MEETING MINUTES	
Location	Skype/Teleconference
Attendees	Mark Kucza, DOC Senior Administrator
	Mike Schindler, Contract DOC Facilitator
	Chris Idso, DOC Capital Planning & Development Director
	Brandy Jacobs, DOC Executive Secretary
	Whitney Hays, DOC Project Manager
	Tony Lindgren, KMB Architects
	Gar Rodside, DOC Facilities Senior Planner
	Brian Little, KMB Architects
	Jeremy Barclay, DOC Director – Engagement & Outreach
	Jean Hernandez
	Peter Kwon
	Ana Perera
	Autry Bell
	Carl Cole
	Gerald Bradford
	Steve Dalton
	Denise Lathrop
	Kimberli Dewing
	Erin Sitterley
	Evan Maxim
	Clyde Hill
	Dave Kaplan
	Chad Mulligan
	Phillip Baskaron
	Franklyn Smith
	Steven Simmons
	James Koroma
	Mike (no last name provided)

IINTRODUCTIONS & OPENING	
Mike Schindler	
Slides	*Welcome*
Discussion	Mike Schindler opened the meeting and welcomed back past and new participants. Introductions were made. Mark acknowledged DOC's receipt of and response to the letter received from the City of SeaTac, he also stated that both letters would be available on the outward facing website soon.

PROGRAM OVERVIEW	
Mark Kucza	
Slides	*Work Release Expansion*
Discussion	Mark provided an overview of the DOC mission/vision, reasons behind work release, placement criteria and expectations of the participants in work release. Also presented was the existing facilities, location of existing facilities, and pictures of some of the existing facilities.
Questions/ Concerns	• Franklyn shared his experience and the importance that the work release program had in his personal experience. Additionally, he stressed the gradual approach to returning individuals to the community by reuniting with families and community, is very beneficial to positive outcomes and futures for incarcerated individuals.

DATA REQUESTS	
Mark Kucza	
Slides	*Work Release Expansion*
Discussion	Mark provided an overview and explanation of the included slides.
Questions/ Concerns	• **Is there a complete dataset statewide breaking down crimes at different locations? Also noted is that different locations show a higher return to prison rate, is there a reason why, and is there a strategy to reduce that number across the state?** Crime data would come from local police arrest reports and takes some time to track due to the delays in charging and adjudicating criminal behaviors. The slide concerning violations resulting in a return to prison identifies largely technical violations. Each case is different and each facility supervisor and Case Manager work to balance safe operations with the need to assist persons individually in making positive decisions and pro-social behaviors. The rate at which individuals are returned to prison is not a picture that represents that there was law enforcement involvement for the return. Rather, it is the facility staff that are intervening and working with the individual to correct their behavior, and if compliance isn't achieved or there is an egregious violation, the facility can immediately return the individual to total confinement as opposed to a continued risk in the community because of violations or case plan non-compliance. **Is there any data provide that is broken down by ethnicity?** That is not a part of the current analysis. We'll try to identify that breakdown in a future data request and present the information to the LAC. • **Are local crime statistics taken into consideration when evaluating a siting selection? I assume we want to site facilities in lower crime communities than high crime areas?** Crime statistics are not a part of the search formula for identifying a site for evaluation. The LAC can certainly request local crime statistics and consider that information when and if a site is moved from evaluation to preliminary consideration phase. The goal is acclimating individuals to the community to which they are releasing and ultimately reducing criminal activity for those in the work release. Historically, recidivism rates have shown to reduce when an individual has had the opportunity to participate in the work release program. DOC's experience has been that our facility or field office and staff presence as well as the resulting increase in law enforcement and neighborhood stakeholders investment in those operations can have a positive influence on a neighborhood. • **Clyde commented in the chat, Reynolds is showing to be one of the higher return to prison stats.** Mark – yes Clyde but for technical violation behavior, not criminal activity.

	- **What is the level of tolerance typically for violating behavior? Is it generally one violation or is it be multiple violations before anything is addressed?** Each case is on its own merits, based on the violation it could result in immediate return to prison or a warning and another chance for another opportunity. If the violation was a risk to community safety or threat of violence, they would be returned to prison immediately. - **What is the benefit back to the community by hosting a site in their community?** There would be great employment opportunities to the community members within the facility. DOC has a history of making communities safer/better with their presence. The ability of individuals to become stabilized gradually through work release allows them time and opportunity to make plans and sound decisions when it comes to housing, employment, education, how to spend and budget their finances, and rebuilding relationships with family, loved ones, and others in a pro-social manner, provided they make sound choices. We hope to have employability statistics regarding those who transition from WR versus those who do not have this advantage.
COUNTY ZONING DATA & SITE-SPECIFIC PROGRESS *Tony Lindgren*	
Slides	*Work Release Expansion Project – Siting Work in Progress*
Discussion	Tony presented a map of King County that included the cities within the County. He explained the process that each city is responsible for regarding development and interpretation of land use plans and controls.
Questions/ Concerns	- **Is DOC going beyond the minimum process to notify communities as stated in the RCW?** If the authority having jurisdiction has additional requirements i.e. larger area of notification than ½ mile radius, DOC will work with that jurisdiction and go above the minimum requirements noted in the RCW. - **Has there been any progress in searching for other locations in King County since the March meeting?** One other possible site has been suggested in the Federal Way area, however that property has not been fully evaluated. KMB is looking at zoning and code first to see if the site is a viable option to move forward. - **What other efforts have been exhausted outside the RFP have been done to identify additional sites? Can a realtor search for sites currently for sale?** We are working with a real estate broker to filter properties, Gar/DOC is conducting an initial review to determine if the properties meet the minimum requirements before moving them onto KMB for full evaluation (i.e. size, public transport, job opportunities for residents) Additionally, Gar mentioned that when evaluating properties it is important to keep in mind that investors will take into consideration the cost of renovations and the return on their investment needs to make developing the property worth their efforts. - **Have geographic and social equities been taken into consideration when selecting a site since the meeting in March?** The focus in the SeaTac area is primarily being driven due to the need for a facility in south King County to accommodate individuals releasing to the south King County area, as DOC currently operated three facilities in Seattle.
LAC COMMUNICATION PLAN *Mark Kucza*	
Slides	*Work Release Expansion Project*

Discussion	Mark presented the communications plan that the LAC developed prior to pause.
	Communication is often used to identify locations, design and operation. What I hear today is that this project appears to be geared towards the later of those, not the location itself. What am I missing in terms of the intent of the communication plan? Once a preliminary recommendation is made by the LAC, and DOC moves to the first public hearing; community stakeholders will be engaged by the DOC/LAC teams. The LAC has and continues to exceed the minimum requirements listed in the RCW and WAC. **Is there evidence from other facilities that individuals want to release to their families in communities that they previously resided?** There is an RCW the drives individuals must be released to their first county of conviction. There are exceptions that can be made upon review and approval by the Department and the County that the individual will be re-directed to. **The largest employer in the SeaTac area requires a 10-year FAA background checks, how would this work for the desire for employment opportunities?** There are a variety of employers offering work opportunities that our current facilities work with that can be viewed on the public expansion web-site, with the robust transportation opportunities in the SeaTac area individuals would have access to many of the same opportunities that we currently work with in the surrounding area. **Is there a complete list of all locations that have been considered outside of the SeaTac site? Will this property be paying property tax or any other local taxes?** KMB/DOC will share the complete list on the external site. The property would be owned by a private investor and leased to the DOC; taxes would be applicable.
GENERAL DISCUSSION, NEXT STEPS & TASKS FOR FOLLOW UP *Mike Schindler*	
Slides	*Questions/Wrap Up*
Discussion	Action Items: - Please send any additional properties you become aware of for consideration to the email listed below to be evaluated - If you would like to be part of the LAC, please email your interest to the email below *Work Release Expansion Website* https://doc.wa.gov/about/business/capital-planning/capacity-work-release.htm *King County Expansion email inbox:* docwrexpandkc@doc1.wa.gov *Next meeting:* Tuesday, May 18, 2021 5:30 – 7:30 pm, via Teams (virtual)