

From: webmaster@shorelinewa.gov
To: [agenda comments](#)
Subject: City of Shoreline: Agenda Comments
Date: Thursday, April 27, 2017 12:30:50 PM

A new entry to a form/survey has been submitted.

Form Name: Comment on Agenda Items
Date & Time: 04/27/2017 12:30 PM
Response #: 301
Submitter ID: 13697
IP address: 73.42.189.177
Time to complete: 26 min. , 27 sec.

Survey Details: Answers Only

Page 1

1. Michele Earl-Hubbard
2. Shoreline
3. (O) Richmond Beach
4. michele@alliedlawgroup.com
5. 05/01/2017
6. 8-a
7. I have read the materials attached to the agenda regarding the construction of a 3 story addition to City Hall to house the Police Station at an estimated cost of nearly \$8 million dollars. The materials suggest the existing station property will be sold for \$1.8 million and that the City will receive \$3.2 million in seizures. I do not see any property appraisal showing the valuation of the existing station and property and find \$1.8 million to be an extremely high expectation for this property and small building the City seems to suggest is basically a tear down. I also do not see any data showing the City has a reasonable expectation of receiving \$3.2 million in seizures. this means the City could be committing to construction contracts and costs of nearly \$8 million dollars with a potential shortfall of not the slightly more than \$1 million stated but more realistically a shortfall of \$4 million or more -- half the cost of the project. I fully support providing our law enforcement with facilities and support it needs, but this seems like a lot more than the City can realistically afford, and that the Council is being asked to authorize contracts, and the public to support that, without necessary information such as property valuations of the existing station to be sold and data about seizure estimates. I also am disappointed that the City is not continuing an open-minded, serious, discussion about a Shoreline-owned police force like cities such as Woodway have had, rather than a rented force from King County. I note that the estimates in the report at agenda 9 fail to identify the cities with non-contracted forces, and fail to list Woodway as a comparator. When I served on the neighborhood traffic committee for Richmond Beach several years we asked the King County Sheriff representative sent to us about having more police on our streets to ticket dangerous driving through our neighborhoods and ticketing at 5 miles over the speed limit like Woodway does. We were told King County Sheriff's policy was not to ticket at less than 9 miles over the limit because KC

District Court judges wanted that margin to allow for radar detection errors, and it was explained to us that Shoreline did not keep the revenue from tickets -- King County got that -- because we used King County Sheriffs and used the KC District Court instead of contracting with a municipal court like Woodway did to prosecute violations, and thus we could not pay for increased traffic patrols with ticket revenue because Shoreline was not allowed to keep any. I have been very concerned that Shoreline pays for a force whose policies it cannot control, and whose revenue it does not get to keep. I also have been put on hold and had very long wait times when calling 911 and being transferred to KC Sheriff in Shoreline and been told there was no officer available to come to me and that it could be days before someone was sent out to take a report. I am not knocking the hard-working officers who provide the contracted services to Shoreline. But there is a lot to be said for owning our own force, controlling its policies, and reaping the revenue from the tickets and fines issued as a result of their policing. When considering whether to spend \$8 million in taxpayer revenue to build a 3 story addition to house this rented police force (more than \$4 million of which I think realistically will come from the general fund, not the \$1 million projected), I think the Council owes it to its residents to have this frank, open-minded, serious discussion about the future of our force. And that means doing research into the entities that are not "apples to apples" as agenda item 9 (the police annual report) does not do -- but looking at the cities with their own forces, their actual costs, and determining if this is something we can give our residents even if the costs were slightly more. Rather than just a nice new shiny building addition. (I note that the agenda item 9 report from the police department shows while we may have a slightly lower cost than some cities, we have 50 % or more fewer officers on the road than many of these other cities as well. Edmonds has a higher percentage of officers per 100 residents than Shoreline, for example. And Woodway was excluded from the police department's report.) I also would like to see more community policing and community presence. I like the mentions of sessions in the high schools with students about their concerns with the police in the police annual report at agenda item 9. We need more of those types of public sessions for the community. And we need a force that knows this community, is familiar with our community, is invested in this community, and truly belongs to this community. I would support that, and more officers on the road, even with smaller station locations, than an \$8 million 3 story addition at City Hall. I urge my elected representatives to do more research, demand more data, and share that data before committing to this tremendous expense and a path that cannot be altered.

8. Oppose

Thank you,
City of Shoreline

This is an automated message generated by the Vision Content Management System™. Please do not reply directly to this email.