

# **Work Release Siting Advisory Committee**

Minutes – December 5, 2007

DOC HQ, Tumwater, WA

8:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

**Committee members present:** Anne Fiala, Ross Gallagher, John Hickman, Ed Holm, Nancy McLaughlin, and Tim Quenzer

**Committee members absent:** Ida Ballasiotes and Marie Sullivan

**Moderator:** David Jansen

**Support:** Simone Currier

## **Welcome**

David Jansen welcomed the committee and asked them to introduce themselves. David recommended that the committee report be submitted to DOC and DOC will submit to OFM with a cover letter. A Draft was submitted to the committee per their request at the November 14<sup>th</sup> meeting.

The committee reviewed and approved the agenda. Agenda accepted as presented.

Hickman Motioned to approve the November 14, 2007 committee minutes: Ed Holm Seconded the motion. The minutes were approved as submitted.

## **Public Input**

**Casey Salisbury, Mason County Sheriff**, presented concerns with the process. Mason County has a 30 year history of insufficient law enforcement staffing, a lack of physical space for additional facilities, potential burden to the county budget and local criminal justice system. Mr. Salisbury also drew attention to the county's lack of adequate infrastructure to support Work Release Facilities and community support needs. Mason County is a county of "have nots". Mason County is dealing with current jail overcrowding and a high per capital crime rate and continues to operate below staffing needs, and that job opportunities are limited. His "assumption" is that the County will be stuck with the budget burden in the future for work release facilities. Mr. Salisbury thanked the committee for considering his concerns today, and is encourage seeing the committee is considering the potential impacts or work release siting.

**Terry Davenport, Shelton Chief of Police**, presented concerns for potential budget stress at the city level. Shelton is facing layoffs and has the highest unemployment rate in the state. Chief Davenport also expressed concern for the burden work release facilities would put on community social services. Has the committee considered siting

with in the existing prison? Chief Davenport also asked if services would be located in communities of release.

Judge Hickman asked what the perceived budget drain on resources would be, and stated that the work release facilities are funded by the state. Mr. Salisbury agreed it was an “assumption” that the cost would be placed on the county budget in the future.

Ross Gallagher stated equitable distribution is just one step in the process. Providing work release facilities, programming, and supervision is something we have to do.

Ed Holm stated that with the county of first release requirement from the Legislature, it is an advantage to have work release facilities in the community to provide supervision. The increase of offenders returning to their county of first conviction will happen, and work release is a better option to assist both communities and offenders in the process.

The committee discussed the placement of work release programs within the current prison facilities. David Jansen and Anne Fiala confirmed historically the department has not placed work release with in the prison. Work Release is a reentry tool, a step down opportunity to integrate offenders back into the community prior to community release.

Nancy McLaughlin suggested closer net working with the state and local communities should be encouraged. We should strive to provide training to offenders for identified labor needs as many will be returning to the workforce upon release. 98% of offenders will be released back to the communities and with the county of first conviction requirements now passed, the issue becomes do you want offenders returned with work release support or with no support. Equitable Distribution of work release facilities is a must in support of community safety. Nancy McLaughlin did empathize with the community concern for over burdening of local budgets.

Tim Quenzer recognized the community concern for impacts on local law enforcement and community services, this needs to be recognized by DOC due to the 6157 legislation requirements. “Unfunded” impacts are a big concern for all parties.

**Michelle Swanson, Work Release Contractor,** Is the contractor for the state operated Olympia Work Release operation, this is a 25 bed facility and in 17 years has not called law enforcement to help with the arrest of an offender while at the facility. The facility supports Mason County also. Offenders have many needs as they enter the work release program, things a basic as a Drivers License so they can get to work. Offenders are training for many types of jobs construction workers, parks and recreations jobs, landscaping, dish washers, asbestos removal, Trades Related Apprenticeship Coach (TRAC) Construction and work release facilities assist with valid employment.

David Jansen stated that work release facilities provide a boost to offenders to be more stable upon reentry to their county of first conviction with jobs and community support services.

Judge Hickman explained that the committee is tasked with equitable distribution of future work release facilities, not the function of work release facilities. Population is the most neutral base, all factors have been noted. Every community has an obligation to facilitate work release facilities.

Tim Quenzer reiterated that the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs was involved with the 6157 legislation process, the bill has now been past, and so we are now tasked with managing the impacts at this point.

### **Committee Discussion**

David Jansen opened the committee work session with a brief review of the draft report presented to the committee prior to today's meeting. The format is open for revision and the draft is in effort to capture the summations of the committee work and recommendations to the Department of Corrections and OFM.

The committee members reviewed the draft report page by page to finalize their report. It was agreed that the report would be submitted to the agency Secretary. The committee was sensitive to the concern of over burdening individual counties with existing correctional facilities. But also does not want existing correctional facilities to become an excuse for a community to not site a work release facility in that county. They worked diligently to not have the committee intent of equitable distribution by county population be manipulated in the future.

The committee requested a printed copy of the final draft for review, and requested that all committee members sign the final copy once all edits are incorporated into the final report. Simone Currier incorporated the committee edits and provided a printed copy to the committee members.

Judge Hickman moved to accept the final draft with updates discussed and table updates: Tim Quenzer 2<sup>nd</sup> the motion. The final draft was accepted and will be prepared for signature and presentation to the Secretary.

David Jansen agreed to work with Simone Currier to finalize the edits and that the report would not be distributed until the committee members have signed the final report and it is submitted to the Secretary. Once the report is submitted to the Secretary it will be release to the public. David thanked the committee on behalf of the Department for their work.