



King County

Metropolitan King County Council Capital Budget Committee

Agenda Item No.:	<u>5</u>	Date:	<u>April 2, 2008</u>
	2007-0614		
Proposed No.:	<u>2008-0141</u>	Prepared By:	<u>Polly St. John</u>

STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: Today's discussion is on the Executive Proposed King County 2006-2007 Space Plan and the 2008 Update to Executive Summary.

SUMMARY:

Today's report is intended to be an overview of the plans transmitted by the Executive. The discussion will reacquaint members with information regarding the space planning process and background, the status of the existing planning environment, emerging conditions, a summary of a lapsed 2006-2007 plan, and an update to the Executive Summary.

Today's report will center around two pieces of legislation:

1. **2007-0614** – AN ORDINANCE relating to comprehensive planning; adopting the King County 2006-2007 Space Plan; and amending Ordinance 10810, Section 1, as amended, and K.C.C. 20.12.100. *Legislation has LAPSED, but included 170 page 2006-2007 plan*
2. **2008-0141** – AN ORDINANCE relating to comprehensive planning; adopting the 2006-2007 King County space plan; and amending Ordinance 10810, Section 1, as amended, and K.C.C. 20.12.100. *included only a revised Executive Summary for the 2006-2007 plan*

Additionally, today's report will provide a list of arising questions for analysis as councilmembers' consideration of the space plan continues.

Space Planning Timelines: The Executive transmitted 2006-2007 Space Plan legislation¹ during consideration of the annual budget on November 7, 2007. This transmittal was almost 2 years overdue. According to King County Code (KCC), the plan was due on March 1, 2006. KCC 200.12.100 states that:

"The executive shall update the current and future space needs and implementation plans of the county space plan and submit them to the council as amendments to the county space plan by March 1 of every other year, beginning on March 1, 2006."

¹ Proposed Ordinance 2007-0614

The Executive's transmittal letter acknowledged the lateness of the transmittal and suggested that the plan be viewed as a background document prior to transmittal of the 2008 plan which was due March 1, 2008. The Executive transmitted Proposed Ordinance 2008-0141 that includes a new Executive Summary to make 2008 updates to the 2006-2007 plan. The change between the two documents is a revised Executive Summary; an inclusive 2008 plan was not submitted for consideration.

According to the Executive, the 2006-2007 plan was delayed by "the number of significant facility and real estate proposals that have been under consideration over the last two years." The new Executive Summary 2008 also states that the plan is limited and subject to change due to the significant facility planning initiatives currently underway. The document states that the "development of a wholly new space plan should await the outcome of those efforts".

BACKGROUND:

The Executive is responsible to update the current and future space needs and facility work program sections of the county space plan and submit them to the Council as amendments to the county space plan by March 1 every other year². The Council is responsible to review, amend, defer or adopt the Executive proposed space plans but is not obligated to adopt a space plan on an annual basis. See **Attachment # 7** for a summary of applicable King County Code (KCC) and Charter sections. *It should be noted that both Executive and Council staff acknowledge that these sections need to be updated and coordinated to reflect current county policies.* For instance, although current space planning documents refer regularly to a facility master plan (FMP), the KCC does not mention FMPs, but talks about "capital improvement plans" and "project program plans".

Previous Adopted Space Plans: Previously adopted space plans occurred in 1993, 1997, 2002, and 2005. Recent plan history includes:

- **2002 Space Plan:** On November 25, 2002, the Council passed the King County Space Plan 2002 as an amendment to the County's Comprehensive Plan. This was the first Plan to incorporate recommendations by the Space and Facilities Peer Review Panel (Peer Panel). This group helped standardize space plan procedures, by making recommendations about planning, leasing, building, operations and maintenance, and long term projections.
- **2003 Space Plan:** The 2003 Space Plan was transmitted for County Council consideration in late February 2003. The Council's Budget and Fiscal Management Committee (BFM) were briefed three times on the 2003 Space Plan; in October 2003, early February 2004 and finally in April 2004. This plan was held pending the development of the Executive's proposal for a new county office building (NCOB).

² Previously, space plans were to be submitted for council review annually on August 1. Ordinance 15328 that adopted the 2005 Space Plan changed the due date to allow for biennial consideration, beginning in 2006, and the date for submittal was changed from August 1 to March 1. This change was to allow for a more reasonable timeline to prepare and consider this large body of work.

- **2004 Space Plan:** The 2004 Space Plan was introduced on August 23, 2004 but was not heard in committee during 2004. The 2004 Space Plan was reintroduced on January 18, 2005 and review was deferred pending receipt of the Executive's proviso response on the final proposed NCOB tenant agencies.
- **2005 Space Plan:** Due to the above timelines for consideration of the 2004 plan, the Council adopted Ordinance 15328 that updated space planning policies contained in the Executive's 2004 proposal. The King County Department of Executive Services Space Plan 2004 was incorporated as an attachment to those over-riding policies.

OVERVIEW:

Relationship of the Space Plan to the Comprehensive Plan

The County Space Plan consisting of space standards, current and future space needs, and county facility development policy framework, is a subelement of the public facilities element of the comprehensive plan. RCW 36.70A.070, **Attachment 8**, lists the mandatory elements that must be included in the Comprehensive Plan. The capital planning element must include:

Requirement	Included
An inventory of existing facilities	✓
A forecast of future needs	✓ staffing projections x for capital facilities
Proposed locations and capacities of facilities	✓ for current facilities x for future facilities
A six-year plan that will finance the facilities	<i>within annual budget process</i>
Coordinated and consistent plans	x subject to OMPs/FMPs

The transmitted documents include an inventory of existing facilities and the locations and capacities of current facilities. Additionally, each agency has included a forecast of long term needs based upon projected staffing levels. Essentially, these forecasts are based upon anticipated operational changes and are the agency's best estimation of staffing needs in 2016. However, the Executive is correct that the space plan does not include a forecast of future capital needs that are coordinated and consistent, as these long term plans are indeed subject to the outcomes of OMPs and FMPs that have recently been completed or that are currently in development. (These proposals will be discussed in the existing and emerging condition sections of this staff report.)

It should be noted that past major capital decisions have resulted from OMP or FMP recommendations or from budgetary appropriations and/or provisos. These policies were made outside the space plan forecasts.

As a subelement of the Comprehensive Plan, the Council may adopt amendments to the space plan only in conjunction with either 1) the annual amendment to the Comprehensive Plan; or 2) adoption of the annual county budget. Upon completion of committee review, the ordinance adopting the plan would hold its place on the Council agenda to coincide with either of those actions.

King County Code

The space plan is addressed in the county code in Chapters 4 and 20 – excerpts are included as **Attachment 7**. The space plan adoption is specifically addressed in Chapter 20 as part of the Comprehensive Plan where it is stated specifically that the county space plan “shall govern development of all facility master plans, facility program plans and CIP and lease requests for space housing county agency operations”.

Additionally, KCC 4.04.020, the Budget and Reporting System section states that the adopted county space plan should be the basis for capital improvement plans and project program plans. Although facility master plans are not mentioned within Chapter 4, it is generally assumed that the definitions for project program plans and FMPs are similar in nature.

These code requirements make it clear that the space plan shall be the overarching policy document for capital planning decisions. As noted in the timing section, the transmitted documents have been delayed pending the outcomes of OMP and FMP planning efforts. The transmittal letter views the space plan as “one component of a complicated, comprehensive capital planning strategy currently underway” within the county. The letter acknowledges that space plan updates have been limited by on-going planning proposals and “do not address many of the strategic facilities issues being studied”.

EXISTING ENVIRONMENT:

All space plans transmitted by the Executive and considered by the Council, represent a “snapshot in time”, as planning decisions are influenced by on-going policy decisions. To ensure that updates are on-going, the space plan is to be transmitted every other year. A wide range of strategic planning initiatives have either recently been completed or are currently under development. These include a number of operational master plans (OMP) and facility master plans (FMP). Listed below are a number of existing bodies of work and their status:

- Consolidated Elections Facility – On March 12, 2007, the Council passed Ordinance 15702 that approved a ten year lease with an option to purchase the Earlington building located in Renton to consolidate elections functions. The option to purchase will most likely move forward to the council in 2008. *This ordinance also requested that the Executive develop options to move the Sheriff’s criminal investigations division (CID) to the Courthouse in downtown Seattle.* Additionally, the 2005 space plan also stated that the CID “shall be relocated to the downtown Seattle core complex of King County buildings”. The policy direction in both documents was linked to the elections relocation because possible vacancies opened due to the elections move from the administration building could result in a priority location for the relocation of the sheriff’s departmental functions. *completed – option to purchase likely in 2008*
- District Court OMP – The District Court OMP was adopted by the council on May 31, 2005 in Ordinance 15195. The OMP outlines policies for the court’s delivery of services, provides guidance for court operations, recommends how to address suburban courthouses and their locations, and offers a basis for any negotiations with cities for contract court services. *completed*

- District Court FMP – On September 17, 2007, the District Court FMP was adopted by the Council in Ordinance 15899. This plan was prepared by building on OMP policy directives and included recommendations for space improvements based upon input from representatives of the District Court, the Executive's Office, and court stakeholders. *completed, capital decisions dependent upon coordination of other CJ efforts and court contracts*
- Superior Court Targeted OMP and FMP – The TOMP was adopted by the council on September 25, 2006 and included a work plan to develop a targeted FMP to examine alternatives for providing space to deliver the recommended justice services. The FMP work should include workload forecasts, staffing needs, operational impacts, space requirements, facility configurations, and life-cycle costs analyses. Work is still on-going to determine a preferred alternative to be transmitted to the council for consideration. *TOMP completed, TFMP on-going, with capital decisions dependent upon coordination of other CJ efforts*
- King County Sheriff's Office (KCSO) OMP and FMP – Ordinance 16027, accepting the Sheriff's Office OMP was adopted by the council on February 25, 2008. Similar to the Superior Court work, the OMP included a work plan to develop a FMP. The schedule anticipates a final FMP by May 2009. *OMP completed, FMP on-going, with capital decisions dependent upon coordination of other CJ efforts*
- Department of Adult and Juvenile Detention OMP and FMP – Motion 12042 approving the DAJD OMP was adopted by the council on November 22, 2004. The OMP provides a menu of potential operational changes and efficiencies. *(Motion 2005-0315 to approve the evaluation and implementation plan for the OMP was not introduced and was allowed to lapse in 2006.)* However, the DAJD is implementing portions of that plan that are viable and cost effective. *OMP is complete and portions are being implemented. FMP has not been done; however, facility needs are being considered within the context of the Integrated Regional Jail Initiative that consists of a work group including county representatives from Executive, DAJD, Sheriff, PAO, District Court, and Council staff plus affected cities and law enforcement agencies. Additionally, DAJD is reviewing Community Corrections capacity and facility needs.*
- Department of Public Health OMP and FMP – Ordinance 15913, adopted by the council on October 1, 2007, approved the Public Health OMP. The OMP establishes four-year goals and strategies to be implemented through the departmental business plan, beginning in 2008. The goals and strategies include an examination of the role of the Department in the direct provision of services through public health clinics. Decisions in this and other areas will impact the facilities needs of the Department and would influence development of a FMP. *OMP completed. A FMP may be undertaken beginning in 2009 or 2010.*
- Maleng Justice Center (MJC) Site Master Plan – This effort began with a limited parking study in the City of Kent area adjacent to the MJC and a long-term plan has been directed for future development of the site. These details are still in the planning stages, but the results of such a study could have long term impacts for agencies associated with the facility. Appropriations are made in CIP Project 395558. *The site master plan is currently on hold subject to coordination of other CJ planning efforts. (The new summary states that this work will be completed in July 2008.*

Most of these efforts are associated with the provision of criminal justice (CJ) services. According to the Executive's transmittal letter, the close operational relationships between these CJ agencies and the overlap in the timing of the OMP and FMP efforts among them creates a unique opportunity to integrate their respective capital planning efforts as part of a larger effort to identify potential efficiencies and to ensure the provision of services. Given the large scale of capital assets required to provide services by CJ agencies, the potential for cost savings through an integrated effort could be significant. Such efficiencies could include the co-location of related services, identifying opportunities for sharing capital expenses, and the strategic sequencing of capital projects to maximize the utilization of CJ facilities.

It should be noted that these decisions could also affect other agencies that support many of these CJ agencies such as the Prosecuting Attorney's Office (PAO), the Department of Judicial Administration (DJA), and the Office of the Public Defender (OPD). Also, due to the financial impact of these CJ decision, other non-CJ agencies could be impacted.

Additionally, it should be acknowledged that successful long term management of jail population growth within the region is being addressed through the Integrated Regional Jail Initiative. This initiative is intended to provide a foundation for future planning and improvements, regional population management cost savings, cooperation and collaborative problem solving by the county and the jurisdictions it serves. As a consequence, an integrated regional jail working group was formed consisting of King County representatives from Executive, DAJD, Sheriff, PAO, District Court, and Council staff plus affected cities and law enforcement agencies to formulate regional jail policy recommendations. The outcomes of this initiative could also contribute to the county's space planning needs. *As of this writing, the outcomes of the working group recommendations are currently being developed.*

EMERGING CONDITIONS

Pending proposals or "emerging conditions" within the county could also affect the use of space in King County. Many of these decisions will not be resolved in the short term but they should be taken into consideration and inform the space planning discussion.

- Data Center – On August 16, 2007 the Executive transmitted proposed legislation for a \$17 million appropriation³ and a thirty year lease⁴ at the Sabey Data Center for consideration by the council. No action has yet been taken on these two proposals, as on-going negotiations for the space continue between the county and Sabey. As of this writing, the Executive has committed to a new transmittal of legislation to reflect the negotiations by the end of March.
- Replacement of the Administration Building and Sale of the King Street Center – Proposed Ordinance 2007-0446, adopted by the Council on October 1, 2007, approved a supplemental appropriation of \$615,000 to fund a feasibility study of the Executive's proposal to explore the sale of King Street Center and leverage its value to finance a new, larger building on the King County Administration Building site. If the Administration Building is replaced, the skybridge between the KCCF and the

³ Proposed Ordinance 2007-0444

⁴ Proposed Ordinance 2007-0443

Courthouse will be removed, creating another emerging condition to be addressed – the transport of inmates for court appearances during the construction of a new facility.

As proposed, the redevelopment of the Administration Building would be completed in a little over three years, with an expected move-in date of March 2011. The proposed redevelopment timeline occurs in five main phases:

- | | |
|--|----------------------------|
| 1. Initial Study Phase | September – November 2007 |
| 2. Pre-development Phase | December 2007 – March 2008 |
| 3. Design Phase | March – August 2008 |
| 4. Completion of Permitting, Lease Negotiations, and Development Agreement | October – November 2008 |
| 5. Demolition and Construction Phase | February 2009 – March 2011 |

Other emerging issues that could affect the space planning process include the recent United States Department of Justice report regarding DAJD, the status of the Integrated Regional Jail Initiative, implementation of District Court and KCSO contracts, status of the Courthouse South Entrance, relocation of the KCSO Criminal Investigation Unit, possible expansion of the DAJD Community Corrections programs, and expansion of county technology planning.

SUMMARY OF THE LAPSED 2006-2007 SPACE PLAN PROPOSAL (PO 2007-0614):

The Executive Proposed 2006-2007 Space Plan contains the following information:

1. Policies that guide decisions on the use and acquisition of county office space
2. Summary of current conditions including:
 - a. Identified operational and facility master planning efforts
 - b. Agency staffing levels, building location and square footage occupied
 - c. Square footage per FTE (full-time equivalent)
 - d. County office building conditions
 - e. Status of agency space – is it owned or leased?
 - f. Lease rates and expiration dates
3. Long-term projections including future growth or decrease of FTEs and office space needs, particularly in relationship to the Chinook Building
4. Implementation plan for achieving space plan policies

A complete copy of the space plan is available in PDF format in Legistar under proposed ordinance 2007-0614, Attachment A, or upon request.

CONTENTS OF PROPOSED 2006-2007 SPACE PLAN (PO 2007-0614):

Space plan policies establish the framework and inform planning decisions for future space use in the county. A summary of the major policies in the proposed 2006-2007 Space Plan is in Section 4 (Page 23) which includes an explanation of changes to the adopted 2005 policies (**Attachment #5**). A complete crosswalk illustrating the transition of policies since 1993 is included in Appendix IB of the plan.

Staff review of key elements of the proposed space plan policies is summarized below.

SPACE POLICIES:

1. **Co-location of Services**

This long standing policy has been consistent since 1993. Not only are agencies to co-locate where accessibility to services is warranted and economically feasible, functional adjacency or related functions should be considered when co-location is considered. *no change from adopted 2005 policy*

2. **Retain and Restore the Courthouse:** The policy to retain and restore the Courthouse has been a consistent policy in the three previous plans as well as the 2003 and 2004 proposed space plans. However, the policy has evolved over the years from the Courthouse being the general seat of government to becoming a facility for more specific criminal justice and security needs. Agencies requiring a heightened security level should be candidates for occupancy. *no change from adopted 2005 policy*

3. **Location of Services:** This policy to locate services outside of regional centers is designed to serve particular localities with services when they are not required in an urban setting. Criminal justice function should be regionally co-located and centralized at or near corrections facilities and should be in conjunction with council adopted operational master plans. *no change from adopted 2005 policy*

This 2006-2007 plan deletes a previous policy – added in 2005 – that any substantive changes to jail contracts or any new regional agreement (related to the jail initiative) shall be approved by the council. *The plan notes that this was policy was deleted because the policy is more appropriate as a code-required procedure.*

Additionally, the plan deletes direction that a broad planning process for suburban locations should include a strategy to reconfigure the location and services as areas are annexed. Contracts with cities for service delivery should also be considered in this effort. *The plan notes that the OMP/FMP process will include this analysis.*

4. **Public Building Care and Safety:**

- **Maintain Safe, Attractive Buildings** – The policy to maintain safe attractive public buildings has not changed. *no change from adopted 2005 policy*
- **Establish seismic standards for future development** – This policy is maintained. *no change from adopted 2005 policy*
- **Council approval of cost benefit analysis** – The implementation plan for both the 2003 and 2004 space plans encouraged consideration of a transition to a full cost recovery model for building operations, maintenance, and replacement. Operations and maintenance (O&M) costs attributable to CX agencies are included in the CX fund, but are not allocated directly to CX agency annual budgets. The policy for a full cost recovery model, added in 2005, was intended to ensure that a full cost recovery model would fully reflect these costs; it was deleted. *This policy was deleted as not appropriate to space planning.*

5. **Lease versus Own:**

Numerous feasibility studies and several expert panels, such as the Space Plan and Peer Review Panel, have concluded that the county should own rather than lease downtown office space. These study efforts determined that it is in the county's best financial interest to transition from leased to owned office space to the greatest extent possible. Not only are the direct costs of space in county-owned buildings less than those in leased space, but also county-owned buildings provide a long-term capital investment.

- **Downtown** – The policy to move from dependence on short-term leased space in downtown Seattle to county owned or long-term leased space with the option to own when leased space exceeds 10% of occupied space has been reworded to acknowledge that with the occupancy of the Chinook Building has met that goal. *The rewording states that the leased space in downtown should be monitored and that action should be taken when the 10 percent limit has been exceeded.*
 - **Suburban Areas** – The policy to consider select ownership in suburban areas when it would provide a long term cost benefit has remained. *no change from adopted 2005 policy*
 - **Council Approval of Leases** – The policy requiring council approval of leases for a term of more than one year or with a term cumulatively longer than two years has been removed. The Capital Budget Chair has directed staff to clarify this lease policy in the King County Code. Executive and Council staff are working toward clarification of the language. *This policy was deleted because it was changed in the King County Code.*
6. **Reduce the Cost of Short-term Moves:** The policy to reduce the cost and disruption of moving county agencies for a short period was expanded in the 2005 proposed space plan to include special exceptions. This basic policy has not been revised. *no change from adopted 2005 policy*

However, the previous plan states that short term moves would be subject to council approval of capital improvement projects and leases. *This direction was considered a procedural requirement of KCC and was deleted.*

7. **Space Programming Standards and Work Environment:**

- **Employee Space Standards** – The 2005 Plan established space standards that were prescribed as per square foot ranges for various categories of county employees (**Attachment # 6**). The policy calls for the manager of the Facilities Management Division (FMD) to certify that office designs fully comply with the new county's space standards. These standards were to be applied as part of the programming for the NCOB, as the standard will affect overall density of building occupants. *No change from adopted 2005 policy; however, references to the Chinook Building as a test standard was removed since the building has been occupied.*
- **Modular Furnishings:** The policy and implementation plan regarding emphasis on modular furniture to achieve efficient use of office space has remained unchanged. *no change from adopted 2005 policy*

- **Space Presentation:** The policy requiring that space be presented in useable square fee (USF) and (RSF) has not changed. *no change from adopted 2005 policy*
 - **Employee Office Space:** Standards for clean, safe, functional, handicapped accessible office spaces have not changed. *no change from adopted 2005 policy*
 - **LEED Criteria:** The policy on compliance with county-wide LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) criteria has not changed; however, it should be noted that Proposed Ordinance 2008-0107 has been forwarded for council consideration. This legislation would approve an expanded green building policy for all county-owned, financed, or alternatively financed capital projects. *Further analysis will be required to ensure that if the policy is expanded, the space plan is coordinated with the legislation. no change from adopted 2005 policy*
8. **Fiscal Notes and Surplus Watch List:** The 2005 plan asked that in addition to fiscal notes for CIP proposals that estimates for other anticipated costs such as tenant improvements, relocation costs and furniture, fixtures and equipment (FF&E) costs that could be associated with a project. Additionally, any buildings placed on a surplus watch list would be subject to a reduced level of capital investment that would be limited to safety requirements. Neither of these policies was amended. *no change from adopted 2005 policy*
9. **Location of County Agencies:** The 2005 plan specifically allowed certain agencies to be programmed within the Chinook Building and for additional agencies to be programmed in “appropriate locations”. The transmitted plan updates the locations of agencies that currently occupy the Chinook Building. This section also reflects agreement that the preferred location for the Executive is the Courthouse and that leased space in the Columbia Center will be occupied by the Executive and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) until such a move is feasible. *This policy was updated to reflect current Chinook Building tenants.*

NEW A new section was added to identify up-coming facilities that were likely to move – Elections consolidated facility and the ITS data center. As noted earlier in this report in the existing and emerging conditions sections, the elections facility has since been located in Renton and the Executive is expected to transmit an updated data center package by the end of this month.

Additionally, the transmitted plan deleted sections regarding council approval of the data center relocation, to be informed by specific reports. *This direction was removed, assuming council approval via lease or new construction project.*

Other deleted sections include:

- Business continuity and redundant data center – Deleted because action has already been taken on a redundant center that will be established in a state facility.
- Selection of a new Elections facility – Deleted because action has been taken

- Move of the Criminal Investigation Division to the downtown core and the Maleng Justice Center (MJC) Site Master Plan were deleted pending OMP/FMP plans that are on-going.

Direction to reexamine the relocation of the Work Education Release (WER) area in the Courthouse after completion of the Integrated Security Project (ISP) remained unchanged. *no change from adopted 2005 policy*

CURRENT CONDITIONS:

Section Five of the proposed Space Plan includes space templates that describe current conditions of space occupancy for the County, including:

- Current and authorized staffing levels.
- Current amount of space by building.
- Current amount of space and location by agency and a per square foot calculation of rentable square foot by employee.
- Amount of owned and leased office space.

The square footage calculations have been updated to reflect both rentable and usable square footage for most County-owned buildings (Section Five, Table 1).

Additionally, the Current Conditions section includes a summary of building conditions and which buildings have been placed on a “watch list” for reduced maintenance status based on the potential for reduced services or possible annexations. The Watch List includes:

- Administration Building
- Youth Services Center Alder Wing (non-detention uses)
- Sheriff Precincts in Burien and Kenmore Precinct
- Barclay/Dean Building
- Public Health Clinics in Renton, Auburn, Northshore, and the North Multi-Service Center
- District Court facilities in Burien and the Aukeen Court

Agency and Building Occupancy Data: The plan summarizes 2006 agency and building occupancy data⁵, outlining the 16 core buildings⁶ totaling 1.66 million square feet of owned and leased space with over 5,400 budgeted Full Time Equivalent and Term Limited Temporary employees⁷ (FTE/TLT). The total space in county-owned downtown core buildings is 1.6 million rentable square feet. Total leased space is 358,098 square feet.

As shown in the list below, the Chinook Building is not included in this data because the building was not occupied until 2007. Prior to occupation of the Chinook Building it was anticipated that lease figures would be significantly reduced and that for the first time

⁵ The 2004 *Space Plan* analyzes space for administrative, court, executive, legislative and judicial functions, and DOES NOT address space for jails, health centers, or police precincts.

⁶ Buildings excluded from the core buildings summary are specialty type buildings including functions such as, public health clinics, police precincts, storefronts, shops, storage facilities and jails. These spaces typically do not lend themselves to a per square foot analysis.

⁷ 2006 budgeted

the county would achieve its long standing goal to reduce its dependence on outside leased space to less than 10 percent. *Staff will work to update the leased and owned square footages prior to the next report.*

Buildings in downtown corridor

King County Courthouse
Administration Building
Yesler Building
King Street Center
Columbia Center
Bank of California
Exchange Building
Wells Fargo Building
Seattle Municipal Tower
Waltheu Building
Boren Building
Downtown Clinic

Other Buildings

King County International Airport
Black River facility
Regional Justice Center (RJC)
Youth Service Center

LONG-TERM PROJECTIONS:

Staffing projections were evaluated for a ten year period from 2006 and 2016. Factors considered included future revenue variables, potential staff reductions, voter initiatives, agency business plans and projected annexations and incorporations. Ten-year projections were acknowledged as the most volatile and resulted in a high and low percentage range, which varied, significantly by department ; however average growth rate was assumed at 7.8 percent county-wide. Applying current core building average square feet per person, the projected ten year growth in space demand will vary between 86,252 to 111,716 square feet. According to the proposed plan:

“Unless there is a movement of a large downtown agency or agencies to the suburbs, this data shows that there will be a probable demand for increased downtown office space that will potentially outstrip the size of the NCOB and other core downtown buildings.”

One result of these projections is that the county may eventually need to rely on outside leased space to accommodate growth.

CONTENTS OF PROPOSED 2008 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (PO 2008-0141):

An updated Executive Summary was transmitted in Proposed Ordinance 2008-0141 to replace the summary in the 2006-2007 plan. This new Executive Summary, along with the 2006-2007 plan, is intended to serve as the 2008 Space Plan. According to the summary, because the 2006-2007 plan was transmitted in November and on-going planning efforts are not completed, “development of a wholly new space plan should await the outcome of those efforts”.

This summary again stresses the on-going planning efforts in different stages of completion within the county – particularly in the area of criminal justice – and the need to ensure that these efforts (OMPs/FMPs) be coordinated. The summary also highlights the need to coordinate development of the downtown campus (Administration Building and South Entrance

Other highlights included in the summary are:

- Chinook Building – As noted earlier, the occupancy of this building meets standards for leased and owned space ratios, has met space and FF&E standards, and uses modular guidelines.
- OMP/FMP Efforts – These efforts will meet adjacency and space standards through an integrated criminal justice FMP. It is anticipated that by coordinating the results of these efforts, there will be a potential for efficiencies and improved service delivery. For instance, co-location of services may be enhanced through these efforts.
- Courthouse as a heightened security facility – A comprehensive security study is underway for county buildings that will conclude in facility, organizational, and resource recommendations. This study may influence how security is handled within the building.
- Watch List Buildings – Major maintenance funding is limited for buildings on the watch list. Buildings that warrant consideration of replacement prior to further significant outlays of major maintenance funding – the Alder Building at the Youth Services Center and the King County Administration Building.

NEXT STEPS:

The Executive has acknowledged in his transmittal letters that the transmitted documents are to be supplemented by OMP and FMP studies and that many of the strategic facility issues have not been resolved. It is also acknowledged that the space plan is now limited in that it is “but one component of a complicated, comprehensive capital planning strategy currently underway”. The new Executive Summary stresses the need to ensure that these efforts are coordinated and efficient.

Although significant direction has been legislated to guide the county’s space planning processes – either through the space plan, individual legislation or through budget directives (OMPs/FMPs) – an environment has been created that could be confusing; and it is not currently a coordinated effort, as the planning is developed by individual groups of stakeholders. Additionally, as noted earlier in the KCC section of this staff report, it is clear that the space plan shall be the overarching policy document for capital planning decisions.

Consequently, questions arise as to how to provide a framework for overall coordinated long-term capital strategic planning – particularly in the context of the space plan. As it is currently proposed, the space plan does not present framework policies or guidelines for such coordination and planning. Some questions that could be further investigated are:

Outstanding Questions:

1. How should operational and capital space planning be coordinated?
2. What should be the guiding document for space planning?
3. If it is the space plan, should it contain direction for the contents of OMPs and FMPs?
4. How will these space planning directives be prioritized?
5. Who will be in charge of coordinating these projects when they are completed?

6. How will they be implemented?
7. If the space plan is a framework document, where should specifics be clarified?
8. How should these policies be coordinated with the King County Code direction?
9. Should a study of best practices in other jurisdictions be developed as a guideline?
10. Should it be a combination of these or other choices?
11. Should a consultant, the auditor, or a peer group from both branches be brought on or formed to address these questions?

Further analysis will be required to explore particulars of the plan and to address the need for framework policies.

INVITED:

- Kathy Brown, DES, Director, FMD
- Noel Treat, DES, Deputy Director, FMD
- Bob Cowan, Director, Office of Management and Budget (OMB)
- Sid Bender, CIP Program Supervisor, OMB

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Proposed Ordinance 2007-0614 (lapsed), without attachment (available upon request)
2. Transmittal Letter, dated November 5, 2007
3. Proposed Ordinance 2008-0141, containing new 2008 Executive Summary
4. Transmittal Letter, dated March 6, 2008
5. Proposed 2006-2007 Space Plan Policies
6. Proposed Space Standards
7. Applicable Space Plan References in K.C.C. and the Charter
8. Mandatory Elements of the Comprehensive Plan



KING COUNTY

1200 King County Courthouse
516 Third Avenue
Seattle, WA 98104

Signature Report

March 27, 2008

Ordinance

Proposed No. 2007-0614.1

1 AN ORDINANCE relating to comprehensive planning;
2 adopting the King County 2006-2007 Space Plan; and
3 amending Ordinance 10810, Section 1, as amended, and
4 K.C.C. 20.12.100.

5
6 BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF KING COUNTY:

7 SECTION 1. Findings.

8 A. King County has adopted the 1994 King County Comprehensive Plan to meet
9 the requirements of the Washington state Growth Management Act. The King County
10 space plan is a subelement of the capital facilities element of the King Comprehensive
11 Plan and any amendments to that plan are currently required to be submitted by the
12 executive to the council by August 1 of each year.

13 B. The Growth Management Act requires the county's comprehensive plan to be
14 amended only once each year except for amendments including those to the capital
15 facilities element of the Comprehensive Plan that occur in conjunction with the adoption
16 of the county budget.

Ordinance

17 SECTION 2. Ordinance 10810, Section 1, and K.C.C. 20.12.100 are each hereby
18 amended to read as follows:

19 The ~~((2005))~~ 2006-2007 county space plan ~~((dated July 13, 2005))~~, consisting of
20 ~~((planning policies, location of county agencies and implementation plan, and~~
21 ~~incorporating the King County Department of Executive Services Space Plan 2004~~
22 ~~transmitted by the executive on July 23, 2004))~~ space standards, current and future space
23 needs, county facility development policy framework and implementation plan as
24 contained in Attachment A to this ordinance, is adopted as a subelement of the public
25 facilities element of the ~~((e))~~Comprehensive ~~((p))~~Comprehensive plan and the master
26 plan for county facility development as defined in K.C.C. 4.04.020. The adopted space
27 plan shall govern development of all facility master plans, facility program plans and CIP
28 and lease requests for space housing county agency operations.

29 The executive shall update
30

KING COUNTY COUNCIL
KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON

ATTEST:

Ordinance

APPROVED this ____ day of _____, _____.

Attachments A. King County 2006-2007 Space Plan

November 5, 2007

The Honorable Larry Gossett
Chair, King County Council
Room 1200
C O U R T H O U S E

Dear Councilmember Gossett:

Enclosed is the 2006-2007 Space Plan (hereafter referred to as the Space Plan). Submission of this plan to council has been delayed by the number of significant facility and real estate proposals that have been under consideration over the last two years. Throughout 2006 and 2007 there have been a number of important proposals brought forward that have a significant impact on King County space planning. In particular, the council decided upon a solution for a consolidated Elections facility in Renton, the council is currently considering a major new data center, and has just approved further study of replacing the King County Administration Building and selling King Street Center. Operational master planning and resulting facility plans for several of the larger King County agencies are have also been ongoing and result in a moving target with regard to space planning, further delaying the transmittal of this plan.

In the King County Council meeting on October 1, 2007, councilmembers reminded the Facilities Management Division (FMD) that, although there are many moving pieces still in the planning stages that will significantly affect the Space Plan, the Space Plan is overdue for transmittal to council. I am transmitting this Space Plan, in its current state, recognizing there are significant unknowns that will very likely substantially change space planning assumptions in the relatively near future. In spite of these significant variables, I must concur that the transmittal of the Space Plan is past due and that this plan – although it will likely soon be outdated – could be a helpful tool in council's review of other, related issues.

This report continues to analyze and propose resolutions to issues outlined in the 2005 Space Plan as approved by the King County Council in November of 2005. As a reminder, the 2005 Space Plan was a combination of the 2004 Space Plan I transmitted to council on July 23, 2004 and subsequent updates by council staff. The 2004 Space Plan, with the updates, was renamed the 2005 Space Plan and adopted in November of 2005.

While I certainly encourage adoption, I suggest that this 2006-2007 Space Plan be viewed primarily as background information for other important policy decisions in the near future, and that a final 2008 Space Plan be reviewed and approved as a final document next year after some key proposals have been assessed and other master planning efforts completed. My FMD staff would be pleased to work through the many space planning issues with the Legislative Branch to produce an up-to-date, comprehensive 2008 Space Plan covering as many of the currently pending space planning decisions as possible.

The enclosed King County Space Plan is a snap-shot in time of the myriad of space issues facing King County government, ranging from the cost-efficient use of existing spaces to major capital development. Furthermore, the plan considers several critical policy decisions adopted by the King County Council over the past two years which impact the mid and long range general government office needs.

Since the geographic size and population of unincorporated King County is shrinking due to annexations and incorporations, one might expect corresponding reductions in staff and facilities requirements. This is not necessarily the case for many of the core county services located in downtown Seattle, which comprise "regional" services that must be provided by the county regardless of annexations and incorporations. Furthermore, reductions are not occurring as one might expect in many of the suburban locations. Shifting service populations and growth in the urbanizing areas has created a need to relocate services rather than eliminate services. Additionally, the county frequently provides contract services to cities requiring a continuation of services previously provided before annexation or incorporation. These contracts can be terminated by the cities with little notice, providing a heightened level of complexity to any OMP/FMP analysis.

A projection of staffing outcomes for county departments over the next 10 years does not result in a significant reduction in demand for downtown Seattle office space. Rather, the staffing forecast once again shows a slight growth in space needs as the probable outcome. One possible variable which has not yet come into play would be a significant movement of one or more of the larger county agencies to the suburban areas from downtown Seattle. The movement of elections to Renton is an example of such a move. That move, which will occur later this year, will result in the vacation of about two thirds of a floor in the King County Administration Building. While the 15,000 rentable square feet vacated is relatively immaterial when compared to the county's 1.5 million square feet of occupied downtown space, further moves to the suburbs could result in a space planning issue.

The Space Plan also includes revised space programming standards that were developed as the New County Office Building (NCOB) was being programmed. Under many circumstances, investment in upgraded modular furnishings may prove cost effective over the long term by providing more efficient use of space. Modular furniture will be a feature of the NCOB and other upgrades of workspace undertaken over the next few years.

The average occupancy for office workers in both owned and leased core facilities is 256 rentable square feet per employee exclusive of courtrooms and court affiliated spaces. This compares favorably to national occupancy benchmarks for similar type spaces. According to exchange data for 2006 presented by the Building Owners and Managers Association International (BOMA), average occupancies are over 300 rentable square foot per employee for comparable owner occupied or public buildings. The 2006-2007 Space Plan goal with regard to space occupancies is to reduce the average square foot occupancy for county agencies even further, particularly for those agencies that have square foot occupancies materially higher than the county average.

Although the 2006-2007 Space Plan incorporates policy decisions over the past two years, as well as updated staffing forecasts and space needs, there are many unknowns yet to be addressed. Additional needs include space requirements for criminal justice agencies, as well as the Seattle-King County Department of Public Health. The long-term program needs for many of these agencies are being identified through a series of operational master plans (OMPs) and facility master plans (FMPs) studies that have been recently completed or are currently underway for:

- District Court;
- Superior Court;
- King County Sheriff's Office (KCSO);
- Department of Adult and Juvenile Detention (DAJD);
- Support functions to the Criminal Justice System, including the Prosecuting Attorney's Office (PAO), the Department of Judicial Administration (DJA), and the Office of the Public Defender (OPD) and
- Seattle-King County Department of Public Health.

Also, the issue of relocating services to suburban sites is being evaluated in the context of the evaluation of the redevelopment of the King County Administration Building. Services currently provided from agencies occupying the King Street Center will be reviewed for possible relocation to suburban areas. A preliminary look into this issue suggests that potential relocation of staff from the King Street Center will not be a significant factor in the Administration Building redevelopment; further analysis is needed, however, to make a final determination on the operational viability and comparative costs of such relocation proposals.

Another consideration affecting the Space Plan is the Juvenile Court facility on 12th and Alder. The Alder Tower Building is showing signs of reaching the end of its useful life with major maintenance requirements approaching \$20 million. This does not account for probable code upgrades that would be required if a major renovation of this building is undertaken. The youth detention facility, collocated on the same site with the Juvenile Court, is relatively new (constructed in 1992). The continued use of the Alder Tower court building will be evaluated as part of the facility master planning process that implements the Superior Court and DAJD operational master plans currently completed or underway.

The Honorable Larry Gossett
November 5, 2007
Page 4

Over the course of the next year, FMD will update this Space Plan as policy decisions are made regarding the King County Data Center, Administration Building, criminal justice entity facility master plans, health department master plans, decentralized services, and other space related issues. The FMD team will seek input from the Legislative Branch and will keep councilmembers apprised as they lay out the steps necessary to develop the 2008 Space Plan. Please call Kathy Brown, FMD Director, at 206-296-0631, if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Ron Sims
King County Executive

Enclosures

cc: King County Councilmembers

ATTN: Ross Baker, Chief of Staff
Nancy Glaser, Policy Staff Director
Frank Abe, Communications Director
Anne Noris, Clerk of the Council

Bob Cowan, Director, Office of Management and Budget (OMB)
Sid Bender, Capital Budget Supervisor, OMB
James Buck, County Administrative Officer, Department of Executive Services (DES)
Kathy Brown, Director, Facilities Management Division (FMD), DES
Noel Treat, Deputy Director, FMD DES
Reed Holtgeerts, Director, Department of Adult and Juvenile Detention
Dr. David Fleming, Director, Seattle-King County Department of Public Health
The Honorable Dan Satterberg, King County Prosecuting Attorney
The Honorable Michael Trickey, Presiding Judge, Superior Court
The Honorable Barbara Linde, Presiding Judge, District Court
The Honorable Sue Rahr, King County Sheriff



KING COUNTY

1200 King County Courthouse
516 Third Avenue
Seattle, WA 98104

Signature Report

March 27, 2008

Ordinance

Proposed No. 2008-0141.1

Sponsors Phillips

1 AN ORDINANCE relating to comprehensive planning;
2 adopting the 2006-2007 King County space plan; and
3 amending Ordinance 10810, Section 1, as amended, and
4 K.C.C. 20.12.100.

5

6 BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF KING COUNTY:

7 SECTION 1. Findings.

8 A. County code currently requires county council approval of a county space plan
9 every two years. Council has previously approved the 2002 and 2004 space plans.

10 B. Transmittal of the 2006 – 2007 Space Plan to council by the executive was
11 delayed due to the other significant facility planning efforts that were underway and the
12 need to establish final direction regarding Chinook Building tenancy, designation of a
13 new elections site and assessment of options for a new county data center.

14 C. There are currently many major on-going facilities planning efforts underway,
15 including major criminal justice facilities master plans and the evaluation of the proposal
16 to redevelop the King County Administration Building site. Given the status of those
17 efforts and the significant impact they may have on county space planning, development

Ordinance

18 of a wholly new space plan should await the outcome of those efforts. The attached 2006
19 -2007 Space Plan with the updated Executive Summary should therefore serve as the
20 2008 Space Plan.

21 SECTION 2. Ordinance 10810, Section 1, and K.C.C. 20.12.100 are each hereby
22 amended to read as follows:

23 The ~~((2005))~~ 2008 county space plan~~((, dated July 13, 2005))~~, consisting of
24 ~~((planning policies, location of county agencies and implementation plan, and~~
25 ~~incorporating the King County Department of Executive Services Space Plan 2004~~
26 ~~transmitted by the executive on July 23, 2004))~~ space standards, current and future space
27 needs, county facility development policy framework for office space and
28 implementation plan as contained in Attachment A to this ordinance, is adopted as a
29 subelement of the public facilities element of the ~~((e))~~Comprehensive ~~((p))~~Plan ~~((and the~~
30 ~~master plan for county facility development as defined in K.C.C. 4.04.020. The county~~
31 ~~space plan dated July 13, 2005, shall govern development of all facility master plans,~~
32 ~~facility program plans and CIP and lease requests for space housing county agency~~
33 ~~operations))~~.

34 The executive shall update the current and future space needs and implementation
35 plans of the county space plan and submit them to the council as amendments to the
36 county space plan by March 1 of every other year, beginning on March 1, 2006. In
37 accordance with Motion 11118, any future space plan documentation should use as a
38 guideline the document "A Template for Space Planning: Recommendation from the
39 King County Space & Facilities Peer Review Panel December 2000" ("peer review
40 report"), which was adopted as Attachment C to Ordinance 14515. While the peer

Ordinance

41 review report should guide the preparation of future space planning documentation, it
42 report does not constitute mandatory requirements for space planning.

43

KING COUNTY COUNCIL
KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON

ATTEST:

APPROVED this ____ day of _____, ____.

Attachments A. 2008 Update to Executive Summary

2008 Update to Executive Summary

This is the 2008 update to the 2006 - 2007 Space Plan. This updated Executive Summary should replace the Executive Summary in the 2006 – 2007 Space Plan. This update to the Executive Summary, along with the existing Space Plan that was previously transmitted to County Council, serves as the 2008 Space Plan.

Updating the 2006 – 2007 Space Plan in this manner, rather than submitting a new plan, is the most appropriate approach at this time. The 2006-2007 Space Plan was transmitted to council only this past December and has not yet been acted upon. In addition, there are many ongoing facilities planning efforts currently underway, including major criminal justice facilities master plans and the evaluation of the proposal to redevelop the King County Administration Building site. Given the status of those efforts and the significant impact they may have on county space planning, development of a wholly new space plan should await the outcome of those efforts.

The King County Space Plan addresses some of the office space issues facing King County government. This report continues to analyze and propose resolutions to issues outlined in the 2005 Space Plan as approved by the King County Council in November of 2005. Furthermore, the plan considers several critical policy decisions adopted by the King County Council over the past year which impact the mid and long range general government office needs.

Now that King County has achieved its goals of reducing its reliance on outside leased space through the construction and occupancy of the New County Office Building, now known as the Chinook Building, the emerging program-specific space needs in several areas must be addressed expeditiously and in a coordinated manner. While the King County Council has approved the lease and acquisition of a consolidated elections facility in Renton, there remains a critical need to secure a primary King County Data Center. The King County Executive has transmitted for King County Council consideration a long-term lease and supplemental appropriation request to move the existing data center located in the Seattle Municipal Tower. The County Council is considering the Executive's proposal for a long-term lease opportunity near Tukwila. Approval of this lease and appropriation will bring to an end the search for a new data center.

Additional needs include space requirements for criminal justice agencies, and the Seattle-King County Department of Public Health. The long-term program needs for many of these agencies are being identified through a series of operational master plans (OMP) and facility master plans (FMP) studies have been recently completed or are currently underway for:

- District Courts;
- Superior Court;
- King County Sheriff's Office (KCSO);

- Department of Adult and Juvenile Detention (DAJD); and
- Seattle-King County Department of Public Health.

Developing facility solutions to address the projected program needs of the various other agencies will be both challenging and costly in terms of capital investment requirements and increased ongoing operating costs. These solutions will affect both downtown facilities as well as facilities at many of the county's suburban locations.

Since the geographic size and population of unincorporated King County is shrinking due to annexations and incorporations, one might expect corresponding reductions in staff and facilities requirements. This is not necessarily the case for many of the core county services located in downtown Seattle, which comprise "regional" services that must be provided by the county regardless of annexations and incorporations. Furthermore, reductions are not occurring as one might expect in many of the suburban locations. Shifting service populations and growth in the urbanizing areas has created a need to relocate services rather than eliminate services. Additionally, the county frequently provides contract services to cities requiring a continuation of services previously provided before annexation or incorporation. These contracts can be terminated by the cities with little notice, providing a heightened level of complexity to any OMP/FMP analysis.

The program planning for the Chinook Building has resulted in a building large enough to house 1,450 employees in 2007; this includes 120 work spaces on the currently non-specific programmed eighth floor and is consistent with the 10-year staff projections for the Chinook Building tenant agencies. The Facilities Management Division expects that full occupancy ultimately will exceed 1,550. The current 2016 staffing projection for the Chinook Building tenants is 1,287 budgeted FTEs (not including temporary staff and the 8th floor). The space programming in the Chinook Building is being used as a basis for the final countywide space standards presented. Proposed changes and expansion of the space standards are presented in "Section Four" of the previously submitted 2006-2007 plan, entitled, "Space Policies."

A projection of staffing outcomes for county departments over the next 10 years does not result in a significant reduction in demand for downtown Seattle office space. Rather, the staffing forecast once again shows a slight growth in space needs as the probable outcome. One possible variable which has not yet come into play would be a significant movement of one or more of the larger county agencies to the suburban areas from downtown Seattle. The movement of elections to Renton is an example of such a move. That move resulted in the vacation of about two thirds of a floor in the King County Administration Building. While the 15,000 rentable square feet vacated is relatively immaterial when

compared to the county's 1.5 million square feet of occupied downtown space, further moves to the suburbs could be a space planning issue.

The King County 2005 Space Plan clearly established the King County Courthouse as a specialty facility for agencies that require security screening and a higher level of security throughout the building. Currently the county's detention facilities and courthouses have this level of screening. Duplicating this level of screening for general office settings is expensive. Projected growth, suburban specialty building consolidations, or changes in policy may add to the demand for secured space in the Courthouse or elsewhere. Functions not in need of the heightened level of security in the Courthouse may be moved to other locations, while functions in need of a heightened level of security may be moved to expanded court or detention facilities.

With that in mind, the Facilities Management Division (FMD) recently evaluated the feasibility of moving the Work Release Program from the Courthouse. That study concluded that while it is currently not cost effective to move Work Release from the Courthouse to create space for general office/courts backfill, there will be a time when this type of move may need to be considered again. The council has asked that this idea be revisited once the Integrated Security Project (ISP) is completed in the King County Correctional Facility (KCCF).

Major maintenance will continue to be funded consistent with county code requirements. A plan to reduce deferred maintenance has been developed with the intent to maximize the useful life of facilities and thereby avoid excessive repair and replacement costs. The FMD is working to address conditions found from a countywide building assessment survey and to strengthen management of the county's Facilities Major Maintenance Program. There are two buildings that warrant consideration of replacement prior to further significant outlays of major maintenance funding. These are the Alder Building at the Youth Services Center and the King County Administration Building.

The Alder Building is showing signs of reaching the end of its useful life with major maintenance requirements estimated in excess of \$20 million. This does not account for probable code upgrades that would be required if a major renovation of this building is undertaken. The continuing use of this building will be evaluated as part of the facility master planning process that implements the Superior Court and Department of Adult and Juvenile Detention (DAJD) operational master plans and integrated criminal justice planning currently completed or underway.

Another planning effort currently underway is an economic feasibility analysis related to the potential redevelopment of the King County Administration Building site and the possible sale of the King Street Center. Market conditions appear to be such that these efforts could result in an ability to redevelop the King County

Administration Building site, and consolidate King County services downtown without added costs to King County taxpayers. The redevelopment of this site also comes into play when considering the results of criminal justice planning currently underway and the space needs of criminal justice agencies.

The King County Administration Building will require significant major maintenance investments in the very near future. These maintenance investments, coupled with the presence of asbestos in the building and its inefficient design, may contribute to the economic viability of replacing the building. This idea is currently under study and the FMD will proceed, as approved, with additional feasibility study of this approach.

The Space Plan continues to address annexation/incorporation impacts by placing those suburban facilities that may be affected by changing county service delivery on a "watch list." This approach has been expanded in the 2006 -2007 Space Plan to include those facilities likely to be affected by the outcome of OMP/FMP processes or facilities at risk because of budgetary constraints. Buildings placed on the "watch list" will be subject to reduced levels of refurbishment and rehabilitation until it is confirmed that individual buildings will be needed over the long-term for county operations. Capital investments in "watch-list" buildings will be limited to near-term requirements involving direct risks to health and safety or to maintain the physical integrity of the building. The Space Plan continues a policy to address this condition.

The Space Plan also includes revised space programming standards that were developed as the Chinook Building was being programmed. An implementation step accompanying the 2002 Space Plan called for a pilot test of modular furniture efficiencies. The Assessor's Office remodel was selected as the test project. Although affected employees of the Assessor's Office are primarily field employees, the Assessor reduced their eighth floor Administration Building space by over 20 percent, freeing up space for other county functions and further reducing the reliance on leased space. Thus, under many circumstances, investment in upgraded modular furnishings may prove cost effective over the long term by providing more efficient use of space. Modular furniture will be a feature of the Chinook Building and other upgrades of workspace undertaken over the next few years.

The Chinook Building contains primarily open workstation configurations with hard-walled rooms in the middle of the floor, and on the north and south sides of the building. Rooms on the north and south sides of the building will have substantial glass so that all workstations will have access to natural lighting. The available workstations are modular with two size options. There is a standard size and a supervisor/specialty size that is slightly larger. The space planning goal for the Chinook Building was to provide employees highly efficient work space that adheres to modern work practices and environments. This has been

achieved with highly efficient space configurations and noise mitigation measures. Accordingly, the 2006 - 2007 Space Plan once again proposes a policy that embraces this concept by calling for a feasibility study to systematically replace office furniture and provide on-call ergonomic assistance to size and configure new work stations. This study would be carried out subject to the availability of funding. These space improvements should be closely coordinated with the county's technology plans and upgrades/changes to computer equipment and other hardware.

The average occupancy for office workers in both owned and leased core facilities is 260 rentable square feet per employee exclusive of courtrooms and court affiliated spaces (see Table 2 for a list of buildings and staff included in this calculation). This compares favorably to national occupancy benchmarks for similar type spaces. According to exchange data for 2006 presented by the Building Owners and Managers Association International (BOMA), average occupancies by relevant categories compared to the county average are as follows:

Category	Average Rentable Square Feet per Office Worker
*King County General Office Occupancies – Budgeted	260
Private Sector – All Buildings Single Purpose	342
Private Sector – Downtown 100,000 to 300,000 Sq Ft Single Purpose	283
Seattle – Downtown 100,000 to 300,000 Sq Ft Owner Occupied Buildings	312
Public Sector – All Buildings	331

*Does not include true temporary employees. Includes TLTs.

The 2006 - 2007 Space Plan goal with regard to space occupancies, is to reduce the average square foot occupancy for county agencies even further, particularly for those agencies that have square foot occupancies materially higher than the county average.

With the completion of the Courthouse Seismic Project and the programming of a new building or buildings, expectations are that future tenant improvements in the Yesler Building, Courthouse, and Administration Building (if retained) will be designed using these space standards. Proposed space standards will then be tested against the results of this programming effort but in the context of accommodating probable staff growth over the next five to ten years. A combination of space efficiency initiatives and long-term office building strategies will result in the optimum-sized building to house county agencies and more efficient use of the larger downtown core office buildings.

Finally, the development of the Chinook Building has provided King County an opportunity to address space planning policies related to Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) principals. We expect to receive at least LEED Gold designation for the Chinook Building.

The remaining sections of this document contain the balance of the King County 2006 – 2007 Space Plan. The data that served as the foundation for the analysis included herein is presented in the appendices to this plan. Below is a summary of the key recommendations in this plan.

It is recommended that:

- ***King County continue to move toward office space consolidation through the programming of the Chinook Building, the consolidation of long-term leases, or the development of facility master plans (FMPs) in response to approved operating master plans (OMPs);***

2008 Status Update. With the addition of the Chinook Building to the county's inventory, King County was able to terminate more than 251,000 rentable square feet of leased space in the downtown core. By relocating to the Chinook Building the Department of Public Health, Department of Community and Human Services, and the Office of Information and Resource Management were able to achieve greater consolidation of their functions. Moving Finance and Business Operations from the Exchange Building to the Chinook building brought them in closer proximity to the rest of their operations which were left in the Administration building close to the Assessor's Office, due to the interrelated business operations and service delivery.

- ***The programming of the Chinook Building will serve as a foundation for the updated space standards as presented in this 2006 - 2007 Space Plan;***

2008 Update. The programming of the Chinook Building, using efficient modular furnishings, resulted in a new King County space standard to use as a guideline for all future space programming in a general office setting. The 2006 Space Plan reported that the average per square foot occupancy for the county combined leased and owned in the downtown core was 260.

- ***The county should continue to backfill vacated spaces in county-owned buildings by moving agencies from leased space to county-owned space, rather than leasing new outside office space during periods of program expansion;***

2008 Update. The new consolidated Elections facility in Renton vacated 15,300 rentable square feet (11,500 useable square feet) on the 5th floor of the Administration Building.

- ***Over the mid-term, the FMD should create project spaces in the Chinook Building designed to eliminate the need to move assigned employees to***

outside leased space. This project space would provide surge space for tenants in the Chinook Building, thereby eliminating the need to move employees to outside leased space for expanded programs;

- **The FMPs addressing each operational master plan will not only consider adjacency requirements but also common facility solutions addressing the needs of the various agencies;**

2008 Update. The Integrated Criminal Justice FMP is poised to do just that. Over the next two years, the Superior Court, District Court, King County Sheriff's Office (KCSO) and the Department of Adult and Juvenile Detention (DAJD) have or will complete Operational Master Plans, Facility Master Plans, and related studies to identify future needs, increase efficiency in service delivery and reduce overall facilities capital and operating costs. Components of these long-range plans are being accelerated to help policy makers with 2008 decisions.

Given the overlap in the timing of the OMP, FMP and space planning processes, and the close operational relationships of key criminal justice (CJ) departments and branches, the county has a unique opportunity to integrate these capital planning efforts to identify potential efficiencies and to provide the seamless delivery of services. Given the large scale of capital assets required to provide CJ services, the potential for achieving cost savings through an integrated effort is significant.

Operational and facility decisions of CJ agencies will impact the facility and capital decisions of other non-CJ agencies in King County. Such efficiencies may include the co-location of services, identifying opportunities for sharing capital expenses, and the strategic sequencing of capital projects to maximize the utilization of facilities. Ultimately, operational and facility issues require a holistic look at a given entity and its partners.

- **As the current round of FMPs are finalized, the county should undertake a broad planning process related to services currently delivered at suburban locations and develop a strategy to reconfigure the location and services delivered in the suburbs as additional annexations to cities occurs. Contracts with cities for delivery of services should also be considered in this planning effort;**
- **The county's current efforts to complete operational and facility master planning for the District Courts, Superior Court Children and Family Programs, KCSO, Adult and Juvenile Detention, and Seattle-King County Department of Public Health all lead to further analysis and implementation of co-location recommendations. The FMPs addressing each operational master plan will not only consider adjacency requirements but also common facility solutions addressing the needs of the various agencies and lead to further analysis and implementation of facility changes for those buildings on the watch list. Accordingly, site master plans should be developed for:**

- **The Norm Maleng Regional Justice Center**

2008 Update. Site masterplan efforts began in September 2007 and will be completed by July 2008.

○ **The Youth Services Center Site**

2008 Update. A site master plan was completed in 2005 and will be updated in 2008 as Superior Court's unified family court needs are defined.

○ **Downtown buildings including Goat Hill**

2008 Update. The outcome of planning for the criminal justice agencies and feasibility, programming of the new County Administration Building, and resolution of considerations associated with City Hall Park and the south entrance to the Courthouse all will serve as a foundation for the downtown campus master plan.

- ***In response to the King County Council's interest in providing weapons screening to all separately elected officials and the King County Executive, the county should develop a strategic security plan that will address all facets of security in the county's general government buildings and parking garages. The council recently expressed their desire that the Executive ultimately be located in the Courthouse;***

2008 Update. King County is undertaking a comprehensive assessment of security in King County buildings which will conclude in facility, organizational, and resource recommendations.

- ***The county's current efforts to complete operational and facility master plans for the District Courts, Superior Court Children and Family Programs, KCSO, Adult Detention and Public Health will lead to further analysis and implementation of service locations including recommendations related to placement of services downtown and the Norm Maleng Regional Justice Center (RJC);***
- ***If deemed advisable, the FMD and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) will propose a full costing methodology for building operations, maintenance and replacement for review and approval by the council;***
- ***The FMD shall participate in the KingStat Performance Measurement program as a means to ensure that the FMD is monitoring and meeting performance expectations expected with regard to building operations and maintenance;***
- ***King County agencies should utilize space standards during the planning and design of tenant improvement projects and capital improvement projects (CIP). Implementing agencies should certify compliance with space standards to the King County Executive and the King County Council for all tenant improvement and CIP projects;***

- **County agencies should program and construct all new or refurbished office space and tenant improvement projects consistent with the Leadership (LEED) policies found in Ordinance 15118, if the cost of those projects exceeds \$250,000;**
- **Modern workstation furnishings and filing systems should continue to be considered in remodels of existing county-owned space and planned into the Chinook Building. The FMD should undertake an evaluation of office work station replacement, and, if feasible, develop a strategy for systematically upgrading all office work stations. Decisions on installing such furnishings should be considered when proven cost effective and/or would result in substantial ergonomic improvements to work space; and**

2008 Update. Where economically feasible, modern workstations are being considered in all re-models of existing countyowned space and modern workstations were installed in the Chinook Building. It is not economically feasible to systematically upgrade all office work stations at this time.

- **The OMB should revise instructions related to CIP requests so that requests consider not only the direct cost of service, but also ancillary costs of space and move.**
- **King County should continue to evaluate space planning options in the context of the potential redevelopment of the King County Administration Site.**

March 6, 2008

The Honorable Julia Patterson
Chair, King County Council
Room 1200
C O U R T H O U S E

Dear Councilmember Patterson:

Enclosed for your information is an update to the Executive Summary of the 2006 - 2007 Space Plan as well as a proposed ordinance adopting the Space Plan. Please insert this update into your copy of the 2006 – 2007 Space Plan. This update, along with the existing Space Plan that was previously transmitted to you, serves as our 2008 Space Plan in order to formally comply with the March 1, 2008 due date in the King County Code. This approach seems most appropriate given that the 2006-2007 Space Plan transmittal occurred only this past December and there are many ongoing facilities planning efforts, including the criminal justice facilities master plans and the evaluation of the proposal to redevelop the County Administration Building site.

In this context, it is also important to recognize the limited role of the county Space Plan; it is but one component of a complicated, comprehensive capital planning strategy currently underway. It has not historically been utilized to provide an overarching structure to make strategic decisions about specialized county facilities. Other planning efforts, such as facility master plans and evaluation of the redevelopment of the King County Administration Building site, will be included in a comprehensive, strategic capital planning effort.

The Space Plan template has been supplemented by referencing the operational and facilities master plan efforts (OMPs/FMPs) in process, acknowledging that the outcomes of those processes would result in parallel space-related recommendations. The large scope of the OMP/FMP processes occurring contemporaneously with the development of 2006-2007 Space Plan brought these specialty needs to the forefront, rendering preparation of the Space Plan very much secondary. The transmittal of the 2006-2007 Space Plan was accordingly delayed. Any updates to that Plan (or the current transmittal) are necessarily limited and do not address many of the strategic facilities issues being studied presented by the major OMPs/FMPs recently completed and in progress.

The Honorable Julia Patterson

March 6, 2008

Page 2

Moreover, the current Space Plan is limited and subject to change due to the significant facility planning initiatives that are currently underway. As you know, my staff is undertaking a comprehensive planning approach in integrating overall space and service needs with the criminal justice OMPs in its current Integrated Criminal Justice (CJ) FMP. The Facilities Management Division (FMD) is working in partnership with the Superior Court, District Court, Sheriff's Office, and the Department of Adult and Juvenile Detention (DAJD), as well as and other criminal justice stakeholders (such as the Prosecuting Attorney's Office, the Office of Public Defense, and the Department of Judicial Administration), to coordinate the planning effort, identify varying operational needs, and ways to reduce costs by co-locating functions. This presents a myriad of significant challenges: overall need and sequencing for jail expansion, operational priorities for Superior and District courts, Sheriff's Office space needs, such as relocation of the Criminal Investigations Division (CID) from the Maleng Regional Justice Center to downtown, space planning for future expansion of Community Corrections – the list is very lengthy. The subtext of this work is the development of a cohesive overall plan synchronizing the capital facilities options for all these services in an integrated criminal justice strategic plan.

In relation to this effort, I am considering renewing my request for financial support for the Integrated Criminal Justice Facilities Master Plan (Integrated CJ FMP) planning effort. This request was originally included in the Fourth Quarter omnibus package submitted last year.

Another significant effort that is underway is the feasibility study regarding a redevelopment of the existing King County Administration Building site. Such a development might allow for the cost effective consolidation of county services and departments into a centralized county campus. We are continuing our work with the potential developer and hope to report to council in coming weeks on the status and feasibility of the project.

The proposed new county administration building has become a potentially significant piece to meeting the criminal justice needs of the county. Initial cost estimates for criminal justice needs are significant – in the hundreds of millions of dollars. A new county administration building could provide a cost effective means to accommodate some of the new operations envisioned in the Targeted Superior Court OMP and the Integrated CJ FMP, as well as space for those criminal justice programs displaced from current locations by consolidation. It is critical to underscore the relationship between both planning efforts. We will not know whether we can support or afford the criminal justice program needs in the near term without a parallel pre-development study of a new county administration building.

The transmittals to come will delineate the specifics of the Integrated CJ FMP and new county administration building planning efforts. It is my intent to evaluate all of these planning efforts, including the Space Plan, in a comprehensive, strategic manner. Your continued support is appreciated and will allow us to continue to complete and coordinate these important planning efforts.

The Honorable Julia Patterson
March 6, 2008
Page 3

If you have any question about the enclosed Space Plan, please contact Kathy Brown, Director of the Facilities Management Division, at 206-296-0631.

Sincerely,

Ron Sims
King County Executive

Enclosures

cc: King County Councilmembers
ATTN: Ross Baker, Chief of Staff
Saroja Reddy, Policy Staff Director
Anne Noris, Clerk of the Council
Frank Abe, Communications Director
Bob Cowan, Director, Office of Management and Budget
The Honorable Dan Satterberg, King County Prosecutor
The Honorable Michael Trickey, Presiding Judge, Superior Court
The Honorable Barbara Linde, Presiding Judge, District Court
The Honorable Sue Rahr, King County Sheriff
Reed Holtgeerts, Director, Department of Adult and Juvenile Detention
Dr. David Fleming, Director, Seattle-King County Department of Public Health
James. J. Buck, County Administrative Officer, Department of Executive Services (DES)
Kathy Brown, Director, Facilities Management Division (FMD), DES
Noel Treat, Deputy Director, FMD DES

Space Policies

King County's 2006-2007 Space Plan is a tool to aid decision-makers in determining the best course to follow in acquiring and managing space for criminal justice agencies, health and human services agencies and other county administrative functions.

Purpose

The 2006-2007 Space Plan provides information regarding agency location, area occupied, potential for growth or shrinkage, and other data that describes the office space conditions of the county. Also provided is an identification of the operational and facility master planning efforts (OMPs and FMPs) currently underway that will ultimately affect the way the county is using existing general government buildings and that will drive future capital investment decisions. The Space Plan indicates whether agencies are overcrowded or have underutilized space, if the space is owned or leased, and if leased, the rate and expiration date of the lease. The 2006-2007 Space Plan addresses administrative office space, court space and other support spaces where the executive, legislative and judicial business of the county occurs, while making reference only to specialized space such as jails, health centers, district courts, police precincts or other program defined facilities. The 2006-2007 Space Plan also presents information about the staff projections related to those agencies that are planned to occupy the New County Office Building (NCOB).

Below are the 2006-2007 proposed space policies and an explanation of changes to the space plan policies approved by the County Council with adoption of the 2005 Space Plan. A matrix presenting a comparison of past, current (2005 Space Plan), and 2006-2007 proposed policies is presented in Appendices IA and IB.

2006-2007 Space Policies

Proposed Space Policies	Explanation of Changes to 2005 Adopted Policies
<p>Co-Location</p> <p>Co-locate services when relationships and/or user accessibility warrant and when economically feasible. Long term asset management of county properties shall consider the needs of agencies with functional adjacency or related functions, especially when co-locating.</p>	<p><i>No change.</i></p>

Proposed Space Policies	Explanation of Changes to 2005 Adopted Policies
<p>Courthouse and Security</p> <p>The county has retained, upgraded and restored the King County courthouse, including life safety improvements, so that it is available for functions requiring weapons screening or a heightened level of security. Due to the availability of heightened security, elected officials such as judges, council members, the executive, the prosecuting attorney, the sheriff and the assessor should be considered priority candidates for occupancy in the courthouse. Supporting functions for approved courthouse occupants requiring heightened security shall also be candidates for occupancy.</p>	<p><i>No change.</i></p>
<p>Location of Services</p> <p>Locate services outside of the regional centers when warranted by the need to serve particular localities, the need for a particular specialized location or environment, the ability to reduce cost or improve functioning in cases where public accessibility and visibility are not significant issues or a use which is not appropriate in an urban center.</p> <p>When feasible, law and criminal justice functions should be regionally co-located and centralized at or near corrections facilities in downtown Seattle and the Regional Justice Center. Coordination or co-location of law and criminal justice functions should take place in conjunction with council-adopted operational master plans.</p>	<p><i>No change.</i></p> <p><i>No change.</i></p> <p><u>Deleted:</u></p> <p><i>Any substantive changes to existing jail contracts or any new regional</i></p>

Proposed Space Policies	Explanation of Changes to 2005 Adopted Policies
	<p><i>agreements related to the regional jail initiative that will affect space utilization of county facilities shall be approved by the county council.</i></p> <p>More appropriate as a code-required procedure.</p> <p><i>The county shall undertake a broad planning process related to services currently delivered at suburban locations and develop a strategy to reconfigure the location and services delivered as additional annexations to cities occur. Contracts with cities for delivery of services should also be considered in this effort.</i></p> <p>See Implementation Plan.</p>
<p>Public Building Care and Safety</p> <p>The county shall develop and maintain safe, attractive public buildings that create a good image for government and that are sound financial investments.</p> <p>Establish seismic standards in the space plan to provide policy direction for future decisions involving the construction of new buildings, acquisition of existing buildings and execution of new leased space.</p>	<p><i>No change.</i></p> <p><i>No change.</i></p> <p><u>Deleted:</u></p> <p><i>Any proposed changes to budgeting and financing for space shall be based upon a council approved cost benefit analysis that utilizes a full costing methodology for building operations, maintenance and replacement.</i></p> <p>Not a Space Plan policy in that it only addresses council approval of a costing methodology.</p>

Proposed Space Policies	Explanation of Changes to 2005 Adopted Policies
<p>Lease versus own</p> <p>The county shall monitor its use of leased space in downtown Seattle. If downtown leased space exceeds 10 percent of downtown occupied space and when building ownership will provide a long term cost benefit to the county, then the county should move to ownership or lease to ownership as a means to reduce reliance on downtown leased space.</p> <p>The county may consider and select ownership options in the suburban areas when it is clearly demonstrated that ownership will provide a long term cost benefit to the county.</p>	<p><i>This language acknowledges that, with the occupancy of the NCOB, the goal of having no more than 10 percent of downtown occupied leased space has been achieved. However, the county should remain vigilant of the amount of downtown leased space and take action once again when the 10 percent limit has been exceeded.</i></p> <p>No change.</p> <p><u>Deleted:</u></p> <p><i>Any lease of real property to the county for a term of more than one year shall be approved by the council. Exceptions to this policy shall be made in limited cases under KCC 4.04.040, provided that all leases with terms cumulatively longer than a total of two years must be approved by the Council.</i></p> <p><i>More appropriately placed as a code required procedure.</i></p>
<p>Short-term moves</p> <p>The cost and disruption of short-term moves will be avoided unless:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Warranted by the inadequacy or inappropriateness of current space. • Necessary to achieve flexible lease terms in contemplation of an ultimate move to a county-owned facility. 	<p>No change except,</p> <p><u>Deleted:</u></p> <p><i>Short term moves of county functions shall be subject to council approval of capital improvement projects and leases.</i></p>

Proposed Space Policies	Explanation of Changes to 2005 Adopted Policies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Necessary to economically reclaim pockets of vacant space created through budgetary reductions. • Necessary as an interim measure during CIPs. 	<p><i>Eliminated reference to council approval of projects since this is a procedural requirement included in existing King County Code.</i></p>
<p>Space Programming Standards and Quality of Work Environment</p> <p>Established Programming Space Standards will be prescribed as per square foot ranges for various categories of County Employees and specialty programmed space. These Standards are to be used during planning and design. Adjustments to the actual square footage standard may occur during design as a result of the physical constraints of a given building. The implementing agency shall certify that designs fully comply with the space standards except for specific conditions noted.</p> <p>Space standards shall be refined in future space plans.</p> <p>Modern modular workstation furnishings and filing systems continue to be considered in remodels of existing county-owned space and planned into the new county office building. The Facilities Management Division shall undertake a feasibility evaluation and, if feasible, develop a strategy for systematically upgrading all office workstations. Decisions on installing such furnishings should be considered when proven cost effective or when installation would result in substantial ergonomic improvements to the work space. Cost benefit analysis and available funding shall determine use of modern modular workstations.</p>	<p><i>No change.</i></p> <p><i>Eliminated reference to the NCOB as far as testing the standards. That has been done.</i></p> <p><i>No change.</i></p>

Proposed Space Policies	Explanation of Changes to 2005 Adopted Policies
<p>Any space owned or leased by King County shall be presented in future space plans in both useable square feet (USF) and rentable square feet (RSF) to ensure consistency of analysis and comparison.</p>	<p><i>No change.</i></p>
<p>County employees will be provided with office space that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Is highly functional and accessible; B. Is kept clean, reasonably secured, and well maintained; C. Complies with future space plan seismic standards to protect health and safety in the event of a major earthquake; D. Uses modular furnishings and configurations to enhance the functionality and efficiency of office space and to substantially reduce the ergonomic risk of the work environment, subject to council approval of the cost benefit analysis and available funding; E. Complies with the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) policies set forth in Ordinance 15118 including but not limited to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. King County departments and offices shall utilize LEED criteria to implement green building practices in the planning, design and construction of all new capital improvement projects as set forth herein. 2. King County departments and offices shall seek the highest achievable LEED certification level that is cost-effective based on life cycle cost analysis and the limits of available funding. Projects qualifying for LEED certification shall be registered through the US Green Building Council. 3. For all new projects where the scope of the project or type of structure limits the ability to achieve LEED certification, departments and offices shall incorporate 	<p><i>No change.</i></p>

Proposed Space Policies	Explanation of Changes to 2005 Adopted Policies
<p>cost-effective green building practices based on life cycle cost analysis and the limits of available funding.</p> <p>4. For all remodels and renovations with budgets over two hundred fifty thousand dollars, departments and offices shall seek ;the highest LEED certification level achievable that is cost-effective based on life cycle cost analysis and the limits of available funding.</p>	
<p>Fiscal Notes</p> <p>In addition to the required fiscal note, CIP proposals forwarded for council consideration shall include estimates for any other anticipated costs such as tenant improvements, furniture, fixtures and equipment costs, relocation costs and any other costs associated with the project that might result in a future funding request.</p>	<p><i>No change.</i></p>
<p>Surplus Watch List</p> <p>Buildings placed on the surplus watch list, Referenced in Section 5, shall be subject to a reduced level of capital investment for rehabilitation or upgrade. Long term capital investments shall be limited to those building components that are a direct threat to health and safety or would result in failure of a building component. Short term capital investments shall be made to maintain the asset to ensure there is no significant loss of property value.</p>	<p><i>No change except making reference to Section 5.</i></p>
<p>Location of County Agencies</p>	
<p>Agencies to be Located in the NCOB</p> <p>The following agencies are currently planned as tenants in the NCOB:</p>	<p><i>Updates location of county agencies.</i></p>

Proposed Space Policies		Explanation of Changes to 2005 Adopted Policies
<p>Agency</p> <p>Location</p> <p>DES Finance Building</p> <p>DCHS Building</p> <p>DCHS/C&C DPH Building</p> <p>DPH (EH only) Building</p> <p>DES/BOE OIRM</p> <p>ITS (Except Data) Ombudsman</p>	<p>Current</p> <p>Exchange</p> <p>Exchange</p> <p>Bank of Cal Bldg Wells Fargo</p> <p>Lynn Trust</p> <p>Columbia Center Columbia Center</p> <p>Seattle Muni Twr Yesler Building</p>	
<p>The King County Executive and OMB shall remain in space at the Bank of America Tower under their current lease until such time as it is feasible for these functions to move to the Courthouse.</p>		<p>Reflects an agreement between the County Executive and the County Council that the preferred location for the executive is the Courthouse and that the executive and OMB shall remain in the leased space in the Columbia Center Tower until a move into the Courthouse is feasible (Ordinance 15563) .</p>
<p>Other Agencies Likely to Move</p> <p>The following agencies/functions are being considered for moves during 2007 or beyond subject to identification or construction of suitable facilities:</p> <p>Elections Elections Warehouse Elections ITS Data Center</p>		<p>New</p> <p>Reflects the need to address the facility needs of a Consolidated Elections Facility and the county's Data Center who will both be moving in 2007 and 2008..</p>
	<p>AOC Building Fir St</p> <p>EMBOS Center Seattle Muni Tower</p>	

Proposed Space Policies	Explanation of Changes to 2005 Adopted Policies
	<p><u>Deleted:</u> <i>It is the council's intent to provide for infrastructure improvements, including structural upgrades, to support a future potential option to consolidate elections operations in the new county office building.</i></p> <p>Elections will not be locating at the NCOB.</p>
	<p><u>Deleted:</u> <i>ITS and the data center shall not be relocated without council approval. It is the intent of the council that such approval shall be informed by the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>A. the Strategic Technology Plan;</i> <i>B. the executive's recommendation on the Information Technology Organization Project;</i> <i>C. the Network Infrastructure Optimization Report; and</i> <i>D. the Business Continuity Project</i> <p>The council approved a move of ITS (less data center) to the NCOB. The data center will need to be relocated because the City of Seattle will limit their lease term to 2008. The move to a new data center will require council approval for either a new lease or new construction project per King County Code.</p>
<p>Business Continuity and a Redundant Data Center</p>	<p><u>Deleted:</u></p> <p><i>Action taken with redundant data center established in a State facility</i></p>
<p>Selection of a New Consolidated Elections Facility</p>	

Proposed Space Policies	Explanation of Changes to 2005 Adopted Policies
	<p><u>Deleted:</u></p> <p>Action Taken</p>
<p>Move of the Criminal Investigation Division</p> <p>The criminal investigation division (CID) in the King County Sheriff's Office shall be relocated to the downtown Seattle core complex of King County buildings if deemed consistent with the Sheriff's approved operational master plan and if deemed feasible.</p>	<p><u>Deleted:</u></p> <p><i>Reference to the vacated space in the Administrative Building being a priority location for CID eliminated and identification of the need to determine whether space is available to do so..</i></p> <p>There is insufficient facility programming to draw that conclusion. See Implementation Plan.</p>
<p>RJC Site Masterplan</p> <p>The Regional Justice Center space vacated by the CID shall be converted to functions consistent with approved facility master plans for the District Courts, Superior Court Juvenile Programs, and Adult Detention Programs.</p>	<p><u>Deleted:</u></p> <p><i>Reference to specific backfill going to the District Courts.</i></p> <p>Acknowledges the many operational master plans currently underway whose outcome may involve increased occupancy at the RJC. The vacated CID space may be appropriately assigned to any one of the criminal justice agencies needing increased space in that facility.</p>
<p>Relocation of Work Education Release Program</p> <p>Upon completion of the department of adult and juvenile detention operational master plan Implementation Plan and the Integrated Security Project (ISP), the executive shall develop a proposal for locating the Work Education Release (WER) program in the west wing of the King County Correctional Facility. The proposal shall include recommendations for alternative tenants in the courthouse space vacated by WER.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

-46-

Appendix II Space Standards Comparison

Category / Personnel Space	Space Standard Adopted 1993		Program Standard DLR Group Study*	City of Seattle Standards		Assessor Remodel Pilot	Proposed Standards 2004 Space Plan		2006-2007 Space Plan Standards	
	Low SF	High SF	SF	Low SF	High SF	SF	Low SF	High SF	Low SF	High SF
Elected Officials										
Executive	300	400	280				250	400	250	400
Councilmember	300	400	280	250	400		250	400	250	400
Assessor	300	400	280	250	400		250	400	250	400
Prosecuting Attorney	300	400	280	250	400		250	400	250	400
Presiding	300	400	224				250	400	250	400
Superior Court Judge	200	250	224				200	225	200	225
District Court Judge	200	250	224				200	225	200	225
Appointed Officials										
Executive Appointees										
Department Director	300	400	280	200	325		200	325	200	275
Division Manager	185	225	224	145	225	144	140	225	150	200
Section Manager	110	180	120	90	100		110	130	90	180
Council Appointees										
Ombudsman	200	250	224				200	225	150	225
Board of Appeals Chair	200	250	224				200	225	150	225
Hearing & Zoning Chair	200	250	224				200	225	150	225
Other Appointees**									120	165
County Staff										
Administrative										
Executive Designated										
Manager	85	120	120	90	100		110	130	95	165
Administrative Assistant	85	120	100				85	100	70	100
Assistant Manager	85	120		90	100		85	100	70	100
Supervisor				90	100	108	85	100	70	100
Supervising Attorney				110	145		110	145	95	145
Professional										
Executive Designated										
Planner	85	100	80	75	85		110	130	95	165
Architect	85	125	80				75	85	55	85
Engineer	85	125	80				75	85	55	85
Specialist	85	100	80				65	80	55	80
Technician	85	100	80	75	85	64	65	80	55	80
Attorney				110	130		110	130	95	130
Field Staff	60	100	64	60	60	56	55	70	55	70
Clerical										
Office Technician	50	70	64	45	60		45	65	45	64
Secretarial										
Confidential Secretary	85	110	80				65	80	55	75
Secretary	50	70	64	45	60		45	65	55	64
Temporary										
Extra Help	40	60	48	45	60		45	60	45	56
Intern	40	60	48	45	60		45	60	45	56
Work Study	40	60	48	45	45		45	45	45	56
Ave PSF Usable/FTE's						152				
* Some categories interperlated to correspond to Adopted										

47

King County Code
Budgeting System & Capital Improvement Program

BUDGETING AND REPORTING SYSTEM

4.04.010 - 4.04.020

Chapter 4.04
BUDGETING AND REPORTING SYSTEM

Sections:**II. BUDGETING SYSTEM**

4.04.020 Definitions.

4.04.020 Definitions.

L. "Capital improvement plan" means a plan that establishes the capital improvements required to implement an approved operational master plan. This plan should extend over a minimum period of six years to define long-range capital improvement requirements and the annual capital improvements budget for a user agency.

1. The capital improvement plan shall include the following elements, where applicable:

- a. general program requirements that define the development scope for specific sites or facilities;
- b. general space and construction standards;
- c. prototype floor plans and prototype facility designs for standard improvements;
- d. space requirements based on the **adopted county space plan**;
- e. initial, and life-cycle cost, of alternative facilities and locations including lease and lease/purchase approaches;
- f. approximate location of planned capital improvements;
- g. general scope and estimated cost of infrastructure;
- h. a schedule, that extends over a minimum of six years, for the implementation of projects included in capital improvement plans, based on overall user agency priorities and projected available revenue;

C. All above-grade CIP projects shall be subject to the following process:

1. An operational master plan shall be developed by the agency requesting a CIP project in conjunction with the director of the office of management and budget and shall be submitted to the executive and the council for approval;

2. A capital improvement plan, based upon the **adopted county space plan**, where applicable, and the approved operational master plan, shall be developed by the user agency with assistance from the implementing agency and shall be submitted to the executive and the council for approval.

3. A project program plan, based upon the **adopted county space plan**, where applicable, and the approved operational master plan, shall be developed by the user agency, with assistance from the implementing agency, for each requested CIP. This plan shall be submitted to the executive and the council for approval. This plan shall specify which projects will require a site master plan;

4. A site master plan shall be developed by the implementing agency, with input from the user agency, for all capital improvements that involve multiple projects, are complex in nature, or are otherwise identified as requiring such a plan in the project program plan. This plan shall be submitted to the executive and council for approval;

5. The executive may exempt smaller scale projects from the requirements in subsection C.1 and C.2 of this section if criteria for granting

exemptions are established and approved by the council and if the implementing agency certifies the project program plan and related CIP or lease request is in conformance with the **adopted county space plan**; and

6. Capital projects that involve the development of new parks or significant addition to or rehabilitation of existing parks shall require a public meeting in the affected community at the program plan and site master plan stages, before submitting these plans to the executive and council for approval.

Sections:

V. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

4.04.200 Executive responsibilities.

4.04.210 Council responsibilities.

4.04.200 Executive responsibilities.

A.1. The executive shall be responsible for the implementation of all CIP projects pursuant to adopted project budgets and schedules. However, major maintenance reserve fund CIP projects may be implemented in accordance with the major maintenance reserve fund capital improvement budgeting procedures in K.C.C. 4.04.265, road CIP projects may be implemented in accordance with the roads capital improvement budgeting procedures in K.C.C. 4.04.270, solid waste CIP projects may be implemented in accordance with the solid waste capital improvement budgeting procedures in K.C.C. 4.04.273, surface water management CIP projects may be implemented in accordance with the surface water management capital improvement budgeting procedures in K.C.C. 4.04.275 and wastewater CIP projects may be implemented in accordance with the wastewater capital improvement budgeting procedures in K.C.C. 4.04.280

2. At least fifteen days before advertising for construction bids for any capital project, the council chair and councilmembers in whose district construction will take place shall be notified. The notification shall include project identification, advertising dates and a summary description of the work to be performed, though failure to comply with this provision shall not delay bid advertisement.

B.1. The executive shall be responsible for implementation of adopted CIP projects to ensure their completion on schedule and within adopted budgets. However, major maintenance reserve fund CIP projects may be reprogrammed in accordance with K.C.C. 4.04.265, roads CIP projects may be reprogrammed in accordance with K.C.C. 4.04.270, solid waste CIP projects may be reprogrammed in accordance with K.C.C. 4.04.273, surface water management CIP projects may be reprogrammed in accordance with K.C.C. 4.04.275 and wastewater CIP projects may be reprogrammed in accordance with K.C.C. 4.04.280.

2. The budget for each major maintenance reserve fund CIP project shall not exceed by more than fifteen percent the amount specified for that project in the adopted six-year major maintenance reserve fund CIP, except when the amount is modified by ordinance or in accordance with the CIP exceptions notification process. The budget for each roads CIP project shall not exceed by more than fifteen percent the amount specified for that project in the adopted six-year roads CIP, except when the amount is modified by ordinance or in accordance with the CIP exceptions notification process. The budget for each solid waste, surface

King County Code
Budgeting System & Capital Improvement Program

water management and wastewater CIP project shall not exceed by more than fifteen percent the amount specified for that project in the adopted six-year solid waste, surface water management or wastewater CIP, except when the amount is modified by ordinance or in accordance with the CIP exceptions notifications process.

4.04.210 Council responsibilities.

The council shall review, amend, defer or adopt operational master plans, facility master plans, facility program plans, CIP project cost elements, schedules and total budget in the annual CIP budget or amendments thereto pursuant to the provisions of the King County Charter.

**Chapter 20.12
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

Sections:

20.12.100 County space plan.

20.12.100 County space plan. The 2005 county space plan dated July 13, 2005, consisting of planning policies, location of county agencies and implementation plan, and incorporating the King County Department of Executive Services Space Plan 2004 transmitted by the executive on July 23, 2004, is adopted as a subelement of the public facilities element of the comprehensive plan and the master plan for county facility development as defined in K.C.C. 4.04.020. The county space plan dated July 13, 2005, shall govern development of all facility master plans, facility program plans and CIP and lease requests for space housing county agency operations.

The executive shall update the current and future space needs and implementation plans of the county space plan and submit them to the council as amendments to the county space plan by March 1 of every other year, beginning on March 1, 2006. In accordance with Motion 11118, any future space plan documentation should use as a guideline the document "A Template for Space Planning: Recommendation from the King County Space & Facilities Peer Review Panel December 2000" ("peer review report"), which was adopted as Attachment C* to Ordinance 14515. While the peer review report should guide the preparation of future space planning documentation, it report does not constitute mandatory requirements for space planning. (15328 § 2, 2005: Ord. 14515 § 1, 2002: Ord. 10810 § 1, 1993).

36.70A.070

Comprehensive plans — Mandatory elements.

The comprehensive plan of a county or city that is required or chooses to plan under RCW 36.70A.040 shall consist of a map or maps, and descriptive text covering objectives, principles, and standards used to develop the comprehensive plan. The plan shall be an internally consistent document and all elements shall be consistent with the future land use map. A comprehensive plan shall be adopted and amended with public participation as provided in RCW 36.70A.140.

Each comprehensive plan shall include a plan, scheme, or design for each of the following:

(1) A land use element designating the proposed general distribution and general location and extent of the uses of land, where appropriate, for agriculture, timber production, housing, commerce, industry, recreation, open spaces, general aviation airports, public utilities, public facilities, and other land uses. The land use element shall include population densities, building intensities, and estimates of future population growth. The land use element shall provide for protection of the quality and quantity of groundwater used for public water supplies. Wherever possible, the land use element should consider utilizing urban planning approaches that promote physical activity. Where applicable, the land use element shall review drainage, flooding, and storm water run-off in the area and nearby jurisdictions and provide guidance for corrective actions to mitigate or cleanse those discharges that pollute waters of the state, including Puget Sound or waters entering Puget Sound.

(2) A housing element ensuring the vitality and character of established residential neighborhoods that:
 (a) Includes an inventory and analysis of existing and projected housing needs that identifies the number of housing units necessary to manage projected growth; (b) includes a statement of goals, policies, objectives, and mandatory provisions for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing, including single-family residences; (c) identifies sufficient land for housing, including, but not limited to, government-assisted housing, housing for low-income families, manufactured housing, multifamily housing, and group homes and foster care facilities; and (d) makes adequate provisions for existing and projected needs of all economic segments of the community.

(3) A capital facilities plan element consisting of: (a) An inventory of existing capital facilities owned by public entities, showing the locations and capacities of the capital facilities; (b) a forecast of the future needs for such capital facilities; (c) the proposed locations and capacities of expanded or new capital facilities; (d) at least a six-year plan that will finance such capital facilities within projected funding capacities and clearly identifies sources of public money for such purposes; and (e) a requirement to reassess the land use element if probable funding falls short of meeting existing needs and to ensure that the land use element, capital facilities plan element, and financing plan within the capital facilities plan element are coordinated and consistent. Park and recreation facilities shall be included in the capital facilities plan element.

(4) A utilities element consisting of the general location, proposed location, and capacity of all existing and proposed utilities, including, but not limited to, electrical lines, telecommunication lines, and natural gas lines.

(5) Rural element. Counties shall include a rural element including lands that are not designated for urban growth, agriculture, forest, or mineral resources. The following provisions shall apply to the rural element:

(a) Growth management act goals and local circumstances. Because circumstances vary from county to county, in establishing patterns of rural densities and uses, a county may consider local circumstances, but shall develop a written record explaining how the rural element harmonizes the planning goals in RCW 36.70A.020 and meets the requirements of this chapter.

(b) Rural development. The rural element shall permit rural development, forestry, and agriculture in rural areas. The rural element shall provide for a variety of rural densities, uses, essential public facilities, and rural governmental services needed to serve the permitted densities and uses. To achieve a variety of rural densities and uses, counties may provide for clustering, density transfer, design guidelines, conservation easements, and other innovative techniques that will accommodate appropriate rural densities and uses that are not characterized by urban growth and that are consistent with rural character.

(c) Measures governing rural development. The rural element shall include measures that apply to rural development and protect the rural character of the area, as established by the county, by:

- (i) Containing or otherwise controlling rural development;
 - (ii) Assuring visual compatibility of rural development with the surrounding rural area;
 - (iii) Reducing the inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land into sprawling, low-density development in the rural area;
 - (iv) Protecting critical areas, as provided in RCW 36.70A.060, and surface water and groundwater resources; and
 - (v) Protecting against conflicts with the use of agricultural, forest, and mineral resource lands designated under RCW 36.70A.170.
- (d) Limited areas of more intensive rural development. Subject to the requirements of this subsection and except as otherwise specifically provided in this subsection (5)(d), the rural element may allow for limited areas of more intensive rural development, including necessary public facilities and public services to serve the limited area as follows:
- (i) Rural development consisting of the infill, development, or redevelopment of existing commercial, industrial, residential, or mixed-use areas, whether characterized as shoreline development, villages, hamlets, rural activity centers, or crossroads developments.
- (A) A commercial, industrial, residential, shoreline, or mixed-use area shall be subject to the requirements of (d)(iv) of this subsection, but shall not be subject to the requirements of (c)(ii) and (iii) of this subsection.
- (B) Any development or redevelopment other than an industrial area or an industrial use within a mixed-use area or an industrial area under this subsection (5)(d)(i) must be principally designed to serve the existing and projected rural population.
- (C) Any development or redevelopment in terms of building size, scale, use, or intensity shall be consistent with the character of the existing areas. Development and redevelopment may include changes in use from vacant land or a previously existing use so long as the new use conforms to the requirements of this subsection (5);
- (ii) The intensification of development on lots containing, or new development of, small-scale recreational or tourist uses, including commercial facilities to serve those recreational or tourist uses, that rely on a rural location and setting, but that do not include new residential development. A small-scale recreation or tourist use is not required to be principally designed to serve the existing and projected rural population. Public services and public facilities shall be limited to those necessary to serve the recreation or tourist use and shall be provided in a manner that does not permit low-density sprawl;
 - (iii) The intensification of development on lots containing isolated nonresidential uses or new development of isolated cottage industries and isolated small-scale businesses that are not principally designed to serve the existing and projected rural population and nonresidential uses, but do provide job opportunities for rural residents. Rural counties may allow the expansion of small-scale businesses as long as those small-scale businesses conform with the rural character of the area as defined by the local government according to *RCW 36.70A.030(14). Rural counties may also allow new small-scale businesses to utilize a site previously occupied by an existing business as long as the new small-scale business conforms to the rural character of the area as defined by the local government according to *RCW 36.70A.030(14). Public services and public facilities shall be limited to those necessary to serve the isolated nonresidential use and shall be provided in a manner that does not permit low-density sprawl;
 - (iv) A county shall adopt measures to minimize and contain the existing areas or uses of more intensive rural development, as appropriate, authorized under this subsection. Lands included in such existing areas or uses shall not extend beyond the logical outer boundary of the existing area or use, thereby allowing a new pattern of low-density sprawl. Existing areas are those that are clearly identifiable and contained and where there is a logical boundary delineated predominately by the built environment, but that may also include undeveloped lands if limited as provided in this subsection. The county shall establish the logical outer boundary of an area of more intensive rural development. In establishing the logical outer boundary the county shall address (A) the need to preserve the character of existing natural neighborhoods and

communities, (B) physical boundaries such as bodies of water, streets and highways, and land forms and contours, (C) the prevention of abnormally irregular boundaries, and (D) the ability to provide public facilities and public services in a manner that does not permit low-density sprawl;

(v) For purposes of (d) of this subsection, an existing area or existing use is one that was in existence:

(A) On July 1, 1990, in a county that was initially required to plan under all of the provisions of this chapter;

(B) On the date the county adopted a resolution under RCW 36.70A.040(2), in a county that is planning under all of the provisions of this chapter under RCW 36.70A.040(2); or

(C) On the date the office of financial management certifies the county's population as provided in RCW 36.70A.040(5), in a county that is planning under all of the provisions of this chapter pursuant to RCW 36.70A.040(5).

(e) Exception. This subsection shall not be interpreted to permit in the rural area a major industrial development or a master planned resort unless otherwise specifically permitted under RCW 36.70A.360 and 36.70A.365.

(6) A transportation element that implements, and is consistent with, the land use element.

(a) The transportation element shall include the following subelements:

(i) Land use assumptions used in estimating travel;

(ii) Estimated traffic impacts to state-owned transportation facilities resulting from land use assumptions to assist the department of transportation in monitoring the performance of state facilities, to plan improvements for the facilities, and to assess the impact of land-use decisions on state-owned transportation facilities;

(iii) Facilities and services needs, including:

(A) An inventory of air, water, and ground transportation facilities and services, including transit alignments and general aviation airport facilities, to define existing capital facilities and travel levels as a basis for future planning. This inventory must include state-owned transportation facilities within the city or county's jurisdictional boundaries;

(B) Level of service standards for all locally owned arterials and transit routes to serve as a gauge to judge performance of the system. These standards should be regionally coordinated;

(C) For state-owned transportation facilities, level of service standards for highways, as prescribed in chapters 47.06 and 47.80 RCW, to gauge the performance of the system. The purposes of reflecting level of service standards for state highways in the local comprehensive plan are to monitor the performance of the system, to evaluate improvement strategies, and to facilitate coordination between the county's or city's six-year street, road, or transit program and the department of transportation's six-year investment program. The concurrency requirements of (b) of this subsection do not apply to transportation facilities and services of statewide significance except for counties consisting of islands whose only connection to the mainland are state highways or ferry routes. In these island counties, state highways and ferry route capacity must be a factor in meeting the concurrency requirements in (b) of this subsection;

(D) Specific actions and requirements for bringing into compliance locally owned transportation facilities or services that are below an established level of service standard;

(E) Forecasts of traffic for at least ten years based on the adopted land use plan to provide information on the location, timing, and capacity needs of future growth;

(F) Identification of state and local system needs to meet current and future demands. Identified needs on state-owned transportation facilities must be consistent with the statewide multimodal transportation plan required under chapter 47.06 RCW;

(iv) Finance, including:

(A) An analysis of funding capability to judge needs against probable funding resources;

(B) A multiyear financing plan based on the needs identified in the comprehensive plan, the appropriate parts of which shall serve as the basis for the six-year street, road, or transit program required by RCW 35.77.010 for cities, RCW 36.81.121 for counties, and RCW 35.58.2795 for public transportation systems. The multiyear financing plan should be coordinated with the six-year improvement program developed by the department of transportation as required by **RCW 47.05.030;

(C) If probable funding falls short of meeting identified needs, a discussion of how additional funding will be raised, or how land use assumptions will be reassessed to ensure that level of service standards will be met;

(v) Intergovernmental coordination efforts, including an assessment of the impacts of the transportation plan and land use assumptions on the transportation systems of adjacent jurisdictions;

(vi) Demand-management strategies;

(vii) Pedestrian and bicycle component to include collaborative efforts to identify and designate planned improvements for pedestrian and bicycle facilities and corridors that address and encourage enhanced community access and promote healthy lifestyles.

(b) After adoption of the comprehensive plan by jurisdictions required to plan or who choose to plan under RCW 36.70A.040, local jurisdictions must adopt and enforce ordinances which prohibit development approval if the development causes the level of service on a locally owned transportation facility to decline below the standards adopted in the transportation element of the comprehensive plan, unless transportation improvements or strategies to accommodate the impacts of development are made concurrent with the development. These strategies may include increased public transportation service, ride sharing programs, demand management, and other transportation systems management strategies. For the purposes of this subsection (6) "concurrent with the development" shall mean that improvements or strategies are in place at the time of development, or that a financial commitment is in place to complete the improvements or strategies within six years.

(c) The transportation element described in this subsection (6), and the six-year plans required by RCW 35.77.010 for cities, RCW 36.81.121 for counties, RCW 35.58.2795 for public transportation systems, and **RCW 47.05.030 for the state, must be consistent.

(7) An economic development element establishing local goals, policies, objectives, and provisions for economic growth and vitality and a high quality of life. The element shall include: (a) A summary of the local economy such as population, employment, payroll, sectors, businesses, sales, and other information as appropriate; (b) a summary of the strengths and weaknesses of the local economy defined as the commercial and industrial sectors and supporting factors such as land use, transportation, utilities, education, workforce, housing, and natural/cultural resources; and (c) an identification of policies, programs, and projects to foster economic growth and development and to address future needs. A city that has chosen to be a residential community is exempt from the economic development element requirement of this subsection.

(8) A park and recreation element that implements, and is consistent with, the capital facilities plan element as it relates to park and recreation facilities. The element shall include: (a) Estimates of park and recreation demand for at least a ten-year period; (b) an evaluation of facilities and service needs; and (c) an evaluation of intergovernmental coordination opportunities to provide regional approaches for meeting park and recreational demand.

(9) It is the intent that new or amended elements required after January 1, 2002, be adopted concurrent with the scheduled update provided in RCW 36.70A.130. Requirements to incorporate any such new or amended elements shall be null and void until funds sufficient to cover applicable local government costs are appropriated and distributed by the state at least two years before local government must update comprehensive plans as required in RCW 36.70A.130.

The executive's proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan can be found on the web at:
<http://www.metrokc.gov/permits/codes/CompPlan/2008/>