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1.0 OVERVIEW

The North/East Cities (NEC) proponents, Bellevue, Kirkland, Redmond, Seattle, and Shoreline, are evaluating potential sites for construction and operation of a new regional municipal jail. As part of the evaluation, the cities are preparing an environmental impact statement (EIS) to analyze the potential impacts associated with development of the jail at each of the proposed site alternatives.

From an economic perspective, the assessment of potential impacts focuses on three key questions:

- How could development of a jail affect the local property values in the surrounding areas?
- How could development of a jail affect the tax revenues and public services for the hosting local jurisdictions?
- How could development of a jail affect patterns of commerce and potential displaced businesses?

Analyses of potential economic activities are based on the following assumptions about the operating characteristics of the jail.

- The facility would be used to process, arraign, and hold individuals charged with misdemeanor offenses.
- The five stand-alone sites would be sized to house 640 inmate beds. The King County Jail Annex, in partnership between the NEC and King County, would have 1,080 operational capacity (1,188 inmate beds).¹
- At this point in the process, the NEC has not identified a definitive release policy. For the purpose of this assessment, there are two options considered.
  - Option 1: Inmates are directly released from jail and it is assumed that existing King County Jail practices would continue. This includes inmates being picked-up at the jail by a family member or friend, inmates departing the jail and arranging their own transportation (e.g., taxi, etc.), or inmates being provided a bus ticket to return to their local community.

¹ The Jail Annex facility would include 588 jail cells that would each have two jail beds and 12 ADA jail cells that would each have one jail bed for a total of 1,188 jail beds (588 X 2 = 1,176 + 12 = 1,188). King County’s operational policy is to use no more than 80 percent of the cells to house two inmates and to have at least 20 percent of the cells with only one inmate, thereby, leading to an operational capacity of 1,080 inmates.
o Release Option 2: Inmates are picked up at the jail by the arresting police agency, are transported by the arresting police agency to the city in which the arrest occurred, and are released at a police station in the precinct within the arresting jurisdiction.

The report is organized into three broad sections. First, there is an assessment of property values, followed by an assessment of impacts to the host jurisdiction, concluding with a discussion of impacts to local patterns and displaced businesses.
2.0 IMPACT TO PROPERTY VALUES

To begin an assessment of potential property value impacts, one must start by stating the obvious:

*The value of a given property can be affected by land use changes on nearby properties.*

If someone redeveloped a public park in an upscale neighborhood and replaced it with a pulp mill, the houses that surround the new pulp mill will almost certainly have lower market values.

**Defining Terms – The Notion of Amenity Value**

In economic terms, the issue of a park versus a pulp mill is discussed in terms of the property’s *amenity* value. An *amenity* is simply a desirable characteristic of a property, and for purposes of this discussion, the notion of amenity is used in the context of a property’s location.

For example, if a house has a great view of Mount Rainier, if it is located close to a park, or if it is located close to an attractive retail center with good restaurants, all of those would be described as locational amenities. A *disamenity*, in contrast, describes a locational characteristic of a property that is undesirable. Commonly cited disamenities include noise, pollution, or unattractive views.

In the case of the park versus the pulp mill, economists would say that (1) eliminating the park eliminated at least one amenity for the neighborhood and (2) developing the pulp mill introduced new disamenities to that same neighborhood (perhaps introducing noise, traffic, odors, and diminishing the quality of the views). A shorter way to say this would be to say the replacement of the park with a pulp mill “diminished the amenity value” of the neighborhood.

**A Framework for Assessing the Potential for Property Value Impacts**

When it comes to assessing property value impacts associated with a new jail, there are two central questions:

1. In what ways, and to what extent, could a new jail diminish a neighborhood’s amenity value?
2. Under what circumstances could any such diminishment result in reduced property values?

At the end of this section, we offer profiles of each of the six contemplated sites that seek to answer these questions. Specifically, these profiles do three things:

- They graphically identify the sites and describe the ways in which each site relates to surrounding properties;
- They offer an assessment of each site by asking and answering a series of six key questions; and
- In light of the answers to those six questions, the profiles conclude with a synthesis of the potential for property value impacts at each site.
To lay the groundwork for these summary profiles, the following sections offer a foundational discussion in four parts:

**Part 1** focuses on the challenges of trying to observe property value impacts of jails in the real world.

**Part 2** focuses on the fundamental economic theory about the factors that drive property values and how development of a jail facility might be expected to fit into that construct.

**Part 3** offers a brief examination of the question: *Under what conditions might a new jail be viewed as a disamenity from the perspective of its neighbors (or potential neighbors).*

**Part 4** focuses on the specific considerations that, given the economic theory, would be expected to influence the extent and nature of property value impacts.

**Part 1: The Challenge of Trying to Observe Impacts on Property Values**

When one begins to consider the potential impact of a jail on property values, it is tempting to pose a straightforward question:

> Why not just look at where jails are located and look at property values of surrounding properties to see if they are lower, higher, or the same as can be found elsewhere?

In reality, if one were to look at a map of property values in King County (or virtually any other county across the country) one would see an immensely complex picture where property values varied from place to place, and in some instances, from block to block. One could look at the King County Jail in downtown Seattle and see that the nearby properties are quite valuable. One could look at the Regional Justice Center in Kent and see nearby properties with somewhat lower property values. And one could look at properties surrounding any number of city jails and see yet different values and patterns.

The value of any given piece of property is influenced by a vast array of considerations. Even when you limit your scope to a single family house, the value of a given house will be influenced by a number of considerations including:

- How the house relates to local and regional employment centers;
- How the house relates to centers of regional and local retail and services;
- Quality of local schools;
- Characteristics of the house itself (square footage, number of bedrooms, number of bathrooms, layout, quality of materials and workmanship, lot size, nature and quality of landscaping, etc);
- Proximity of the house to parks and recreational opportunities;
- Quality and nature of views;
- How the house relates to streets and nearby buildings; and
- The nature of the surrounding neighborhood.

Getting one’s arms around all of the factors that can drive the value of a property is difficult (1) because of the sheer number of factors; (2) because all of these factors can differ in any
number of ways, in terms of nature and extent, and from one property to the next; and (3) because it is difficult to acquire good data about many of their attributes.

**The Challenge of Complexity**

In theory, one can say that factors like being close to a park or being close to a museum or library should have an impact on property values. Given the immense complexity of how property values are defined in the market, however, economists who have tried to explore these relationships have found that it is very difficult to model these relationships in a way that even proves that relationships exist, let alone to assign a specific impact to a given category of amenity.

**Past Efforts to Determine Property Value Impacts of Jails Bear Out the Challenges**

Over the years, a number of analysts have attempted to use statistical assessments to determine whether, and to what extent, jails have an impact on the values of surrounding properties. Most of these analyses identified no meaningful impacts associated with jails. Of course, given the difficulty of the task, it is not possible to know whether these findings mean that (1) no impacts exist or (2) impacts indeed do exist but the modelers were unsuccessful in identifying them.

At least one analysis (an analysis that studied property values before and after the location of a jail) did find a negative impact on property values on one of the seven locations included in the study. This finding of a statistically-significant impact occurred in the community of Perryville, Arizona and involved development of an Arizona State Prison Complex. It is interesting to note that this relatively affluent community strongly opposed development of the prison complex, and analysts speculated that the impact on property values may be a result, at least in part, of the high-profile political battle. The study did not find a statistically significant impact at the other six locations. (For additional discussion of BERK’s review of available literature and past analytic efforts, see the sub-section entitled Literature Review – Assessments of Impact on Property Values at the end of this property value discussion.) Given how challenging it has proven to be, for analysts to assess the influence that a given amenity or disamenity may have on property values, and given our review of work that has been done around the specific impacts of jails, BERK believes that it would be overly speculative to try to quantitatively estimate the impact a jail facility would have on the surrounding property values of the six alternative sites.

We do believe, however, that it is possible to evaluate the relative potential for property value impacts associated with each development alternative.

Given fundamental economic theory about how property values are determined (for different categories of properties) and given the specific circumstances of each site alternative, in our assessment, some alternatives are more likely to generate impacts on surrounding property values while others are less likely to do so.
Part 2: An Economic Perspective on Property Values

The Determinants of Property Value

The Demand Side of the Equation

For both residential and commercial uses, the selling price (the market value) of a given property is the mechanism that equilibrates supply and demand. In an efficient market, the value of a given property reflects what the buyer with the greatest willingness-to-pay would need to spend to out-bid the potential buyer with the second greatest willingness-to-pay.

In this context, it is useful to think of demand for a given property in terms of the property’s relative attractiveness to a pool of potential buyers.

The characteristics that drive a property’s attractiveness differ for residential and commercial properties.

Setting aside the characteristics of buildings, the demand for residential properties is driven by factors including:

- Access to centers of employment;
- Relation of property to amenities and/or disamenities (i.e. open space, views, environmental quality, noise);
- Availability and quality of public services;
- Taxes; and
- Expectations about future conditions.

Demand for commercial property is driven by different factors. These factors include:

- Access to markets;
- Access to factors of production:
  - Labor;
  - Production inputs; and
  - Capital/Entrepreneurial initiative;
- Availability and quality of public services;
- Taxes; and
- Expectations about future conditions.

Residential Users

Among residential users, the intensity of demand is driven by each property’s bundle of attributes. Again, setting aside the specific characteristics of buildings, properties that offer the best of everything—easy access to major centers of commerce, high levels of amenities, great schools, and high levels of other public services—will see the greatest intensity of demand. Properties that present tradeoffs—ranking somewhat lower in regard to one or more factors (e.g. a property with long commutes to employment centers or with lower levels of amenities or services) will see a lower intensity of demand.
**Commercial Users**

For commercial properties, too, intensity of demand is driven by the property's unique bundle of attributes. For commercial uses, however, it is also important to recognize differences among categories of users.

**Software Development.** While all commercial users consider the same core attributes, different categories of commercial users bring different perspectives and different weights to the factors listed above. For example, for a software development firm, the nature of their product (software that is inexpensively delivered to customers via the internet or other means) means that virtually any site offers access to markets. Further, non-labor production inputs (including computers, servers, telecommunication equipment, etc.) for software development are minimal and broadly available. For this kind of firm, therefore, the key siting considerations revolve around access to labor (i.e. Does the site allow my firm to access, and effectively compete for, the high-skill, creative labor force we need?)

**Retailer or Consumer Services.** For a retailer or consumer services business, on the other hand, access to markets is the most important factor. For retailers in particular, a site that gives them great access to the customers they want to attract is the dominant consideration. For most retailers, the key to success is to take advantage of synergies with other retailers. For the typical apparel or electronics retailer, this means locating in areas that possess a critical mass of retail activity (e.g. locating in or near a regional shopping center).

For an auto dealer, on the other hand, synergistic dynamics often mean the best locations are in close proximity to other auto dealers. When looking to purchase a car or truck, most buyers want to look at a variety of options before they make a purchase. This means that, when one assesses a pool of buyers, more buyers are likely to make a trip to an area with three or four auto dealerships in relatively close proximity than they are to an area with only a single dealership. For an auto dealer, a location in a highly visible, highly accessible cluster of dealerships is likely to represent the ideal location.

**Industrial.** The typical industrial user brings yet another set of siting considerations. For an industrial user, the most important considerations typically revolve around (1) access to markets; (2) access to production inputs; (3) absence of conflicting uses; and (4) site costs.

All else being equal, an industrial user that relies on large volumes of raw materials and delivers large volumes of finished products to regional, national, or international markets will look for a site that has good access to freight networks (highways, rail, and ports). The same industrial user would also prefer a site that is protected from land uses that could engender conflict (e.g. established residential neighborhoods or higher-amenity retail users who might object to noise, truck traffic, or other perceived disamenities). Finally, this “typical” industrial user will tend to select a site with low land costs. In the competitive landscape, industrial users seek to minimize production costs and are well positioned to do so because they actively seek sites that are

---

2 As a general category, the characteristics of office users can vary widely. Dentists, for example, are much more reliant on a site that gives them access to their market (their clients). At the other end of the spectrum, phone support centers can be located almost anywhere in the world, as long as it has robust telecommunication links.
tolerant of noise and truck traffic—sites that are often low-cost because they engender less competition from residential and other more amenity-focused commercial users.

Industrial users that are more constrained in terms of geographic choice—users who need to be located in a given area because they provide goods or services to a local market—may be forced to compromise on one or more of their siting requirements. For example, a small metal fabricating business that provides custom, high-end residential fixtures may need to pay a higher land price, or settle for a site that is less protected from conflicting uses, to ensure that the business has access to its urban market.

*The Supply Side of the Equation*

The supply of residential or commercial properties is a function of (1) the availability of comparable developed properties, (2) the availability of comparable properties that are suitable for development, and (3) the cost of construction.

Again, for both residential and commercial uses, the price (property value) is the mechanism that equilibrates supply and demand. Given the balance of the above demand determinants, and given the overall availability of usable sites relative to that demand, property values rise or fall to the point that allow a given property’s seller to come to terms with the buyer who exhibits the greatest willingness-to-pay.

*Applying Economic Theory to an Assessment of Jail Impacts*

As noted above, property values can be affected by changes to either demand or supply. From a supply perspective the only impact associated with developing a jail would result from “using up” the property in question. By developing the site in question, one fewer sites would be available for use. This means that development of a jail site would only have a minimal impact on supply conditions.

If supply conditions would be minimally affected, then logic dictates that, if impacts to property values occur, they must be as a result of impacts to demand for the properties in question.

*Focusing on Impacts to Demand*

What the above discussion about the drivers of demand suggests is that different categories of land uses bring different perspectives to the introduction of an amenity or disamenity. This, in turn, suggests that the effects of a jail on demand (if they exist) should vary depending on the use-categories of the surrounding properties.

Land whose value is driven by uses that put less weight on amenity value (e.g. industrial and segments of retail and general commercial uses) would be less likely to be affected by an action that is perceived to diminish the amenity value of a neighborhood. Land whose value is driven by uses that put a great deal of weight on amenity (e.g. high- and mid-market value residential, or high amenity retail and office uses) are more likely to be affected by a perceived diminishment in a neighborhood’s amenities.
Potential for Value Impacts – Distinctions within Categories

It is important to note that for uses like housing and office, virtually all users take into consideration the presence of amenities and disamenities. However, lower market value residential and office sites often exhibit lower market values precisely because they already offer a less-than-optimal mix of characteristics (from the perspective of buyers with the greatest ability to pay). Therefore, all else being equal, introduction of a facility that is perceived to be a modest disamenity in proximity to lower market value residential or office uses is likely to have a more modest effect on their market values.

For example, if a cluster of housing has low property values because it has few amenities and is located next to a pulp mill, then building a jail near that neighborhood is unlikely to have a large incremental impact on property values.

Another, more straightforward reason why higher value properties are likely to see greater impacts is due to higher base value of these properties. If one is comparing a block of potentially-impacted properties that has a current value of $1 million to a similarly-sized block of properties with a current value of $4 million, in dollar terms, a 10% decrease in property values is much larger for the high-value block than for the low-value block (10% of $4 million is $400,000, while 10% of $1 million is $100,000).

Developing a Hierarchy

If one applies the accepted economic principles discussed above to develop a hierarchy of uses, in terms of their potential to be impacted by a new disamenity, we propose that the hierarchy presented in Exhibit 1 reflects those principles.

Exhibit 1

Potential to be Impacted by Introduction of a Perceived Disamenity

Ranked from Greatest to Least

Greatest Potential for Impact

High Market Value Residential

Medium Market Value Residential, High-Amenity Retail

High Market Value Office, Mid-Amenity Retail

Medium Market Value Office, Low Market Value Residential

Least Potential for Impact

Low-Amenity Retail, Low Market Value Office

Industrial
Among the above list of uses, relative rankings among types of housing (and among categories and types of commercial uses) are more straightforward and tractable. Relative rankings between housing and commercial uses are less clear.³

## Part 3: A Jail as Neighborhood Amenity or Disamenity

As we noted above, when economists talk about the characteristics of property, one of the key considerations revolves around the question of amenities that are associated with the property (i.e. *What are the desirable characteristics of the property that are a function of its location?*). Amenities can include things like views, air quality, access to desirable parks, restaurants, or shops, etc. Disamenities represent the flip side of the same coin (i.e. *What characteristics of the property’s location are viewed as detracting from its attractiveness?*) Disamenities might include noise, pollution, excessive traffic, a lack of parks, dilapidated buildings or overgrown lots in the neighborhood, etc.

When discussing construction of a jail, the question of the jail’s amenity or disamenity value tends to revolve around issues of noise; safety; traffic; the relative attractiveness of the physical facility itself; and the introduction of generally less desirable individuals into the neighborhood, in instances where detainees are released out the door.

### Attractiveness

It is also worth noting that the *relative* attractiveness of a jail facility depends in large part on what one is comparing it to. In other words: _If the jail is not there, what use could you expect to be in its place?_ To return to our extreme example, if one is comparing a jail to a pulp mill, when it comes to questions of noise, air quality, traffic, and overall attractiveness of the physical plant, a jail is likely to be viewed as *more* attractive than the alternate use. On the other hand, if one is comparing a new jail and a new library, then the jail is likely to compare less favorably.

### Safety Impacts

A final distinction that is important to point out, particularly in connection with safety impacts, is the distinction between *real, observable impacts*, and *perceived impacts*.

When one reviews the experiences associated with other jails, it appears that real, observed impacts on crime rates associated with most jails range from very modest to non-existent. (See discussion of potential public service impacts.) However, this is where the distinction between *real* and *perceived* impacts becomes important. Even in instances where no meaningful change in neighborhood safety is apparent, it is still possible that neighborhood residents, businesses, and/or visitors could *perceive* an increased risk of crime. Even if it is not grounded in reality, this perception of risk still has the potential to influence how residents and businesses (and potential residents and businesses) view the relative amenity-value of the jail development.

---

³ Shultz and King suggest that residential property values are impacted by the proximity to commercial and industrial areas (Shultz, Steven D. and David A. King, 2001. “The Use of Census Data for Hedonic Price Estimates of Open-Space Amenities and Land Use”, Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics 22, 2: 239-252).
Part 4: How might Specific Circumstances around Each Alternative Influence Potential Property Impacts?

Given the preceding discussion, as one contemplates the six site alternatives for jail development, a number of key questions rise to the surface that speak to the potential for property value impacts:

**Question 1. What is the mix of land uses in the surrounding area?**

As discussed above, the use to which a nearby property is dedicated has a great deal to do with the potential for property value impacts.

**Question 2. What geographic and/or structural barriers exist around the site? And how do these barriers influence the set of potentially-impacted sites?**

When considering the list of surrounding uses, it is important to recognize the role that geographic or structural barriers play in determining which properties are most likely to be impacted. A number of sites are located adjacent to substantial structural barriers (e.g. the King County Jail Annex site is adjacent to I-5 and the Bellevue site is adjacent to I-405). Other sites are located near geographic barriers like waterways or wooded hillsides (which, depending on the nature of the slope, can insulate a neighborhood from impacts to varying degrees).

**Question 3. How does the jail site relate to the surrounding properties?**

The way in which surrounding properties relate to the contemplated jail site can influence the potential for impacts. Key questions include:

- Is a site highly visible from the perspective of surrounding properties?
- In what ways might comings and goings from the jail change conditions for nearby properties?
- Are potentially-impacted properties partially insulated from the site by arterial roadways and businesses?

**Question 4. Is the site located in an existing center of urban activity?**

The densest urban centers in King County include a vast array of amenities and disamenities. Whether households or businesses, land users in downtown Seattle, for instance, enjoy access to a long list of amenities, including restaurants, shops, galleries, museums, theaters, concert venues, sporting events, the waterfront, and an array of other public spaces. Users also face any number of disamenities, including among others, street noise, traffic, air pollution, scarce parking options, construction, and potential sidewalk interactions with people they might like to avoid.

In such centers of urban activities, all else being equal, introduction of yet another amenity or disamenity is unlikely to generate a marked impact on property values. Users of downtown locate there with an expectation that they
will be faced with a tapestry of competing effects, and addition of yet another would blend into the background noise condition.

This is not to say that introduction of a substantial amenity or disamenity has no impact on surrounding properties. However, in such an environment, one expects that the geographic reach of such effects will be much more constrained. Put simply, in a dense center of urban activity, something that happens at a distance of two city blocks will often be perceived as a long way away.

Question 5. **How might the mix of surrounding land uses change in the foreseeable future?**

When assessing impacts of a proposed land use, most analysts and readers are accustomed to thinking about impacts to the environment as it exists today, not as it might exist in the future. When discussing property values, however, it is not possible to discuss current impacts without discussing expectations about potential futures.

The current value of any given piece of property reflects its current bundle of attributes (including its current use and the current use of surrounding properties), but it also reflects expectations about the future.

For example, if I buy a retail store that is surrounded by a large number of vacant properties, I will behave differently (and be willing to pay a different price) if I have observed that many similar vacant properties in the area have developed into upscale condos and office buildings.

What we are recognizing, here, is the reality that expectations about future conditions are inextricably linked to current values. Further, given this reality, it is not possible to comment on potential impacts on property values without considering the range of potential future conditions.

More specifically, it is not possible to comment on impacts on property values without considering expectations that reasonable buyers and sellers would be expected to consider when negotiating a sale.

Question 6. **What alternative use might the site be put to if jail development does not go forward?**

As we noted in discussions above, the issue of whether a jail is perceived as an amenity or a disamenity is a relative issue. The key question is:

If a property is not used to accommodate a jail, what use would it be likely to accommodate?

A useful way to think about this question is to consider what goes through potential buyers’ minds as they stand on a nearby property and look at the contemplated jail site, with and without the jail.

In the without-jail instance, they look at the jail site with its existing current use. If the current use seems sustainable and unlikely to change in the foreseeable future, they will ask themselves how that fits with the use they envision for the
purchase property. If the jail property is underutilized and seems likely to be redeveloped, they will look at the site, consider the likely future uses, and consider what those uses might mean to the property they are considering.

In the with-jail alternative, potential buyers will be looking at a newly constructed jail. They will know that the jail is unlikely to go away anytime in the foreseeable future. And they will consider what its presence means for the uses they envision on the purchase property.

Clearly, expectations about future uses of the site enter into the value-calculations of potential buyers.

If the alternative is that the contemplated jail site will most likely be used for heavy industrial uses (uses that are likely to generate any number of disamenities), then the disamenity created by the jail will be relatively modest, if it exists at all.

If the alternative is that the contemplated site will be used for development of an attractive retail center or some other use that is perceived as relatively desirable by its neighbors, then the perceived disamenity introduced by the jail would be more substantial.
SUMMARY PROFILES AND ASSESSMENTS OF ALTERNATIVE SITES

In the following pages we provide, in succession, summary profiles and assessments for each of the six contemplated jail sites. Each begins with a series of two maps: (1) a map identifying the site in question; and (2) a medium-zoom map that highlights geographic and/or structural barriers that may influence the set of potentially-impacted properties.

After the maps, each profile asks and answers each of the six key questions:

1. What is the mix of land uses in the surrounding area?
2. What geographic and/or structural barriers exist around the site? And how do these barriers influence the set of potentially-impacted sites?
3. How does the jail site relate to the surrounding properties?
4. Is the site located in an existing center of urban activity?
5. How might the mix of surrounding land uses change in the foreseeable future?
6. What alternative use might the site be put to if jail development does not go forward?

The goal of these questions and answers is to lay out the key considerations that influence our overall assessment of potential property value impacts.

Each summary profile concludes with a synthesis. This synthesis seeks to:

- Pull together all of the key considerations;
- Emphasize the considerations and conditions that are of particular importance for a given site alternative; and
- Provide our summary assessment of the potential for impacts.

As we stated previously, we believe that it would be overly speculative to try to precisely quantify the degree of impacts to a given property with development of the jail.

Rather, the following summary assessments discuss the prospect for, and potential nature of, observable impacts in relative terms.

Ultimately our goal is to identify instances where the potential for impact exists, and to compare the six site alternatives to one another in terms of the likelihood and possible extent of these impacts. Note that the concepts of likelihood and possible extent are related, but different issues. The issue of likelihood revolves around the question: How likely or unlikely it is that impacts could occur? The issue of possible extent revolves around the question: In dollar terms, how big could the impacts be?

As discussed previously, quantitative studies to date have found few instances where neighborhood property-value impacts were discernable. Given the nature of the statistical tools that are used for these kinds of analysis, this circumstance suggests that, if impacts exist at all, the geographic extent of impacts in most cases will be limited. Moreover, the greatest potential for impacts certainly exists in the immediate vicinity of the facility.
To best characterize the surrounding environment and the pool of potentially-impacted properties, summaries of surrounding land uses identify the mix of land uses (by acreage) within a reasonable radius: one-quarter and one-half mile of the site.

Finally, it should be noted that the extent and nature of impacts may be affected by things like the release policy that is ultimately adopted for the facility. If, for example, the policy is to release detainees out the door of the jail, this policy could generate different levels of activity on the street than a policy which requires transport to the jurisdiction where the original arrest occurred.
King County Jail Annex Site Profile

Exhibit 2
Site Map

Source: King County Assessor; BERK, 2009
Exhibit 3
Physical Barriers Map

Source: King County Assessor; BERK, 2009
Question 1: What is the mix of land uses in the surrounding area?

Exhibit 4 summarizes the mix of land uses (by acreage) within one-quarter and one-half mile of the site. The area surrounding the King County Jail Annex jail site is urban in nature, including a mix of office, civic, multifamily residential and other commercial uses. In the context of this site, the majority of “other” uses refer to parking garages and commercial parking lots.

Civic uses include City of Seattle and King County administrative offices, courts, and the existing King County Jail. As the alternative’s name suggests, this alternative represents an extension of the existing King County facility (which serves both felony and misdemeanor inmates).

Question 2: What geographic and/or structural barriers exist around the site? And how do these barriers influence the set of potentially-impacted properties?

This site is flanked on the east side by I-5, which represents a substantial structural barrier, and it is largely surrounded by high-rise or mid-rise buildings. Given these barriers, the areas that have the potential to be impacted will be properties in the immediate vicinity (within one to two city blocks) of the site, on the west side of I-5.
**Question 3: How does the jail site relate to surrounding properties?**

This site is located on the hillside between 5th Avenue and I-5. In terms of neighbors, the site is largely surrounded by high- and mid-rise buildings, many of which are public/government buildings.

**Question 4: Is the site located in an existing center of urban activity?**

Yes. This site lies within one of the most urban areas in the Pacific Northwest, with a robust mix of high-rise office, retail, hotel, multifamily housing, and sports stadiums within a half-mile radius. Most prominent in the immediate site proximity are city and county administration and law and justice facilities.

**Question 5: How might the mix of surrounding land uses change in the foreseeable future?**

The area in the immediate vicinity of this site has seen substantial development in recent years, with the introduction of new public facilities, new office and mixed use, and new multifamily housing. Most of the properties immediately to the north of the site are built out, but it appears that certain developable sites still exist to the south. Given the recent pace and nature of development, one would generally expect to see continued development of properties for a mix of urban, with mid- to high-market value developments.

**Question 6: What alternative use might the site be put to if jail development does not go forward?**

At present, the site is vacant (an access point and tunnel to the garage to the northeast are located onsite) and is zoned Downtown Mixed Commercial. It is located in an area that has seen substantial new development in recent years. Given trends of recent development in the area, one could envision development of office or civic uses similar to those found in the immediate area in the future.

**Synthesis**

The site is situated in a very urbanized area, where it will blend into a wide array of urban amenities and disamenities. Given this array, any impacts with development of a jail at this site, to the extent they exist at all, are likely to be very localized (felt within one or two blocks at most).

Land uses within one-quarter mile of the site include a mix of multifamily housing; office; small retail spaces; commercial parking lots; parking garages; and, most prominent in the immediate site proximity, city and county administration and law and justice facilities.

Overall, given the immediate proximity of existing court and jail facilities, it is unlikely that introducing an additional misdemeanor jail facility will have a significant incremental effect on the perceived amenity value of the neighborhood. Recognizing this, and recognizing the highly-urbanized nature of the location, we believe that the potential for property value impacts in the
area is minimal (see for a summary list in Exhibit 5 of the key considerations leading to this conclusion).

To the extent that a jail would negatively impact the property values surrounding any of the site alternatives, locating the jail at the King County Annex site would be less likely to result in these impacts than at any of the other sites.

Exhibit 5

Key Considerations – King County Annex

- Highly urban setting
- High existing concentration of law and justice activities
- Immediate area dominated by government uses
Seattle North Site Profile

Exhibit 6
Site Map

Source: King County Assessor; BERK, 2009
Source: King County Assessor; BERK, 2009
**Question 1: What is the mix of land uses in the surrounding area?**

The area surrounding the Seattle North site is characterized by a mix of vacant or low-intensity use properties, residential, retail and general commercial uses, and a small amount of industrial or warehouse land. In contrast to the King County Jail Annex site in downtown Seattle, civic uses in this area include Port of Seattle properties (a large portion of which are vacant) and the National Guard property. Within the immediate quarter mile of the site, “Other” is made up almost entirely of a rail yard, while in the quarter mile to half mile range “Other” principally includes parking, rail yard, and sports facility (Interbay Athletic Complex) land uses.

Housing that lies within one-quarter and one-half mile of the site is general medium- to high-market value multifamily and single family housing, with housing that falls within one-quarter mile skewing towards medium-market value multifamily and housing within one-half mile skewing more toward high-market value multifamily and single family houses.

**Exhibit 8**

**Surrounding Land Uses**

![Land Use Acres within 1/4 Mile of Site](image1)

- Civic: 25%
- Residential: 23%
- Other: 32%
- Vacant: 5%
- Retail: 6%
- Warehouse: 4%

![Land Use Acres within 1/2 Mile of Site](image2)

- Residential: 43%
- Other: 30%
- Vacant: 10%
- Retail: 3%
- Warehouse: 4%
- Office: 1%

**Source:** King County Assessor, 2009; BERK, 2009

**Question 2: What geographic and/or structural barriers exist around the site? And how do these barriers influence the set of potentially-impacted properties?**

The site is flanked on the west side by the Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) Railroad switching yard and, further to the west, by a wooded hillside that leads up to the Magnolia neighborhood. To the east, properties are buffered at least in part by 15th Avenue W, which is a heavily-used urban arterial.

Accounting for these barriers, the properties in the immediate vicinity that are most likely to be affected by jail development include a mix of low- and medium-amenity retail and consumer services, industrial, small office spaces, and medium- and high-market value residential on the...
west slope of Queen Anne Hill. Some of the most affected properties, including the National Guard property, the site immediately south of the new Whole Foods-anchored retail center, and the Port of Seattle’s North Bay site immediately across from the BNSF switching yard are currently vacant or are largely underutilized.

**Question 3: How does the jail site relate to surrounding properties?**

The site is located at lower elevation in the Interbay lowlands between Seattle’s Queen Anne and Magnolia neighborhoods. The site is somewhat below 15th Avenue W and the businesses that line this main arterial. The site is overlooked by households living in medium- and high-market value multifamily and single family units on the east side of Magnolia hill and the west side of Queen Anne hill.

Many of the housing units in the area have broad views of the Interbay lowlands. These units have views that encompass things that most would consider attractive (including Puget Sound, mountains, and city lights) and things many might find unattractive (including existing industrial uses in the lowlands 4). Given the scope and nature of these views, a new jail would be unlikely to be perceived as a disamenity from an aesthetic perspective. However, if residents or potential buyers are aware of the jail’s proximity and if they generally view the jail’s presence as a public safety issue, then a visual reminder of the jail’s proximity could be viewed as a modest disamenity. To a certain degree, the extent to which such an effect would exist or not could be influenced by the level of controversy surrounding the jail’s construction, and the extent to which the broader public perceives the jail as impacting the Queen Anne and Magnolia communities.

**Question 4: Is the site located in an existing center of urban activity?**

To a degree, the potential site lies within an area that has historically included industrial and other general commercial uses. As properties in the area have redeveloped, the area has begun to play host to a more robust mix of urban amenities and disamenities.

**Question 5: How might the mix of surrounding land uses change in the foreseeable future?**

The properties that surround the site most immediately have historically been industrial in nature, or they have been used for decades for low-intensity uses (e.g. the National Guard Site immediately to the south). In recent years, development that has occurred in the general area has been mostly focused on higher-amenity uses serving the surrounding neighborhoods. Within the past few years, some of the more high-profile developments have included construction of the Amgen campus, construction of a multi-level retail center anchored by Trader Joes (about 1.5 miles to the north), and construction of a community retail center anchored by Whole Foods (immediately to the south of the jail site).

---

4 In the past, land uses in the Interbay lowlands were less attractive than they are at present. In particular, many of the houses on the west slope of Queen Anne and the East Slope of Magnolia were built at a time when the site of the existing golf course was a landfill. The existence of this disamenity, and other disamenities in the Interbay area, help explain why property values on the West slope of Queen Anne hill tend to be lower than values on, say, the South Slope of the same hill.
The Port of Seattle controls roughly 95 acres of largely undeveloped property immediately to the west of the potential jail site (on the west side of the BNSF tracks). The Port has been engaged for a number of years in an effort to develop the so-called North Bay Uplands, and in that process, the Port has contemplated, among other things, development of higher-market value, campus-style office uses; smaller, flex-style office/industrial spaces; and retail. Many of the contemplated development scenarios for the Port property would require rezoning some or all of the developable parcels from their current industrial zoning (an action that the City of Seattle does not currently support). Discussions about potential development of the North Bay site have also contemplated redevelopment of the National Guard Property.

Given recent development patterns and ongoing development efforts, it would not be surprising for vacant and underutilized properties in the immediate vicinity to develop into office, retail, or other higher-amenity uses. Such uses are generally allowed under current zoning on most properties in this area (excluding the Port of Seattle’s North Bay property).

**Question 6: What alternative use might the site be put to if jail development does not go forward?**

The site is currently used for a variety of warehouse and other low-market value commercial uses and is zoned for industrial uses. One could envision use of the site under its current configuration for some time to come. However, given current development trends in the area, it would also not be surprising if the potential jail site were to redevelop from its current use to some higher-amenity use in the future. Depending on the specifics of the redevelopment, this type of higher amenity use might require a zoning reclassification. In general, properties in the Ballard-Interbay-Northend Manufacturing/Industrial Center Plan, such as this site, are zoned to preserve and maintain industrial uses in the area. However, current zoning does allow some level of office, retail, or flex uses.

Compared to its current use, development of the site into a jail might be viewed as a modest diminishment of amenity value in the neighborhood. Compared to likely use under some other redevelopment effort (presumably for some other higher-amenity use), the jail would likely be viewed as diminishing amenity value in the neighborhood.

**Synthesis**

The Interbay neighborhood is developing into a diverse urban neighborhood with a modest mix of urban amenities and disamenities. When weighed against potential alternative future uses of the Seattle North site, however, a new jail facility could be viewed as a substantial disamenity from the perspective of neighboring property owners.

In terms of the most proximate uses, retail and other commercial uses located along 15th Avenue W, and the golf center to the north, could view a new jail as a disamenity. Some of these uses are modestly isolated from the jail site by an elevation gain of 25 to 30 feet, while others located on the east side of 15th Avenue W are also isolated by the arterial.

Also, given the range of potential uses for future new development on vacant and underutilized properties in the immediate vicinity of the site, it is possible that prospects for redevelopment of these sites could be affected by location of a jail at the site.
Beyond the most proximate properties, the North Seattle site’s area of potential impact includes some categories of land uses (particularly high- and medium-market value residential and retail uses) that have the greatest potential to be impacted by the introduction of a disamenity.

To one degree or another, the housing units in the area are isolated from the contemplated jail. Housing units that fall within a quarter mile are separated from the potential jail by 15th Avenue W and the businesses that line this major arterial. The larger pool of housing units that fall within one-half mile of the site (a pool which include many of the highest-market value units) tend also to be isolated by 15th Avenue W and the slope of Queen Anne Hill on the Queen Anne side, and by the BNSF switching yard and the wooded slope of Magnolia Hill on the Magnolia side. Notwithstanding these buffers, however, perceived public safety impacts associated with the jail have the potential to influence the perceived amenity value in the area. This effect could be reinforced by the nature of the views.

In total, given the proximity to residential uses in the Queen Anne and Magnolia areas, the potential exists for impacts to the value of these properties. Given the distances and barriers involved, and given the overall attractiveness of the Queen Anne and Magnolia neighborhoods, such an outcome is by no means certain. On the other hand, given the sheer number and value of properties that overlook the site, if impacts did occur, the possible extent of impacts could be substantial.

More concrete potential for property value impacts revolve around the properties in the immediate area around the site. One of these properties has recently developed into a retail center and others are underutilized or vacant and have the potential for development into higher amenity uses. From the perspective of a potential seller or buyer, development of the jail on the identified site could diminish the potential for development of these properties, thereby potentially impacting the value of the properties.

Overall, the potential for property value impacts around the North Seattle site hinges on the combination of factors in play. The most concrete potential for impacts exists as a result of the immediate proximity of retail and the golf center, and the potential for the jail development to influence the potential for future development on close-by sites. Folding in the possible impacts to nearby housing, all told, we believe there is moderate or more-than-moderate potential for property value impacts (see Exhibit 9 for a list of the key considerations leading to this conclusion).

To the extent that a jail would negatively impact the property values surrounding any of the site alternatives, locating the jail at the Seattle North site would be more likely to result in these impacts than at a number of other sites, including the Bellevue, Unincorporated King County, Seattle South, and King County Annex.
Exhibit 9

Key Considerations – Seattle North

- Amenity-value difference between jail and other potential uses of site
- Potential for impacts to existing uses in immediate vicinity
- Potential for impacts to development potential for vacant or underutilized properties in immediate vicinity
- Substantial number of medium- to high-market-value housing units in the Queen Anne and Magnolia neighborhoods within one-quarter and one-half mile of site
- Residential uses and certain retail/commercial/public uses are isolated from site by arterial and other structural and geographic barriers
- Views from the Queen Anne and Magnolia residential areas have potential to reinforce sense of proximity to the site
Seattle South Site Profile

Exhibit 10
Site Map

Source: King County Assessor; BERK, 2009
Exhibit 11
Physical Barriers Map

Source: King County Assessor; BERK, 2009
Question 1: What is the mix of land uses in the surrounding area?

The Seattle South Site vicinity is characterized by largely industrial uses, including industrial, warehouse, some medium- to low-amenity retail, and other commercial uses. The immediate area includes very little residential, with a small amount of low-market value residential falling within one-quarter mile of the site and slightly more low- to medium-market value residential on top of the ridge above the site (falling within a half-mile of the site). The immediate area also includes a large amount of vacant land. The “other” category includes rights-of-way, park/open space, marine terminal, and parking land uses.

Exhibit 12
Surrounding Land Uses

Question 2: What geographic and/or structural barriers exist around the site? And how do these barriers influence the set of potentially-impacted properties?

The site is flanked on the west and southwest sides by a wooded slope with an elevation gain of more than 200 feet. It is flanked on the east and southeast sides by the Duwamish River and State Route 509. Accounting for these barriers, the properties with the greatest potential for impact are dominated by industrial uses.

Question 3: How does the jail site relate to surrounding properties?

The site is located at low elevation in the Duwamish Valley. It is overlooked by houses and other facilities located at the top of the ridge in West Seattle (Highland Park), some of which have

Source: King County Assessor, 2009; BERK, 2009
views of the entire Duwamish Valley, extending to downtown Seattle and the Cascade Mountains.

**Question 4: Is the site located in an existing center of urban activity?**

To a degree, the potential site lies within a well-established urban industrial area. From the perspective of non-industrial users, the area could be viewed as being dominated by disamenities that are commonly associated with industrial uses, and would not be viewed as offering a robust mix of amenities and disamenities.

**Question 5: How might the mix of surrounding land uses change in the foreseeable future?**

The area in the immediate vicinity of the potential jail site is largely industrial in nature, and would be perceived by potential competing uses (e.g. residential or office uses) as presenting substantial disamenities. Given this, it appears that the area most immediately surrounding the site would likely remain industrial in nature. The pace of development in the immediate area has been slow in recent years, with only modest demand for new industrial space in the broader area.

**Question 6: What alternative use might the site be put to if jail development does not go forward?**

Given trends of recent development in the area and the site’s industrial zoning, one could envision that the site would remain industrial in nature. Compared with the current use (and likely alternative uses), development of a jail would likely be viewed, at most, as only a modest diminishment of amenity value in the area.

**Synthesis**

Compared with other likely uses of the site, development of a jail is unlikely to represent a substantial disamenity. The jail could introduce perceived public safety impacts in the area, but the categories of use that are likely to be most sensitive to such perceived impacts (residential, high-amenity retail, or high-amenity office uses) are largely absent from the vicinity.

Properties in the most immediately-affected areas that surround the site are dominated by industrial and medium- to low-amenity retail/commercial uses. These users chose to locate in the area in the context of the area’s industrial nature and, in general, these categories of use are among the least likely to see property value impacts from introduction of a disamenity.

From the perspective of households and others who overlook the valley, given the industrial nature of surrounding uses, and given the likely alternative uses of the site, development of a jail is unlikely to be perceived as markedly diminishing the aesthetic quality of views.

As was discussed in the examination of the Seattle North site, the potential exists for households to perceive the proximity of a jail as impacting public safety. In the case of the Seattle South site, however, the barriers of the Duwamish River, SR 509, and the wooded slope between the valley and the Highland Park ridge are substantial. In particular, the elevation differences between the site and the most proximate houses on top of the ridge exceed 250 ft.
feet, and accessing the nearest neighborhoods would require a trip in excess of more than one-half mile.

The Highland Park neighborhood also appears to have few housing units within one-half mile of the site that have clear views of the site.

Overall, given the predominantly industrial nature of the area; given that the most proximate properties are used for industrial and medium- to low-amenity retail/commercial uses; and given the geographic barriers and distance separating the site from residential neighborhoods, a jail located on the Seattle South site is considered to have minimal potential to impact property values (see Exhibit 13 for a list of the key considerations leading to this conclusion).

To the extent that a jail would negatively impact the property values surrounding any of the site alternatives, locating the jail at the Seattle South site would be less likely to result in these impacts, similar to the King County Annex.

### Exhibit 13

**Key Considerations – Seattle South**

- Geographic and structural barriers partially isolate site
- Industrial nature of area means most proximate properties are not particularly sensitive to disamenities
- Modest amenity-value difference between jail and other potential uses of site
- Few housing units are located within the Highland Park residential area within one-quarter or one-half mile of site
Shoreline Site Profile

Exhibit 14
Site Map

Source: King County Assessor; BERK, 2009
Exhibit 15
Physical Barriers Map

Source: King County Assessor; BERK, 2009
**Question 1: What is the mix of land uses in the surrounding area?**

The area surrounding the Shoreline jail site is dominated by residential uses. The area is largely built out, with relatively little vacant or redevelopable land. Housing in the area is dominated by medium-market value residential, with a large number of single family homes. The “Other” category principally includes parking, rights-of-way, a preschool/day care center, and public utilities land uses.

**Exhibit 16**
**Surrounding Land Uses**

![Surrounding Land Uses Diagram]

*Source: King County Assessor, 2009; BERK, 2009*

**Question 2: What geographic and/or structural barriers exist around the site? And how do these barriers influence the set of potentially-impacted properties?**

The site has few substantial geographic or structural barriers within a half mile radius that would affect the pool of potentially-impacted properties.

**Question 3: How does the jail site relate to surrounding properties?**

There are modest elevation changes across the site and between the site and surrounding properties. However, overall the topography is relatively level.

**Question 4: Is the site located in an existing center of urban activity?**

No. The site lies within a neighborhood that is dominated by residential uses.
**Question 5: How might the mix of surrounding land uses change in the foreseeable future?**

The area immediately surrounding the contemplated jail site appears to be relatively built-out with residential and school uses and appears unlikely to see substantive changes in the foreseeable future.

**Question 6: What alternative use might the site be put to if jail development does not go forward?**

Given the characteristics of the site and the surrounding area and the site’s residential zoning, it would appear that the site would be well-suited to develop into housing in the future. Alternative uses might include a park or other public facility.

**Synthesis**

Compared with likely alternative uses for the site, development of a jail at the Shoreline site would likely be viewed as a significant disamenity. The site is located in the immediate vicinity of medium market value housing—a category of use that has a relatively high potential for being impacted by introduction of a perceived disamenity. Because the area is not a center of urban activity, a jail would be likely to stand in stark contrast to the surrounding residential uses. Prospects for development of any undeveloped or underdeveloped properties in the area would also likely be impacted by jail construction, which could result in property value impacts as well.

Given these considerations, there is a high potential for impacts to property values (see Exhibit 17 for a list of the key considerations which led to this conclusion).

To the extent that a jail would negatively impact the property values surrounding any of the site alternatives, locating the jail at the Shoreline site would be more likely to result in these impacts than at the other five alternative sites.

**Exhibit 17**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Considerations – Shoreline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Area surrounding site is almost exclusively residential, uses that are among the most sensitive to introduction of disamenities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Likely alternative uses for site would fit more seamlessly with neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Area is not urban in nature and activity introduced by jail would stand out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Amenity-value difference between development of the jail and other potential uses of the site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bellevue Site Profile

Exhibit 18
Site Map

Bellevue: 555 116th Avenue NE

Source: King County Assessor; BERK, 2009
Source: King County Assessor; BERK, 2009
**Question 1: What is the mix of land uses in the surrounding area?**

The area around the Bellevue site includes a robust mix of office, retail, and other commercial activities and, particularly within a one-half mile radius, the area includes multifamily housing in Downtown Bellevue. The “Other” category principally includes parking, rights-of-way, a preschool/day care center, and public utilities land uses.

**Exhibit 20**

**Surrounding Land Use**

**Question 2: What geographic and/or structural barriers exist around the site? And how do these barriers influence the set of potentially-impacted properties?**

The site is flanked on the west by I-405, a barrier that isolates the site from properties in Downtown Bellevue, including large amounts of office, retail, and most of the nearby housing. Accounting for the I-405 barrier, the pool of properties with the greatest potential for impacts is dominated by auto dealerships, which line 116th Avenue NE along the same superblock. The area also includes a hotel (to the north of the jail site), and a mix of low- and medium-amenity retail uses, including auto-oriented retail centers, a Whole Foods grocery store and a Best Buy electronics retail outlet.

**Question 3: How does the jail site relate to surrounding properties?**

The site lies at the same elevation with other uses on the superblock on 116th Avenue NE and is virtually level with auto dealerships and other commercial uses, including the hotel located to the north. The site, along with much of Bellevue’s urban center, is overlooked by high-rise buildings in downtown Bellevue.
**Question 4: Is the site located in an existing center of urban activity?**

Yes. The site lies directly adjacent to the downtown Bellevue urban center. This area offers a vast array of urban amenities and disamenities.

**Question 5: How might the mix of surrounding land uses change in the foreseeable future?**

With the continued rapid development of downtown Bellevue, one would expect to see growing pressure on underutilized properties along 116th and 120th Avenue NE for more intense development. Over a 20-year time horizon, one could easily envision development of a mix of urban uses, including residential, higher-amenity retail, office, and other commercial uses.

**Question 6: What alternative use might the site be put to if jail development does not go forward?**

The site is currently used for mid- to low-market value office uses. Given the characteristics of the site and the dynamics of the surrounding market, it is plausible to envision redevelopment of the contemplated jail site into a higher-amenity use in the future. Other sites on 116th and 120th Avenue NE are likely to be in a position to develop first, but if the neighborhood begins to develop into a new urban node, it appears that the jail site could redevelop at some point in the future.

Compared with the current office use or a potential higher-amenity use under redevelopment, the jail would likely represent a diminishment of amenity value in the neighborhood.

**Synthesis**

Compared with the site’s current use as an office building and compared with potential alternative future uses, development of the jail on the site is likely to diminish the amenity value of the immediately surrounding area. Because of the site’s proximity to Bellevue’s downtown urban center, for properties that are located more than a block or two distant, the modest perceived disamenity of the jail would likely blend in with the broader array of amenities and disamenities in the urban center.

Current uses in the immediate vicinity of the jail (auto dealerships, hotel and low- to medium-amenity retail) are among the categories that have moderate potential to be impacted by the introduction of a disamenity. Potential future uses, however, could include medium- and higher-market value residential, medium- and higher-market value retail, and medium- and higher-market value office/commercial. These use categories have a greater potential to see property value impacts from a perceived disamenity.

As was true of the Seattle North site, the most concrete potential for property value impacts for the Bellevue site revolves around close-in properties that have potential for more intense and higher-amenity developments in the future. From the perspective of a potential seller, buyer, or developer, a jail on the identified site could diminish the potential for redevelopment of these properties, thereby potentially impacting the values of the properties.
Given these considerations, there is a moderate potential for property value impacts (see Exhibit 21 for a list of the key considerations which led to this conclusion).

To the extent that a jail would negatively impact the property values surrounding any of the site alternatives, locating the jail at the Bellevue site would be less likely to result in these impacts than some sites (Shoreline and Seattle North) but more likely than others (King County Annex and Seattle South).

### Exhibit 21

**Key Considerations – Bellevue**

- Site near major center of urban activity in Downtown Bellevue
- Amenity-value difference between jail and other potential uses of site
- Potential for impacts to existing uses in immediate vicinity
- Potential for impacts to development potential for redevelopable properties in immediate vicinity
- Few residential units within one-quarter mile and those units are located within the Bellevue urban center and somewhat isolated from the site by I-405
Unincorporated King County Site Profile

Exhibit 22
Site Map

Source: King County Assessor, 2009; BERK, 2009
Exhibit 23
Physical Barriers Map

Source: King County Assessor, 2009; BERK, 2009
Question 1: What is the mix of land uses in the surrounding area?

The area surrounding the unincorporated King County site is characterized by a mix of industrial, other commercial, and vacant land in the area immediately surrounding the site, with medium- to higher-market value residential located to the north, at the top of the ridge above the site. Immediately to the north of the site, there exist a number of vacant properties on the hillside. Most of these properties are zoned industrial, but one has recently been rezoned to allow multifamily development. The “Other” category principally includes parking, rights-of-way, plant nursery, public utilities, and a park.

Exhibit 24
Surrounding Land Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Acres within 1/4 Mile of Site</th>
<th>Land Use Acres within 1/2 Mile of Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Commercial 28%</td>
<td>Civic 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial 27%</td>
<td>General Commercial 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential 14%</td>
<td>Industrial 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant 21%</td>
<td>Office 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail 1%</td>
<td>Residential 39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehouse 8%</td>
<td>Vacant 16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other 1%</td>
<td>Retail 1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: King County Assessor, 2009; BERK, 2009

Question 2: What geographic and/or structural barriers exist around the site? And how do these barriers influence the set of potentially-impacted properties?

The site is flanked to the north by a partially wooded hillside with an elevation difference in excess of 120 feet. This hillside (which is zoned for industrial or multifamily uses) serves to isolate the jail site from most of the higher-market value housing that falls within one-half mile of the site. To the south, areas of housing, including apartments and a modest number of medium-market value single-family housing, can be found from 0.25 to 0.5 miles distant. These housing units are isolated from the proposed site by industrial uses, the NE 124th Street arterial, and lower market value retail and small office uses that line the arterial. The immediate vicinity surrounding the site is dominated by industrial uses.
**Question 3: How does the jail site relate to surrounding properties?**

The jail site lies in the lowlands at the base of a slope. Views from individual parcels vary depending on topography and vegetation, but it appears that relatively few current housing units have a view of the jail site or surrounding industrial uses.

**Question 4: Is the site located in an existing center of urban activity?**

To a modest degree, the site lies within an area with a fairly small number of industrial, retail, and other commercial users.

**Question 5: How might the mix of surrounding land uses change in the foreseeable future?**

The immediate area surrounding the site is industrial in nature and appears to be relatively stable. Other businesses that line NE 124th Street include lower- to medium-market value retail and lower- to medium-market value commercial/office. Some new development of office spaces has occurred about one-third of a mile to the east (on sites that have a view of the Sammamish River Valley), but the area now appears to be relatively stable.

The vacant properties on the hillside to the north are listed as being zoned industrial, but the property immediately to the north of the contemplated site appears to have been recently rezoned for multifamily use. (King County parcel records show the property with a “current use” of “vacant multifamily.”) The property was purchased in 2006, for a price of less than $4 per square foot. This price falls at the very low end of the range of typical land prices in the area (the jail site has a current assessed land value of $15 per square foot) and suggests that the perceived options for use of the site are limited and/or it will be expensive to develop the site in a way that mitigates the site’s physical and economic characteristics.

**Question 6: What alternative use might the site be put to if jail development does not go forward?**

Given the characteristics of the site and surrounding industrial uses, it appears that the contemplated jail site could easily remain industrial or light-industrial for some period of time.

**Synthesis**

The Unincorporated King County site is perhaps the most difficult to assess from a perspective of potential property value impacts.

Typically, the current industrial use of the site would be viewed by many as at least a modest disamenity. Compared with this and many of the potential future uses, development of a jail is likely to be viewed as a different sort of disamenity, with different implications depending on the potential use in question.

The uses in the areas most immediately affected by development of the site are vacant or industrial, with a second-tier of low- to medium-market value retail, and low- to medium-market value office/commercial. On the hierarchy of use-categories, these categories are less likely to be impacted by introduction of a disamenity. The next tier of potentially-affected properties
include apartment buildings, with a final tier of potentially-affected properties that includes medium-market value housing, with higher-market value housing on top of the ridge above the site.

The vacant hillside property immediately to the north has been rezoned to allow multifamily development. However, given the disamenities of the industrial uses in the immediate area, it is unclear how developers would make best use of the site to allow multifamily use while minimizing the impact of the industrial uses to the south. Notwithstanding these well-established challenges, development of a jail could add another category of disamenity (i.e. due to perceived safety impacts), which could further challenge development of the site into multifamily.

Overall, location of the jail on the site would appear to have a moderate potential to diminish the amenity value of the area. Most of the immediately surrounding properties are industrial or commercial in nature, and have been built in the context of industrial uses on the site in question. Potential for impacts to these properties would appear to be modest but not non-existent. Potential for impacts to vacant, multifamily zoned property immediately to the north could be somewhat greater, but are limited due to the existing low market value of the site (recently purchased for less than $4 per square foot – this price is close to the minimum price for land in the area and most likely represents a floor for land values).

Because the medium- to high-market value housing on the ridge above the site falls in the categories of uses that have the greatest potential to be impacted, the possibility exists that impacts to the values of these properties could occur. Like the Seattle North site, the housing falls within one-quarter mile of the site, and while the hillside offers some insulation from the site, accessing the neighborhood from the site would not be particularly difficult. Perceptions of safety impacts could translate to impacts on property values. Unlike the Seattle North site, however, relatively few houses appear to have views of the site.

Overall, given the relative proximity of housing units that have the greatest potential for property value impacts, tempered by the relative scarcity of houses overlooking the site and the current industrial uses of the site and immediately surrounding properties, there is a moderate potential for property value impacts (see Exhibit 25 for a list of the key considerations which led to this conclusion).

To the extent that a jail would negatively impact the property values surrounding any of the site alternatives, locating the jail at the Unincorporated King County site would have less potential to result in these impacts than some sites (Shoreline and Seattle North) but more likely than others (King County Annex and Seattle South).
Exhibit 25

Key Considerations – Unincorporated King County

- With exception of potential perception of public safety impacts, modest amenity-value difference between jail and other likely uses of site
- Most proximate uses are industrial and commercial and were developed in the context of industrial uses on the site
- Medium- and low-amenity retail uses are partially insulated from site by arterial
- Substantial residential use within one-quarter and one-half mile of the site, but separated from the site by a hillside
- Few housing units with a view of site

Summary of Findings

Based on the assessment for each site profile, Exhibit 26 summarizes the expected potential likelihood for property value impacts at each site.

Exhibit 26

Relative Rankings of Sites in Terms of Potential for Property Value Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Relative Potential for Impact</th>
<th>Key Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Shoreline     | High                         | • Surrounded by residential uses  
|               |                              | • Non-urban setting                                                              |
| Seattle North | Moderate – More Than Moderate | • Nearby retail, commercial, and public uses; some isolated by structural or geographic barriers  
<p>|               |                              | • Nearby developable or redevelopable properties                                  |
|               |                              | • Residential uses nearby, but partially isolated by structural or geographic barriers |
|               |                              | • Many housing units with view of site                                             |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Relative Potential for Impact</th>
<th>Key Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>• Site on edge of major center of urban activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Nearby retail and commercial uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Nearby redevelopable properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated King County</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>• Immediate area dominated by industrial uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Nearby retail and commercial uses, but partially isolated by arterial,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Residential uses nearby, but partially isolated by structural or geographic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>barriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Few housing units with view of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle South</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>• Immediate area dominated by industrial uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Retail/commercial uses nearby, but uses are consistent with, and were developed in context of, the industrial nature of area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Few housing units within one-quarter and one-half mile of site, and virtually all units isolated from site by substantial structural and geographic barriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County Annex</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>• Located in major center of urban activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Substantial jail and law and justice presence already in area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Immediate area dominated by government buildings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: BERK, 2009
Literature Review – Assessments of Impact on Property Values

BERK conducted a literature review of available research publications to identify the effects the placement of a misdemeanant jail could have on property values in the surrounding area. Surveying the literature quickly confirmed the assumption that a highly comparable example in the existing body of literature did not exist, given the sheer number of complex interactions between factors affecting property values. For example, studied cases in the literature differed from the proposed NEC Municipal Jail for a number of variables, such as the type of correctional facility (jail vs. prison, security level, etc.) and the characteristics of the surrounding area (rural vs. urban, socioeconomic conditions, etc.).

The literature review did, however, identify high-level trends regarding what potential property value impacts could result from the placement of a correctional institution jail and reinforced the importance of understanding the local context in which any scenario is examined.

Methodology

BERK conducted a literature review of jail siting publications, which included reviews of actual Environmental Impact Statements from other jurisdictions, including Michigan and, more locally, for the Kent Regional Justice Center. In addition, we explored the broader academic literature regarding disamenity, LULU (Locally Unwanted Land Uses), and NIMBY (Not In My Backyard) phenomena. Wherever available, we obtained the original research, but also reviewed summary and compilation documents in cases when the complete study was not available. In particular, we reviewed the following:

Jail Siting Literature

- Fehr, Larry M. Literature Review of Impacts to Communities in Siting Correctional Facilities. July 1995. (This review references 51 studies (1981-1994) related to a correctional facility’s effect on (1) crime and safety (2) property values (3) local economic impact and (4) quality of life)
- Property Counselors Real Estate Research and Appraisal. Property Value Analysis: South King County Regional Justice Center (Appendix D) in Regional Justice Center Environmental Impact Statement, 1991.

5 Note: This was particularly the case with studies dating back twenty years or more, which were not readily accessible through online academic libraries and publications.


**Disamenity Literature**


**Key Findings**

From our review of the literature, we’ve identified the following high level findings:

• The vast majority of literature identified no statistically significant relationship between the siting of a correctional facility and surrounding property values.

• In cases where property values did decrease in the vicinity of a new correctional facility, several potential factors were identified that could have also affected property values. These other factors, including zoning changes, natural boundaries, an overabundance in rental property, lack of owner care, and persistent public opposition to the facility, may have contributed in the resulting decrease in property values demonstrated.

• There is a strong public perception that the siting of a correctional facility decreases neighboring property values. In some instances, persistent and vocal public opposition may, in fact, result in negative impacts to the local real estate market.

• Direct proximity to correctional institutions, as well as other LULUs, is a critical factor in determining the magnitude of any potential negative impacts on property value. In general, closer proximity equated with a larger relative impact.
3.0 IMPACT TO HOST JURISDICTIONS

This section considers a range of potential impacts on the jurisdiction in which the jail may locate. Specifically, there are four different assessments:

- The first section considers the potential differences in aggregate costs likely to be borne by the NEC cities due to construction and operation of the jail.
- The second section discusses the potential revenue impacts that are likely to flow to the host jurisdiction as a result of the construction and operation of the jail.
- The third section considers how the location of the jail may create demand for new land uses near the jail.
- The last section discusses the potential impacts to the host jurisdiction’s public services as a result of hosting the jail.

Cost Impacts tied to Construction and Operation of the Jail

This examination looks at the cost associated with building and operating the new jail facility, and in particular, how differences between the site alternatives could affect the total cost of the project to the NEC cities. While no specific cost sharing or contracting agreements have been developed between the NEC cities, the potential differences in construction and operation of the alternative sites are likely to impact the amount any single NEC city would contribute towards construction and/or operation. Differences in site acquisition and design will lead to differences in total construction costs. Difference in site layout will lead to different staffing and overall operating costs.

Specifically, the analysis seeks to understand: 1) what one-time costs are tied to acquisition and construction of the jail facility; and 2) what the recurring costs are associated with operating the new jail facility.

One-Time Costs

The one-time costs that might be incurred by the NEC cities are tied to acquisition and construction of the jail facility. Exhibit 27 summarizes a comparison of the 2009 assessed valuation of the parcels that make up the alternative sites.

| NEC Alternative Site Assessed Values, 2009 |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                 | King County     | Seattle North   | Seattle South   | Shoreline       | Bellevue        | Unincorporated  |
|                 | Jail Annex      |                 |                 |                 |                 | King County      |
| 2009 Assessed Value | $11,499,805     | $13,362,000     | $5,724,400      | $11,803,900     | $18,636,900     | $8,090,900      |

Source: King County Assessor, 2009; CGL, 2009; BERK, 2009.
Note: Since the King County Jail Annex site is a portion of an existing tax parcel, the assessed value is a pro-rated estimate on the land value on a per acre basis.
It is assumed that in acquiring the jail site the NEC would pay current market rate for the land (it should be noted that some of the sites are already in public ownership). While assessed values do not always correspond to the actual market rate for any particular property, they do provide a useful benchmark in assessing the likely range of costs that might be incurred in acquiring a site. The price of land acquisition on all six sites ranges from about $8.1 million to $18.6 million. The Bellevue site, at $18.6 million, has the highest valuation.

In acquiring the land, the NEC cities would also incur costs for other incidentals such as surveys, design/permitting, and real estate transaction fees. However, these fees would be a small fraction of the total land costs.

The largest single cost to the NEC cities would be the construction of the new jail. Exhibit 28 summarizes the estimated preliminary construction cost at the alternative sites. These figures are based on a November 2009 study by Rider Levett Bucknall (RLB) as a conceptual estimate of the potential costs of construction. The estimates include buildings, site improvements, fixtures/equipment, project fees, and project contingencies.

### Exhibit 28

**NEC Alternative Site Conceptual Construction Costs, 2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King County Jail Annex</th>
<th>Seattle North</th>
<th>Seattle South</th>
<th>Shoreline</th>
<th>Bellevue</th>
<th>Unincorporated King County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost</td>
<td>$326,001,537</td>
<td>$152,179,855</td>
<td>$150,436,969</td>
<td>$158,770,697</td>
<td>$141,679,515</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: RLB Draft NEC Jail Concept Study; July, 2009.*

The King County Jail Annex site is the most costly to construct mostly due to the site’s preliminary design as a multi-story facility and its larger scale (1,188 beds as opposed to 640 at the stand-alone sites, and an approximately 539,000-square-foot building as opposed to an approximately 281,700-square-foot building at the stand-alone sites). It should be noted that this alternative would be a partnership between the NEC cities and King County, combining the facilities of both entities. The stand alone sites provide a closer comparison in costs. The distinctions in costs are primarily due to differences in the building design/construction, site preparation work, and fixtures/equipment.

### Operating Costs

The cost to the NEC cities of operating the facility will be a function of the total operating cost multiplied by the number of subscribed beds per city. However, it should be noted that it has not been decided which entity will operate the jail (i.e. a city or other regional entity).

The main differences in operating costs will be between the stand alone sites (which are all assumed to have the same size building and the same operating costs) and King County Annex, because the Annex Site will be a multi-story facility. The facility configuration and layout at the King County Annex is likely to create operating costs differences that can impact the total cost to operate the jail in terms of staffing needs and facility costs.

Preliminary operational cost information is available from a draft report from Carter Goble Lee and KMD Architects (Development Program: North/East Cities 640-Bed Municipal Jail).
December, 2009). Operating costs fall into two categories: 1) Salary costs, and 2) Non-salary costs. Salary costs cover the salary and benefit costs of staff positions at the jail. Non-salary costs cover such things like administrative costs, utilities, maintenance, medical services, and supplies.

The report assumes that the operating costs of the five stand alone sites will be comparable. Carter Goble Lee and KMD estimate that annual salary costs will total $17,041,023 with non-salary costs at $9,200,162. The total annual operating costs in 2016 are $26,241,185 in 2009 dollars.

Operating cost estimates for the King County Annex site were not available at the time of this report’s drafting (Deceber 2009). Work to develop preliminary estimates for the King County Annex is in progress.

Potential Revenue Impacts

The fiscal revenue analysis focuses on the core tax revenues that support the delivery of general city services; as well as capital-restricted revenue used to fund infrastructure. It does not contemplate impacts to dedicated fee revenues for services that are charged on a cost recovery basis (e.g. planning and permitting fees). Tax revenues were estimated based on the changes in the components of the host jurisdiction’s tax base resulting from construction and operation of the jail.

Tax revenues are differentiated into two categories:

- **One-time Revenues.** These revenues are tied to the construction of the jail. Specifically, they include the retail sales tax on construction (materials and construction services) and the business and occupation (B&O) tax on gross receipts (if such taxes are levied in a given host jurisdiction). Construction of the jail is likely to occur over a number of years. This analysis uses current estimates of construction costs to determine revenue estimates in 2009 dollars, using 2009 tax rates for the jurisdiction the jail would be located in. The conceptual construction cost estimates were taken from a report on the potential construction costs at the sites completed by RLB in November 2009.

- **Recurring Revenues.** These revenues are derived from the full occupation and operation of the jail. Specific revenues include the retail sales tax, B&O taxes (for vendors and private providers of services to the jail), and utility taxes. This analysis considers the likely magnitude of annual revenues that would flow from the jail assuming the jail operates at full capacity. An assumed operating profile for taxable utility expenditures, taxable consumables, and taxable capital improvements for the jail are derived from calibrated estimates from the proposed SCORE Jail, Thurston County Jail, and Spokane County Jail. There is no specific operating date for the jail assumed in this assessment. This analysis uses 2009 tax rates for the jurisdiction the jail would be located in to create an estimate of the annual tax revenues generated at the site.
Revenues Included

Exhibit 29 summarizes the 2009 tax rates used for the estimate of tax revenues for the potential host jurisdictions. The section below provides a detailed description of these taxes.

Exhibit 29
General Fund Tax Rates

| Source: Washington Department of Revenue; Cities of Seattle, Bellevue, and Shoreline; King County, 2009. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bellevue | 0.85% | 0.15% | 5.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% |
| Seattle North | 0.85% | 0.22% | 15.54% | 12.00% | 6.00% |
| Seattle South | 0.85% | 0.22% | 15.54% | 12.00% | 6.00% |
| Uninc. King County | 1.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Shoreline | 0.85% | 0.00% | 6.00% | 6.00% | 6.00% |
| King County Jail Annex | 0.85% | 0.22% | 15.54% | 12.00% | 6.00% |

Local Option Sales Tax. Of the sales tax currently collected in most areas of King County, only the 1% local option sales tax accrues to local jurisdictions. All the host jurisdictions currently use the full local option. For local sales taxes collected within cities, the city in question receives 85% of the 1% local option sales tax and the County receives the remaining 15%. In the unincorporated part of the County, the County receives the full 1% local tax levy. This tax is levied not only on taxable retail sales from businesses in the area, but also on the value of construction (both materials and labor).

Utility Tax. All the potential host cities levy a tax on utility consumption. King County is not statutorily enabled to levy a utility tax. This tax would apply to utility consumption at the jail when it is operational.

Business and Occupation (B&O). All the local jurisdictions except the City of Shoreline and King County levy a B&O tax on the gross receipts of businesses doing business in the respective city. This tax would apply to companies engaged in construction, planning, and capital improvements (e.g. replacement and maintenance) activities for the jail. King County is not statutorily enabled to levy B&O taxes.

One-Time Revenues

These revenues accrue from the construction of the jail site. Specifically, they include the general fund revenues coming from retail sales tax on construction and the B&O tax on gross receipts of construction businesses (for those cities that have the tax). Capital restricted real estate excise taxes are also included.

Exhibit 30 summarizes the conceptual construction expenditures of the sites. The estimates were taken from a report on the conceptual construction costs at the site done by RLB in November 2009. The estimates for construction costs include those activities that would be subject to the retail sales tax, including buildings, site works, and fixtures and equipment. The
B&O tax basis includes the gross receipts of businesses doing construction work, as well as revenue earned from architectural and engineering firms.

### Exhibit 30

**Conceptual One-Time Expenditures at the Jail Sites**

#### One-Time Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GFA</th>
<th>Beds</th>
<th>Buildings</th>
<th>Siteworks/Improvements</th>
<th>FF&amp;E and Specialties</th>
<th>Const. Contingenci</th>
<th>AV of Land</th>
<th>Project Fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>281,682</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>78,863,783</td>
<td>6,046,752</td>
<td>14,542,415</td>
<td>18,468,721</td>
<td>16,636,900</td>
<td>14,071,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle North</td>
<td>281,682</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>85,305,039</td>
<td>5,809,305</td>
<td>14,542,415</td>
<td>19,783,142</td>
<td>13,362,000</td>
<td>16,393,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle South</td>
<td>281,682</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>84,725,184</td>
<td>5,201,321</td>
<td>14,542,415</td>
<td>19,536,598</td>
<td>5,724,400</td>
<td>16,211,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninc. King County</td>
<td>281,682</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>79,385,013</td>
<td>9,397,823</td>
<td>14,542,415</td>
<td>19,271,758</td>
<td>8,090,900</td>
<td>14,599,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline</td>
<td>281,682</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>83,105,224</td>
<td>12,860,364</td>
<td>14,542,415</td>
<td>20,835,749</td>
<td>11,803,900</td>
<td>16,565,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County Jail Annex</td>
<td>558,800</td>
<td>1,188</td>
<td>194,937,088</td>
<td>1,999,914</td>
<td>23,568,742</td>
<td>50,194,804</td>
<td>11,499,805</td>
<td>33,353,766</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: BERK, 2009. All figures in 2009$.*

**Note:** Since the King County Jail Annex site is a portion of an existing tax parcel, the assessed value is a pro-rated estimate on the land value on a per acre basis. King County Jail Annex includes both the NEC and King County portions combined.

**Note:** The 558,800 gross floor area (GFA) for the King County Annex Site includes renovation to the existing KCCF if the Annex is built. GFA for the building itself is 539,000.

Exhibit 31 summarizes the one-time tax revenues that would accrue to the host jurisdiction from the retail sales tax, and B&O tax. The King County Jail Annex alternative generates the largest revenue impact to the City of Seattle through the larger magnitude of construction costs, but also through a larger combination of the type and rate of taxes imposed. The five stand alone sites all generate a similar level of tax revenues.

The location of the Unincorporated King County site outside an incorporated area will mean that the County will receive the full 1% option on the local sales tax instead of the 0.15% of the 1% it usually receives in incorporated areas. It is also worth noting that King County will receive tax revenues regardless of where the site is located in the County due to the split in the local option sales tax between the cities and the County.

### Exhibit 31

**One-Time Tax Revenues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>King County Jail Annex</th>
<th>Seattle North</th>
<th>Seattle South</th>
<th>Shoreline</th>
<th>Bellevue</th>
<th>Unincorporated King County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax on Construction</td>
<td>$ 2,301,000</td>
<td>$ 1,066,000</td>
<td>$ 1,054,000</td>
<td>$ 1,116,000</td>
<td>$ 1,002,000</td>
<td>$ 1,226,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;O Tax on Construction</td>
<td>$ 654,000</td>
<td>$ 305,000</td>
<td>$ 301,000</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 197,000</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total one-Time Revenues</td>
<td>$ 2,955,000</td>
<td>$ 1,371,000</td>
<td>$ 1,355,000</td>
<td>$ 1,116,000</td>
<td>$ 1,199,000</td>
<td>$ 1,226,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: BERK, 2009. All figures in 2009$.*
Recurring Revenues

A fully operational jail will generate a stream of tax revenue to the host jurisdiction. These revenues will principally come from taxes applied to the purchase of utilities, supplies and consumables delivered to the site, and on-going construction and maintenance services. Businesses that provide on-going construction and maintenance services will be subject to the business and occupation tax on their gross receipts from their business activities at the jail.

Exhibit 32 summarizes the conceptual operating expenditures of the sites. Operational costs were not specifically available at the time of the writing of the analysis. As a proxy, operating estimates were developed from operating data from the Thurston and Spokane County jails, as well as estimates from the proposed SCORE jail facility serving several south King County cities. The data from these facilities was calibrated to the annex and stand-alone sites on a per square foot basis.

The estimates were developed to provide a baseline estimate of the magnitude of operating costs the facility might experience that would result in incremental tax revenues to the host jurisdiction.

### Exhibit 32

**Conceptual Taxable Operating Expenditures at the Jail Sites**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>King County Jail Annex</th>
<th>Seattle North</th>
<th>Seattle South</th>
<th>Shoreline</th>
<th>Bellevue</th>
<th>Unincorporated King County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utility Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$2,042,000</td>
<td>$1,083,000</td>
<td>$1,083,000</td>
<td>$1,061,000</td>
<td>$1,081,000</td>
<td>$1,044,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>$148,000</td>
<td>$88,000</td>
<td>$88,000</td>
<td>$107,000</td>
<td>$73,000</td>
<td>$96,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer</td>
<td>$463,000</td>
<td>$274,000</td>
<td>$274,000</td>
<td>$179,000</td>
<td>$199,000</td>
<td>$139,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas</td>
<td>$766,000</td>
<td>$386,000</td>
<td>$386,000</td>
<td>$386,000</td>
<td>$386,000</td>
<td>$386,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric</td>
<td>$665,000</td>
<td>$335,000</td>
<td>$335,000</td>
<td>$389,000</td>
<td>$423,000</td>
<td>$423,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumables and Supplies</td>
<td>$948,000</td>
<td>$562,000</td>
<td>$562,000</td>
<td>$562,000</td>
<td>$562,000</td>
<td>$562,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance and Capital</td>
<td>$3,658,000</td>
<td>$1,844,000</td>
<td>$1,844,000</td>
<td>$1,844,000</td>
<td>$1,844,000</td>
<td>$1,844,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Exhibit 33 summarizes the recurring annual tax revenues that would accrue to the host jurisdiction from the retail sales tax, B&O tax, and utility taxes. The King County Jail Annex site generates the largest recurring annual tax revenues to the City of Seattle through a combination of its larger scale of operations and type and rate of taxes that are collected. The Annex site is physically larger; it has 1,188 beds, as opposed to 640 beds in the stand alone sites. The City of Seattle also has more tax sources and higher rates than the other host cities.

The Unincorporated King County site will generate only sales taxes. As with the one-time revenues, King County will receive tax revenues regardless of where the site is located in the County due to the split in the local option sales tax between the cities and the County. The County does not have the ability to collect utility or B&O taxes.
**Exhibit 33**

**Recurring Annual Tax Revenues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>King County Jail Annex</th>
<th>Seattle North</th>
<th>Seattle South</th>
<th>Shoreline</th>
<th>Bellevue</th>
<th>Unincorporated King County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility Taxes</td>
<td>$164,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$64,000</td>
<td>$54,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer</td>
<td>$56,000</td>
<td>$33,000</td>
<td>$33,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas</td>
<td>$46,000</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
<td>$19,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax</td>
<td>$39,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;O Tax</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Ongoing Revenues**

|                  | $208,000               | $112,000      | $112,000      | $84,000   | $76,000  | $24,000                   |


**Impact to Property Tax Levy Collections**

The real and personal property associated with the jail will be tax exempt due to its public use exemption. For those sites not already wholly or partially exempted for public use and/or ownership, the conversion of property from taxable to tax-exempt will mean the local jurisdictions will no longer collect property taxes from the site. The loss of property tax revenues from the sites are summarized below in Exhibit 34.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>King County Jail Annex</th>
<th>Seattle North</th>
<th>Seattle South</th>
<th>Shoreline</th>
<th>Bellevue</th>
<th>Unincorporated King County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009 Property Taxes</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$101,664</td>
<td>$11,150</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$29,496</td>
<td>$75,326</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: King County Assessor, 2009; BERK, 2009.

However, due to the effects of Initiative 747 and subsequent legislative actions to limit the growth of property taxes, jurisdictions will not see a drop in property tax levy collections. Legislative action in the wake of Initiative 747 limits cities in Washington to a maximum property tax levy increase of 101% over the previous year’s levy (plus additional levy revenues from the amount of new construction value in the previous year), unless a larger increase is allowed through a public vote. Because the assessed value of most property historically increases at a rate greater than 1% per year, the result of the 101% limit is a lessening over time of the property tax yield of any individual piece of property (in real, inflation-adjusted dollars), and absent public votes for a so-called “levy lid lift,” a gradual lowering of the levy rate.

As a matter of policy, city policy makers can choose a lower property tax levy in any given year. Many cities, however, choose to use their entire authorized levy capacity, which means that the 101% limit becomes the controlling factor in the amount they can collect. This means that the amount of property tax a city can legally collect is driven by what they collected in the past, statutory limitations, and city policy. Modest shifts of property from taxable to tax-exempt status do not meaningfully affect the amount of property taxes the city can collect. Thus, the loss of...
taxable assessed value from a city’s tax base will result in a very small shift in burden to remaining taxable properties within the city.

Finally, jurisdictions that might experience property value decreases from the jail may experience some fractional increase in their property tax collections resulting from larger levy add-on revenues from new construction. The loss of overall assessed value dampens the decline of the levy rate (per the 101% limit) allowing for larger new construction add-on value from the previous year. For example, a $1 million basis for new construction levy add-on value would be higher in instance where the levy rate is $1.50 as opposed to $1.40.

**Impact to Public Services**

This section addresses the potential impacts of the jail on the public services of the host jurisdiction. Specifically, this analysis focuses on the police, Fire/EMS, and general administrative services and how they may be impacted by new service demands generated by construction and operation of the jail.

**Overview**

There are two central questions that this assessment addresses in regards to the potential impacts on public services.

1. In what ways might the jail introduce new incremental demand for public services?
2. In what ways might any new demand translate into service costs for the host jurisdiction?

The answer to the first question is challenging because no substantial roster of large, regional misdemeanant jails (in a variety of settings) exists to serve as examples. Ideally, one would like to have a lot of different regional misdemeanant jails to evaluate, to examine (1) whether the jails introduced any additional demand for public safety services, and (2) if so, under what conditions.

BERK used several different methods to address the first question above. Notwithstanding the paucity of directly comparable facilities, BERK conducted a review of academic and professional literature on jail siting to summarize the current understanding of impacts to public services from correctional facilities. In addition to this inquiry, BERK assessed a set of case studies to examine the public service impacts in other Washington State jurisdictions with similar jail facilities. For police services in particular, BERK conducted a series of informational interviews with command staff of the police department of the potential host jurisdiction of each site alternative.

Regarding the second question above, it is instructive to consider a broad outline of how a city manages the delivery of public services. In general, cities have a great deal of fixed capacity already in place (e.g. key positions in leadership and management, and existing city service systems and infrastructure) that do not necessarily change in a linear fashion as the city grows. A city’s service delivery equation also has a variable side; meaning that a city deploys its service capacity to meet the demands as they are generated by activity within a city.
This capacity is fairly “lumpy” and varies by the unique service and policy characteristics of the individual city. In other words, for any given public service, service capacity is put into place to accommodate an amount of new demand before that capacity is exhausted. The jail has the potential to impact public services depending on how the characteristics of the jail interact with each service.

The following section presents the findings from the literature review and case studies. At the end of this section, a framework for assessing the public service impacts is presented followed by a discussion of impacts to public services.

**Literature Review**

**Methodology**

BERK conducted a literature review of academic and professional literature on the impact of correctional facilities on public services. Wherever available, we obtained the original research, but also reviewed summary and compilation documents in cases when the complete study was not available.

While there is a range of studies that examine the impact that correctional facilities have on crime rates, there were no studies BERK identified that addressed this issue in the broader context of public services in general.

**Jail Siting and Public Safety Literature**

- Fehr, Larry M. Literature Review of Impacts to Communities in Siting Correctional Facilities. July 1995. *(This review references 51 studies (1981-1994) related to a correctional facility’s effect on (1) crime and safety (2) property values (3) local economic impact and (4) quality of life)*
Key Findings

From our review of the literature, BERK identified the following high level key findings:

- There were no studies surveyed that addressed the specific issue of impact to public services.
- Most studies focused on the impact of correctional facilities on crime around a facility.
- In general, studies have shown that the presence of a correctional facility does not create additional crime in a community, but among community members there may be a perception that crime is more prevalent.
- Some studies report a drop in crime rates in areas surrounding a new correctional facility due to the increased police presence.
- A U.S. Department of Justice study of seven facilities in Idaho, Arizona, Florida, and Tennessee found that in all but one of the locations there was either: (1) no notable difference between the crime rates in the target and control area or (2) the target area experienced considerably lower crime rates than the control area. In the one case in which crime rates were higher in the target area, a higher degree of urbanization (more commercial and shopping centers) was identified as a factor contributing to the higher crime rate.

Case Studies

In addition to the literature review, BERK undertook a series of case studies as an opportunity to explore the experiences of other jail host jurisdictions in Washington. The following section describes the characteristics of the facility and host jurisdictions to provide context for how the sites compare to the proposed NEC regional municipal jail alternatives. After the profiles, a summary of key findings are presented detailing the experience of the host jurisdictions.

Methodology

In selecting the cases for study, BERK sought to query jail sites that presented a similar range of jail and host jurisdiction characteristics to the proposed NEC regional municipal jail alternatives. From the perspective of jail operations, case study sites were selected that had somewhat similar capacity, types of inmates, number of booking/releases, and release policies. From the perspective of the host jurisdiction, sites were selected that were located in a range of land use environments (e.g. differing amounts of urban character and activity), and city sizes (e.g. small, medium, and large cities) to be consistent with the six sites in question for the proposed NEC regional municipal jail facility.

A profile of the jail facility was developed by contacting the jail and characterizing its operating and inmate features. Further, BERK contacted administrative staff and law enforcement officials at the host jurisdictions for their perspectives on the impact of the jail. While every attempt to contact these individuals was made, not all respondents were able to take part in the inquiries.

A summary comparison table is shown in Exhibit 35.
Kent, WA - Maleng Regional Justice Center (MRJC)

The MRJC is a direct supervision facility that can house up to 1,384 inmates located in downtown Kent. There is a 6,000-seat Event Center and shopping area (with movies, retail and restaurants) across the street. There is also a residential neighborhood within a half mile of the site. Thirty-six of thirty-nine cities in King County contract for bed space at the MRJC. MRJC houses both misdemeanor and felony inmates.

Inmates arrive through local police agencies, the Department of Corrections, or via the cooperative transportation shuttles. They are booked at MRJC, although some inmates can also be booked in at KCCF first. All courts are located in the courts building at the MRJC.

The number of bookings per day varies, on average, between 25 and 45 inmates per day. Inmates stay, on average, between 18 and 21 days overall. Inmates are released in the parking garage at the MRJC. There are, on average, between 50 and 70 inmates released per day. There are a number of transit options available at the site.

Port Orchard, WA - Kitsap County Jail

The Kitsap County jail currently operates 477 beds, with 421 designated for adult corrections and 56 beds for work release/alternative jail program. The facility is located in the County administrative buildings, attached to the main courthouse, in Port Orchard, approximately four to five blocks from the downtown. The neighboring area is mostly residential and office space.

The County contracts with cities in Kitsap County, the City of Gig Harbor in Pierce County, the Washington State Department of Corrections, and the Suquamish tribe. The jail population includes both pretrial and post-trial offenders, each comprising fifty percent of the total population. Pretrial offenders range from misdemeanants to felons. Post-trial offenders are misdemeanants or felons whose sentences are less than one year and one day.

The jail has, on average, 25 to 30 bookings per day. Inmates stay, on average, about 17 days. Offenders appearing in district or superior court are escorted by jail staff to the courthouse, attached to the jail. The jail has video arraignment facilities for all municipal court hearings, with the exception of Gig Harbor, whose officers transport offenders to their municipal court.

There are, on average, between 25 to 30 inmates released per day. Inmates are released out the door (the release point is behind the courthouse). The jail offers transit tokens for purchase for all prisoners, and will provide tokens for those unable to pay for them. A transit stop is located near the release point.

Tacoma, WA - Pierce County Jail

The Pierce County Jail expanded its facility in 2002. Together, the old and new jail can hold 1,500 inmates. Housing in the old and new jail is allocated according to an inmate classification system, with lesser offenders (classified as levels four through eight) housed in the 700-bed old jail and more severe offenders (classified as levels one through three) housed in the 800-bed new jail. Both the old and new jails are located in the Pierce County/City of Tacoma Business Park, located in downtown Tacoma. The surrounding area is business and residential.
The jail houses misdemeanants and felons. On average, bookings equal around 70 to 75 per day. Inmates stay for 14 days on average.

Municipal, district, and superior courts are also located within the City Administration Complex, and jail staff escort inmates to court appearances via tunnels. The facility also has two video courts for arraignments and simple court procedures.

There are, on average, between 70 to 75 inmates released per day. Inmates are released from the facility through the public lobby. Transit options are located near the jail.

**Spokane, WA - Spokane County Jail**

Spokane’s Geiger Corrections Center (GEI) and County jail together have a capacity to hold 1,285 inmates, with a current population of approximately 1,100. The County jail is located in downtown Spokane and GEI (the work release facility) is located nine miles outside of Spokane in a rural setting.

The County is currently undergoing a Jail Expansion project to alleviate overcrowding conditions and absorb inmate capacity when GEI closes in 2013. The combined jail facilities house misdemeanants and felons. Inmates are brought to the Spokane County Jail for booking by various arresting agencies.

The jail facilities average approximately 19,050 bookings per year. The average length of stay equals 9.8 days for misdemeanants and 32.2 days for felons.

The County Jail is part of a larger County administrative complex that houses seven district courts, twelve superior courts, three municipal courts, and two video courtrooms. Most arraignments are conducted in video courts.

The jail facilities average approximately 52 releases per day. Inmates are released from the facility through the public lobby. The County Jail is located in an area with transit service.

**Thurston County Jail**

The Thurston County Corrections Facility is currently in the process of expanding its jail. The existing jail is located in the County’s Main Courthouse Complex in Olympia. The surrounding area has several residential housing options (apartments and condominiums) and some office space. The facility has a capacity of 408 beds. The jail has video arraignment facilities for first-appearance, and trial courts are located within the Main Courthouse Complex.

It houses a wide variety of pretrial offenders, from misdemeanants to felons. Bookings, which occur at the jail facility, average between 16 to 22 a day.

On average, inmates stay in the facility for 25 to 30 days, but lengths range from one night to more than one year. Inmates are released (by court order or once their sentence is served) out the front door and are responsible for their own transportation from the Corrections Facility.
## Exhibit 35
### Summary of Washington Jail Case Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jail Facility</th>
<th>MRJC</th>
<th>Kitsap County</th>
<th>Pierce County</th>
<th>Spokane County</th>
<th>Thurston County</th>
<th>NEC Regional Municipal jail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Downtown Kent, Court Complex</td>
<td>Port Orchard, County Administration Complex</td>
<td>Downtown Tacoma, County/City Administration Complex</td>
<td>(1) County Jail in downtown Spokane, (2) Geiger Corrections in rural area</td>
<td>Olympia, County Courthouse Complex</td>
<td>Various – six alternative sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity</strong></td>
<td>1,384 inmates</td>
<td>477 beds</td>
<td>Up to 1,500 inmates</td>
<td>Up to 1,285 inmates</td>
<td>408 beds</td>
<td>640 beds for stand alone. 1,080 for KC Jail Annex (1,188 capacity)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Inmate Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Crimes</th>
<th>MRJC</th>
<th>Kitsap County</th>
<th>Pierce County</th>
<th>Spokane County</th>
<th>Thurston County</th>
<th>NEC Regional Municipal jail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Misdemeanors and felonies</td>
<td>Misdemeanors and felonies</td>
<td>Misdemeanors and felonies</td>
<td>Misdemeanors and felonies</td>
<td>Misdemeanors and felonies</td>
<td>Misdemeanors, except at Annex site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Stay</td>
<td>18-21 days</td>
<td>17 days</td>
<td>14 days</td>
<td>9.8 days for misdemeanors 32.2 days for felons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Jail Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Bookings</th>
<th>MRJC</th>
<th>Kitsap County</th>
<th>Pierce County</th>
<th>Spokane County</th>
<th>Thurston County</th>
<th>NEC Regional Municipal jail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Bookings a day</td>
<td>25-45 bookings</td>
<td>25-30 a day</td>
<td>70-75 a day</td>
<td>52 a day</td>
<td>16-22 a day</td>
<td>44 a day for current NEC cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interface with Courts</td>
<td>Courts located at MRJC; Inmates securely transported</td>
<td>Video municipal courts; District and Superior courts attached to facility</td>
<td>Video facilities; courts located within complex</td>
<td>2 video facilities; courts located within complex</td>
<td>Video arraignment courts; main courthouse is attached</td>
<td>Arraignment court on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Releases</td>
<td>50-70 a day</td>
<td>25-30 a day</td>
<td>70-100 a day</td>
<td>52 a day</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>62 a day (estimated for stand-alone); 93 a day (estimated for KC Annex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release Policy</td>
<td>Inmates are released in the parking garage</td>
<td>Inmates are released out behind the courthouse</td>
<td>Inmates are released out the front door</td>
<td>Inmates released from facility through lobby</td>
<td>Inmates are released out the front door</td>
<td>Two release options: 1) at site, 2) transport back to arresting jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: BERK, 2009.*
Case Study Findings

Site Comparability

In summary, the case study jail facilities represent a range of operating characteristics also found in the proposed NEC regional municipal jail alternatives. The case study sites constitute a relatively similar comparison to the NEC alternatives in terms of location and operating characteristics. The greatest departure is in type of inmates at the jail. The proposed NEC regional municipal jail will house only misdemeanants while the case studies all accommodate both misdemeanants and felons. Other comparisons are listed below.

- The sites cover a wide array of location settings. All but Thurston County are located in areas with some urban character and activity.
- While the NEC stand alone sites will have 640 beds (the King County Jail Annex site will have 1,188), the case study jails have a range of inmate capacity spanning that configuration.
- The NEC stand alone sites are estimated to generate about 22,500 bookings a year in the future, fully occupied jail. The King County Annex site will generate about 34,000 bookings per year (Heffron Transportation, NEC Trip Generation Assumptions, October 8, 2009). This estimate is at the higher end of booking activity relative to the case study sites. Only Pierce County Jail accommodates more bookings (27,000) than the stand alone sites.6
- All the case study sites had court facilities, as do the NEC alternatives.
- The NEC alternative jails would have about estimated 70 inmate releases on an average weekday once the jail was fully occupied. This estimate is at the higher end of release activity relative to the case study sites. Only Pierce County Jail accommodates a similar amount of releases.
- The NEC is contemplating two different release policies: 1) where inmates are released to the street, and 2) where inmates are transported back to their arresting jurisdiction and released there. By contrast, all of the case studies release their inmates from the facility to the street.
- While all the sites were located in urban areas where transit service is available, Kitsap County took the added action to provide transit fare to released inmates.
- Generally, the county sheriff’s departments operate the jails (except for the MRJC) and are the primary responders to calls for service inside the jail. It has not been determined how the NEC will operate the jail, or who the primary responder to calls for service inside the jail will be.

---

6 Note: Booking and release estimates for the proposed NEC Regional Jail (stand-alone and King County Annex) are forecasts for the future jail while the case study facilities cite recent 2008 data.
Host City Public Service Impacts

The following section summarizes the key themes that host jurisdictions observed about the impact of hosting the jail.

Law Enforcement

- The county sheriffs, who operate the jails (except for MRJC which is operated by Department of Adult & Juvenile Detention of King County), are responsible for responding to incidents/investigations at the jail. Calls for service to the host jurisdiction for internal incidents were rare and were not identified as creating an impact on local law enforcement resources.

- A police agency cited that the area around the jail had higher crime rates relative to other areas of their city. However, it was unclear if this was attributable to the jail or because of the baseline higher crime activity in the area.

- Some respondents reported that the jail had no observable impact on crime in the area around the jail.

- After release from the jail, most respondents noted that inmates typically leave the area immediately to return to where they are from.

- All respondents identified that there have been no changes in staffing or shifting of resources because of the location of the jail above the baseline activity in the area. In other words, they felt that the jail itself had a negligible effect on the amount of service calls in the area.

Fire/EMS

- While no specific data were provided, most respondents cited that calls for service were for EMS services for transport to other medical facilities.

- Respondents observed that many of the jails have their own medical services that respond to less serious incidents at the jail.

- Since the jails were located in urban areas where there was existing Fire/EMS coverage, respondents thought that the jail did not impact the delivery of services.

General City Administrative Services

- Respondents felt that the jail did not create any additional impact to the city’s general administrative functions.
Host Jurisdiction Police Department Interviews

BERK conducted a series of informational interviews with command staff of the police departments of the potential host jurisdictions of each site alternative, and included the police departments of Seattle, Bellevue, and King County. These interviews surveyed the jurisdictions on:

- The anticipated amount of service demand created by the site alternatives;
- Any unique service delivery issues that the jail might present at the given site; and
- Their ability to meet the service needs of the jail.

The information from these interviews is presented in the impact discussion section for police services.

A Framework for Assessing the Potential for Public Service Impacts

Based on the literature review and case study assessment, two key themes emerged that help frame the discussion of potential impacts to public services of the host jurisdiction. First, there is building evidence from the literature and case studies that jails do not serve as sources or catalysts for increases in the level of crime around them. Based on discussions with police staff in the case studies, in cases where relatively high crime rates are observable in the area around a jail, this is due to the fact that the broader area around the jail is an area with relatively high crime.

Given that reality, it is difficult to isolate any incremental contribution of the jail, if such a contribution exists at all. Anecdotal experience with other jails in the State from the case studies indicates that released inmates prefer not to linger in areas around the jail, and prefer to return to where they are from – acknowledging that sometimes that destination is in the immediate vicinity of the jail. These findings have service implications for the host’s police department.

Second, not surprisingly, most jurisdictions have not experienced significant impacts on either their general city administrative services or Fire/EMS services because of the jail.

With this information in hand, we can revisit the central questions that this assessment seeks to address with regard to the impact on public services.

1. In what ways might the jail introduce new incremental demand for public services?
2. In what ways might any new demand translate into service costs for the host jurisdiction?

General Administrative Services Impacts

General administration services for a local jurisdiction include those activities tied to the overall management of the jurisdiction’s affairs. While the range of services differs from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, they generally include executive, finance and budget, internal support, planning and community development, legal, and clerk services.
The jail will trigger new service demand to a jurisdiction commensurate with the extent that it has specialized needs for these services. The jail (or jail developers) will use these services during both construction and operation.

The construction of the jail will have to coordinate with a city’s planning and development services; however, any incremental need for staffing to process permits and other development processes is likely to be covered through planning and permit fees on a cost recovery basis. These demands would be new to the jurisdiction; however, their impact would be accounted for in the fee for service.

Once the jail is operational, it is not likely to generate any significant new demand for these general administrative services. Clearly, the jail represents one constituent demander of a city or county’s administrative service. However, given the fixed-cost component of these services (i.e. the jail will not increase the administration, or budget/financial services), it would be atypical for addition of a single constituent user to translate to a change in resources required to use any of the city services above and beyond the level that is needed to run basic city services. For these reasons, the jail will not impose any significant impacts on the host jurisdiction’s general administrative services.

**Fire/EMS Impacts**

Fire and EMS services are time-sensitive and logistics-driven services. A city’s or district’s Fire/EMS service delivery structure is principally driven by the need to respond in a timely manner to any property in the agency’s service delivery area. Once this logistical service-delivery structure is in place, in most instances, adding a handful of new constituent users does not trigger the need to expand the system.

Ultimately, of course, a given cadre of firefighters and a given pool of apparatus are limited in the number of calls for service they can effectively serve. What this means is that adding new potential demanders of service has the potential to require expansion of resources, but such effects are expected to be minimal. In effect, if adding one more potential demander of fire services pushes the responding agency over a certain threshold, then the agency would need to expand its ability to respond.

Based on the case study analysis, calls for Fire/EMS service at the jail are expected to be minimal due to the presence of medical facilities at the jail. Jail operators cited that calls will be primarily for aid. Fire emergency incidents at the jail are expected to be minimal because the facilities would be constructed to current fire codes and with robust fire control systems.

The amount of calls for service will ultimately depend on how the proposed NEC regional municipal jail operates. If the facility has a medical clinic and infirmary functions to allow jail operators to provide appropriate medical services on-site, the host jurisdiction would likely avoid the calls for service. Instead, it would only serve those calls for service where appropriate care cannot be delivered at the jail facilities, necessitating transfer to an outside medical facility.

Given the modest level of new demand that would be generated by a new jail, and given that all of these service providers are currently delivering services to the sites in question (including existing uses on certain sites), it would be atypical for introduction of the jail facility to push a service agency over the threshold where it would be required to expand its response resources.
In summary, this means that it would be unlikely that a host jurisdiction would face new costs for Fire/EMS services as a result of placing a jail in their service area.

- Fire/EMS services are provided by the Seattle Fire Department for the King County Jail Annex, Seattle North, and Seattle South alternative sites. The hosting of the jail is expected to have minimal impact on Fire/EMS services of the host jurisdiction, resulting in no new costs.

- Fire/EMS services are provided by Bellevue Fire Department for the Bellevue alternative site. The hosting of the jail is expected to have minimal impact on Fire/EMS services to host jurisdiction, resulting in no new costs.

- Fire/EMS services are provided by Shoreline Fire Department/King County Fire District #4 for the Shoreline alternative site. The hosting of the jail is expected to have minimal impact on Fire/EMS services to host jurisdiction, resulting in no new costs.

- Fire/EMS services are provided by King County Fire District #34 via the Redmond Fire Department for the Unincorporated King County alternative site. The hosting of the jail is expected to have minimal impact on Fire/EMS services to the host jurisdiction, resulting in no new costs.

All of these departments have mutual aid agreements with neighboring jurisdictions for emergency service.

A high demand for Fire/EMS services during construction is not anticipated for any of the jail facility at any of the site alternatives. It is expected that the construction of the jail at the alternative sites would not generate activity that could not already be accommodated by the existing service in the host jurisdiction. No significant impacts to Fire/EMS services are therefore expected during construction.

**Police Impacts**

A high demand for police services is not anticipated during the construction of the jail facility at any of the site alternatives. The construction site would be secured to prevent trespassing and vandalism, and to avoid accidents involving the public. It is anticipated that traffic impacts to policing would be dealt with via a Construction Transportation Management Plan for the respective cities. In addition, construction is not expected to result in any substantial population increase from construction workers relocating to the area that would result in increased demand for services beyond existing levels. No significant impacts to police services are expected during construction.

The impacts on police service on an on-going operational basis will come from three principal sources: 1) responding to incidents at the jail; 2) policing activity around the jail; and 3) logistical issues related to the transport of inmates.

**Incidents at the Jail**

While it has not been decided which entity will operate the jail, it is assumed that the jail operator will be responsible for responding to common incidents at the jail (theft, assault, etc). In
cases where there is a need for major support or back-up to an incident at the jail, it is assumed that the host jurisdiction’s police force will respond.

For the Seattle sites (Annex, South, North), the Seattle Police Department would respond to these major incidents and use specialized units as they are needed.

The Bellevue site is served by the Bellevue Police Department and they would respond to major incidents as they are needed.

The City of Shoreline contracts with the King County Sheriff’s Office, the same entity that provides service to the Unincorporated King County site, and they would respond to major incidents as they are needed. Based on discussions from the case studies, incidents that require the involvement of the host police department are infrequent and, pending a workable operating agreement, from the perspective of the host jurisdiction, there is no expected need to expand resources to serve this function.

Incidents around the Jail

For each site alternative, the impact to the host police service will be driven by two key factors:

- How much will the jail change the baseline activity that leads to new incremental calls for service? Within this question:
  - What is the likelihood that the release activity will stand out from the baseline activity?
  - What are the potential factors that might mitigate this noticeable difference?
- What is the jurisdiction’s ability to respond to increases in service call volume?

Based on the evidence available from the literature and case studies, the general answer to the first question is that areas around the jail are likely to see minimal increases in call volumes due to the jail itself.

The case studies revealed that most released inmates quickly leave the area to return to their places of residence. Access to transit or other transportation modes that facilitate this exit would obviously help to ensure that this would be the pattern at the new jail site (the Transportation Element of DEIS found that all sites are currently served by transit within a half mile).

Additionally, the alternate release policy that stipulates that inmates be transported back to their arresting jurisdiction would mitigate this addition of activity to the immediate community.

The potential exceptions to the trend of minimal impact around the jail facility might come in instances where the activity on the street introduced by the new jail facility would differ markedly from the current baseline level of activity. As the most extreme example, the Shoreline site represents an instance where new activity associated with releases from the jail would stand out as a departure from the norm for the surrounding community. Because the surrounding community is almost entirely residential, the potential exists that released detainees (or other visitors to the jail) who are traveling in the neighborhood could raise the suspicions and/or concern of local residents. Under such circumstances, it would not be surprising if such incidents resulted in a general increase of calls to the Shoreline Police Department (i.e. suspicious persons type calls).
At the other end of the spectrum, given the proximity of the current King County Jail and other law and justice functions, the King County Jail Annex site would not be expected to generate any appreciable difference in the nature and levels of activity on the street.

Overall, one could categorize the potential for “differences” in activity as follows:

- For the King County Jail Annex, there is likely to be no appreciable difference from the release of inmates given the level of urban activity in the area.

- The Seattle North and Bellevue sites have moderate levels of baseline activity from their commercial uses. The addition of released inmates could add some marginal activity to these areas, but it would be unlikely to stand out from the general nature of current activity.

- The Seattle South and Unincorporated King County sites have lower baseline activity than the commercial areas in the sites above due to the primarily industrial character of their settings. The addition of released inmates and associated jail activity could add activity to these areas above levels they currently experience.

- Releases of inmates at the Shoreline site have the greatest potential to increase activity in the area around the jail given the primarily residential character of the community.

The impact to the ability of the host jurisdiction to respond to any potential new police service call demand will depend on the depth of their existing service. Generally, the larger cities (Seattle and Bellevue) have larger police forces. With these larger forces, their ability to flexibly respond to shifts in demand will be greater. In areas where there is less coverage, or where locally-based police forces are smaller, the host jurisdiction may find it harder to absorb any incremental shift in demand.

For these agencies (i.e. King County Sheriff’s Office or Shoreline Police Department) it may be the case that additional staffing would not be required to respond to modest introductions of new demand. However, even if the departments did not add new resources, any increase in demand for resources in the vicinity of the jail would translate to lower availability of resources elsewhere in their respective coverage areas.

The current release schedule of the jail has the majority (about 85% for the stand alone sites and 60% for the annex site) of inmates being released between the hours of 8am to 6pm. These hours coincide with the highest levels of staffing at the host Police Departments, resulting in the greatest capability to respond to potential incidents related to inmate release. The hours also coincide with peak transit services. The high level of transit service would give released inmates more options to leave the area.

According to the Transportation Element of the DEIS, the alternative sites all have varying levels of transit service (measured by number of routes/stops, time of service, and headways). Currently, there are transit stops within a half mile of all alternative sites. Generally speaking, the King County Jail Annex has the most transit service while the Seattle South and Unincorporated King County sites have the least. The other stand alone sites have service levels in between these two.

The following discussion of potential impacts focuses on the potential incremental impact associated with activity around the jail (driven largely by the release of detainees). Discussion of resource implications around transport of prisoners is discussed in the sub-section that follows.
Seattle Police Department

The West Precinct serves the King County Annex and Seattle North sites and has a minimum staffing of 23 officers. The Southwest Precinct serves the Seattle South site and has a minimum staffing of 18 officers. Given the fairly modest anticipated crime incident expectations, the Seattle Police Department is in a position to absorb any potential modest new demands for service and not be significantly impacted. These alternative sites would also be releasing inmates into areas with more urban activity and character, where their presence is less likely to be seen as a threat to public safety.

Conversations with the Department also indicate that this is their perspective, that both the amount of service calls resulting from the jail would be minimal, and that they have enough service capacity to absorb any incremental service demands. Based on discussion with the Seattle Police Department, the Department is also moving toward a more uniform response standard throughout the City indicating that potential new service calls are more likely to be met by capacity through the entire police force and not just the local precinct. The result of this service delivery policy will mean that any given call for service (jail or otherwise) will draw from a larger set of police resources.

Shoreline

The patrol area for the Shoreline site by the City of Shoreline Police Department has one patrol unit assigned to it with no less than three officers on duty at any time during the day. The Department is at greater risk of being impacted by the release of inmates since the Shoreline site has the greatest potential to increase baseline activity in the area around the jail given the primarily residential character of the community. As stated above, because the surrounding community is almost entirely residential, the potential exists that released detainees (or other visitors to the jail) who are traveling in the neighborhood could raise the suspicions and/or concern of local residents. Under such circumstances, it would not be surprising if such incidents resulted in a general increase of calls.

While the exact amount of incremental new calls that will materialize cannot be guaranteed, it will likely be an increase over the current use of the site. The informational interview with the King County Sheriff’s Office (who provides contract service to the City of Shoreline) confirmed that this is also their expectation. The Shoreline Police Department may not add additional staffing to respond to modest introductions of new demand. However, even if it did not add new resources, any increase in demand for resources in the vicinity of the jail would translate to lower availability of resources elsewhere in their respective coverage areas.

It should be noted that the location of the proposed jail in certain jurisdictions could be a benefit because of the possibility of freeing up police resources due to reductions in transport time. For Shoreline, the location of the jail in the City would could free up police resources because they won’t have to spend as much time transporting inmates to jail/court.

If the department experienced a substantial increase in calls associated with the jail, and if departmental resources were already stretched (with little excess capacity in their system) the possibility exists that new police resources would be required. Under this situation, the
department may need another patrol officer to accommodate this increase in demand. The City of Shoreline’s 2009 budget for police patrol services is $4.5 million for 28 full time employees (average cost of $162,000 per officer). The need for an additional officer could cost the City of Shoreline in the range of $162,000 annually (2009 dollars) for an additional officer.

Bellevue Police Department

The patrol area for the Bellevue site has one squad assigned to it with eight officers per squad and no less than six officers during any time of the day. Given the fairly modest anticipated crime incident expectations, the Bellevue Police Department is in a position to absorb any potential modest new demands for service and to not be significantly impacted by the jail. The Bellevue site would also be releasing inmates into an area with more urban activity and character (due to the commercial activity in the area combined with the close proximity to downtown), where their presence is less likely to be seen as a threat to public safety.

The interview with the Department also indicates that this is their perspective, that the amount of service calls resulting from the jail would be minimal, with enough service capacity in the existing patrol district and the downtown patrol district to absorb any incremental service demands.

It should be noted that the location of the proposed jail in certain jurisdictions could be a benefit because of the possibility of freeing up police resources due to reductions in transport time. For Bellevue, the location of the jail in the City would could free up police resources because they won’t have to spend as much time transporting inmates to jail/court.

King County Sheriff’s Office

Precinct 2 serves the Unincorporated King County site. The precinct has minimum staffing of six deputies. The Unincorporated King County site has lower baseline activity than other sites with more urban activity. The addition of released inmates and associated jail activity could add activity to these areas above levels they currently experience.

The Sheriff’s Office is at greater risk of being impacted by the release of inmates because the current staffing coverage is spread from the eastern edge of the Kenmore/Kirkland/Bellevue area all the way over to the Cascade mountain passes (at I-90 and the county line). The six deputies have to cover a vast area, which could complicate responses to service calls. Any increase in demand for resources in the vicinity of the jail would translate to lower availability of resources elsewhere in their coverage areas.

The interview with the Office indicated that the amount of service calls resulting from the jail would be minimal with enough service capacity in the existing patrol district to accommodate them. However, the Office would be vulnerable to the jail potentially pulling resources away from other areas, resulting in longer response times on an overall basis. For urgent, life threatening situations, the Sheriff’s Office has mutual aid agreements with Woodinville and Kenmore, so there are other resources that could respond in the area.
Transport of Inmates

While no specific arrangements for transport services of inmates have been developed by the NEC cities, the impact of transportation of inmates is not expected to be significant, given solutions that could be employed to mitigate their impact. Under the current arrangement, NEC cities transport their detainees to a variety of correctional facilities, with the King County Corrections Facility being one of them (note: some detainees are taken to correctional facilities outside the Puget Sound region).

The construction of a new regional jail will create changes in the distances travelled for the cities. The differences in the amount of travel distance/time could create logistical impacts related to the transporting and holding of inmates. Conversely, siting a jail in one of the jurisdictions that currently transports inmates to/from the existing King County Jail (i.e. Bellevue, Shoreline and Unincorporated King County) could possibly free up police resources because they won’t have to spend as much time transporting inmates to jail/court.

If officers are required to transport inmates from the place of arrest to the jail site, increases in the differential travel times (and distances) among the jail alternatives could affect officer staffing by:

- Impacting (decreasing or increasing) the amount of time they are available to respond to service calls.
- Impacting other police resources at the precinct level (i.e. relative need for short-term inmate holding).

The alternative release policy where inmates would be returned to their arresting jurisdiction has the potential to further complicate this transport issue.

In order to demonstrate a range of transportation distance/time impacts on the NEC cities, a distance proxy is used to illustrate the degree that siting the jail at the alternative sites would likely increase or decrease the transport “cost” to the host jurisdiction.

Exhibit 36 summarizes the distance differentials (in miles) that the five largest NEC cities would encounter relative to their transport distance to the current KCCF (assuming transport from the city municipal center using the shortest distance identified in Google Maps). Location of the proposed jail at the King County Jail Annex site would not change the transport distances for the cities since it is located next to the existing jail.

### Exhibit 36
Illustrative Additional Transport Distances from KCCF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Center</th>
<th>Distance to KCCF</th>
<th>King County Jail Annex</th>
<th>Additional Distance to NEC Regional Jail Alternative</th>
<th>Seattle North</th>
<th>Seattle South</th>
<th>Shoreline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>0.3 miles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland</td>
<td>11 miles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>11 miles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline</td>
<td>12 miles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redmond</td>
<td>16 miles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This assessment demonstrates how the City of Seattle could potentially be impacted most since all the alternatives but the Annex site increases their transport times from their current arrangement at KCCF. In addition, the City of Seattle also has the most arrests and potentially could be more sensitive to any increases in transport times.

The other NEC cities are differentially impacted by the degree the alternate sites are a relative improvement over the current arrangement at KCCF. Some cities could see a reduction to their transport distances and a potential improvement to their transport situation.

As stated earlier, location of the proposed jail in certain jurisdictions (i.e. Bellevue, Shoreline and Unincorporated King County) could be a benefit because of the possibility of freeing up police resources due to reductions in transport time. However, it should be cautioned that this assessment is done for illustrative purposes and the actual impacts are more complex given a jurisdiction’s transport needs and policies.
4.0 LOCAL COMMERCE AND RELOCATION ASSESSMENT

IMPACTS ON LOCAL PATTERNS OF COMMERCE

The location of the jail (and its associated activity) has the potential to change the local patterns of commerce by injecting new demand for commercial services. The mechanism for adding this new demand originates from the unique activities that occur at the jail related to employment of jail staff, processing of inmates, and visitation from professional services and inmate visitors.

These activities have the potential to generate new demand near the site for:

- Bail/bond firms serving inmates needing to post bail/bond for release.
- Professional services firms supporting the needs of inmates for arraignment and social services.
- Convenience oriented retail businesses to meet the food, restaurant, drugstore, and other related needs of employees and volunteers working at the jail, as well as professional staff and inmate visitors traveling to and from the jail.

The following section discusses how the activity at the jail may lead to the introduction of new demand around the site. Each section assesses: 1) the market access factors for business that would serve activity at the jail, 2) the relative scale of demand that would be created, and the ability of that demand to be accommodated by existing or new businesses.

**Bail/Bond Firms**

**Description**

Bail/Bond services will be needed by misdemeanants at the jail. While bail/bond service can be accommodated electronically, many bail/bond firms find a competitive advantage by having a physical location near the locations where bail/bond is posted, typically near the correctional facility.

**Demand Assessment**

Based on a brief inquiry of Seattle area bail/bonds firms, it is difficult to assess the degree of business generated by misdemeanant inmates since the firms respond to needs for municipal, county, and federal inmates for both misdemeanor and felony crimes. Regardless, many firms with a physical business presence cited the need to be close to the location where bail/bond payments are made.

In the case of the proposed NEC regional municipal jail, the processing of bond payments will take place at the jail. While the exact amount of new demand tied to the construction of a misdemeanor jail is not easily discernable, it is reasonable to conclude that the proposed NEC regional municipal jail will generate some demand for bail/bond services in the immediate area due to its size and flow of inmates.

In order to develop a general assessment for the number and size of bail/bond firms that may locate near the jail, a survey of bail/bonds firms around a select number of regional jail facilities
was conducted. Exhibit 27 summarizes the number of bail/bonds firms that are located within approximately a quarter mile of a jail site (the majority of bail/bond firms surveyed around the sites were located within this distance). The survey was done using business listings for bail/bond firms identified in a Google business search in July 2009.

**Exhibit 37**  
**Bail/Bonds Firms Around Select Jail Facilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jail Facility</th>
<th>Inmates</th>
<th>Beds</th>
<th>Bail Bonds in 1/4 mile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King County</td>
<td>Felony/Misdemeanor</td>
<td>1,723</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurston County</td>
<td>Felony/Misdemeanor</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap County</td>
<td>Felony/Misdemeanor</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


From this assessment, it is reasonable to conclude that the jail may generate demand in the order of 5-7 new bail/bond firms within a close proximity to the jail (approximately a quarter mile). The office space needs of bail/bond firms vary. A brief physical survey of firms found that many of these firms function with a minimal amount of office space, estimated to be in the 1,000 to 2,000 square feet range. Using these estimates, the location of the jail may trigger the demand for approximately 5,000 to 14,000 square feet of commercial space around the jail.

However, the amount of new space demands around the area will need to be adjusted by the amount of that demand that is likely to be absorbed by existing bail/bond businesses in the area. Areas where there are no existing bail/bond firms will likely feel the greatest demand for the estimated space needs. Conversely, the demand introduced by the jail in areas that are already well-served by bail/bonds firms is likely to be absorbed by existing businesses.

Areas surrounding the Bellevue, Shoreline, and Unincorporated King County site will experience the greatest demand for these uses given the lack of existing bail/bond businesses in the area. The Seattle North and Seattle South site vicinities will likely experience some of this demand since there are no bail/bond firms in the immediate vicinity (quarter mile). This demand is likely to be tempered by the location of the jail relative to downtown Seattle area where they are closer to existing bail/bond businesses. The King County Jail Annex site vicinity is likely to experience little to no new demand for space given the concentration of existing businesses in downtown Seattle that would likely absorb the new demand.

**Professional Services**

**Description**

Attorney representation is needed at arraignments and other legal proceedings at the jail. There will also be a need for social and health services for inmates at the jail. The current King County Corrections Facility offers an array of literacy, health education, and personal support services. However, most of these professional activities are typically organized within the jail itself.
**Demand Assessment**

Attorney representation is needed at arraignments. While the location of jail is an important factor for legal service professionals, it likely is not the most important issue driving the location decisions of these businesses. Criminal defense attorneys typically cover a large area and may need to split their time at multiple court and/or jail facilities. For this reason, most legal service firms locate in centralized urban areas with abundant office space which typically optimize their access to multiple markets of regional and local court/jail facilities. While the jail will generate activity for professional services it is unlikely to induce any perceivable demand for space near the jail site.

**Convenience Oriented Retail**

**Description**

The employees, volunteers, professional staff, and visitor activity at the jail is likely to generate demand for a variety of convenience oriented retail purchases. Convenience oriented retail consists of purchases made for dining, grocery, drugstore, and other related items. Spending for these items is likely to be generated by individuals coming to the jail for their particular purpose as part of their routine spending.

**Demand Assessment**

Daytime spending from employees, visitors, professional staff, and volunteers will generate demand for convenience oriented retail uses near the jail site (food, restaurants, convenience stores, drugstores, etc). There are no available estimates of consumer spending by jail employees so a survey estimate of office workers retail spending patterns developed by the International Council of Shopping Centers (ICSC) was used and supplemented by BERK to generate an estimate of the amount of spending that is likely to be captured close to the jail (ICSC, Office Worker Retail Spending Patterns, 2004). The proposed NEC regional municipal jail will have a cafeteria, so some of the estimated spending has been discounted to account for this.

Activity estimates at the jail relied on trip generation assumptions developed by Heffron Transportation Inc. as part of the Transportation element of the proposed NEC regional municipal jail EIS. It is assumed that the 156 employees and 20 volunteers working at the jail on an average weekday would generate approximately $125 in weekly spending on convenience oriented retail purchases based on ICSC’s survey work. Approximately 40% of this spending would be captured close to the jail (approximately within a half mile).

There are no established estimates of spending for family members and professional visits to jails. BERK assumes that the average weekly visits by family members (675) would generate $30 per visit and professional service visits (225) would generate $10 per visit. This spending would be wholly captured near the jail site.

It should be noted that all these estimates are intended to capture an upper range on potential spending since there may be restrictions on jail staff requiring them to eat their meals on site.
and it is unclear the exact amount of spending that is likely to materialize from family members and professional visits.

Using these spending assumptions, there is estimated to be approximately $1.6 million a year in convenience oriented retail spending associated with activity at the jail. Translated into building space needs, this amount of spending could support approximately 6,000 square feet of retail space; assuming $275 of gross sales per square feet – an average estimate for these types of retail uses (Urban Land Institute, Dollars and Cents of Shopping Centers, 2008).

The amount of this demand that would translate into demand for new retail space around the jail is more difficult to assess. Personal spending patterns are highly influenced by the type, size, and quality of nearby offerings. It is likely that this small amount of demand will be absorbed by existing businesses in the immediate vicinity in areas where there is existing convenience oriented retail offerings. In areas where there are more limited amounts of these uses, it is likely to introduce some small demand for retail space; however, given the limited amount of demand generated, it would not likely cause any substantial changes in land use near the site.

Areas surrounding the Seattle South, Shoreline, and Unincorporated King County sites will see the greatest demand for these uses given the lack of existing businesses. The King County Jail Annex, Seattle North, and Bellevue sites are located within existing urban areas where there are established retail presences that would likely absorb the new demand.

Displacement and Relocation Assessment

The Displacement and Relocation Assessment evaluates the impacts of displacing the existing uses on the six sites and the potential for relocating these uses to suitable properties. The first section analyzes the existing conditions for each of the six sites, followed by an assessment of the impacts due to the displacement of the uses currently on the site.

Existing Site Conditions

The assessment of existing conditions includes an inventory of the businesses, uses, and buildings on each site, as well as the surrounding land uses of each neighborhood. The inventory of surrounding uses summarizes the square feet of commercial and industrial buildings and number of housing units within a half a mile to the site. Building uses are grouped into four use categories: office, retail, industrial, and warehouse. Housing units are grouped by single-family, apartment, and condominium units.

Primary sources of site specific information include 2009 King County Assessor data, G-Logics Inc.’s Phase I Environmental Site Assessment conducted in December 2008 and March 2009 for each site, and the Land Use section of the proposed NEC regional municipal jail Draft EIS. No businesses at the sites or current property owners were contacted as part of this assessment.
Site Descriptions

King County Jail Annex

The King County Jail Annex site sits on the corner of 5th Avenue and Jefferson Street across from the current County Jail. The parcel is owned by King County. There is underground access to the adjacent parking garage to the east and the remainder of the site is vacant. The total parcel acreage is 1.9 acres, with the jail site targeted for a portion that is vacant and approximately 0.7 acres in size.

Office space makes up the large majority of uses in the south downtown area, with a little more than 25 million square feet of office space within a half mile of the site. Retail space has the second most square feet within a half mile, with almost 2.4 million square feet.

This site also has the most residential units within a half mile of any of the sites, with 4,131 apartment units, 1,591 condominium units, and 58 single-family units. The residential uses are mainly to the east in First Hill and to the south in the International District and Pioneer Square. Interstate 5 is directly east of the site and serves as a barrier between Downtown and First Hill.

Seattle North

The Seattle North site is located on West Armory Way just off of 15th Avenue W in the Interbay neighborhood of Seattle. The site is 7.7 acres in size and has four buildings: one 43,401 square foot office building, one 8,141 square foot warehouse, one 5,118 square foot warehouse, and a 34,810 square foot warehouse/office. The G-Logics, Inc. site assessment for the City of Seattle cites a number of users, including an upholstery business, a manufacturer of simulated body parts for medical training, a wood shop and furniture maker, a social service provider, gaming association, and the Emerald City Basketball Academy, which uses a gymnasium on the site.

The immediate surrounding area has a mix of commercial, residential, industrial, and recreational uses. The plurality of commercial and industrial building square feet within a half mile is for warehouse uses, approximately 380,000 square feet. Other uses include about 245,000 square feet of office space, about 175,000 square feet of industrial uses, and slightly more than 160,000 square feet of retail space. Residential uses are primarily to the east in the Queen Anne neighborhood with some also to the west on the hill in the Magnolia neighborhood. There are a total of 1,249 single-family units, 995 apartments, and 649 condominiums within a half mile of the site.

Seattle South

This site is at the intersection of West Marginal Way SW and Highland Park Way SW in the Duwamish Valley. It consists of four parcels totaling approximately 10 acres. Two of the parcels are vacant, and owned by the Washington State Department of Transportation. A third vacant parcel is owned by the Seattle Department of Transportation. The only privately owned parcel is 0.77 acres and has a 16,320 square foot warehouse, which is currently being used for storage purposes.

The surrounding area is primarily industrial and commercial in character. There is over 1.3 million square feet of industrial and warehouse uses within half a mile. Comparatively, there are
no retail uses and only 123,109 square feet of office uses within a half mile. There are also very few residential uses nearby. There are 74 single-family housing units within a half mile, which are mainly on the ridge above the site to the west. The forested hillside along the hill is a barrier between the residential area on the ridge and the industrial area below.

**Shoreline**

The Shoreline site is located on NE 200th Street east of Ballinger Way NE (SR 104). It is the site of a middle school that is no longer in use. The property is 16.6 acres with a 75,358 square foot school building on site.

The school yard and play fields on the site are used for recreational purposes by the community at large. The school district is responsible for the upkeep of the property, and the district has a joint use agreement with the City of Shoreline regarding use of the gymnasium.

The surrounding neighborhood is residential in character. The majority of residential units are single-family homes with approximately 953 units; apartments and condominiums make up the remainder with 464 and 357 units, respectively. Almost all the commercial or industrial uses are beyond a half mile from the site. The largest commercial use is the Ballinger Village shopping center, which is slightly over a half mile to the west on Ballinger Way NE.

**Bellevue**

This site consists of two parcels east of Downtown Bellevue next to Interstate 405 approximately 5.7 acres in size based on the Land Use section of the report. The larger parcel is owned by the City of Bellevue and is the site of the Lincoln Center Office Park. The other parcel is a vacant parcel used as a parking lot, and is surrounded by the larger parcel. The office park consists of two Class B office buildings of 29,176 and 41,578 square feet in size. The office is tenanted by a variety of businesses.

The immediate area along 116th Avenue NE is dominated by auto dealerships, while the broader surrounding land uses are mainly office, retail, and multi-family residential. Office use predominates, with over 8 million square feet within a half mile of the site. There are a large number of multi-family housing units in the area, with approximately 2,000 apartment units and 800 condominium units within a half mile.

Interstate 405, which is the western border of the property, is a barrier between the site and the core of downtown to the west, where much of the office, retail, and residential uses are located.

**Unincorporated King County**

The site in unincorporated King County is located along NE 126th Place, east of Kirkland and Totem Lake and just north of Redmond. It includes two parcels totaling approximately 10.8 acres, which are currently used by Waste Management as an office, maintenance, storage, and fueling facility. There are seven buildings on the property that are used for office, warehouse, and other industrial uses.

The immediate area within a half mile has mostly office and industrial uses. Office, warehouse, and industrial buildings each total between 600,000 and 700,000 square feet, while retail uses total about 65,000 square feet. In addition, there are 759 apartments and 229 condominiums.
units within a half mile, mainly to the southwest of the site. There are also 315 single-family units within a half mile; many of the units are in the Kingsgate neighborhood on the hill north of the site. The wooded hillside is a barrier between the housing at the top of the hill and commercial and industrial uses below.

Assessment of Displacement and Relocation Options

The impact assessment evaluates impacts on businesses/organizations currently operating on the site and the availability of suitable/comparable sites within reasonable proximity of the current location. The assessment also discusses the impact to the neighborhood/community due to the relocation of the existing uses. This assessment evaluates whether the loss of the businesses/organizations would reduce the commercial options for local residential or commercial entities.

Of the six sites, three have existing businesses that would be displaced and have to relocate if the proposed jail is built on the site. The three sites are: Bellevue, Seattle North, and the Unincorporated King County site. The King County Jail Annex site is currently vacant, the Seattle South site is used for storage purposes and the Shoreline site is used for recreational purposes.

At a minimum, existing businesses would face relocation costs from moving, business disruption, and configuring their new space to meet their business needs.

**King County Jail Annex**

This site is currently vacant. The site does have an access tunnel to the parking garage on it that would need to be rerouted or accommodated for construction; however, this is not expected to impact the overall viability of the parking garage.

**Seattle North**

The Seattle North site has a variety of different users. Generally, with the exception of the basketball court used by the Emerald City Basketball Academy, the businesses on the site need general light industrial or warehouse space. While it is difficult to assess without specific operating information, the market area for these businesses would appear to extend beyond the neighborhood, and as a result, likely could operate at other sites.

Many options are available to these businesses for relocation in the immediate area. The Interbay area has 1.3 million square feet of warehouse space and 334,195 square feet of industrial space within one mile of the site in 2009. The current vacancy rate for industrial uses in the Seattle area is 6.89% (GVA Kidder Mathews, 2009 Quarter 2). Additional opportunities exist in other parts of Seattle and the region where these businesses could operate. Therefore, it is likely that any space needs of these users could be met at other sites and buildings in other business areas in Seattle, if not in the Interbay neighborhood itself.

The relocation of the businesses is not likely to alter the commercial options to the local community. The market areas for these uses tend to draw from a large area that would extend beyond the immediate vicinity of the Interbay neighborhood. Local residents and businesses would have multiple options for upholstery and furniture businesses in Seattle and the greater
region, as would customers of simulated body parts for medical training. To the degree that the private gymnasium is used by local community members, the relocation of the gym could pose some impact on users, however, there are other public and private options available in the City of Seattle.

**Seattle South**

The warehouse on the Seattle South 0.77-acre site is currently used for storage of marine supplies and outboard motors. The warehouse on the site is 16,320 square feet in size. There are no known special site needs for this business at the site, and it is likely that the storage function can be accommodated in other locations around the City or region.

Locally, the Duwamish Valley has a large amount of warehouse space; there are 3,780,000 of warehouse building square feet within one mile of the current site. Current vacancy rate for industrial uses in general in the Seattle area is 6.89% (GVA Kidder Mathews, 2009 Quarter 2).

The impact to the local community from the loss of the storage space should be minimal. There is an abundance of warehouse space in the area that would be available to Sea-Way Marine, and the loss of the warehouse structure on the Seattle South site therefore is not likely to impact its customers.

**Shoreline**

Currently, the site is occupied by an unused school, however, the school yard and play fields on the site are used by the public on a formal and informal basis. If the site was selected, the community could lose an area that it is using as a park, for open space recreation, and scheduled recreational activities at the fields and gymnasium. The scheduled recreational activities would have to relocate to another facility in the area. However, the District has expressed intent to sell the property. If the property is not purchased by a public agency for recreational/open space uses, it could be sold to a private party with the potential displacement of the recreation and open space area possible under multiple scenarios without regard to the jail.

**Bellevue**

There are no known unique space needs for these businesses, and they should be able to operate their businesses at other locations with similar types of office space as they currently occupy. There is approximately 8 million square feet of office space within a half mile of the site. The 2009 office vacancy rate in downtown Bellevue is 12.1% and 14.7% in the overall Eastside suburban market (Cushman Wakefield, 2009 Quarter 1). This indicates that similar office space is relatively available in the area.

The loss of 70,754 square feet of office space in Downtown Bellevue should not have much if any impact on the area’s office market. The Lincoln Center Office Park represents 1.37% of the total office space within one mile of the site. Even more office space possibilities exist in other parts of Bellevue, Redmond, and Kirkland.

To the degree that the businesses on this site provide irreplaceable services to the local community, there could be a potential impact from relocation to outside the area. However, it is
likely that there are other options available in the area. Since there is an abundance of office space in the immediate area available for relocation, there is high likelihood that businesses at this site would be able to relocate in the area.

**Unincorporated King County**

Given the characteristics of the current site, Waste Management likely has specific criteria for a new site that may limit possible places for relocation. Specifically, the current site is 10.8 acres in size with office, warehouse, and storage uses. The site is also a fueling and maintenance station for Waste Management trucks. Based on information from Waste Management’s web site, the facility serves a broad (yet undefined) region of northern King County.

The specific site needs of the Waste Management facility are not known, but it can be assumed that relocation would require: 1) a site large enough to support Waste Management’s current operation, 2) a location that would allow the facility to serve its existing service area in an effective and efficient manner, and 3) that it have the appropriate zoning for the uses that are currently on the site.

This assessment evaluated sites that would meet these three basic criteria to see how many potential sites are available for relocation. Specific assumptions developed by BERK include limiting the range of potential sites to parcels within five miles (direct distance (e.g. “as the crow flies”)) of the current site to ensure the current area can be served efficiently. The site also had to be at least eight acres in size, and zoned for industrial uses to support the current facility. Lastly, redevelopment of site was not considered because of the uncertainties regarding the availability, relocation schedule, and redevelopment costs of using an already built site. As a result, the assessment takes a conservative approach and only considers vacant parcels that would be readily available for development.

The assessment identified four sites that met these requirements (expanding the search radius to ten miles could result in an additional eleven potential properties); however, three of these four sites have challenging site issues that may limit the effective building area, due to their narrow width and current use as parking for adjacent commercial and industrial uses.

As a result, only one site was determined to be readily available. The site is a 60 acre parcel in an industrial area south of NE Union Hill Road in Redmond. While classified as vacant industrial, the parcel does appear to be used by the Lehigh Cement Company for equipment and material storage.