

ATTACHMENT A.

King County District Court 2007-279

Facility Master Plan

March 2007



King County

Department of Executive Services

Facilities Management Division

Capital Planning and Development Section

500 4th Avenue, Room 320
Seattle, WA 98104

King County District Court

Facility Master Plan

March 2007

Department of Executive Services
Facilities Management Division
Capital Planning and Development Section
500 4th Avenue, Room 320
Seattle, WA 98104

King County District Court

Facility Master Plan

Table of Contents

<u>Description</u>	<u>Page</u>
Executive Summary	1
Chapter 1 Organizational Structure.....	8
District Court Mission and Vision Statements	
Operational Master Plan Guidelines	
Background, City Contracts, Court Functions	
Chapter 2 District Court Facility Program Guidelines	19
Methodology	
Planning Issues	
Space Guidelines	
Space Program Standards	
Space Relationships	
Typical Court Features	
Parking Analysis	
Chapter 3 Site and Building Analysis	53
User Survey – Environmental Features	
Burien	55
Redmond	63
Shoreline.....	72
Issaquah	81
Bellevue.....	90
Seattle	94
Kent and RJC	103
Vashon.....	118
Office of the Presiding Judge.....	120
Includes Call Center, IT Center,	
Payment Center, Probation &	
Probation Compliance	
Chapter 4 Facility Improvements and Alternatives	130
Options 1 – 4	
Kent Consolidation	
Cost Estimates	
Appendices A - County Space Standards - Sections One, Two and Three	
B – ADA Accessibility Summary Report	

Executive Summary

A. Introduction

This Facilities Master Plan (FMP) identifies facility related issues within the King County District Court system that will need improvement over the next six to ten years. For the past year, representatives from King County District Court, the King County Executive Office, County Council, Contract Cities and other stakeholders have worked together to evaluate District Court facilities using the policy directives and recommendations provided in the King County District Court Operational Master Plan (OMP) which was approved by Council Ordinance in May 2005. Because the County's District Court is also a partner in a much larger criminal justice system, the FMP was developed within the context of other ongoing Operational and Facility Master Planning efforts in King County including the Superior Court Targeted Facility Master Plan, the Sheriff's Office Operational Master Plan, the Department of Adult and Juvenile Detention Regional Integrated Jail Plan, and the Regional Justice Center Site Master Plan. These planning efforts are expected to be complete within the next 24 to 36 months.

While these studies will generate initial recommendations, final space-related decisions will depend on how these efforts, including the District Court FMP, are integrated into an overall approach. Previously considered scenarios may change as decisions become finalized during the integration process. The work plan to accomplish this integration will be submitted to Metropolitan King County Council in early April 2007.

King County Code (KCC) 4.04.020 states that capital improvements required to implement an approved operational master plan should include the following elements where applicable: general space and construction standards; prototype floor plans and prototype facility designs for standard improvements; space requirements based on the adopted county space plan; initial and life-cycle cost of alternative facilities and locations including lease and lease/purchase approaches; approximate location of planned capital improvements; and general scope and estimated cost of infrastructure. The FMP addresses these requirements and evaluates long and short-term options that respond to the changing needs of the District Court, consistent with the Operational Master Plan and the new city contracts. Options considered as part of this evaluation included changes in operational practices, capital improvements in combination with operational practices, renovation/expansion of existing facilities, and construction of new facilities.

In developing the various options to meet the needs of District Court, some assumptions were made regarding the effect that other operational and facility master plans might have on the amount and location of available space. Before any option within this report can be implemented, additional steps will be required including detailed design development, refinement of costs, negotiations with contracting cities, cost-sharing discussions, and the securing of funds. Implementation of this FMP will take place in the context of King County's six-year capital improvement program which is updated annually.

An overarching goal of the FMP is to facilitate access to justice by appropriately locating and designing quality spaces for the District Court. Serving as the “people’s court”, District Courts provide an institutional representation of democracy in our local communities. The FMP considered how District Court facilities support the dispensation of justice as outlined by their mission and vision statements.

B. Standards and Guidelines

In determining which facility improvements might become capital projects over the next six to ten years, it was necessary to complete an evaluation of existing facilities and how they relate to the long range goals of the OMP. Numerous methods were used to gain a comprehensive picture of the facilities’ place in the system and their overall condition. Where one approach may not have covered all the issues, the combination of approaches did. Resources used for evaluating existing facilities, and any contemplated new work, included the County’s Space Standards which were adopted by Council in 2005, the Trial Court Facilities Guidelines developed by the Task Force on Court Facilities in 2002, and the National Center for State Courts, “The Courthouse: A Planning and Design Guide for Court Facilities, 1998”.

How these guidelines were used depended on the anticipated status of the facility as noted in the latest District Court electoral re-organization and as outlined in the OMP. Chapter One explores that concept in more detail. Obviously, existing facilities may not meet the more recent standards as established by the resources noted above. However, if expansion and/or renovation work were found to be appropriate and cost effective, the industry guidelines would be used to the extent possible. Any plan for new facilities would use the guidelines/standards more literally as they apply to the operational policies developed by the District Court. Chapter Two defines these standards in greater detail where documentation of the comparison data begins. Not all sites will require every type of space, particularly if it is not financially feasible. Choices are also inter-dependent as the selection of one option at one site may impact how other sites will be used in the future.

C. Other Work

In addition to the goals outlined in the FMP, there is other work being accomplished at the various Court facilities. The Facilities Management Division has developed a separate Major Maintenance Reserve plan that outlines work to be accomplished over time to keep the buildings in good operating order. That work will occur on a systematic basis even if no capital work is recommended. There is an ADA accessibility study underway which is identifying work to be done at all County facilities. Recommendations coming out of that report will be submitted as part of the yearly capital budget process and work will be done in a phased approach as funding allows. There are also several projects with funding from previous budget cycles that are currently underway. One will retrofit the judges’ benches so they are in conformance with ergonomic guidelines. Another will assess the potential for upgrading workstations in certain administrative areas to meet ergonomic standards and allow for the implementation of operational changes that would increase efficiency.

D. Process

The process for developing the FMP included an evaluation and documentation of the current District Court organizational structure as defined in the OMP; the development of standard facility program guidelines to evaluate existing buildings or to design new facilities; an assessment of existing sites and buildings based on the program guidelines; and an analysis of the various alternatives which would address the areas needing improvement as identified in the assessment process.

1. Organizational Structure

Chapter One spells out in greater detail, the District Court OMP directives, the Court's Mission and Vision, background on the Court's organizational structure, interlocal agreements with contracting cities, functions of the court at various locations, judicial assignments, and a summary of what would be required at each site to best serve the anticipated needs of the organization.

The District Court Facility Master Plan is based on the directives spelled out in the OMP. The directives that most impact the facilities planning aspect of this process include a) the unification and centralization of workload to improve efficiency where appropriate; b) flexibility in providing services and facilities for customers; c) supporting the Court's function to serve cities through contracts, and d) the consolidation of facilities that exist in the same city. The OMP recommended, and County Council agreed, that the two facilities in Kent should be consolidated at the RJC site.

2. Facility Program Guidelines

Chapter Two details the methodology used to evaluate the various sites, and the planning issues, security requirements, and space standards associated with each function. It also lists the square footage required for each space category at every site. Standards are defined for typical courtroom areas, including the Judge's Bench, Clerk's Station, Witness Stand, Jury Box, Attorney's Area, and Spectator's Area. Also included in Chapter Two is the description of the method used to determine the number of parking stalls required for each courtroom.

3. Site and Building Analysis

The FMP process included a detailed assessment of the existing District Court facilities which are located at the following sites: Seattle Courthouse, Yesler Building, and King County Correctional Facility in downtown Seattle, Regional Justice Center (RJC) in Kent, Kent Courthouse in Kent, Bellevue, Redmond, Shoreline, Issaquah, and Burien. Space issues were evaluated as they related to Court functions, the staff required to perform them, the type of cases heard, caseload volume, and the number of people the various case types and calendars would bring to the Courts during any given time frame. Also considered were issues of accessibility, safety and security, and parking as they related to caseload and the types of cases heard.

Chapter Three contains the results of the site and building analysis using the standards defined in Chapter Two. It shows a space summary for each site, floor plans, lists basic characteristics of the existing building, outlines operations at each Court, and discusses where improvements can be made. It also summarizes the results of a survey that was done where employees and users of each site

commented on issues not defined in the facility program guidelines. A chart showing the Major Maintenance Replacement tasks outlines what is planned to be completed over the next twenty years, and there is a code analysis of the major systems of each building. At the end of each facility analysis, areas needing improvement are described.

4. Facility Alternatives

Chapter Four includes a summary chart of the areas needing improvement for each site, and outlines the facility alternatives most likely to address these issues. After substantial review and analysis, four options are presented. Many approaches were considered as well as combinations with operational changes before arriving at the four presented. Each option provides a solution from a slightly different viewpoint. All assume additional space needs at the RJC site. As stated in Ordinance 15328, passed by County Council in February 2006,

It is the intent of the council that the space plan shall provide additional space needs for the district court at the Regional Justice Center in Kent through the conversion of vacated criminal investigation division space into courtrooms, jury rooms, and associated support space.

While the options presented for consolidating facilities in Kent meet the long-term space requirements of District Court, there is an immediate need for two additional Courtrooms in this electoral district. Two possible solutions for providing this interim courtroom space include 1) not renewing the lease with the City of Kent for use of the existing Aukeen Court so that all four courtrooms at this location can be used by District Court, or, 2) finding an alternate space to lease which can accommodate four courtrooms and their ancillary support space. District Court should not be moved from the Aukeen Court facility until an alternate space is completed that meets this interim need.

The Bellevue site is not included in the estimate ranges shown herein nor is it included in the Chapter Four estimates. The Interlocal Agreement between the county and the City of Bellevue outlines a separate process and time frame for the parties to reach agreement on meeting the facility needs in this community. With the adoption of the Interlocal Agreement at the end of 2006, the county is working with the City of Bellevue on the process to identify a solution to their court facility needs.

What direction is taken at remaining Court sites could yet be influenced by other County operational and facility master plans still in progress. In addition, any changes undertaken at the County's court facilities will need to be reviewed by the Court Facility Management Review Committees as provided for in the Interlocal Agreement for Provision of District Court Services between King County and the suburban cities. This mechanism provides a vehicle for contracting cities to negotiate with the County the type and cost impact of court improvements outside of projects included in the County's major maintenance plan.

The estimates for the various alternatives are shown as a range of cost because the improvements outlined are still conceptual in design. The estimates include a life cycle cost analysis and should be considered preliminary until greater detail can be developed during the implementation of the

selected alternative. Although the estimates presented are preliminary, as tools for comparative analysis, they represent a valid methodology for considering the options described within the FMP.

The following summary outlines the four alternatives being considered as possible solutions for addressing those areas identified as needing improvement at the various District Court locations. Individual elements included under one option may ultimately be combined with other options should that prove to best meet the needs of the District Court operation. Interim solutions may come into being as projects are finalized and other OMP/FMP policy decisions are made. Options will be considered in the context of King County's six-year capital improvement program which is updated annually. However, some improvements recommended within the options may be considered for more immediate implementation as part of the regular capital budget process. Greater detail on the pros and cons of each option is contained in Chapter Four, as is additional information on cost.

Option 1 – Complete minor capital improvements, implement operational changes where deemed reasonable and cost effective, and make building code and security improvements. This option includes security improvements such as holding cells, access control, surveillance cameras, and expanded weapons screening areas, as well as ADA accessibility improvements at Shoreline, Redmond, Burien, and Seattle Courts with minor revisions at Issaquah.

\$15,171,162 - \$27,233,373

Option 2 – No changes to current operational model. To meet space needs, expand Redmond, Burien, Shoreline and RJC; replace Bellevue; remodel Seattle to meet program needs; and consider using Issaquah for other County functions. Expansions would include holding cells, access control, surveillance cameras, expanded weapons screening areas, and ADA accessibility improvements as noted in Option 1.

\$19,340,000 - \$36,095,000

Option 3 – No changes to current operational model. To meet space needs, replace existing facilities at Redmond, Burien, and Bellevue; remodel Shoreline and Seattle; and consider using Issaquah for other County functions. Replacement and remodel work would also include the holding cells, access control, surveillance cameras, expanded weapons screening areas, and ADA accessibility improvements as noted in Option 1.

\$18,818,000 - \$35,285,000

Option 4 – Alter operations to hear State criminal caseload at the Seattle, RJC, and Issaquah facilities. To meet space needs, remodel Seattle to meet program needs; and make minor revisions to Shoreline, Burien, and Redmond facilities. Minor revisions include holding cells, access control, surveillance cameras, expanded weapons screening areas, and ADA accessibility improvements as noted in Option 1.

\$7,054,000 - \$13,183,000

In addition to the above options for Burien, Redmond, Shoreline, Issaquah and Seattle locations, the following alternatives are for the consolidation of facilities in the Kent area:

RJC Expansion with Parking Structure at the existing site

\$20,720,000 - \$38,850,000

RJC New Building on Adjacent Site with Surface Parking

\$14,000,000 - \$26,250,000

5. Preferred Option

District Court and the King County Executive realize that a number of factors exist that could impact how the facility needs of District Court are met in the coming years. Issues including those noted below could change how District Court is affected by circumstances currently considered problematic.

- Integration of other County criminal justice operation and facility planning efforts
- Fluctuations in District Court staffing levels or caseload including case type
- Legislative changes to state laws that may impact the Court's organization and jurisdiction
- Judicial rulings related to limited jurisdiction courts
- Cost-sharing agreements with contract cities
- Availability of funding through the King County budget process

Until these issues are resolved, the preferred option of District Court and the King County Executive is Option 4. It is the least expensive but it is also the option which has enough flexibility to accommodate changes that may occur in the County and with District Court. It combines operational changes and capital improvements. With the integration of the County's criminal justice planning efforts taking shape, this flexibility allows a process to be established to address District Court facility needs including an interim solution to provide additional courtrooms in the Southeast Electoral District which includes the City of Kent.

Acknowledgments and Participants

The FMP process included the work and cooperation of many individuals and organizations. The following is a partial list of those who contributed.

Co Conveners:

Kathy Brown, Director, King County Facilities Management Division
Tricia Crozier, Chief Administrative Officer, King County District Court

Work Group Members:

Chief Presiding Judge Barbara Linde
Assistant Presiding Judge Linda Thompson
Former Chief Presiding Judge Corinna Harn
Leslie Harper Miles, Executive's Office
Jim Burt, Facilities Management Division, Capital Planning & Development
Karen Heidergott, Facilities Management Division, Capital Planning & Development
Donna Brunner, King County District Court
Nina Lemenager, King County District Court
Darlene Allen, King County District Court
Toni Rezab, King County Office of Management and Budget
Bobbie Faucette, King County Office of Management and Budget
Jeremy Jepson, King County Office of Management and Budget

Stakeholders:

District Court Management Review Committee (DCMRC) Members
King County Superior Court

Chapter 1 Organizational Structure

A. District Court Mission and Vision

The King County District Court mission and vision, approved by King County ordinance, provides direction for determining how the OMP will be used in the facility assessment process and the ultimate development of recommendations contained in the FMP.

King County District Court Mission

A. The King County District Court will serve the public by:

- Providing an accessible forum for the fair, efficient, and understandable resolution of civil and criminal cases; and
- Maintaining an atmosphere of respect for the dignity of individuals.

King County District Court Vision

A. The King County District Court will be the preferred forum in King County for the resolution of all cases of limited jurisdiction.

B. To provide the highest quality of justice, the King County District Court will:

- (1) Protect the public safety by providing resources to hold convicted offenders accountable for their actions;
- (2) Work as an independent branch of government with other units of government to achieve common goals;
- (3) Make effective use of taxpayers' resources;
- (4) Continuously ascertain and respond to the needs and expectations of all court users;
- (5) Provide a uniform and predictable level of service;
- (6) Provide efficient, convenient, and safe facilities;
- (7) Seek out and use modern technology and equipment;
- (8) Serve as the coordinator for all the services necessary for an effective judicial system;
- (9) Maintain a diverse and professional workforce;
- (10) Maintain sentencing options and sentence offenders appropriately;
- (11) Educate the justice system community, legislative, and executive agencies, and public about the courts; and
- (12) Respect the diversity of the community.

B. Operational Master Plan Recommendations

Based on the District Court's Mission and Vision, the 2005 Operational Master Plan made the following strategic recommendations intended to guide the District Court for the next five to ten years. These recommendations directed how the facilities' assessment was used and how priorities were determined for the Facility Master Plan.

1. Court of Choice

Retain for the long term, the aspiration to be the court of choice for limited jurisdiction in the County, focusing energy and resources on improving operations and services, balancing the needs of citizens, the Court, the County and the cities.

2. Quality Service Standards

Develop and apply quality service standards and measures for District Court operations, including but not limited to (a) access to justice; (b) case flow management; (c) customer service; (d) jury management; (e) court productivity and (f) collections.

3. Problem Solving Courts

Continue to support Problem Solving Courts, improving access to Problem Solving Courts, and incorporating Problem Solving Courts in the Court's planning process.

4. Unification and Centralization

Continue and make explicit the strategy of improving efficiency through unification of governance, administration and planning, centralizing workload where appropriate.

5. Technological Improvements

Continue to develop and implement technological improvements, such as "paperless" case processing and E-filings that support District Court operations and increase access to court services and information.

6. City Contracts

Continue to support the Court's function to serve cities through contracts.

7. Service and Facility Flexibility

Support flexibility in providing services and facilities for District Court customers.

8. Facilities

Continue to support a unified, Countywide District Court, utilizing existing facilities, to provide for a more equitable and cost effective system of justice for the citizens of King County.

- A. Ensure Court facilities promote system efficiencies, quality services and access to justice.
- B. Consolidate District Court facilities that exist in the same city.

- C. Reconsider facilities if there are changes with contracting cities or changes in leases.
- D. Work with cities to develop a facility master plan as it relates to the District Court.

9. Study Court Integration

Study the integration of District Court, Superior Court and the Department of Judicial Administration assuring that the needs of District Court are met; and best practices are considered.

10. Work with Stakeholders

Work together with stakeholders to gain state and local cooperation and assistance to meet the needs of the judicial system.

11. Additional Resources

Recognize that implementation of these strategic and operational recommendations may require reallocation or commitment of additional resources.

C. Background

The District Court of King County is a part of the judicial branch of King County government and is the largest court of limited jurisdiction in the State, providing District Court services to more than 1.8 million King County residents. Citizens are most likely to experience the judicial system through the District Courts. Matters before the court include small claims, civil matters involving matters up to \$50,000, traffic infractions, protection orders, misdemeanor criminal cases, state offenses (violations of state statute in the County or when the citing agency is the Washington State Patrol or other state law enforcement agency), and death inquests. The court processes more than a quarter million new filings per year in addition to an untold number of pending open cases from previous years. The District Court is funded by the County's general fund. They collect revenue for the general fund in the form of fees, costs, and assessments. Cities contract with King County for Court services through a full cost recovery interlocal agreement. In addition, King County receives funding from the State of Washington for a Trial Court Improvement Account which may be allocated for District Court improvements to the Court.

The District Court currently provides for public access at ten facilities located throughout King County:

- Bellevue
- Burien
- Issaquah
- Kent (Aukeen)
- King County Courthouse (Seattle)
- King County Correctional Facility (Seattle – jail calendars only)
- Redmond
- Regional Justice Center (Kent)
- Shoreline
- Vashon Island (1 day per month)
- Yesler Building (Seattle)

All of the facilities listed are county-owned except Bellevue (at Surrey Downs) and Vashon, which are leased, and Issaquah, which is a builder-owned, lease back situation. The Vashon lease has a 5-year term with two automatic extensions for 5 years each. The Vashon lease is a no cost agreement. The lease for the Surrey Downs facility was just renewed with an end date of December 31, 2008. Any extensions will likely be in short, one-year terms until the location, funding, program, and schedule for a different facility are determined.

Since the last FMP in 1995, two facilities have been closed, Renton and Federal Way, and a facility was built in Issaquah. The contract with the city of Mercer Island was not renewed so the lease for that location's facility was terminated. In addition, the District Court space occupied in Bellevue was reduced, and space was added at the Yesler Building in downtown Seattle to consolidate IT administration and other support staff. The Yesler Building space is not open to the public.

D. City Contracts

Contracts for municipal court services between the County and cities help reduce the overall costs to County taxpayers through economies of scale, eliminating the need for duplication of facilities, management staff, and overhead. Contracts also maximize access for all citizens in King County, provide consistency, and reduce the confusion and delay caused by a fragmented court system. District Court provides all case type services to its contract cities including Criminal Non Traffic, Criminal Traffic, DUI, Infraction Traffic, Infraction Non-Traffic, Parking, Orders for Protection and Ordinances plus access to any other District Court services designated for their particular site as shown on Table 1-1 herein. This also means that space for Probation services, Prosecuting Attorney, and Office of the Public Defender may need to be available at the various sites as District Court does make those services available to the Contract Cities.

In 2006, King County and the contracting cities reviewed and approved a new, long-term contract which began on January 1, 2007 and runs for five years with two five-year extensions. The contract provides direction that comports with the OMP regarding utilization of existing facilities; establishes a process and schedule for the parties to reach agreement on meeting facility needs in Bellevue; and outlines the approach to be followed for negotiating future cost sharing for capital improvement projects. The contract requires regular meetings between the cities and the District Court to insure service level expectations are being met. It also provides the opportunity for contracting cities to participate in the District Court's OMP/FMP process.

The contract language related to capital improvement projects states that improvement to space dedicated to the sole use and benefit of one party shall be funded by the benefiting party. Projects benefiting all parties served in the facility are to be presented to the affected Court Facility Management Review Committee and the contribution of costs determined by mutual agreement of the County and the cities served in the affected facility. Absent an approved capital cost sharing agreement between the County and the cities served in the affected facility, the Cities are not responsible for capital project costs.

Table 1-1 Functions of the Court at Each Facility

Location	Contract Cities	City Case Type	State & County	Civil Case Types	In Custodi	Passports	Probation Space at	Specialty Courts & Programs
				City Infractions				Juvenile Diversion
				Courtesy File Small Claims				2 nights/wk
Bellevue	Bellevue	All	No	and Civil Suits, Name Changes	Yes	Yes	Bellevue City	**SC ExParte
	Beaux Arts	All		All Orders for Protection	Yes		Probation	2 afternoons/wk
Redmond	Redmond	All	Criminal	City Infractions	Yes	Yes	No	Juvenile Diversion
	Woodinville	All		Courtesy File Small Claims	Yes			1 night/wk
	Skykomish	All		and Civil Suits, Name Changes	Yes			Mentor Program
	Duvall	All		All Orders for Protection	Yes			
	Carnation	All		State Accident Infractions	Yes			
Issaquah	Samamish	All	Infractions	State and City Infractions	Yes	Yes	Yes	Student Traffic
		All	Civil	All Civil and Small Claims				Court-2 nights
		All		Hearings, Name Changes				a month
				All Orders for Protection				
Shoreline	Shoreline	All	Infractions	State and City Infractions	Yes	Yes	Yes	Juvenile Diversion
	Kenmore	All		Small Claims Hearings for Shoreline	Yes			1 night/wk
				Courtesy File Civil Suits and				
				Small Claims; Names Changes				
				All Orders for Protection				
Kent (Aukeen)				State and City Infractions		Yes	Yes	Juvenile Diversion
Facility is shared with City of Kent Municipal Court	Covington	All	Infractions	All Civil & Small Claims Hearings	Yes			1 night/wk
			Civil	Name Changes				Relicensing Program
			Relicensing	All Orders for Protection				
Kent (RJC)	Provides in-custody first appearance hearings for cities at RJC	In-custody Video hearings for Federal Way Tukwila and Sea-Tac Courts	In Custody Jury Trials Domestic Violence Court	Courtesy File Small Claims and Civil Suits Civil Jury Trials	Yes	No	Yes (for DV court only)	Domestic Violence Court
Burien	Burien	All	Criminal	City Infractions		Yes	No	Juvenile Diversion
				Courtesy File Small Claims	Yes			1 night/wk
				and Civil Suits, Name Changes				
				All Orders for Protection				
				State Accident Infractions				
Vashon			All	Small Claim Hearings	No	No	No	
			Criminal					
			Mental Health Court	All Civil and Small Claims Hearings	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Seattle (KCCH)			Domestic Violence Court	Names Changes				Domestic Violence
			Relicensing	Order for Protections				Relicensing Program
				State Accident Infractions				Mental Health Court
				Inquests				
KCCF	Provides in-custody first appearance hearings for cities at KCCF		In Custody Felony first appearance hearings at KCCF	Criminal Felony	Yes	No	No	Felony and Misdemeanors
Central Administration								Central Admin.
Office of Presiding Judge					No	No	No	serves all contract
Payment Center		All	All	All	No	No	No	cities.
Call Center, IT, and ECR		All	All	All	No	No	No	
**SC = Superior Court								

The following cities have signed the 2007 Court service contract.

- Bellevue
- Beaux Arts
- Redmond
- Woodinville
- Skykomish
- Duvall
- Carnation
- Sammamish
- Shoreline
- Kenmore
- Covington
- Burien

The City of Lake Forest Park has signed a contract for District Court to provide Saturday in-custody hearings at the King County Correctional Facility (KCCF).

E. Organizational Structure

The requirements and structure for the district court are contained in state statute, County code and by the local court rules.

The District Court has undergone numerous organizational changes since the 1995 OMP. While the District Court has officially been a “unified, countywide district court” since 1988, the unification from nine (9) separate District Courts to one integrated District Court has been gradual with the most significant operational changes having taken place since 2002.

The size and structure of the court’s Executive Committee and Leadership Team reflect a more centralized structure of the court. In addition, certain functions performed by the court have been consolidated including the creation of a Payment Center and Call Center. As mandated by the court’s 2005 OMP, the court will “continue to improve efficiencies through the unification of governance, administration and planning, centralize workload when appropriate”. Where areas of improvement are noted for any given facility, both operational and capital approaches will be considered and evaluated.

Independent of the courts administrative structure and the number of judges, the electoral districts of the court have also undergone certain changes since the last OMP. At the time of the last OMP, the court had nine (9) electoral districts and twenty-six (26) judges. In 2003, the County Council reduced the number of electoral districts to three (3) and the State legislature reduced the number of judges to 21, allowing the court to attrit down to 21 between 2003 and the next judicial election in 2006. In 2006, the County Council made another change to the number of electoral districts, expanding to five (5) and assigning five (5) individual positions to each district with the exception of Shoreline, where there is one (1) position. See Table 1-2 for a historical review of these changes.

Table 1-2 Summary of Recent Organizational Changes

2002 Electoral Districts	2002 Judges	2002 Contract Cities
Aukeen	3	Covington
Bellevue	3	Bellevue, Beaux Arts and Mercer Island
Issaquah	1	Issaquah, North Bend, Snoqualmie and Sammamish
Federal Way	3	
Northeast	4	Redmond, Carnation, Duvall, Woodinville and Skykomish
Renton	2	Newcastle
Seattle	5	
Shoreline	2	Kenmore, Shoreline
Southwest	3	Burien, Normandy Park
Total:	26	
2003 Electoral Districts	2003 Judges	2003 Contract Cities
East	10	Bellevue, Beaux Arts, Mercer Island, North Bend, Snoqualmie, Sammamish Redmond, Carnation, Duvall, Woodinville, Skykomish, Newcastle
South	11	Burien, Covington, Normandy Park
West	5	Kenmore, Shoreline
Total:	26	
2006 Electoral Districts	* 2006 Judges	2006 Contract Cities
East	7	Bellevue, Beaux Arts, Sammamish, Redmond, North Bend, Snoqualmie Carnation, Duvall, Woodinville, Skykomish
South	10	Covington, Burien
West	6	Shoreline, Kenmore
Court Commissioner	1	
Total:	24	
2007 Electoral Districts	* 2007 Judges	2007 Contract Cities
Southeast	5	Covington
Southwest	5	Burien
Northeast	5	Bellevue, Redmond, Beaux Arts, Sammamish, Carnation, Duvall, Woodinville, Skykomish
Shoreline	1	Shoreline, Kenmore
West	5	Lake Forest Park Saturday In-Custody, and In-Custody First Appearance Hearings for Cities at KCCH
Court Commissioner	1	
Total:	22	

*Includes One Court Commissioner Position that hears mitigation hearings for most Districts.

Table 1-3 outlines how the judicial officers were assigned in 2006 to meet the caseload requirements of the various court locations.

Table 1-3 2006 Judicial Assignments

Facility Location	*Judicial Resources	Current Clerks	Required Courts
Redmond	2.7	18	3
Bellevue	2.5	15	3
Issaquah	1.5	11.5	2
Kent/RJC	** 6.0	23	*** 7
Burien	2.8	19.5	3
Seattle	** 4.9	19	*** 6
Shoreline	1.5	12	2
Presiding Judge	1.0	16	0
Asst. Presiding Judge	0.1	0	0
Totals	23.0	134	26
*Includes Court Commissioner			
**Includes portability for Superior Court.			
***Includes current in-cusotdy GB at RJC & in-cusotdy CR at KCCF			

The judicial assignments changed in 2007 as the number of judges declined from twenty-three (23) which included one (1) Court Commissioner to twenty-two (22) which includes one (1) Court Commissioner. Table 1-4 sets forth the current judicial assignments at the various facilities.

Table 1-4 Judicial Assignments 2007*

Bellevue	2.1 Judicial Officers
Burien	3.0 Judicial Officers
Issaquah	1.5 Judicial Officers
Kent (Aukeen)/RJC	3.5 Judicial Officers
Office of Presiding Judge	1.0 Judicial Officer
Assistant Presiding Judge	0.1 Judicial Officer
Redmond	2.9 Judicial Officers
Seattle	5.6 Judicial Officers (includes KCCF)
Shoreline	1.4 Judicial Officers
Court Commissioner	1.0 Judicial Officer
Total	22.1 Judicial Officers

*The .1 Judicial Officer for Assistant Presiding Judge and .50 Judicial Officer for Superior Court portability will need to be absorbed in one or more locations.

