

From: [Deborah Vinsel](#)
To: [Meghan Porter](#)
Cc: [Robin Courts](#)
Subject: Re: Courthouse video hours
Date: Tuesday, August 27, 2019 2:26:03 PM

That is correct. These hours are included in the current contract.

Deborah Vinsel, CEO

pronouns: she/her

Thurston Community Media
440 Yauger Way SW, Suite C
Olympia WA 98502
360.956.3100

On Tue, Aug 27, 2019 at 2:20 PM Meghan Porter <meghan.porter@co.thurston.wa.us> wrote:

Thank you for the information Deb.

Thurston County contracts with TCMedia for 1700 hours of production time, and as of today we have used approximately 1300 hours, including the 66-70 hours indicated below for the Courthouse projects. The hours used for these projects would not be considered at the over contract hours cost, as they are included in the contract.

Thanks,

Meghan Porter

Public Information Supervisor

Board of County Commissioners

2000 Lakeride Drive SW

Olympia, WA 98502

P: 360.867.2097

C: 360.490.0562

From: Deborah Vinsel <dvinsel@tcmedia.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 27, 2019 2:05 PM
To: Meghan Porter <meghan.porter@co.thurston.wa.us>

Subject: Courthouse video hours

We used 66-70 hours of staff time for the Courthouse Videos.

Our contract with the County says that we will charge \$50 per hour if you go over your 1700, so that would be a good number to use for the value.

So.. \$3300 - \$3500 dollar value of the time used.

Deborah Vinsel, CEO

pronouns: she/her

Thurston Community Media

440 Yauger Way SW, Suite C

Olympia WA 98502

360.956.3100



Thurston County Board of Commissioners Work Session Summary

Date of Work Session:	January 31, 2019
Time:	10:00
Office/Department:	Commissioners
Subject:	Courthouse Comprehensive Comparative Feasibility Briefing
Staff Contact/Author:	Rick Thomas
Attendees:	<p>Commissioners: John Hutchings & Gary Edwards</p> <p>Ramiro Chavez, Robin Campbell</p> <p>Other Staff: Rick Thomas, Patrick O'Connor, Tawni Sharp, Meghan Porter, Bryan Hanks, John Snaza, Steven Drew, Mary Hall, Maria Aponte, Pam Hartman-Beyer, Schelli Slaughter, Jon Tunheim, Sheriff John Snaza, Judge Brett Buckley, Judge Carol Murphy, Jeff Gadman, Nathaniel Jones, Mark Renfro, Keith Stahley, other City and County employees TAS – Ron Thomas Doug Mah & Associates – Doug Mah</p>
Discussion Points:	<p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commissioner Hutchings led introductions around the table. • <i>Expectations for Meeting (Ramiro Chavez)</i> <p>Ramiro Chavez explained the hard work that lies ahead. Need to be strategic and on the same page with communicating the message. Take time and talk about it. Rick will walk through next steps. August 2019 is target for ballot. Have a bigger conversation about that piece.</p> <p>Commissioner John Hutchings encouraged the group to think positively about the obstacles ahead.</p> <p>Communication & Outreach</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Review latest Talking Points (Rick Thomas/Meghan Porter)</i> <p>Rick mentioned his role as a basketball coach, using the analogy that practice is over and the game has started. Time to come together as a</p>

team. Everyone does their part. As a project manager, he can coordinate and facilitate. Four months to get information together. He reviewed the Talking Points document.

Ramiro said the group needs to develop talking points to elected officials. Current one doesn't describe what project is all about. Need energy behind communicating to community. Zero in on outreach focusing on what facts are important to citizens.

Judge Buckley indicated that the elected official need to give input on their specific needs and how improved by the new courthouse. He wanted to know if all the commissioners would support the new courthouse, despite not total agreement on the site selection. A consistent message is key. Commissioner Hutchings said they all support a new courthouse.

Mary Hall stated that there are 3 overarching points: it's expensive here, we need to provide better services and community benefits. Jeff Gadman echoed Mary's 3 core point philosophy. Courthouse and civic center project asks people to vote in an increased financial tax burden. Need to be able to provide the facts so that the citizens can understand the value. Vast majority of people don't care about court security. The citizens want better, more efficient services and saving money long term. Commissioner Tye Menser said he was nervous about high level talking points. Inspiring people with intangibles doesn't work. Can talk about District Court operating in half the space they need. Going to grow by 40% over next 20 years and can't renovate. County has obligation to provide basic government operations and these buildings can't do it. Can supplement main points with saving money, etc. Jeff said it goes along with his point. Population growing fast and will soon need another Superior Court judge. No space for them. Commissioner Menser said it still seemed too high level and ignored specific points.

Nathaniel Jones stated Olympia is anxious to get on the team, but not there yet. Still resolving financial feasibility. Appreciated Rick Thomas and Ron Thomas giving their input. Recognize the opportunity to revitalize the City. Acknowledge and appreciate the

County's interest. Shouldn't take long for Olympia to join but still working on complete understanding of the ballot deadline. Need feedback. Ramiro encouraged Commissioner Menser to address Nathaniel's concern. Commissioner Menser said the voting public in primary is different than the general election. The August election will feature citizens who choose to vote, more invested in community. MRSC's website has information showing property tax initiatives, etc. are more likely to pass then. Timeline compression seems negative but the pros outweigh the cons.

Judge Murphy moved the discussion back to talking points. Talking points similar. Everyone saying the same thing. Judges Buckley and Murphy have spoken to public for many years and talking points evolved. Gets better and better over time. Experienced people add to it. Mary wondered if a PowerPoint would help. Line out benefits for each elected office, with some overarching benefits. Going to be a smorgasbord. Each office knows their citizenry best. Ramiro liked the idea of individual offices offering their perspective and then overarching for County-wide benefits. Judge Buckley said all the County offices need a new courthouse. Also talk space and security. Huge benefit to downtown Olympia and co-locating services. Saving money, too.

Ramiro said Meghan Porter has taken copious notes and will be sending them out to the group for feedback. Distill the key messages to two or three points. Comments due back by the end of the week. Judge Murphy reiterated that conversations will happen regularly, organically, even before talking points are finalized. She will work with Meghan. Robin Campbell asked what Judge Murphy's top 3 points are. Judge Murphy said efficient use of resources, which includes potential liability and safety issues. Lack of space highlights inefficiency. Benefit to the community in that it saves money. County's obligation to provide adequate and safe facilities. Judge Buckley said the need existed since 2004. Cost continues to rise. If ballot rejected, only cost more in future. Mentioned the leaky roof directly over the probation director in Building 3. Too expensive to patch. Moving the air handler will cause it to fall apart. Public would understand it. Have to get something to replace it.

Doug Mah spoke and reminded the group of the involvement of Public Disclosure Commission. Using public resources in campaigns and how frame it. Judicial tenets fall into place. Ballot measures passed on 2 things. Public trust and accountability of organization is one. Second is meaningful, measurable, demonstrable things. Most successful ballot measures go back to response time for fire or routes for intercity transit. Meaningful, "what's in it for me?" items. Voting for more or less of something. Leads to next point around rules and process matter. Cannot drop ball on process and procedures. Also, actions matter as elected. What you do and what don't do count. Very clear things you can and cannot do. People vote for or against something. Trick not to give them a reason to vote against it for lack of transparency or a misstep. Consider what County can issue informationally. What private group can do for advocacy. But go back to 2004. Put Proposition 1 on ballot. Regional justice center cost \$88 million. Needed bonds. Four bullet points around jail at the time. Jail not safe. No vacancy, no accountability. More expensive to put off. Safety comes first. Cited location and number of beds. Final vote was 39% for, 61% against. In 2007 sales and use tax for criminal justice at 3/10 of one percent. Municipalities received funds, too. Failed at 65% no, 35% for. Making sure stick in lane around PDC and transparency and accountability. Also, how position these types of messages to community. All talking about issues. Echo chamber in here. Most individuals who participated in the earlier public meetings are already a vested stakeholder, a resident, employee or business in area and aware of issues and outcomes. Concern is average person doesn't know a whole lot about the specifics of this project. Successful ballot measures all done as part of overall planning process. Outreach levels were around sites, not support per se. Commissioner Hutchings asked about the previous ballot measure statistics. Doug said the sales tax was a 2007 general election. The regional justice center was a May 2004 special election, standalone. Doug was on the City Council at the time. Broad support across jurisdictions and didn't even come close. Need to articulate how average person can benefit, because they don't usually come here. Messaging concise and clear. Realize competing against messaging from others.

Jon Tunheim agreed with Doug. Can talk about messaging but needs to be based on facts - goals, benefits, needs. Focus on own messaging. Stay factual. Move away from political strategy. Doug said the Prosecutor had the right idea. Factual information, timing,

amount location, all the details. Trust the process that conversations will be held outside the courthouse. Next step is Commissioners issue a fact sheet. Another group outside this arena can have different meetings around how message conveyed for outreach purposes. Ron Thomas mentioned the Talking Points don't include study input. He asked if the group could agree on needs and talking points for the informational flier. Doug said yes. Highlight the needs. Problem is with benefits. Can't sound like persuasive arguments. Auditor's Office can talk about increasing space for more customer service counter staff, reducing wait time. Pass a resolution to place measure on the ballot and make sure it says the right things.

Ron Thomas invited Keith Stahley to talk about the ballot process for the City of Olympia. Keith said the City hired a company to put out a survey before February 2018 vote. Took a month. Consultant called 390 residents and put out a direct mail to random sampling for an online survey with a login. Increased participation. Stayed in contact through focus groups. Sought public interest in public safety and housing. Went into votes with high degree of confidence and understanding. Distributed copies of information sheet to all the households. All on point with survey documents, like Doug said. Not advocacy. Rick suggested collecting key service elements to the community, specifically from each elected. Renderings tell a good story for public to digest. Put it together in a packet.

Rick opened it up for brainstorming from attendees. Commissioner Hutchings suggested parking for public and campus navigation as two immediate fixes. Pam Hartman-Beyer said jurors lack a waiting area. Shuttle them between Buildings 2 and 3. Often wait in hallways, on floors. No vending machines. Risk of mistrials as mix in with all populations. They eat lunch at the tables meant for passport paperwork, leaving sticky residue behind. Cascading effect of space issues. Ron Thomas suggested self-serve kiosks. Mary said parking is a huge hassle around election time. Lines to vote take over Room 152. Often gets double booked with courts. Jeff Gadman would like a combined lobby for customer convenience. Customers need employee escorts here to find other offices or departments. Mary said vital records and health department should be in same space, not here and at Tilly Road.

Judge Murphy stated that in order to be an innovative government, we'd have to have capacity to do that. Hindered in this existing building. Can't do high tech things. Bandwidth issues due to cement floors. Could provide creative and better service, even to those who never visit. Rick said County has ability to draft the facilities perspective on aging buildings. Need to come up with visuals of new experience vs. old. Commissioner Hutchings said one stop for services is unclogging the pipe that is service now.

Robin asked about what should go in the pictorial flier besides fact sheet. Mary said a roving photographer would be great to capture current state, especially jury pools. Judge Buckley said photos during the last power outage would show how it paralyzed employees. Video the roof leaking onto probation director's head. Meghan said video script is almost finalized. Ramiro said need to include services now and in the future. Jeff said campus access is huge. Lost one of two routes in the earthquake and the hill route when it's closed due to ice. The County can promote the co-located courts. Public often confused about which court they belong in. Nathaniel said longevity, cost sharing and dynamic scheduling are all benefits.

Judge Buckley asked Doug about how to include points on civic pride and government complex. A lot of public feedback is negative on these buildings, including that buildings have no majesty to them, no grandness. Offenders don't take court seriously. Continue to offend. Doug said didn't rise high on outreach. Public can use it for meetings and it's a welcoming space. Also, talk about these buildings being modern in 1978, before ADA existed. What did a regular cubicle look like? No computers. Shared terminals then. What has occurred between 1980 and 2020? Expect LTE in middle of building, whether working or visiting. Expect electrical car charging stations. Society has changed. Aging population and ADA, improving general access. Talk about improving safety without saying it's unsafe now. Addresses civic pride. Contemporary space to meet efficiency and effectiveness expectancy. Judge Buckley thought news clips from the past could work, next to today, crammed into spaces. Jon said could include images of houses and cars, too. Commissioner Hutchings said public's demands have changed as well. Ron said could project out to

2050 and potential population.

Nathaniel said he appreciated Doug's wisdom. Trust issue is primary on ballot measures. Results from past measures were pathetic. Bringing Olympia to table adds credibility as combined in effort. County has huge track record to overcome. Not sure discussion we had today brings to that point. Tell story of facts. Public trust hurdle. Done in different setting. Not realistic if don't acknowledge failures of past and build something resilient. Judge Buckley encouraged all the elected to get out and put on a face on it to generate community trust. Rick asked for members of a mini committee to figure out the financial piece. Robin said it was time to bring in bond counsel and an advisor. Rick pointed out a couple of items in the packet. High-level milestone list is draft. Idea as to how proceed could work through construction docs. Will review another time.

Ramiro reiterated that Meghan send out what she heard today. Get finalized by next week. Provide feedback to her ASAP. Finalizing next phase of contract with TAS. Include Ron available as technical advisor when talk to community. Consider financial subcommittee and ballot drafting to go hand in hand. Finances leads to how draft language.

Rick Thomas mentioned setting reoccurring meetings at once a month. Jon suggested meeting at the elected officials' monthly lunch, extending it to 90 minutes. Helps court's scheduling. Judge Murphy advocated immediately telling the public about meetings going forward. Media has been notified, and the project website is live, too. Ramiro wanted directors included in meetings, too.

Next Steps

Milestone Schedule (Rick Thomas)

I certify this is a true and correct copy of the original document maintained in the Office of the Board of Thurston County Commissioners.

ATTEST:

LaBonita I. Bowmar, Clerk of the Board

Date: _____



Thurston County Board of Commissioners Work Session Summary

Date of Work Session:	February 20, 2019
Time:	9:30-10:00 a.m.
Office/Department:	PW
Subject:	Mullen Road Project Communication Plan
Staff Contact/Author:	Name/Title: Jennifer Walker/Director (x2271), Scott Lindblom/County Engineer (x2329), Matt Unzelman/Sr. Civil Engineer (x2335), April Leigh/Communication & Outreach Coordinator (x2375)
Attendees:	Commissioners Present: Tye Menser, Vicki Larkin for Gary Edwards, Kelli Lee for John Hutchings County Manager: Ramiro Chavez Other Staff: Meghan Porter, Ruth Pierce
Discussion Points:	<p>BLUF: Jennifer Walker identified this briefing as an information only follow-up to a November 1, 2018 briefing where Public Works (PW) provided project management/delivery system information on the Mullen Road Project and the BoCC requested a future briefing on the communication plan for this significant project. Staff will provide the status of this project. Jennifer introduced April Leigh, Communication & Outreach Coordinator in the Office of the County Engineer and Matt Unzelman, project manager.</p> <p>Matt provided project background: the Mullen Road project runs from Timberline High School to 500 ft. past Carpenter Road. Mullen Road is currently a two-lane roadway with no street lighting, no bicycle lanes and very limited shoulders; which is significant because there are three schools within the project limits (Timberline High School, Lakes Elementary, and Woodland Elementary), as well as two preschools. Deep dirt paths have been created by the volume of children walking to these schools and the situation before and after school hours is chaotic. Federal money was awarded to this project because of several high-profile pedestrian/vehicle collisions. The planned improvements include bike lanes and sidewalks throughout the entire project limits, and a roundabout at the intersection of Mullen Rd and Carpenter Rd. The current estimated construction cost is just over \$8 million to be paid with a combination of state and federal grants, local funding, and over \$3 million from City of Lacey (Lacey). Lacey is a partner in this project because there is water and sewer going throughout the project limits owned by the City. A frequent question is whether the County will require people who live adjacent to the project connect to water and sewer; the answer is no, the County will place service connection boxes in front of properties. This will allow residents to connect to water and sewer at a later date by contacting Lacey.</p> <p>Commissioner Menser asked if these will be new water and sewer lines. Matt said Lacey has step systems for some of the neighborhoods but there is not a continuous water or sewer main going all the way through the project. Lacey wants to use the project as an opportunity to replace their facilities throughout the project. West of Glen Terra Dr. there's an un-named creek flowing into Pattison Lake where we will be upsizing a 4-ft. culvert to a 10-ft. box culvert. The water and sewer aspect is very important in this area</p>

due to the proximity of the drain fields to Pattison Lake.

There are no good detour routes to use during construction of this project. The only detour would be Marvin Rd to Yelm Highway and back to Ruddell Rd. These would be 15-minute detours during construction. This route is currently used by more than 10,000 vehicles per day. During construction hours, one of the two existing lanes will have to be closed, meaning 10,000 vehicles using a single lane of alternating traffic. The communication strategy is about how we will address all of the stakeholders in this project and what we can do to minimize delays. Staff is currently working on procuring a consultant to review our construction documents to help determine strategies we may have missed in minimizing delays.

Commissioner Menser how long the project will take. Matt said it will take two years because of clearing and grubbing and the fact there are as many as twelve utilities to relocate (PSE, AT&T, Century Link, Comcast, City of Lacey water & sewer, etc.) before work can begin.

Ramiro Chavez asked if staff plan on closing the road. Matt said no, they plan on doing construction staging and contract specifications will state the contractor is not allowed to close the road and must have a minimum of one lane of traffic open during the day and two lanes of traffic open at the end of the work day. Staff plan to work with the consultant to incentivize the contract for early completion and minimizing of daily delays.

The project is on track to be advertised fall, 2019.

Vicki Larkin asked Matt how this project timeline compares to the completed Yelm Highway project. Matt said it's very similar. The Yelm Hwy construction cost was approximately \$10.5 million because the project had more lanes than Mullen Road has. It was an easier project construction-wise because there was much more right of way to work in, allowing both lanes to be open most of the time. On Mullen Road, the houses are very close together and are either way above or way below the road, allowing no room to work.

April pointed out this briefing is about the pre-construction communication strategy – before the first shovel hits the ground.

Keys to effectiveness in getting our information out to the public who use this road are:

- Identify and work with key stakeholders on messaging and through their channels of communication. Starting in April, begin initial meetings with these stakeholders, including the City of Lacey, North Thurston School District, Intercity Transit, and garbage and postal service providers – to begin letting them know what will be happening with the project. She will look for information such as when their newsletters go out.
- General public information strategy: there's a small budget for "ad-buy" information for this project, including social media, local newspapers, possible radio public service announcements – to be implemented closer to the project groundbreaking (currently scheduled for January 1, 2020).
- Her research showed the most effective form of communication for projects of this size is early signage at the site with information including size of project, length of project, and community partners. This is a good way for residents to understand what's going to happen on their roadway and how much the project will cost. April cited WSDOT project signs as an example and what PW will model their signs on.
- As we enter the construction phase of the project, staff will review the

preconstruction communication plan, using lessons learned from its implementation to refine it as a construction phase communication plan.

Matt said with Lacey as essentially a partner in this project, we need to put together an interagency agreement outlining project and long-term maintenance responsibilities. Upon review of the agreement by County and City legal, PW will submit an AIS to obtain BoCC signature in early spring. In early summer PW will be seeking BoCC approval for our Director to execute the funding agreements for the project as well as another AIS seeking authorization for the County Engineer to open sealed bids.

Commissioner Menser asked if there are any anticipated issues in working out the specific interagency agreement details with Lacey. Matt said Lacey has been very cooperative regarding this project; usually the issues with this type of project involve long-term maintenance commitments. Lacey has already verbally agreed to do a lot of the maintenance of our landscaping. The County historically has not maintained the landscaping with a lot of irrigation and plantings other than hydroseed or grass. Jennifer pointed out this project is in the UGA (unincorporated). Commissioner Menser asked for confirmation this area at some point will be an annexation target. Matt agreed it was likely. Ramiro asked if Lacey will maintain the landscaping at our cost. Matt said the details are being worked out; he believes they want to trade some maintenance responsibilities. In response to a question from Vicki, Matt confirmed Lacey already maintains the portion going on the other side of Ruddell Rd over to College St. A few years ago, Lacey completed the project from the other side of Ruddell Rd to where our project starts. They currently own the Carpenter Rd leg of the proposed roundabout.

Vicki asked if we do traffic counts for what comes in off Marvin Rd and traffic coming in from the Lk Saint Clair area heading into Lacey. Matt confirmed staff have done so and said once the project starts, they anticipate drivers cutting through other neighborhoods to avoid the project traffic issues. In anticipation of this happening, staff have gone into these neighborhoods and collected baseline count data so once construction starts, staff can conduct new counts to verify there's an increase in traffic through these areas. The Traffic Engineer, Scott Davis will be conducting outreach to determine what Traffic can possibly do as far as interim traffic measures to deter traffic from cutting through these neighborhoods.

Ramiro stressed no matter how great our communication plan is, staff must be prepared for handling a high volume of calls from the public and we will need someone to provide consistent information. Frustration will arise after 6 months and we need to prepare ahead of time to deal with inevitable damage to the neighborhood since it's very unlikely we can stop drivers from cutting through. Jennifer said staff is currently looking at managing expectations, understanding there will be impacts. Commissioner Menser suggested a one-page FAQ sheet instead of just a postcard. April said there will be talking points as well as questions and answers – all accessible online or by phone. Vicki said during the Yelm Highway project, the up-to-date, daily information on work status and potential delays on the PW website was extremely helpful in alleviating the public's frustration with the project. Scott Lindblom pointed out our social media outreach efforts are much more robust in the last few years.

Matt said many of the roads in the project area are older, chipsealed roads which will be impacted by high volume and heavier traffic.

Ramiro said another thing to consider is including incentives in the project contract, for the contractor to finish the work ahead of time. Scott said staff

has been working with one of our "On-Call" consultants to help us look at incentives for the contractor to finish the work more quickly and improve staging, realizing this project will have a huge impact with 10,000 vehicles per day. The daily cost of the detour for the L4 bridge a few years ago was huge. Jennifer referenced the I5 Interchange work at Marvin Rd. Matt said the developer has the Marvin and Mullen project, which is literally the next intersection over, scheduled for 2020.

Vicki asked what the expected ground-breaking date is and April said January 1, 2020. Jennifer explained the date would be for the initial clearing and grubbing, followed by the utilities. Matt said staff is adding up timelines and working with the utilities to determine when utility work will begin. He said the issue with the utilities is they don't like to work together and each want the whole project site to themselves. PW staff are working on ways to encourage them to work together at the same time. Another issue is each utility company has their own traffic control which PW must manage.

In response to a question from Vicki, Matt said there has been one total property acquisition needed for the project – a rental property. The paperwork has been signed and we have nearly completed the remaining facility removal on-site. 34 properties have been acquired with 33 closed and secured in less than a year's time, with no condemnations. The last of the 34 properties is in process with the North Thurston School District.

Tye Menser asked if there is anything new or different from recent projects as far as the communication strategy for this project. April said early placing of uniform signage at the construction site is a new initiative as well as a message of partnership. Matt said that most of PW projects are on much less traveled roadways in the county. April said we modeled our communication strategies after federal highway administrations communication strategies for construction. She is looking at the possibility of radio public service announcements and working on making PW web pages more user friendly in search engine optimization (80% of web traffic) and mobile (60% of web traffic). The public should be able to google the name of a project and bring up the web page. In addition, April is looking at an optimized social media strategy to get project information out to the public. Ramiro suggested a Thurston County media piece and looking at buying a one page in the Olympian. He said most of the phone calls from the public are related to utility relocation. Staff need to look at franchise agreements; it's critical we don't have these agreements with all utilities.

Vicki asked if PSE plans to place phone lines underground. Matt said this is a common question, with many believing the county can dictate this which is only true if we pay PSE to place them underground. Matt said Lacey went underground in one of their previous projects (to the project limits) but don't want to do so in a county project.

Ramiro pointed out the short-term pain – long term benefit of this project. Scott said on dark, rainy mornings, it's disheartening to see the large number of students walking in the rutted trails to school and to hear that many parents are concerned about letting their children walk or ride their bikes to school. Ramiro said that of the 10,000 daily vehicles using the road, 50% are from the local neighborhoods. We likely won't receive much negative feedback from them about the project; it will be the other 50% who use the road as a connection.

In response to a question from Vicki Larkin, April said that informational open houses are definitely part of the communication plan.

	<p>Ramiro pointed out that a strategy used by the WSDOT is to overestimate construction related delays. April said Jennifer has stressed the importance of managing public expectations for the project.</p> <p>Matt asked if staff will have opportunities at future BoCC meetings to talk about this project. Ramiro said he would encourage staff to do so.</p>
Results/Board Direction:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•



Thurston County Board of Commissioners Work Session Summary

Date of Work Session:	February 20, 2019
Time:	2:00-3:00 PM
Office/Department:	Community Planning & Economic Development
Subject:	Habitat Conservation Plan – Introduction and Background
Staff Contact/Author:	Name/Title: Christina Chaput Phone: Ext. 5486
Attendees:	Commissioners Present: Hutchings, Edwards, Menser
Attendees:	County Manager: Ramiro Chavez
Attendees:	Other Staff: Robin Campbell, Joshua Cummings, Cynthia Wilson, Andrew Deffobis, Brad Murphy, Travis Burns, Vince McDowell, Meghan Porter
Discussion Points:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dir. Cummings provided framing for briefing: to provide information about the history and present status of, and future tasks for, HCP development. • Christina Chaput presented information about federal species listings, the timeline of HCP development, elements of an HCP, and benefits to citizens. • She also discussed current status, next steps and schedule. At the current pace, the HCP could be implemented at the end of 2020/beginning of 2021. • Dir. Cummings stated the Board provided guidance in 2018 that the HCP should include 'all species, all activities' included in the draft at that time. • Question, Comm. Hutchings: If a currently non-listed covered species becomes listed during the HCP, the county already has coverage for that species? • Answer: Yes, that is the intent behind considering species that may become listed during the HCP 30-year permit term. Staff are having technical discussions with consultants and USFWS regarding the current proposed covered species and if any changes should be made. • The species guild concept was discussed. Species with similar habitat needs were grouped together in the HCP. USFWS has advised the County that there are changes to how they review HCPs. This led to pulling the guilds apart, and looking at impacts to each species. This provided an opportunity to use the most up-to-date species information. • Dir. Cummings stated that staff will bring a more detailed discussion of covered species back to the Board in the future. • Management is also discussing the 10% methodology with USFWS managers. The County has asked for written comments. This discussion will also come back to the Board. • Question, Comm. Menser: The gopher gets a lot of attention. How do other species fit in? Does it make sense to include other species if their habitats overlap?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answer: Impacts to each species must be quantified, which involves considering whether impacts actually overlap habitat for all proposed species. The various species also have differing needs and therefore different mitigation and habitat restoration requirements, so this must also be considered. • Frequency of gopher detection was discussed. Comm. Edwards recalled gophers were found on 1% of sites visited by staff during land use review. Permit data indicates that approximately 10% of submitted permits actually require review. Approximately 10% of those are found to be occupied (or approx. 1% of permits submitted). • County Manager Chavez: USFWS may believe that by using the 10% methodology, the County could run out of take before the end of the HCP permit term. • Question, Comm. Menser: Do we have to mitigate only for occupied habitat, or for all potential habitat? • Answer County Manager Chaves: This question is central to the current discussions. The population of gophers is not known; the conversation has focused on habitat. • Dir. Cummings stated that draft recovery plans have been developed by USFWS for all three gopher subspecies in Thurston County. They are under review and should be published in the coming weeks or months.
<p>Results/Board Direction:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue technical and management discussions with USFWS. • Return to Board with updates.



Thurston County Board of Commissioners Working Session Meeting Minutes by Rick Thomas

Date:	February 20, 2019
Time:	12N
Office/Department:	Office of the County Commissioners
Subject:	Courthouse & Regional Administrative Buildings project
Staff Contact/Author:	Name/Title: Rick Thomas / Project Coordinator Phone: ext 2986
Attendees:	<p>Commissioners Present: John Hutchings, Gary Edwards, Tye Menser</p> <p>County Manager: Ramiro Chavez</p> <p>Asst. County Manager: Robin Campbell</p> <p>Other Staff: Meghan Porter, Elizabeth Petrich</p> <p>Observing: City of Olympia, TC Elected Officials, TC Bar Association, Duncan Brown, Nancy Neraas</p>
Discussion Points:	<p>Public Disclosure Guidelines Elizabeth Petrich distributed a packet of information regarding Public Disclosure Guidelines for Local Government Officials and Employees. These documents are included as reference documents attached to these meeting minutes.</p> <p>Communication / Outreach Plan Elway Research will be coordinating and managing a citizen’s questionnaire survey to help determine areas of factual information needed to focused on. The survey will include about 30 questions and will be administered by Elway Research. It is anticipated that 500 – 600 county residents will be contacted via telephone or on-line. The initial report is planned to be published during the first week of April.</p> <p>No further refinements will be made to the draft Key Messages and Talking Points documents. A project informational video will also be produced this Spring.</p> <p>Thomas Architecture Studios (TAS) is researching additional factual information regarding the selected Plum Street site. This information will be used to create a project Fact Sheet that will be mailed to all the residents in County. The City of Olympia provided two examples of fact sheets from recent projects that will be used as a template.</p> <p>The County Manager made a recommendation that the title for the ballot measure should be “Courthouse and Regional Administrative Buildings”. This was accepted by all parties.</p> <p>Finance / Project Budget The County Manager reviewed the Levy Lid Lift analysis that was developed by PFM in February 2018. There was one incorrect assumption used in the 2018 analysis, so an updated analysis will be conducted to test the actual present conditions.</p> <p>Next Steps Establish the LLL ballot measure writing team.</p>

**PUBLIC DISCLOSURE GUIDELINES¹ FOR LOCAL
GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS AND EMPLOYEES**

**BASIC PRINCIPLES REGARDING USE OF PUBLIC RESOURCES
IN CAMPAIGNS – PROHIBITIONS AND EXCEPTIONS**

1. The Public Disclosure Commission holds that it is not only the right, but the responsibility of local government to inform the general public of the operational and maintenance issues facing local agencies. This includes informing the community of the needs of the agency that the community may not realize exist. **Local governments may expend funds for this purpose provided that the preparation and distribution of information is not for the purpose of influencing the outcome of an election.**

2. The PDC will presume that every agency may distribute throughout its jurisdiction an objective and fair presentation of the facts for each ballot measure. Historically, the PDC has routinely advised and held that with respect to election- related publications, one jurisdiction-wide objective and fair presentation of the facts per ballot measure is appropriate

If the agency distributes more than this jurisdiction-wide single publication, the agency must be able to demonstrate to the PDC that this conduct is normal and regular for that agency. In other words, the agency must be able to demonstrate that for other major policy issues facing the government jurisdiction, the agency has customarily communicated with its residents in a manner similar to that undertaken for the ballot measure.

In addition, if an agency has also customarily distributed this information through means other than a jurisdiction-wide mailing (e.g. regularly scheduled newsletter, website, bilingual documents, or other format), that conduct has also been permitted under RCW 42.17A.555 so long as the activity has been normal and regular for the government agency.

3. The PDC is charged with enforcing RCW 42.17A.555. Among the factors considered are the normal and regular conduct and the timing, tone, and tenor of activities in relation to ballot measure elections. **As in any matter where intent is to be considered, hard and fast rules, which will be applicable to all situations, are difficult to establish.**

The combination of a number of activities into a coordinated campaign involving close coordination between agency activities and citizens' committee activities which closely resembles traditional election campaign activities and which is targeted at and/or occurs close in time to a ballot measure election is likely to draw close scrutiny and careful consideration by the PDC as to whether a violation has occurred.

4. Local elected officials are free to support agency ballot issues and engage in other political activities as long as such activities do not make use of government facilities, time or resources and do not either pressure or condone employees' use of agency facilities, time or resources to support ballot issues.

¹ Public Disclosure Interpretation No. 04-02, Amended May 22, 2013 regarding RCW 42.17A.555 (Use of public facilities in campaigns –Prohibitions-Exceptions). https://www.pdc.wa.gov/sites/default/files/04-02Revised052213.rev_.pdf

PUBLIC DISCLOSURE GUIDELINES¹ FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS AND EMPLOYEES

PERMITTED ACTIVITIES REGARDING BALLOT MEASURES

- Agencies may distribute an objective and fair presentation of the facts regarding agency needs, including the accurate costs and other anticipated impact of a ballot measure, based on and expanded upon the information prepared by the agency in accordance with the normal and regular conduct² of the agency.
 - **Agencies need to be aware, however, that in no case will the PDC view a marketing or sales effort related to an election as normal and regular conduct.**
- Legislative bodies may vote to support or oppose a ballot measure at a properly noticed public meeting, where opponents of the measure are given an equal opportunity to express views.
 - Notice of public meeting must include the title and number of the ballot proposition.
- Elected Officials and public employees may respond to questions regarding a ballot measure if such activity is consistent with normal and regular duties.
- Elected Officials and public employees may speak at community forums and clubs to present factual and objective information on a ballot measure during regular work hours.
 - An elected official may use his or her title, but should clarify that he/she is speaking on his/her own behalf, and not on behalf of the agency.
 - If the elected legislative body has adopted a resolution to place a ballot measure on the upcoming election, the official can then speak on behalf of the agency.
- Elected Officials and public employees are encouraged to communicate to staff the difference between acceptable and unacceptable activities related to a ballot measure.
- Elected Officials and public employees may encourage staff and members of the public to vote, as long as such encouragement routinely occurs for other elections.
- Elected Officials and public employees may fully participate in campaign activities, including meeting with citizens' campaign committees to plan strategies, during non-work hours and without the use of public resources.
- Agency administrators and employees may inform staff during non-work hours of opportunities to participate in campaign activities.
- Elected Officials and public employees may wear campaign buttons or similar items while on the job if the agency's policy generally permits employees to wear political buttons.

¹ Public Disclosure Interpretation No. 04-02, Amended May 22, 2013 regarding RCW 42.17A.555 (Use of public facilities in campaigns –Prohibitions-Exceptions). https://www.pdc.wa.gov/sites/default/files/04-02Revised052213.rev_.pdf

² WAC 390-05-273 (definition of normal and regular conduct).

**PUBLIC DISCLOSURE GUIDELINES¹ FOR LOCAL
GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS AND EMPLOYEES**

PROHIBITED ACTIVITIES REGARDING BALLOT MEASURES

- Shall not pressure or coerce employees to participate in campaign activities.
- Shall not use internal memoranda solely for the purpose of informing employees of meetings supporting or opposing ballot measures.
- Shall not coordinate informational activities with campaign efforts, in a manner that makes the agency appear to be supporting or opposing a ballot measure.
- Shall not use public resources to operate a speakers' bureau in a manner that may be viewed as promoting a ballot measure.
- Shall not direct agency staff to perform tasks to support or oppose campaign activities or ballot measures.
- Shall not use public facilities or resources to engage in political activities.
- Shall not use agency resources to organize the distribution of campaign materials.

¹ Public Disclosure Interpretation No. 04-02, Amended May 22, 2013 regarding RCW 42.17A.555 (Use of public facilities in campaigns –Prohibitions-Exceptions). https://www.pdc.wa.gov/sites/default/files/04-02Revised052213_rev_.pdf

**PUBLIC DISCLOSURE GUIDELINES¹ FOR LOCAL
GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS AND EMPLOYEES**

**PERMITTED AND PROHIBITED ACTIVITIES
REGARDING SURVEYS AND RESEARCH**

Permitted Activities:

- Agencies may conduct surveys and/or other community research, including demographic questions, to determine the community's priorities, public perception of performance, and/or to inform the community about agency programs and policies.
- Agencies may conduct community research (including but not limited to the use of questionnaires, surveys, workshops, focus groups, and forums) to determine the community's priorities for both programs and/or facilities and their associated total costs and projected dollars per thousand assessment.
- The surveys and/or other community research can be conducted before or after the governing body has approved a resolution to place a ballot measure on the ballot. However, research conducted after the adoption of the resolution may be subject to greater scrutiny.
- Agencies may publish survey results if it is consistent with the normal and regular conduct of the agency

Prohibited Activities:

- Agencies shall not conduct surveys to determine what taxation level the public would support.
- Agencies shall not conduct surveys designated to shore up support or opposition for a ballot measure.
- Agencies shall not target registered voters or other specific subgroups of the jurisdiction in conducting their election-related surveys.
- Agencies shall not use survey results in a manner designed to support or oppose a candidate or ballot measure.

General Considerations:

- Has the elected legislative body passed a resolution authorizing a measure to be placed on the ballot? (If so, actions may be more closely scrutinized.)
- Does the election-related survey target specific subgroups?
- Is the survey or community research consistent with normal and regular activities of the agency?

¹ Public Disclosure Interpretation No. 04-02, Amended May 22, 2013 regarding RCW 42.17A.555 (Use of public facilities in campaigns Prohibitions-Exceptions). <https://www.pdc.wa.gov/sites/default/files/04-02Revised052213.rev.pdf>

I certify this is a true and correct copy of the original document maintained in the Office of the Board of Thurston County Commissioners.

ATTEST:

LaBonita I. Bowman, Clerk of the Board

Date: _____



Thurston County Board of Commissioners Work Session Summary

Date of Work Session:	March 20, 2019
Time:	9:00 – 9:30 am
Office/Department:	Community Planning and Economic Development
Subject:	Western Washington Phase II Municipal Stormwater Permit Annual Report
Staff Contact/Author:	Name/Title: Polly Stoker / Admin Asst Phone: x5473
Attendees:	Commissioners Present: John Hutchings, Tye Menser
	County Manager: Ramiro Chavez; Asst. County Manager: Robin Campbell
	Staff: Joshua Cummings; Larry Schaffner
Discussion Points:	<p>Information only briefing reviewing the progress made during the 2018 calendar year in complying with the obligations contained in the Municipal Stormwater Permit (Permit). The Permit requires submittal of an annual progress report to the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) by 3/31/19.</p> <p>As a refresher, the Permit conditionally allows the County to discharge stormwater from County owned or operated storm sewer systems within the geographic scope of the Permit.</p> <p>The compilation of the annual progress report involved numerous County departments: Public Works, Central Services, PHSS, IT, and CPED. This year, upwards of 15 staff worked together to gather information for this report.</p> <p>The report involved responding to 79 questions of different types. This includes providing an updated <i>Stormwater Management Program Plan</i>. Draft revisions to that Plan were reviewed by an internal stormwater staff team and the Storm & Surface Water Advisory Board. The Plan's program components include education and outreach (including stewardship opportunities), public involvement and participation, illicit discharge detection & elimination (e.g., spills), controlling runoff from development and construction sites (i.e., the County's drainage manual), operations & maintenance, and tasks in Total Maximum Daily Load water cleanup plans. To comply with the monitoring & assessment requirements, the County pays ~\$36K annually to support the Permit's regional monitoring program.</p> <p>Q: Comm. Hutchings: We are adhering to state & federal requirements, which includes a money contribution element. Is Ecology collecting data for comparison purposes? A: Ecology created a standardized report mechanism that allows them to do comparisons among permittee, so yes. This provides a feedback loop to help Ecology identify compliance challenges and program gaps which they, in turn, can use to inform revisions and refinements to consider in reissuing Permits.</p> <p>Q: Asst. County Manager Campbell: What kind of things have they found? A: An example would be disparities between well-resource vs. under-resourced jurisdictions given underlying economic conditions. To a certain extent, such differences are reflected in Permit requirements and compliance timelines.</p>

Ecology also has required more documentation to demonstrate compliance.

Q: County Manager Chavez: Is standardizing the way Ecology views permittees realistic based on the differences among Phase 1 and Phase 2 jurisdictions?

A: Yes, in that annual reporting questions between Phase 1 and 2 permittees reflect difference in regulatory obligations. Ecology only likely compares these permits where requirements overlap (i.e., are the same).

Q: Comm. Hutchings: The Phase II Permit covers over 80 cities and five counties, some are exempt?

A: Yes, permits coverage is triggered based on population and overall density. It generally applies to census-defined urbanized areas.

Q: Comm. Menser: This 85-page *Stormwater Management Program Plan* (SWMPP), it is submitted with the annual report?

A: Yes, the annual revision of the SWMPP is one of the narrative reporting pieces submitted. The content generally doesn't change much from year to year until new obligations emerge such as with the reissuance of the Permit. An example of a significant change we made over the years was to write the Plan in a way that was more accessible to laypeople.

Q: Comm. Menser: On the permit coverage map, why is half of Lacey under us?

A: Only the unincorporated portions (depicted as goldenrod) are included in the geographic scope of the County's Permit. Also, it's important to recognized that the boundaries change with annexations. Annually, we have to report these changes to Ecology as part of our annual report.

Q: Comm. Hutchings; In the Permit compliance elements: \$36K to training?

A: The \$36K is for monitoring and assessment. The Permit stipulates you can participate in the Permit's regional monitoring program or do-it-yourself. Our preference would be to support our local monitoring efforts, but unfortunately, the "do-it-yourself" option was crafted to make that cost prohibitive.

Q: Comm. Hutchings: Do the other jurisdictions which report to Ecology also give them this feedback?

A: Yes, many other permittees with local monitoring programs have expressed this. Ecology's regional funding approach appeals to smaller jurisdictions where carrying out local monitoring programs on their own would be cost-prohibitive.

Q: Comm. Menser: What exactly are they monitoring?

A: The three regional monitoring program elements consists of: status and trends, program effectiveness, and source ID.

Q: Comm. Hutchings: So, the current brewery spill, are they monitoring the spill at the point of origin or all the way down?

A: Regional monitoring funds don't get used for that actually. The source ID program has used the money to develop a database that permittees will likely be required to use for annual reporting when the permit is reissued. The County has expressed our views on the Permit's monitoring approach, but strong forces exist to keep it the way it is. The County has expressed its views via the local Permittee caucus, in our public review draft permit comment submittal, and even through a conference presentation given jointly with an Ecology staff person who shares many of our views.

Joshua brought up in the past year a portion of Stormwater staff split off, yet CPED retained the Permit and the water planning folks. It's a big lift for CPED.

Larry mentioned we had one non-compliance instance this reporting period. This involved missing some deadlines in a Corrective Action Plan. However, by the end of the year, the County was back in full compliance.

Larry Schaffner stated staff relies on SSWAB to fulfill the need for increased opportunities for citizen engagement, a mandate in our Permit for public involvement. Examples: SSWAB provided valuable input to help revise the *Stormwater Management Program Plan* so it's more accessible in layman's terms. SSWAB has been helpful on the CFP process by assembling a subcommittee to review proposed projects. Recently, we have both staff and SSWAB members engaged in the exploration of performance metrics. The Permit's annual report sets performance measures and SSWAB is exploring if those same ones are valuable for their purposes too. Identifying performance metrics gives staff insight into what's valuable from our rate payers' perspective.

Joshua Cummings mentioned the reorg of Water Resources into Public Works. One of the downline impacts is SSWAB asking how they work. Larry is still engaged, but a lot of SSWAB's engagement involves Public Works staff. The concept of bringing in new citizen advisory members is a question being asked on behalf of all the boards and commissions.

Tim Wilson concurred with the importance of public involvement and sees this aspect as a major role of SSWAB. It is not a one-way street as many of its members are also involved in other boards as well (e.g., Long Lake, Shellfish Protection, and Nisqually River Council). I have had good conversations already with this group. Tim wanted to take a step back to manage expectations as a commissioner-appointed committee with how those roles are defined. We are starting the discussion for onboarding for new SSWAB members.

Tris Carlson shared SSWAB will not be reviewing CFP projects this year as no new projects are being proposed. Some of the interest involves getting a better effort out of the SSWAB in like of the reorg of Public Works and CPED. We will be a much more effective advisory board for the County since we have members with high level backgrounds in water, shell fish, etc. He would like to focus on performance metrics, the budget, asset protection, and SSWAB recruitment. He would like to have an "A-list" of 4-6 people waiting to get on the SSWAB. We will be very effective and be a great source of information.

Q Comm. Menser: When you reviewed the Plan, were there any hot topics?
A: Barbara Craven (previous Chair) really worked on this and her comments initiated the questions about education and outreach programs and their effectiveness. That discussion led to a broader program- and cost-effectiveness discussion. Now that topic has taken on a life of its own with SSWAB's interest in developing some key performance metrics over time. This in turn will allow SSWAB to report out to rate payers what utility fees are accomplishing.

Casey Kramer mentioned that the area of water resources is rapidly changing, technically and regulatory. It's in the news. Where are resources needed? Do we need more resources to handle all these upcoming changes? For example, with the reorg, Public Works engineers could help with projects in the CFP.

Joshua Cummings added the larger concept of water, and how it flows, finding what the outcomes are for each individual section are the same questions staff is asking.

Larry added, from a staff perspective, SSWAB has added new blood recently which has been positive and generated a better partnership and interaction with staff which is great. More so than in the past, where the interactions were largely information sharing. SSWAB wants to be more active in answering how can they support the County meet regulatory obligations and also help citizens. It's pretty exciting seeing citizens wanting to be an asset to staff and he appreciates this new energy.

County Manager Chavez stated he thinks it would be a good opportunity, considering the reorg, to have a briefing on the purpose and intent of how the Utility was formed so we can continue to meet that intent in moving forward in this new environment.

Q: Comm. Hutchings noted the connections SSWAB members have and has eight names of potential candidates he wrote down. Does SSWAB meet every other month? Do the cities have comparable boards? Is their cross-pollinating?
A: SSWAB meets every other month. It depends on the jurisdiction as to whether they have similar advisory boards. Tris said that was a question, if there are other boards, can we reach out to them to see what they are doing?

Q: Comm. Hutchings: Are we in contact with our tribal partners?
A: Phyllis Farrell is also on the Nisqually River Council, so that channel exists.

Phyllis Farrell invited all to attend April 2nd, at the Olympia Center, the League of Women Voters' forum on *Where's the Water: Stormwater & Toxic Runoff*.

- Results/Board Direction:**
- Have a briefing on the intent of the Stormwater Utility as requested by Ramiro.



Thurston County Board of Commissioners Work Session Summary

Date of Work Session:	March 20, 2019
Time:	2:00pm
Office/Department:	Community Planning and Economic Development
Subject:	Development Code Docket 2019
Staff Contact/Author:	Name/Title: Polly Stoker / Admin Asst Phone: 5473
Attendees:	Commissioners Present: Comm. Hutchings Hutchings, Comm. Menser Menser, Vickie Larkin for Gary Edwards
	County Manager: County Manager Chavez Chavez, Asst. County Manager: Robin Campbell
	Staff: Joshua Cummings, Cynthia Wilson, Jeremy Davis, Allison Osterberg, Robert Smith

Discussion Points:

This is a follow-up briefing to the overview on high priority amendments the BoCC would like to add and/or reprioritize on the current Development Code Preliminary Docket in order to finalize an Official Docket. Additionally, there will be a discussion on comments received on the citizen initiated request: A-17 Plat Extensions of Time – Title 18 Subdivisions.

Q Comm. Hutchings: How many items are pending, what is a doable list of items, and we can change them around?

The items finished by staff in the past year:
Marijuana Regulations
Title 18 Final Plat Process
Title 14 Building Code amended
Title 26 Sign Code and Code Enforcement chapter

Q County Manager Chavez: Where is the citizen initiative regarding Northpoint proposal request?

A: It is under the Comprehensive Plan amendment docket, not the development code docket.

Jeremy then reviewed the comments received during the 20 day public comment period which is now complete for citizen initiated proposed amendment - Title 18 Plat Time Extensions Platting and Subdivision. 4 comments received, 2 from the cities Tumwater & Lacey. They were concerned with prioritizing this item over the joint plans. 1 from OMB supporting the proposal. 1 from Heather Burgess on behalf of Ron Deering supporting the proposal.

Staff reviewed the draft scope for the proposed amendment, and specific changes that may be considered. Staff then reviewed current extension of time allowances in county code.

What do we have now: vested for 5 years, with one year extension, 3 one year extensions proposed. Or for larger ones: 200 lots or more where 50% have gone to

Q Comm. Menser: The other part questions is regarding what we learned at the Short Course on Planning session. Currently, there's a hearing examiner opportunity in the code. We would be removing that with this amendment?

A: We would be removing only the part we don't do anymore. The hearing examiner is not involved with other types of extensions of time for subdivisions.

Comm. Menser pointed out that information is not clear on the document provided.

A: Correct, this was a short synopsis of the issue and would be fully explained if approved to work on this code amendment. If the BoCC wants this prioritized on the docket, we would continue the public process.

Robert Smith added any staff decision is appealable to the hearing examiner and that appeal goes to the hearing examiner. This opportunity would not be going away in the proposal. If the hearing examiner decision is appealed, the case would then go before the BoCC.

The 2nd citizen initiative to amend Title 20 regarding Hobby Kennel regulations. The 3rd citizen initiative to amend Title 23, to change the zoning requirements in the Community Oriented Shopping District, which is also on the Comprehensive Plan docket amendments. The Board in 2018 decided to hold on this issue until it is reviewed during the Comprehensive Plan process and if added to the development code docket it would be on a dual track.

Q: Comm. Hutchings Olympia supported these last 3 citizen requested items?

A: Unknown at this time as these 3 requests haven't gone through the 20 day comment period.

Comm. Menser: He needs more information about the kennel issue if he is to make a decision on whether to prioritize or not.

A: The person requesting this would like less lenient regulations in regards to dog kennels. Jan Burns and Michael Burns have requested amendments for hobby kennels. Michael Burns proposal would be more lenient for private kennels used for personal use.

Q Comm. Menser: Big picture, are we identifying high priority items today?

A: Today we are discussing them only. These would all stay on the preliminary docket if not prioritized and would come back next spring for your review, noting the BoCC can make amendments anytime to the development code docket, unlike the Comprehensive Plan docket amendments.

Q Comm. Hutchings: What does "staffing level" mean?

A: It's the effort (in hours) to complete the task start to finish, which helps to develop a work plan for staff.

Q Vickie: With the hobby kennel item, when you talk about the time it takes, don't you also add information on whether or not staff believes there is an issue with our code that should be resolved?

A: Yes.

Q Comm. Menser: Of the 4 citizen requests, we only did the public comment for the first one?

A: Yes, as directed by the Board.

Staff then listed the high priority docket items currently being worked on: HCP, Comprehensive Plan update, SMP, Nisqually Sub-area, CRS, Emergency Homeless ordinance, Buildable Lands, and others. The yellow and green-coded items plus the one citizen amendment have already been identified as the Board's priorities and we would like to confirm those are still the top items for staff to work on.

Josh stated the staff available and complexity is used to determine how many items are worked on each year.

Q Comm. Hutchings: His goal is not to change priorities throughout the year, so if 5-6 works, let's keep it at that level.

A: We make efficiencies where we can. The public process takes 4-6 months per item.

Q County Manager Chavez: On the yellow and green-coded items, staff would like to keep working on those, and include the number one citizen initiative?

A: Yes, staff recommends continuing same yellow and green, adding #1, and receiving from the Board a determination on priority for the other 3 citizen initiatives (adding 20 public comment to those?)?

Q Comm. Menser: Joint plans have to be done? So would it be adding 2, 3 or 4, or replacing one on the yellows?

A: Yes joint plans need to be worked on either way. And yes, you could replace a current yellow one for either #2, 3 or 4.

Q Comm. Menser: Looking at your list right now you have lined up, those are monumental staffing challenges coming forward at the same time, plus the yellow coded. Is it even reasonable to add anything? What is reasonable for you accomplish?

A: This is a priority list, and adding things to the docket won't change that.

Q Comm. Menser on # 3 is already being considered on another list?

A: Yes, the Official Docket of Comprehensive Plan amendments. The joint plans are part of the Comprehensive Plan update so both are moving forward.

Q Josh: What is the status of the A-9 Correctional Institution?

A: Called Maple Lane. Working on trying to come up with a contract with DOC for the past year and half. It ebbs and flows with communication.

County Manager Chavez stated next Tuesday there will be a discussion about an approach to potentially decoupling the other elements of the comprehensive plan docket.

Josh stated when we receive these citizen requests, we relay to them we have a process but anytime they are able to come to the BoCC individually as well.

County Manager Chavez stated amending Title 24, last week a comment was received, and he is working with Public Health on the additional information he's learned since then, and will bring it to Tuesday morning.

Jeremy stated if you establish a docket, items can still be added throughout the year at the direction of the Board.

Board Decisions or direction	<p>Jeremy and Cynthia will work with Thomasina for additional information on the Peace Lutheran and other requests.</p> <p>More background on citizen amendments from Jeremy will be provided.</p> <p>Tuesday decision will be brought back.</p> <p>Staff needs Approval of what to work on in 2019</p> <p>•</p>
-------------------------------------	--



**Thurston County Board of Commissioners
Work Session Summary**

Date of Work Session:	March 20, 2019
Time:	12:00 PM
Office/Department:	Commissioners
Subject:	Courthouse & Regional Administrative Buildings Project Update
Staff Contact/Author:	Whitney Pearsall
Attendees:	Commissioners: John Hutchings, Tye Menser
	Other Staff: Vicki Larkin for Commissioner Gary Edwards, Ramiro Chavez, Robin Campbell, Meghan Porter, Elizabeth Petrich, Patrick O'Connor, Jennifer Creighton, John Snaza, Steve Drew, Rick Thomas, Mary Hall, Judge Carol Murphy, Judge Brett Buckley,
	Other: Ron Thomas, Doug Mah, Olympia Mayor Cheryl Selby
Discussion Points:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commissioner Hutchings opened the meeting and led introductions. On the phone is Nancy Neraas. Ramiro Chavez mentioned this is a follow up meeting to the ongoing project meetings. Duncan and Nancy will walk through information on a finance stress test. Will send out materials via email. • Levy Lid Lift Analysis Presentation – Duncan Brown Duncan Brown of PDW shared background information on levy lid lifts and their rules. All different nuances of financing and levy lid lift itself. Limited in raising property tax. Levy lid lift is voter approved to bypass limitation. Year over year more than 1%. Can't use to pay debts or bonds. Have a 25-year limit. Lid lift cannot be longer than that. If don't start until year 2, restrained to 23 years. Bond can be shorter or longer. Levy lid lift can be broad or narrow and serve many purposes other than debt service. All in the language presented to voters.

Lid lift does not do away with other limitation on property tax rate. Currently, it's \$1.80 per \$1,000 assessed value. Cannot exceed it. In 2019, it was \$1.22 per \$1,000. Leaves a 58-cent delta. As assessed values grow, 1% in place, rate declined. Reverse is also true. These 3 scenarios show a sensitivity to that. Various bond issues, including sizes and terms. Used that to back into what the dollar amount of levy lid lift would need to be and what translates into as to rate. Translate into dollars each year. Thinking in reverse here. Ask is for a rate, but may not know the exact dollar amount of bond issue. Interest rates change between now and then and these scenarios are abstract. Three options. Scenario 1. Bond issue generating \$250 million in proceeds in bonds. Issue as soon as levy lid lift takes effect. Very early into 2020. Assumption is it's just for assumed debt service. No extra. For the 25-year, \$250 million issued right away. Scenario 2 is 23-year bond issued in 2 years. Collect full amount of incremental regular property tax levy first 2 years. In year 2, issue the bond. Nancy Neraas said have to levy it under state law. Don't have a choice not to. Duncan said March 2020 is a very aggressive timeline. Might be more realistic in 2022.

Steve Drew asked for some clarification. Is it difficult to get bonds issued by March 2020? Why looking at 2 years later in the scenarios? Nancy said federal tax rules accrue

taxes on bonds. The proceeds need to be spent within 3 years. IRS doesn't want agencies issuing bonds sooner than they need to. Don't want to pay interest on proceeds if not using for awhile. Duncan stated that these were scenarios only. Robin Campbell explained that assumptions were made to come up with them. If passed in August of 2019, collect levy in 2020. Could use the \$20,000 referenced in Scenarios 2 and 3 to do preliminary work on courthouse. Ramiro said the \$230 million scenario included a 3-year construction period, enough time to spend the money. The third scenario is similar to second. Capture all incremental regular levy. Difference is kept term of bonds at 25 years. Does not need to be limited on bond terms. Taking this approach would leave an additional 2 years where bonds paid from another source. Include to make an option but maybe not best one.

Back to Scenario 1, \$250 million for 25 years. Ask for 47 cents per \$1,000. What if near term declines in assessed value? Say 3% in 2021 and 2022. Brings up to \$1.80 limit.

Modest shortfall. About \$350,000. Nancy said if the County has more money than it needs, commissioners could not levy the full amount in the future. This is not a forecast, only an assumption. If the County prospers, could build up a cushion and have more wiggle room to weather a recession.

Scenario 3 shows the bonds exceeding the lid lift term. The County would need to pay back \$15.9 million per year after the left lid lift expires. Bonds would be issued after the ballot measure approval. Nancy encouraged the group to think carefully about the ballot title, that it should cover financing construction of the facility and not only debt service.

Robin Campbell thought that based on the scenarios presented, the County could afford a building in the \$250 million range. Ramiro said the scenarios helped to show that this project would not jeopardize the levy lift option for the next 25 years. Steve asked about Scenario 3, and funding 2 years of debt. What tools would the County employ to bridge that gap? Ramiro said the County would not pursue that option, as it's unaffordable. An economic downturn will be mitigated by getting the bond in place at the start of the 25-year term. Can go ahead with engineering, permitting, etc., ahead of time. Steve thought the County might use interfund loans or some other means, short of layoffs. He'd like to know the full inventory of tools. Ramiro said he couldn't answer that today. Steve said he'd asked before and still needs an answer. He urged County leadership to contemplate a \$1 million shortfall in debt service and how to address it. Robin said answering the question today didn't mean the same answer would apply in the moment. She suggested property taxes or general fund as possibilities. It's a broader budget conversation and they can have it later if needed. Duncan closed out the discussion by saying the County has flexibility when and how many bonds to issue. Can factor in a certain amount of uncertainty.

- *Update on Questionnaire Survey – Rick Thomas*

Rick Thomas said the team is in the midst of finishing up questionnaire. Focusing on getting citizens opinions on features of courthouse facility potential and service levels at the county to citizens. Two main goals. Garner information from it. Finalize deliverables from Ron. Mayor Selby said she hadn't seen it, but it was later explained the survey team started with great input and direction from the City of Olympia.

- *Update on Deliverables – Ron Thomas*

Ramiro reminded everyone that using County resources can't be used to campaign for a project, only provide factual information. Need to respect the bounds of the PDC. Ron Thomas agreed. He is creating deliverables with talking points and graphics. City of Olympia provided information on their on-site facilities, but no carbon footprint information. Rick is working on an abbreviated Traffic Impact Analysis, showing impact on surrounding roads. There will also be an informational video with citizens uploaded to the website. Steve suggested including the cost of upgrading this building if the County stays here. Judge Buckley asked about including the value of this surplus property.

Mayor Selby asked for including the benefits of partnering with the City.

- *Title for Ballot Measure – Ramiro Chavez*

Conversation at last project meeting yielded a new title for the ballot measure: Courthouse and Regional Administrative Buildings. Mary Hall suggested Financing Construction of Courthouse and Regional Administrative Buildings. There's a 75-word limit. The explanatory statement can be longer, but the ballot title is binding.

Marie Docter (member of the TC Bar Association) confirmed that they are organizing a campaign committee in support of the new Courthouse project. Group of about 15, with three in attendance today. Meet every Tuesday and have sought a professional advisor. May 17 deadline to get ballot measure support statement in. The group is currently named Access

Thurston County.

- LLL Ballot Measure development/writing team

Ramiro said the ballot measure requires a resolution from Board. Working on a draft form for the Board by April 2 to set a public hearing 20 days later. Weigh in on resolution. Commissioners act in early May to get measure ready for August 2019. Draft resolution will present a couple of options, such as February 2020. Recommend commissioners don't put ballot on general election in November. Up to them to proceed. Timeline gives commissioners more time.

Steve said he reached out to the labor community and they requested 2 things. First, that it's built by union workers. Important that ballot description contains workforce labor

agreement. Second is that the project be deemed an apprentice project for trades. Important to labor community. Want it embedded in ballot measure and adopted by a legislative authority so voters can hold County's feet to the fire. Ramiro said a resolution isn't appropriate or possible. Mary suggested looking at King County's workforce labor agreement they put in place for capital facility projects. Commissioner Hutchings said he liked the apprenticeship piece. The union portion is covered by the County's obligation to pay prevailing wage, indicated in each public works contract. Apprenticeship can be outlined more specifically within the contract. Commissioner Menser said he'd speak to the labor union.

Commissioner Hutchings said he'd like feedback on the August or February ballot dates. Mary said the February 2020 ballot could be very expensive, as they share cost on August ballots with cities and towns. February ballots are full of school measures. Don't want to compete with them for funding. Rick asked about when taxes would start if the County pursued a February ballot. Would lose a year of escalation costs? Robin confirmed. Judge Murphy said expert opinion over the years has been that August 2019 has the best chance of passing. Steve said the lowered property taxes this year, the first time in 10 years, makes August timeframe the most desirable moment to place the courthouse on the ballot.

Rick Thomas said he'd distribute Duncan Brown's report along with the meeting minutes.

I certify this is a true and correct copy of the original document maintained in the Office of the Board of Thurston County Commissioners.

ATTEST:

LaBonita I. Bowmar, Clerk of the Board

Date: _____

Courthouse & Regional Administrative Building Project Update
Wednesday, April 17, 2019 – 12:00 p.m. Bldg. 1, Room 280

Attendees: **Thurston County** - Commissioner John Hutchings, Commissioner Tye Menser, Commissioner Gary Edwards, Marianne Clear, Josh Cummings, Jonathan Sprouffske, Jeff Gadman, Diana Benson, Maria Aponte, Judge Carol Murphy, Jennifer Creighton, Judge Brett Buckley, Steven Drew, Rick Thomas, Olympia Mayor Cheryl Selby, **TAS** – Ron Thomas, **Doug Mah & Associates** – Doug Mah, various City and County officials

Introduction

- Commissioner Hutchings welcomed everyone and led introductions.

Communication & Outreach

- *Update on Questionnaire Survey*
Rick Thomas said the questionnaire survey, completed last week, yielded basic raw data. Draft report is out and in a few hands to get comments to Elway Research for final report. Final report will be complete by start of next week. Stuart Elway will present to Board next Thursday, April 25 from 10:00 until 11:30 a.m. Strictly to address survey discussion. Today is not discussing or interpreting it. Quickly run through questions and percentages.
- *Update on FAQs and Informational Video*
Meghan Porter said the FAQs are on website. Could go on the ballot. Can add and subtract as go along. Informational video is in draft form, finalizing through the legal department now. Will start filming shortly. Rick said Ron has downloaded FAQs to his presentation. Go through what's out there and if other FAQs exist, please share with Meghan. Keep it up to date. Ron will present the first run at deliverable with this informational presentation. Lays out facts from last 6 months of investigation. Need good info about existing conditions to be included. Not there today. Ask questions during presentation. If things need to be added besides existing conditions, let Rick and Ron know that, too. Make it comprehensive. Jeff Gadman asked if Ron's presentation would go out to citizens' committee? Lay people have different questions than County employees. They will ask citizen questions. Rick said he hadn't talked about it, but the CAC is part of it. It's a good point. Commissioner Hutchings asked if he could take it on the road. Ron Thomas said he would weave it into a PowerPoint presentation as well as an informational brochure.

Thomas Architecture Studios Scope of Work

- *Project Informational Presentation – Ron Thomas*
Five sections overall. Site plan first. Keep aesthetics of Yoshiro Gardens. Below grade garage and street level parking. Gated entry for inmate transfer entering from below grade. Secure parking for judges, elected and maybe even jury. Steven Drew asked about the water table level. Ron said the site rises up from Plum St., the east end of property.

Sea level rise issue came up in an outreach meeting. Should be fine based on the property rise.

Commissioner Hutchings asked about the parking numbers: 150 temporary and 750 for garage parking. How temporary are the 150? Ron said they are short term for visits to planning or the auditor for citizens who don't want to go into the garage. Not for juries, who ideally will have secured parking. Elected and jurors, too. Commissioner Hutchings also asked about the elevation of the building, which will be reduced by 18 feet or so. Is it well within City code? The height limit of this zone is 75 feet. Working with the City on the best path forward. Could utilize a text amendment or a zoning code change. Rick pointed out the wetland buffer areas to work around. Ron explained the footprint of garage and surface parking are in a wetland area. They will work with the City to do a wetland exchange, finding a comparable wetland to enlarge and enhance in order to construct on this one. Wetlands have different classifications based on size and what they drain into. It's worth pursuing. Can't mitigate on site or in this City block. Rick put a slight disclaimer on screen shots. They are artist's renditions of what could be. Site is constrained. Very likely will be different once design/build contract is executed. Get a vision to see now and show community. Jeff asked about rooftop parking on the parking garage, or would it be rooftop solar? Ron said the parking garage is a good candidate for rooftop solar because it has no shading from other buildings. Can have both. Solar can be mounted on posts. Can make a significant impact on electrical needs. Worth doing a cost benefit analysis. This new facility costs less and is 1/3 bigger. Geothermal, etc. can really increase the energy efficiency.

Courthouse aerial view is next. Covered connection from garage to front lobby. Courthouse drop off. Combine users and make a 2-story main lobby. Commissioner Edwards asked about the covered walkway. How does that work with only one entrance for security purposes? Ron explained that citizens approaching from the garage walk on the walkway under the canopy. They enter through the front doors and into the security checkpoint. All the building functions are accessed through there. View of the potential expansion of Yoshiro Gardens there also, creating the effect of a building within a park. Open lobby and first 2 floors. Steven asked if the courtyard was accessible from inside and outside of building. Yes. Poses security threat. Ron suggested a gate that closes at night to keep the building and grounds clean and safe. Mayor Selby asked about the location of the municipal jail. It will be co-located down below with County holding, with its own secure entrance and sallyport.

Stacking diagram is next. It's a vertical drawing showing functions on each floor. Show how 315,000 square feet fits and nothing more. Not exact placement, only logical progression for how organized. Concentrate heavily used public functions on first 2 floors. Shows security and flow of people groups.

On to energy analysis for the existing facility. Got utility information on all buildings. Energy cost totaled across seven buildings all together, including City. Summary sheet. Have 78KBtu/gsf/year currently. Annual cost \$360,000. Proposed is 315,000 square feet with 40KBtu/gsf/year for energy usage, including electricity, gas, etc. It's \$242,000 annually. Made up \$120,000 first year. Qualifiers in analysis. Depend on design, energy systems, and more. Going to save money year after year.

On to survey results. High level and very basic. Online and phone survey combo. Received 972 valid responses. Driven by online, with 722 online. Jeff asked if 722 were unique responses. Yes. Survey team threw out less than 100. Included 972 with a 3.1% error margin. This is raw statistical data only. Weighted by size of communities. Most people visited the courthouse for jury duty. Steven asked if telephone survey results could be segregated from online. Could be a relevant difference separating online from telephone results.

Opinions about County courthouse. Excellent to poor. Poor on parking, location of courthouse is good. Public perception didn't see buildings as bad. Feeling of safety is satisfactory to fair. The final deliverable will be posted. Steven thought the cross tab (telephone vs. online voting) would inform that decision.

Judge Murphy said she's not surprised to see that not everyone understands security issues at the courthouse. Might need the Board to issue a statement saying they see it differently. Detailing that as commissioners voted on stages of project, the importance of security, save money, all in the FAQ. Needs to be from Commissioners as well from informed elected. Important piece. Strong statement. Also include the building deficiencies and how lucky the County has been up until now. Pay now or pay later. Saving taxpayers money over time. Commissioner Mesner said security is one message, courthouse building conditions another. The survey revealed 76% don't see buildings in bad condition. Groups he spoke to posed no argument about security. Judge Murphy said the messaging needs to go along with data. There's a misperception, but can set it straight. Commissioner Menser said the purpose of the survey was for the County to understand the challenge, not convince anyone. Commissioner Menser said he's given presentations to various groups and has heard many of the rebuttals. Jeff pointed out that most visitors to the campus go into Buildings 2 and 3 and hit the security checkpoint right away. They assume Building 1 has similar setup.

Meghan said some of this will be addressed in the video. People only see small area of complex. Put it together and show shortcomings. Security. Deteriorating buildings. Another avenue to help and tell the story. Judge Buckley said people want to know where the commissioners stand on the courthouse. Do they support it? Message isn't being heard. Public constantly asks. Courthouse will most likely be the biggest County project in this generation and for several to come. Hugely important and public needs to pay attention. Get the word out. Commissioner Edwards said the public hearing coming up on

April 23 will be a great opportunity to get both the word out and input. He asked Rick if Ron Thomas would be providing a true cost, including interest and debt servicing. Rick said right now the estimate based on median home ownership prices and pencils out to around \$12 per month. Meghan said Robin Campbell was working on it. Commissioner Edwards said he's been asked that question.

Jeff asked about the presentation on energy analysis. Was there a notation for cost estimated with traditional utilities? Yes, used 40,000 BTUs. Was there a note about alternative energy sources possibly altering numbers? No. Ron conceded it was a good point.

Rick reiterated the public hearing on the ballot measure is April 23. Hearing from the public in room 152. The video will not be ready yet. On the same evening, Rick and Ron are going to speak at Tenino's city council. Also, a reminder that Thursday April 25 at 10:00 Elway Research presenting a briefing to the BoCC on survey final results. Another decision point on April 30. Commissioners will meet in Rochester for the BoCC meeting. Commissioner Hutchings brought up the RCWs mandates pro and con writers for ballot measures. Have to appoint people to it, recruit them. Meghan said the commissioners have to vote to put it on the ballot before advertise for ballot writers.

Commissioner Menser brought up the August ballot as potential option. Timeline tight. Vote is on April 30. Have people identified by May 10 and written statements due by May 17. Both sides need more time if still choosing August. If not, there's more time. Back up dates as fast as possible to keep August viable. Mayor Selby mentioned February usually has school board measures. Commissioner Menser said after meeting with the school board, they have no plans for ballot items. Jonathan Sprouffske suggested consulting with the County Manager. The decision of appointees can be made on the same day after the vote. Gives committees an extra week. Steven asked if the pro courthouse statement can be from elected officials. Diana Benson said she didn't know. Mayor Selby said she wrote one for a City election. Doug said at least one elected should participate. Three names can be listed on the statement, but only one statement for the voter's pamphlet.

Next Steps

- *Next meeting is Wednesday, May 15 at 12:00 p.m.*
- *Public Hearing on April 23 regarding the proposed Ballot Measure Ordinance*

Courthouse & Regional Administrative Building Project Update
Wednesday, May 15, 2019 – 12:00 p.m. Bldg. 1, Room 280

Attendees: **Thurston County** - Commissioner John Hutchings, Commissioner Tye Menser, Vicki Larkin for Commissioner Gary Edwards, Ramiro Chavez, Jeff Gadman, Robin Campbell, Mary Hall, Patrick O'Connor, Pam Hartman-Beyer, Marianne Clear, Tim Braniff, Schelli Slaughter, Meghan Porter, Josh Cummings, Jon Tunheim, Kurt Hardin, Rick Thomas **TAS** – Ron Thomas, **Doug Mah & Associates** – Doug Mah; **City of Olympia** – Mayor Cheryl Selby, Steve Hall and various other and County employees

Introduction

- Commissioner Hutchings welcomed everyone and led introductions.
- *Final Executive Monthly Meeting – Ramiro Chavez*

Ramiro Chavez said this is the last meeting of this group. Ballot in April 2020. Increasing property tax by 47 cents per \$1,000. Factual meeting. No ballot measure discussion. Can't campaign. Will hear an update on communication strategies and next steps. Jeff Gadman said the City should do the same, campaigning for the project in off hours and off government premises. Mayor Selby asked about project meetings continuing in order to mesh City and County needs. Ramiro said yes, at the staff level for project logistics, especially to work out the agreement with the City.

Commissioner Hutchings mentioned Rick Thomas and Ron Thomas did a courthouse presentation in Bucoda last night. The friendly folks asked about value and timing. Also asked about carbon footprint of new facility. Ramiro said the team would continue to present on the facts only. We met with Yelm last week and will meet with Tenino in two weeks. Consistent messaging of facts.

Jon Tunheim said he'd like to be in the loop for scheduled presentations. Would be happy to answer questions. Rick Thomas said he worked with Judge Buckley's office, who has a master schedule template. Can get all the presentations scheduled in one place and everyone can see it. Today's informational PowerPoint is iterative, not final yet.

Communication & Outreach

- *Update on FAQs, Mailer & Informational Video – Meghan Porter*

Public meetings brought up new questions. Adjusting FAQs to answer common questions which are on the project webpage, along with a property value calculator. Updating tomorrow. Also, preparing Informational mailer to go out closer to ballot measure so it's fresh. Getting it together, with photos. Making sure language is concise and clear. Video. Met with Pam and Jennifer. Script is final. Photo and video opportunity this Monday morning. Trying to get overhead footage to include in Power Point, but drone might not happen. It's in the airport's air space. Tim Braniff said Mike from his office might be able to get access for Meghan. Voice over for the video will be May 29. Still filling in visuals for video. Meghan coordinating with Kelly at the City to talk about deliverables.

- *Project Informational Presentation – Ron Thomas*

Rick Thomas said the PowerPoint is a work in progress. Placeholder slides, too. Inside look at progress of information gathering. Format Ron's putting it in. Intent not go out and present. Set up in a systematic way. Different groups have ability to customize to needs. Discussion can be pertinent. Ask you to jot down notes to bring up at end. Real idea is giving you a card deck scenario. Feedback at end. Make sure important information emphasized and what's missing. Fill in gaps. Ron will run thorough it not present it. Ron will make it available after the meeting on Friday.

Ron pointed out the five circles on first slide. They're a guide. Factual information. Existing courthouse. The need. Educational information. Fourth bullet is proposed courthouse and lastly, needs addressed for fifth bullet. Eighty slides total. Some suggest 10-15 slides. Compress it where can and customize to audience. Can tailor it. Reduced Bucoda to 40 slides and presented in 20 minutes.

History of work and then upcoming milestones to vote. Design and construction. Early 2024 before move in if voters approve. Existing courthouse. Aerial views. Parking. County building. Currently, walk ¼ mile to get from jury and employee parking lot to Bldg. 1. Existing parking and street parking for public. The need. Covers security, with circulation paths crossing and citizen screening. Jury overflow in screening. Hard to access via transit or alternate routes. ADA compliance not in effect until 15 years post build. Mechanical and plumbing. Deteriorating equipment. Rooftop equipment, electrical, plumbing designed for 25 years, now past 40 years. End of useful life. Ramiro said the useful life message needs to be consistent, with useful life well-defined. Gotten some citizen feedback that some think that the County intentionally did not keep up the current buildings. Feedback from surveys. Commissioner Menser suggested a bar graph showing the budget investment and \$50 million in known costs to the campus, and how it would increase if the County stays in these buildings.

Commissioner Hutchings pointed out the electrical failure slide photo. Doesn't make sense to most lay people. Need a better photo or rely on the explanation (in bubble). Jeff suggested showing offices helping customers in a dark office. Vicki Larkin said she had some. Ron said he, Meghan or Rick would take any pictures available to help support the story. Maintenance estimates sit at around \$50 million for known issues. Structure is not earthquake code compliant. Building has outdated technology.

Historical building photos contrasted with the existing wood framed courthouse. Significant increase in necessary square footage. Had doubled since 1930 facility built. Needed as much square footage as possible, but not built to last. Energy analysis slide. Use less energy in the new facility just implementing standard code. Jeff said the slide was confusing. Make the per square foot total easier to read or specify total energy costs. Ron said he would add clarification.

County growth. Population was less than 150,000 in 1978. By 2024 will be about double. Looking ahead to beyond 30 years. Should last 100 years. Space constraints for parking, courtrooms and citizens. Rick said he needs photos to show space constraints. Jeff Gadman said the last 3 slides were good for court upgrades, but nothing on the administrative side. Schelli Slaughter said the customer service side should be depicted as well with photos. Tim Braniff asked if 2054 would see most County business done online? Ron said that's why he only planned for 900 parking spots with room to spare. Society and technology will change. Designing a building to anticipate changes.

Jeff thought the stacking diagrams of building floor levels could have a watermark of exterior of building over this. Show it better. Shared lobby for assessor, treasurer and auditor. Clark county already doing it. One information desk person. Real time. Secure lobby. Both county and city here. Sustainable design materials. Small carbon footprint.

Courthouse aerial view. Renderings of what it could look like - just a test to ensure all the functions will fit in a typical building. Major civic presence. Last bullet. Needs addressed. Security. Accessibility. Possible Plum St. exit backup. A traffic impact analysis will be conducted as part of the project. Commissioner Menser asked why the transit score was 56 out of a possible 100. Ron said he would circle back to Transit. Mayor Selby thought the slide about secure parking should list empaneled jurors first, then judges, then elected officials. Public care more about that.

Energy efficiency improvements. Sustainable design principles. Reduced life cycle costs. Space needs addressed. Can't afford to go to living building. LEED silver is baseline for state buildings. Jeff said that should be the introduction point.

Last information slide. Shows costs relative to entire property tax. Annual project property tax for a \$275,000 assessed value home would be about \$130. Mary Hall said slide should show \$11 per month as well. Questions and answers for very last slide. People want an answer about roof. Answer for why it looks bad. Metal baked finish off. Rick said last slide should point back to the website for additional information. Ramiro said the PowerPoint will be on the website for anyone to use.

Commission Hutchings said Bucoda asked if the City of Olympia would be paying for their portion of the project. More to come regarding the services and funds. Advantages. Real buy in. Mayor Selby said the land was part of the City's contribution. She wondered about the number of courtrooms and potential to expand. Said diversion programs should mean less courtrooms needed. Enhanced with sharing space. Jeff said greater County population meant more need for civic courts.

Jeff asked if any of this information made it onto Thurston County TV? Meghan Porter said yes, and Channel 3. The informational video when completed will go on Channel 3.

Jon Tunheim said the partnership opportunity with the City of Olympia needs to be fully explained. Detainee space will be temporarily relocated during construction along with the rest of the Municipal Court functions. Partnerships can help with diversions and restorative justice. Right now, not much option to connect municipal services.

Commissioner Menser thought the PowerPoint should lead with space needs. The rest is value judgment. Space needs study showed District Court operating on 50% of what it needs. Funding slide. Thoughtful citizens will care. Elected leaders got special accommodation to reduce cost to citizens through the 25 year State Legislative enactment for financing in Thurston County.

Jeff said the crossed circulation paths could result in costly mistrials. Ramiro said risk and consequences could be outlined. Pam Hartman-Beyer has citizen survey information to share. Jonathan Sprouffske brought up the several court security studies in the last 15 years, and no one rated it safe. Share snippets of that. Jon Tunheim said storytelling would help citizens understand the issues. Had a murder case with a jury that ran over 2 weeks. Had to put the screen on boxes to raise it high enough to be seen. Every one of those jurors saw the problems and said they'd vote for a new courthouse. Powerful story. Ramiro said electeds can tell their own story offline and on own time.

Ballot measure is set for April 28, 2020. Should it pass, the tax revenue increase would commence in January 2021. Design after that, but can start design right away once ballot approved. Can move money from one area to another and pay it back in order to start the project.

Next Steps

- *Finalize County/City MOU – Rick Thomas*

Working with City and will continue meeting with Keith and staff weekly. Ramiro and Steve talk details of MOU.

- *Rezone Hilltop and Plum St. Site – Rick Thomas*

Rezoning process to meet timelines. Two possible paths to explore. Also thanks to everyone for the collaborative work completed over the last 2 years. Thanks to Commissioners for putting on ballot.

Mayor Selby thanked commissioners for leading the process. Good confidence. Encouraged by schedule and individuals' outputs. Commissioner Hutchings said the time would go quickly, thanking Rick and Ron. Rick said he'd email out the PowerPoint by the end of week. Get comments back to Rick and Ron by end of next week. Include photos and even specific dialog.

Ramiro thanked everyone for 2 years of work. Participation has been stellar and consistent. Now to get the information out to the public.