



MEETING MINUTES	
<i>Location</i>	Skype/Teleconference
<i>Attendees</i>	Mike Schindler, Contract DOC Facilitator Chris Idso DOC Capital Planning & Development Director Mark Kucza, DOC Senior Administrator Brandy Jacobs, DOC Executive Secretary Tony Lindgren, KMB Architects Brian Little, KMB Architects Gar Rodside, DOC Facilities Senior Planner Kelsea Kuhnert Clyde Hill Pam Fernald Gerald Bradford Sam Betz Denise Lathrop Kimberli Dewing Erin Sitterly Evan Maxim Gwen Voelpel Jean Hernandez Lawrence Willis Chad Mulligan Robert White Franklyn Smith Stan Tombs James Koroma

INTRODUCTIONS & OPENING	
<i>Mike Schindler</i>	
<i>Slides</i>	<i>Welcome</i>
<i>Discussion</i>	Mike Schindler opened the meeting and welcomed back past and new participants. Introductions were made.
DOC MISSION/VISION & PROGRAM OVERVIEW	
<i>Mark Kucza</i>	
<i>Slides</i>	<i>Work Release Expansion</i>
<i>Discussion</i>	Mark provided an overview of DOC’s mission and vision, and the importance of Work Release. Additionally, Mark provided a program description, focus of work release, placement criteria, expectations, and what progression through work release entails.

LIVED EXPERIENCES OF PARTICIPANTS IN WORK RELEASE	
<i>Kelsea Kuhnert & Hyuk Ro</i>	
<i>Slides</i>	<i>Work Release Expansion Project</i>
<i>Discussion</i>	Kelsea and Hyuk shared their experience while in work release. They both shared that they have been imprisoned twice, neither were able to participate in work release during their first imprisonment; however, did participate during their second. They both agreed that participating in the work release program changed their lives for the better and allowed them to gain positive tendencies to be successful upon their release.
<i>Questions/Concerns</i>	Q: Does anyone on this call live within ¼ mile of any of the work release facilities? A: Mark reported living close to a work release; however, not within ¼ mile. Two people reported that they would not have any concerns living near a work release.
AUTHORITIES HAVING JURISDICTION OUTREACH	
<i>Tony Lindgren</i>	
<i>Slides</i>	<i>Work Release Expansion Project</i>
<i>Discussion</i>	Tony stated that the letter was sent to all cities and towns in Snohomish County requesting assistance with other possible sites to be considered.
<i>Questions/Concerns</i>	Q: Is there a plan to send a follow-up email to the cities and towns for response? A: Great suggestion, the team will discuss when we should send the follow-up email.
SITE REVIEW RESPONSIBILITIES & SITE-SPECIFIC PROGRESS	
<i>Tony Lindgren</i>	
<i>Slides</i>	<i>Work Release Expansion Project</i>
<i>Discussion</i>	Tony provided an overview of the LAC site review responsibilities to take into consideration when determining viability of a site. Tony provided a progress report on the SeaTac site at 18845 International Blvd, what next steps are, and that the team is currently pausing on next steps to search for additional properties to be considered.
<i>Questions/Concerns</i>	Q: Discussion regarding the scoring of each consideration. A: There is no consideration more important than the other, they are all evaluated in terms of building criteria, cost associated with renovations, and cost of lease agreements with investors would be. Renovation costs and lease costs need to be taken into investors considerations. Q: Is building of a new facility a consideration? A: Yes, the RFP that was released was specific to existing facilities that met the basic criteria that could be renovated. However, the Department would also consider ground up new construction. Q: Does the Department have anyone actively searching for additional properties? A: Yes, the Department is actively working with investors and brokers to identify additional possible sites. Q: When will the Department be finished looking for additional properties? A: The Department wants to make sure that we give municipalities an opportunity to respond to the letter that was sent out and make sure that the brokers and investors have time to continue their search before moving forward. The Department will be meeting the early part of June, to present an internal DOC review of our progress to date; to report on all four areas where expansion efforts are underway. The Agency may decide to provide direction in terms of advancing or holding. The recommendation of the Expansion Team would be to give at

	<p>least a month until our next meeting to determine if we can identify additional sites for evaluation; prior to advancing the SeaTac location to the consideration phase.</p> <p>Concerns: Members of the call felt uncomfortable with targeting other areas outside the SeaTac area.</p> <p>Clarification: It was clarified that the team is not asking you to point to another jurisdiction outside of SeaTac; however, if you know of other locations in King County to please send those forward, as the team would like to have more sites to consider.</p>
<p>LAC COMMUNICATION PLAN <i>Mark Kucza</i></p>	
Slides	<i>Work Release Expansion Project</i>
Discussion	Mark provided an overview of LAC Communication plan moving forward once a site is identified to advance to consideration phase. Also, asked for additional people to join the LAC Communication Team.
<p>GENERAL DISCUSSION, NEXT STEPS & TASKS FOR FOLLOW UP <i>Mike Schindler</i></p>	
Slides	<i>Questions/Wrap Up</i>
Discussion	<p>Additional Questions:</p> <p>Q: Did Kelsea release to the county in which she participated in work release?</p> <p>Action Items:</p> <p>A: No, she participated in work release in King County because there was not a work release in Snohomish County. When she released from work release, she had to leave her job in King County and find a job in Snohomish County, which was her county of origin. She has since completed her supervision and has relocated to Pierce County.</p> <p>Q: Is light rail considered participants only mode of transportation to get to work, grocery shopping, treatment needs, etc.? An example is that grocery stores are far away from the proposed location, and there are only a couple in the City of SeaTac.</p> <p>A: The program has several options available to participants, they have public transportation, in some cases upon approval participants may have their own vehicle, some employers offer pick up/drop off from the facility to their place of employment, and the facility also has transportation from staff to locations in the community. Additionally, participants are provided food at the facility, so there really isn't a need for grocery shopping in terms of a regular basis.</p> <p>Comment: Would rather see ground up construction and propose built facility to have the best possible facility for a 60 year lifespan. If we start with the 60 year old building we may grossly underestimate the cost of getting it renovated for initial use, also the cost of maintenance of the building over a 20 year lease may cost a horrendous amount of money to manage the site.</p> <p>Action Items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify additional sites, please send any recommendations forward for review/consideration <p><i>Work Release Expansion Website</i> https://doc.wa.gov/about/business/capital-planning/capacity-work-release.htm</p> <p><i>Snohomish County Expansion email inbox:</i> docwexpandkc@doc1.wa.gov</p>

	<p><i>Next meeting:</i> Tuesday, June 15, 2021 5:30 – 7:30 pm, via Teams (virtual)</p>
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------