1200 King County Courthouse
516 Third Avenue
Seattle, WA 98104

KING COUNTY

Signature Report

August 21, 2018

Motion 15203

Proposed No. 2018-0276.2 **Sponsors** Gossett

A MOTION accepting a report describing the feasibility of establishing contact visits for incarcerated parents and their children in compliance with Ordinance 18408, Section 55, as amended by Ordinance 18602, Section 29, Proviso P9.

WHEREAS, a 2017-2018 Supplemental Budget Ordinance, Ordinance 18602, Section 29, Proviso P9, which amended the 2017-2018 Biennial Budget Ordinance, Ordinance 18409, Section 55, requires the executive to transmit a report describing the feasibility of establishing contact visits for incarcerated parents and their children, and a motion accepting the report, and

WHEREAS, Ordinance 18602, Section 29, Proviso P9, provides that $100,000 shall not be expended or encumbered until the report required by the proviso is accepted, and the motion accompanying this reports is passed, and

WHEREAS, the council has reviewed the report submitted by the executive;

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

The report describing the feasibility of establishing contact visits for incarcerated

parents and their children, which is Attachment A to this motion, is hereby accepted in accordance with Ordinance 18602, Section 29, Proviso P9.

Motion 15203 was introduced on 6/18/2018 and passed as amended by the Metropolitan King County Council on 8/20/2018, by the following vote:

Yes: 9 - Mr. von Reichbauer, Mr. Gossett, Ms. Lambert, Mr. Dunn, Mr. McDermott, Mr. Dembowski, Mr. Upthegrove, Ms. Kohl-Welles and Ms. Balducci
No: 0
Excused: 0

METROPOLITAN KING COUNTY COUNCIL
King County
Washington

KING COUNTY COUNCIL
KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON

J. Joseph McDermott, Chair

ATTEST:

Angel Allende for
Melani Pedroza, Clerk of the Council

Attachments: A. Feasibility of Establishing Contact Visits for Incarcerated Parents and Their Children, dated 8/20/2018

15203

Attachment A

DAJD-Motion and Report on the Feasibility of Establishing Contact Visits for Incarcerated Parents and Their Children in Compliance with Ordinance 18409, Section 55, as amended by Ordinance 18602, Section 29, Proviso P9.
Revised 8/20/2018

King County Department of Adult and Juvenile Detention
King County Courthouse (M/S: KCF-AD-0600)
516 3rd Ave., Seattle, Washington 98104

Introduction

This report is submitted in response to Ordinance 18409, Section 55, as amended by Ordinance 18602, Section 29, Proviso P9. The proviso reads as follows:

P9 PROVIDED THAT:

Of this appropriation, $100,000 shall not be expended or encumbered until the executive transmits a report on the feasibility of establishing contact visits for incarcerated parents and their children and a motion that should accept the report and should reference the subject matter, the proviso's ordinance, ordinance section and proviso number in both the title and body of the motion and a motion accepting the report is passed by the council.

The report shall include, but not be limited to:

A. *An analysis of what would constitute a preferred design for family contact visits, including design needs for families and to ensure facility security at each of the department's detention facilities;*
B. *A review of the potential locations within the department's two secure detention facilities that would meet the design needs and could be used for family contact visitation;*
C. *A review of the needed facility modifications that would be necessary to implement family contact visits at both of its secure detention facilities;*
D. *An analysis of the operating and capital costs associated with identified options, including implementation timelines for each option; and*
E. *An analysis of potential funding strategies for the identified options.*

The executive must file the report and a motion required by this proviso by June 1, 2018, in the form of a paper original and an electronic copy to all councilmembers, the council chief of staff and the lead staff for the law and justice committee or its successor.

Overview

On May 8, 2013, Governor Jay Inslee signed SHB 1284, or the Children of Incarcerated Parents bill, into law. The law guides the courts' discretion to delay the termination of parental rights if the parent's incarceration or prior incarceration is a significant factor for the child's continued stay in the foster care system. That same law doesn't absolve incarcerated parents from doing their utmost to participate in their children's lives; they must show that they are maintaining a significant role in their children's lives and that delaying termination of rights is in the best interests of the child. The law does provide visitation language as long as visitation is in the best interest of the child but it doesn't require contact visits specifically.

Over the last decade, there have been multiple studies detailing the impact that the incarceration of parents has on their children. A May 2017, National Institute of Justice (NIJ) article commented:

> "Children whose parents are involved in the criminal justice system in particular, face a host of challenges and difficulties: psychological strain, antisocial behavior, suspension or expulsion from school, economic hardship, and criminal activity. It is difficult to predict how a child will fare when a parent is intermittently or continually incarcerated, and research findings on these children's risk factors are mixed.
>
> However, research suggests that the strength or weakness of the parent-child bond and the quality of the child and family's social support system play significant roles in the child's ability to overcome challenges and succeed in life."

And, while visiting parents who are incarcerated may benefit children, it can also be a difficult environment for children and presents a variety of safety and security challenges for corrections professionals.

DAJD currently has two options for visitation between inmates and their families. The first is Video Visitation. Under this system, the public can log into a website, enter their information, and schedule a video visit (similar to Skype) with the inmate. After the family member is screened (basic background check), the visit is scheduled and placed into a future queue for the inmates in designated video visitation booths within the facilities. Officers check their visitation lists and notify inmates to be ready prior to the visits taking place. The public can then access the system via a website on a computer or smart device or go to one of the King County Jails and use a kiosk to conduct the video visit.

Alternately, each inmate can schedule three one-hour visits a week at the facility where they are housed. There is an online scheduling system for in-person visits at either facility. Again, the same basic process is completed with the screening of the public member before their visit occurs, and after the screening approval, the visit is scheduled. Depending on the jail location, dates of the visit are sent to the inmate's housing location and unit officers look up visitation lists daily, and inmates are transported to visiting locations prior to their visit. In the alternative, in-person visits can also be on a pre-set schedule and inmates are notified or moved before the visitor arrives.

Maleng Regional Justice Center

The Maleng Regional Justice Center (MRJC) in Kent is a direct supervision facility, opened in 1997 and designed as a podular configuration with 12 units designed to have 64 inmates supervised by a single corrections officer, ranging in custody level from minimum to close. Each unit is designed with its own multi-purpose room, visiting and attorney booths, dayroom, recreation yard, email/commissary kiosk, video visitation access, television, and telephone access. The units are self-contained with staff working inside the unit among the inmate population. There is no public access to these housing units, except for the visiting booths.

Officers who work in these direct supervision units, have an officer's station and interact with inmates throughout the unit where they can observe and communicate as they perform their daily tasks conducting security checks and performing routine inspections.

While there is a public entrance to the jail, it is generally used to manage the in-person visits that occur in booths for each of the units. There are some public spaces where family members can add money to an inmate's commissary account, use kiosks to participate in video visitation calls, and interact with staff who can facilitate exchange of inmate property. All of these spaces are outside of the secure detention perimeter and currently have limited security staff assigned.

Programming for inmates is offered at both facilities and occurs either within housing units or in multipurpose rooms, all inside the secure detention areas of the facilities. Program participation can often depend on the security level or classification of the inmates. High-risk offenders, for example, might not be appropriate participants in large minimum security-focused programming.

Research has identified eight criminogenic needs that largely focus on self-improvement. One outlier focuses on family dysfunction. This dysfunction is often alleviated through proper parenting and positive family engagement. Parenting experts refer to communication skills, positive behavior modeling, and stress management as essential components to the realization of good parenting.

In response, DAJD has focused its efforts on increasing programming targeting individual needs and skill development that will help achieve stability. Additionally, DAJD has some history of partnering with local courts to provide programming related to current court engagements. For example, in 2017, DAJD partnered with King County Superior Court to provide Dependency 101 classes for parents involved in dependency litigation. Dependency 101 provided information and support for parents attempting to remain legal caregivers of their children. As of January 2018, this class was discontinued due to Superior Court funding limitations. Although DAJD does not currently provide focused parenting classes, parenting; reflection on family impact, family engagement while in custody, and family engagement post release are topics that are covered in all self-improvement programming.

King County Corrections Facility

The King County Correctional Facility (KCCF) in downtown Seattle is an 11-story facility opened in 1986, well before the MRJC, and represents an older corrections model than the MRJC. Each of the wings or units are generally smaller in design and function, having the ability to house a number of inmates in six separate units or "tanks", divided into upper and lower levels, each having

similar stacked tanks. The wings in KCCF can hold a range of between 48 to 160 inmates. Each tank holds a specific number of inmates that are housed in either one or two-person cells, or open dormitory-style settings. Each wing is controlled by an officer who is intermittently seated at the center of the wing on an elevated platform at the approximate midpoint of the two levels where they supervise the inmates they have been assigned to manage. The floors in the facilities are generally grouped and housed by like classification levels, with some floors focused on specialized housing like those for psychiatric or medical housing.

The only public access to these residential floors is through dedicated secure visiting booths that require officers to move inmates to them, rather than being part of a living unit like at the MRJC.

Neither the MRJC nor the KCCF is currently built to facilitate securely confined inmates access to contact visits with the public. While there are locations that might be used, remodeling a secure confinement facility is typically expensive and any space change would take away from current uses. Finally, neither facility currently has a staffing model, security screening, cameras, funding, or other requirements needed to manage contact visits in this way.

Programs and Models

As part of DAJD's work to determine what might be needed from both a space and programmatic standpoint, staff has been in contact with a variety of other correctional organizations who do this kind of work. Visits were made to both prisons and jail settings to see first-hand how they were operationalized. Prisons are generally built, staffed, and programmed for much longer stays than local jails. In contrast, jails are generally smaller and have less flexible spaces that focus on much quicker transitions of inmate stays.

A. Washington State Department of Corrections

Over the past two years, the Washington State Department of Corrections (DOC) has put into place a program that centers on educating incarcerated parents; focusing on them, their families, and specifically their children through a program called Parenting Inside Out (PIO). The program and contact visitations have been instituted in 11 of 12 DOC facilities. This program has been developed with the assistance of Pathfinders of Oregon, a nonprofit organization that has been in place since 1993. Pathfinders of Oregon has served the local Portland, Oregon area as a community resource, specific to justice-involved individuals and focused on the impacts of incarceration on children.

PIO has developed a subset of community outreach programs to serve, and have provided outreach and instruction to over 30,000 inmates as well as services to over 400 families annually. PIO is an accredited, evidence-based cognitive-behavioral program focusing on high-risk individuals, families, and children.

DOC also provides programming specific to men using Dynamic Dads as its model. Dynamic Dads is a parenting program for fathers based on the Nurturing Dads curriculum, an evidence-based class for fathers. Dynamic Dads is a shorter program base and provides critical instruction for fathers to gain cognitive behavior skills. There are a variety of modules in this program that focus on skills like: self-nurturing skills; fathering without fear or violence; self-care and stress management; the value of play; creating and sustaining

healthy environments and child development and realistic expectations. Unlike PIO, Dynamic Dads offers a flexibility that seems more conducive to a short-term environment like jails, versus longer-term programming in a prison setting, since the modules can be broken into shorter sessions.

Staff also visited DOC's Cedar Creek Corrections Center in Littlerock, WA as part of our analysis. This facility is a minimum custody facility with a capacity of 450 inmates. We went to Cedar Creek to see how the facility manages its intake process for visitors and observe both a contact visitation event and a science fair for the kids who were coming to see their incarcerated fathers. The fair was not restricted to just children of the incarcerated fathers. There were spouses, brothers, sisters, mothers, fathers, and even some grandparents that had come to see their loved ones.

The screening process is similar to how DAJD handles visits to our visiting booths – rules are described, restrictions for what can be brought in to the facility are shared, families go through security screening, visitor badges are provided, etc. Once families are cleared through the background process, they are bussed into the secured perimeter where the fair occurs. There is limited physical contact between spouses and significant others, but children related to the incarcerated inmate may sit on their parent's lap for as long as is wanted and for as long as the child is comfortable doing so. Strict monitoring of this is done and if there is any indication that a child is in distress in any way, staff will intervene and remove a child from an inmate and warn them of inappropriate contact. Security staff cameras and other safety and security equipment and protocols were in place and volunteers and inmate workers helped to staff the events, generally for the benefit and education of the visiting children. The event would be very difficult to emulate in a jail, but seemed to work well within the larger confines of that prison setting.

B. San Francisco Jails

DAJD also travelled to San Francisco to see how three of their county jail facilities managed their child/parent contact visitation programs. We were interested in the safety and security measures used and the success of the program from the viewpoint of jail's administration, the program vendor, and the inmates and families involved in the program.

The jails were using Parenting Inside/Out as their program curriculum. And, while it is an evidence-based program, it does require a substantial number of weeks to complete (20 weeks) in settings that only occur once per week. While King County's jail stays average relatively short stays, California jails have absorbed prison populations under a statewide public safety realignment. Accordingly, jails in the near term may house former prison inmates awaiting trial for many years and therefore have a population much more like a prison population that can be programmed for months at a time. The jails also worked closely with a strong community partner/vendor called Community Works West (One Family).

One Family provides the program training to the inmate population, but also provides support to the caregiver who is on the outside. They are a resource for the family of the incarcerated parent and can, and do, provide several therapeutic services to them. The

Community Works West model is now being used by the Urban Institute and replicated in multiple states.

One of the most impressive aspects of the program was the connection the One Family Team had established with the children and the parents. Their interaction with the children throughout the visit reduced risks of trauma for the children that one might be concerned about with visitation in a jail setting. In all three of our visits, the children were happy, engaged, and well cared for. The age range of the children involved in visits was between 4 months and approximately 11 years old.

In our discussions with uniformed staff involved, the goal was to consider all possible needs of the visiting children, (i.e. diapers, snacks, formula, wipes, stroller, infant carrier, toys, games, etc.). The visitation room was set up with corrections grade furniture, cleaning friendly surfaces (including floors), and kid friendly surroundings that included painted murals. Emphasis was placed on safety and security of the children, inmates, and staff. This started with the intake of the children to the room's security measures, panic buttons, security cameras, remote monitoring, and inmate screening protocols. It also meant searching the children as well. They did this in partnership with the parent-child Coordinator from One Family, who is not a uniformed staff member.

The interactions that we observed between the inmates and their children were genuine. There was no denying that every father that was there was fully engaged with their son or daughter, most had a difficult time leaving when the visits were over.

Analysis

While there are certainly some good models available to follow, there are a variety of operational considerations that need addressing. Safety and security issues alone would be a monumental effort, but again, models are available. Implementing a safe and effective screening process along with political and financial support and a strong program provider round out key elements for planning effective programming in this area.

While long-term educational programs are consistent with the needs of a prison environment, it is much more difficult when we look at a jail setting. Prisons are static and focused on long-term prison stays with accompanying programing for that specific population in mind. Classrooms, library, workshops, and skill-based trades, are all programing aspects of prison life that are "built into" the design features of each facility. These are meant to support the long-term stay. Prison programs keep inmates occupied and productive while incarcerated over long periods of time. Unlike most of the jail population, the prison population has been adjudicated, has a sense of finality, and understands where and what the current situation their family, finances, and future holds, and can plan for that future. This impacts the psychology of the inmate population.

Jails are more dynamic in that the populations vary and are coming and going much quicker than prison inmates. Jail inmates generally cycle through in days, not years. While jails do have longer-stay inmates, most are out within a month. Short stays are generally not conducive to longer, multi-part programs and can therefore be challenging to plan and program. Jail design is also not conducive to programming and potential contact visits. Both the MRJC and KCCF were not

designed to accommodate contact visitation with children and parents. Even finding suitable programming space within the facilities for parenting or other related classes is at a premium and difficult to manage.

While contact visits, and ultimately maintaining healthy parent/child relationships and bonds is a laudable goal, King County's jails were built to ensure safety and security of inmates, staff, and volunteers within the secure perimeter. Introducing contact visits necessarily exposes the County to increased instances of contraband coming into the facility and would likely require difficult screening protocols and protections be built for this new population, children. Careful consideration would need to be given for how to manage children as they enter facilities.

For this process to move in a safe and secure direction, all aspects of security must be considered. When we look at the current state of our in-person visitation (window visits) and review some of the basic security issues that we find problematic, one issue that stands out among all is the searching and screening of children coming into our secured facility. Every day, DAJD manages hundreds of people who come into the two jails for either person-to-person or face-to-face visitations. Most are public visitation and some professional (i.e. attorney, law enforcement, clergy, etc.). DAJD is set to manage these kinds of visitations, in that both facilities have two armed corrections officers who are on guard at the entry point of KCCF in Seattle and at the main visiting area at the MRJC. The officer's first duty at both facilities is to observe and maintain order of the entry points of both facilities, aid the general public, and screen any and all individuals who enter into the facilities visually, through communicating with them and then through the use of provided screening tools for potential contraband.

The current systems in use are "see/detect" systems. A walk-through metal detector and hand wand system are used to detect any potential "metal" items of a small nature on individuals who wish to enter the public visitation area. This avoids any physical contact of individuals. KCCF has the added measure of an x-ray machine used at point of entry. This is due to design and the different areas that the public have need to access for things like court and visitation processing, which are not considered secured detention areas. Those same tools, however, are not meant to detect "soft" contraband that would be needed for contract visiting. They don't screen for things like illicit drugs, tobacco, money, letters or messages, etc.

As part of this analysis, DAJD considered each of the adult jails to determine whether there were locations in them that might accommodate such programming and visits. No funding was provided as part of the budget or proviso in order to engage the Facilities Management Division (FMD) to understand possible costs. But, in order to truly study options, FMD funding would be needed to study, design, and possibly build out space. Currently, neither facilities have appropriately safe and secure locations to manage contact visits. And, while there are programming spaces in both facilities, the spaces are challenging to schedule, given the many demands on those spaces.

Any areas at the MRJC that could be converted could only be done by discontinuing something else, like eliminating video court. In all cases, such projects would need to be properly resourced. At the KCCF there are open spaces within the West Wing, but work has been done in the past to evaluate the expense of changing purposes for that space that generally end up in the hundreds of

thousands, to millions of dollars, range. Moreover, the cost to reopen an entrance is an expensive proposition that needs to be considered from both a people and capital improvement perspective.

The addition of cameras would be a prerequisite for any area in order to monitor both inmates and visitors. Because of safety and security concerns, additional staffing for units like this would be needed. Additional security screening equipment will be necessary to include things like metal detectors, hand held metal detection wands, possible new body scanners, and drug detection equipment, all of which will be needed to mitigate the potential introduction of weapons, drugs, and other forms of contraband.

These additional security deterrents will not only assist in the detection of secreted items, but also prevent any undue trauma to individuals who wish to enter our facilities. These new advanced detection systems will provide the least invasive form of search with the most comprehensive use of technologies and avoid any unnecessary physical contact with visitors. There is a balance that can be made between the screening processes and the safety and security it provides, but only when the tools in place are applicable and appropriate to those processes and the needs for its use.

Ultimately, DAJD does not have any area that would be available as a workable space for parent-child contact visitation. Further review and study for appropriate design space, the needs of each facility based on a set of base criteria for the participation of the specific target population, and the appropriate set of parents strengthening programing tools for its success would be needed.

In addition to a lack of current program funding and space constraints, DAJD and other county agencies are exploring ways to cut budgets instead of adding general fund expenses. DAJD has been able to find community partners who do voluntary work with inmates, but generally cannot do so on a sustained basis. Grants can be available for some programming, many are time-limited and generally can't be found for capital projects or improvements. Some of the strategies involved in a program like this align with things like Best Start for Kids or MIDD programs, but more discussion would need to be had to determine whether these jail-based programs would be a good fit for those funding sources and if they should be prioritized over other programming choices. In order to take an idea like this forward, funding would certainly need to be a larger discussion and focus.

There are a lot of great reasons to take on programs to keep families connected through times of incarceration, but there are many obstacles that also need to be overcome, and likely difficult choices between many competing initiatives for limited public dollars would need to be made.

INFORMATION TO REPORT ADDED AFTER TRANSMITTAL

CONTACT VISIT HIGH LEVEL ESTIMATES:

The proviso provided an opportunity for the department to reach out to Washington State Department of Corrections (DOC) and San Francisco County (SFCO), who have both spearheaded successful programs within their agencies. The contact visiting programs at DOC and SFCO support the engagement of the incarcerated parents with their children—by developing their parenting skills and encouraging strong relationships while they're in custody, they have the means to continue down the path of being responsible parents to their children after their release.

A DAJD Sergeant was assigned to gather information specific to the proviso. He met with DOC personnel to research their programs, Parenting Inside Out and Dynamic Dads. He also traveled to SFCO to see firsthand the management of their program, called Parenting, Inside/Out. Both agencies consider their respective programs to be successful, though it was clear that safety and security were a high priority, and that there are special considerations when introducing a contact visit program. Specifically, both agencies had concerns about contraband, as contact visits carry the risk of passing contraband into a secure facility.

Programming: We learned that best practices in this area dictate having a community provider to assist not only with the contact visits themselves, but with helping inmates prior to getting their visits. In San Francisco County, for example, they work with an organization called Community Works West and have a contracted program called One Family. The provider does one-on-one family therapy with inmates, provides parenting classes, and they supervise contact visits. This type of programming supports the transition from facility-sponsored programming into the community once the person leaves the facility.
It would be our hope that we provide similar type of programming. San Francisco County pays **$300,000** annually for that contract. This cost does not include additional in-house staffing or capital improvements.

Possible Locations for Visits: The Department focused on areas within the Seattle and Kent Division that would least impact normal day to day operations. Each facility would require capital improvements to ensure that the integrity of the facility and well as safety and security were not compromised. Each facility had challenges as outlined below.

- MRJC – Consider repurposing the current lineup room in secure detention. This could offer an alternative access to the programming area, eliminating the need to access the room through secure detention. It would lessen the impact to children exposed to inmates/corrections setting. Would require tenant improvements for access, additional screening and monitoring, etc. This would displace DOC as it is currently used as a hearing room for community corrections violators.

- KCCF – Previous visitation occurred on the West Wing, 1st floor, which supported visitation for floors 1-4. Currently, other than the 1st floor, is not in use. Any inmate

programming would require reopening WW entrance which would require additional staffing.

- Each of these areas would require improvements such as new camera(s) at screening; a scanner or x-ray machines; some tenant improvements to the area and the softening of the areas to support the programming specific to a more family-oriented environment.

- Staff escorts for the inmate to and from these areas would also be required as outlined in the staffing model.

Staffing: While contact visits could be scaled from once a week to 7 days a week, we are presenting a staffing model for each of the adult facilities that would offer contact visitation 8 hours per day, 5 days per week from approximately 2:30 pm to 10:30 pm daily. This model is the least costly and would provide the Department an opportunity to evaluate and determine if adjustments could be made depending on the usage amount. This would require the addition of staff and appropriate relief factor. Additionally, if the number of days is reduced to 2-3 days per week, staffing needs could be reduced, impacting the overall cost associated with the visitation which is another option in determining staffing needs.

5 day Model

KCCF	FTE	Relief Factor	FTE Need
Control Booth	1	.4	1.4
Visiting Room	1	.4	1.4
Screening	1	.4	1.4
Relief	1	.4	1.4

5.6 FTE Total

	Sal	Benefits	Combined Total
2019 Cost	$82,056	$35,977	$118,033
2020 Cost	$84,781	$36,865	$121,646

With relief factor

2019 FTE Cost $660,985

2020 FTE Cost $681,217

Biennial Cost **$1,342,202**

MRJC	FTE	Relief Factor	FTE Need
Visiting Room	1	.4	1.4
Screening	1	.4	1.4
Relief	1	.4	1.4
			4.2 FTE Total

	Sal	Benefits	Combined Total
2019 Cost	$82,056	$35,977	$118,033
2020 Cost	$84,781	$36,865	$121,646

With relief factor

2019 FTE Cost $495,738

2020 FTE Cost $510,913

Biennial Cost **$1,006,651**

The Department has a history of supporting additional programming and improving on current programs and services offered to inmates. For example; our current programming at the MRJC includes:

1. Custodial Training Program
2. King County Public Health- MOM's Project
3. King County Court Parents for Parents Program
4. Linking to Employment Activities Pre- Release (LEAP)
5. Seattle Education Access
6. Substance Use Disorder Treatment (SUD)
7. Transitional Recovery Program (TRP)
8. Veterans Program
    a. Yoga Behind Bars
    b. Military Values/ Resiliency Class
    c. NW Justice Project Civil Litigation
    d. The Hero's Journey
    e. PTSD Psycho/ Social Group

f. Stress Relief Education
g. WDVA Release Planning Group
h. Empowering Change

We also believe that a parenting programming with clear support guidelines and outcomes for those incarcerated assisting in re-connecting with their children is extremely beneficial once the parent is released from custody. It should also be clear that the success of any programming within DAJD is a collaboration of many departments, work groups and volunteers.
The Department has also added a Corrections Program Specialist (CPS) through the last Omnibus, and in the 2019-20 Biennial budget we are asking for a Corrections Program Supervisor (CPSS) and an AS III to support the programming outlined above along with additional programming that may occur in the future.

Additional Cost: Below are rough estimates of possible additional costs of items that were outlined above. However, the information provided by FMD is very high level and preliminary. Without a full study from FMD these numbers could be subject to changes.

- 2 body scanners – 1 at each facility: **$428,000**
- 2 additional cameras and sound in each new visiting area – would include wiring and FMD costs: high level estimate **$100,000** *(need to validate numbers with FMD)*
- Softening of visiting spaces for improved family access (includes painting and other amenities): approximately **$72,000** (design and implement).
- HVAC and other electrical tenant improvements: **$80,000.**
- While KCCF could open an existing entrance at the West Wing, the MRJC room contemplated would require using a new entrance – tenant improvements would be needed to make appropriate space for screening instruments and likely new camera
- Security stations for both facilities: **$122,000** (tables, and wands parcel scanners)

Attached:

EXCEL Spreadsheet--Facilities and Management Division, Detailed Construction Cost, KCCF & MRJC Family Contact Visit Remodel, July 20, 2018.

PROJECT COST ESTIMATE SUMMARY

Project Name: KCCF & MRJC Family Contact Visit Re
Requesting Agency: DAJD
Implementing Agency: FMD

MMRF/CIP #: 0 Date: 7/20/2018
Estimator: M Thomas & D Millar
Checked by: 0

Project Scope:

Preliminary Estimate based upon information provided by DAJD via email 7/11/2018. No Program or other information for a basis of design were provided, no site visits were performed by FMD. This Estimate if based on the following draft scope of work provided by DAJD: "What modification would be required at MRJC and KCCF to allow for contact visits between incarcerated parents and their children" DAJD proposed converting the existing KCCF WW Visiting Room and the MRJC Line-Up Room for this new use. DAJD requested cost estimates to add a new entry at the south end of MRJC, costs for cameras, body scanner, handwands, x-rays and screen devises, and the estimated cost to "soften" the interior design of each room to be more appropriate for family visits.

	Planning Phase 1	Preliminary Design Phase 2	Design Phase 3	Implementation Phase 4	Closeout Phase 5	Acquisition Phase 6	Column Total
01 - CONSULTANT DESIGN		13%	55%	30%	2%		
Basic A/E Fee		$17,007	$71,951	$39,248	$2,616		$130,820
Add Services (incl services during construction)		$0	$0	$0	$0		$0
Reimbursables		$0	$0	$0	$0		$0
Consultant Selection Advertisement Costs		$0	$0	$0	$0		$0
Total 01 - Consultant Design Cost	$0	$17,007	$71,951	$39,248	$2,616	$0	$130,820
02 - ACQUISITIONS						$0	$0
03 - CONSTRUCTION				$1,108,270			$1,108,270
MAX ALLOWABLE CONST COST (MACC)				$111,935			$111,935
Sales Tax				$16,624			$16,624
Building Permit Fees				$0			$0
Local Grading/Land use/Other Permits				$5,541			$5,541
Commissioning							
Interim Parking Cost				$0			$0
Moving Cost				$0			$0
Data/Telecommunications							
Networks							
Telephony							
Wireless							
800 Mhz Radio							
Data Cabling							
KCIT labor							
IT Project Manager costs				$5,431			$5,431
Relocation/Temp Construction Cost				$0			$0
Security cost during construction							
				$0			$0
Survey							
Utility Connection Fees							
Pre-Construction Services				$0			$0
Project/Program Management Services				$8,312			$8,312
Special Inspection & Testing Fee				$8,312			$8,312
Printing Cost (Bid Documents)							
Total 03 - Construction Cost	$0	$0	$0	$1,264,426	$0	$0	$1,264,426
04 - EQUIPMENT & FURNISHINGS				$16,294			16,294
Total 04 - Equipment & Furnish. Cost							
05 - CONTINGENCY		5%	20%	75%			
Project Contingency		7,479	29,916	112,184			149,578
Total 05 - Contingency Cost	$0	$7,479	$29,916	$112,184	$0	$0	149,578
07 - COUNTY FORCE DESIGN (other agencies)		15%	55%	30%			
Project Design		$0	$0	$0			$0
Other		$0	$0	$0		$0	$0
Total 07 - County Force Design Cost	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
08 - CLIENT AGENCY		15%	55%	30%			
Primary Client Agency Administrative		$0	$0	$0			$0
Other Agency							
Security/Escort		$0	$0	$0		$0	$0
Other		$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Total 08 - County Force Design Cost	$0	$0	$0	$0			
09 - COUNTY FORCE ADMINISTRATION	18%	12%	40%	24%	5%	0%	100%
Project Management Time							
Supervision (Lead, & Mgr)							
Total 09 - County Force Admin. Cost	$13,973	$9,316	$30,741	$18,631	$3,728	$0	$76,387
06 - ART				$16,212			$16,212
Total	13973 18816	33800 9792	132607 6951	1466992 562	6342 58314	0	$1,653,717
Less Existing Funds	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Total Project Request	$13,973	$33,601	$132,608	$1,466,993	$6,343	$0	$1,653,717

PROJECT COST ESTIMATE SUMMARY

Uniformat code

Project Name:	KCCF & MRJC Family Cont	MMRF/CIP #:	Date: 7/20/2018
Requesting Agency:	DAJD	Estimator:	M. Thomas & D. Miller
Implementing Agency:	FMD	Checked by:	

Project Scope: Preliminary Estimate based upon information provided by DAJD via email 7/11/2018. No Program or other information for a basis of design were provided, no site visits were performed by FMD. This Estimate if based on the following draft scope of work provided by DAJD: "What modification would be required at MRJC and KCCF to allow for contact visits between incarcerated parents and their children". DAJD proposed converting the existing KCCF WW Visiting Room and the MRJC Line-Up Room for this new use. DAJD requested cost estimates to add a new entry at the south end of MRJC, costs for cameras, body scanner, handwands, x,rays and screen devises, and the estimated cost to "soften" the interior design of each room to be more appropriate for family visits.

Basis for Inflation:

Avg inflation rate for professional labor	3.0%	Date of estimate	Midpoint of design	Yrs
		7/20/18	12/31/19	1.4
Avg inflation rate for construction	5.0%	Date of estimate	Midpoint of const	Yrs.
No. of yrs to midpoint of construction		7/20/18	3/30/20	1.7

ELEMENT - DESCRIPTION			TOTAL PROJECT COST	ESCALATED PROJECT COST	2019-20 REQUEST
01 - CONSULTANT DESIGN					
Basic A/E Fee			$125,334	$130,820	$130,820
Add Services (Incl services during construction)			$0	$0	$0
Reimbursables			$0	$0	$0
Consultant Selection Advertisement Costs				$0	$0
Total 01 - Consultant Design Cost			$125,334	$130,820	$130,820
02 - ACQUISITIONS					$0
03 - CONSTRUCTION					
MAX. ALLOWABLE CONST. COST (MACC)			$1,020,260	$1,108,270	$1,108,270
Sales Tax	10.10%	of MACC (Check site area)	$103,046	$111,939	$111,939
Building Permit Fees	1.50%	of MACC	$15,304	$16,624	$16,624
Local Grading/Land use/Other Permits				$0	$0
Commissioning	0.50%	of MACC	$5,101	$5,541	$5,541
Interim Parking Cost				$0	$0
Moving Cost	($500-$1000/person)			$0	$0
Data/Telecommunications	($15/sf average cost)			$0	$0
Networks	($500/device)			$0	$0
Telephony	($350/phone)			$0	$0
Wireless				$0	$0
800 Mhz Radio				$0	$0
Data Cabling				$0	$0
KCIT labor				$0	$0
IT Project Manager costs	5% of IT budget		$0	$0	$0
Relocation/Temp Construction Cost			$5,000	$5,431	$5,431
Security cost during construction	FMD	hours	$0	$0	$0
DAJD Escorts during construction					
Survey				$0	$0
Utility Connection Fees		water		$0	$0
Pre-Construction Services				$0	$0
Project/Program Management Services				$0	$0
Special Inspection & Testing Fee	0.75%	of MACC	$7,652	$8,312	$8,312
Printing Cost (Bid Documents)			$7,652	$8,312	$8,312
Total 03 - Construction Cost			$1,164,015	$1,264,426	$1,264,426
04 - EQUIPMENT & FURNISHINGS					
Total 04 - Equipment & Furnish. Cost			$15,000	$16,294	$16,294
05 - CONTINGENCY					
Project Contingency	10.00%	of 01, 03, 04, 07, & 09	$137,700	$149,578	$149,578
Total 05 - Contingency Cost					
07 - COUNTY FORCE DESIGN (other agencies)					
Project Design	Intersection/roads design & survey or other				$0
Other					$0
Total 07 - County Force Design Cost			$0	$0	$0
08 - CLIENT AGENCY					
Primary Client Agency Administrative				$0	$0
Other Agency				$0	$0
Security/Escort	DAJD	1008	$86,704	$93,264	$93,264
Other				$0	$0
Total 08 - County Force Design Cost			$86,704	$93,264	$93,264
09 - COUNTY FORCE ADMINISTRATION					
Project Management Time		328 Hours	$65,600	$68,972	$68,972
Supervision (Lead, & Mgr)		33	$7,052	$7,415	$7,415
Total 09 - County Force Admin. Cost			$72,652	$76,387	$76,387
(rolls forward from Schedule Sheet)					
06 - ART	1.0%	of 01, 03, 05, 07 & 09	$14,997	$16,212	$16,212
☒	Check if project is visible to the public				
TOTAL PROJECT COST			$1,618,402	$1,746,981	$1,746,981
Less Existing Funds				$0	$0
Total Project Request			$1,618,402	$1,746,981	$1,746,981

PROJECT FEE ESTIMATE SUMMARY

Project Name:	KCCF & MRJC Family Contact Visit Remodel	**Date:**	20-Jul-18
Estimator:	M. Thomas & D. Miller	**MMRF/CIP Number:**	0
Checked by:	0		

Fee Proposal Estimate

		Estimate
Estimated MACC		$1,020,260
Basic Fee:		
WA State Fee Schedule Type : Schedule B (Average)		10.28%
Check if a Renovation or Remodel ☑		2.00%
RS Means add for MACC <500K		0.00%
Total Basic Fee Percentage:		12.28%
Total Basic Fee:		125,334.35

Additional Services:	**Estimated Hours**	**Estimate Rate/Hr**	**Estimate**
Civil Design (Above basic Services)			$0
Landscape Consultant (If not the prime)			$0
Courtroom design specialist			$0
Detention Security Electronics			$0
Security (access control, cameras,etc)			$0
Elevator			$0
Acoustical Consultant			$0
Project signage			$0
Pre-Design Report			$0
Public Relations/communications (separate contract)			$0
Public Relations during construction (separate contract)			$0
Traffic Study			$0
Conditional Use Permit & Contract Rezone			$0
Site Survey			$0
Value Engineering Participation (Team)			$0
Energy Modeling			$0
Energy Conservation Report			$0
Hazmat assessment (asbestos and lead			$0
Landmarks Commission Presentations			$0
LEED Certification			$0
Constructibility Review			$0
Geotechnical Investigation			$0
Sensitive Area Delineation\Mitigation	NA	> 1/2 acre	$0
Biological Assessment			$0
Environmental Checklist/Impact Statements			$0
Commissioning			$0
Training			$0
Drainage Technical Reports			$0
Record Drawings			$0
Total Additional Fees			$0

Reimbursable Expenses:	
Additional Printing	
On-site representation beyond basic services	
Presentations	
Additional Cost Estimates	
Total Reimbursable Expenses:	$0
Total Estimated Fee	$125,334

DETAILED CONSTRUCTION COST

Project Name: KCCF & MRJC Family Contact Visit Remodel
Estimator: M. Thomas & D. Millar
Checked by: 0

Date: 20-Jul-18
MMRF/CIP #: 0

Resource	Reference	Item Description	Unit	Unit Cost	Qty.	Total Cost
		Equipment:				
		Cameras 2 per room	ea	$3,500	4	$14,000
		Walk-through Magnetometer	ea	$6,000	2	$12,000
		Hand wands 3 per facility	ea	$200	6	$1,200
		Parcel scanner	ea	$54,000	2	$108,000
		Tables, trays, gun lockers, personal property lockers	ls	$2,520	2	$5,040
						$0
		Construction:				
		Demolition	sf	$19	800	$15,200
		Hazmat abatement	ls	$13	400	$5,200
		Interior Finishes (medium upgrade)	sf	$49	800	$39,200
		HVAC modification per building code	ls	$35,000	2	$70,000
		Construct new south entry at MRJC	ls	$42,000	1	$42,000
		Secured Officer station at entry	ls	$150,000	2	$300,000
						$0
						$0
						$0
						$0
						$0
		Cost of applicable mandated Sustainability tasks				$12,237
		Subtotal Direct Construction Cost				$624,077
Means City Cost Index		Seattle Weighted Average (incl. above)	0.00%			$0
10	GEN COND	On-site Overhead (see General Conditions Tab)	13.26%			$82,725
		Subtotal Direct Cost				$719,038
		Home Office Overhead (Calculated - do not override)	6.2%			$44,703
		Contractor Profit (see Profit Factor Tab)	7.30%			$52,467
		Subtotal Contractor's cost				$816,208
		Design Contingency (use chart below)	25.00%			$204,052
MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE CONSTRUCTION COST (MACC):						**$1,020,260**

Design Contingency:		
	Preliminary/Feasibility/Conceptual Stage	25%
	Schematic Stage	20%
	Design Development	15%
	Final Design	8%

GENERAL CONDITIONS DETERMINATION

Project Name: KCCF & MRJC Family Contact V **Date:** 7/20/2018
Estimator: M. Thomas & D. Millar **MMRF/CIP #:** 0

General Conditions Variable Factors Description	Option/Value	Weight	Factor	GC% (Weight x Factor)
Value of Project: (Calculated) (Includes Insurance, submittals, coordination, supervision, and administrative procedures)	$624,077	60%	0.11	6.46%
Temporary Facilities: (Includes temporary offices, toilets, barricades, protective covers, power, lighting, security, water...etc.)	High	10%	0.17	1.70%
Market Conditions: (Judgement on economic conditions, bidding climate, availability of labor)	Unfavorable	10%	0.17	1.70%
Site Access and Storage Area: (Availability of staging and storage areas, work access problems, multi-story transporting of personnel, materials and equipment)	Limited	15%	0.17	2.55%
Other Factors (Technically difficult, historic preservation, multiple governing jurisdictions or sites, multiple coordination issues....)	Special Conditi	5%	0.17	0.85%
General Conditions for Project		100%		**13.26%**

PROFIT FACTOR DETERMINATION

Project Name: KCCF & MRJC Family Contac **Date:** 7/20/2018
Estimator: M. Thomas & D. Millar **MMRF/CIP Number:** 0

Description of Profit Factor	Option/Value	Weight	Factor	Profit (Weight x Factor)
Degree of Risk (Consider that lump sum bids have higher risk than unit price or purchase order contracts, nature of the work, where the work will be performed, amount of labor in costs)	High	20%	0.12	2.40%
Value of Project (Calculated)	$719,038	15%	0.11	1.70%
Difficulty of Work (Consider the nature of the work, who is doing the work, and the time frame for the work)	Simple	15%	0.03	0.45%
Period of Contract Performance (in months)	6	15%	0.052	0.79%
Contractors Investment (Consider the amount of subcontracting, mobilization, owner furnished equipment, how much exposure before progress payment)	Above Avg	5%	0.12	0.60%
Assistance by Government (Consider use of county owned property, equipment, and facilities, and county coordination assistance)	Above Avg	5%	0.03	0.15%
Subcontracting (enter % of anticipated subcontracted work)	75.0%	25%	0.048	1.21%
Profit Factor for Project				**7.30%**

(Based on Corps of Engineers publication ETL 1110-2-573, 2008)

PROJECT SCHEDULE FORM

Jan-19	Feb-19	Mar-19	Apr-19	May-19	Jun-19	Jul-19	Aug-19	Sep-19	Oct-19	Nov-19	Dec-19	Yr Total
PL - Project Planning	PL - Project Planning	CS - Consultant Selection	SD - Schematic Design	SD - Schematic Design	DD - Design Development	DD - Design Development	CD - Construction Drawings	CD - Construction Drawings	P - Permits	P - Permits	B - Bidding	
20	20	20	20	20	16	16	16	16	24	4	24	216
Jan-20	Feb-20	Mar-20	Apr-20	May-20	Jun-20	Jul-20	Aug-20	Sep-20	Oct-20	Nov-20	Dec-20	Yr Total
B - Bidding	C - Construction	C - Construction	C - Construction	C - Construction	C - Construction	CO - Closeout	CO - Closeout	NA - No Activity	NA - No Activity	NA - No Activity	NA - No Activity	
16	16	16	16	16	16	8	8					112
Jan-21	Feb-21	Mar-21	Apr-21	May-21	Jun-21	Jul-21	Aug-21	Sep-21	Oct-21	Nov-21	Dec-21	Yr Total
NA - No Activity	NA - No Activity	NA - No Activity	NA - No Activity	NA - No Activity	NA - No Activity	NA - No Activity	NA - No Activity	NA - No Activity	NA - No Activity	NA - No Activity	NA - No Activity	
												0

Total Project Hours	328

Hours % formula error formula error