



King County

Metropolitan King County Council

STAFF REPORT

Proposed No.:	2020-0387	Name:	Clifton Curry
----------------------	-----------	--------------	---------------

SUBJECT

A MOTION acknowledging receipt of the second of two independent monitor report on the implementation of Ordinance 18637, Sections 2 through 5, as they relate to confinement of juveniles in county detention facilities in compliance with the 2019-2020 Biennial Budget Ordinance, Ordinance 18835, Section 52, as amended by Ordinance 18930, Section 36, Proviso P8.

SUMMARY

As part of its deliberations on the 2019-2020 Budget, the Council added a proviso that required that the Executive to continue its engagement of an independent monitor to review the impact of the changes to solitary confinement on the youth in detention. This proposed motion would accept the second of two required monitoring reports. These reports are a continuation of the independent monitoring related to the County's implementation of Ordinance 18637 which placed significant new restrictions on the use of solitary confinement of youth. In this report, the monitors reviewed operations at both the Youth Services Center, the Children and Families Justice Center (CFJC) and the department's adult facilities. This monitoring report covers the status of implementation of Ordinance 18637 during the period January to June 2020 and also follows up on earlier monitor reports. The monitors reported on the use of restrictive housing for youth in both juvenile and adult facilities, reviewed operations, and made a variety of recommendations to improve processes and operations. The report appears to meet the requirements of the proviso.

BACKGROUND

Through the efforts of the County Council, Executive, and separately elected criminal justice officials, King County has taken significant steps to improve its criminal justice system for both adults and juveniles. King County has taken significant steps to improve its criminal justice system for both adults and juveniles.¹ The County has adopted policy frameworks for the use of secure detention while also establishing policy direction to develop alternatives to secure detention, as well as the need for treatment services in the

¹ Juvenile Justice Operational Master Plan Ordinance 13916, adopted August 7, 2000 and the Adult Justice Operational Master Plan Ordinance 14430, adopted July 22, 2002.

community to reduce recidivism and improve public safety. As a result, even though the County's overall population has grown, the number of youths arrested, charges referred, charges filed, and the use of secure detention for juveniles has declined significantly over the past 15 years.

As part of its reform efforts, King County participates in the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI), which is a national juvenile justice improvement initiative geared towards changing how detention should be used for youth. JDAI has been implemented in 300 jurisdictions in 30 states and the District of Columbia.² The King County Juvenile Court began implementing JDAI strategies in 1998 with the implementation of Juvenile Justice Operational Master Plan. The county became a formal JDAI site in 2004 joining nine other Washington State counties (Adams, Benton, Clark, Franklin, Mason, Pierce, Snohomish, Spokane, and Whatcom). The county has experienced significant positive results from JDAI and other system changes, reducing the use of secure detention while also reducing overall juvenile crime in the county. The County uses JDAI standards for its programs and detention.

Juvenile Detention Programs The King County Department of Adult and Juvenile Detention's Juvenile Division has operated the county's juvenile detention system since 2002. Under state law, King County is required to operate a detention facility for juvenile offenders. While detained, youth receive a medical assessment to determine if the youth is in crisis or needs immediate medical or mental health intervention. The youth also receives an assessment to determine the youth's appropriate placement in detention and any special issues that may need to be addressed.

Most juveniles detained in King County were housed at the Youth Services Center, but now are housed in the Judge Patricia Clarke Children and Family Justice Center (CFJC). The County's average daily population (ADP) of 32 youth, of which 27 were detained on juvenile matters and five were held pending adjudication in adult court through June 2020.³ According to department staff, juvenile detention staff has utilized a Behavior Management system that allows youth to earn Tier Levels based on positive behavior which increases their programming time outside of school and gym. However, this 30-year old system is being replaced with a new system with significant changes in how discipline is used. The Seattle School District provides regular and special education and the school is operated as part of the detention facility. Detainees also receive at least one hour of physical exercise in the facility's gym daily.

In addition, prior to 2018, some youth who were charged as adults were housed at the department's adult facilities rather than the County's juvenile detention facility at the Youth Service Center.⁴ Most often, an average of five to fifteen youth were held at the Maleng

² Annie E. Casey Foundation, Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative, <http://www.aecf.org/work/juvenile-justice/jdai/>

³ Detention and Alternatives Report, Department of Adult and Juvenile Detention, June 2020.

⁴ Washington State law allows prosecutors to petition to transfer a youth to adult court, at the discretion of the juvenile court. This type of transfer is known as a *discretionary decline* of jurisdiction. In addition to discretionary transfer, the 1994 Washington State Legislature passed the Youth Violence Reduction Act establishing an *automatic decline*

Regional Justice Center. In an Executive Order signed on November 2, 2017, the Executive directed that all youth under 18 who have been charged as adults will be housed at the Youth Services Center.⁵ All of the youth in adult facilities were transferred to the Youth Services Center by December 2017.⁶

Use of “Solitary Confinement” for Adults and Youth Solitary confinement is a form of imprisonment in which an inmate is isolated from any human contact, often with the exception of members of prison staff, for 22–24 hours a day, with a sentence ranging from hours to decades. Solitary confinement can also be called room confinement, segregated housing, protective custody, restrictive housing, restricted housing, time out, restricted engagement, close confinement, special management unit, administrative detention, non-punitive isolation, or temporary isolation.

While solitary confinement can be useful in certain circumstances—either for the protection of the inmate, other inmates, or staff, there has been significant research that calls into question the regular use of solitary confinement for youth. Research has shown that, for youth especially, this type of confinement can adversely affect brain the individual.

JDAI detention facility standards prohibit the use of room confinement for reasons other than as a temporary response to behavior that threatens immediate harm to a youth or others. The standards reflect the advice of dozens of practitioners and nationally recognized experts that room confinement should not be used for discipline, punishment, administrative convenience, or other reasons.⁷ Further, the Council of Juvenile Correctional Administrators reports that isolating or confining a youth in his/her room should be used only to protect the youth from harming him/herself or others and if used, should be for a short period and supervised.⁸

Restricting the Use of Solitary Confinement In King County In December 2017, the Council adopted Ordinance 18673 which placed significant restrictions on when youth could be placed in solitary confinement or isolation.⁹ This legislation had three specific elements.

(which is also known as “auto-decline”) of jurisdiction to the adult court for certain youth. Youth ages 16 and 17 are automatically “declined” to the adult court when charged with the violent felonies. Prior to 2017, some youth who were charged as adults (usually “auto-declines” aged 16 and 17) had been housed at the department’s adult facilities. Most often, the youth are held at the Maleng Regional Justice Center. However, federal law requires any inmate under the age of 18 must be kept separated from adult inmates—known as “sight and sound separation.”

⁵King County Executive Order “Youth Charged as adults to be housed at the Youth Services Center,” November 2, 2017

⁶King County Executive Order “Youth Charged as adults to be housed at the Youth Services Center,” November 2, 2017 new release, <http://kingcounty.gov/elected/executive/constantine/news/release/2017/November/02-executive-order-jvenile-justice.aspx>

⁷ JDAI Tools and Resources, Conditions of Confinement, Use of Room Solitary Confinement/Isolation, <http://www.jdaihelpdesk.org/SitePages/conditionsofconfinement.aspx>

⁸ The Council of Juvenile Correctional Administrators, Toolkit: Reducing the Use of Isolation, Council of Juvenile Correctional Administrators, March 2015

<http://ejca.net/attachments/article/751/CJCA%20Toolkit%20Reducing%20the%20Use%20of%20Isolation.pdf>

⁹ Ordinance 18637, adopted December 21, 2017.

The first element banned the use of solitary confinement for youth detained by King County, “except as necessary to prevent significant physical harm to the juvenile detained or to others when less restrictive alternatives would be ineffective,” regardless of the facility that the youth is held. The ordinance defines “solitary confinement” as the placement of an incarcerated person in a locked room or cell alone with minimal or no contact with persons other than guards, correctional facility staff, and attorneys. The ordinance further notes that using different terminology for this practice, such as room confinement, segregated housing, protective custody, restrictive housing, restricted housing, time out, restricted engagement, close confinement, special management unit, administrative detention, non-punitive isolation, temporary isolation or reflection cottage, among others, does not exempt a practice from being considered solitary confinement.

Secondly, this ordinance also placed the requirement on the department’s juvenile division to ensure that all juveniles detained in any King County detention facility are given reasonable access to the defense bar, juvenile probation counselors and social service providers and educators in a timely manner.

Finally, the ordinance requests that the Executive appoint an independent monitor or monitors who have expertise in juvenile detention operations and corrections, officer safety and security and on trauma-informed behavioral modification practices to monitor and report on the implementation of this ordinance.

While the ordinance bans the use of solitary confinement, it allows the practice in instances where, because of safety, security or another reason, when no less restrictive option is available. According to department staff, youth have not been subject to solitary confinement at the Youth Services Center since the early 1990’s. The department’s current practice for youth mirrors the national standards as promulgated by JDAI and the Council of Juvenile Correctional Administrators. However, youth have been confined to their room for disciplinary purposes, known as “room confinement.” When the “auto-decline” youth were moved to juvenile detention facilities they became subject to these restrictions on the use of isolation and solitary confinement. In addition, the auto-decline youth now have access to all services for youth in detention when detained in juvenile facilities (such as access to education).

The Ordinance defines the term “juvenile” to include any person currently confined in a King County detention facility for a charge that was filed in juvenile court or based on conduct that occurred before the person’s 18th birthday, and where confinement begins before their 18th birthday. Therefore, the Ordinance applies to:

- All juveniles held in juvenile facilities;
- Youths who turn 18 (age out) and are transferred to an adult facility; and,

- Youth who are older than 18 and are booked on a juvenile probation/parole matter these latter two categories are identified in the adult facilities as “Adult Age Outs” (AAOs).¹⁰

Prior Monitor Report Findings The Executive engaged the first independent monitor and independent monitoring services began on July 1, 2018.¹¹ As required, the first report provided information on the use of solitary confinement (the monitor reviewed instances of the use of solitary confinement but also looked at the use of “program modifications” or PMs for youth to document a disciplinary action¹²) looking at the cumulative use and whether it was used for more than four hours in any given instance. The report noted that there was no automated means of collecting this data, and that she relied on hand-written materials kept by YSC staff.¹³ As a result, the monitor reviewed all PMs in July 2018, looking at why the PM was given and also developing demographic information on the individuals who received PMs.

Based on the review of PMs in July 2018, the monitor concluded that there were some data issues with the documentation of PMs, inconsistencies in how PMs were applied, and that it was sometimes difficult to determine whether youth were remained in their rooms for longer than four hours (the monitor, in some instances, could not determine from the documentation whether a youth stayed in their room for extended periods out of choice or because of the PM).

The reports also considered restrictive housing matters at DAJD adult facilities, the King County Correctional Facility (KCCF) and Maleng Regional Justice Center (MRJC). The report found widespread use of restrictive housing of youth at KCCF and MRJC based on the risk assessment classification received at booking, as well as during placement into restrictive housing. The monitor noted that the classification system at the adult facilities does not align well with that used by juvenile facilities. Some of the recommendations made included: policy revisions to implement mandates under the Ordinance, monthly tracking of restrictive housing data, reconsideration of the inmate classification scheme, and distribution to appropriate staff of a list of adult facility detainees who fall under the Ordinance.

¹⁰ The DAJD Adult Division and prior reports initially referred to AAOs as “Juvenile Ordinance Inmates (JOIs).”

¹¹ Ms. Stephanie Vetter, Senior Consultant and JDAI Advisor, Center for Children's Law and Policy, working as a private contractor and juvenile justice expert in the areas of JDAI, the federal Prison Rape Elimination Act, adolescent development, juvenile detention operations and corrections, officer safety and security, and trauma-informed behavioral modification practices.

¹² Program Modifications (PMs) are the main mechanism used at YSC to respond to youth infractions and misbehaviors and used in addition to verbal warnings and cool-down periods. PMs are a sanction (for disciplinary purposes) that result in a loss of normal programming time and free time for youth. Program Modifications and “Shifts” are used interchangeably and refer to a youth’s normal programming being altered. It is during the PMs that periods of solitary confinement can occur while youth are in their cell. To determine whether or not solitary confinement had been used during the evaluation period and how it manifests at YSC, all PMs for July 2018 were reviewed.

¹³ One of the recommendations of the report is to improve forms and look for ways to have a more comprehensive reporting structure.

The Council accepted the monitor's first report as Motion 15256, December 3, 2018. The Executive transmitted the required second report on January 30, 2019 which was heard by the Committee in March 2019. The second report noted that DAJD had made progress in implementing the elements of the Ordinance including policy and practice improvements and the creation of data collection strategies but that policies and procedure at adult facilities were not fully implemented at the time of the review.

Proviso Requirements As part of its budget deliberations during the Second Omnibus Budget Supplemental, the Council added a proviso that required that the Executive to continue the use of an independent monitor to review the impact of the changes to solitary confinement on youth and DAJD operations.¹⁴ The proviso required that:

Of this appropriation, \$200,000 shall not be expended or encumbered until the executive transmits two reports on the implementation of Ordinance 18637, Sections 2 through 5, as they relate to confinement of juveniles in county detention facilities, each accompanied by a motion that should acknowledge receipt of each respective report and reference the subject matter, the proviso's ordinance, ordinance section and proviso number in both the title and body of the motion, and a motion acknowledging receipt of each report is passed by the council. Upon passage of each motion, \$100,000 is released for encumbrance or expenditure.

The two reports required by this proviso should build on the two reports submitted on practices related to the confinement of juveniles required by Ordinance 18637, Section 6. The two reports required by this proviso shall be prepared by an appointed, independent monitor or monitors who, either alone or together, have extensive knowledge of the processes and procedures by which the reports required by Ordinance 18637 were generated and, in accordance with Ordinance 18637, Section 6, the monitor or monitors shall have expertise in adolescent development, juvenile detention operations and corrections, officer safety and security and trauma-informed behavioral modification practices. The monitor or monitors shall report on the implementation of Ordinance 18637, Sections 2 through 5, and the report shall also include, but not be limited to:

- A. A review of the number of times solitary confinement was used during the evaluation period;*
- B. An evaluation of the documentation of the circumstances for the use of solitary confinement;*
- C. A determination whether, for each instance solitary confinement was used, it did not exceed four hours;*
- D. An evaluation of the documentation of supervisory review before the use of solitary confinement;*
- E. An evaluation of the documentation that youth in solitary confinement have*

¹⁴ Ordinance 18766, adopted September 18, 2018, contained the original proviso requirement for two monitoring reports, one in 2018 and the second due in 2019. The adoption of Ordinance 18835, the 2019-20 Biennial Budget, continued the requirement for subsequent monitoring reports.

been assessed or reviewed by medical professionals;

F. An evaluation of the documentation of how youth subject to solitary confinement had full access to education, programming and ordinary necessities, such as medication, meals and reading material, when in solitary confinement; and

G. An assessment of the progress by the department of adult and juvenile detention juvenile division on implementing the recommendations outlined in the two reports on practices related to the confinement of juveniles as required by Ordinance 18637, Section 6.

In preparing and completing the reports required by this proviso, the monitor or monitors shall consult with stakeholders, including representatives of the King County Juvenile Detention Guild (Department of Adult and Juvenile Detention - Juvenile Detention) representing employees in the department of adult and juvenile detention juvenile division.

The first report should cover December 1, 2018, through July 30, 2019. The second report should cover August 1, 2019 through March 31, 2020.

The Executive engaged the required independent monitor and independent monitoring services began on July 1, 2019.¹⁵ The Executive transmitted the required first report on February 21, 2020. Motion 15680¹⁶ accepted the first of two required independent monitoring reports of the implementation of Ordinance 18637 which prohibits solitary confinement of juveniles at both juvenile and adult detention facilities.

ANALYSIS

This second report assesses progress by the King County Department of Adult and Juvenile Detention (DAJD) to implement Council Ordinance 18637, which restricts the use of juvenile detainee solitary confinement, referred to as “restrictive housing” by DAJD. Restrictive housing is prohibited for disciplinary purposes and only can be used when necessary to prevent imminent and significant physical harm to the juvenile or others and less restrictive alternatives were unsuccessful.

Consequently, in this report, the monitors reviewed operations at the Youth Services Center, the CFJC and the department’s adult facilities. This monitoring report covers aspects of the Ordinance implementation during the period January to June 2020 and also follows up on the earlier reports on initial efforts by DAJD for prior periods.

The independent monitoring team reports that DAJD encountered a number of unexpected challenges during the January – June 2020 reporting period, some shared by others and some unique to the Department. First, early in this period, DAJD and the rest of King County formulated and began implementing plans to help prevent the spread of the coronavirus. By early March, nonessential employees began working remotely from

¹⁵ Independent monitoring team members are Kathryn Olson, Bob Scales, and Kate Eaves.

¹⁶ Adopted September 15, 2020.

their homes, public access to detention and jail facilities was greatly reduced, and efforts were made to release a significant number of detainees, allowing for more social distancing within the facilities. Also, shortly after the Juvenile Division made the move its new facility, the Children and Family Justice Center (CFJC), there was a water main rupture that caused a flood on most of the first floor of the facility, with repairs continuing late into the summer. After weeks of protests following the police officer-involved death of George Floyd in Minneapolis, on July 25 Seattle demonstrators broke through a fence in the construction area next to the new juvenile facility, started a fire, and broke facility windows and damaged numerous vehicles in the employee parking lot. At another point, demonstrators attempted to enter the King County Correctional Facility (KCCF) and caused property damage to the building.

Despite these many challenges over the past six months, the monitors report that the DAJD continued making strides to limit the use of restrictive housing, while keeping detainees and employees safe and secure.

Review of Policies, Procedures and Data on the Use of Confinement The report notes that the Juvenile and Adult Divisions have developed processes to track and evaluate whether policy requirements for placement, review, and assessment of each instance of restrictive housing were met. The report also indicates that, under a settlement with Columbia Legal Services, this information is shared quarterly. The monitors note that many of the Juvenile Division detention officers (JDO)s, supervisors, and other staff have greatly improved compared to the prior review period and have been providing more detail about restrictive housing events, and a new Restrictive Housing Assessment Checklist form implemented in July 2020 provided more guidance to encourage documentation of the specifics involved. The monitors stated that the checklist is very helpful for the original decision-making process and for anyone reviewing the restrictive housing event to have the pertinent details clearly stated to establish there was a *risk of imminent and significant physical harm*. Providing such detail will also help reduce the inordinate amount of time spent by staff after the fact ascertaining information about the event for reporting and other purposes. The monitors also state that records were reviewed to confirm that the information reported appeared to accurately summarize all restrictive housing events and note any irregularities. The monitors did note that DAJD staff could improve documentation of individualized plans for reintegrating youth after the stint in restrictive housing.

The monitors noted that while it appears that the Juvenile Division remains committed to building a culture dedicated to restorative principles, “a reset of sorts would be useful at this time, to clarify the place of restoration practices in the larger set of interventions available and appropriate to use with individual youth in the juvenile facility.” According to the monitors, while “the Juvenile Division continues to face a variety of challenges, providing direction to staff and demonstrating commitment about how restorative practice goals fit with other priorities would be beneficial.” The monitors report that, given the low numbers of youth in the juvenile facility at this point, the Juvenile Division should consider using a more individualized case management model, involving all staff in the process so there is a consistent theme of working with each youth.

Adult Division According to the report, the DAJD Adult Divisions use a different process for tracking restrictive housing for AAOs. First, the King County Correctional Facility (KCCF) and Maleng Regional Justice Center (MRJC) use a system of publishing daily lists of AAOs, including those who initially were detained at YSC and transferred to an adult facility after turning 18 along with those individuals who are 18 through 24 years old and returning to detention for a probation or parole violation related to their initial juvenile offense. The daily lists also provide booking information, jail location, and other brief details about the detainee and the lists are distributed to supervisors and managers at the adult facilities.

According to the monitors, if an AAO is placed in restrictive housing, an AAO Restrictive Housing Monitoring Checklist (AAO Checklist) is used for documentation. Similar to the form used by CFJC for restrictive housing, the AAO Checklist has space to indicate the date, time, and security issue for placing an AAO in a Cool Down, not to exceed two hours. If the AAO's status changes to restrictive housing, the date, time, and reason for placement is to be entered on the form, and a Sergeant and Shift Commander must be consulted, with an immediate request for a medical evaluation from Jail Health Services (JHS) and a psychiatric evaluation, if necessary. The form states that restrictive housing must be in response to behavior that creates a risk of imminent and significant physical harm and has a space to indicate the reasons for placement and uses a key that includes threats to staff, threats towards others, physically aggressive, and destructive behavior.

The monitors indicate that, in comparison to the Juvenile Division, adult facilities have relatively few instances of restrictive housing for AAOs (the report shows just four instances for review period). Furthermore, AAOs comprise a very small percentage of the overall adult facility detainee population—only four in second quarter of 2020.

The monitors report that adult facilities reportedly provide AAOs access to education and programs in accordance with state law. However, When COVID-19 restrictions began in March 2020, it was difficult for volunteers, teachers, and others to lose direct access to the youth. From the perspective of Juvenile Division staff, it was challenging to lose those resources and have significantly more responsibility in meeting programmatic and educational goals without outside support, at least initially. Through a partnership with the Chaplaincy Program, CFJC acquired and installed webcams and microphones, allowing for remote education since in-person teaching no longer was an option with COVID-19 concerns. Initially, remote capability was set up in the CFJC multipurpose room, with units rotating through for one class a day. By mid-April, the classroom in each unit was equipped for remote academic instruction and programming, with half-day classes available for all youth. Even in the virtual context, education and programming schedules had to account for the need to continue keeping certain detained youth separate from each other, such as when there were court ordered separations or when females were present in the detainee population. Systems were devised to meet those requirements. Also, to facilitate the education process, the Juvenile Programs Manager developed a method of picking up lesson plans and work packets the teachers provide, deliver them to the unit classrooms, collect completed assignments for grading and

comments by the teachers, and then redistribute them to the youth. While many programs have been put on hold due to COVID-19, others pivoted over time to work with youth remotely.

In the monitoring report for the period July through December 2018, there was a recommendation to improve the variety and volume of programming for AAOs in the adult jails to reflect adolescent development and JDAI standards. However, DAJD concluded in a December 2019 report to King County Council¹⁷ that providing similar programming and services to AAOs in adult facilities is not feasible, as it “would require substantial investments in new or expanded facilities and staff.” Since submitting its December 2019 report, DAJD’s ability to expand educational and programming opportunities for AAOs has been further impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic, at the same time that the AAO population in the Adult Divisions has decreased significantly.

This report appears to meet the requirements of the proviso.

INVITED:

- John Diaz, Director, Department of Adult and Juvenile Detention
- Allen Nance, Director, Juvenile Division, Department of Adult and Juvenile Detention

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Transmittal Letter

¹⁷ Adopted as Motion 15679, September 15, 2020.



King County

Dow Constantine

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

September 30, 2020

The Honorable Claudia Balducci
Chair, King County Council
Room 1200
COURTHOUSE

Dear Councilmember Balducci

This letter transmits the second of two reports on the implementation of Ordinance 18637, Sections 2 through 5, related to confinement of juveniles in county detention facilities in compliance with Ordinance 18835, Section 52, as amended by Ordinance 18930, Section 36, Proviso P8. Also included is a proposed motion, that if approved, acknowledges receipt of the report.

The Council acknowledged receipt of the first report via Motion 15680. The Executive worked with the Council to adjust reporting periods and the due dates for both reports earlier this year. In addition the Council also extended transmittal due dates for work products by sixty days in consideration of the impacts from the COVID-19 pandemic and statewide mitigation efforts.

The enclosed report recognizes the Department of Adult and Juvenile Detention's (DAJD) continued work to fully implement and operationalize policies and practices to reduce the use of restricted housing in both the adult and juvenile divisions. The report acknowledges the challenges over the last six months associated with controlling the spread of COVID-19 while balancing access to programming for young people in the County's care. This report also addresses continued challenges with tracking and reporting uses of restricted housing.

The last monitor's report included 13 recommendations for improvement to department policy and practices, and the enclosed report details the department's response and plans for addressing those recommendations. The recommendations and responses include changes to DAJD's process for transferring young adults between the juvenile and adult divisions, as well as changes to policy language and terminology used in the department, particularly in the adult divisions.

This report furthers the County's Strategic Plan goal of efficient, accountable regional and local government. It is estimated that this report required approximately 100 staff hours costing approximately \$6000 to produce.

The Honorable Claudia Balducci

September 30, 2020

Page 2

If your staff have any questions, please contact John Diaz, Director, Department of Adult and Juvenile Detention, at 206-263-3669.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Dow Constantine". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a horizontal line extending to the right.

Dow Constantine

King County Executive

Enclosure

cc: King County Councilmembers

ATTN: Carolyn Busch, Chief of Staff

Melani Pedroza, Clerk of the Council

Shannon Braddock, Deputy Chief of Staff, Office of the Executive

Karan Gill, Director of Council Relations, Office of the Executive

Dwight Dively, Director, Office of Performance, Strategy and Budget

John Diaz, Director, Department of Adult and Juvenile Detention