

**Comments received via <http://www.seattle.gov/municipaljail/questions.htm>
on December 18, 2008**

Name: James Schultz

City: Kirkland

Several items that need consideration for an alternative site to the Unincorporated King County location on NE 126th PL. This location is very close to the railroad site that is intended for a public use trail for walking, jogging, and biking. It is also close to Lake Washington Votek and Totem Lake Shopping Center, that is already struggling to survive. Evergreen Hospital is our local hospital. The proposed jail site is too close to this facility that has people coming and going at all hours. As far as I am concerned this area is too concentrated with residential housing and small businesses, including child care facilities, to be appropriate for a jail.

Thanks, Jim Schultz

Name: Mike McFarlane

City: Lake Forest Park

Putting a jail in the middle of a neighborhood is not a smart plan. If built this jail could easily turn into a facility to house more dangerous offenders. The idea that a jail is a community center is absurd. A jail is not a community center unless you are being processed or have a relative who is. It is poor planning to transform a middle class neighborhood into a regional jail system.

Name: Ted McLean

City: Unincorporated King County

RE: NECC Regional Jail Site

3225 NE 126th Place

Since recently discovering that a property in our neighborhood was being seriously considered as a possible site for what could be a 640 bed jail facility, several members of the nearby residential community have become somewhat concerned. At a crowded public meeting on December 10, 2008 virtually everybody in attendance agreed that a jail facility at 3225 NE 126th Place was unacceptable.

The selection process involving the 23 cities in the NE sector of King County has been going on for almost two years yet the neighboring residents were unaware of the process until only a few days ago. For most of this time our area in King County has had no representation in the deliberations of the NECC.

Per RCW 39.34.180 the proposed facility is to accommodate misdemeanor offenders for the east side cities and the City of Seattle. Today a majority of misdemeanor offenders have long rap sheets and many are felons. The very idea of concentrating this group from a large urban area in an established community is ludicrous. No matter how many of the participating cities budgets may be trimmed on a cost per day per bed the social impact needs to be the principal factor in meeting these needs.

Consider the land use issues:

No member of NECC has ever determined if the site is available for purchase as a potential jail site and at what cost. The argument that acquisition by "eminent domain" is possible is

ridiculous considering it is one of twelve possible sites. To consider spending additional time and effort studying this site without knowing if it is even possible to acquire the site is ludicrous. The site is zoned Industrial (I) and a jail is not a permitted use in an industrial zone. A jail is a Special Use that may be established by a judicial process open to appeal.

The site is currently leased to Waste Management, a national company. Has it been determined that a jail is a preferred land use to the current Waste Management operation? If so, on what basis?

The land on the north side of NE 126th Place is designated for multi-family use. A jail facility is not an appropriate land use immediately adjacent to a residential use.

Using the site as a jail would deprive King County of much needed tax revenue.

Consider policing in Unorganized King County:

Currently police service in unorganized King County is almost nonexistent. [See Seattle PI December 11, 2008] Placing a revolving population of up to 640 criminals in a community with virtually no police service is ludicrous.

Consider other issues:

Roads and streets in the area are inadequate to accommodate the additional use.

Safety of school children in the area is of paramount concern.

There are no facilities in the area to support a jail facility.

There are numerous local parks and schools in relatively close proximity to the site.

Quite simply, the responsible thing to do is for King County and the NECC to take action to remove the NE 126th Place site from any further consideration as a jail site. It is irresponsible to continue spending taxpayer money on EIS and SEPA studies when this property is not a viable candidate. It should never have been added in the first place.

Name: Ted McLean

City: Unincorporated King County

RE: NEC Municipal Jail Planning Group

Anticipating the need for jail facilities in the future, there is currently a long drawn out bureaucratic process in full operation to select a site for a new jail facility in the NE Sector of King County. Cities and counties in Washington State are responsible for misdemeanor offences in their respective jurisdictions and counties are responsible for felony offences [RCW 39.34.180]. This process has apparently been going on for some two years and is expected to continue for another two to three years at least. Somewhere along the way those involved have decided that the new facility would serve the combined requirements of the 23 cities in the NE Sector. So instead of each city on its own complying with RCW 39.34.180, the cities could use "interlocal agreements" as provided in the same RCW to combine their responsibilities into a single facility to accommodate 200, 440 or 640 inmates. Following this decision twelve specific sites have been selected for evaluation: five on the Eastside, four in Seattle and three in Shoreline. Consultants have also been hired and paid to evaluate these sites. Based on these recommendations two sites on the Eastside, two in Seattle and one in Shoreline have been selected for further evaluation. More consultants have been hired to hold public meetings as a part of this seemingly endless "process".

At this stage my advice to all those involved is STOP!! The basic premise is wrong. To continue the exercise is to accept the decision that a combined facility is the best solution to future requirements for jail facilities. In the simplest terms, the broader community does not accept this decision. While it may be true that a combined facility may be less expensive to operate on a cost per bed per day basis, this should not be the tail that wags the dog. What about the matter of public safety for the local residents and businesses? What about the capital cost of land and construction? What about lost tax revenue when cities and counties are already strapped?

Today a majority of misdemeanor offenders have long rap sheets and many are felons. The very idea of concentrating this group from a large urban area in an established community is ludicrous. No matter how much the budget can be trimmed on a cost per day per bed the social impact needs to be the principal factor in meeting these needs.

Considering the residents, whom all the politicians and bureaucrats work for, small is beautiful. Cities should look after themselves and expand their current facilities to meet the growing needs. The size of the jail or public safety facility should be commensurate with the area it serves. Smaller jails should remain in areas that have already been established for such uses and have the related services nearby. Inmates should not be transported from one jurisdiction to another to be booked or held. By the way, the difference in 200 inmates and 640 inmates is to accommodate 440 inmates from Seattle. Can anyone imagine making the decision to transport inmates from Seattle to say Shoreline? The very idea is also ludicrous.

So residents in the Northeast, start sending those emails to the city councilors, the NECC, King County and your local newspapers this train is on the wrong track.

Additional comments received via email on December 18, 2008

Dear Mr. Ishizaki,

I am writing as a nearby resident in opposition to the proposed jail site at 2545 NE 200th Street in Shoreline. This is an entirely residential area, quiet and peaceful. I have a ten year old daughter. I don't want to have to worry about her safety from this potential threat. Yes, I know I sound like a NIMBY. But there are other locales that are not directly and literally in people's back yards.

Please find another more suitable use for this old school location (for example, for education or recreation).

As one final note, I think it is sad and ironic that public funds seem to be more readily available for prisons than schools.

Sincerely,

Eugene Ayres