



King County

Metropolitan King County Council Law, Justice and Human Services Committee

STAFF REPORT

AGENDA ITEM: 6

DATE: June 5, 2008

PROPOSED MOTION: 2008-0280

PREPARED BY: Clifton Curry

SUBJECT: A MOTION acknowledging receipt of a report from the department of adult and juvenile detention detailing the results of its capacity analysis for its community corrections program.

SUMMARY: At the committee's May 1st and 15th meetings, the committee heard from individuals who have successfully completed community corrections programs and an update on the county's current programs in preparation for the committee's review of these motions related to the acceptance of 2008 Budget Proviso responses. Since the inception of these programs, the county has seen a significant decline in its secure jail population and continuing increases in its use of alternatives to secure detention. Today, the committee will hear from the directors of the Office of Management and Budget, Community Corrections, and other staff the results of a review of the current system and how that system might be expanded through process improvements and/or actual program expansion.

Background. King County's criminal justice system, that includes law enforcement, secure detention, prosecution, indigent defense, and adjudication of criminal matters in superior and district courts, accounts for almost three quarters of the county's discretionary expenditures. While these responsibilities are mandated by constitutional, statutory, and other requirements, the county has a great deal of flexibility in establishing levels of service. In recognition of the fact that increases in criminal justice expenditures are outpacing the county's ability to pay for these increases, the county council adopted the Adult Justice Operational Master Plan. As a result, King County's adult justice system has been engaged in an intensive effort to explore alternative types of sanctions, identify justice system process improvements that will reduce costs and make the best use of limited detention resources in order to promote public safety and preserve jail capacity for those offenders for whom jail is the only option and reduce the use of secure detention in the county.

With the approval of the Adult Justice Operational Master Plan, the county established policies for the use of secure detention capacity, that emphasized system and process efficiencies that reduce the utilization of jail and reduce overall criminal justice expenditures, encouraged alternatives to the use the secure detention for adult offenders in order to make best use of limited detention resources and preserve public safety, and to established as a county policy the requirement for the use of integrated and coordinated treatment of offenders whose criminal activity is related to substance abuse or mental illness in order to avoid future system costs, reduce jail utilization for these groups, and reduce future criminality. Specifically, the council adopted as policy in Ordinance 14430:

SECTION 5. The council also encourages the development and use of alternatives to the use of secure detention for adult offenders in order to make best use of limited detention resources and preserve public safety. These intermediate sanctions should be used in a graduated and measured manner, appropriate to the offense and cognizant of the cost effectiveness—measured through lower costs, or reducing the costs of future offending.

Therefore, it has been the County's adopted policy for adult criminal justice since 2002 to make maximum use of alternatives to secure detention. In addition, county policy includes the council's stated intent that treatment—when it reduces offender recidivism—should be used to the fullest extent possible.

When the reform efforts began, the county had minimal numbers of individuals involved in alternative programs. In 2002, in an average week, 100 individuals were in the county's work release program and three individuals were on electronic home release. Since 2002, the county's criminal justice agencies have been working towards the implementation of these policies. The executive created within the Department of Adult and Juvenile Detention, a Community Corrections Division. The representatives of the division worked successfully with the superior and district courts (along with the prosecutor and public defender) to develop the means by which the courts will use alternatives to secure detention. To ensure public safety and avoid liability issues—the decision to place an individual in a community corrections program is always done through a judicial decision. Several new alternatives and other programs have been developed since 2002.

The council recognized during its 2003 budget deliberations that, with the goal of maximizing the use of alternatives and treatment options, the judges would need to have specific information in order to make appropriate decisions. As a consequence, the council added to the 2003 budget an appropriation for the development of an "intake services pilot program." The council placed this appropriation within the Superior Court's budget. However, after review, the responsibilities of the Intake Services Unit were transferred to the Division of Community Corrections in 2003. Additionally, resources were made available to the Department of Community and Human Services for the development of "Criminal Justice Initiative" programs that sought to provide appropriate services and treatment to individuals to avoid secure detention and to reduce re-offending. Many of these programs have been implemented in conjunction with the community corrections program. In 2004, the council added resources to community corrections for expanded work crews, intake services, and community alternatives programs. The council also provided funding for inmate re-licensing programs and added resources to develop the "Helping Hands" initiative. In 2005, the budget added resources for the development of information technology initiatives and a community "re-entry program." For 2006, the council added resources for the expanding alternatives programs and to initiate a learning center.

In 2008, the county's community corrections division has, on average, over 1,000 individuals involved in all of its various program each week—an almost ten-fold increase in less than five years. The 2008 Budget maintains implementation of the county's policies related to the use of alternatives to secure detention. However, there were no significant increases for the Community Corrections Division budget. Nevertheless, alternatives to secure detention through the department's Community Corrections Division are being utilized at rates much higher than expected. For example, the county's day reporting program (Community Center for Alternative Programs—CCAP), were projected to have an average number of 99 participants in the 2008 budget, but have grown to an average daily number of 192 participants through April 2008. All of the division's programs have shown similar utilization patterns. A significant issue is that continued growth in these programs is limited because of space and

facility limits. For example, there have been up to *30 day waiting periods* to get eligible inmates in the jail into the Work and Education Release program because of space limitations. At times, there have been waiting lists of up to 90 inmates who stay in secure detention waiting for space availability. The division's programs have also been constrained by geographic issues (most programming is located in Seattle) and most are unavailable to city misdemeanants.

As consequence of the identified limitations on the enrollment in these programs, the council adopted two provisos in the 2008 Budget. The first requires a review of the feasibility of implementing changes in how the county uses its community corrections programs. The proviso requires the executive, working with representatives of the Superior Court, District Court, Office of the Prosecuting Attorney, Office of the Public Defender, sheriff and the departments of Adult and Juvenile Detention and Community and Human Services, review the current use of community corrections alternatives and programs and evaluate whether changes in screening, processing, sentencing or monitoring compliance could lead to better utilization of existing community corrections program capacity. The other proviso requires the executive to report to the council on which community corrections need to be expanded, when expansion is needed, and a description of the best geographical locations for the expanded programs.

Facilities Proviso. As noted above, the council adopted the following Budget Proviso as part of the 2008 Budget:

Of this appropriation, \$25,000 shall not be expended or encumbered until the council reviews, and by motion, acknowledges receipt of a report from the department detailing the results of its capacity analysis for its community corrections program. The department shall transmit the report to the council by May 15, 2008. The report shall identify: (1) which community corrections programs need to be expanded; (2) when expansion is needed; and (3) a description of the best geographical locations for the expanded programs. The report shall include an immediate analysis of facility space vacated by the county's elections division upon their move to a consolidated facility in Renton that is scheduled to occur in December 2007. The report should also identify the executive's plans for expanding programs, including program options, schedules, resources needed for expansion, and milestones.

In adopting this proviso, the council was acknowledging that community corrections capacity can be increased by either adding new program resources or space, or by improving the system and processes to make them more efficient overall. For example, capacity for work/education release can be created by adding beds or by reducing the length-of-stay for current users—thus freeing up space earlier and allowing more participants.

In order to respond to the proviso, the Department of Adult and Juvenile Detention (the Community Corrections Division is part of the department) sought to analyze community corrections program capacity and forecast the future population of individuals that would be eligible to use alternatives to secure confinement. The department contracted for studies to forecast the adult secure population, the community corrections population, the adult secure capacity and the community corrections capacity.

Based on the findings of the contractors engaged to project program utilization, the following conclusions were drawn by the department:

- Work/Education Release is projected to reach maximum capacity in 2012-2013. According to the report, this is the most difficult alternative to expand because it requires custodial housing space which takes significant time and resources to select a site and carry out the necessary public involvement process, to acquire the site and to complete the required permitting

processes. Nevertheless, current utilization of the program regularly results in wait times before eligible inmates are admitted.

- Electronic Home Detention will not reach capacity until some time after 2026. This alternative is most easily expanded because space requirements are only for staff offices.
- Community Center for Alternatives Program (CCAP) is expected to reach maximum capacity in 2011-2012. There are many factors that need to be taken into account when considering expansion of CCAP. Expansion of CCAP requires not only staffing, but also adequate classroom space and security to monitor and manage a more diverse population mix. As more clients are served, the population diversifies and classrooms are more crowded which can exacerbate tension and behavior issues. If capacity grows without associated increases in infrastructure, overall staff control decreases.

Based on current average daily workload, the Community Work Program is not likely to reach maximum capacity for some time.

It is important to note that the data and the projected years that the population will exceed maximum capacity in 2011 assume no changes to the current use and structure of community corrections alternatives, particularly the expansion of alternatives to cities that contract for jail services. If King County makes changes to how community corrections alternatives are used or who can use them, capacity may be reached much earlier than these projections.

In addition, the department concluded that consultant's work provided only limited insight into where expanded programs could be located. Given that King County has a secure custody facility along with courts and other criminal justice services in the City of Kent, it is logical to consider geographic expansion in South King County. Because work release, CCAP, and work crew are located in downtown Seattle, it is difficult for individuals residing outside of Seattle to participate in them, particularly if they are reliant on public transportation. If community corrections alternatives were available in closer proximity to where individuals live, it is reported that more judges may use them—this is especially true for judges at the Maleng Regional Justice Center dealing with defendants and sentenced individuals from the southern part of the county, although judges in Seattle have expressed the same desire for individuals adjudicated in Seattle, but who reside in the southern part of the county.

According to the report, the exploration of the option to expand programs and facilities into the southern part of the county requires the participation of the department and the Facilities Management Division, the Office of Management and Budget, and the south end community in the broader consideration of space needs, program site and funding availability. An assessment needs to be done regarding accessibility by bus/train from various parts of the county to determine the best location for geographic expansion. When this study goes forward, it should be coordinated with other criminal justice agencies and ensure participation by all criminal justice and community stakeholders (communities and the service providers that work in various communities that serve community corrections participants).

The report does conclude that planning for the expansion of community corrections should be coordinated with current jail and facility planning efforts, including how King County will be using its alternatives in the future.

Analysis of Administration Building—After Elections Division Relocation. The proviso requires that the executive’s response must “include an immediate analysis of facility space vacated by the county’s elections division upon their move to a consolidated facility in Renton.” The Facilities Management Division conducted an analysis of the space in the Administration Building and compared it to the space and facility needs for community corrections. The report concludes that, based on this facilities management analysis of the vacant space on the 5th floor of the Administration Building, the space is not a viable option for expanding community corrections capacity. According to the report, rather than move a portion of the community corrections current operations to a different building, it makes sense to keep their programs in close proximity. Remodeling work necessary to make the Yesler Building space useable for Community Corrections is minimal, so startup of the new programs can occur quickly.

Next Steps. The proviso also required that the executive’ response “identify the executive’s plans for expanding programs, including program options, schedules, resources needed for expansion, and milestones.” The report concludes that the process and next steps must be coordinated with several other planning efforts which will have an overall impact on the outcome of community corrections capacity expansion decisions. Additionally, this review will need to consider the current and projected future fiscal climate in King County. The report contains a work plan and schedule for this review with an estimated completion in the third quarter of 2009.

ATTENDEES:

1. Bob Cowan, Director, Office of Management and Budget
2. Nate Caldwell, Director, Community Corrections Division, Department of Adult and Juvenile Detention
3. Kari Tamura, Deputy Director, Department of Adult and Juvenile Detention
4. Toni Rezab, Chief of Administration, Department of Adult and Juvenile Detention

ATTACHMENT:

1. Executive Transmittal Letter
2. Proposed Motion 2008-0280
3. Community Corrections Division Capacity Analysis, Report to King County Council, May 2008



King County

Ron Sims
 King County Executive
 701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3210
 Seattle, WA 98104
206-296-4040 Fax 206-296-0194
 TTY Relay: 711
 www.kingcounty.gov

RECEIVED

2008 MAY 14 PM 3:54

CLERK
 KING COUNTY COUNCIL

May 14, 2008

2008-280

The Honorable Julia Patterson
 Chair, King County Council
 Room 1200
 COURTHOUSE

Dear Councilmember Patterson:

I am pleased to transmit to you legislation responding to two provisos in the 2008 Adopted King County Budget (Ordinance 15975).

Both provisos pertain to the Department of Adult and Juvenile Detention's Community Corrections Division (CCD). The first is found in Proviso P3, Section 19 of the ordinance and requires that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) provide a report "detailing a review of the feasibility of implementing changes in how the county uses its community corrections programs." The second is found in Proviso P1, Section 51 of the same ordinance and requires that the Department of Adult and Juvenile Detention (DAJD) provide a report "detailing the results of its capacity analysis for its community corrections program." In March, I requested an extension of the original deadline for both provisos to May 15, 2008.

In order to respond to the OMB proviso, in December 2007 OMB reconvened the Adult Justice Operational Master Plan (AJOMP) Advisory Group – comprised of representatives of the Superior Court, District Court, Office of the Prosecuting Attorney, Office of the Public Defender, Sheriff's Office, the Department of Adult and Juvenile Detention and the Department of Community and Human Services – to guide this work. The Advisory Group has been meeting regularly since December to consider changes to the use and capacity of community corrections. A smaller work group of criminal justice system stakeholders was charged with carrying out the research and conducting the necessary analysis to produce an initial set of recommendations; this includes three recommendations for immediate implementation and 11 possible changes that will require further exploration and analysis. Thus far, the process has laid the foundation for a more in-depth review of issues and ideas that may lead to better utilization of existing community corrections capacity. The report lays out a plan for moving forward with this analysis and sets a rough timeline for making implementation decisions.

The Honorable Julia Patterson

May 14, 2008

Page 2

Some of the AJOMP Advisory Group recommendations for further exploration, if implemented, would have an impact on the size and geographic capacity of CCD alternatives. Using this information as a starting point, a work group comprised of staff from OMB, DAJD, and Facilities Management Division (FMD) was formed to respond to the DAJD proviso. In addition to reviewing the capacity recommendations of the AJOMP Advisory Group, they also considered the population forecasts for CCD alternatives that were submitted by two separate consultants in 2007. Based on this information, preliminary capacity conclusions have been drawn and a plan has been laid out for moving forward with conducting additional analysis to inform potential CCD capacity expansion decisions. As there are interdependencies between these decisions and several other jail and criminal justice facility planning efforts currently underway, the work moving forward will need to be closely aligned with the work plans for each of these projects.

As directed in the DAJD proviso, FMD staff analyzed the office space vacated by the Department of Executive Services, Elections Division, on the fifth floor of the King County Administration Building in December 2007 as a possible location for CCD expansion. This analysis concluded that the office space in the Administration Building is not a good option for housing CCD programs and alternatives. However, with additional space in the Yesler Building being provided to CCD by the end of this year, there should be enough square feet to meet the existing space needs of the division. This assumes no significant changes in the near future.

Moving forward, there will need to be considerable coordination between the two work plans outlined in the proviso reports. How King County uses its community corrections alternatives will direct and inform priorities for considering expansion of specific alternatives. In addition, both efforts require similar data gathering and statistical analysis that will guide decisions moving forward. Next steps for capacity expansion and use of CCD recommendations will be staffed by the same OMB project manager and the CCD Director and both will be guided and informed by the AJOMP Advisory Group. These efforts will be coordinated and the ultimate set of recommendations will be mutually supportive and provide a logical framework for moving forward with making capacity or programmatic changes to CCD.

As you are aware, King County will experience significant budget challenges this year as well as moving into 2009 and beyond. The known budget deficit will require significant annual budget reductions in the foreseeable future. Any consideration of expanding or changing CCD programs and alternatives will need to take this into account. Necessarily, the next steps work and analysis of possible changes and/or expansion to CCD alternatives outlined in each of the proviso reports will need to be carefully evaluated for cost implications as well as possible cost savings to the county.

On a positive note, on April 9, 2008, President Bush signed Second Chance Act of 2007. This new legislation authorizes grant funding for states and counties to provide community-based prisoner re-entry services aimed at reducing re-offense and violations that result in re-incarceration. Grant funding will be available to promote the safe and successful reintegration

The Honorable Julia Patterson

May 14, 2008

Page 3

into the community of individuals who have been incarcerated. Among the specific topics to be considered for demonstration grants will be projects to improve release and revocation decisions through the use of risk assessment tools. My staff will be closely tracking the Department of Justice web site for the notice of funds availability associated with the Second Chance Act of 2007 as this may present an opportunity for King County to secure additional funding for community corrections programs and alternatives.

Both of these proviso reports were produced through the collaborative effort of several Executive departments and all of King County's criminal justice agencies. I want to express appreciation to the members of AJOMP Advisory and Work Groups for their willingness to come together and work collaboratively to improve King County's criminal justice system.

If you have questions or comments regarding either of these reports, please contact Bob Cowan, Director, Office of Management and Budget, 206-296-3434, or Nate Caldwell, Community Corrections Division Director, Department of Adult and Juvenile Detention, 206-296-3600. My staff and I look forward to working collaboratively with the AJOMP Advisory Group in executing the next steps outlined in these proviso reports.

Sincerely,



for Ron Sims
King County Executive

Enclosures

cc: King County Councilmembers

ATTN: Ross Baker, Chief of Staff

Saroja Reddy, Policy Staff Director

Anne Noris, Clerk of Council

Frank Abe, Communications Director

Bob Cowan, Director, Office of Management and Budget (OMB)

Beth Goldberg, Deputy Director, OMB

Jeannie Macnab, Senior Policy Analyst, OMB

Reed Holtgeerts, Director, Department of Adult & Juvenile Detention (DAJD)

Toni Rezab, Chief of Administration, DAJD

Nate Caldwell, Community Corrections Division Director, DAJD

James J. Buck, County Administrative Officer, Department of Executive Services (DES)

Kathy Brown, Director, Facilities Management Division (FMD), DES

Terri Flaherty, Director of Special Initiatives, FMD



Signature Report

May 22, 2008

Motion

Proposed No. 2008-0280.1

Sponsors Lambert

1 A MOTION acknowledging receipt of a report from the
2 department of adult and juvenile detention detailing the
3 results of its capacity analysis for its community
4 corrections program.

5
6 WHEREAS, the county is mandated by constitutional, statutory and other
7 requirements to provide secure detention and alternatives to incarceration; and

8 WHEREAS, it is the policy of King County to encourage alternatives to the use of
9 secure detention for adult offenders in order to make the best use of limited detention
10 resources and preserve public safety; and

11 WHEREAS, King County established the community corrections division of the
12 department of adult and juvenile detention to provide alternatives to adult detention; and

13 WHEREAS, community corrections alternatives are well utilized in King County
14 and some are serving more clients than anticipated through annual budget planning; and

15 WHEREAS, King County must ensure that its community corrections alternatives
16 have sufficient size and geographic capacity to meet the needs of the courts; and

17 WHEREAS, Ordinance 15975, the 2008 King County Budget Ordinance,
18 contains a proviso requiring the department of adult and juvenile detention to identify
19 which community corrections programs need to be expanded, when expansion is needed,
20 and a description of the best geographical locations for the expanded programs, and
21 include in the report an analysis of facility space vacated by the county's elections
22 division upon their move to a consolidated facility; and

23 WHEREAS, the executive has transmitted to the council with this motion, a
24 report that details the results of the department of adult and juvenile detention's capacity
25 analysis for its community corrections program and an analysis of the vacated elections
26 space;

27 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT MOVED by the Council of King County:
28

Motion

29 The Community Corrections Division Capacity Analysis – Report to King County

30 Council, Attachment A to this motion, is hereby acknowledged as received.

31

KING COUNTY COUNCIL
KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Julia Patterson, Chair

ATTEST:

Anne Noris, Clerk of the Council

Ron Sims, County Executive

Attachments A. Community Corrections Division Capacity Analysis Report to King County
 Council May 2008

2008-280

ATTACHMENT A

Attachment 3

**Community Corrections Division
Capacity Analysis**

Report to King County Council

May 2008

Prepared by:

King County Department of Adult & Juvenile Detention
Reed Holtgeerts, Director

King County Office of Management and Budget
Bob Cowan, Director

King County Department of Executive Services
Facilities Management Division
Kathy Brown, Director

Executive Summary

This report responds to a proviso in the 2008 Adopted Budget (Ordinance 15975) requesting a capacity analysis of King County's community corrections program. The proviso directed the Department of Adult and Juvenile Detention (DAJD) to: identify which community corrections programs need to be expanded, when they need to be expanded, and where they need to be expanded; analyze vacant facility space in the Administration Building for use by Community Corrections Division (CCD); and identify a plan for next steps.

As staff considered expansion of the Community Corrections Division, it became apparent - through the work of understanding the caseload forecast and additional analysis - that the final recommendation of this proviso response is a set of next steps for making geographic and capacity expansion decisions. As there are interdependencies between these decisions and several other jail and criminal justice facility planning efforts currently underway, the work moving forward will need to be closely aligned with the work plans for each of these efforts. Additionally, given the current fiscal climate in King County, with significant budget reductions necessary in 2009 and beyond, any consideration of expanding CCD programs and alternatives must take this into account.

Capacity and Space Conclusions:

DAJD hired two consultants to conduct population forecasts for the alternatives to incarceration housed within the Community Corrections Division. Based on this forecasting, a work group further analyzed the data and came to the following conclusions:

- Work and Education Release (WER) is projected to reach maximum capacity in 2012-2013. This is the most difficult alternative to expand because it requires custodial housing space which takes significant time and resources to select a site and to carry out the necessary public involvement process, to acquire the site, and to complete the required permitting processes.
- Electronic Home Detention (EHD) will not reach capacity until some time after 2026. This alternative is most easily expanded because space requirements are only for staff offices.
- Community Center for Alternative Programs (CCAP) is expected to reach maximum capacity in 2011-2012. Expansion of CCAP requires not only staffing, but also adequate classroom space and security to monitor and manage a more diverse population mix.
- Based on current average daily workload, Community Work Program (CWP) is not likely to reach maximum capacity for some time.
- Using either intake events or workload data, Helping Changes Program (HHP) is very close to capacity. However, it may be possible to place additional defendants sentenced to community service hours with a non-profit agency using existing resources if certain tasks are removed from the case manager's duties and if some functions are automated and/or delegated to clerical support staff.

This analysis also determined that, should CCD programs be expanded, the most logical geographic location for expanding community corrections alternatives is South King County. The report discusses in more detail the specific needs and implications for expanding each of the CCD alternatives.

Facilities Management Division (FMD) conducted an analysis of the office space vacated by the Department of Executive Services Elections Division on the fifth floor of the King County Administration Building in December 2007. There is not sufficient space on the 5th floor of the Administration Building to accommodate all of the CCD programs currently housed in the Yesler and Prefontaine Buildings. Nor does the Administration Building space meet the current unmet need of a lunch room/break space for CCAP participants. Thus, only a portion of Community Corrections' operations could be accommodated in the Administration Building. This results in a split operation with inherent inefficiencies and risks and thus, the Administration Building space is not recommended for CCD.

The final section of the report lays out next steps for making geographic and capacity expansion decisions. This work will be integrated with other jail and criminal justice system planning efforts.

Introduction

This report responds to a proviso in the 2008 Adopted Budget (Ordinance 15975) requesting a capacity analysis of King County's community corrections program. Historically, the Department of Adult and Juvenile Detention (DAJD) has retained the services of a consultant to forecast adult secure detention populations for the purpose of budget and facility planning. In addition to the King County Correctional Facility in Seattle and the Maleng Regional Justice Center in Kent, this forecasting has included Work Education Release (WER) and Electronic Home Detention (EHD). In 2003, when the Community Corrections Division (CCD) became operational, existing alternatives to incarceration ("alternatives"), WER and EHD, were incorporated into the division. Additional, non-secure alternatives – such as the Community Center for Alternative Programs (CCAP) – were established, but not incorporated into the forecasting process.

As part of its Regional Jail Planning project, DAJD retained the services of a consulting firm, with expertise in corrections facility planning, to conduct a needs and alternatives evaluation of the workload, operational, and space needs for CCD. This included a 20-year forecast for each CCD alternative. This report presents the results of that analysis, the viability of using vacant office space in the King County Administration Building for CCD programs, and provides a plan with next steps for further analysis.

Proviso

The following is an excerpt from the King County 2008 Adopted Budget, Ordinance 15975, Section 51 Adult and Juvenile Detention, P1.

Of this appropriation, \$25,000 shall not be expended or encumbered until the council reviews, and by motion, acknowledges receipt of a report from the department detailing the results of its capacity analysis for its community corrections program. The department shall transmit the report to the council by May 15, 2008. The report shall identify: (1) which community corrections programs need to be expanded; (2) when expansion is needed; and (3) a description of the best geographical locations for the expanded programs. The report shall include an immediate analysis of facility space vacated by the county's elections division upon their move to a consolidated facility in Renton that is scheduled to occur in December 2007. The report should also identify the executive's plans for expanding programs, including program options, schedules, resources needed for expansion, and milestones.

The plan required to be submitted by this proviso must be filed in the form of 12 copies with the clerk of the council, who will retain the original and will forward copies to each councilmember and to the lead staff for the law, justice and human services committee, or its successor and to the lead staff for the capital budget committee, or its successor.

CCD Background

Through CCD, King County operates a series of alternatives which provide the courts with sanctions between jail and release to the community. As noted above, when CCD was created in 2002, existing alternatives, WER, EHD, and Community Work Program (CWP) were moved into the division. A day reporting program, called Community Center for Alternative Programs (CCAP) was established and since that time, several other alternatives, education and reentry support programs have been implemented.

CCD has added programs and alternatives to its mix of services ongoing for the past five years. Both programs and alternatives have been adapted and in some cases expanded throughout this time period. There has been no formal evaluation or capacity analysis of CCD. In 2005, Mark Morris Associates – an independent consulting firm with expertise in adult justice systems – reviewed CCD’s programs and alternatives and provided recommendations for improvement. Initially, it was intended that the consultant would provide a comprehensive evaluation of the newly established division. Due to issues with the division’s data systems, a comprehensive evaluation was not possible. Similarly, there has been very limited space planning for CCD. Program space has been adapted and increased as the CCD population has expanded or programs added.

Community Corrections Division Capacity Analysis

In order to analyze CCD capacity and forecast the future population of alternatives to secure confinement, DAJD contracted for studies to forecast the adult secure population, the CCD population, the adult secure capacity and the CCD capacity. The adult secure population study was completed by John O’Connell, PhD (“O’Connell”), and the remaining three studies were completed by Carter Goble Lee (CGL). The WER and EHD population was also forecasted in the O’Connell adult secure population forecast. Population forecasting is imprecise because CCD has limited history and the division programs and alternatives have been in constant flux during the past five years. As a result, the consultants developed a variety of capacity estimates and this analysis is reflected in a range of years when the population is projected to exceed maximum capacity. Table 1 on the following page summarizes some of the findings associated with the studies of CCD capacity and population. A key to concepts and abbreviations used in the table follows:

- “Program Capacity” is broken down between “Physical” and “Staffing” and the “Population at Max Capacity” is based on limitations from both sources.
- Average Daily Population (ADP) is the term used for WER and EHD programs, where the persons are considered by statute to be in partial confinement. ADP is the average of the total number of inmate days divided by the number of days in the reporting period.
- Average Daily Enrollment (ADE) is used to describe non-custody programs, and is the average of the number of persons enrolled in the program divided by the days in the reporting period. ADE is not always an indication of daily participation in the program.

- Average Daily Workload (ADW) is calculated by dividing the total number of active participation days by the total participation days in the same time period. This is most relevant in the case of CWP where not all participants report to the program every day, so enrollment is significantly larger than the actual number of individuals participating on a daily basis.
- “Year(s) Projected Demand Exceeds Max Capacity” contains consensus estimate ranges based on the consultants’ reports. WER and EHD are based on the O’Connell and the CGL forecasting studies, while the remaining programs are ranges estimated by CGL.
- All estimates assume that there are no substantial changes to the existing CCD programs, including changes to admissions criteria or judicial use of the programs.

Table 1

Summary of CCD Capacity and Population Projections

Name	CCD Program Description	Existing Capacity		Population at Max Capacity		Utilization		Year(s) Projected Demand Exceeds Max Capacity*	Description of what is needed for expansion
		Physical	Staffing	ADP/ADE	ADP/ADE	2007 Actual ADP/ADE	2008 Budgeted ADP/ADE		
Work Education Release (WER)	Partial custody program which allows inmates to go to work, school, or treatment during the day/evening and return to the secure WER facility at night. Participants must remain drug and alcohol free. Urinalysis (UA) is conducted as required.	189 beds (includes contract beds), case manager office space.	7 case managers with a shared WER and EHD caseload (WER staffing also includes DA,JD corrections officers)	189 - the max capacity for WER is determined by the bed space in King County's existing facility and the contract with the Department of Corrections (for 30 beds).	146	162	2012-2013	Additional beds, case managers with additional office space, expanded UA equipment and space, administrative support, and county overhead costs.	
Electronic Home Detention (EHD)	Partial custody program using an electronic monitoring system that restricts participants to their home, except to go to work, school, treatment or court hearings. Participants wear and are monitored by an electronic bracelet. UA is conducted as ordered by the court. BASIC: Employment or enrollment in school is verified at admission. Note - the AJOMP Advisory Group has proposed eliminating this program and providing only EHD Enhanced. ENHANCED: Employment or enrollment in school is verified at admission and attendance is monitored and verified.	Storage and space to apply the electronic bracelets, case manager's office.		210 - the max capacity for EHD is determined by staffing and assumes a 1:57 client to case manager ratio.	115	110	After 2026	Case managers with additional office space, expanded storage space, expanded UA equipment and space, administrative support, overhead costs, and expansion of the monitoring costs.	

