

# **Final Report and Recommendations**

**on the**

**Pierce County Jail**

**Ad Hoc Committee**

**June 27, 2013**

Ad Hoc (Jail) Committee Final Report and Recommendations  
June 27, 2013

Issues and concerns regarding the Pierce County jail are well documented. Over the past 15 years efforts to address these issues have had limited success. In December 2012 the Pierce County Finance and Personnel (F&P) Committee took action to create a committee comprised of citizens to study the issues involving the jail and make a recommendation based on their findings. This document is the written summary report of recommendations that the committee was charged with producing.

I. Creation of committee

On December 3, 2012, the Pierce County F&P Committee created an Ad Hoc Committee and assigned the committee this charge:

The Pierce County Finance and Personnel Committee has appointed an ad hoc committee of citizens to address the many issues related to the jail. The purpose of the ad hoc committee would be researching and analyzing jail issues and liability concerns in order to identify and consider potential corrective alternatives. The ad hoc committee's work will include an estimate of cost of the identified alternatives. The ad hoc committee will provide a written summary report with recommendations to the F&P committee, with alternatives to include, but not limited to building a new jail, remodeling and adding on to the current jail, remodeling the existing jail, closing the existing jail and utilizing it only as a holding facility, and contracting out 911 and emergency dispatching.

Appointees to this committee were Rod Rommel, Jay Richardson and Mike Hunter. All members have a strong business background in the private sector (banking, farming, and investments), and two of the members have served on elected boards in Pierce County. The members brought a mixed background of business and government as they approached this issue. F&P also hired a jail consultant, Marvin Wilson, to assist the both committees (F&P and Ad Hoc) in their work. Mr. Wilson worked for the Polk County, Iowa, Sheriff's Department for over 34 years, 17 of which as the chief jailer. Mr. Wilson's resume is attached as Appendix A.

II. Activities and efforts of Ad Hoc Committee members in response to their charge

Prior to the first Ad Hoc Committee meeting, the members reviewed several documents and studies to understand the background issues connected with the jail. These documents included several jail studies completed over the past 15 years including space and needs assessments including a Facility Needs Review, Update and Comprehensive Analysis by DLR Group dated 6/7/2012, a Final Draft Pre-architectural Program for a Justice Center by Voorhis Associates dated 5/15/1998, and a Criminal Justice Gap Analysis by Moffett and Associates dated 5/6/2012. Other documents the committee reviewed were jail inspection reports over the past 4 years from the Wisconsin Department of Corrections, data and demographics on jail operations over the past 3 years provided by jail staff, and budget information for a total of approximately 500 pages of background material. A more complete list of documents and materials are set forth in Appendix K.

At the first meeting Ad Hoc Committee members agreed they needed to learn as much as they could about the current situation regarding the Pierce County jail and about county corrections in general. The committee began by identifying stakeholders connected with the jail and jail services. They invited individuals connected to various stakeholder groups to attend a committee meeting to provide input and share their thoughts, concerns, perspective and expertise on corrections in general and specific issues surrounding the Pierce County jail.

Individuals representing stakeholder groups appearing at committee meetings included:

- Judge Joseph Boles, Pierce County Judicial System
- Consultant Marvin Wilson
- John Dirkse, Aegis/Wisconsin Mutual Insurance Company
- Sean Froelich, District Attorney
- Bradley Lawrence, Corporation Counsel
- Mike Bondarenko, Prescott Police Chief
- Greg Place, Ellsworth Police Chief
- Roger Leque, River Falls Police Chief
- Neil Gulbranson, Pierce County Chief Deputy, retired
- Jason Matthys, Pierce County Chief Deputy
- Lt. Mike Knoll, Pierce County Jail Administrator
- Bradley Hompe, Jail Inspector, Wisconsin Department of Corrections
- Nancy Hove, Pierce County Sheriff
- Julie Krings, Pierce County Department of Human Services
- Denise Hackel, National Alliance on Mental Illness
- Tom Kellogg, National Alliance on Mental Illness
- Cheri Schindler, Probation and Parole Supervisor, Wisconsin Department of Corrections
- Mark Lemke, Probation and Parole agent, Wisconsin Department of Corrections
- Mary Zimmerman, Ellsworth School District
- Jason Haugley, Chaplain, volunteer tutor

In addition to meeting with stakeholders as a committee, some members met one-on-one meetings with the following individual stakeholder group representatives:

- Lt. Mike Knoll
- Mike Bondarenko
- Neil Gulbranson
- Judge Joseph Boles
- Jeff Holst, Pierce County Board Chair
- Jim Ross, Pierce County Law Enforcement Committee Chair
- Ken Snow, Pierce County Law Enforcement Committee member
- Brad Lawrence
- Marvin Wilson
- Jason Matthys

In addition to the visits with stakeholders, individual committee members toured several jail facilities and had discussions with staff at the following facilities:

Pierce County jail  
Dunn County jail  
Pepin County jail  
Steele County jail, Owatonna, MN  
Olmsted County jail, Rochester, MN

The Ad Hoc Committee met a total of 11 times on these dates– January 24, February 4, February 21, March 7, March 21, April 1, April 4, April 18, May 16, June 6, and June 27. All members were in attendance at every meeting. Minutes from all the meetings are attached as Appendix B.

Stakeholder input summary chart and narrative

Once all the input was received from the stakeholders, the committee summarized the information in the following table. The table reflects the committee’s organization of the information by stakeholder groups and should not be considered all inclusive.

<b>Law Enforcement</b>	<b>Judge/District Attorney/Police Chiefs/ Human Services</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Need office space*</li> <li>▪ Meeting room space*</li> <li>▪ Separation of victim/offender*</li> <li>▪ Flow of booking for large events, i.e. Fair, Polka Festival, etc.</li> <li>▪ Need improved vehicle entry</li> <li>▪ Decontamination area: negative pressure (Mike Knoll)*</li> <li>▪ Need more staff – a 2<sup>nd</sup> shift; 3 to 5 people*</li> <li>▪ 3 people in communications – could be civilians*</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Concerned about safety &amp; security*</li> <li>▪ Security officer</li> <li>▪ Victim/offender separation*</li> <li>▪ OK to farm out some prisoners*</li> <li>▪ Don’t overbuild*</li> <li>▪ Size of jail does not dictate sentencing</li> <li>▪ Don’t need juvenile facilities*</li> <li>▪ Wants programs &amp; space for meetings*</li> <li>▪ Prisoners get quality programming in Dunn</li> <li>▪ Community/family support essential for rehabilitation (financial hardship)</li> <li>▪ Criminal Justice Council</li> <li>▪ Concern about 911 privatization (Police Chiefs)</li> </ul>
<b>Consultant Marvin Wilson</b>	<b>Jail Inspector</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Huge liability issues*</li> <li>▪ DLR/KKE Group uses Twin Cities cost</li> <li>▪ Split communication from jail duties – use civilian workers*</li> <li>▪ Programs work best if prisoners incarcerated for at least 90 days</li> <li>▪ Opportunity to upgrade criminal incarceration</li> <li>▪ Time to think outside box*</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Looking out for us / understands reality*</li> <li>▪ Tied for worst – 17<sup>th</sup> place</li> <li>▪ Has power to shut down but would be a political firestorm</li> <li>▪ Willing to work w/committee*</li> <li>▪ Damage of converting jail to holding facility</li> <li>▪ Jail code getting tougher</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Look at needs not wants*</li> <li>▪ Value architecture*</li> <li>▪ Use good construction plans to reduce labor costs*</li> </ul>	
<b>Corporation Counsel</b>	<b>Wisconsin County Mutual (Insurance)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Zero Liability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Every county has same premium; rate x operating budget</li> <li>▪ Wisconsin Mutual does not increase premium based on risk but reduces coverage down from \$10,000,000</li> <li>▪ Wisconsin Mutual will not drop county insurance but will reduce coverage</li> <li>▪ Monroe County example</li> </ul>

\*denotes items of higher significance

### Law Enforcement

Representatives from the law enforcement community expressed concerns about the lack of space in the current facility. This included individuals from the sheriff's department and police chiefs from municipal agencies in Pierce County. Office space for staff and meeting spaces for service providers (attorneys, human services staff, medical personnel, etc.) with inmates were mentioned by several individuals. The current space for booking was designed years ago and does not flow well, particularly when there are large events in the county when multiple arrests are possible (the Pierce County fair, River Falls Days, etc.). The impact of separating the jailer and dispatch positions was discussed extensively. Some individuals within this group expressed concern that the current model (joint dispatch/jailer positions) does not work well due to the need to divide one's attention between two very different functions. In addition, the current level of staffing is such that there are not enough hands to do both jobs well. Concern was expressed that this is one of the greatest liabilities the county has connected to the jail. While there was consensus that these positions should be separated and that dispatch staff should be civilian, there was acknowledgement that this will have a significant fiscal impact. Further analysis of this issue is found under the "Separate jail and dispatch" discussion on page 8. Concerns were also expressed about the need for more staff if the County Board opts to build a new, larger facility. Although the mission statement did not specifically charge the committee to consider the funding of any recommendations, the committee acknowledges there will be a fiscal impact to some degree no matter what the committee recommends. For example, any building project would have a fiscal impact both in capital and possibly operating budgets, and a recommendation to make no changes would have a fiscal impact given the liability and risk associated with such a recommendation. However, the committee acknowledges that the determination regarding fiscal matters is an issue for the elected officials to make.

### Judge/District Attorney/Police Chiefs/ Human Services

Representatives from the legal/human services community included the judge, district attorney, human services agency representatives, and police chiefs. This group expressed concerns about the safety and security of everyone involved with the jail and judicial system. This includes offenders, victims,

witnesses, courthouse staff, attorneys, and the public. To some degree at least one person in every group made some comment about the lack of security in the current facilities, but it was a top concern of individuals in the legal system. These concerns include the inability to keep a distance between victims and witnesses from offenders including the ability to keep offenders in a secured area until they enter a courtroom. Concerns were also expressed about the current facility and the numerous entrances and access points that would have to be monitored in order to keep everyone safe. The recent high profile case in St. Croix County illustrates these concerns. Media coverage indicated there were threats on the suspect's life because of the horrific nature of the crime as well as concerns he might harm himself. Had the location of the crime scene been 200 yards to the south, that horrific crime would have happened in Pierce County instead of St. Croix. Even with the newer facility in St Croix County, there were many concerns about the safety of the suspect and others. It is important to note that for two of the four courtrooms in the St Croix facility, the design of the building allows for keeping offenders in a secured area during transport. The only time there is any contact between the offender and someone other than jail staff is when he/she is in the courtroom. In Pierce County such an offender would have to go through public hallways in order to get to the courtroom and would pass multiple points where an individual wanting to harm that person had access into the building. While this was not so much of an issue when the current jail opened in 1968, it is of grave concern now, particularly in such high profile cases.

This stakeholder group had additional concerns about the lack of programming available to inmates in the Pierce County jail. Programming is provided in many jails to help offenders successfully transition back into society after they have served their sentence. Programs aimed at reducing recidivism (released inmates repeating behaviors that got them locked up in the first place and causing them to end up back in jail) are available at the Dunn and Pepin County jail, but not Pierce County. This group did not have concerns about continuing to house prisoners in other facilities, as is currently being done, but did mention that the distance to these other facilities may limit how supportive an inmate's family may be able to be. For example, an inmate trying to be a better parent may have fewer visits from their child if that child needs to be transported to another county to visit that inmate. Some individuals within this group also expressed concerns about the possibility of privatizing county 911 services, but expressed no concern with the prospect of a joint dispatch service with another county or governmental agency.

NOTE: The remaining categories consisted of input with one individual. These individuals brought a level of expertise on a specific issue or issues that were of concern to the committee.

#### Jail Inspector

The committee asked the jail inspector from the Wisconsin Department of Corrections to come to a committee meeting to discuss the past several years of jail inspection reports. These reports document several violations of current state requirements both on the administrative side as well as the Pierce County jail physical plant itself. The inspector affirmed with the committee that the current facility is very deficient and creates a significant liability risk for the county. When asked if the state would actually shut down the jail, he responded that while the state has that power, it is unlikely that would

happen due to the political nature of such a decision. The jail inspection reports clearly indicate there are many issues with the facility and operations that expose the county to considerable liability and risk. The inspector answered committee members' questions about turning the existing facility into a holding operation only. One requirement of a holding facility is the limited amount of time a person could be held in such a facility. The inspector shared with the committee his thoughts that a holding only facility would not be a good option for Pierce County and that it would be difficult to convert the current facility into a holding facility that would meet current codes.

#### Corporation Counsel

Corporation Counsel's input focused on the liability concerns and the fact that the numerous reports from the jail inspector detail these issues. He also expressed concern regarding the need for more security in the courthouse and the potential significant reduction in insurance coverage in the event of an incident resulting in a claim (see section with Wisconsin County Mutual immediately following). His primary concern is the county needs to address the issue sooner rather than later.

#### Wisconsin County Mutual

Because of the many comments made about liability concerns connected to the existing facility, the committee had specific questions they wanted the county's liability carrier to address. The committee wanted to understand how the insurance rates and coverage are affected by the current jail facility and operation. A representative from the county's insurance carrier shared information about how premiums are calculated on operating budget, not on loss history. He stated that insurance premium rates are not adjusted based on level of risk, however the insurance company may reduce the amount of coverage they will provide for certain claims depending on risk and the county's efforts to manage that risk. He gave an example of another Wisconsin county with a similar jail situation that, once an incident happened that resulted in a large claim, the county's coverage dropped from \$10 million to \$1 million per incident. Any future claims over \$1 million will have to be paid directly by the taxpayers in that county until efforts are made to manage current risk. Claims involving inmates harming themselves or others, sexual contact, and strip searches can result in multi-million dollar claims.

#### Jail Consultant Marvin Wilson

The committee met with jail consultant Marvin Wilson to get his perspective and input on the current situation in Pierce County. Mr. Wilson confirmed the significant liability issues with the current facility and operation and the advantages of splitting dispatch and jailer duties using civilian employees in dispatch. He encouraged the committee to discern between needs and wants as they move forward in the process to determine what recommendations they would forward to F&P. He also shared ideas about value architecture and if a new facility is built, design should incorporate the staffing level. He encouraged the committee to build what the community could afford and provided a reality check with the advice "you don't have enough money to solve every problem completely."

### III. Analysis - Committee's Core Principles

The input received from these various stakeholders took place at six meetings over a period of three months for a total of approximately 21.5 hours. Based on the input received from all the stakeholder groups both at committee meetings, the review of the numerous documents, and the site visits, the committee developed a set of core principles that guided their recommendations to F&P. These principles are briefly outlined in the following table. A summary narrative of the principles and related discussion by the committee follows the table.

We believe:	Supportive Considerations:
Pierce County should have a jail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Power of negotiation with other jails is at risk – not in control</li><li>▪ Pierce County citizens expect it</li><li>▪ Logistics of not having one are horrendous</li><li>▪ Integral part of what a County does</li><li>▪ Duty and responsibility of County government</li><li>▪ Reduction of liability</li><li>▪ Where are you going to place criminals?</li></ul>
Separate Jail & Dispatch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Civilian classification</li><li>▪ Job pool applicants</li><li>▪ Liability of communication</li><li>▪ All parties agree with separation</li></ul>
Liability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Losses could transfer from insurance to taxpayer rapidly</li><li>▪ We acknowledge that law enforcement is 37% of budget however it represents a far greater liability (approximately double or 80%)</li><li>▪ Experience of other counties suggest needed action</li></ul>
Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Can't put a price on it</li><li>▪ Need improved security</li><li>▪ Want to have a safe facility for jail and court system</li></ul>
Money	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ We are concerned about the economy and the impact on taxpayers</li><li>▪ Interested in solution that gets the greatest return for the money</li></ul>
Poor planning by other counties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Built too large</li><li>▪ Built classrooms with no services / programming</li><li>▪ Scale and functionality is important</li></ul>
Housing prisoners in other counties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Ok to do</li><li>▪ \$47/day plus \$17/day transport cost is reasonable – if it stays at that rate</li><li>▪ Saves on developing programs</li></ul>
What does a jail need	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Multi-purpose Rooms</li><li>▪ Medical space</li><li>▪ Proper kitchen</li><li>▪ Negative air flow cells</li><li>▪ Adequate objective classification space</li></ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Sustainability</li> <li>▪ Larger booking area for big events</li> <li>▪ Vehicle Room (Sally Port)</li> <li>▪ Decontamination room</li> <li>▪ Office space</li> <li>▪ Exercise area</li> <li>▪ Meet Wisconsin jail standards – Ch. DOC 350</li> </ul>
--	---

### Summary Narrative

Pierce County should have a jail – the committee does not believe a good option would be to house out all prisoners in other counties and use the existing facility as holding cells only. Transporting arrestees to other counties would be very difficult logistically (having enough drivers at the right times).

Detainees can only remain in a holding cell for a short period of time, so individuals would have to be transported even if they were only to remain in custody for a couple days. Over 76 percent of those arrested in Pierce County are released within six days. Most of the law enforcement resources in the county would be spent transporting prisoners, and there would also be increased liability and risks associated with more transporting of prisoners. In addition, while currently the cost of housing out of county is relatively low, the committee had concerns that once the county had no option but to house prisoners off site, the power of negotiating for these services would not be in Pierce County favor. Occasionally, when a particular prisoner becomes a disciplinary or other problem at the out-of-county facility where they are housed, Pierce County must remove that person from that jail. This would be very problematic if Pierce County were to have no facility of its own.

Separate jail and dispatch – the committee firmly believes the jailer and dispatch duties should be separated. These are very different jobs that require different skill sets. The dual roles make for poor candidate pools when recruiting and contribute to the high turn-over in the position. Keeping the positions joined is a significant liability as evidenced by the 2012 jail inspection report and cover letter dated May 17, 2012. The 2012 jail inspection report and letter are attached as Appendix C. On page two of the letter Inspector Hompe writes “Staff and supervision levels at the jail remain a concern. This is compounded by the fact that dispatch is located in the jail, requiring staff to perform dual duty. Often there is not enough staff assigned to the jail to complete the required tasks.” Failure to make the required inmate checks is cited on page three of the 2012 report stating “this is a direct result of the lack of staff and the combination of the jail control and dispatch.” The 2012 report rates the situation as Needs Improvement, but in the 2013 report the situation was down-graded to a Non-compliant finding. The 2013 report and letter are attached as Appendix D. The committee acknowledges there would be a significant fiscal impact associated with separating the dispatch and jailer positions because it would require additional staff to cover both functions adequately. According to the sheriff’s department, a minimum of 10 additional staff is required if the jailer and dispatch positions are separated (see Appendix E, #3). However, separating the positions would allow for civilian workers in dispatch and eliminate the costs associated with protective classification for dispatch workers. The committee understands current discussions are ongoing to explore the potential of a joint dispatch service with St.

Croix County, which could potentially address this critical issue in a more cost effective manner. The separation of these duties should also correspond with a significant risk reduction.

Liability – the committee agrees with the liability concerns expressed by various stakeholders. The committee’s concern on this point is twofold. First, the county has a great responsibility to protect and keep safe people in their custody. When the county fails to do this, it could create a situation that becomes a financial liability. Second, the committee does not want any failure to adequately protect prisoners to transfer from insurance to the taxpayers. The only way to assure both the safety of individuals and minimize the financial impact is for the county to take action to remedy the existing, known problems. The committee would rather the county address the liabilities proactively than deal with the aftermath when problems occur.

Safety – the committee wants a safe facility for the court system, the jail, the public and everyone that interacts with the systems and facilities. Security needs to be improved. Any solution recommended by the committee must adequately address the safety and security concerns.

Money – the committee is concerned about the economy and the financial impact of their recommendations to F&P. Although financial impact was not a part of the mission statement given to the committee by F&P, the committee acknowledges the cost of any recommendation is a constraint in terms of the feasibility of any solution. The committee wants their recommendation to reflect the biggest bang for the taxpayer’s buck in that it addresses the great number of needs and concerns for the least amount of money, and the long term sustainability of the recommendations is considered.

Poor planning by other counties – the committee does not want to make the same mistake as some other counties by overbuilding for the present. The committee wants to address current needs and have the ability to appropriately expand the facility in the future. This will require a site large enough for the jail to expand in the future. An incremental solution of building to solve immediate issues now and add on at some point in the future is a reasonable strategy. The scale of the first phase of a new jail project should be carefully considered.

Housing prisoners in other counties – the committee feels this is acceptable as a part of the solution. The current price, if accurate, for housing inmates is reasonable, but the committee recognizes that could change at some point. Housing longer term inmates in other counties could delay the need for program development at the Pierce County jail.

What a jail needs – if a new facility is built it must measure up to current jail standards and include enough space for all required functions. This would include multi-purpose rooms, sally port, office space, medical space, kitchen, classification space and an adequate booking area. If a jail is built with a future expansion option, the common spaces must be adequate or appropriately planned for in the first building phase.

#### IV. Criteria for analysis of options

With the input from stakeholders resulting in the committee's core principles being identified, the committee could now develop the criteria for analysis of options. The core principles are summarized as the following criteria and are not in any priority order.

- Space needs – the facility must have enough space for employees to work efficiently and effectively and enough space for inmate needs (programs, meetings with service providers, etc.).
- Security/safety concerns – victims, offenders, staff and the public must be in safe environments. Keeping offenders in a secured area between the courtroom and the jail is critical. Limited access of the public to court staff is highly preferred.
- Limit liability and risk exposure – address as many issues in the jail inspection report and as identified elsewhere as practical. Building a facility consistent with American Correctional Association (see Appendix F) standards will address many of the concerns in the inspection reports.
- Costs – both construction and ongoing operating costs need to be considered. New staff requirements must be considered in any option that is recommended.
- Sustainability – spending money on a solution that will address the problem for 10 to 20 years is not as sustainable as a solution that can expand as needs change in the future. Preferred recommendations will address current and future needs or be able to adjust to future needs. If a new facility is built that does not address needs for at least the next 40 to 50 years, it should include plans for expanding the facility at some point in the future. This should be reflected in the building design and available land adjacent to any new facility.

#### V. Identification and analysis of options

After identifying the criteria against which the committee's identified recommendations should be measured, the committee was ready to begin identifying options to resolve the jail issues as requested by F&P in the committee's mission statement and analyzing how those options stacked up against the core principles.

The committee spent time identifying options in an informal brainstorming process. The basis of the analysis was the criteria developed from the core principles. The criteria can also be used to assess the options that F&P asked the committee to consider in the mission statement.

Based on the committee's comprehensive analysis, three possible recommendations were identified for F&P to consider:

**Option 1** – Build a justice center which would house a jail, sheriff department, and all judicial system spaces including courtrooms, district attorney's office, clerk of court, etc. A proposal to build a justice center was before the County Board at the September 12, 2000, meeting, but the action failed to garner the three fourths majority required to pass. As with any new construction, the building can be designed to address the current deficiencies and built to current jail standards, thereby significantly reducing the liability and risk associated with the existing facility. Jail staff could escort inmates to court proceedings without any contact with the public until entering a courtroom, which is optimum for security. This

option would easily meet four of the five decision criteria – space, security, liability and risk, and sustainability. However, the cost associated with this option is steep. Based on the June 2012 needs analysis and pro forma done by the DLR Group (attached as Appendix G), a Justice Center with a 110 bed jail and two courtrooms with 106,500 square feet would cost about \$35 million in construction costs. The construction of this project could be phased to make it more affordable, but at a minimum the jail and sheriff department should both be included in the first phase. Depending on how long it would take to get phase two (the courtrooms and other justice related spaces) going, it could be a long time before the security issue surrounding getting inmate/offenders to court in a secure environment would be addressed. Depending on the design of the facility, there may be additional staff required, which would result in increased operating expenses.

**Option 2** – Remodel the existing jail and add on with the additional building footprint within the sidewalks by the current county annex building. The January 21, 2013, report from DLR (attached as Appendix H) addressed a version of this option by remodeling the existing jail with some expansion of the building footprint. The remodel increased the total number of cells from 29 to 38 by adding a total of 22 beds in Huber dorms, but it decreased the number of medium and maximum security cells from 29 to 16. The decrease in medium and maximum security beds will make classification of inmates difficult and will likely increase transportation costs to other county facilities since there would be less space to house inmates in Pierce County. The plan proposes an addition at the south east corner of the jail for a new communication/dispatch area and includes an elevator for transporting inmates to the third floor of the courthouse for court. This plan displaces the Probate office and does not address where that office would relocate and at what cost. According to the jail inspector, who was at the meeting when this plan was presented, the layout was problematic. It is questionable if the Department of Corrections would accept this plan because it may not meet the requirements to be classified as a jail. Instead it might qualify as a holding facility, but the inspector was not sure without further analysis. In addition to the cost to remodel the existing facility and construct an addition to the building, the communications tower at the northwest corner of the building would potentially have to be moved. According to the DLR report, the estimated cost for this version of the option is \$9.2 million and does not address moving the communications tower. This plan improves the safety and security concerns in that inmates will not have to go through unsecured areas of the courthouse in order to get to court. However, the loss of medium and maximum security cells makes classification more problematic, which is a liability concern. The biggest concern about this option is it does nothing to address the liability and risk concerns, and it has a low level of sustainability in that there would be no way to add onto today's investment at some point in the future. It does not change the current lineal style of cells, which increases risk. This option would need to more fully address courthouse security issues and get added costs in order to be considered. One such security issue is the multiple access points into the courthouse since the courtrooms would remain in the current location.

**Option 3** – Build a stand-alone jail and sheriff's department facility on county owned property and remodel the existing jail space into a justice center. This option proposes a new jail and sheriff department building on county owned land. It also proposes to remodel the existing annex into a justice center with courtrooms and court offices in that building. As with option one, new construction can be

designed to adequately address the current deficiencies to meet the space, security/safety and liability/risk criteria. Because the courtrooms would not be in the same building as the jail, transport of prisoners would still be needed. However, transport could go from a secure sally port in one building to a secure sally port in another building and both the jail and the justice center could be designed so prisoners are in a totally secure area other than when they are in a courtroom. In order to meet the sustainability criterion, the new building must be designed that enables expansion in the future should additional jail space be needed and secures land adjacent to the new facility and reserved for that purpose. A needs assessment and pro forma on this option has not been addressed, but an initial calculation of needed space and construction costs was done by the committee. Appendix I details the methodology used to calculate that 27,000 square feet are needed for a 50 bed jail at a cost of approximately \$6.8 million. This includes construction costs only. In follow up to this estimate, the committee asked Cedar Corporation of Menomonie, WI to provide a rough estimate of a 27,000 square foot building housing a 50 bed jail and space for the sheriff's department. Cedar Corporation's estimate for construction of the new facility is \$7.85 million and is attached as Appendix J. An estimate of \$2.1 million was done on the remodel of the existing facility by DLR in 2012 as a part of another project (see page 21 of Appendix G), providing at least a ballpark amount for this portion of the project. A rough estimate for the complete project including a stand-alone jail and sheriff's department along with remodel of the existing jail into a justice center is approximately \$10-\$12 million.

Options were measured against each criterion identified above and summarized in the following matrix:

Criterion	Option 1 Justice Center	Option 2 Remodel existing with strategic add on	Option 3 New jail and sheriff department, remodel existing into justice center
Space	Meets	Does not meet	Meets
Security/safety	Meets	Partially meets	Meets
Liability/risk	Meets	Partially meets	Meets
Cost	Does not meet	Meets	Meets
Sustainability	Meets	Does not meet	Meets

## VI. Recommendations and Conclusion

Option 1 meets four of the criteria. It will provide for adequate space, can be designed to address the safety/security issues and liability/risk issues identified by stakeholders and documented in inspection reports. It is sustainable because it would address the needs for the next 40 or more years. However, this option comes with a price tag of \$35 million. Under the pro forma submitted by DLR in June 2012, this plan would require 13 additional staff in the new jail facility and 13 additional staff in dispatch (the pro forma calls for separating jail and dispatch positions), increasing the annual operating budget more than \$850,000 for these new positions. While it is not within the committee's charge to address the financial piece, the committee did consider stakeholder feedback and current economic conditions and feels a responsibility to make a recommendation that is not overly burdensome to Pierce County

taxpayers. For that reason, this option does not meet the cost criteria. The committee does not recommend this option.

Option 2 meets the cost criterion, partially meets the security/safety and liability/risk criteria, and does not meet the space and sustainability criteria. By providing a secured route from the jail to the court, this option addresses some of the security/safety and associated liability/risk issues. Unfortunately the loss of medium and maximum security cells under this option makes classification more challenging, thus increasing liability/risk in that area. This biggest concern with this option is the failure to meet the sustainability criterion. Although the overall cost of this option falls within a reasonable range of acceptability for the committee, it leaves many of the concerns on the table and provides no answers for the future. There would be no option to expand the current site any further in the future. And the changes would not adequately address the problems the jail has today. Because of the decrease in the number of medium and maximum security cells, this option would likely carry additional transportation costs in the operating budget, although the committee did not attempt to determine what that amount might be. The committee does not recommend this option.

Option 3 meets all the criteria of the committee. The projected 27,000 square footage appears to be adequate for a 50 bed jail and sheriff's department operation, thereby meeting the space criterion. The new construction can be designed to address the safety/security and the liability/risk concerns that were raised during the committee's meetings with stakeholders and on jail inspection reports. It is critical that this new building be located on a site that would allow for expansion in the future thereby meeting the sustainability criterion. A 50 bed jail is smaller than the 110 bed jail recommended in the DLR needs assessment, so it is possible, maybe even likely, that additional housing space may be added at some point. It is very important to address the planning for any future expansion both in terms of available land and plan design. The only concern with this option is security while transporting inmates to court. While it is preferable to have the transport all take place within the same building, this option would require a brief transport in a vehicle. Remodeling the current jail into a justice center can provide for a secure environment (no contact with the public) from the sally port to the courtroom. The same is true for moving an inmate from their jail cell into a vehicle at the jail facility. The brief transport in the vehicle is the only downside of this option and for the difference in cost between Option 1 and Option 3, the committee believes it is a reasonable tradeoff. This option meets the cost criterion based on the rough numbers from the committee's calculations and the Cedar Corporation's estimate. The rough \$10 million estimate does not address any site preparation or land acquisition costs. The committee recommends the County pursue this option and hire an engineer/architect firm to do a needs assessment and pro forma within the parameters of this option in order to have a solid estimate of cost for this option. The committee also recommends that if this option is pursued, the design of the new facility be such that, as much as practical, it can be operated with the current level of staffing, notwithstanding the separation of the jail and dispatch positions.

After spending many hours over the past six months studying the Pierce County jail and related concerns, the AD Hoc Committee strongly encourages the Finance and Personnel Committee, other related committees, and the County Board to invest in a solution to these issues. A jail is an important investment in the community and reflects the values of its citizens and the community. Jails are a costly

function for any county, but there is a bigger cost for running an inadequate facility. The committee believes not only is there a significant liability on all county taxpayers if the current situation is allowed to continue, but also that Pierce County will be better off once this investment is made. The committee recommends pursuing option 3 as outlined above and further recommends the county take action to get more detailed information on costs and possible design options.

This report concludes the work of the Ad Hoc Committee.