Interlocal Agreement for Provision of District Court Services Between King County and Cities

Summary of Changes/Updates to ILA – November 2020

ILA Section	Change/Update
Recitals	
Recitals 1-6	Updated and simplified language.
Recitals 5-8	Added Recitals 5-8.
Recital 10	Moved the language from section re: filing fees up to Recitals section.
Definitions	Added Definitions section.
Sections (by number)	
1.1: Term	Updated terms to track with judicial elections as required by RCW on termination.
1.2: Termination and Notice of Termination	Termination provision altered to comply with RCW 3.50.810 and RCW 35.20.010(3) and (4) and to make County subject to same notice requirements as cities (since statute allows for shorter notice by County).
2.1: District Court Services Defined	Added provision for community court, as it did not exist when the previous contract was written.
2.2: Decision-Making	Added titles to many sections to help simplify.
2.2.1: Case Processing and Management	Updated this section to reflect current practice where parties get this information online.
2.2.3: Customer Service	Updated to reflect this as a collaborative process without defined standards, as DCMRC has not established standards.
2.2.4: Probation Services	Updated to provide extra 6 months' notice to cities if County decides to stop providing probation to an individual city.
2.2.5.1: Regular Court	Reorganized these sections and provided for some flexibility for rescheduling calendars due to
Calendars	emergency or other specified circumstances.
2.2.5.3: Regular Court	Provided a process to change the number of calendars, if needed.
Calendars	
2.2.6: Participating City Judicial Services	Added requirement of discussion before finalizing of judicial assignment changes.
3.1.3: Relocation Due to Closure	Updated to comply with RCW on termination.

3.1.4 (removed):	Removed this section as it was specific to Issaquah and no longer applicable.
Relocation Due to Closure	
3.1.4 (added): Other	Added to reflect other facilities that may be utilized at a future date or in case of emergency.
County Facilities	
3.1.5: Temporary	Added to cover emergency relocations.
Emergency Relocations	
3.2: Relocation from a	Modified this to refer to any city who wants to relocate from a city facility into another facility.
Participating City Facility	
3.2.3: Temporary	Added to cover emergency relocations from city buildings.
Emergency Relocations	
3.3.3: City Buildings	Clarified this section is for County buildings.
4.1: Filing Fees	Footnote added to explain that filing fees can only be charged to defendants on criminal cases.
Established	
4.1.2: Filing Fees	Moved this language up to the Recitals section.
Established	
4.7: Local Court Revenue	Updated to clarify that County does not intend to keep a city's revenue if the city leaves (per how we handled when Woodinville left).
4.8.1: One-Time Costs for	Updated this section and the Exhibit to reflect that these funds can be used for system
District Court Technology and	improvements (in addition to technology projects) if approved by the DCMRC.
System Improvement	
Projects	
5.0.2: System Wide	Consolidated sections on system-wide disputes and disputes resulting from a change in the law
Disputes	(which are really system-wide). Updated to allow for 90 days of negotiation prior to mediation
	(previous were 60 for system and 120 for change of law).
Park 11-14-	
Exhibits	Added can an accurity rate increase (CDL) (1.10()
Exhibit A: Security (new	Added cap on security rate increase (CPI-W+1%).
tab C) Exhibit A: Current	Demoved surrent synapse systemed easts
_	Removed current expense overhead costs.
Expense Overhead (former tab C)	
Exhibit A: One-Time for	Set cities' reserve cap to start at \$1 million and included the ability to fund system improvement
Technology and System	projects.
Improvement Projects	
	1

Exhibit A: Facilities ("Facility Costs" tab and "Facility Rates" tab)	Added cap on facility rate increase (CPI-W). Updated facility allocation methodology – facility costs will not be influenced by the workload of other cities or the County; the County will pay for all space not allocated; the model allocates 200 square feet per clerical need and an individualized facility average square footage per judicial FTE need. This tab replaces old tab D.
Exhibit A	Cleaned up footnotes, page titles, and tab titles.
Exhibit B	Consolidated County facilities into one exhibit. Defined FMD rate. Added cap on facility rate increase (CPI-W).
Exhibit D	Moved city's regular calendar day(s) from section 2.2.6.2 to Exhibit D.

Note: This matrix reflects all substantive changes made to the Interlocal Agreement. There have also been minor technical edits made to the agreement that are not noted in the matrix.

EXHIBIT A

SUMMARY TO ATTACHMENTS A THROUGH Q

Attachment	Item	City Case Costs 2018	City Case Costs 2017
	2018 District Court Program Budget		
А	Salaries and Benefits	4,975,644	4,866,520
	Non-Facility costs/Non-CX overhead		
В	costs less probation	695,956	509,488
С	Security Costs per Facility	644,906	631,729
D	Facilities - Call Center/Payment Center	27,772	21,064
E	Reconciliation Costs	567	507
	One-Time Costs for District Court		
	Technology and System Improvement		
F	Projects	73,963	57,522
	-		
J-Facility Costs	Facility Usage	274,391	449,154
	TOTAL CITY CASE COSTS IN 2018:	6,693,198	6,535,984
	TOTAL CITY REVENUE IN 2018	\$ 6,246,369	\$ 6,453,133
	Percentage of Total City Case Costs to		
	Total City Revenue 2018	107%	101%
	City Dedicated Costs		
G	Dedicated City space	-	-
	TOTAL CITY COSTS w/ DEDICATED	6,693,198	6,535,984

Methodology/Definitions/Notes:

1. District Court Program Budget: A budget that is created by the Court to portion out salaries and benefits by specific court programs

2. Based on the District Court Program Budget (Attachment A), contract cities represent a percentage of District Court Program Budget Costs ------>

24.65%

-

- --

3. The District Court Program Budget will be updated annually as will the percentage representing contract cities.

4. The multiplier referred to in Exhibit A is the percentage of the District Court Program Budget attributed to contract cities (see Attachment A).

5. The "City Cost" for each year, calculated by the County, is equal to the sum of Attachments A through G and Facility Costs.

6. The account codes referenced throughout this Exhibit may be modified by the County and the codes

referenced herein are deemed to include any future successor or modified codes adopted by the County.

						Difference of Total	City	County
					City Revenue	City Cost and City	Remittance to	Reimbursement
City	City Portion of Case Costs	City Dedicated Costs	Total City Cost	Total City Revenue	Paid	Revenue Paid	County 2018	to City 2018
Auburn	\$ 2,000,655	-	2,000,655	764,289	0	2,000,655	\$2,000,655	-
Beaux Arts	\$ -	-	-	-	0	0.00	-	-
Bellevue	\$ 2,041,809	-	2,041,809	3,824,437	2,280,709	(238,900)		\$238,900
Burien	\$ 442,655	-	442,655	184,520	184,520	258,135	\$258,135	-
Carnation	\$ 8,823	-	8,823	3,327	3,327	5,496	\$5,496	-
Covington	\$ 209,373	-	209,373	100,378	100,378	108,996	\$108,996	-
Duvall	\$ 91,618	-	91,618	48,154	48,154	43,465	\$43,465	-
Kenmore	\$ 175,920	-	175,920	140,383	140,383	35,537	\$35,537	-
Redmond	\$ 743,218	-	743,218	446,444	446,444	296,774	\$296,774	-
Sammamish	\$ 279,318	-	279,318	259,938	259,938	19,379	\$19,379	-
Shoreline	\$ 694,001	-	694,001	469,379	469,379	224,622	\$224,622	-
Skykomish	\$ -	-	-	-	0	0		-
Woodinville	\$ 5,655	-	5,655	5,121	5,121	535	\$535	-
Total	\$6,693,044	\$0	\$6,693,044	\$6,246,369	\$3,938,352	\$2,754,693	\$2,993,593	\$238,900

1

		ATTACH	MENT "A'	' - TO T	HE FIN	ANCI/	L EXHI	BIT					
			King C	ounty D	istrict	Court							
	201	8 District	Court Pro	gram B	udget	Salarie	es and B	enefits	5				
					OPJ/							•	
	Judges				Central		Prob		Prob		Salary/Benefit		
		Clerks* LT	* CN	1*	Admin	Aides*	Mgmt	PO Is	Support *	Total	Expenditure	% to subtotal	
County-State Criminal	8.43	8.78	0.20	1.34	3.79	0.07				22.61	3,344,218	. 16.57%	
County-State Infractions	1.13	22.51	0.52	3.44	7.51	0.19				35.31	3,516,348	17.42%	
County-State Civil	6.49	27.22	0.62	4.16	9.63	0.23				48.35	5,515,136	27.33%	
City Contracts	7.29	22.08	0.51	3.37	8.04	0.19				41.48	4,975,644	24.65%	
DV Court	0.98	1.76	0.04	0.27	0.68	0.01				3.75	496,184	2.46%	
Jail/Felony/Expedited	2.00	1.92	0.04	0.29	0.66	0.02				4.93	751,321	3.72%	
Inquests	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00				0.01	1,140	0.01%	
Passports		2.14	0.05	0.33	0.49	0.02				3.02	287,029	1.42%	
Subtotal without Probation	26.33	86.40	1.98	13.20	30.81	0.73				159.46	\$ 18,887,020		will not add up to 100%
Total Salary and benefits for Court											\$ 20,181,618		
District Court Program Budget	. Salaries a	and Benefit	ts attribute	d to Con	tract C	ities.						\$ 4.975.644	
Multiplier Percent of Salaries and												24.65%	
County Probation		9.35	0.36	2.43	4.73	0.08	1.52	6.0	9 6.60	31.16	3,211,573		
City Probation		6.97	0.38	1.87	3.62	0.08		4.9		24.26	2,506,923		
DV Court Probation		0.68	0.28	0.27	0.50	0.00	0.25	4.9		3.82	404,307		
Subtotal Probation Costs		17.00	0.69	4.57	8.85	0.01		12.0		59.25		•	
Subtotal FIODALION COSIS		17.00	0.05				rcentage c			24.98%	φ 0,122,003		

District Court Costs	26.33	103.40	2.67	17.77	39.66	0.88	3.00	12.00	13.00	218.71 \$	25,009,823

 1.10
 *Judges included in Central Admin

 10.00
 *Call Center Clerks counted in Central Admin

 8.00
 *Payment Center Clerks counted in Central Admin

 3.00
 *CM included in Central Admin for Call Center & Payment Center

 13.00
 *Court Clerks counted in Prob Support

** Does not include RMHC, RVC, Comm Crt *** Does not include 3 CMS Clerks ****Does not include 3 frozen positions

	ENT "B" - TO THE FINANCI				-
Non-Facility co	sts/Non-CX overhead costs	less probation			-
	Probation Staff as %		24.98%		-
t_DISTRICT COURT(0530)	2018 Total District Court	Probation where applicable		Net less probation	Comments
FUND					
52110 OFFICE SUPPLIES	42,915		10,719		
52180 MINOR ASSET NON CONTROL	114,837		28,683		
52181 INVENTORY EQUIP 5K UNDER	33,845		8,454		
52189 SOFTWARE NONCAP	-		0	-	
52190 SUPPLIES IT	3,556		888	2,668	
52202 SUPPLIES MISC	34,005		8,493	25,511	
52205 SUPPLIES FOOD	4,148		1,036	3,112	
52208 SUPPLIES UNIFORMS	-		. 0	-	
52215 PUBLICATIONS	19,058		4,760	14,298	
52222 SUPPLIES COMMUNICATIONS	797		199		
52290 MISC OPERATING SUPPLIES	-		.00		
53100 ADVERTISING	0		0	0	
53101 PROF SRV PRINTING	21,140		5,280	15,860	
53102 PROF SRV-Interpreters	772,431		192,932	579,499	
53105 OTHER CONTRACT/PROF SRVCS	111,160		27,765	83,395	
Agency Temp Employees	-		0	-	Adjusted bel
53106 EDP & MICROFICHE/FILM SVC 53108 CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS	127,554		31,860	95,695	
	-		-	-	
53120 MISC SERVICES	307,755		76,869	230,886	
53210 SERVICES COMM	6,134		1,532	4,602	
53212 TELECOM SERV-ONE TIME	44,221		11,045	33,176	
53213 CELL PHONE	45,275		11,308	33,967	
53220 POSTAGE	123,502		30,847	92,655	
53310 TRAVEL SUBSISTENCE	7,831		1,956	5,875	
53311 TRAVEL SUBSISTENCE	11,753		2,936	8,818	
53330 PURCHASED TRANSPORT	11,587		2.894	8,693	
53611 SERVICES REAPIR MAIN IT	(66))	(16)	(49)	
53612 LAUNDRY SERVICE			-	-	
53711 RENT- LEASE	_		-	_	
53712 RENT-COPY MACHINE	81,975		20,475	61,500	
53712 RENT-OTHER EQUIP					
	10,274		2,566	7,708	
53801 LEGAL SRVS	-		-	-	
Jury	128,697		32,145		Adjust below
Witness	2,441		610		Adjust below
53803 MEMBERSHIPS	32,103		8,018	24,084	
53808 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS	-		-	-	
53814 TRAINING	32,162		8,033	24,129	
53863 BANK FEES	29,331		7,326	22,005	
53890 MISC SERVICE CHARGES	89,217		22,284	66,933	
55023 ITS NEW DEVELOPMENT	7,120		1,778	5,342	
55026 GIS OPERATIONS	24.602		6,145	18.457	
55027 TECH SERV REBATE	(34,354))	(8,581)	(25,773)	
55032 TELECOM OVERHEAD	(04,004)	, ,	(0,501)	(23,113)	
55040 COUNTY PARKING GARAGE	- 12,960			- 9,723	
			3,237	9,723	
55045 COURTHOUSE SCREENERS 55144 PROPERTY SERVICES	-		-	-	
	339		-	339	Adjusted bel
55145 FACILITIES MGMT	100,745		25,163	75,581	Adjusted be
55147 RECORDS AND LICENSING	-		-	-	-
			. –		
55159 FMD COPY CENTER	67		17	50	

Dpt_DISTRICT COURT(0530) 55245 FINANCIAL MGMT SVCS	2018 Total District Court 309,744	Probation where applicable 77,365	Net less probation 232,379	<u>Comments</u>
55249 FMD STRATEGIC INITIATIVE FEE 55251 INSURANCE REBATE	- (155,088)	- (155,088)	-	Probation related
55252 INSURANCE S/S (PROBATION)	59,447	59,447	-	Probation related
55253 SYSTEM SRVS	-	-	-	
55255 FINANCIAL MGMT SRVCS		-		
55258 MOTOR POOL	4,726	1,180	3,546	
55264 KCIT SRVS 55265 KCIT WORKSTATION SRVS	37,368 650.872	9,333 162.570	28,035 488,302	
55268 KCIT eGOV SERVICES	56,790	14.185	400,502	
55270 KCIT COUNTYWIDE SRVS	114,323	28,555	85,768	
55331 LONG TERM LEASES	4,472	1,117		Adjusted below
55347 BRC SRV CHRG	271,607	67,840	203,767	
55350 RADIO ACCESS	1,872	468	1,404	
55351 RADIO MAINTENANCE PROGRAM	672	168	504	
55353 RADIO EQUIP RESERVES 55353 EDP EQUIPMENT	718	179	539	
58077 TTKCITCIPFUND	- 35,568	- 8.884	- 26,684	
	00,000	0,004	20,004	-
Expenditures	6,661,559	1,592,036	5,069,524	
Total District Court	6,661,559	1,592,036	5,069,524	
53105 OTHER CONTRACT/PROF SRVCS AGENCY TEMP WORKERS		-	-	
55045 COURTHOUSE SCREENERS 55144 PROPERTY SERVICES	- 339	-	- 339	
55331 LONG TERM LEASES	4,472	- 1.117	3,355	
55249 FMD STRATEGIC INITIATVFEE	-	-	-	
53801 JURY/WITNESS FEES & MILEAGE	131,139	32,755	98,384	
55145 FACILITIES MGMT	100,745	25,163	75,581	
55160 CONST & FACLTY MGMT	2,907,349	726,175	2,181,174	
Total Removed Accounts	3,144,043	785,210	2,358,833	-
Subtotal to Apply Multiplier to:	3,517,516	806,825	2,710,690	
Multiplier (from Program Budget Salaries/Benefits, see Tab A) "TOTAL CITY COSTS" City Jury Costs Owed			24.65% 695,956.21 27,654	

Methodology/Det	finitions/Notes:

 Annual Total District Court Expenditures means the Final Year End Actual District Court Expenditures as set forth in the County's Accounting, Reporting and Management System ("ORACLE") (when "closed" by the King County Department of Executive Service – Finance) and includes at a minimum all accounts codes 52xxx, 53xxx, 54xxx, 55xxx, 56xxx, 57xxx, 58xxx, 59xxx.
 Non-Salaries/Benefits, Non-Facilities, & Non-CX Overhead Costs Less Probation includes Annual Total District Court Expenditures less actual expenditures for

2. Non-Salaries/Benefits, Non-Facilities, & Non-CX Overhead Costs Less Probation includes Annual Total District Court Expenditures less actual expenditures for probation, less account 55160 (facilities/construction), and less 55331 (long term leases). The City Cost is calculated by applying the Multiplier from Attachment A to the Non-Salaries/Benefits, Non-Facilities, & Non-CX Overhead Costs Less Probation.

3. One-Time Costs for District Court Technology and System Improvement Projects totaling under \$100,000 may be included in some of the above accounts (e.g., 53105, 55021, 55025, 56740, and 56741) per Section 4.8 of the Agreement.

City Jury Cost Calculation						
Juries Set		% of Total Juries Set	2018 Total Jury Costs			
State/County						
Criminal	158	57.87%	75,889			
City	58	21.09%	27,654			
State/County Civil	58	21.04%	27,596			
	274	100.00%	131,139			
		Paid by Cities	0			
		27,654				

ATTACHMENT "C" - TO THE FINANCIAL EXHIBIT

Security Costs per Facility

Facility	<u>Total Sheriff</u> <u>Security Costs per</u> <u>Facility (capped</u> <u>amount)</u>	Average of Judicial percentage and clerical percentage per Facility	<u>City Case</u> <u>Costs per</u> <u>Facility</u>
Auburn	220,189	78%	172,665
Bellevue	220,189	86%	189,561
Burien	220,189	13%	28,074
Issaquah	220,189	19%	40,997
Redmond	220,189	33%	71,687
Shoreline	220,189	64%	141,922
			644,906

Total Security Costs per Facility	Cost per FTE	# of FTEs
Security screener includes Overtime	\$ 75,234	1.00
Deputy/Marshal includes Overtime	\$ 137,376	1.33
Sergeant includes Overtime	\$ 7,579	0.05
	\$ 220,189	

Security Cost Increase Cap Calculation:

Year		Cos	curity sts Per cility	CPI-W + 1%	Сар		ped Costs Facility
	2017	\$	216,477				\$ 216,477
	2018	\$	220,189	4.40%		4.40%	\$ 220,189
	2019			3.10%		3.10%	\$ -
	2020			1.00%		1.00%	\$ -
	2021			1.00%		1.00%	\$ -
	2022			1.00%		1.00%	\$ -
	2023			1.00%		1.00%	\$ -
	2024			1.00%		1.00%	\$ -
	2025			1.00%		1.00%	\$ -
	2026			1.00%		1.00%	\$ -
	2027			1.00%		1.00%	\$ -
	2028			1.00%		1.00%	\$ -
	2029			1.00%		1.00%	\$ -
	2030			1.00%		1.00%	\$ -
	2031			1.00%		1.00%	\$ -
	2032			1.00%		1.00%	\$ -

1%

Calculation of Multiplier by Facility:

	Clerical	Need Percenta	age	Judio	ial Need Percer	itage	
	Α	В	C = B/A	D	E	F = E/D	G = (C+F)/2
	Total Clerical Need per Facility	Total Contract City Clerical Need	Percent of Clerical Need for Contract Cities	Total Judicial Need per Facility	Total Contract City Judicial Need	Percent of Judicial Need for Contract Cities	Average of Clerical Need Percent and the Judicial Need Percent by Facility
Auburn	15.00	10.25	68%	2.00	1.77	89%	78%
Bellevue	13.00	9.32	72%	2.05	2.06	100%	86%
Burien	18.00	1.89	11%	3.00	0.45	15%	13%
Issaquah	12.00	1.04	9%	1.40	0.40	29%	19%
Redmond	15.00	3.38	23%	3.10	1.32	43%	33%
Shoreline	11.00	3.18	29%	1.20	1.30	100%	64%

Methodology/Definitions/Notes:

1. The multiplier by facility is the average of the percent of clerical need for contract cities in the facility and the percent of judicial need for contract cities in the facility. The City Cost is the product of the actual staff salary and benefits for security and screening at each facility and the multiplier by facility.

2. FTE costs include salary, benefits, overtime, vacation, sick leave and required training for security personnel.

3. Security cost increases shall not exceed 100% (one hundred percent) of the Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue CPI-W, annual, plus an additional 1% (one percent), with a maximum capped increase of a 5% (five percent) in any given year for the total security costs per facility starting in 2022.

ATTACHMENT "D" - TO THE FINANCIAL EXHIBIT

Facilities - Call Center/Payment Center

Year	2018					
Facility	<u>Sq Footage</u> by facility	Shared Space	<u>Tot</u>	al per foot <u>cost</u>	<u>Multiplier</u>	<u>City Case</u> <u>Costs</u>
Call Center	2,459	2,459	\$	27.51	24.65%	19,512
Payment Center	1,041	1,041	\$	27.51	24.65%	8,260
Total Costs						27,772

Methodology/Definitions/Notes:

1. The "Total per foot cost" rate for each year is calculated in the attachment "Facility Rates" pursuant to Exhibit B. Changing the year at the top of this sheet will update the facility rate.

ATTACHMENT "E" - TO THE FINANCIAL EXHIBIT

Reconciliation Costs

\$567

Total Costs for Reconciliation

Calculation of Reconciliation Costs

Calculation of Reconcination Costs					
			Budget		
			Manager/City	PSB Budget	
Staff person name	KCD	C Director	Contracts	Analyst	Total
Hours spent on Reconciliation		6.00	-	1.00	7.0
Cost per hour (include Salary and Benefits)	\$	81.43	\$ -	78.73	160.2
Total Costs for reconciliation		\$489	\$0	78.73	\$567
Specific Task done and hours spent on Reconciliation listed below Reconciliation Documents Preparation Review/ Analysis Reconciliation Documents		6.00 1.00			
Sum of All Hours		7.00			
Sum of All Hours		7.00			

Methodology/Definitions/Notes:

1. The amount the County incurs to complete the annual reconciliation as referenced in Section 4.3.

ATTACHMENT "F" - TO THE FINANCIAL EXHIBIT

One-Time Costs for District Court Technology and System Improvement Projects

		City Contribution				Reserve		
	Threshold	City Multiplier	City Share	Beginning Balance	Expenditures	Interest Earnings	Ending Balance	Reserve Cap*
** est 2021	300,000	22.00%	67,000	387,000	0	18,000	405,000	TBD
** est 2022	300,000	24.65%	73,963	405,000	0	0	405,000	1,000,000
2023	300,000			0	0	0	0	1,020,000
2024	300,000						0	1,040,400
2025	300,000						0	1,061,208
2026	300,000						0	1,082,432
2027	300,000						0	1,104,081
2028	300,000						0	1,126,162
2029	300,000						0	1,148,686
2030	300,000						0	1,171,659
2031	300,000						0	1,195,093
2032	300,000						0	1,218,994
2033	300,000						0	1,243,374
2034	300,000						0	1,268,242
2035	300,000						0	1,293,607
2036	300,000						0	1,319,479

Methodology/Definitions/Notes:

1. This Attachment is developed pursuant to Exhibit C. The City Multiplier is calculated in Attachment A. The City Cost is the product of the multiplier and the threshold unless adjusted or waived in any year where the reserve is projected to exceed the equivalent of the Cities' share of reserve cap \$1,000,000 increased by 2% per year beginning in 2022.

2. FY21 and FY22 values are estimates for placeholders only and trued up in 2022.

ATTACHMENT "G" - TO THE FINANCIAL EXHIBIT

	Dedicated City Space	<u>Total square foot</u> <u>charge</u>	City cost for dedicated city space
Auburn			-
Beaux Arts			-
Bellevue			-
Burien			-
Carnation			-
Covington			-
Duvall			-
Kenmore			-
Redmond			-
Sammamish			-
Shoreline	-		-
Skykomish			-
Woodinville			-
Total	-		-

Dedicated City space

Description

Methodology/Definitions/Notes:

1. Figures for dedicated and shared spaces are based on FMD rate.

Summary of All City Costs for Cities

Methodology/Definitions/Notes:

1. This attachment (and NonFacility Costs and Facility Costs- Security portion only) divide the overall City Costs as determined in Exhibit A to individual cities based on the same method currently used to allocate costs. Facility costs allocation is noted below.

2. Those costs which are mainly salaries and benefits and are non-facility based, Attachments A, B, E, F and G, are allocated based on each cities percentage of all cities' clerical weights.

3. Those costs which are facility based, Attachment C is allocated based on the average of city case filings percentage and city judicial weights percentage per facility; Attachment Facility Costs

allocates facility costs based on FMD standard square footage for an FTE-clerk and judicial square footage based on an inidvidual building's average courtroom+jury+chambers+348 jury assembly room square 4. The tables below describe how this method allocates these costs across each city.

Summary of City Case Costs

Total Costs per	Summary Exhibit A			Method for	Allocation
			No	n-Facility Costs	Facility Costs % Clerical Need/Judicial
Attachment	Item	City Case Costs 2018	C	erical Weights	Weights
	2018 District Court Program Budget				
A	Salaries and Benefits	4,975,644	\$	4,975,644	
	Non-Facility costs/Non-CX overhead				
В	costs less probation	695,956	\$	695,956	
С	Security Costs per Facility	644,906			\$ 644,906
D	Facilities - Call Center/Payment Center	27,772	\$	27,772	
E	Reconciliation Costs	567		567	
	One-Time Costs for District Court				
	Technology and System Improvement				
F	Projects	73,963	\$	73,963	
J-Facility Costs	Facility Usage	274,391			\$ 274,391
	TOTAL CITY CASE COSTS IN 2018:	6,693,198	\$	5,773,902	\$ 919,296
	TOTAL CITY REVENUE IN 2018	\$ 6,246,369			
	City Dedicated Costs				
G	Dedicated City space	-		-	
	TOTAL CITY COSTS w/ DEDICATED	6,693,198			

		Facil	lity Usage/Security							
City	Non-Facility Costs	Facil	Costs	Dedicated Costs*	Т	otal City Costs	Tota	I City Revenue	0)ifference
Auburn	\$ 1,848,415	\$	152,240	-	\$	2,000,655	\$	764,289	\$	(1,236,366)
Beaux Arts	\$ -	\$	-	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
Bellevue	\$ 1,852,443	\$	189,366	-	\$	2,041,809	\$	3,824,437	\$	1,782,628
Burien	\$ 374,678	\$	67,976	-	\$	442,655	\$	184,520	\$	(258,135)
Carnation	\$ 2,884	\$	5,939	-	\$	8,823	\$	3,327	\$	(5,496)
Covington	\$ 188,857	\$	20,517	-	\$	209,373	\$	100,378	\$	(108,996)
Duvall	\$ 76,765	\$	14,854	-	\$	91,618	\$	48,154	\$	(43,465)
Kenmore	\$ 122,206	\$	53,713	-	\$	175,920	\$	140,383	\$	(35,537)
Redmond	\$ 595,490	\$	147,727	-	\$	743,218	\$	446,444	\$	(296,774)
Sammamish	\$ 202,838	\$	76,479	-	\$	279,318	\$	259,938	\$	(19,379)
Shoreline	\$ 509,326	\$	184,675	-	\$	694,001	\$	469,379	\$	(224,622)
Skykomish	\$ -	\$	-	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
Woodinville	\$ -	\$	5,655	-	\$	5,655	\$	5,121	\$	(535)
Total	\$ 5,773,902	\$	919,142	\$ -	\$	6,693,044	\$	6,246,369	\$	(446,676)

Non-Facility Costs for Cities

Summary of City Case Costs

Total Costs per	Summary Exhibit A		Method for	r Al	location
Attachment	ltem	0:4.0	n-Facility Costs erical Weights		Facility Costs % Clerical Need/Judicial Weights
Attachment	2018 District Court Program Budget	City Case Costs 2018	erical weights		weights
А	Salaries and Benefits Non-Facility costs/Non-CX overhead	4,975,644	\$ 4,975,644		
В	costs less probation	695,956	\$ 695,956		
С	Security Costs per Facility	644,906	,	\$	644,906
D	Facilities - Call Center/Payment Center	27,772	\$ 27,772		
E	Reconciliation Costs One-Time Costs for District Court Technology and System Improvement	567	567		
F	Projects	73,963	\$ 73,963		
J-Facility Costs	Facility Usage	274,391		\$	274,391
	TOTAL CITY CASE COSTS IN 2018:	6,693,198	\$ 5,773,902	\$	919,296
	TOTAL CITY REVENUE IN 2018	\$ 6,246,369			
	City Dedicated Costs				
G	Dedicated City space	-	-		
	TOTAL CITY COSTS w/ DEDICATED	6,693,198			

	Clerical Usag	le		
City	Total Weights (Time)	Percent of All Cities	Cost Di	stribution
Auburn	955,455	32.01%	\$	1,848,415
Beaux Arts	0	0.00%	\$	-
Bellevue	957,537	32.08%	\$	1,852,443
Burien	193,673	6.49%	\$	374,678
Carnation	1,491	0.05%	\$	2,884
Covington	97,621	3.27%	\$	188,857
Duvall	39,680	1.33%	\$	76,765
Kenmore	63,169	2.12%	\$	122,206
Redmond	307,812	10.31%	\$	595,490
Sammamish	104,848	3.51%	\$	202,838
Shoreline	263,273	8.82%	\$	509,326
Skykomish	0	0.00%	\$	-
Woodinville	0	0.00%	\$	-
Total	2,984,559	100%	\$	5,773,902

	By Attachment													
City		Α		В		E	F	F		G	Total			
Auburn	\$	1,592,866	\$	222,798	\$	8,891	\$	182	\$	23,678	#######################################			
Beaux Arts	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$-			
Bellevue	\$	1,596,337	\$	223,284	\$	8,910	\$	182	\$	23,730	#######################################			
Burien	\$	322,878	\$	45,162	\$	1,802	\$	37	\$	4,800	\$ 374,678			
Carnation	\$	2,486	\$	348	\$	14	\$	0	\$	37	\$ 2,884			
Covington	\$	162,747	\$	22,764	\$	908	\$	19	\$	2,419	\$ 188,857			
Duvall	\$	66,152	\$	9,253	\$	369	\$	8	\$	983	\$ 76,765			
Kenmore	\$	105,311	\$	14,730	\$	588	\$	12	\$	1,565	\$ 122,206			
Redmond	\$	513,162	\$	71,777	\$	2,864	\$	59	\$	7,628	\$ 595,490			
Sammamish	\$	174,795	\$	24,449	\$	976	\$	20	\$	2,598	\$ 202,838			
Shoreline	\$	438,910	\$	61,391	\$	2,450	\$	50	\$	6,524	\$ 509,326			
Skykomish	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -			
Woodinville	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -			
Total	\$	4,975,644	\$	695,956	\$	27,772	\$	567	\$	73,963	#######################################			

Facility Usage

Summary of City Costs

Facility Costs for Cities	

Total Costs per Summary Exhibit A				Method for A	lloca	ation
			No	on-Facility Costs	F	acility Costs % Clerical
Attachment	Item	City Case Costs 2018	8 Clerical Weights			leed/Judicial Weights
	2018 District Court Program Budget					
A	Salaries and Benefits	4,975,644	s	4,975,644		
	Non-Facility costs/Non-CX overhead					
в	costs less probation	695.956	s	695.956		
С	Security Costs per Facility	644,906			\$	644,906
D	Facilities - Call Center/Payment Center	27,772	s	27,772		
E	Reconciliation Costs One-Time Costs for District Court	567		567		
	Technology and System Improvement					
F	Projects	73.963	s	73.963		
J-Facility Costs	Facility Usage	274,391			\$	274,391
	TOTAL CITY CASE COSTS IN 2018:	6,693,198	\$	5,773,902	\$	919,296
	TOTAL CITY REVENUE IN 2018	\$ 6,246,369				
G	City Dedicated Costs					

	TOTAL CITY COSTS w/ DEDICATED	6,693,198	
G	Dedicated City space		

Facility Usage Costs

Courthouse facility charge per square foot

2018							
	Clerical Facility Usage		Judicial Facility Usage				
	Total Judicial Need per Facility & Clerical Allocated Facility & Contract City Judicial A Contract City Clerical Need Square Fodtage Judicial Need Square Fr				Total Allocated Square Footage	Total Allocated Facility Costs	
Auburn Courthouse	15.00		2.00				
Auburn	9.30		1.52			s	
	0.00		1.02			Ŷ.	
Covington	0.95		0.26			\$	-
Bellevue Courthouse	13.00		2.05				
Beaux Arts	0.00		0.00			\$	-
Bellevue	9.32		2.06			\$	-
Burien Courthouse	18.00	3,600	3.00	7,242	10,842	\$ 298,	263
Burien	1.89	377	0.45	1,078	1,455	\$ 40,	,040
Issaquah Courthouse	12.00	2,400	1.40	4,516	6,916	\$ 190,	,270
Carnation	0.01	3	0.04	128	131	\$ 3,	613
Sammamish	1.02	204	0.36	1,169	1,374	\$ 37,	786
Redmond Courthouse	15.00	3,000	3.10	6,687	9,687	\$ 266,	,481
Duvall	0.39	77	0.10	215	293	\$ 8,	,048
Redmond	3.00	599	1.15	2,481	3,080	\$ 84,	726
Skykomish	0.00		0.00	-	-	\$	-
Woodinville	0.00		0.07	141	141	\$ 3,	880
Shoreline Courthouse	11.00	2,200	1.20	2,636	4,836	\$ 133,	,049
Kenmore	0.61	123	0.32	699	822	\$ 22,	619
Shoreline	2.56	513	0.99	2,166	2,678	\$ 73,	680
	•			Total C	ities Allocated Cost	\$ 274,	391

Square footage assumptions

Component	Square footage - used to determine cost share	Notes					
Clerical	200	FMD standard amount per FTE.					
		Square footage of individual facility's rentable square footage					
		of average courtroom+average jury room+average					
Judicial	Variable, below	chambers+ Cell J31 (jury assembly). Values from FMD.					
Additional Judicial	348	Additional square footage to represent jury assembly space					
Auburn Courthouse		Building is owned by the City of Auburn.					
Bellevue Courthouse		Building is leased by the City of Bellevue.					
Burien Courthouse	2,414	Sq. footage 2066 + 348					
Issaquah Courthouse	3,226	Sq. footage 2878 + 348					
Redmond Courthous	2,157	Sq. footage 1809 +348					
Shoreline Courthous	2.197	Sa. footage 1849 + 348					

Security Costs Spreading Attachment D (security) across each City

Calculation of Multiplier by Facility:

		Clerical Need Percentage			Judicial Need Perce	ntage		Average of the percent values of the Clerical Need by Facility Method and	Attachment D
		Total Clerical Need per Facility	Total Contract City Clerical Need	Percent of Clerical Need for Contract City	Total Judicial Need per Facility	Total Contract City Judicial Need	Need for Contract	the Judicial Need by Facility Method:	Security Costs per Facility
Auburn Courthouse		15.0	0 10.25		2.00	1.77			\$ 172,665
	Auburn		9.30	91%		1.52	86%	88%	\$ 152,240
	Covington		0.95	9%		0.26	14%	12%	\$ 20,517
Bellevue Courthouse		13.0	0 9.32		9.32	2.06			\$ 189,561
	Beaux Arts			0%		-	0%	0%	s -
	Bellevue		9.32	100%		2.06	100%	100%	\$ 189,366
Burien Courthouse		18.0	0 1.89		1.89	0.45			\$ 28,074
	Burien		1.89	100%		0.45	99%	100%	\$ 27,937
Issaquah Courthouse		12.0	0 1.04		1.40	0.40			\$ 40,997
	Carnation		0.01	1%		0.04	10%	6%	\$ 2,326
	Sammamish		1.02	98%		0.36	91%	94%	\$ 38,693
Redmond Courthouse		15.0	0 3.38		3.10	1.32			\$ 71,687
	Duvall		0.39	11%		0.10	8%	9%	\$ 6,806
	Redmond		3.00	89%		1.15	87%	88%	\$ 63,002
	Skykomish			0%		-	0%	0%	s -
	Woodinville		-	0%		0.07	5%	2%	\$ 1,775
Shoreline Courthouse		11.0	0 3.18		1.20	1.30			\$ 141,922
	Kenmore		0.61	19%		0.32	24%	22%	\$ 31,094
	Shoreline		2.56	81%		0.99	76%	78%	\$ 110,996
							Total	Cities Allocated Costs	\$ 644,752

Total Cities Allocated Costs \$ 644,752 1. The facility rate per square foot for each year is calculated in the attachment (tab) "Facility Rates." Changing the year in the middle of this sheet (cell A25) will update the facility rate. 2. Refer to Exhibit 16 or the overall methodology for the rate per square foot. Facility costs are based on FMD standard square footage for an FTE-derk and judicial square footage based on an individual building's average Courtborny tay-chambers 348 jury assembly from square footage. 3. Figures for defacilities of the overall appears are based on remitalie space consistent with BOMA standards. 4. The multiplier by facility for security is the average of the percent of derical need for contract cities in the facility. The security cost is the product of the multiplier and the total security cost per facility assembly contained on the security cost is the product of the multiplier and the total security cost per facility assembly cost per facility assembly cost per facility and the percent of judicial need for contract cities in the facility. The security cost is the product of the multiplier and the total security cost per facility assembly cost per facility assembly cost per facility assembly cost per facility assembly cost per facility as calculated on the cost security cost is the product of the percent of derical need for contract cities in the facility. The security cost is the product of the multiplier and the total security cost per facility assembly assembly cost per facility assembly cost

County/Other Dedicated Space

		Dedicated	
	<u>Sq. Footage by</u>	County/Other	
Facility	facility	Space	Description
Auburn	-	-	
Bellevue	-	-	
Burien	11,583	757	County prosecutor occupies two rooms in NW corner of facility.
Issaquah	15,017	4,961	1070 sf is vacant, previously occupied by County prosecutor.1891 sf for DC probation. 2000 for courtroom
		(County prosecutor occupies three rooms off the lobby hallway. County public defender, County Prosecutor (state cases), and Marshall occupy
Redmond	,		three rooms to the right of the main entrance.
Shoreline	11,523	653	DC probation occupies several offices off the main lobby hallway (653).
Total	49,779	7,391	-

Methodology/Definitions/Notes:

1. As requested, the County can provide drawings of these facilities to illustrate how spaces are allocated.

			Court Costs (TD Revenues						
	100% Revenue Collected	Split Co/City	Actual Retained by County	Revenue Remitted to City	100% Revenue Collected	Split Co/City	Actual Retained by County	Revenue Remitted to City	Revenue Remitted under Old Contract
Auburn	788,831	0%/100%	0	788,831	764,289	0%/100%	0	0	0
Beaux Arts	39	100%/ 0%	39	0	0	100%/ 0%	0	0	0
						75%/25% (4) then 70%/30% (2)then 30%/70% (3) then			
Bellevue	4,033,494	50%/50%	2,275,309	1,758,185	3,824,437	60%/40% (3)	2,280,709		0
Burien	176,109	100%/0%	176,109	0	184,520	100%/0%	184,520	0	0
Carnation	2,986	100%/ 0%	2,986	0	3,327	100%/ 0%	3,327	0	0
Covington	91,132	100%/ 0%	91,132	0	100,378	100%/ 0%	100,378	0	0
Duvall		100%/ 0%	48,705	0	48,154	100%/ 0%	48,154	0	0
Kenmore		100%/ 0%	166,531	0		100%/ 0%	140,383		0
Redmond		100%/0%	408,824	0		100%/0%	446,444		0
Sammamish		100%/ 0%	279,656	0		100%/ 0%	259,938		0
Shoreline		100%/0%	422,402	0		100%/ 0%	469,379		0
Skykomish	-	100%/0%	0	0		100%/0%	0	0	0
Woodinville	34,424	100%/ 0%	34,424	0	5,121	100%/ 0%	5,121	0	0
	6,453,133		3,906,117	2,547,016	6,246,369		3,938,352	121	0

King County District Court City Revenue

Total City Revenue

6,453,133

6,246,369

**Dollar amount is different from page 1. We have deleted cities which no longer contract with us.

Methodology/Definitions/Notes:

1. Contracting Cities changed in 2005 & 2007.

2. Cities that no longer contract with KCDC are not reflected above.

			2018 - K	ING COUNT	Y DISTRICT C	OURT FILINGS	BY CASET	(PE				
	Infraction Traffic	Infraction Non-Traffic	DUI	Criminal Traffic	Criminal Non-Traffic	Protection AH/Orders	Civil	Small Claims	Expedited Hearings	PC Jail Felony Hearings	Parking	Total Jan Dec
JURISDICTION												
State/County	76.247	8.029	3,360	315	1,057	2,684	3.359	3,205	586	12,344	11,441	122,627
Ecourt	10,211	0,020	0,000	010	1,001	2,001	16,798	0,200	000	12,011	,	16,798
Vashon Island	4	11	6	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	86	110
Total State/County	76,251	8,040	3,366	316	1,059	2,684	20,157	3,205	586	12,344	11,527	139,535
•	·					· · · ·				· · · · · ·	· · · ·	
Auburn	5,363	122	230	1,111	2,400						3,482	12,708
Beaux Arts	0	0	0	0	0						0	0
Bellevue	8,287	39	118	770	1,385						37,100	47,699
Burien	913	8	226	84	369						668	2,268
Carnation	0	0	0	3	4						0	7
Covington	1,000	8	20	130	150						155	1,463
Duvall	490	0	8	63	29						0	590
Kenmore	699	6	23	82	45						463	1,318
Redmond	5,161	38	41	213	547						719	6,719
Sammamish	2,435	6	30	58	61						128	2,718
Shoreline	3,876	67	75	260	271						985	5,534
Skykomish												0
Total Contract Cities	28,224	294	771	2,774	5,261	0	0	0	0	0	43,700	81,024
Total KCDC	104,475	8,334	4,137	3,090	6,320	2,684	20,157	3,205	586	12,344	55,227	220,559

	Infraction Non- Traffic/Traffic	Infraction Non- Traffic/Traffic E-citations		Misd Traffic	Misd Non- Traffic	DV Court (State Cases)	Protection AH/Orders	Civil	Name Changes	Small Claims/Imp ounds	Expedited Filings	Felony 1st Appear	Parking	Parking E-citations	Passports	Total Jan - Dec
Case Wgt (Minutes)	40	27	370	305	149	409	132	149	28	60	83	12	9	6	15	
URISDICTION																
State/County Workload	373,320	2,023,866	1,245,420	96,380	47,978	180,778	354,288	2,502,902	88,004	205,260	48,638	148,128	103,743	0	219,510	7,638,215
otal State/County	373,320	2,023,866	1,245,420	96,380	47,978	180,778	354,288	2,502,902	88,004	205,260	48,638	148,128	103,743	0	219,510	7,638,215
Case Wgt (Minutes)	40	27	370	305	149	139							9	6		
uburn	1,160	147,312	85,100	338,855	269,541	82,149		0	0		0	0	31,338	0		955,455
Beaux Arts	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0		0
Bellevue	4,760	221,589	43,660	234,850	164,943	38,642		0	0		0	0	79,479	169,614		957,537
Burien	840	24,300	83,620	25,620	29,651	23,630		0	0		0	0	6,012	0		193,673
Carnation	0	0	0	915	298	278		0	0		0	0	0	0		1,491
Covington	0	27,216	7,400	39,650	16,539	5,421		0	0		0	0	1,395	0		97,621
Duvall	320	13,014	2,960	19,215	2,086	2,085		0	0		0	0	0	0		39,680
Lenmore	160	18,927	8,510	25,010	2,086	4,309		0	0		0	0	4,167	0		63,169
Ledmond	2,000	139,023	15,170	64,965	61,835	18,348		0	0		0	0	6,471	0		307,812
ammamish	800	65,367	11,100	17,690	3,874	4,865		0	0		0	0	1,152	0		104,848
horeline	4,640	103,329	27,750	79,300	25,628	13,761		0	0		0	0	8,865	0		263,273
kykomish	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	0		0
otal Contract Cities	14.680	760.077	285,270	846,070	576,481	193,488		0	0		0	0	138,879	169.614		2,984,559

Methodology/Definitions/Notes: 1. The NCSC staffing study was incorporated into case weights in 2007.

County vs. Cit	y Weighted Filin	gs
		%
Total Weighted Filings	10,622,774	100.00%
County Weighted Filings	7,638,215	71.90%
City Weighted Filings	2,984,559	28.10%

	Total Judicial Units <u>Available</u> per Week	Total Judicial Units <u>Assigned</u> per Week		Judicial Officers FTE	24.20
Total Judicial Units <u>Assigned to County</u> per Week		19.04			
Fotal Judicial Units Assigned to Cities per Week		7.31		Presiding Judge	(1.00)
Cross-check	23.10	26.35	26.35 26.35	Assistant Presiding Judge Total Judicial Units available per week	(0.10) 23.10

		County/State Criminal	County/State Infractions	County/State Civil	DV Court	Jail/Felony Expedited	Inquests		Shared
JURISDICTION									
State/County Calendars	708.02	263.49	58.89	279.73	23.45	56.07		0.24	26.15
State/County Judges	14.89	5.07	1.13	5.38	0.80	2.00		0.005	0.50
State/County Juries	4.15	2.86		1.11	0.18				
Total Judges Used	19.04	7.93	1.13	6.49	0.98	2.00		0.00	0.50

JURISDICTION	Total Calendars	Judges for Calendars	Judges for Juries	Total Judges per City	Total Judges Assigned
Auburn	70.39	1.35	0.16	1.52	1.52
Beaux Arts	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Bellevue	90.09	1.73	0.32	2.06	2.06
Burien	20.83	0.40	0.05	0.45	0.45
Carnation	1.47	0.03	0.01	0.04	0.04
Covington	10.94	0.21	0.05	0.26	0.26
Duvall	4.59	0.09	0.01	0.10	0.10
Kenmore	14.15	0.27	0.05	0.32	0.32
Redmond	48.12	0.93	0.22	1.15	1.15
Sammamish	15.85	0.30	0.06	0.36	0.36
Shoreline	44.06	0.85	0.14	0.99	0.99
Skykomish	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Woodinville	1.00	0.02	0.05	0.07	0.07
Total Contract Cities	321.49	6.18	1.11	7.29	7.29

	Total Calendars	Judges for Calendars	Civil	Judicial Allocation
Auburn	8.40	0.16		0.16
Beaux Arts	0.00	0.00		0.00
Bellevue	16.80	0.32		0.32
Burien	2.40	0.05		0.05
Carnation	0.60	0.01		0.01
Covington	2.40	0.05		0.05
Duvall	0.60	0.01		0.01
Kenmore	2.40	0.05		0.05
King County	158.40	4.15	57.60	4.15
Redmond	11.52	0.22		0.22
Sammamish	3.00	0.06		0.06
Shoreline	7.20	0.14		0.14
Skykomish	0.00	0.00		0.00
Woodinville	2.40	0.05		0.05
y Totals		1.11		1.11
Totals	216.12		57.60	5.26

	Totals		%	Judicial Allocation
Criminal		148.80	68.89%	2.86
Criminal DV		9.60	4.44%	0.18
Civil		57.60	26.67%	1.1
Totals		216.00	100.00%	4.15

No. of Judges needed for Jury Tr	ials
Judge Days / Month	80.00
Judge Days / Year	960.00
Divided by 52 weeks	18.46
Total Judges used per day for Juries	3.69

Facility	Assigned Judicial Officers
Auburn	2.00
Bellevue	2.05
Burien	3.00
Issaquah	1.40
Redmond	3.10
Shoreline	1.20
Total	12.75

cial Assignment Judges	
Court Burien	0.10
Court Seattle	0.10
Court MRJC	0.80
elony/ MRJC	0.70
Fugitive Seattle	1.10
ny/Expedited Seattle	0.20
Total	3.00

Methodology/Definitions/Notes: 1. Removes judicial differential factor. Resulting in only judges deemed necessary per court calendars.

2018 - KING COUNTY DISTRICT COURT CLERICAL ALLOCATION

2.29 2.49

4.78

			31.00	
Programs	Clerical Staff	% of Clerical staff	Clerks after removal of Centralized and Compliance Clerks	Total w/o Centralized Clerks
County-State Criminal				
DUI/Phy Control, Mis Traffic & NT				
& PO's	22.07	16.42%	5.09	16.98
County-State Infractions (Traffic & Non-Traffic, Prkg) County-State Civil, Name Changes,	31.64	23.54%	7.30	24.34
Small Claims/impounds	35.38	26.32%	8.16	27.22
City Contracts				
Auburn	12.09	8.99%	2.79	9.30
Beaux Arts	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00
Bellevue	12.12	9.01%	2.79	9.32
Burien	2.45	1.82%	0.57	1.89
Carnation	0.02	0.01%	0.00	0.01
Covington	1.24	0.92%	0.28	0.95
Duvall	0.50	0.37%	0.12	0.39
Kenmore	0.80	0.59%	0.18	0.61
Redmond	3.89	2.90%	0.90	3.00
Sammamish	1.33	0.99%	0.31	1.02
Shoreline	3.33	2.48%	0.77	2.56
Skykomish	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00
DV Court (State)	2.29	1.70%	0.53	1.76
Jail/Felony/Expedited	2.49	1.85%	0.57	1.92
Passports	2.78	2.07%	0.64	2.14
Total	134.40	100.0%	31.00	103.40

Total FTES as Clerical Staff	134.40	SPECIALTY F	TEs
Compliance Clerks	13.00	Program	Clerl
Passport Clerks	2.78	DV Court	
Specialty FTEs	4.78	Jail	
Centralized FTEs	18.00		
Remaining Clerical	95.85		

CENTRALIZED FTEs					
Court	Program	Clerks			
Central	Payment Ctr	8.00			
Central	Call Center	10.00			
		18.00			

Clerical Allocation

**18 Centralized Clerks + 13 Comp Clerks = 31

FACILITY RATES

	District Court Facilities						
	Streamlined/ Actual FMD Rate	Capped Rate	CPI-W	Facility Charge			
2018	33.50	27.51	3.40%	27.51			
2019	31.91	28.09	2.10%	28.09			
2020							
2021				-			
2022				-			
2023				-			
2024				-			
2025				-			
2026				-			
2027				-			
2028				-			
2029				-			
2030				-			
2031				-			
2032				-			

Methodology/Definitions/Notes:

1. Per Exhibit B, the rate each year following 2022 is the lesser amount between the actual rate provided by King County's Facilities Management Division and the capped rate determined by multiplying the previous year's facilities charge by that year's CPI-W.

EXHIBIT B ANNUAL FACILITY CHARGES FOR DISTRICT COURT FACILITIES

This Exhibit is attached to the Interlocal Agreement for the Provision of District Court Services between the County and the City. The terms and conditions described in this Exhibit are a further description of the obligations of the parties regarding the calculation of annual facility charges for County owned or operated District Court facilities.

King County's Facilities Management Division (FMD) determines the cost per square foot for facilities owned and maintained by the County. The FMD rate typically includes: operating costs, debt service, major maintenance contribution, space planning, conservation/energy management, cost of carbon, and FMD overhead. FMD's rates are specific to each building group. District Court facilities are a single group.

The annual facility charge is the net rentable square footage in each facility pursuant to Section 3.1 multiplied by the FMD rate per square foot for the District Court facilities.

FMD will provide the rate for the District Court dedicated buildings for the next two calendar years by September of each even year. For 2022, cities will pay the actual FMD rate. The rate each year thereafter is the lesser amount between the actual rate provided by the Facilities Management Division and the capped rate determined by increasing the previous year's facilities charge by that year's annual CPI-W (Seattle Tacoma Bellevue, all items, base period 1982-84=100).¹

¹ Annual CPI-W will be sourced each year from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics during contract reconciliation. Annual CPI-W is available in 2020 at <u>https://data.bls.gov/timeseries/CWURS49DSA0&output_view=pct_12mths</u>.

EXHIBIT C RESERVE FUNDS FOR ONE-TIME COSTS FOR DISTRICT COURT TECHNOLOGY AND SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

This Exhibit is attached to the Interlocal Agreement for the Provision of District Court Services between the County and the City. The terms and conditions described in this Exhibit are a further description of the obligations of the parties regarding the one-time costs for technology and other system improvement projects.

This Exhibit operates to maintain a reserve fund for technology and other system improvement projects so that funding for these projects is available when needed and to enable the Cities to spread out such costs over time.

- The District Court shall present its technology plan and updates to the DCMRC. The technology plan shall describe the projected business needs of the District Court, assess the ability of current technology systems to meet these needs, and outline overall technology strategies and potential projects to support the projected business needs of the District Court. The District Court shall present the business case for each proposed technology improvement project. The business case shall identify: (1) capital, operations, maintenance costs, and potential funding sources for each technology improvement project, (2) the benefits to the court system and users (3) potential impacts to cities associated with implementing each technology improvement project, and (4) proposal for use of reserve funds. The Cities shall have an opportunity to provide input on the technology plan and business cases for proposed technology improvement projects.
- 2. District Court shall present to DCMRC any system improvement project that includes a proposal for the use of reserve funds. System improvement projects include, but are not limited to, clerical weighted caseload studies.
- 3. Funds from the reserve shall not be used until the DCMRC approves such expenditure. Such approval shall be obtained by mutual agreement of the DCMRC. The funds shall not be expended until the technology or system improvement project has been implemented. If the funds in the reserve are not sufficient to cover the Cities' share of an implemented technology or system improvement project, the contributions of Cities to the reserve fund in subsequent years may be used to cover this shortfall.
- 4. One-time costs for technology or system improvement projects shall be identified separately from operating and capital costs as part of reconciliation.
- 5. Beginning in 2022, the amount of the Cities' annual contribution shall be equivalent to the Cities' proportionate share of \$300,000. The Cities' share is defined as the multiplier calculated in Attachment A of Exhibit A (percentage of salaries and benefits for contract cities).
- 6. The Cities' contribution would be adjusted or waived in any year where the reserve is projected to exceed the Cities' share of the reserve cap. Beginning in 2022, the reserve cap shall be \$1,000,000 and shall increase by 2% per year thereafter. The reserve cap for each year of the contract is included in Attachment A of Exhibit A.

- 7. The parties may decide to suspend the 2% increase to the reserve cap for any particular year if the parties, through agreement of the DCMRC, agree that the reserve is at a sufficient amount for that year. Annually, the net interest earnings attributable to the balance of funds in the Cities' reserve shall accrue to their reserve.
- 8. If this Agreement is terminated as to a particular City or Cities, such City(ies) shall receive its portion of the reserve remaining by January 1st following the date of termination.

EXHIBIT D City Regular Court Calendar

This Exhibit is attached to the Interlocal Agreement for the Provision of District Court Services between the County and the City.

The City of ______'s regular court calendars will be held on ______(day(s) of the week). The designated day(s) may be adjusted upon mutual agreement of the City and County and without formal amendment of this ILA so long as such agreement is memorialized in writing between the Chief Presiding Judge or designee and City's designated representative.