

KING COUNTY

Signature Report

ATTACHMENT 1

1200 King County Courthouse 516 Third Avenue Seattle, WA 98104

July 21, 2017

Ordinance

	Proposed No. 2016-0550.1 Sponsors Upthegrove
1	AN ORDINANCE relating to the adult and juvenile justice
2	systems and detention; and amending Ordinance 12432,
3	Section 2, as amended, and K.C.C. 2.16.120.
4	PREAMBLE:
5	In 2000, the county council recognized that increases in criminal justice
6	expenditures were outpacing the county's ability to pay for these increases,
7	and the county council required the development of master plans for both
8	the county's adult and juvenile criminal justice systems in order to reduce
9	crime and the need for new detention facilities. As a result, King County's
10	criminal justice system leaders engaged in an intensive effort to: explore
11	alternative types of sanctions; identify justice system process
12	improvements; improve the use of limited detention resources in order to
13	promote public safety; and, preserve detention capacity for those offenders
14	for whom jail is the only option. The county now makes use of a variety
15	of local community services and programs for offenders to reduce
16	recidivism and the county seeks to ensure that inmates have access to
17	families and the community to ensure successful reentry after
18	incarceration.
19	As a result of these efforts, the county has reduced its use of secure

21support current and projected secure detention needs.22Other jurisdictions, including the State of Washington and the federal23Department of Homeland Security's Immigration and Customs24Enforcement, have not been able to reduce secure detention caseloads and,25as a result, contract with private, non-governmental entities, also known as26private prisons, to house inmates in secure detention.27The existence of private prison service providers has become, in recent28years, a focal point of controversy in the United States. Proponents stress29that privately owned prisons operate with efficiencies not present in30government-run systems and due to those efficiencies, have lower costs.31However, national reviews contradict these assertions and have identified32other negative issues associated with private prison. Researchers have33determined that contracts with private prison providers are not necessarily34less expensive when all costs are considered, determined that there is lack35of oversight of the contractors who provide the services, and that cost-36saving measures in these institutions lead to conditions that put inmates37and staff at risk. Additionally, the private detention facilities have little or38no link to community services because the facilities are located out-of-39state.40It is the intent of the council, therefore, that the county shall not use any41private or nongovernmental secure detention providers to house any adult42	20	detention for adults and juveniles and maintains sufficient capacity to
23Department of Homeland Security's Immigration and Customs24Enforcement, have not been able to reduce secure detention caseloads and,25as a result, contract with private, non-governmental entities, also known as26private prisons, to house inmates in secure detention.27The existence of private prison service providers has become, in recent28years, a focal point of controversy in the United States. Proponents stress29that privately owned prisons operate with efficiencies not present in30government-run systems and due to those efficiencies, have lower costs.31However, national reviews contradict these assertions and have identified32other negative issues associated with private prisons. Researchers have33determined that contracts with private prison providers are not necessarily34less expensive when all costs are considered, determined that there is lack35of oversight of the contractors who provide the services, and that cost-36saving measures in these institutions lead to conditions that put immates37and staff at risk. Additionally, the private detention facilities have little or38no link to community services because the facilities are located out-of-39state.40It is the intent of the council, therefore, that the county shall not use any41private or nongovernmental secure detention providers to house any adult	21	support current and projected secure detention needs.
 Enforcement, have not been able to reduce secure detention caseloads and, as a result, contract with private, non-governmental entities, also known as private prisons, to house inmates in secure detention. The existence of private prison service providers has become, in recent years, a focal point of controversy in the United States. Proponents stress that privately owned prisons operate with efficiencies not present in government-run systems and due to those efficiencies, have lower costs. However, national reviews contradict these assertions and have identified other negative issues associated with private prison. Researchers have determined that contracts with private prison providers are not necessarily less expensive when all costs are considered, determined that there is lack of oversight of the contractors who provide the services, and that cost- saving measures in these institutions lead to conditions that put inmates and staff at risk. Additionally, the private detention facilities have little or no link to community services because the facilities are located out-of- state. It is the intent of the council, therefore, that the county shall not use any private or nongovernmental secure detention providers to house any adult 	22	Other jurisdictions, including the State of Washington and the federal
25as a result, contract with private, non-governmental entities, also known as26private prisons, to house inmates in secure detention.27The existence of private prison service providers has become, in recent28years, a focal point of controversy in the United States. Proponents stress29that privately owned prisons operate with efficiencies not present in30government-run systems and due to those efficiencies, have lower costs.31However, national reviews contradict these assertions and have identified32other negative issues associated with private prisons. Researchers have33determined that contracts with private prison providers are not necessarily34less expensive when all costs are considered, determined that there is lack35of oversight of the contractors who provide the services, and that cost-36saving measures in these institutions lead to conditions that put inmates37and staff at risk. Additionally, the private detention facilities have little or38no link to community services because the facilities are located out-of-39state.40It is the intent of the council, therefore, that the county shall not use any41private or nongovernmental secure detention providers to house any adult	23	Department of Homeland Security's Immigration and Customs
26private prisons, to house inmates in secure detention.27The existence of private prison service providers has become, in recent28years, a focal point of controversy in the United States. Proponents stress29that privately owned prisons operate with efficiencies not present in30government-run systems and due to those efficiencies, have lower costs.31However, national reviews contradict these assertions and have identified32other negative issues associated with private prisons. Researchers have33determined that contracts with private prison providers are not necessarily34less expensive when all costs are considered, determined that there is lack35of oversight of the contractors who provide the services, and that cost-36saving measures in these institutions lead to conditions that put inmates37and staff at risk. Additionally, the private detention facilities have little or38no link to community services because the facilities are located out-of-39state.40It is the intent of the council, therefore, that the county shall not use any41private or nongovernmental secure detention providers to house any adult	24	Enforcement, have not been able to reduce secure detention caseloads and,
The existence of private prison service providers has become, in recent years, a focal point of controversy in the United States. Proponents stress that privately owned prisons operate with efficiencies not present in government-run systems and due to those efficiencies, have lower costs. However, national reviews contradict these assertions and have identified other negative issues associated with private prisons. Researchers have determined that contracts with private prison providers are not necessarily less expensive when all costs are considered, determined that there is lack of oversight of the contractors who provide the services, and that cost- saving measures in these institutions lead to conditions that put inmates and staff at risk. Additionally, the private detention facilities have little or no link to community services because the facilities are located out-of- state. It is the intent of the council, therefore, that the county shall not use any private or nongovernmental secure detention providers to house any adult	25	as a result, contract with private, non-governmental entities, also known as
 years, a focal point of controversy in the United States. Proponents stress that privately owned prisons operate with efficiencies not present in government-run systems and due to those efficiencies, have lower costs. However, national reviews contradict these assertions and have identified other negative issues associated with private prisons. Researchers have determined that contracts with private prison providers are not necessarily less expensive when all costs are considered, determined that there is lack of oversight of the contractors who provide the services, and that cost- saving measures in these institutions lead to conditions that put inmates and staff at risk. Additionally, the private detention facilities have little or no link to community services because the facilities are located out-of- state. It is the intent of the council, therefore, that the county shall not use any private or nongovernmental secure detention providers to house any adult 	26	private prisons, to house inmates in secure detention.
29that privately owned prisons operate with efficiencies not present in30government-run systems and due to those efficiencies, have lower costs.31However, national reviews contradict these assertions and have identified32other negative issues associated with private prisons. Researchers have33determined that contracts with private prison providers are not necessarily34less expensive when all costs are considered, determined that there is lack35of oversight of the contractors who provide the services, and that cost-36saving measures in these institutions lead to conditions that put inmates37and staff at risk. Additionally, the private detention facilities have little or38no link to community services because the facilities are located out-of-39state.40It is the intent of the council, therefore, that the county shall not use any41private or nongovernmental secure detention providers to house any adult	27	The existence of private prison service providers has become, in recent
 government-run systems and due to those efficiencies, have lower costs. However, national reviews contradict these assertions and have identified other negative issues associated with private prisons. Researchers have determined that contracts with private prison providers are not necessarily less expensive when all costs are considered, determined that there is lack of oversight of the contractors who provide the services, and that cost- saving measures in these institutions lead to conditions that put inmates and staff at risk. Additionally, the private detention facilities have little or no link to community services because the facilities are located out-of- state. It is the intent of the council, therefore, that the county shall not use any private or nongovernmental secure detention providers to house any adult 	28	years, a focal point of controversy in the United States. Proponents stress
However, national reviews contradict these assertions and have identified other negative issues associated with private prisons. Researchers have determined that contracts with private prison providers are not necessarily less expensive when all costs are considered, determined that there is lack of oversight of the contractors who provide the services, and that cost- saving measures in these institutions lead to conditions that put inmates and staff at risk. Additionally, the private detention facilities have little or no link to community services because the facilities are located out-of- state. It is the intent of the council, therefore, that the county shall not use any private or nongovernmental secure detention providers to house any adult	29	that privately owned prisons operate with efficiencies not present in
32other negative issues associated with private prisons. Researchers have33determined that contracts with private prison providers are not necessarily34less expensive when all costs are considered, determined that there is lack35of oversight of the contractors who provide the services, and that cost-36saving measures in these institutions lead to conditions that put inmates37and staff at risk. Additionally, the private detention facilities have little or38no link to community services because the facilities are located out-of-39state.40It is the intent of the council, therefore, that the county shall not use any41private or nongovernmental secure detention providers to house any adult	30	government-run systems and due to those efficiencies, have lower costs.
 determined that contracts with private prison providers are not necessarily less expensive when all costs are considered, determined that there is lack of oversight of the contractors who provide the services, and that cost- saving measures in these institutions lead to conditions that put inmates and staff at risk. Additionally, the private detention facilities have little or no link to community services because the facilities are located out-of- state. It is the intent of the council, therefore, that the county shall not use any private or nongovernmental secure detention providers to house any adult 	31	However, national reviews contradict these assertions and have identified
 less expensive when all costs are considered, determined that there is lack of oversight of the contractors who provide the services, and that cost- saving measures in these institutions lead to conditions that put inmates and staff at risk. Additionally, the private detention facilities have little or no link to community services because the facilities are located out-of- state. It is the intent of the council, therefore, that the county shall not use any private or nongovernmental secure detention providers to house any adult 	32	other negative issues associated with private prisons. Researchers have
 of oversight of the contractors who provide the services, and that cost- saving measures in these institutions lead to conditions that put inmates and staff at risk. Additionally, the private detention facilities have little or no link to community services because the facilities are located out-of- state. It is the intent of the council, therefore, that the county shall not use any private or nongovernmental secure detention providers to house any adult 	33	determined that contracts with private prison providers are not necessarily
 saving measures in these institutions lead to conditions that put inmates and staff at risk. Additionally, the private detention facilities have little or no link to community services because the facilities are located out-of- state. It is the intent of the council, therefore, that the county shall not use any private or nongovernmental secure detention providers to house any adult 	34	less expensive when all costs are considered, determined that there is lack
 and staff at risk. Additionally, the private detention facilities have little or no link to community services because the facilities are located out-of- state. It is the intent of the council, therefore, that the county shall not use any private or nongovernmental secure detention providers to house any adult 	35	of oversight of the contractors who provide the services, and that cost-
 no link to community services because the facilities are located out-of- state. It is the intent of the council, therefore, that the county shall not use any private or nongovernmental secure detention providers to house any adult 	36	saving measures in these institutions lead to conditions that put inmates
 39 state. 40 It is the intent of the council, therefore, that the county shall not use any 41 private or nongovernmental secure detention providers to house any adult 	37	and staff at risk. Additionally, the private detention facilities have little or
40 It is the intent of the council, therefore, that the county shall not use any41 private or nongovernmental secure detention providers to house any adult	38	no link to community services because the facilities are located out-of-
41 private or nongovernmental secure detention providers to house any adult	39	state.
	40	It is the intent of the council, therefore, that the county shall not use any
42 or juvenile detainees.	41	private or nongovernmental secure detention providers to house any adult
	42	or juvenile detainees.

43

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF KING COUNTY:

44 <u>SECTION 1.</u> Ordinance 12432, Section 2, as amended, and K.C.C. 2.16.120 are
45 each hereby amended to read as follows:

A.1. The department of adult and juvenile detention is responsible to manage and 46 be fiscally accountable for the Seattle division, the Kent division, the juvenile division, 47 the community corrections division and the administrative services division, each of 48 which shall have equal standing within the department. Through the Seattle division and 49 the Kent division, the department shall operate the King County adult correctional facility 50 51 and the security operation of the work and education release unit in Seattle and the Regional Justice Center adult correctional facility in Kent. Through the juvenile division, 52 the department shall operate the county's juvenile detention facility. Through the 53 54 community corrections division the department shall administer programs that provide alternatives to confinement in the adult correctional facilities, as well as services and 55 support functions directed toward reduction of the adult correctional facilities' 56 57 populations. Through the administrative services division, the department shall administer personnel operation, budget and fiscal operations and other central support 58 services for the department. In addition, the administrative services division shall be 59 responsible for the administration and monitoring of jail health expenditures and services 60 61 through a jail health levels of service agreement and contract with its health services 62 contractor. The division shall monitor the provision of health care services and is responsible for ensuring that minimum inmate health care needs are met and monitoring 63 the cost-containment provisions for both operational and health care related costs. 64 65 2. The judges of the superior court have final authority for approval of all

66	screening criteria for admission to the juvenile detention facility and alternatives to
67	confinement in the juvenile detention facility. The department shall implement such
68	criteria approved by the superior court related to the juvenile detention facility. The
69	department shall implement the criteria approved by the superior and district courts
70	related to adult detention facilities and alternatives to confinement, subject to the
71	eligibility conditions in subsections E. and F. of this section. The department may also
72	accept, from the prosecuting attorney's prefiling diversion program, persons arrested for
73	the following misdemeanor offenses for placement on work crews: possession of less
74	than forty grams of marijuana (RCW 69.50.4014); minor in possession of alcohol (RCW
75	66.44.270); possession of drug paraphernalia (RCW 69.50.412); and unlawful bus or
76	transit conduct (RCW 9.91.025, K.C.C. 28.96.010).
77	B. The duties of the Seattle division and the Kent division shall include the
78	following:
79	1. House adult persons who are any combination of arrested for, charged for or
80	held on investigation of a criminal offense.
81	2. House adult persons during trial, and before sentencing after conviction;
82	3. House adult persons serving sentences not exceeding one year;
83	4. Maintain records and process and identify property of persons confined or
84	committed to correctional facilities operated by the division;
85	5. Perform functions related to residential and building security, including
86	supervision of persons confined or committed to correctional facilities operated by the
87	division;
88	6. Transport confined or committed adult persons to and from court and provide

89 secure escort of those persons outside the facilities;

90 7. Provide nutritional meals daily to confined or committed adult persons,
91 including preparation of special meals in response to medical and religious requirements;
92 8. Provide health care to confined or committed adult persons in conjunction
93 with the Seattle-King County department of public health, including medical, dental and
94 psychiatric care;

95
9. Provide social services to and for confined or committed adult persons,
96 including, but not limited to, the following: classifying those persons; evaluating
97 mentally ill or developmentally disabled confined or committed persons, including
98 referral to available community programs; reviewing those persons with psychiatric
99 problems; reviewing other special population groups; providing general population group
100 management; and providing outside agency access to those persons including special
101 visitation, library, recreational and educational services; and

102 10. Ensure compliance with laws and regulations applicable to the management103 and operation of the correctional facilities.

104 C. The principle function of the juvenile division is to operate the county's 105 juvenile detention facility in a safe, secure and humane manner as prescribed by state law 106 and court rules. The juvenile division shall administer alternatives to secure detention as 107 approved by the court, a school program, a health program and other related programs. 108 The juvenile division shall be operated in a manner that will give reasonable access to the 109 defense bar, juvenile probation counselors and social service providers and educators,

110 consistent with appropriate security measures and public safety.

111

D. The duties of the administrative services division shall include administering

personnel operations, budget and fiscal operations and other central support services
involving all divisions in the department to ensure consistency and efficiency of
operations. The department's director of the administrative services division shall oversee
these operations and services, and the operations and services shall conform to county
policies and procedures and to department guidelines and practices.

E. An individual is not eligible for the pretrial alternative to adult detention entitled community corrections alternative program basic if the individual is charged with a violent offense or sex offense and has one or more convictions of a violent offense or sex offense, as defined in RCW 9.94A.030, in the ten years before the date of the charged offense.

F. An individual is not eligible for the pretrial alternative to adult detention entitled community corrections alternative program basic if the individual is charged with a domestic violence felony offense and has one or more convictions of a domestic violence felony offense, as defined in RCW 9.94A.525, in the ten years before the date of the charged offense.

127 <u>G. The executive shall not enter into any contractual relationship with any private</u>
 128 or nongovernmental entity for the provision of secure detention services to house

129 any adults or juveniles under the jurisdiction of the department as defined in sections B

130 <u>and C.</u>

131

KING COUNTY COUNCIL KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON

J. Joseph McDermott, Chair

ATTEST:

Melani Pedroza, Clerk of the Council

APPROVED this _____ day of _____, ____.

Dow Constantine, County Executive

Attachments: None