn't get anything on Friday or over the weekend.

Beth Mountsier I Senior Principal Legislative Analyst
Committee Coordinator I Regional Policy Committee and Regional Water Quality Committee
(206) 296-0319 (o) I (206) 909-0583 (c) I beth.mountsier@kingcounty.gov

---

From: Cusack, Rebecha
Sent: Sunday, October 04, 2009 7:39 AM
To: Mountsier, Beth
Cc: Wickens, Don; Aratani, Tim; Tanaka, Paul
Subject: follow-up
Importance: High

Beth:
Did you receive a write up from Don on Friday? If so could you please send it my way? Thanks. Rebecha

Cusack, Rebecha

From: Walker, Hall
Sent: Monday, October 05, 2009 5:45 PM
To: Cusack, Rebecha; Hamacher, Pat
Cc: Goldberg, Beth
Subject: AV
Attachments: 09CompareState.pdf; 08AccountStats.pdf

Rebecha,

Attached please find 2 pdfs with detail on assessed value. In 2009, the total AV for the county was $386.9 billion. One of the attachments shows how AV has changed by city between 2008 and 2009. The other attachment breaks down AV by type of account for 2008. I have requested the 2009 version of this breakdown from the Assessor's Office and will send it to you when I receive it. Please let me know if you have questions.

Thanks,
Hall

COMPARISON OF 2008 AND 2009 ASSESSED VALUATIONS AND TAXES

STATE, COUNTY, PORT, EMERGENCY MEDICAL, ROAD, FERRY, RURAL LIBRARY, CITIES AND TOWNS

District	2008 Assessed Value	2008 Levy Rate	2008 Tax	2009 Assessed Value	2009 Levy Rate	2009 Tax	Increase or Decrease Value	Increase or Decrease Tax
State	$340,995,439,577	$2.13233	$723,908,902	$386,889,727,909	$1.96268	$756,272,108	$45,894,288,332	$32,363,206
County	340,995,439,577	1.20770	409,763,053	386,889,727,909	1.09772	422,757,529	45,894,288,332	12,994,476
Port	340,995,439,577	0.22359	75,908,664	386,889,727,909	0.19700	75,911,308	45,894,288,332	2,644
Emergency Medical Services	340,995,439,577	0.30000	101,845,335	386,889,727,909	0.27404	105,590,617	45,894,288,332	3,745,282
Road District	50,633,008,012	1.61081	81,145,013	52,794,446,915	1.58880	83,476,300	2,161,438,903	2,331,287
Ferry District	340,995,439,577	0.05500	18,670,739	386,889,727,909	0.05018	19,335,328	45,894,288,332	664,589
Rural Library	207,037,171,348	0.45336	91,371,026	232,829,364,753	0.41736	95,398,383	25,792,193,405	4,027,357
Total			**$1,502,612,732**			**$1,558,741,573**		**$56,128,841**
Cities and Towns								
Seattle	$121,621,130,668	$2.77365	$335,512,466	$137,830,853,871	$2.58127	$354,064,528	16,209,723,203	$18,552,062
Algona	410,820,502	1.47032	600,931	448,417,523	1.37797	614,741	37,597,021	13,810
Auburn	5,728,381,288	1.48385	8,456,827	7,903,816,346	1.48678	11,695,553	2,175,435,058	3,238,726
Beaux Arts	115,582,991	1.17720	135,799	128,983,553	1.07289	138,143	13,400,562	2,344
Bellevue	31,485,645,842	0.92056	28,904,404	37,718,474,045	0.93684	35,251,780	6,232,828,203	6,347,376
Black Diamond	579,159,749	1.65059	949,098	647,422,007	1.52072	978,122	68,262,258	29,024
Bothell	3,275,422,445	1.35586	4,414,782	3,532,933,963	1.27256	4,470,381	257,511,518	55,599
Burien	3,845,144,599	1.39132	5,304,745	4,303,311,289	1.26467	5,399,571	458,166,690	94,826
Carnation	202,887,553	1.15077	232,075	227,655,121	1.04228	236,084	24,767,568	4,009
Clyde Hill	1,579,857,435	0.51757	816,640	1,788,185,878	0.50996	910,680	208,328,443	94,040
Covington	1,886,073,554	1.04814	1,970,599	2,119,105,094	0.98104	2,072,649	233,031,540	102,050
Des Moines	2,936,127,933	1.50065	4,365,907	3,267,951,672	1.42155	4,605,161	331,823,739	239,254
Duvall	823,259,327	1.45075	1,191,556	965,039,066	1.33445	1,285,013	141,779,739	93,457
Enumclaw	1,068,153,935	2.07236	2,190,864	1,176,367,763	1.92515	2,244,483	108,213,828	53,619
Federal Way	9,010,356,378	1.03800	9,300,030	9,881,647,631	0.97189	9,551,027	871,291,253	250,997
Hunts Point	765,357,352	0.32742	250,442	854,001,971	0.29937	255,525	88,644,619	5,083
Issaquah-0	4,976,318,353	1.30654	6,473,477	5,795,265,451	1.12524	6,495,706	818,947,098	22,229
Issaquah-1	913,681,693	1.25081	1,142,075	1,071,702,417	1.12524	1,204,791	158,020,724	62,716
Kenmore	2,941,435,130	1.32538	3,876,924	3,364,190,503	1.19968	4,015,446	422,755,373	138,522
Kent	11,556,074,644	2.36421	27,228,931	12,796,789,489	2.18029	27,815,160	1,240,714,845	586,229
Kirkland	11,452,502,304	1.27678	14,564,760	13,157,392,603	1.13712	14,908,508	1,704,890,299	343,748
Lake Forest Park	2,162,443,195	1.25981	2,703,869	2,420,450,418	1.14052	2,742,646	258,007,223	38,777
Maple Valley	2,303,190,025	1.16881	2,680,542	2,589,735,426	1.07571	2,774,251	286,545,401	93,709
Medina	2,681,076,024	0.81801	2,191,267	2,998,855,044	0.74973	2,246,940	317,779,020	55,673
Mercer Island	8,900,540,134	1.13689	10,095,166	10,332,031,615	1.00407	10,352,321	1,431,491,481	257,155
Milton	82,372,778	1.56978	127,936	91,114,076	1.51872	137,311	8,741,298	9,375
Newcastle	2,051,575,851	1.86906	3,826,473	2,333,916,338	1.69918	3,958,962	282,340,487	132,489
Normandy Park	1,278,891,064	1.08222	1,379,481	1,454,032,963	0.98250	1,423,934	175,141,899	44,453
North Bend	679,244,265	1.36787	925,510	784,290,211	1.22685	958,799	105,045,946	33,289
Pacific	459,833,283	0.99322	453,773	507,589,105	1.10000	554,948	47,755,822	101,175
Redmond	12,774,174,381	1.46929	18,738,107	14,538,857,647	1.34727	19,555,137	1,764,683,266	817,030
Renton	9,659,677,654	2.62382	25,232,353	13,233,244,780	2.36923	31,214,469	3,573,567,126	5,982,116
Sammamish	8,739,143,248	2.23534	19,509,340	9,825,920,554	2.03573	19,978,815	1,086,777,306	469,475
Seatac	4,606,470,336	2.44664	11,221,572	4,909,121,511	2.33931	11,433,716	302,651,175	212,144
Shoreline	7,293,134,085	1.26533	9,113,826	8,023,085,077	1.16412	9,230,441	729,950,992	116,615
Skykomish	24,534,629	2.15042	51,850	33,049,858	1.62584	53,046	8,515,229	1,196
Snoqualmie	1,725,358,551	2.46442	4,247,454	2,097,243,745	2.23736	4,687,659	371,885,194	440,205
Tukwila	4,450,243,674	2.56911	11,400,106	5,188,404,039	2.37324	12,283,193	738,160,365	883,087
Woodinville	2,555,578,871	1.12184	2,860,016	2,880,050,636	1.02109	2,934,231	324,471,765	74,215
Yarrow Point	761,575,842	0.59116	449,446	874,780,695	0.54207	473,492	113,204,853	24,046
Total Cities and Towns	**$290,362,431,565**		**$585,091,418**	**$334,095,280,994**		**$625,207,362**	**$43,732,849,429**	**$40,115,944**

ACCOUNT STATISTICS
2008 TAX ROLL

TAXABLE REAL PROPERTY ACCOUNTS

Account Type	Number of Accounts	Assessed Value
Single Family Residential	554,681	$224,151,883,174
Multiple Family Residential	26,849	25,810,486,982
Manufacturing	3,062	8,673,833,095
Commercial	22,821	50,972,852,939
Agricultural not in Current Use Program	101	81,049,000
Agricultural, Forest Lands, Open Space and Timberland in Current Use	4,940	1,675,853,706
State Public Service	288	444,889,723
Other Real Property	39,036	8,006,109,521
TOTAL	651,778	$319,816,958,140

PERSONAL PROPERTY ACCOUNTS

Account Type	Number of Accounts	Assessed Value
Agricultural Machinery and Equipment	60	$20,575,469
Industrial Machinery and Equipment	2,955	2,088,564,298
All other Machinery, Equipment, Furniture, etc.	49,297	5,699,148,265
Taxable Improvements on Exempt Property	166	340,285,839
All Other Items of Personal Property	6,706	2,508,617,193
Supplies/Materials Not for Sale	126	414,440,906
Aggregate Deductions	851	(5,354,672)
State Public Service	3,437	6,083,671,293
TOTAL	63,598	$17,149,948,591

CURRENT USE AND DESIGNATED FOREST LAND PROGRAM ACCOUNTS

Classification	Applications Approved	Parcels Approved	Acres	Parcels Removed	Acres Removed	Total Parcels in Program	Total Acres in Program	Total Market Value	Total Current Use Value
Farm & Agricultural	14	19	242	4	17	1,924	30,515	$829,435,120	$381,616,648
Timber Land	13	13	164	0	0	375	3,203	161,253,900	95,890,082
Open Space	79	87	426	19	206	1,003	6,585	521,232,200	360,420,123
Forest Land	0	0	0	58	781	1,638	263,190	1,511,921,220	837,926,853

Cusack, Rebecha

From: Brown, Kathy
Sent: Friday, October 09, 2009 1:23 PM
To: Cusack, Rebecha
Cc: Tanaka, Paul; Nakatsu, Ken; Hills, Jennifer-Risk Mgt; Bissonnette, Pam; Faquir, Ameer; Treat, Noel; Cowan, Bob; Goldberg, Beth
Subject: Fw: Questions From Rebecca Concerning Insurance

Rebecha,
Here is the information you requested regarding insurance. (Thanks Jennifer!)
--Kathy

From: Hills, Jennifer-Risk Mgt
To: Faquir, Ameer; Brown, Kathy; Nakatsu, Ken
Cc: Tanaka, Paul; Mitchell, Keith
Sent: Fri Oct 09 11:45:04 2009
Subject: RE: Questions From Rebecca Concerning Insurance
Ameer-please see our responses below:

- Are there any cancellation triggers in our policies that we should be concerned about generically?
  Our insurance policy with FM Global requires that they give us 60 days notice of cancellation other than for non-payment of premium. The concern is, will they cancel our coverage with the proper notice, or will they non-renew our coverage at our next renewal in September 2010. It has been our insurance broker's experience that cancellation is not FM Global's normal business practice. FM Global is known for managing their exposure to loss through increased deductibles and a cap on limits for catastrophic perils. In the event of catastrophic flooding in the Green River valley, it is reasonable to assume that some insureds will be viewed more favorably during renewal negotiations than others. There is no doubt that any insurer will view King County as a better risk if we construct a flood protection wall or take other pre-loss measures to protect our assets. If flood insurance becomes unaffordable or unavailable during the duration of the increased exposure over the next 3-5 years, we may need to rely solely on loss prevention measures.

- Same question, relative to whether we build the wall or not, with the caveat of potential multiple events in the same year (multiple floods)?
  FM Global is not requiring the county to construct the wall. Their cancellation triggers would be unchanged. Whether we build a wall or not, insurance coverage under our property policy is triggered by direct physical damage to our facility. Currently, mitigation does not affect policy coverage, but more importantly, it directly impacts the amount of the loss and length of the recovery. Risk Management recommends constructing a protective wall or taking other prudent loss control measures to protect the county's assets. FM Global is currently considering lowering the MRJC flood deductible from $500,000 to $250,000 if we construct the flood protection wall.

- Are there triggers for requiring KC to take mitigation efforts after such a multiple event?
  There are no current requirements in our insurance policy for mitigation measures. A claims adjuster handling the loss may make recommendations on mitigation efforts. However, **FEMA** has long used a proactive approach to the prevention of further loss and eligibility for funding. In many of their Public Assistance responses, they have required mitigation projects to prevent similar damage from re-occurring events. In addition, with all events they require insurance to be procured subsequent to an event in order to receive funding for the initial event. It is possible that without our proactive mitigation measures, insurance subsequent to the event may become unavailable or extremely costly.

- Does the policy have language regarding premium or deductible acceleration if there is any type flood event, whether it be single or multiple?
  There is no escalation provision. The Flood deductible will continue to apply per location for each flood event.

- Any other language that is within the theme that I've laid out here, please comment??? Or Kathy, if I've missed anything, please chime in?

We have asked FM to supply information on how they determine a single event versus multiple events if there are repeated occasions when flood waters enter our locations.

Jennifer Hills, ARM-P, CRM
Director, Office of Risk Management
King County Department of Executive Services
400 Yesler Way, #410
Seattle, WA 98104
Phone: 206.205.1649 Fax: 206.296.0949
jennifer.hills@kingcounty.gov

From: Faquir, Ameer
Sent: Thursday, October 08, 2009 3:49 PM
To: Hills, Jennifer-Risk Mgt
Cc: Brown, Kathy
Subject: Questions From Rebecca Concerning Insurance

Hi Jennifer,

In our session with Rebecca on MRJC and other flood supplemental concerns, she asked that we inquire and provide the following type of info: (We may have discussed these already?)

- Are there any cancellation triggers in our policies that we should be concerned about generically?
- Same question, relative to whether we build the wall or not, with the caveat of potential multiple events in the same year (multiple floods)?
- Are there triggers for requiring KC to take mitigation efforts after such a multiple event?
- Does the policy have language regarding premium or deductible acceleration if there is any type flood event, whether it be single or multiple?
- Any other language that is within the theme that I've laid out here, please comment??? Or Kathy, if I've missed anything, please chime in?

If you need to contact me before responding, please do by cell: 206.399.5074.

Best,

Ameer

Cusack, Rebecha

From: Bissonnette, Pam
Sent: Friday, October 09, 2009 3:59 PM
To: Cusack, Rebecha
Cc: Tanaka, Paul
Subject: RE: Water supply

I responded about local contamination of water supplies in a subsequent email. As to contamination of the Duwamish, yes, that will occur. Nothing we can do about it once it floods. DOE is working w/their list of businesses that have hazardous materials onsite now to get them to move out, or move up, these materials so the flood won't reach them. Where this can't happen, they are working w/businesses to provide containment from the flood. DOE has informed us that they are taking the lead on this since they have the data and the jurisdiction. To the extent these materials get into the flood waters and out into the Green and Duwamish, it will require cleanup after the fact, presumably something FEMA would fund.

From: Cusack, Rebecha
Sent: Friday, October 09, 2009 3:49 PM
To: Bissonnette, Pam
Subject: RE: Water supply

Pam: thx for getting this to me. So, as I read this it's about supply? What about contamination including Seattle & the Duwamish if it's affected? r

---

From: Bissonnette, Pam
Sent: Friday, October 09, 2009 3:46 PM
To: Cusack, Rebecha; Tanaka, Paul
Subject: RE: Water supply

We have met w/the water suppliers to the Valley. They are the cities themselves, and a district or two as mostly retailers. Auburn has its own supply. The rest get water from Seattle.

Their main issue is power outages. Most have to pump to keep their systems pressurized, and in Auburn's case to pump from their aquifer. Their systems will be compromised based on whether they keep their primary power running, or they have backup generation. We don't have a lot of information about what they have. Another issue for them is their telemetry systems may go down. Like us, much of their operations are automated or at least controlled from remote sites via telecommunications. If communications go down they also will have no way to remotely control their systems. They will either move to manual controls, or shut down if their manual controls are flooded. The public information we have jointly developed with Puget, wastewater, and the water suppliers is that utilities will be down. They should not expect, in the event of a flood, to have water, sewer, or power.

As to mitigations that the water suppliers are installing, again they haven't shared this. Neither has Puget Power. They don't like publicizing due to disclosing the vulnerability of their systems for Homeland Security reasons. We have in the past asked for this type of information from some of the districts and Seattle when approving their water supply plans, and been denied on security grounds. We haven't pushed it.

If you need more let me know and I will dig deeper.

From: Cusack, Rebecha
Sent: Friday, October 09, 2009 3:36 PM
To: Bissonnette, Pam; Tanaka, Paul
Subject: Water supply

Will any of the regional water supply be contaminated if the Green River Valley floods? If so, what are the envisioned mitigation measures.

Comparison of Flood Protection Methods

Category	Material			
	Bladders	Blocks	Sand Bags	HESCO Bags
Availability	5 - 6 Weeks	1 - 2 Weeks	3 - 4 Weeks	3 - 4 Weeks
Installation Timing	During Flood	Before Flood	Before Flood	Before Flood
Installation Effort	Low	Medium	High	Medium
Number of uses	Multiple	Multiple	Single	Varies
Aesthetics (relative)	Good	Average to Poor	Poor	Average to Poor
Vandalism Security	Low	High	Medium	Medium
UV Durability	No	Yes	No	No
Overall Durability	Low	High	Low	Medium
Width (at 3' High)	7.5'	2'	6'	3'
Cost (3' High X 100' L)	$94	$85	$390	$75

Key: Better / Average / Worse