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The Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee (JLARC) carries out oversight, review, and evaluation of state-funded programs and activities on behalf of the Legislature and the citizens of Washington State. This joint, bipartisan committee consists of eight senators and eight representatives, equally divided between the two major political parties. Its statutory authority is established in RCW 44.28.

JLARC staff, under the direction of the Committee and the Legislative Auditor, conduct performance audits, program evaluations, sunset reviews, and other policy and fiscal studies. These studies assess the efficiency and effectiveness of agency operations, impacts and outcomes of state programs, and levels of compliance with legislative direction and intent. The Committee makes recommendations to improve state government performance and to correct problems it identifies. The Committee also follows up on these recommendations to determine how they have been implemented. JLARC has, in recent years, received national recognition for a number of its major studies.
Jail managers deal on a daily basis with offenders who have mental illnesses or co-occurring mental and chemical dependency disorders (co-occurring disorders). Estimates are that, on any given day, at least 16 percent of those in jails are mentally ill. Many jail managers express concern over their ability to appropriately manage this offender population—a population considered to present increased suicide risk, increased problems to custody staff, and who are likely to re-offend.

In an effort to develop options for local law enforcement, the Legislature directed JLARC to assess whether there are existing facilities in the state that could be converted to a specialized regional jail facility. Most jails are run by one county or one city government and are comprised of offenders with and without mental health issues. This specialized jail would be different: it would have only those offenders with mental health or co-occurring disorders, and offenders would come from multiple counties and cities.

THREE QUESTIONS: SIZE, FEATURES, AND COSTS

JLARC addressed a number of topics in this analysis. These are summarized into three key questions: 1) What would the size of the jail be: how many offenders might use such a jail? 2) What are the key features, or attributes, of a specialized jail? and 3) What are the costs to convert an existing building and operate a specialized regional jail?

LESSONS LEARNED

This report shares the lessons we have learned in the course of our analysis:

SIZE: The average potential pool of offenders statewide is about 500, but there is no guarantee that this will equal actual demand for the services of a regional jail.

In order to properly size the jail, we attempted to estimate demand. While such an estimate was possible—we assume that 430 men and 67 women statewide would be the pool of offenders at any given time—there are many unknowns. Local jurisdictions would choose whether to send offenders to a specialized facility. Who pays will have an impact on how much the jail is used. Issues such as distance from courts and community services—how close this jail is to existing jails—are also a key. So too is the type of program provided: different jurisdictions will have different demand for the jail.

FEATURES: The jail must deliver security, stabilization, and transition services.

From our analysis and interviews, we have learned much about the attributes that a regional jail facility must include in order to be effective. Foremost, jail construction and operation must meet a jail’s requirements for security. Additionally, the construction and operation of a regional facility must also acknowledge the relatively brief average stay of an offender in a city or county jail: 15 days. A regional jail for offenders with mental health or co-occurring disorders must be able to focus on initial stabilization of the offender, and then on transition—linking the offender to other mental health services in preparation for a return to “regular” jail or release to the community.

In the course of our analysis, we also identified both basic construction attributes and basic programmatic attributes necessary for a regional jail. These include construction that withstands the rigors of an institution, cells that are designed with suicide prevention in mind, and space for medical and counseling staff.
**COSTS:** Building a new facility, rather than converting an existing one, is generally the least expensive alternative.

JLARC conducted a detailed analysis of the costs associated with converting three different existing buildings. The three buildings were selected to get a cross section of size and location, and to learn what it might take to convert a building into a regional jail and what the demand for such a jail might be. We interviewed jail managers to determine what they might need in a regional jail, and we developed a detailed life-cycle cost financial model to compare the costs of the three buildings to each other. In addition, to provide another point of comparison, we developed an estimate of the cost of constructing a new building.

We calculated a life-cycle, per-bed equivalent baseline cost based on a series of assumptions such as the cost to buy the facility, construction costs, capacity, and staffing. We made a similar estimate for the cost of a new facility. The table below illustrates the ranking of the examples, from lowest cost to highest cost (1=lowest). Because it was developed with staffing efficiency and this population’s specific requirements in mind, the new facility ranks as the least expensive of the examples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buildings Used as Examples</th>
<th>Assumed Capacity</th>
<th>Cost Ranking (1=Lowest)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Facility</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail Annex</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Rehabilitation Facility</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Converted Nursing Home</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Rankings and life-cycle costs will vary depending on assumptions used in the model.

**A REMAINING QUESTION: BENEFITS—INFORMATION AVAILABLE IN 2006**

Jails have a constitutional requirement to provide adequate levels of medical care, including care for mentally ill inmates. Beyond this mandate are hoped-for benefits: by providing mental health care, jails may be safer for custody staff and inmates, and the amount of time an offender with mental illness stays in jail—and re-offending when released—may decrease.

The Washington State Institute for Public Policy (Institute) is analyzing information on the cost-effectiveness of jail-based programs. The Institute will complete this work in Fall 2006. The JLARC life-cycle cost model developed for this analysis is designed so that the benefit information—the specific programs that must be delivered to get the benefit—can be incorporated into the model when the Institute completes its work.

**TWO OTHER LESSONS**

**Incorporating a Specialized Wing into Jail Planning**

An option the Legislature may wish to explore was identified when the study was nearly complete: incorporate a specialized mental health/chemical dependency wing into the planning for a new jail. This has two immediate impacts: a specialized wing can be designed with the specific needs of this offender population in mind, and the specialized wing can make use of the custody and other infrastructure needed for the remainder of the jail.

**Regional Jail as Only One Option**

The bill that directed this analysis made substantial changes to the way that mental health and chemical dependency services are provided in Washington State. Included was the establishment of mental health courts designed to divert some with mental health issues from jails.

While not specifically mentioned in the bill, there are other diversion strategies, such as crisis triage centers that provide alternatives to jail. The Institute is working to determine if these strategies are cost-effective. When the Institute has completed its analysis, the Legislature may want to consider how a regional jail fits as one part of a continuum of options in how to best deal with offenders with mental health or chemical abuse disorders.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

We recommend that the Legislature:

1. Consider specific local requirements as it estimates demand for a specialized regional jail.
2. Consider basic custody staffing efficiencies as a key cost factor. Such efficiencies may outweigh building location and age factors.
3. Consider incorporating a specialized regional wing into the planning for a new county jail, rather than creating a stand alone regional facility.
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CHAPTER ONE: BACKGROUND—ANALYZING A SPECIALIZED REGIONAL JAIL FACILITY

Jail managers deal on a daily basis with offenders who have mental illnesses or co-occurring mental and chemical dependency disorders (co-occurring disorders). While exact numbers are not known, estimates are that, on any given day, at least 16 percent of those in jails are mentally ill. Approximately 65 percent of those mentally ill jail offenders reported alcohol or drug use at the time of their offense. Many jail managers express concern over their ability to manage this offender population.¹

Generally, there is little information about a recently arrested offender. Added to this is the probability of a relatively short stay in the jail. Jail managers strive to predict how offenders will act when they come into a jail; the managers have little time to make custody level and other jail management decisions. Mental illness and co-occurring disorders are seen as making the accuracy of this prediction—and thus the management of a jail population—more difficult.

A NEW OPTION: A SPECIALIZED REGIONAL JAIL

To explore options for local law enforcement, the Legislature directed the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee (JLARC) to assess the feasibility of establishing a specialized regional jail facility for offenders with mental health or co-occurring disorders. Unlike most jails, this jail would be designed to serve this specialized population and would serve multiple counties or cities.²

A “LESSONS LEARNED” APPROACH TO REPORTING ON THE ANALYSIS

In the course of our analysis, we have learned much that can help inform the policy discussions surrounding the possible creation of a new regional jail. The analysis is structured around three key questions:

1. What is the size of the pool of offenders who might use a specialized jail? This is estimating the demand for a specialized jail.
2. What are the necessary features or attributes of a specialized regional jail?
3. What are the costs of construction and operation of a specialized regional jail?

The analysis and the lessons learned on these three topics are discussed in Chapter Two. Chapter Two also discusses the assessment of the benefits of jail-based services being conducted by the Washington State Institute for Public Policy (Institute). The Institute expects to have its report on this topic completed in Fall 2006, and we have designed our life-cycle cost model so that the benefits information, and the specific programs that must be delivered to get these benefits, can be incorporated into the modeling effort.

Chapter Three provides additional information and background on regional jails, including information on previous looks at regional jails, the legal framework of providing medical services in jails, and definitions of mental illness. Chapter Four summarizes the lessons learned

² Section 505, Engrossed Second Substitute Senate Bill 5763: Chapter 504 Laws of 2005.
in the course of this study and offers recommendations to the Legislature as it considers the merits of establishing a specialized regional jail.

This introductory chapter concludes with additional background information on the distinctions between jails and prisons in Washington State and a special note on the methodology of life-cycle cost analysis.

**JAILS AND PRISONS IN WASHINGTON STATE**

In Washington State, **jails** are operated by city and county governments. These cities and counties operate 58 jails, with an average statewide daily population of 12,391 in 2004. Costs of construction and operations are the responsibility of these local governments, and these governments make many decisions on how to manage the facilities. Management philosophies—such as the intensity of health services or availability of vocational programs—differ between jurisdictions. Jail average daily population in 2004 ranged from two in the city of Grandview’s jail to 2,456 in King County’s jail.

This can be contrasted to **prisons** which are operated by one agency, the state Department of Corrections. There are about 16,300 offenders in the state’s 15 prisons and 15 work release centers. Prisons in the state’s prison system average 1,041 offenders, while county and city jails average 214 offenders.3

Understanding some key differences between jails and prisons helps give a context to some of the challenges facing jail staff. Table 1 below illustrates some of those differences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Area</th>
<th>Jails</th>
<th>Prisons</th>
<th>Why This is of Interest to This Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of offender?</td>
<td>Those who have just been arrested, those waiting for trial, and offenders who have been tried. May arrive intoxicated and/or mentally unstable.</td>
<td>Post-trial convicted offenders that may have stabilized during pre-trial stay in county jails.</td>
<td>Jails deal with a mix of offenders, from those just arrested to those serving a sentence of up to one year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who runs the facilities?</td>
<td>37 different county governments and 20 different city governments</td>
<td>One department: Washington State Department of Corrections</td>
<td>57 different local government entities run jails, many with different management approaches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long do offenders stay?</td>
<td>Average length of stay: 15 days Sentences of less than one year</td>
<td>Average length of stay: 20 months Sentences of over one year</td>
<td>Short stays often define what jails can do with offenders; offenders are in jail from one hour to one year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Throughout this report, “offender” is used to describe all those in jail, both those who have not been tried and those who have. The number of jails (58) is different to the number of cities and counties operating jails (57) because Spokane County operates two separate facilities: the Spokane County Jail and the Geiger Corrections Center.*

3 In addition to its own capacity, the Department of Corrections also “rents” approximately 1,500 beds from jails and prisons in this state and other states.
Once someone is arrested, jails are generally the first point of contact in the criminal justice system. They are run by different counties and cities with a variety of management styles and philosophies. Jail managers may have to stabilize offenders with mental health or co-occurring issues, and it is quite likely that the person arrested will stay for only a short time.

### A NOTE ON METHODOLOGY: Life-Cycle Cost Analysis

At the core of this analysis lies the question: how much does it cost to convert a building to a specialized regional jail? Because there are so many variables in creating an estimate, JLARC contracted with consultants with experience in jail management and construction to develop a dynamic life-cycle cost model to estimate costs.

With our consultants, we developed a life-cycle cost estimate by combining capital costs, the estimated useful life of a building, and the costs of operating the building (this includes custody and specialized mental health or chemical dependency staff). This requires making assumptions such as how many offenders could fit into a converted building, the type of specialized programming available, and local labor costs. The model is “dynamic” as assumptions can be easily changed. This model allows comparisons of buildings to each other in a methodical way.

With this model, we then estimated and compared the life-cycle costs of three existing buildings as well as a new building. We also spent considerable time talking to jail managers and those who provide mental health and chemical dependency services in jail to develop an understanding of what programs are needed and what the demand for a regional jail might be.

We also visited 13 jails, ranging in size and location from King County to Walla Walla County. We consulted with staff from the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs as they too were analyzing the possibility of establishing a regional jail. We conducted a review of literature on the issue of the mentally ill in jails and consulted with staff from the Washington State Institute for Public Policy on understanding the benefits of services. In addition, we spent considerable time discussing the requirements of providing mental health services in jails with staff from the Pierce County Regional Support Network (RSN). We talked with Pierce County because the RSN has developed useful data on the jail-based mental health services it has been providing over the past ten years.
CHAPTER TWO: LESSONS LEARNED FROM A DETAILED LOOK AT CONVERTING BUILDINGS TO A SPECIALIZED REGIONAL JAIL

OVERVIEW

This chapter answers key questions addressed in this analysis. This includes an important lesson learned during the course of answering the question on the size of the facility—of how many offenders might use the facility: the need to pay particular attention to “price, proximity, and program.” The chapter provides information on the features or attributes of a specialized regional jail, such as the need to have cells designed for suicide prevention and room for special programs. We present results on the detailed life-cycle cost analysis completed on three existing buildings in the state, and compare these costs to that of a new building. In general it is less expensive to build a new facility than to convert an existing one. This is in part because staff is a major cost driver: a new facility can be sized to take advantage of potential staffing efficiencies. The chapter concludes with discussion on the possible benefits of a specialized regional jail.

SIZE: EFFORTS TO UNDERSTAND HOW MANY OFFENDERS MIGHT USE A SPECIALIZED REGIONAL JAIL AND UNDERSTANDING DEMAND

To determine the cost of converting an existing building to a specialized regional jail, an estimate of the size of the jail must be made. This size is in part dictated by the specifics of the building being analyzed. It is also dictated by the number of offenders who might use the jail, or what the potential demand for the jail might be. An early question that has to be answered is: how many offenders might use the facility?

Size of the Potential Pool of Offenders

In constructing the detailed life-cycle cost models, JLARC’s consultants also constructed a basic demand model. This model assumes that 16 percent of the jail population has a mental illness, and of this approximately one-third would then actually use the facility. This allowed for an estimate of demand by geographic area of the state and by whether the offender was male or female. With these assumptions, we estimate that approximately 500 offenders—across the state—would be the potential pool of offenders at any given point in time who might use the specialized services available in a regional jail.

As with other parts of this analysis, the model is constructed so that the assumptions underlying this estimate can be easily changed and estimates updated. The map on the following page (Exhibit 1) illustrates where in the state these offenders might be. Since the model is based on current jail populations, those areas of the state with bigger jails are assumed to have more offenders with mental health issues. (Appendix 3 presents details of the Demand Estimate Model.)
Actual Demand Will Depend on Price, Proximity, and Program

While knowing the size of the potential pool is important, we also learned that this figure will not necessarily equate to the demand for a regional jail. Local jurisdictions would choose whether to send offenders to a specialized regional facility. Discussions with jail managers indicate that the most important question in determining demand is: what will the per-day cost of the jail be and who will pay that cost?

By carefully reviewing the costs of converting three existing buildings (costs associated with constructing a new facility was included as a point of comparison) and by estimating the costs associated with providing custody and specialized services, the analysis did develop ranges of costs. Such estimates are presented later in this chapter.

“Who pays?” however, is a policy question that this analysis cannot answer. The answer to that question may have the biggest impact on the demand for a regional jail.

The second and third important questions raised by jail managers are: how far will the jail be from “my” county, and what programs will be available?

Distance is important for a number of reasons: cost of transportation, distance from courts and counsel, distance from family, and distance from local mental health or chemical dependency services when inmates leave jail. The type of programming is important as some jurisdictions may want to only “purchase” a basic service package (stabilization of an offender) while others may want to “purchase” more than that, such as stabilization, treatment, and transition services. Answers to these questions will also have an impact on demand for a regional jail.
BASIC FEATURES OF A SPECIALIZED REGIONAL JAIL

The analysis identified many of the required basic features of this specialized jail. Table 2 below summarizes these features or attributes.

There are three key themes in these attributes:

1. The facility is a jail and must be constructed with security in mind.
2. The building must be “hardened” to withstand the rigors of an institution and the demands of a confined population.
3. Special program space—and staff—must be provided to assist in initial stabilization of offenders and for transition services back to either the sending jail or for after-jail release.

Table 2 – Analysis Outlines Basic Construction and Programming Features Required of a Specialized Regional Jail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Construction Features</td>
<td>• Any jail will need to be secure: this is fundamental to a jail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Converting an existing building will require that the building meet basic detention facility standards: this may mean that buildings such as nursing homes would have to be “hardened” to withstand the rigors of a confined population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conversion must consider suicide risk in cell and building design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conversion should accommodate men and women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Even utilizing existing jail space will likely require modifications for the programming requirements of this special population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Offenders in crisis must be accommodated: more single cells will be needed than found in a “regular” jail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Appropriate programming and office space will need to be factored in: this space may be in excess of what is found in “regular” jails.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Programming Features</td>
<td>• There are three key programming requirements: crisis management, stabilization, and re-entry planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Specialized program staff will be required: mental health and chemical abuse specialists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Regular access to specialized medical staff, including psychiatrists will be needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Access for both men and women will be needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

JLARC incorporated these basic attributes, or features, into the modeling of the costs of converting a building and operating a specialized regional jail. As the cost analysis on the following page illustrates, different buildings have advantages and disadvantages in the way they are able to provide for these features.
COSTS: EVALUATING COSTS TO CONVERT BUILDINGS AND OPERATE A SPECIALIZED REGIONAL JAIL—LIFE-CYCLE COST ANALYSIS

Four Buildings as Examples

We conducted an in-depth analysis of three existing buildings to develop a range of estimates of how much it might cost to convert a building to a specialized regional jail. These alternatives provide examples of a range of costs and were selected to:

- Respond to the specific directions provided in the bill directing the study, such as to estimate the cost of converting a nursing home;
- Provide alternatives in various parts of the state: one building each in Western, Central, and Eastern Washington; and
- Provide estimates for various sizes: buildings would be converted to 20, 75, or 256 beds.

We also developed a fourth alternative: a new facility. This estimate is used to compare the costs of new construction to that of conversion. This fourth alternative is “sized” at 128 beds to take full advantage of custody staffing efficiencies.

Table 3 below ranks the four buildings in terms of least to most expensive as determined by the total life-cycle cost per bed. The cost estimate includes both construction and operating costs. This ranking is based on the results of the detailed life-cycle cost analysis and presents the baseline assumptions. Appendix 4 provides detail on how these rankings are developed. As the table illustrates, in terms of total life-cycle costs per bed, the least expensive alternative is the new facility.

While there is a “winner” in terms of the baseline life-cycle cost analysis, valuable information was gained in conducting the analysis on all of the alternatives: each alternative has advantages and disadvantages. Table 4 on the following page presents this information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Ranking: Least Expensive to Most Expensive</th>
<th>Baseline Life-Cycle Cost Per Bed (over 30 years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALT 4: 128-bed new facility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$951,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT 1: 20-bed facility in Central Washington</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$987,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attached to existing jail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT 3: 256-bed facility in Western Washington</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,010,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— converted juvenile rehabilitation facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT 2: 75-bed facility in Eastern Washington</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,052,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— converted nursing home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Rankings will vary based on changes in assumptions, such as discount rates and current market value. Appendix 4 of the report provides detail on the life-cycle cost analysis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Current Use Description</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ALT 1: 20-bed facility in Central Washington | This is adjacent to existing regional jail in Wenatchee and contains one dorm with 21 sets of bunk beds. Facility was designed for inmate work crews. | • Attached to existing jail: could make use of some existing jail services.  
• A small facility may address the needs of smaller, more rural counties. | • Small facility results in less efficient operations.  
• Small facility limits treatment options.  
• Facility can only accommodate one gender.  
• Local officials have a different use in mind. |
| ALT 2: Nursing home in Spokane | Former nursing home currently serving as in-patient chemical dependency treatment facility. | • Nursing homes are usually one story with wheelchair access.  
• Cost of acquiring facility is relatively low, with the size large enough to develop various treatment options.  
• May be sized adequately to local demand. | • Made of residential construction materials and requires extensive retrofitting to jail construction standards.  
• Nursing homes generally not constructed with suicide prevention in mind, with exposed fixtures that pose a risk.  
• Location of facility may make it difficult to obtain local support. |
| ALT 3: Juvenile Rehabilitation Center, Chehalis | Major juvenile rehabilitation facility directly adjacent to I-5 with 288 beds. | • Located on Interstate 5 with easy transportation.  
• Constructed with confined population in mind and would require less retrofitting than other options.  
• Housing units are operationally efficient.  
• Size allows for different treatment options. | • “Campus style” design creates substantial distances between buildings, complicating moving offenders.  
• Several buildings would not be used.  
• Sharing facility with juveniles difficult because of legal requirement to keep adults and juveniles separate, both in “sight and sound.” |
| ALT 4: New Facility | Developed as a point of comparison. | • Housing units are scaled to maximize staffing efficiency.  
• Designs meet specific programming needs of this population.  
• New building has longer useful life. | • Siting new jail likely to be difficult. |
Sensitivity Analysis: The Lessons Learned About Alternatives is Equally Important to Their “Score”

Life-cycle cost analysis allows for a methodical comparison of buildings of different sizes and ages. However, use of this tool requires making a number of assumptions, such as:

- Inflation rates
- Discount rates
- Equipment replacement cycles
- Labor costs
- Useful life
- Purchase cost of land and buildings
- Construction costs
- Operating costs
- Maintenance and repair costs
- Treatment types

In conducting this life-cycle analysis, a number of baseline assumptions are made. A sensitivity analysis is also conducted to see how rankings might change as the baseline assumptions were changed. Detail on the sensitivity analysis is presented in Appendix 5.

For instance, in this sort of analysis, an assumption of the discount rate is made to get a sense of the time value of money. This is because when estimating costs associated with buildings and the programs they are designed to house, those estimates will be made over the life of the building: not just this year, but many years into the future.

Changing the discount rate changes the life-cycle costs and the ordering of alternatives. It impacts many of the variables in the model, such as equipment replacement schedules. Table 5 below illustrates what happens when the baseline discount rate assumption of 4 percent is changed to 7 percent: the small facility in Central Washington is now the least costly, with the new facility now ranked second.\(^4\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Life-Cycle Cost Per Bed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALT 4: 128-bed new facility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT 1: 20-bed facility in Central Washington attached to existing jail</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT 3: 256-bed facility in Western Washington—converted juvenile rehabilitation facility</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT 2: 75-bed facility in Eastern Washington—converted nursing home</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This analysis pays very careful attention to the details of the baseline assumptions. For instance, when determining what assumption to make for the current value of the juvenile rehabilitation facility, we use an adjusted current value of the needed buildings of $29.6 million rather than the DSHS stated replacement cost figure of $64.1 million. Both numbers are valid, but this analysis uses a different assumption than another analysis might use. It is also important to note that while the state owns the facility, our analysis requires that a current value be established when

\(^4\) The discount rate of 4% reflects the rate recommended by the Washington State Office of Financial Management. The 7% rate reflects the rate recommended by the Federal Office of Management and Budget.
evaluating alternatives as there are always competing demands for uses of both the land and the buildings.

Our sensitivity analysis demonstrates that rankings will change depending on assumptions: analysis of advantages and disadvantages of various buildings is equally important to answering “which building wins?”

THE QUESTION OF POSSIBLE BENEFITS AND AVOIDED COSTS

JLARC was directed to determine the possible benefits, or avoided costs, of a regional jail for offenders with mental health or co-occurring disorders. The hope is that such a facility would allow for both more efficient and more effective jail services. Benefits might include reduced length of stay in jail and reduced recidivism. Such reductions may help defray some of the added costs of enhanced mental health services.

The Washington State Institute for Public Policy (Institute) is analyzing information on the benefits of jail-based programs. As directed by the Legislature, the Institute should have such information available in Fall 2006.

The JLARC life-cycle cost model developed for this analysis is designed so that the benefit information—with the specific programs that must be delivered to get the benefit—can be incorporated into the model when the Institute completes its work. Given that this information is not yet available, this analysis of a specialized regional jail is only half complete, with just the “costs” side of the equation explored.

CHAPTER SUMMARY

When looking at the size of a specialized regional jail, it is possible to estimate the number of offenders who might need a specialized facility. This analysis estimates about 500 offenders at any given point. However it is difficult to create a completely accurate estimate without first answering a number of key policy questions. The most important of these is “who pays?,” as demand will be influenced by the answer to this question.

Analysis of the features of a specialized facility indicates that it must be renovated or constructed with security in mind; it must be “hardened” for a jail population; and it must have at a minimum the program space and staff required to provide for stabilization and transition services.

Estimates of the cost of a specialized facility show that, generally, it is most cost effective to build a new facility. This is because a new facility can take staffing efficiency into consideration. However, even after such efficiencies are considered, ranking which building is most efficient is influenced by what assumptions are made in the life-cycle cost model. For instance, changing the discount rate will change the life-cycle costs and change the rank order (least to most costly) of the alternatives. Each alternative provides lessons on the advantages and disadvantages of various building sizes and configurations.

Analysis of the costs of a specialized regional jail should also include analysis of possible benefits. Such benefits analysis is currently being undertaken by the Washington State Institute for Public Policy. When this information becomes available in 2006, it can be incorporated into the cost model developed by JLARC.
CHAPTER THREE: ESTABLISHING A REGIONAL JAIL—GENERAL ISSUES AND LESSONS LEARNED

OVERVIEW

This chapter presents additional background on regional jails and summarizes many of the issues of interest to the Legislature as it considers the establishment of a specialized regional jail for offenders with mental illness or co-occurring disorders. This includes background on previous efforts at establishing a regional jail, a description of the legal framework of providing mental health services in jails, a look at standards of providing health and mental health services in jails, definitions of mental illness, description of some of the drugs used to treat those illnesses, and a definition of co-occurring.

PREVIOUS LOOKS AT ESTABLISHING A REGIONAL JAIL

In the late 1980s, Chelan and Douglas Counties built the Chelan County Regional Justice Center, a facility to house offenders from both counties. This is the only regional jail—managed by more than one jurisdiction—in the state.

There have been efforts over the years to further pursue the establishment of regional jails. This JLARC analysis is the fourth look at regional jails in Washington State since 2000. While this is the first to focus solely on a specialized regional jail, the notion of a regional jail is not new. (Appendix 6 provides a description of our analysis of specialized regional jails in other states.)

A Look by the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs

In May of 2001, the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs (WASPC) found that:

- Regional jails are a viable alternative in Washington State.
- They provide economy of scale, construction cost savings, and the possibility of operating expense savings.
- Regional jails can enhance public and officer safety.
- Any jurisdiction that is going to build a new jail—or extensively remodel an existing facility—should give serious consideration to a multiple-jurisdiction facility.
- Such facilities can help improve jail housing conditions, the provision of inmate services, the provision of special offender services, and they can provide a safer and more secure facility.
Specialized Regional Jail Facility Study

The report includes a recommendation that a pilot, multiple-jurisdiction jail be established and that state funding be secured as an incentive to create the pilot. No pilot was established. In 2002, the Legislature formally authorized the creation of regional jails.\(^5\)

A Look by the Sentencing Guidelines Commission

In 2003, the Legislature directed the Washington State Sentencing Guidelines Commission to develop a plan for establishing a pilot regional correctional facility. This was to include a plan for joint use of confinement beds by local and state governments.\(^6\)

In their published report, the Commission determined that there were no legal impediments to the creation and operation of a regional correctional facility. Findings of the report include:\(^7\)

- Planning for regional correctional facilities must proceed on the assumption that no governmental unit will subsidize any other.
- The development of a regional facility requires a high degree of cooperation among counties, cities, and the state.
- Economies of scale offered by regionalization can add to the feasibility of operation.
- Trust is most likely to develop when effected jurisdictions are involved from the beginning in the planning and design of the facility and where the facility design is tailored to the needs as identified by the participants.

The report concludes with a recommendation that a cooperative effort be established to further pursue the establishment of a regional jail. No plan for a pilot was proposed.

Most Recent Look by the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs

In 2005, the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs (WASPC) conducted another analysis of establishing a regional jail facility. As with the Sentencing Guidelines report, the WASPC report was directed by the Legislature.\(^8\)

This recent WASPC analysis contains concepts for the WASPC Board to consider. These include:

- Support state legislative funding to local jurisdictions that choose to operate specialized jail programs on a regional basis.
- Develop standards for definitions of normal and maximum allowable capacity.

\(^6\) Chapter 98, Laws of 2003, SHB 1609.

The 2004 Supplemental Budget (ESHB 2459) provided funding for the report. Funding was also provided by the Washington Sentencing Guidelines Commission and the Washington State Department of Corrections.
Specialized Regional Jail Facility Study

- Support 100 percent state legislative funding for the construction of additional jail capacity provided that the county agrees to meet jail standards and the jail’s capacity accommodates regional needs.
- Support state legislative funding for mental health and chemical dependency case management and treatment programs within the newly created regional jails.

The report also contains a number of “position” statements by WASPC’s executive board. These include:

- Strong support of the concept of jail standards, but only when financial support is available.
- Support of the concept of regional jails provided that a strong financial incentive or revenue stream is provided to make it work.
- The belief, regarding the mentally ill in jails, that a stronger push must be made to divert the mentally ill from jails. Treatment should be provided in jails to those who cannot be diverted and served in another setting.
- The recognition that a regional jail is not the solution to overcrowding; while additional capacity is needed, counties and municipalities cannot build their way out of overcrowding problems.

At the time of the production of this JLARC report, the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs are discussing the concepts included in the report.

STANDARDS OF HEALTH SERVICES IN JAILS: WHY ARE SERVICES PROVIDED?

The Legal Context: Mental Health Services and Health Services are Required in Jails

Based on the prohibition against cruel and unusual punishment contained in the Eighth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, and because inmates must rely on jails to meet their medical needs, courts require that jails and prisons provide for prisoners’ basic necessities. This includes health care.

Over the years, courts have defined this to include:

- Access to care;
- Access to care that is ordered;
- Access to professional medical judgment; and
- The provision of care for “serious” medical needs.

Mental health needs are “serious” if they cause significant disruption in an offender’s everyday life and prevent an offender from functioning in the general population without disturbing or endangering others or themselves.

According to the National Commission on Correctional Health Care, courts have directed jails to:

- Provide mental health screening at intake to identify serious mental health problems, including potential suicide;
- Provide treatment for serious conditions by mental health professionals;
• Train officers to deal with mentally ill inmates; and
• Provide a means of separating mentally ill inmates from other offenders.

Thus, while the level of health care provided in Washington jails varies from basic to hospital-like, legally, some level of mental health care must be provided to offenders.  

Standards Exist for the Provision of Mental Health Care in Jails

Washington State law directs local governments to adopt standards for the operation of their jails. Such standards are to be adopted after considering guidelines established by cities and by counties. This chapter of state law also states that it is the intent of the Legislature that all jail inmates receive appropriate and cost-effective emergency and necessary medical care. It defines health care as including preventive, diagnostic, and rehabilitative services provided by licensed health care professionals, including the provision of prescriptions drugs.

A number of nationally recognized organizations publish detailed jail standards and operating guidelines for the provision of health care and mental health care in jails. These include the American Correctional Association and the National Commission on Correctional Health Care. The American Correctional Association has defined mandatory components of a jail-based mental health program. These are:

• Screening for mental health problems on intake;
• Stabilization of persons with mental illness and the prevention of psychiatric deterioration in the correction setting;

• Referral to outpatient services for detection, diagnosis, and treatment of mental illness;
• Referral and admission to licensed mental health facilities for inmates whose psychiatric needs exceed the treatment capability of the facility; and

• Crises intervention and the management of acute psychiatric episodes;
• Obtaining and documenting informed consent.

These standards do not specify exact staffing levels, but they do specify that an adequate number of qualified staff should be available to deal directly with inmates who have severe mental health problems. The American Correctional standards, and the standards and guidelines published by the National Commission on Correctional Health Care provide considerable detail on how to meet the standards and how compliance to the standards will be evaluated.

---

10 The “City and County Jails Act” is contained in Chapter 70.48 of the Revised Code of Washington.  
SERIOUS MENTAL ILLNESS ISSUES IN JAILS: DEFINITIONS, MEDICATIONS, AND CO-OCCURRING DISORDERS

Mental Illnesses in Jails

Some offenders with mental disorders create management issues for those who run jails. Some offenders with mental disorders are vulnerable to other inmates; a small percentage may be dangerous or violent, and some (such as those with severe depression) pose additional suicide risk. These offenders are also believed to be more likely to have longer stays, to re-offend, and are seen by jail managers over and over—“the revolving door.” In addition, some may have difficult behavior issues, such as poor hygiene or yelling and screaming.

Mental Health professionals diagnose mental disorders using a classification system established by the American Psychiatric Association, referred to as DSM-IV, short for “Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition.” Of the many disorders defined in DSM-IV, three are commonly seen as most problematic to jail managers: serious depression, bipolar disorder, and schizophrenia. Table 6 below illustrates some of the characteristics of these major disorders.

Table 6 – Three Major Mental Illnesses in Jail are Considered Most Difficult

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mental Illness</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Why This May Be An Issue to Jail Managers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serious Depression</td>
<td>Referred to as “severe,” “major,” or “clinical,” serious depression is characterized by profound feelings of hopelessness and is considered to be a disease of the brain, meaning that unlike “normal depression” it is mainly the result of a change in brain chemistry.</td>
<td>Serious depression is considered to be a significant factor in suicidal and self-harming behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bipolar Disorder</td>
<td>Sometimes known as “manic-depressive,” characterized by mood swings from depression to mania which can include delusions.</td>
<td>When in depressed stage, offender considered to be an enhanced suicide risk; when in the manic stage, offender can be disruptive to staff and other inmates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schizophrenia</td>
<td>Thoughts of individuals may seem random, illogical, or irrelevant to the immediate situation. Thoughts may be loosely organized or disorganized and not make sense. Thoughts may have no basis in reality (delusions) or thoughts may come from hallucinations (such as hearing voices).</td>
<td>Offenders may be vulnerable to other inmates. Disease may cause misinterpretation of reality, leading to violence directed to staff or other offenders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Medications: Some Inmates Come to Jail on Medications, Some Do Not

Medications can help individuals with mental illness. Some offenders come to jail on medication; while some have either never had access to medication or are no longer taking medication.

Challenges to jails in dealing with those with mental health issues include identifying those on medication—and keeping them on medication while in jail—and identifying those who might benefit from medication. Often medications for mental illnesses (particularly those for schizophrenia) are costly. Jails may also struggle with keeping a client on a specific medication: different practitioners may prescribe different drugs.
The three major classes of psychiatric medications of most concern to jail managers are: antidepressants, mood stabilizers, and antipsychotics. Table 7 below describes these drugs.  

Table 7 – Major Drug Classes of Concern to Jail Managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug Class</th>
<th>Primary Use</th>
<th>Typical Names</th>
<th>Daily Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antidepressants</td>
<td>Major depression</td>
<td>Prozac, Wellbutrin</td>
<td>Prozac: $1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood Stabilizers</td>
<td>Bipolar disorders</td>
<td>Lithium</td>
<td>Lithium: 53 cents to 73 cents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antipsychotics: First Generation (typical) and Second Generation (atypical)</td>
<td>Schizophrenia</td>
<td>Haldol, Thorazine Clozaril, Zyprexa</td>
<td>Zyprexa: $19.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The costs of the drugs included above are those reported by Pierce County and are the costs of the usual dose per day offered to jailed patients. These may vary from offender to offender and jail to jail.

Co-Occurring Disorders: When Offenders Might Have a Mental Illness and a Chemical Dependency Disorder

While exact numbers are not known—one estimate is 65 percent—a high percentage of offenders with mental illness also have drug and alcohol abuse or dependency disorders. When offenders have both, they are considered to have co-occurring mental and chemical dependency disorders.  

This is of particular concern to jail managers as chemical dependency can exacerbate the mental illness and vice versa. In addition jail managers can be uncertain whether they are dealing with mental illness, chemical dependency, or both.

This is illustrated by how offenders act who are “coming down” from methamphetamine abuse. Jail managers report that offenders’ actions are very similar to those of schizophrenia, and it is difficult to identify which is which. This makes categorizations of mental illness or chemical dependency difficult. From the perspective of someone managing a jail, the categorization is less meaningful than the need to develop methods to deal appropriately with the symptoms. Thus, any specialized regional jail facility must have the expertise to deal with both issues: mental health and chemical dependency.

CONCLUSION

While previous analyses on regional jails have all pointed to their benefits, only one regional jail that is managed by multiple jurisdictions exists in Washington State, and that was created in the late 1980s. There are legal requirements—set at both the federal and state level—to provide medical care to jail inmates, and mental health care is considered health care. Standards for jail health and mental health services have been established by organizations such as the American Corrections Association. The mental illnesses of concern to jail managers include severe depression, bipolar disorder, and schizophrenia, and there are a number of drugs available to help treat these illnesses. The job of jail managers is made more complex by offenders with co-occurring mental and chemical dependency disorders.

---

CHAPTER FOUR: A SUMMARY OF LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS AS THE LEGISLATURE CONSIDERS A SPECIALIZED REGIONAL JAIL

Depending on the desired size, location, and program options, there are a variety of existing buildings which can be converted to a specialized regional jail facility for offenders with mental health and co-occurring disorders. This analysis focused on three buildings as a means of learning what the costs of such a conversion might be and compared them to new construction.

We learned a number of lessons in conducting the analysis. They pertain to both the specifics of converting an existing building to a specialized regional jail as well as more generally to the provision of services to those with mental health and co-occurring disorders in the criminal justice system. These lessons are summarized below. The report concludes with recommendations to the Legislature as it considers the feasibility of establishing a specialized regional jail.

LESSONS LEARNED

A Specialized Regional Jail Facility as One Option in a Continuum of Services

The focus of this study has been on the option of creating a specialized regional jail facility. However, the literature dealing with the mentally ill in jails emphasizes the need to provide both jail-based services and alternatives to jail for the mentally ill. Such alternatives currently utilized by Washington’s counties include:

- Mental Health Courts: Offenders with certain types of misdemeanors and felonies are provided the opportunity of an alternative to jail through utilizing existing community programs for those with mental illness (similar to drug courts). The judge, the prosecuting attorney, the defense attorney, and service providers attempt to create a package of services that can assist in keeping someone out of jail. The court routinely reviews the status of the offender (client) in meeting the requirements of accessing services.

- Crisis Triage Centers: These are generally designed to help those who are experiencing an acute mental health episode. Some are designed to give police officers an alternative to sending someone in the midst of an acute episode to jail. Whatcom County is designing its new crisis triage center and new jail together (same building) to make the alternative convenient for police officers.

- Enhanced Jail-Based Services: In recognition of this need for a continuum, at the same time that this study was directed, the Legislature appropriated $10 million for mental health services for mentally ill offenders who are confined in a county or city jail and for facilitating transition services when offenders leave confinement.

- As field work for this analysis was being conducted, stakeholders also emphasized the importance of linkages with the two state hospitals, where specialized services are available such as competency evaluations. Jail managers were quite concerned with the lag time between requesting such services and their availability.
A Focus on Local Requirements is Needed

Existing jails have different needs when it comes to improving services to offenders with mental health issues: what Whatcom County determines it needs may be different than what Walla Walla County determines it needs.

Before establishing a specialized regional jail facility, local requirements will need to be understood.

For instance, some county courts may not approve of video court arraignment. Thus, only post-trial offenders from that county would likely utilize a regional facility. A neighboring county may fully embrace video arraignment; such a county may be able to utilize a regional facility for both pre-trial and post-trial offenders. Other counties may have policies in opposition to sending offenders with mental health issues to a regional facility: there may be no demand for a specialized jail from that county’s perspective.

Some Lessons Apply More Generally: Construction, Programs, Costs

While the specific needs of individual cities and counties must be taken into consideration, there are a number of general lessons that we learned in this analysis, likely applicable to any specialized regional jail. Table 8 on the following page outlines these lessons. When combined with the need to focus on local requirements, these lessons lead to the first two of the report’s three recommendations.

In our interviews, jail managers routinely emphasized the importance of these services and options—and the need to consider a specialized regional jail as one option in a continuum.
Table 8 – A Summary of Lessons Learned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SIZE</strong></td>
<td>• It is possible to create an estimate of the size of the potential pool of offenders based on current jail populations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Using current jail populations also indicates where the sending jail will be: this helps in developing a sense of where demand might be geographically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Demand is, however, more complex than just current jail population multiplied by the estimate of the percentage of mentally ill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Who pays will have an impact on whether or not a city or county chooses to utilize a regional facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge of the specific needs of each county and each city that might use a regional facility is required before an accurate estimate can be developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The specific needs of individual counties and cities will depend on a number of factors. One such factor is current local capacity, both in terms of jail cell availability and mental health treatment expertise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEATURES</strong> Basic Construction Requirements</td>
<td>• Converting an existing building will require that the building meet basic detention facility standards: this may mean that buildings such as nursing homes would have to be “hardened” to withstand the rigors of a confined population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conversion must consider suicide risk in cell and building design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Even utilizing existing jail space will likely require modifications for the programming requirements of this special population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Offenders in crisis must be accommodated: more single cells will be needed than found in a “regular” jail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Appropriate programming space will need to be factored in: this space may be in excess of what is found in “regular” jails.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEATURES</strong> Basic Programming Requirements</td>
<td>• Any jail will need to be secure: this is fundamental to a jail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There are three key programming requirements: crises management, stabilization, and re-entry planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Specialized program staff will be required: mental health and chemical abuse specialists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Regular access to specialized medical staff, including psychiatrists, will be needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Access for both men and women will be needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COSTS</strong></td>
<td>• Because of increased staff numbers, a specialized facility is likely to be more expensive: baseline daily costs ranged from $120 per day to $147 per day in the building conversion estimates. (<em>Appendix 4 provides detail on daily cost estimates.</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• This compares to a statewide average for county jails in 2004 of $71 per day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Building a facility to take advantage of staffing efficiencies—especially custody staff—will assist in keeping daily rates down.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Retrofitting existing buildings can be more expensive than new construction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation One

As it evaluates the establishment of a specialized regional jail, the Legislature should consider specific local requirements as it estimates the demand for this specialized service.

- Legislation Required: None
- Fiscal Impact: None

Different jurisdictions will have different needs both in terms of filling gaps in services and in philosophies of what level of services to provide to offenders with mental health or co-occurring disorders. Cost, location, and the services provided will influence jurisdictions’ use of a specialized regional jail.

Recommendation Two

As it considers the specifics of converting an existing facility to a specialized regional jail, or constructing a new specialized regional jail, the Legislature should consider basic custody staffing efficiencies as a key cost factor.

- Legislation Required: None
- Fiscal Impact: None

Some facilities may be initially attractive because of their location or age. While this is important, basic layout for staffing efficiency will be important over the life of the building.

Recommendation Three

The Legislature should consider incorporating a specialized regional wing into the planning for a new county jail. Consideration can be given to efficient design, funding mechanisms, and management structures.

- Legislation Required: None
- Fiscal Impact: None

Chapter Two provides detail on the life-cycle cost analysis conducted on three existing buildings and on a new facility. The new facility generally rated as least expensive from a life-cycle cost perspective.

During field work for this analysis, another option surfaced: incorporate a regional facility into the planning for a “regular” county jail. A specialized wing of the jail can be a regional facility, while the remainder of the jail can be constructed with a focus on local needs.

Such an option might take advantage of a new facility’s design efficiencies, utilizing efficient unit size as well as leveraging the new jail’s service (food, maintenance, etc.), custody, and management structures. This strategy would also recognize a growing trend in the state: some jurisdictions are “over building” for their current needs and renting beds to jurisdictions with overcrowded jails. While not titled as such, these jails become similar to a regional jail since they are built—in part—anticipating the needs of other jurisdictions.

Such a regional facility wing of a larger jail might also leverage siting and other planning efforts. Chapter Three provides detail on previous efforts at investigating the creation of a
regional jail. One of the difficulties identified to the establishment of a regional facility is building cooperation and trust between jurisdictions that would share in the management of a regional facility. Attaching a regional facility to a new jail may allow for a single jurisdiction’s management, while contracting with other jurisdictions for their use of the facility.

AGENCY RESPONSES

Responses from the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs (WASPC) and the Office of Financial Management (OFM) are included in Appendix 2.
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APPENDIX 1: SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES

Analysis of Establishing a Regional Jail Facility for Offenders with Mental/Chemical Dependency Disorders

Why an Analysis of a REGIONAL JAIL Facility?

In the 2005 Legislative Session, the Legislature passed Engrossed Second Substitute Senate Bill 5763, which makes major changes in how the state manages the services it provides to those with mental or chemical dependency disorders. This legislation also directed JLARC to conduct an assessment of the feasibility of a regional jail for offenders with mental or chemical dependency disorders (or both) who require specialized housing and treatment.

Background

The 2005 Legislative Session also made two additional important changes that impact this study:

1. Regional Support Networks (RSNs) are now directed to ensure that service delivery policies do not result in a shift of mentally ill persons into state and local correctional facilities. In addition, when the Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS) contracts with RSNs, the contracts must require effective collaboration between the RSNs and law enforcement.

2. The 2005 Operating Budget provides $5 million per year to DSHS for mental health services for mentally ill offenders while confined in a county or city jail and for facilitating access to treatment after release from jail.

Scope

As directed by E2SSB 5763, JLARC will consider the feasibility of using existing state or other facilities, or a closed nursing home, as a regional jail facility for offenders with mental and/or chemical dependency disorders. The study will address the costs and benefits—as well as costs avoided—of such a facility.

Objectives

E2SSB 5763 included the requirement to address the following objectives when assessing possible options for a regional jail facility:

- Analysis of when a facility could be available;
- Estimates of costs, costs avoided, and benefits of such a regional facility;
- Impact on existing offenders or residents in the facilities to be converted;
Estimates of conversion and infrastructure costs;
- Analysis of whether facilities can be sized appropriately to the pool of offenders;
- Analysis of changes in criminal justice costs, including transport, access to legal assistance, and access to courts; and
- Estimates of reductions in jail populations and changes in treatment costs.

**A Modeling Tool will be used to address study objectives**

As there are a number of assumptions which must be made—everything from the number of offenders, the size of the facility, the location of the facility, the type of programming—an important component of this analysis will be the development of a financial estimation model. This model will be designed such that the basic assumptions that must be made to develop a conversion cost estimate can be easily changed and updated. The model will include the major cost drivers in converting a building to a jail, operating the jail, and providing the specialized programming required by this group of offenders.

JLARC will work to quantify many of the assumptions required for the model. The model will be designed so that it can be used by the Legislature as it further considers potential alternatives for this group of offenders.

**TIMEFRAME FOR THE STUDY**


**JLARC STAFF CONTACT FOR THE STUDY**

John Woolley  (360) 786-5184  woolley.john@leg.wa.gov
APPENDIX 2: AGENCY RESPONSES

- Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs
- Office of Financial Management
January 18, 2006

TO:       Ruta Fanning, Legislative Auditor  
          Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee

FROM:  Don Pierce, Executive Director  
        Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs

RE:  Agency Response to JLARC preliminary report,  
      Analysis of Establishing a Regional Jail  
      Facility for Offenders with Mental Health or Co-Occurring Mental and Chemical  
      Dependency Disorders

I am pleased to provide a formal agency response to the above-referenced report. After our original staff review of the preliminary report, WASPC’s position concerning the recommendations is summarized below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>AGENCY POSITION</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| We recommend that the Legislature:  
1. Consider specific local requirements as it estimates demand for a regional facility. | Concur | NA – concurrence does not require comment. |
| 2. Consider basic custody staffing efficiencies as a key cost factor. Such efficiencies may outweigh building location and age factors. | Concur | NA – concurrence does not require comment. |
| 3. Consider incorporating a regional “wing” into the planning for a new county jail, rather than creating a “stand alone” regional facility | Concur | NA – concurrence does not require comment. |

As you may know, WASPC has created a new Corrections Committee, which will be meeting for the first time in the near future. I will forward your report along to them for further consideration and possible action.

Thank you for the opportunity to review the report.

Cc: John Woolley, JLARC Staff  
   Bruce Kuennen, WASPC Staff
January 31, 2006

TO: Ruta Fanning, Legislative Auditor
    Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee

FROM: Victor A. Moore, Director

SUBJECT: PRELIMINARY REPORT – ANALYSIS OF ESTABLISHING A REGIONAL JAIL FACILITY FOR OFFENDERS WITH MENTAL HEALTH OR CO-OCCURRING MENTAL AND CHEMICAL DEPENDENCY DISORDERS

Thank you for giving the Office of Financial Management (OFM) the opportunity to review JLARC’s preliminary report on Analysis of Establishing a Regional Jail Facility for Offenders with Mental Health or Co-occurring Mental and Chemical Dependency Disorders.

OFM concurs with the recommendations in this preliminary report. Our responses are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Agency Position</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. As it evaluates the establishment of a specialized regional jail, the Legislature should consider specific local requirements as it estimates the demand for this specialized service.</td>
<td>Concur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. As it considers the specifics of converting an existing facility to a specialized regional jail, or constructing a new specialized regional jail, the Legislature should consider basic custody staffing efficiencies as a key cost factor.</td>
<td>Concur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Legislature should consider incorporating a specialized regional wing into the planning for a new county jail. Consideration can be given to efficient design, funding mechanisms, and management structures.</td>
<td>Concur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We look forward to your final report. If you have any questions, please contact Nick Lutes at (360) 902-0570.
**APPENDIX 3: ESTIMATING “DEMAND” FOR A SPECIALIZED MENTAL HEALTH JAIL**

**DEMAND ASSUMPTIONS MODEL**

JLARC’s consultants developed a demand assumptions model to gauge the size of the potential pool of offenders for a specialized regional jail.

The model takes the 2004 jail census data recently developed by the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs (WASPC) and applies assumptions on a county-by-county basis. This assists in understanding what the demand might be by geographic area.

The baseline model assumes that 16 percent of those jailed will have a mental illness. Of these, 31 percent would actually be transferred to a regional facility. The model is constructed so that different assumptions can be entered for pre-trial and sentenced offenders. For the baseline model, however, 31 percent was assumed for both.

The result of these two calculations brings the calculated percentage of persons in jail actually transferred (for sizing purposes) to the specialized regional jail facility to 5 percent. Based on a 2004 county jail average daily population calculation of 10,036, 498 would be the average of the pool of offenders on any given day.\(^\text{14}\)

Finding specific data (number of mentally ill offenders, number of mentally ill offenders getting treatment, etc.) in this area is difficult. Thus, the model was developed so that assumptions could be easily changed.

The 5 percent total assumption was reported to the consultants during their site visits. While getting data specific to offenders with mental health issues is difficult, there is some data available to test this 5 percent.

Pierce County does a daily match between its jail booking system and the data system used by the Regional Support Network (RSN). The RSN coordinates the provision of public mental health services in the county.

This match helps them identify those who have been booked and were receiving services through the RSN, either recently or within the last ten years. Table 9 below illustrates that this data shows that 6 percent of those booked during the period were considered to be currently enrolled in RSN services, a number close to the 5 percent demand assumption model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Expressed As Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily Bookings</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Found in RSN System</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36% of Daily Bookings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actually Currently Enrolled in RSN Services at Time of Booking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6% of Daily Bookings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{14}\) The 10,036 factors out any beds rented by other jurisdictions.
Also available is the number of initial contacts (initial contacts may be followed by additional contacts, counseling, medication monitoring, etc.) made by jail-based mental health services in Pierce County for 2004:

- 2,404 initial contacts
- 25,494 bookings into the Pierce County Jail
- 9 percent of those booked received an initial contact by jail-based services

Some lesser percentage of this 9 percent of initial contacts would likely be the pool of offenders of a specialized regional jail. Thus, the 5 percent figure used in the demand assumptions model is an appropriate starting point.

**DEMAND ASSUMPTIONS MODEL: GEOGRAPHIC DETAIL**

To get an understanding of geographic demand (as defined by percent of jail average daily population), the demand assumptions model provides information in a number of “sorts.” These are provided in individual examples below:

- **EXAMPLE 1**: DSHS region
- **EXAMPLE 2**: Eight geographic groupings that might reflect jail regions
- **EXAMPLE 3**: Eastern and Western Washington
- **EXAMPLE 4**: All counties listed separately
- **EXAMPLE 5**: Regional Support Networks
- **EXAMPLE 6**: Key to how each county is sorted in tables 1 through 5
### Example 1: Estimated Demand For Regional Jail Beds By DSHS Region

ADP= Average Daily Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATCHMENT AREA</th>
<th>2004 Jail ADP</th>
<th>Demand Model First Step Estimate</th>
<th>Estimated ADP of Inmates in Regional Jail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pretrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Felons Misd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sentenced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Felons Misd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Felons Misd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grand Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>ADP</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>1,156</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>1,228</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>1,453</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>North Puget Sound</td>
<td>1,739</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>1,744</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal - Men</td>
<td>8,676</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>ADP</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>1,305</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>1,455</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>1,672</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>North Puget Sound</td>
<td>1,875</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>1,876</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal - Women</td>
<td>1,360</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>ADP</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>1,305</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>1,455</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>1,672</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>North Puget Sound</td>
<td>1,875</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>1,876</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>10,036</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CATCHMENT AREA DEFINITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Member Counties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>Adams, Chelan, Douglas, Ferry, Grant, Lincoln, Okanogan, Pend Oreille, Spokane, Stevens, Whitman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>Asotin, Benton, Columbia, Franklin, Garfield, Kittitas, Walla Walla, Yakima</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Example 1: Estimated Demand For Regional Jail Beds By DSHS Region

ADP= Average Daily Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADP</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Counties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>North Puget Sound</td>
<td>Island, San Juan, Skagit, Snohomish, Whatcom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Central Puget Sound</td>
<td>Kitsap, Pierce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>Clallam, Clark, Cowlitz, Grays Harbor, Jefferson, Klickitat, Lewis, Mason, Pacific, Skamania, Thurston, Wahkiakum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example 2: Eight Geographic Groupings That Might Reflect Jail Regions

ADP= Average Daily Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATCHMENT AREA</th>
<th>Num</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2004 Jail ADP</th>
<th>Demand Model First Step Estimate</th>
<th>Estimated ADP of Inmates in Regional Jail</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pretrial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Felons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Misd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sentenced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Felons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Misd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Felons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Misd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Felons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Misd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEN</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2004 Jail ADP</td>
<td>Demand Model</td>
<td>Estimated ADP of Inmates in Regional Jail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>First Step</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pretrial</td>
<td>Sentenced</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td></td>
<td>Felons</td>
<td>Misd</td>
<td>Felons</td>
<td>Misd</td>
<td>Felons</td>
<td>Misd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>NE Washington</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>11 17 2 4 13 20 34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>N Central</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>9 4 4 7 13 11 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>SE Washington</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>11 6 4 7 15 13 28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>S Central</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>6 9 8 12 14 21 35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>North Puget</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>9 3 5 5 13 8 22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Central Puget</td>
<td>3,810</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>111 26 29 23 140 49 189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>NW Washington</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>9 5 3 4 12 9 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>SW Washington</td>
<td>1,586</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>30 8 25 17 54 24 79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2004 Jail ADP</td>
<td>Demand Model</td>
<td>Estimated ADP of Inmates in Regional Jail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>First Step</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pretrial</td>
<td>Sentenced</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td></td>
<td>Felons</td>
<td>Misd</td>
<td>Felons</td>
<td>Misd</td>
<td>Felons</td>
<td>Misd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL |                  |                  |                |                                              |               |               |               |                   |                 |                 |
|       |                  |                  |                |                                              |               |               |               |                   |                 |                 |
|       |                  |                  |                |                                              |               |               |               |                   |                 |                 |
|       |                  |                  |                |                                              |               |               |               |                   |                 |                 |
|       |                  |                  |                |                                              |               |               |               |                   |                 |                 |
|       |                  |                  |                |                                              |               |               |               |                   |                 |                 |
|       |                  |                  |                |                                              |               |               |               |                   |                 |                 |
|       |                  |                  |                |                                              |               |               |               |                   |                 |                 |
|       |                  |                  |                |                                              |               |               |               |                   |                 |                 |
|       |                  |                  |                |                                              |               |               |               |                   |                 |                 |
|       |                  |                  |                |                                              |               |               |               |                   |                 |                 |
|       |                  |                  |                |                                              |               |               |               |                   |                 |                 |
|       |                  |                  |                |                                              |               |               |               |                   |                 |                 |
|       |                  |                  |                |                                              |               |               |               |                   |                 |                 |

| 1.1 | NE Washington    | 754              | 121            | 13 19 2 4 15 22 37                           |               |               |               |                   |                 |                 |
| 1.2 | N Central        | 551              | 88             | 10 4 5 8 15 12 27                           |               |               |               |                   |                 |                 |
| 2.1 | SE Washington    | 641              | 103            | 12 7 4 8 17 15 32                           |               |               |               |                   |                 |                 |
| 2.2 | S Central        | 858              | 137            | 7 11 10 14 17 26 43                           |               |               |               |                   |                 |                 |
| 3.0 | North Puget      | 522              | 83             | 10 4 5 6 16 10 26                           |               |               |               |                   |                 |                 |
| 4.0 | Central Puget    | 4,371            | 699            | 128 29 33 27 161 56 217                      |               |               |               |                   |                 |                 |
| 6.1 | NW Washington    | 484              | 77             | 10 6 4 4 14 10 24                           |               |               |               |                   |                 |                 |
| 6.2 | SW Washington    | 1,855            | 297            | 35 9 29 19 64 28 92                           |               |               |               |                   |                 |                 |
Example 2: Eight Geographic Groupings That Might Reflect Jail Regions

ADP= Average Daily Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Member Counties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>NE Washington</td>
<td>Adams, Ferry, Lincoln, Pend Oreille, Spokane, Stevens, Whitman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>N Central Washington</td>
<td>Chelan, Douglas, Grant, Okanogan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>SE Washington</td>
<td>Asotin, Benton, Columbia, Franklin, Garfield, Walla Walla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>S Central Washington</td>
<td>Kittitas, Klickitat, Yakima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>North Puget Sound</td>
<td>Island, San Juan, Skagit, Whatcom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Central Puget Sound</td>
<td>King, Pierce, Snohomish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>NW Washington</td>
<td>Clallam, Jefferson, Kitsap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>SW Washington</td>
<td>Clark, Cowlitz, Grays Harbor, Lewis, Mason, Pacific, Skamania, Thurston, Wahkiakum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example 3: Eastern And Western Washington
ADP=Average Daily Population

### MEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATCHMENT AREA</th>
<th>Num</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2004 Jail ADP</th>
<th>Demand Model First Step Estimate</th>
<th>Estimated ADP of Inmates in Regional Jail</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pretrial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Felons, Misd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WOMEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATCHMENT AREA</th>
<th>Num</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2004 Jail ADP</th>
<th>Demand Model First Step Estimate</th>
<th>Estimated ADP of Inmates in Regional Jail</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pretrial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Felons, Misd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATCHMENT AREA</th>
<th>Num</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2004 Jail ADP</th>
<th>Demand Model First Step Estimate</th>
<th>Estimated ADP of Inmates in Regional Jail</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pretrial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Felons, Misd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CATCHMENT AREA DEFINITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Member Counties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Other Western Washington</td>
<td>Clallam, Clark, Cowlitz, Grays Harbor, Island, Kitsap, Lewis, Mason, Pacific, San Juan, Skagit, Skamania, Thurston, Wahkiakum, Whatcom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>King, Pierce, Snohomish</td>
<td>King, Pierce, Snohomish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Example 4: All Counties Listed Separately

**ADP=Average Daily Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Num</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>2004 Jail ADP</th>
<th>Demand Model First Step Estimate</th>
<th>Estimated ADP of Inmates in Regional Jail</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pretrial Felons</td>
<td>Pretrial Misd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Benton</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Benton</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chelan</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Clallam</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cowlitz</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ferry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Garfield</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Grays Harbor</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Island</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>1,739</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Kitsap</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Kittitas</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Klickitat</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Okanogan</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Pend Oreille</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>1,059</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>San Juan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Skagit</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Skamania</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Snohomish</td>
<td>1,012</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Example 4: All Counties Listed Separately

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Num</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>2004 Jail ADP</th>
<th>Demand Model First Step Estimate</th>
<th>Estimated ADP of Inmates in Regional Jail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pretrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Felons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Stevens</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Thurston</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Wahkiakum</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Walla Walla</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Whatcom</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Whitman</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Yakima</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Subtotal - Men | 8,676 | 1,388 | 195 | 77 | 80 | 78 | 275 | 155 | 430 |

### Specialized Regional Jail Facility Study

#### WOMEN

- **Adams**: 2 Felons, 0 Misd
- **Asotin**: 4 Felons, 1 Misd
- **Benton**: 56 Felons, 9 Misd
- **Chelan**: 34 Felons, 5 Misd
- **Clallam**: 15 Felons, 2 Misd
- **Clark**: 107 Felons, 17 Misd
- **Columbia**: 0 Felons, 0 Misd
- **Cowlitz**: 36 Felons, 6 Misd
- **Douglas**: 0 Felons, 0 Misd
- **Ferry**: 0 Felons, 0 Misd
- **Franklin**: 12 Felons, 2 Misd
- **Garfield**: 1 Felons, 0 Misd
- **Grant**: 19 Felons, 3 Misd
- **Grays Harbor**: 21 Felons, 3 Misd
- **Island**: 7 Felons, 1 Misd
- **Jefferson**: 7 Felons, 1 Misd
- **King**: 236 Felons, 38 Misd
- **Kitsap**: 44 Felons, 7 Misd
- **Kittitas**: 10 Felons, 2 Misd
- **Klickitat**: 7 Felons, 1 Misd
- **Lewis**: 22 Felons, 4 Misd
- **Lincoln**: 1 Felons, 0 Misd
- **Mason**: 10 Felons, 2 Misd
- **Okanogan**: 20 Felons, 3 Misd
- **Pacific**: 4 Felons, 1 Misd
- **Pend Oreille**: 4 Felons, 1 Misd
## Specialized Regional Jail Facility Study

### Example 4: All Counties Listed Separately

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>2004 Jail ADP</th>
<th>Demand Model First Step Estimate</th>
<th>Estimated ADP of Inmates in Regional Jail</th>
<th>2004 Jail ADP</th>
<th>Demand Model First Step Estimate</th>
<th>Estimated ADP of Inmates in Regional Jail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.5  1.3  1.4  1.1  6.9  2.4  9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0  0.0  0.0  0.0  0.0  0.0  0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skagit</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6  0.3  0.4  0.5  1.1  0.8  2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skamania</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0  0.0  0.1  0.0  0.1  0.1  0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.0  0.9  1.0  0.8  5.1  1.8  7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.0  1.7  0.1  0.3  1.1  2.0  3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0  0.0  0.0  0.0  0.0  0.1  0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurston</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.1  0.2  1.1  0.8  2.2  1.0  3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wahkiakum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0  0.0  0.0  0.0  0.0  0.0  0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walla Walla</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4  0.1  0.0  0.0  0.0  0.4  0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whatcom</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.9  0.3  0.3  0.3  1.1  0.6  2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitman</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1  0.0  0.0  0.1  0.1  0.1  0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakima</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.9  1.8  1.6  2.5  2.5  4.2  7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - Women</td>
<td>1,360</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Num</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>2004 Jail ADP</td>
<td>Demand Model First Step Estimate</td>
<td>Estimated ADP of Inmates in Regional Jail</td>
<td>2004 Jail ADP</td>
<td>Demand Model First Step Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0  0  0  0  0  1  0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Aoslin</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1  0  0  0  0  1  0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Benton</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>6  5  2  7  8  12 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chelan</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4  2  2  5  6  6  12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Clallam</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3  1  0  1  3  2  5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>16 3 8 7 24 10 34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0  0  0  0  0  0  0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cowitz</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4  1  5 3 9 3 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0  0  0  0  0  0  0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ferry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0  0  0  0  0  0  0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2  1  2  1 4 1 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Garfield</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0  0  0  0  0  0  0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4  1  1  2  5  3  9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Grays Harbor</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3  1  2  1 5  2  7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Island</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1  0  1  0  2  1  2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1  1  0  0  1  1  2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>1,975</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>58 13 15 12 73 25 98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Kitsap</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7  3  3  3 10 7 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Kittitas</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2  1  1  1 2  2  4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Klickitat</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0  1  0  1 1 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okanogan</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pend Oreille</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>1,246</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skagit</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skamania</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurston</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wahkiakum</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walla Walla</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whatcom</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitman</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakima</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Example 5: Regional Support Networks

#### MEN - ADP=Average Daily Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATCHMENT AREA</th>
<th>Demand Model First Step Estimate</th>
<th>Estimated ADP of Inmates in Regional Jail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pretrial</td>
<td>Sentenced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Felons</td>
<td>Misd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>2004 Jail ADP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Peninsula</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Grays Harbor County</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Timberlands</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>North Sound MH Admin</td>
<td>1,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>1,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pierce County</td>
<td>1,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Thurston-Mason</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Clark County</td>
<td>579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>North Central Washington</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Chelan-Douglas</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Northeast Washington</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Spokane County</td>
<td>568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Greater Columbia Beh. Health</td>
<td>1,307</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal - Men: 8,676, 1,388, 195, 77, 80, 78, 275, 155, 430

#### WOMEN - Estimated ADP of Inmates in Regional Jail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATCHMENT AREA</th>
<th>Demand Model First Step Estimate</th>
<th>Estimated ADP of Inmates in Regional Jail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pretrial</td>
<td>Sentenced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Felons</td>
<td>Misd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>2004 Jail ADP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Peninsula</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Grays Harbor County</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Timberlands</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>North Sound Mental Health Admin</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pierce County</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Thurston-Mason</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Clark County</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>North Central Washington</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Chelan-Douglas</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Northeast Washington</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Spokane County</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Greater Columbia Beh. Health</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal - Women: 1,360, 218, 30, 12, 13, 13, 43, 25, 67
## Example 5: Regional Support Networks

### TOTAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATCHMENT AREA</th>
<th>2004 Jail ADP</th>
<th>Demand Model First Step Estimate</th>
<th>Estimated ADP of Inmates in Regional Jail</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pretrial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sentenced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Felons</td>
<td>Misd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Peninsula</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Grays Harbor County</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Timberlands</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 North Sound Mental Health Admin</td>
<td>1,672</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 King County</td>
<td>1,975</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Pierce County</td>
<td>1,246</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Thurston-Mason</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Southwest</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Clark County</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 North Central Washington</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Chelan-Douglas</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Northeast Washington</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Spokane County</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Greater Columbia Beh. Health</td>
<td>1,548</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,036</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,606</strong></td>
<td><strong>225</strong></td>
<td><strong>89</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CATCHMENT AREA DEFINITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Member Counties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Peninsula</td>
<td>Clallam, Jefferson, Kitsap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Grays Harbor County</td>
<td>Grays Harbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Timberlands</td>
<td>Pacific, Wahkiakum, Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>North Sound Mental Health Admin</td>
<td>Whatcom, Skagit, San Juan, Island, Snohomish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pierce County</td>
<td>Pierce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Thurston-Mason</td>
<td>Thurston, Mason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>Cowlitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Clark County</td>
<td>Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>North Central Washington</td>
<td>Okanogan, Grant, Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Chelan-Douglas</td>
<td>Chelan, Douglas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Northeast Washington</td>
<td>Ferry, Stevens, Pend Oreille, Lincoln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Spokane County</td>
<td>Spokane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Example 6: Key To How Each County Is Sorted In Examples 1 Through 5.**

Example 1: By DSHS region
Example 2: Possible regional jail regions, as grouped by the JLARC study team
Example 3: Eastern and Western Washington
Example 4: All counties listed separately
Example 5: By Regional Support Network (RSN)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>DSHS Region</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Alternative Region</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>All Counties</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>RSN Num</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>NE WA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eastern WA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>North Central WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asotin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>SE WA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eastern WA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Asotin</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Greater Columbia Behavioral Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>SE WA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eastern WA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Benton</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Greater Columbia Behavioral Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>N Central WA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eastern WA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chelan</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Chelan-Douglas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clallam</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>NW WA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Eastern WA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Clallam</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>SW WA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Clark County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>SE WA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eastern WA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Greater Columbia Behavioral Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowlitz</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>SW WA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Other West WA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cowlitz</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Southwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>N Central WA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eastern WA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Chelan-Douglas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>NE WA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eastern WA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ferry</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Northeast WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>SE WA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eastern WA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Greater Columbia Behavioral Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>SE WA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eastern WA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Garfield</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Greater Columbia Behavioral Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>N Central WA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eastern WA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>North Central WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grays Harbor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>SW WA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Other West WA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Grays Harbor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Grays Harbor County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>NW WA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eastern WA</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Island</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>North Sound Mental Health Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>North Puget Sound</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Other West WA</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Central Puget Sound</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>King, Pierce, Snohomish</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>King County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>NW WA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Other West WA</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Kitsap</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>DSHS Region</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Alternative Region</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Example 1</td>
<td>Example 2</td>
<td>Example 3</td>
<td>Example 4</td>
<td>Example 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kittitas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>S Central WA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eastern WA</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Kittitas</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greater Columbia Behavioral Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klickitat</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>S Central WA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eastern WA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Klickitat</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greater Columbia Behavioral Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>SW WA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Eastern WA</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Timberlands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>NE WA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eastern WA</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Northeast WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>SW WA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Eastern WA</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thurston-Mason</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okanogan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>N Central WA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eastern WA</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Okanogan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>North Central WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>SW WA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Eastern WA</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pend Oreille</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pend Oreille</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>NE WA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eastern WA</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Pend Oreille</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Northeast WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Central Puget Sound</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Other West WA</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pierce County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>North Puget Sound</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Other West WA</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>San Juan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>North Sound Mental Health Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skagit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>North Puget Sound</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Other West WA</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Skagit</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>North Sound Mental Health Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skamania</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>SW WA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Eastern WA</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Skamania</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greater Columbia Behavioral Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Central Puget Sound</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Other West WA</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Snohomish</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>North Sound Mental Health Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>NE WA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eastern WA</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spokane County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>NE WA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eastern WA</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Stevens</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Northeast WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurston</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>SW WA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Eastern WA</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Thurston</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thurston-Mason</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wahkiakum</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>SW WA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Eastern WA</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Wahkiakum</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Timberlands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walla Walla</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>SE WA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eastern WA</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Walla Walla</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greater Columbia Behavioral Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whatcom</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>North Puget Sound</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Other West WA</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Whatcom</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>North Sound Mental Health Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>NE WA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eastern WA</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Whitman</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greater Columbia Behavioral Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakima</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>S Central WA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eastern WA</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Yakima</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greater Columbia Behavioral Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 4: LIFE-CYCLE COST ANALYSIS DETAIL

Life-cycle cost analysis allows comparisons between buildings with different sizes, different ages, and different construction techniques. When converted to total cost per bed (Equivalent Uniform Annual Cost, or EUAC), this analysis tool allows a ranking of alternatives.

The same variables were estimated for each alternative (such as land costs, conversion costs, systems replacement, custody and program staff requirements, etc.). Presented below is some of the detail of the analysis undertaken by JLARC’s consultants.\textsuperscript{15}

Costs of Converting Existing Facilities: Life-Cycle Costs

Capital Requirements

Each of the three alternatives were toured to determine what improvements would be needed to convert the existing buildings to a regional mental health jail. In general, facilities that were not constructed for a jail population required extensive capital improvements to the point that new construction is the least expensive alternative.

The primary reason for this is that building codes require jails to be constructed at a level known as Institutional Occupancy, also referred to as “I-Occupancy.”\textsuperscript{16} This construction level includes fire resistant materials such as masonry walls, fire suppression sprinklers and high grade industrial materials not normally found in residential buildings. Retrofitting a wood framed building (as found in the nursing home example) to secure concrete materials becomes very costly. Additionally, non-jail buildings do not typically have the level of security hardware and electronics required for ensuring public safety. Again, retrofitting an existing building for this purpose is almost always more expensive than new construction planned from the outset for high security. There are also American Correctional Association (ACA) standards to consider. For example, these include specific square footage and shower and toilet ratios that are different from those of a nursing home.\textsuperscript{17}

Required Time Until Occupancy

Converting any of the existing buildings to a specialized jail for inmates with mental illness or co-occurring disorders will take between 18 months and two years. New construction would require at a minimum two and one-half to three years because of issues such as purchasing land and potential requirements for zoning changes.

\textsuperscript{15} Additional detail is contained in the consultant’s report and the electronic models created by JLARC’s consultants.


\textsuperscript{17} Standards for Adult Local Detention Facilities, 3rd Edition, American Correctional Association, March 1991, with yearly supplements.
Operating Costs

Operating costs serve as one of the drivers in evaluating the life-cycle costs of each alternative. We developed a feeder model that estimates operating costs according to each treatment modality in any of eight locations in Washington State. The eight locations were chosen simply for geographical variety. These values are then read by the Life-Cycle Cost Model.

The first component that goes into calculating operating costs is jail services. This entails all of the basic jail operations such as security, administration, food, clothing, booking, transportation, and administrative overhead. In order to determine the cost of specialized services the costs of medications, treatment staff, and added security staff are included. The model calculates operating costs when the jail is at full capacity, when it is less than full, and when it is over capacity. Operating costs vary because the caseload sizes for mental health professionals depend on which treatment modality is being offered. Although the caseload sizes change mental health staffing costs, costs for jail services remain the same because the jail service requirements are the same throughout the three modalities.

Exhibit 2 on the following page is a printout of the summary sheet in the Operating Costs Model.
### MENTAL HEALTH/CO-OCCURRING CHEMICAL DEPENDENCY REGIONAL JAILS
#### ESTIMATED ANNUAL OPERATING COSTS
(Excluding Capital, Land and Other Life-Cycle Costs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLICK ON YELLOW CELLS TO SELECT VALUES</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Treatment staff</th>
<th>Medications</th>
<th>Added security</th>
<th>Jail services</th>
<th>Total daily rate at capacity</th>
<th>Yearly cost at full capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1- Converted Small Size</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modality 1</td>
<td>$ 13.33</td>
<td>$ 13.92</td>
<td>$ 41.97</td>
<td>$ 78.27</td>
<td>$ 147.49</td>
<td>$ 1,076,706</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modality 2</td>
<td>$ 18.08</td>
<td>$ 13.92</td>
<td>$ 41.97</td>
<td>$ 78.27</td>
<td>$ 152.24</td>
<td>$ 1,111,379</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modality 3</td>
<td>$ 22.83</td>
<td>$ 13.92</td>
<td>$ 41.97</td>
<td>$ 78.27</td>
<td>$ 156.99</td>
<td>$ 1,146,052</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2- Converted Medium Size</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modality 1</td>
<td>$ 14.61</td>
<td>$ 13.92</td>
<td>$ 22.38</td>
<td>$ 78.27</td>
<td>$ 129.18</td>
<td>$ 3,536,427</td>
<td>$ 3,536,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modality 2</td>
<td>$ 20.35</td>
<td>$ 13.92</td>
<td>$ 22.38</td>
<td>$ 78.27</td>
<td>$ 134.93</td>
<td>$ 3,693,670</td>
<td>$ 3,693,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modality 3</td>
<td>$ 23.56</td>
<td>$ 13.92</td>
<td>$ 22.38</td>
<td>$ 78.27</td>
<td>$ 138.14</td>
<td>$ 3,781,566</td>
<td>$ 3,781,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3- Converted Large Size</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modality 1</td>
<td>$ 15.72</td>
<td>$ 13.92</td>
<td>$ 13.12</td>
<td>$ 78.27</td>
<td>$ 121.03</td>
<td>$ 11,308,666</td>
<td>$ 11,308,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modality 2</td>
<td>$ 19.43</td>
<td>$ 13.92</td>
<td>$ 13.12</td>
<td>$ 78.27</td>
<td>$ 124.74</td>
<td>$ 11,655,397</td>
<td>$ 11,655,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modality 3</td>
<td>$ 23.88</td>
<td>$ 13.92</td>
<td>$ 13.12</td>
<td>$ 78.27</td>
<td>$ 129.19</td>
<td>$ 12,076,328</td>
<td>$ 12,076,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4-New Construction</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modality 1</td>
<td>$ 14.98</td>
<td>$ 13.92</td>
<td>$ 13.12</td>
<td>$ 78.27</td>
<td>$ 120.28</td>
<td>$ 5,619,660</td>
<td>$ 5,619,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modality 2</td>
<td>$ 19.43</td>
<td>$ 13.92</td>
<td>$ 13.12</td>
<td>$ 78.27</td>
<td>$ 124.74</td>
<td>$ 5,827,698</td>
<td>$ 5,827,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modality 3</td>
<td>$ 23.88</td>
<td>$ 13.92</td>
<td>$ 13.12</td>
<td>$ 78.27</td>
<td>$ 129.19</td>
<td>$ 6,035,737</td>
<td>$ 6,035,737</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Operating costs are read by the Life-Cycle Cost Model (LCC). Table 10 below illustrates the key values that were selected for the baseline analysis, followed by the baseline results.

### Table 10 – Key Values Used Baseline Life-Cycle Cost Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Period</th>
<th>30 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base year</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation rate</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real discount rate</td>
<td>4.0% (OFM recommended value)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.0% (Federal OMB recommended value)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years for deferred system replacement</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service modality</td>
<td>Crisis management, stabilization and re-entry planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor cost location</td>
<td>Pierce County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected useful life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>40 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>40 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
<td>40 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>$20,090 ($7.00 per sq ft per county real estate appraiser)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>$134,945 (9.6% of purchase price adjusted to 2005 dollars – percentage of total per county auditor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>$1,020,000 (50.9 acres at $17,500 per acre + 30 acres at ¼ of $17,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
<td>$80,000 (4 acres at $20,000 per acre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of existing buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>$114,800 (2,870 sq ft at $40 per sq ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>$1,270,733 (90.4% of actual purchase price adjusted to 2005 dollars – percentage of total per county auditor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>$29,591,000 (estimated value of buildings of use to regional jail)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
<td>Zero (new construction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction cost</td>
<td>As provided by architect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating cost</td>
<td>See discussion of operating costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building maintenance &amp; repairs</td>
<td>Included in estimate of operating costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building system replacement cycles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General site improvements</td>
<td>20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building &amp; utility</td>
<td>40 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior finishes</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof systems</td>
<td>20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVAC</td>
<td>25 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>25 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security electronics</td>
<td>8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doors &amp; locking systems</td>
<td>15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment &amp; furnishings</td>
<td>12 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Baseline Life-Cycle Cost Analysis Results

Two baselines were established to serve as a springboard for a sensitivity analysis. (See Appendix 5 for further details on the sensitivity analysis.) Table 11 below summarizes the baseline annual cost per bed (including all construction, financing and operating costs) and the baseline rank order of least cost alternatives using two different discount rates.

Table 11 – Life-Cycle Cost Baseline Annual Cost Per Bed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discount Rate</th>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
<th>Alternative 3</th>
<th>Alternative 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 %</td>
<td>$57,089</td>
<td>$60,845</td>
<td>$58,420</td>
<td>$55,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>$58,066</td>
<td>$64,579</td>
<td>$62,493</td>
<td>$58,465</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discount Rate</th>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
<th>Alternative 3</th>
<th>Alternative 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 %</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first baseline uses an approximation of the OFM recommended real discount rate of 4 percent. The other baseline uses the Federal Office of Management and Budget recommended real discount rate of 7 percent. All other key values are identical. These two baselines are shown in Exhibits 3 and 4 on the following pages.

Using a 4 percent real discount rate and the other assumptions outlined above, the least cost alternative is Alternative 4, new construction; and the most expensive is Alternative 2, nursing home conversion. The latter, on an annual equivalent cost per bed basis, is about 10 percent more expensive.

Using a 7 percent real discount rate, the least cost alternative is Alternative 1, renovation of an existing jail space for a small specialized regional facility. Alternative 2, nursing home conversion, remains the most expensive; costing this time about 11 percent more than the least cost alternative.
**Exhibit 3 – Baseline Life-Cycle Cost Estimate**

**PROJECT:** Regional Mental Health Jail  
**DATE:** 10-Nov-05

**FINANCIAL AND MODELING ASSUMPTIONS**

**Study Period:** 30  
**Base Year:** 2005  
**Real Discount Rate:** 4.00%  
**Number of Years for Deferred System Replacement:** 3  
**Modality:** Crisis management, stabilization and re-entry planning  
**Location (set in Regional MH Jail Operating Cost.xls):** Pierce

### Annual Equivalent and LCC Costs of Project Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Useful Life (Years)</th>
<th>Alternative #1</th>
<th>Alternative #2</th>
<th>Alternative #3</th>
<th>Alternative #4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>40 20</td>
<td>30 75</td>
<td>40 256</td>
<td>40 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Investment Annual Cost</td>
<td>$42,919</td>
<td>$751,695</td>
<td>$2,290,288</td>
<td>$1,011,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Operations Annual Cost</td>
<td>$1,076,706</td>
<td>$3,536,427</td>
<td>$11,308,666</td>
<td>$5,619,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Maintenance &amp; Repair Annual Cost</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building/Site Systems Replacement Annual Cost</td>
<td>$22,361</td>
<td>$277,638</td>
<td>$1,367,277</td>
<td>$410,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual Value of Land Expressed Annually</td>
<td>-$211</td>
<td>-$2,406</td>
<td>-$10,737</td>
<td>-$842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Annual Equivalent Cost per Bed</td>
<td>$57,089</td>
<td>$60,845</td>
<td>$58,420</td>
<td>$55,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Least Cost Alternative</td>
<td>104%</td>
<td>111%</td>
<td>106%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total LCC for Study Period per Bed</td>
<td>$19,743,617</td>
<td>$78,909,680</td>
<td>$258,610,889</td>
<td>$121,761,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Least Cost Alternative</td>
<td>104%</td>
<td>111%</td>
<td>106%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Exhibit 4 – Baseline Life-Cycle Cost Estimate With Alternative Discount Rate

**PROJECT:** Regional Mental Health Jail

**DATE:** 10-Nov-05

**FINANCIAL AND MODELING ASSUMPTIONS**

- **Study Period:** 30
- **Base Year:** 2005
- **Real Discount Rate:** 7.00% **<- Federal OMB recommended value**
- **Number of Years for Deferred System Replacement:** 3
- **Modality:** Crisis management, stabilization and re-entry planning
- **Location (set in Regional MH Jail Operating Cost.xls):** Pierce

#### Annual Equivalent and LCC Costs of Project Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Useful Life (Years)</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Alternative #1</th>
<th>Alternative #2</th>
<th>Alternative #3</th>
<th>Alternative #4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial Investment Annual Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$63,720</td>
<td>$1,047,490</td>
<td>$3,400,250</td>
<td>$1,502,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Operations Annual Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,076,706</td>
<td>$3,536,427</td>
<td>$11,308,666</td>
<td>$5,619,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Maintenance &amp; Repair Annual Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building/Site Systems Replacement Annual Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,996</td>
<td>$260,958</td>
<td>$1,294,316</td>
<td>$362,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residual Value of Land Expressed Annually</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>-$101</td>
<td>-$1,429</td>
<td>-$5,111</td>
<td>-$401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Annual Equivalent Cost per Bed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,161,321</td>
<td>$4,843,447</td>
<td>$15,998,122</td>
<td>$7,483,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rank</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of Least Cost Alternative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>111%</td>
<td>108%</td>
<td>101%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total LCC for Study Period per Bed |          | $14,410,879    | $60,102,534    | $198,521,350   | $92,863,626    |
| **Rank** |          | 1              | 4              | 3              | 2              |
| **% of Least Cost Alternative** |          | 100%           | 111%           | 108%           | 101%           |
APPENDIX 5: RESULTS OF LIFE-CYCLE COST SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS

For each of the three alternative existing buildings analyzed in this report—and for the new jail used as a comparison—a baseline set of assumptions was created. These baseline assumptions are explained in detail in Appendix 4.

JLARC’s consultants also conducted extensive sensitivity analysis to determine how changes in the baseline assumptions might change the life-cycle costs and rankings of the various building alternatives.

The detailed analysis is presented below. Review of each indicates that the most consistent impact is the switch in the ranking of the top two alternatives: ALT 4: new construction and ALT 1: Wenatchee facility. These consistently rank either first or second, depending on which assumption is changed.

RESULTS OF THE SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS

Variables Manipulated in the Sensitivity Analysis

A number of variables were manipulated in the sensitivity analysis using a 4 percent, and 7 percent, real discount rate. These values are:

- **Treatment Modality**: four treatment modalities, varying in intensity of services
- **Labor Cost Location**: eight different counties, ranging from urban (King) to more rural (Clallam and Chelan)
- **Value of Land and Existing Buildings at Green Hill School**: ranging from replacement cost to estimated current value of buildings needed for a regional jail
- **Construction Cost**: ranging from 10 percent higher than the mid-point cost used in the baseline assumption to 10 percent less than the mid-point used in the baseline assumption

Cost comparisons in this analysis are based on the life-cycle annual equivalent cost per bed for each alternative. This provides a common denominator since there are four different size facilities in four locations. When these variables are manipulated within the model, under most circumstances, the new construction is the least cost alternative on a per bed basis.

One exception is Alternative 1, when a lower labor cost is used. However, Alternative 1 can only serve 20 people of the same gender and may not be large enough. On the other hand, it may work well in a small rural area.

**Treatment Modality**

Three treatment modalities are included as choices in the cost model. The three alternatives provide increasing levels of service at increasing levels of cost. They are:

1. Crisis management, stabilization, and re-entry planning;
2. Crisis management, stabilization, maintenance, and re-entry planning; and

3. Crisis management, stabilization, maintenance, treatment, and re-entry planning.

When a 4 percent real discount rate is used, the rank order of the four alternatives is not affected appreciably by changes in treatment modality. Alternative 4, new construction, and Alternative 2, nursing home renovation, are respectively, the least and most expensive alternatives. Modality 2 (crisis management, stabilization, maintenance, and re-entry planning) causes Alternatives 1 and 2 to trade rank order, but with very small differences in annual equivalent cost per bed.

When a 7 percent real discount rate is used, Alternative 1, renovation of an existing jail space, and Alternative 2, nursing home renovation, are, respectively, the least and most expensive alternatives. Alternative 4, new construction, is a close second in each scenario, costing less than 1 percent more than Alternative 1.

The tables below summarize the results of changing the treatment modality on rank order and cost.

Table 12 – Effect of Treatment Modality on Rank Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment Modality</th>
<th>Rank with 4% Discount Rate</th>
<th>Rank with 7% Discount Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alt 1</td>
<td>Alt 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Crisis management, stabilization and re-entry planning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Crisis management, stabilization, maintenance and re-entry planning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Crisis management, stabilization, maintenance, treatment and re-entry planning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 – Effect of Treatment Modality on Equivalent Annual Cost Per Bed (percent of least costly alternative)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment Modality</th>
<th>Cost with 4% Discount Rate</th>
<th>Cost with 7% Discount Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alt 1</td>
<td>Alt 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Crisis management, stabilization and re-entry planning</td>
<td>103.8%</td>
<td>110.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Crisis management, stabilization, maintenance and re-entry planning</td>
<td>103.9%</td>
<td>111.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Crisis management, stabilization, maintenance, treatment and re-entry planning</td>
<td>103.9%</td>
<td>110.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Labor Costs by Location

Staffing represents about 75 percent of a corrections budget. Since staffing costs vary from county to county, where a jail is located can greatly impact its operations costs. The operations cost model component of the life-cycle cost model estimates the costs of operating a specialized jail in eight counties within Washington. The counties were chosen for the purpose of representing the geographic areas of the state. The counties are:

- Chelan
- Clark
- Pierce
- Spokane
- Clallam
- King
- Yakima
- Whatcom

Costs are changed, up or down, based on an index where Pierce County = 100. (Pierce County was used because enough data about the Pierce County Jail is available to isolate operating costs from their mental health treatment services.) Index values are noted in the tables below.

Using a 4 percent real discount rate, locations with lower operating costs increase the attractiveness of Alternative 1, moving it in rank from second to first when the least costly location is used. When a 7 percent real discount rate is used and labor costs go up to their most expensive level, Alternative 4, new construction, moves from second to first. The following two tables summarize the rank and relative cost of the four alternatives at these different locations.

Table 14 – Effect of Location on Rank Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>4% Discount Rate</th>
<th></th>
<th>7% Discount Rate</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alt 1</td>
<td>Alt 2</td>
<td>Alt 3</td>
<td>Alt 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King (105% of baseline)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce (100% of baseline)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane (99% of baseline)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark (98% of baseline)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whatcom (94% of baseline)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clallam (85% of baseline)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakima (82% of baseline)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelan (78% of baseline)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 – Effect of Location on Equivalent Annual Cost Per Bed (percent of least costly alternative)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>4% Discount Rate</th>
<th>7% Discount Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alt 1</td>
<td>Alt 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King (105% of baseline)</td>
<td>105%</td>
<td>110%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce (100% of baseline)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane (99% of baseline)</td>
<td>104%</td>
<td>111%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark (98% of baseline)</td>
<td>103%</td>
<td>111%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whatcom (94% of baseline)</td>
<td>103%</td>
<td>111%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clallam (85% of baseline)</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>111%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakima (82% of baseline)</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>111%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelan (78% of baseline)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>112%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Value of Land and Existing Buildings at Green Hill School**

Determining the value of Green Hill School (Green Hill School is Alternative 3) is challenging. Even though the state owns Green Hill School, it is not free. For instance, the state has a substantial investment in buildings and land. In addition, unless space could be found in other Juvenile Rehabilitations Administration (JRA) facilities for the residents displaced by conversion of the institution to a regional jail, the state would incur additional costs to construct replacement JRA beds. A fair comparison of the conversion of Green Hill School for use as a specialized regional jail therefore requires that the value of land and existing buildings be taken into consideration.

The value of land was estimated based on the current asking price in cost per acre of vacant land adjacent to the freeway in Chehalis. Estimates of the value of buildings and other improvements were made three ways as follows:

- **Replacement Cost:** $64.1 million—this is an estimate of what it would cost to provide equivalent space elsewhere for JRA residents;
- **Current Value of All Existing Buildings:** $41.7 million—this is an estimate of the fair market value of existing buildings based on their size, replacement cost, current age, and condition; and
- **Current Value of Existing Buildings Used By Specialized Regional Jail:** $29.6 million.
The value of existing buildings calculated by these three approaches varies greatly—from a low of $29.6 million to a high of $64.1 million. The baseline life-cycle cost analysis uses the lowest calculated value. The assumptions used to make these estimates are shown in the Table 16 below.

Table 16 – Three Estimated Values for Existing Buildings at Green Hill School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Designation</th>
<th>Area (SF)</th>
<th>Replacement Cost</th>
<th>% of Value Remaining</th>
<th>Current Value</th>
<th>Needed for Regular MH Jail</th>
<th>Current Value of Needed Buildings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entry/Visiting/Security</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>1,590,124</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>1,431,111</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,431,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birch Cottage</td>
<td>16,705</td>
<td>3,666,046</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>3,299,441</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3,299,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining/Kitchen/Warehouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining/Kitchen</td>
<td>8,288</td>
<td>2,095,726</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>1,886,154</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,886,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehouse</td>
<td>8,288</td>
<td>941,692</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>847,523</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>847,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Services</td>
<td>2,380</td>
<td>564,731</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>508,258</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hickory Cottage</td>
<td>16,575</td>
<td>3,637,516</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>3,273,765</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3,273,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry/Maintenance</td>
<td>25,220</td>
<td>6,377,583</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3,188,792</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3,188,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madrona Cottage</td>
<td>16,575</td>
<td>3,637,516</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>3,273,765</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3,273,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spruce Cottage</td>
<td>16,575</td>
<td>3,637,516</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>3,273,765</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3,273,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Recreation Building</td>
<td>20,020</td>
<td>2,854,692</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1,427,346</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education</td>
<td>32,850</td>
<td>4,391,388</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>3,952,249</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMU/Health Center</td>
<td>16,410</td>
<td>3,893,798</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>(New construction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>24,960</td>
<td>4,254,232</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>425,423</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>(New construction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>20,715</td>
<td>2,884,564</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>2,596,107</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Plant</td>
<td>3,415</td>
<td>2,891,276</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1,445,638</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,445,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>192,000</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>96,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Construction Cost</td>
<td>239,975</td>
<td>$47,510,400</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>$30,925,336</td>
<td>$21,919,953</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Development cost at</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>$16,628,640</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,823,868</td>
<td>$7,671,983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$64,139,041</td>
<td>$41,749,204</td>
<td></td>
<td>$29,591,936</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Development costs include professional fees (architects and engineers), sales tax, permits, owner management costs, environmental impact statements, testing (soils, concrete, etc.), equipment and furnishings, and .5 percent for art. All of these add to 35 percent.
In theory, the cost of Green Hill School attributable to its use as a specialized regional jail could be reduced if some of the buildings or land could be sold to another buyer for another use. While some of the buildings not needed for a jail are located on the edge of the developed part of the site, they are close to buildings that would be used for the jail. This proximity introduces security problems by making it relatively easy for someone to throw contraband (drugs, weapons, etc.) over the perimeter fence. This is a serious security risk. Because of this, sale of unused buildings was not taken into account in the life-cycle cost analysis. Sale of land was also not included in the analysis because most of the undeveloped land outside the security perimeter is wetlands.

While reduction in the cost of land or buildings due to sale to a third party was not directly taken into account, a breakeven analysis was done to show how much the value would have to be reduced for Green Hill School to be as economically attractive as the other alternatives studied.

Not surprisingly, given the range of costs involved, the life-cycle cost of Green Hill School is significantly affected by the value of land and existing buildings.

Table 17 – The Effect of the Cost of Green Hill School on Rank Order and Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combined Value of Land and Buildings</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Percent of Least Costly Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4% Discount Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$65,159,000 (land + replacement cost)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>119%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$42,749,000 (land + current value of all buildings)</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
<td>111%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,612,000 (land + current value of buildings useful for jail)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>106%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Breakeven Values</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$22,800,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>103.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,80000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12,300,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$14,000,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Construction Cost**

The architectural consultant working on this analysis provided a range of construction values for two of the four alternatives. The baseline life-cycle cost analysis uses either the midpoint, or a value suggested by the architect for the construction cost of those alternatives where a range was provided. The sensitivity analysis tests the effect of the high and low end of these ranges, or, when a range was not provided, a value of 10 percent above or below the estimate provided by the architect.

Changing construction costs within these ranges had only a small effect on the rank order of alternatives using either a 4 or 7 percent real discount rate. These changes can be seen in the Table 18 on the following page.
Table 18 – Effect of Construction Cost on Rank Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in Construction Cost</th>
<th>4% Discount Rate</th>
<th>7% Discount Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alt 1</td>
<td>Alt 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT 1 10% less</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT 1 10% more</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT 2 10% less</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT 2 10% more</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT 3 at $9,000,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT 3 at $12,000,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT 4 at $11,680,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT 4 at $14,016,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Construction cost ranges also had a modest effect the relative cost of alternatives. As Table 19 below illustrates, with both a 4 percent and 7 percent real discount rate, the difference between the least costly and most costly alternative varied from the baseline within a range of about 2 percent.

Table 19 – Effect of Construction Cost on Equivalent Annual Cost Per Bed (percent of least costly alternative)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in Construction Cost</th>
<th>4% Discount Rate</th>
<th>7% Discount Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alt 1</td>
<td>Alt 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>104 %</td>
<td>111 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt 1 at 10% less</td>
<td>103 %</td>
<td>111 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt 1 at 10% more</td>
<td>104 %</td>
<td>111 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt 2 at 10% less</td>
<td>104 %</td>
<td>109 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt 2 at 10% more</td>
<td>104 %</td>
<td>112 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT 3 at $9,000,000</td>
<td>104 %</td>
<td>111 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT 3 at $12,000,000</td>
<td>104 %</td>
<td>111 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT 4 at $11,680,000</td>
<td>105 %</td>
<td>112 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT 4 at $14,016,000</td>
<td>102 %</td>
<td>109 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 6: INFORMATION FROM OTHER STATES

JLARC’s consultants contacted corrections specialists to see if other states have developed something similar to a regional jail for offenders with mental health or co-occurring disorders. While none were found with this exact population in mind, two useful examples are presented in their analysis below.

National Models

According to jail specialists at the National Institute of Corrections (NIC), there are no known examples of specialized regional jails in the United States that were designed specifically to serve mentally ill inmates or inmates with co-occurring mental and chemical dependency disorders.19

At their recommendation, two nationally recognized experts on jails and treatment programs for offenders were contacted (Dennis Liebert and Kevin Warwick) as were two regional jail programs that include specialized treatment services.

One of the programs is in Virginia; the other is in North Dakota. When interviews were held with representatives from these two programs, both said that they were unable to find other specialized regional jails from which they could learn as they started planning their respective facilities. Neither of the national experts was able to cite examples other than those already recommended by NIC.20

Hampton Roads Regional Jail (Virginia)

The Hampton Roads Regional Jail serves four Virginia municipalities: Norfolk, Newport News, Hampton, and Portsmouth. The four municipalities have a combined population of approximately 670,000.21

Each jurisdiction operates its own jail with inmate populations ranging from about 500 to about 1,500. Together these jails have an average daily population of approximately 3,500.22

In 1994, these jurisdictions formed a regional jail authority under Virginia law to develop a specialized regional jail to serve the medical and mental health needs of their inmate populations. The jail was opened in 1998 with a design capacity of 798, plus 80 special management beds. Under Virginia law, the state pays for one-half the construction of regional jails (and one-quarter the cost of single-jurisdiction jails). Hampton Roads is the only regional jail in Virginia planned and designed for these special populations.

---

19 NIC Jails Specialist Vicci Persons, personal communication. Ms. Persons conferred with the other jails specialists at NIC before making her recommendations.
20 There are national models of regionalized treatment facilities for chemically dependent offenders.
22 Assistant Superintendent David L. Simons, Hampton Roads Regional Jail, personal communication.
Specialized Regional Jail Facility Study

The jail is governed by a board made up of representatives from the four jurisdictions involved. The entity is empowered to issue bonds for construction. The assistant administrator for the jail reported that this structure tends to shift fiscal and treatment control from the sheriffs (who run each jurisdiction’s jail) to the board (which includes other local officials, but not sheriffs). The result, he says, has been a standardization of care that doesn’t shift from one jurisdiction, or one sheriff’s election, to another.

As a result of operating this specialized facility, it was reported that the four municipal jails were able to significantly downsize their own medical and mental health staff and operations.23 Each jail does medical and mental health screening and handles routine cases internally. Cases that exceed local capability are transferred to the regional facility where they are evaluated by medical and/or mental health staff, as appropriate. The regional jail may refuse admission to the facility, and will not accept anyone with less than a two-week expected length of stay.

Once admitted to the regional facility, inmates remain there throughout their jail stay, including after they are stabilized and can live in general population. The reason given for this policy was to avoid becoming an “emergency room” for the feeder jails and thereby only experiencing the very highest cost-per-day inmates. By keeping them after they are stabilized, the average cost per day is reduced.

The facility accepts both sentenced and pre-trial inmates. Transportation distances to courts are relatively short: the maximum commute to the most distant courthouse is 40 minutes; one courthouse is only five minutes away.

The facility is entirely maximum security. It has 16 56-cell pods. Each pod has 52 single occupancy cells and four double occupancy cells, for a total of 60 inmates per pod. Each pod is generally divided into three sections. There is also an 80-bed psychiatric unit, four suicide (camera) cells, and an infirmary. The facility has a number of multi-purpose rooms for various programs, including groups and chemical dependency education. Each pod has its own multipurpose room and exercise yard. Rovers circulate within the units, but direct observation of the pods is provided from a secure control room. Treatment and other program staff provide services in the housing units.

Each jurisdiction pays a flat rate per year based on a per diem cost that is adjusted annually. Two of the jurisdictions guarantee to provide an average daily population of 250 inmates; one will guarantee 200; and one will guarantee 175. Jurisdictions can purchase additional beds on a space available basis. The facility also provides 300 beds on contract to the federal government for immigration holds.

Many mentally ill inmates are in general population. The mental health unit comprises inmates needing more professional attention, protection from others (e.g., developmentally disabled and other vulnerable inmates), and others deemed unable to live in the general population for one reason or another.

Inmates with serious behavior problems are in close observation cells, segregation (23-hour-per-day lockdown), or the 80-bed psychiatric unit. Segregation capacity is

23 Ibid.
expandable since all the cells are high security. Behavior problems can often be controlled by medication, but, like most other jurisdictions, forced medication of inmates requires a court order in Virginia. Those who remain out of control may be transferred to a state mental health hospital.

It was reported that continuity of mental health care following release varies by jurisdiction. Each Monday, the facility produces a list of people who will be released that week. One of the jurisdictions takes advantage of this to facilitate transition to community care—including picking some up at release and taking them to community facilities. Other jurisdictions provide information to those being released, but don’t track them.

**Pierce County Regional Jail (North Dakota)**

Pierce County is a rural county that calls itself the geographic center of North America. It is located 35 miles south of Canada at roughly the east-west midpoint of North Dakota. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, it has a declining and aging population estimated at 4,357 in 2003.

Faced with the need for a new jail and lacking the local tax base to pay for construction, the county started planning a 129-bed regional jail to serve Pierce County, four adjacent counties, the state, and the U.S. Marshals Service.

In the fall of 2005, the jail was under construction with a scheduled completion in early Summer 2006. While not geared precisely to the target population of interest in this report, when completed, it will provide 40 beds for chemical dependency treatment for county and state sentenced prisoners. As such, because of the nature of the chemically dependent inmate population, it will inevitably serve inmates with co-occurring disorders. When interviewed, the sheriff acknowledged the theoretical possibility of the need for mental health services, but it does not appear that the county has done much planning for inmates with co-occurring disorders.

For most of the participating counties, the new regional jail will be their only jail facility. One county will use it when their jail is full. State inmates—who will make up most of the population in the treatment unit—will be transferred to the regional jail when they are one year from their prison release date. The state’s interest in contracting with the regional jail is to supplement the Department of Corrections’ own chemical dependency treatment program which has insufficient capacity to meet the needs of all inmates ordered by the court to have such treatment as a condition of their sentence.

Those transporting inmates from adjacent counties must drive up to 60 miles to the regional jail. State inmates will be transported 125 miles.

Services will be provided on a contract basis with two different per diem fees: one for basic incarceration and one for incarceration plus treatment. Treatment services will be provided by four licensed chemical dependency counselors and a part-time psychologist. While designed to augment the treatment program provided by the state, not all services will be duplicated locally.