



MEETING MINUTES	
<i>Location</i>	Skype/Teleconference
<i>Attendees</i>	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 Jon Frodema Aaron Hastings Andrew Lytle Heidi Beazizo Christine Uselman Alan Hardwick Holly Cordova Duane Leonard Andrea Holmes Jim Lawless Melody Simle Mike Rosen Kelly Miller Phillip Baskeron Stacia Bloom Stephen Boulanger Steve Ewing Tara Lotterer Wesley Deppa John Moreno Mike Stelma Number ending in 87 – Heidi (last name inaudible) Number ending in 62 – Broke up when person identified themselves

IINTRODUCTIONS, OPENING & PROGRAM OVERVIEW	
<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. Mike provided an overview of the DOC mission/vision, reasons behind work release, placement criteria and expectations of the participants in work release.

	<p>Also presented was the existing facilities, location of existing facilities, and pictures of some of the existing facilities.</p>
<p>Questions/ Concerns</p>	<p><i>The following questions were asked during the April LAC meeting. The responses are intended to clarify the answers provided at the time of the meeting, some of which were perhaps only partially accurate or incomplete.</i></p> <p><i>Question asked verbally during meeting:</i> Once the facility is up and running, what is the impact to the community in terms of the facility being an improvement to the community, and how can concerns be mitigated after opening?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Partially accurate/incomplete answer given verbally during meeting:</i> <i>It has been proven and we have statistics that show specifically that when we moved into a facility in Spokane and how much crime in the area reduced because of our presence. It is difficult for our participants to get into these programs. The participants must get involved in the community and their time is busy. The statistics show that communities are safer with our presence.</i> • Accurate and complete answer: The intent is that solid working relationships be developed and sustained between the Department, including the on-site supervisor for the facility, and community stakeholders, concerned neighbors, law enforcement, service providers, community corrections field staff working in the area, employers, and others. We all have a common interest in ensuring community safety through accountability as we work together through work release to assist people transitioning back to the community as contributing citizens. These collaborative working relationships are in place with all 12 existing work releases facilities. A significant component of sustaining these relationships is the on-going communication lines being open through calls, e-mails and periodic meetings. These discussions can result in establishing local practices consistent with state policy but also specific to a local facility’s operational needs. These close working relationships also result in a sort of “force multiplier” of presence and solid communication in areas where the Department has established facilities. <p><i>Question asked verbally during meeting:</i> Can you define heinous or notorious crimes? We are building a new community very close to this site and we're selling homes up into the \$1,000,000 range and they're going to want to know what kind of people will be housed at the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Partially accurate/incomplete answer given verbally during meeting:</i> <i>Sex offenders do not enter the program at all. Participants must meet certain standards to get into work release, their behavior while incarcerated, and work their way to that privilege is steep and there's a long waiting list; some individuals, although approved, do not make it to work release. Those who are participating in work release are not hardened criminals.</i> <i>There is opportunity for you to bring your concerns forward to the LAC, opportunity where you can weigh in, we ask for five reason why this is a great site, and these are five reasons why this may not be a great site for consideration and evaluation. Anybody that is released or leaves the site is doing so with authorization which</i>

means they've met certain criteria they've got a specific destination that they need to go to and return to by a given time so it really is a monitor program.

- **Accurate and complete answer:**

[DOC Policy 300.500 Work Release Screening](#), RCWs [9.94A](#) and [72.65](#), as well as [WAC 137-56](#) set forth the eligibility requirements and restrictions regarding persons related to work release participation. In some cases, a person may be outright prohibited due to their crime of conviction. In many cases, assuming an individual is legally eligible to participate, a secondary screening of the case is made by a multi-disciplinary team of DOC Subject Matter Experts (SME) comprising the Headquarters Community Screening Committee (HCSC), which will review and discuss the case and make a decision. There are always far more persons who meet the eligibility requirements for work release placement than there are available beds. Community safety is the number one consideration when reviewing cases for work release placement.

Question asked verbally during meeting:

Generally speaking, what are the traffic impacts for the neighborhood. How many cars/vehicles would be coming and going from the facility on a daily basis?

- *Partially accurate/incomplete answer given verbally during meeting:*
The residents that would be living there meaning the DOC residents that are under our control are not allowed to drive. That is why there's a need for the public transportation.
- **Accurate and complete answer:**
Traffic estimates would be made based upon the number of staff and residents associated with the facility. The estimates will be determined, in part, based on the size of the location and a conceptual design of the program space (building layout) including the number of beds the facility might accommodate as well as an estimated number of visitors, contractors and vendors serving the location. At some locations and on an individual basis, dependent on need, residents can be approved for use of their own vehicle, provided they have proof of insurance and a valid driver's license. A significant history of traffic violations or other violations, such as DWI, would not be approved.

Question asked verbally during meeting:

What would the foot traffic impact be?

- *Partially accurate/incomplete answer given verbally during meeting:*
Next to public transportation, walking would be their other mode of travel to get to their appointments, programming needs, and point to point passes and work. They are locked down after dark. After hours, if they don't have a reason to be out of the facility, they're not out of facility. I don't know if their programming happens after hours. I am not sure if the participants have late evening hours or early morning work hours, but their programming needs would happen during normal business hours of typical work weeks.
- **Accurate and complete answer:**
It depends upon accessibility to other modes of transportation such as public transit, personal vehicles, bicycles, and in a few situations, there may be facility-provided transportation in the event of a great distance to reach public

	<p>transportation. Residents only travel with prior permission and on a schedule-based point-to-point pass pre-approved by their CCO. They are given a specific amount of time to travel into the community to conduct their business and return to the facility. There is strict enforcement of time allowed for individuals conducting business in the community. Any deviations from their expected route or travel time are investigated and identified violations are handled dependent upon the circumstances.</p>
<p>EXPANSION SITING PROCESS/TIMELINE <i>Tony Lindgren, KMB Consultant</i> <i>Brian Little, KMB Consultant</i></p>	
<i>Slides</i>	<i>Work Release Expansion</i>
<i>Discussion</i>	Brian provided an overview of the expansion program history and the site selection steps that have happened or will happen in the future.
<p>COUNTY ZONING DATA & SITE-SPECIFIC PROGRESS <i>Tony Lindgren, KMB Consultant</i> <i>Brian Little, KMB Consultant</i></p>	
<i>Slides</i>	<i>Work Release Expansion Project – Siting Work in Progress</i>
<i>Discussion</i>	Brian presented an overview of progress and steps going forward - Mountlake Terrace site located at 7125 224 th Street SW
<i>Questions/Concerns</i>	<p>Q: Is the DOC looking for at least three sites to consider before moving forward with a public hearing to start then RCW process; or are they OK just going with one site? A: The goal is to have as many alternatives for the communities to look at as possible. If the Department of Corrections decides to move forward with the first public, then we will at that time it just needs to be three or fewer so it could be one at the time, but the goal is to have as many as three for the community to weigh in on at the time of the hearing.</p> <p>Q: Are there any other locations being considered besides the Mountlake Terrace location? A: It is the only property that we have right now that made it through the preliminary signing process. If you know of more locations that could be considered, please send them in for evaluation. Ideally, close to transportation, opportunities for employment, roughly 10,000 to 12,000 square foot footprint.</p> <p>Q: Can you give an idea on the timing from start to finish if this were to go forward? A: We work with authorities having jurisdiction to understand what their public hearing process is. Sometimes their public hearing process has a notification and then a 90 day waiting period before the public hearing we've talked to some authorities having jurisdiction whom have a 10 day waiting period before a public hearing so it really depends on the community that we move forward with. The complete process could take six to 18 months from start to finish.</p> <p>Q: Is DOC going to take down the existing dental lab and rebuild a new building in its place? A: The building would undergo a remodel of the footprint rather than tear it out. We would be able to accommodate our needs there with basically re-purposing the existing spaces.</p> <p>Q: Will access to the facility be on the Edmonds side or the Mountlake Terrace side of the building?</p>

	<p>A: We don't know that yet because we haven't done a preliminary layout, when we meet with the city, we will ask questions regarding requirements for access to the site. It does appear entrance would be on the Mountlake Terrace side; however, there is a park intervening between Edmonds and this property.</p> <p>Q: Because of this sites proximity to Hwy 99 are there any concerns with it not being a great location, due to there being a lot of illegal activity in the area?</p> <p>A: That will be evaluated by the LAC once the site passes evaluation and the DOC Secretary evaluates and approves for next steps.</p>
LAC COMMUNICATION PLAN	
<i>Mike Schindler</i>	
<i>Slides</i>	<i>Work Release Expansion Project</i>
<i>Discussion</i>	Mike provided an overview of the LAC Communication Plan. A request for volunteers to work on the communication plan was also presented.
GENERAL DISCUSSION, NEXT STEPS & TASKS FOR FOLLOW UP	
<i>Mike Schindler</i>	
<i>Slides</i>	<i>Questions/Wrap Up</i>
<i>Discussion</i>	<p>Action Items:</p> <p>Brandy Jacobs will send specific questions to Mark Kucza for comment and further clarification.</p> <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> docwexpandsc@doc1.wa.gov</p> <p><i>Next meeting:</i> Wednesday, May 11, 2021 4:00 – 6:00 pm, via Teams (virtual)</p>