STATE OF WASHINGTON
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
P. O. Box 41101 • Olympia, Washington 98504-1101 • Tel (360) 753-2500
FAX (360) 664-4056

June 7, 2005

Mr. Victor A. Moore, Director
Office of Financial Management
Post Office Box 43113
Olympia, Washington 98504-3113

Dear Mr. Moore:

RE: Assessment of Department of Corrections Incidents Involving Supervised Offenders

This serves as the Department of Corrections response to the recommendations from the Loss Prevention Review Team's (LPRT) "Assessment of Department of Corrections Incidents Involving Supervised Offenders" report, dated January 2005.

We appreciate the opportunity that exists within RCW 43.41.380 for agencies to respond to the recommendations contained in the report. Since the writing of the report, there has been a change in Governor and in the administration of the Department. Governor Gregoire named a new Secretary for the Department and commissioned outside reviews of the Department's operations. Those reviews are outlined in separate reports authored by Nancy Campbell and Kathy Mix. Both reports overlap with the recommendations of the Loss Prevention Review Team. For the most part the recommendations are consistent, but there is the occasional divergence.

It is not possible to speak of community supervision without reference to the changes in leadership at the agency and the ongoing analysis of the recommendations of the other two reports mentioned above. As a result the Department is undergoing significant change at the present time. Just recently, decisions have been made to separate prison and community corrections operations into two operating divisions. The Deputy Secretary for Community Services has not yet been named at the time of the writing of this report. His/her arrival on the scene is critical to leading the change necessary to strengthen community corrections in the state of Washington.

The Department of Corrections welcomes the opportunity to educate others on the complexities associated with supervising convicted adult offenders in Washington State. The Department of Corrections is committed to mitigating offender risk, while at the same time, providing offenders with opportunities that lead to a law abiding and pro-social lifestyle. As the LPRT concluded,

responsibility for successfully managing and reducing the risk that offenders pose to society cannot rest with one entity. The Department of Corrections will continue to partner with other jurisdictions in an effort to increase the effectiveness of the resources that are expended in supervising offenders and to increase offender success in reintegrating back into their communities.

The recommendations offered by the LPRT reflect how difficult it is to have a thorough understanding of the legal supervision requirements and restrictions, as well as the complicated sentencing laws of the state. The report itself has some significant factual errors regarding jurisdiction at particular moments for certain offenders and does not reflect a complete understanding of what actually occurred in the supervision of individual cases. We have pointed out examples of both in the body of this response. The examples only serve to illustrate the complexity of the challenges facing the agency.

The Department appreciates the time and the commitment on the part of the team to work together to produce an end product that is aimed at better serving the citizens of the state of Washington. We are committed to improve the services provided by the Department of Corrections and to partnering with other stakeholders in the criminal justice system.

Recommendation Number 1:
Make the type and terms of the offender's sentence readily available to CCOs, so that there is no confusion or ambiguity in the CCO's mind about what the offender is required to do.

Discussion:
We concur with this recommendation.

Since the 1984 implementation of the SRA, there has been a layering of legislative sentencing changes. While no precise count exists, experts point to in excess of 30 changes impacting sentencing laws, which have increased the complexity Community Corrections Officers must manage in order to supervise an individual case. Each change to the law has made it more difficult for staff to easily identify the statutory requirements associated with an offender's sentence. That, coupled with the often multiple causes for which an offender is being supervised, creates a complex system. To assist staff with the complicated sentencing requirements, the Department is developing a job aid, which will help staff more easily identify the supervision type and DOC's statutory authority regarding supervision, sanctioning, and the imposition of conditions. This job aid is targeted for deployment by June 30, 2005.

A more comprehensive approach to implementing this recommendation involves possible legislative changes to simplify sentencing and supervision requirements. An option suggested in the Campbell report is a one (1) cause only supervision. In this option, it would be the responsibility of the Judge to roll up any prior existing conditions at the time of any felony sentencing.

Significant legislative and political resolve will be required in order to achieve the intent of the recommendation. Discussion with legislators and other key stakeholders needs to continue to occur in an effort to identify meaningful and workable solutions.

Of note, the Sentencing Guidelines Commission is in the process of exploring recommendations to simplify sentencing and the implications of post release supervision. Other options from those discussions may emerge.

Note: As was stated, it is important to correct factual discrepancies in the report. Following are some clarifications regarding supervision activities related to the subject cases.

Re: Haggerty, Daniel

On page 7 of the report, under the Supervision by the Department of Corrections section, first paragraph, in part it states: "…There was no pre-sentence investigation and the reason for this is not provided." The court did not order a Pre-Sentence Investigation.

On page 8 of the report, under the September 12, 1997 entry, in part it states: "…The condition imposed was 'not consume alcohol to excess, subject to monitoring for alcohol abuse." There is nothing in the written court documents that suggests that this was a condition imposed by the judge. The conditions imposed by the court are cited above."
The Judgment and Sentence dated August 13, 1997, states that the offender was not to consume alcohol to excess and that he will be subject to monitoring for alcohol at the discretion of the CCO.

On page 10 of the report, under the Criminal Conduct section, in part it states: "…It should be noted that Haggerty repeatedly was released from jail and CCO Woods would not find out about it until he committed another crime." Seven separate chrono entries listed in OBTS clearly suggest that CCO Woods was aware of Haggerty's releases from jail. CCO Woods was contacted by the offender or other collateral contacts.

At the time of the murder, Haggerty was on monetary-only supervision. The Department lacked authority to impose and enforce affirmative or prohibitive conditions. His prior convictions for Assault 3rd, Burglary 2nd, and Malicious Mischief 3rd had all been closed.

Re: Shirihama, Anthony

On page 12 of the report, under the Supervision History section, in part it states: "…An assessment by CCO Kinner on June 13, 2002, using the LSI-R concluded that his chance to re-offender was 76 percent with a Risk Management Classification of RM-A. CCO Schilling's assessment on June 13, 2002, with the LSI-R concluded that he had a 77 percent chance to re-offend. However, Schilling reported that Shirihama's Risk Management Classification was RM-D, rather than RM-A."

We appreciate the footnote at the bottom of page 12, with the LPRT acknowledging that they were informed that the CCO was aware of the error and corrected it in the system the same day. On June 13, 2002, the LSI-R was assessed as 43, RM-A. The CCO then entered the information on the RMI and due to computer error, it changed to RM-D. The CCO knew that that was not correct. The RMI was reviewed and triggered to show the proper classification, which was RM-A. Shirihama was an RM-A from June 13, 2002, to January 31, 2003, after the crime.

On page 13 of the report, under the January 17, 2002, entry, in part it states: "…The boxes were checked on the Community Custody Order for abstinence from alcohol, no possession of a controlled substance, report for urinalysis and not drive without insurance or a license and they were marked out and initialed by the judge apparently withdrawing them." In addition, on page 13 under the August 2, 2002, entry it states: "Rodriguez was convicted of 3rd degree assault. He was sentenced to four months confinement and 12 months community supervision with the DOC and to pay legal fees. No pre-sentence investigation was performed." The court did not order a Pre-Sentence Investigation. The Department of Corrections had authority to impose conditions on those two convictions under the OAA and imposed the following:

1. Not possess or consume controlled substances.
2. Submit to urinalysis to monitor drug use.
3. Obtain a substance abuse evaluation.
4. Obey all laws.

Rodriguez's first conviction was for Unlawful Possession of a Firearm. This offense occurred at the time the Sentencing Reform Act was in place in Washington State. Under the Sentencing Reform Act, the Department of Corrections lacked authority to add conditions.

Recommendation Number 2:
DOC should continue its efforts to study how well the OAA is meeting its intended social goals and use the empirical outcome feedback to inform legislative changes that can keep the OAA on target and further refine it. This requires identifying key performance indicators for purposes of an evidence-based assessment.

Discussion:
We concur with this recommendation.

The Department and its state-level partners are positioned to implement this recommendation through the GMAP process.

Recommendation Number 3:
DOC needs to audit supervisor compliance with the Supervisor Manual standards, and institute changes to support supervisors in performing the case audits and implementing the other aspects of CCO support envisioned by the manual's standards.

Discussion:
We concur with this recommendation.

The Department is engaged in several activities that support this recommendation. Presently, a statewide team audits field offices for compliance to the Supervisor's Guide to Offender Risk Management. The audit team meets with the Supervisor to review the office's audit results. Prior to this meeting with the supervisor, a member of the audit team meets individually with the staff member. A final audit report is prepared, which identifies best practices and deficiencies, if any. The Supervisor submits an action plan identifying strategies to bring the office into compliance for any areas identified. The action plan is approved by the Assistant Deputy Secretary for programs and is tracked to completion by the Field Administrators.

Supervisors complete Risk Management Quality Assurance Review (RMQAR) audits on a monthly basis to identify strategies for supervising high-risk offenders, as well as areas needing improvement. This occurs in the form of a case staffing involving multiple staff. Copies of the RMQARs are sent to Headquarters, who then collates and tracks the information for dissemination to each region to assist regions in monitoring compliance.

Note:

The Manual referenced and reviewed by the LPRT was developed approximately 6 years ago. The Department has since replaced that manual with a Supervisors Guide to Risk Management. It is important to distinguish the fact that at the time of the occurrence of the incidents, which drove the review by the LPRT, a different manual was in place than is in existence today.

Recommendation Number 4:
Encourage team supervision efforts, and identify a standard process to use when a CCO is absent for an extended period of time, to ensure that supervision of offenders continues. This also relates to the need to reinforce supervisor activity that conforms to the Supervisor Manual.

Discussion:
We concur with this recommendation.

An increasing number of offices are using a team approach to supervise high-risk offenders. This is a strategy that the Department supports. However, the geography and size of our offices are very different and a one solution for all is not realistic or possible.

Supervisors are expected to organize the unit's work to ensure supervision requirements for RMA and RMB offenders are met. Offices employ various strategies to ensure caseload coverage when the supervising CCO is away for a short or extended period of leave. Options, based on the location and size of the office, include workload relief officers, dividing a caseload among CCOs, assigning CCOs to cover field or office visits, etc.

A Duty Officer (DO) system is also in place at each office. This system allows for the handling of daily emergent issues and has proven to be an effective means for an office to respond to emergencies.

This recommendation aims to create a standard process to ensure caseload coverage during extended periods when the supervising CCO will be absent. Although processes are currently in place (as outlined above) to deal with caseload coverage, the new Deputy Secretary for Community Services will be asked to consider options for a standardized process. This will encompass a review of job duties, as well as policies and procedures.

Note:

As referenced in the item above, the Supervisors Manual has been replaced with a Supervisors Guide to Risk Management.

On page 21 of the report, first paragraph in part states: "…In the Anthony Shirahama case, it was evident to the LPRT that the CCOs were supervising this individual effectively, but, at a crucial juncture when Shirahama needed intervention, the CCOs were attending to family issues and were absent from the job." Attendance records contradict this statement. There was a three-day period during the 2002 Christmas holiday season when both CCOs were absent. During that time, the Supervisor of the office was available for coverage and no issues arose during that time frame. Other than that three-day time period, one or both CCOs were available.

Recommendation Number 5:
Establish a series of mandatory internal workshops that discuss the "basics" of corrections under the OAA. The focus should include providing staff with a better understanding of the available DOC resources and the priorities of allocation of resources. One outcome would include developing plans for reprioritizing deployment of staff that includes a method of providing backup or team supervision to avoid supervision gaps. Overall, this should lead to better understanding by all staff of the finite resources of DOC staff. This could also lead to concrete suggestions for reprioritizing deployment of staff.

Discussion:
We concur with this recommendation and believe it is very fundamental to the future of community corrections.

Community corrections staff are asked to fulfill many roles. To paraphrase the Campbell report, the agency has tried to be all things to all people. The multiple missions have created confusion in the minds of the staff and the public about the proper role of the Community Corrections Officer. The new Deputy Secretary for Community Services, working with agency staff, the Office of the Attorneys General, and our criminal justice partners, will be asked to lead the discussion to clarify this role confusion.

Once this conversation is complete it is very likely it will drive changes to policy and staff deployment. It is imperative that those changes be communicated to staff in a comprehensive and thorough manner.

Recommendation Number 6:
DOC should consider developing additional regional treatment services to provide more opportunities for offenders in smaller rural communities.

Discussion:
We concur with this recommendation.

Although we believe this recommendation was primarily driven by a perception that there is a need for chemical dependency services in rural areas, we believe the need for mental health, domestic violence, sexual deviancy, as well as chemical dependency treatment, outpaces the available resources. Additional resources are necessary in order to meet the critical need for these treatment services. More detail will be developed and available at the time of the Department's next budget request.

The Department has already identified rural areas where contracts with certified chemical dependency providers should be explored. Those areas are: LaPush, Yelm, Arlington, Forks, Monroe, Port Townsend, Castlerock, Enumclaw, Chelan, and Deer Park.

The Department will continually assess the need to expand service in sparsely populated areas. Our Chemical Dependency Unit will institute a process to consult with each office Supervisor on a bi-annual basis. Additional contracts can be pursued, as determined necessary.

Recommendation Number 7:
Risk assessments need to be completed prior to sentencing, so that the court can receive the benefit of the important information gathered in the process for use in determining appropriate sentencing conditions.

Discussion:
We do not concur with this recommendation.

In the majority of cases, the Department has little involvement in the sentencing process. Current statute already allows Judges to request a Risk Assessment Report prior to sentencing. The Department rarely receives such requests, perhaps because of the potential increase in jail bed usage that would occur if such requests were routine.

The Department does complete a risk assessment, pre or post sentencing for all offenders.

Recommendation Number 8:
In addition to event-triggered reassessment, risk reassessments need to be done on a periodic basis according to the offender's current needs and level of risk.

Discussion:
We concur with this recommendation.

A draft policy has been developed, which addresses time-driven reassessments for offenders under supervision in the community. Pending stakeholder feedback, release of the policy is slated for August 2005.

Recommendation Number 9:
Adapt the LSI-R to create a set of brief dynamic risk scales to monitor changes in offender risk or design new scales to measure changes in offender risk. Seek expanded federal funding (in addition to the current grant being sought) from BJA to support development of a set of practical dynamic risk scales. Provision needs to be made for keeping this risk data readily accessible via the CCO's PDA.

Discussion:
We concur with this recommendation.

A discussion regarding IT enhancements occurs in Recommendation # 16.

The Department is working with the Washington Institute for Public Policy to develop an improved risk assessment tool.

In addition, a coalition involving the American Probation and Parole Association (APPA), the Association of State Correctional Administrators (ASCA), and the Corrections Technology Association (CTA) has partnered in the submission of a grant proposal to the Bureau of Justice Assistance. The Washington State Department of Corrections Information Technology Chief is serving as the Grant Project Manager. Through the grant, the ultimate goal is to develop an acute dynamic composite risk assessment that employs offender diagnostic, criminal history and supervision monitoring data to determine the probability of re-offending by persons currently under community supervision. The availability of such an instrument would represent an important improvement to the capabilities of CCOs to assess risk. It would enable staff and service providers to better understand the types of risks posed by the offender, determine whether s/he is in crisis, and to obtain guidance about what to do about it. Ultimately, this information will facilitate more efficient deployment of public resources. Discussions are occurring with the Department of Justice to determine if funding can be made available for this project. The amount of the grant request is just over $2 million.

Recommendation Number 10:
Review the DOC hearing process to determine whether the agency should recommend amendment to either improve its ability to respond appropriately to offender's behavior by imposing more severe sanctions, return the process to the court, or some other solution to address the difficulty in creating effective sanctions for offender behavior.

Discussion:
We do not concur with this recommendation.

Data does not support the assumption that more severe sanctions are an appropriate response to violation behavior or that increased confinement results in fewer violations. What the data does say is that effective intervention must be "swift" and "sure."

Prior to the OAA, it took several months for courts to act on violation reports, simply due to their workload. The agency is able to respond quickly to OAA violation behavior, through use of electronic requests and the subsequent issuance of a Secretary Warrant. Depending on the risk level of the offender, this can take from 1 hour to 1 week.

CCOs have the option of utilizing a Stipulated Agreement, in which the offender admits guilt to the alleged violation(s) and agrees to certain interventions, e.g., submit to increased UAs, enter a drug or alcohol treatment program, complete community service work, etc. CCOs can also enter into a Negotiated Sanction with the offender, which is much like the Stipulated Agreement process; however, it involves a DOC Hearings Officer and allows for the imposition of confinement, along with other appropriate interventions. Both the Stipulated Agreement and Negotiated Sanction are swift processes and are effective intervention tools.

In implementing the OAA, the agency designed the Offender Behavior Response Guide. An extensive list of response options was identified, resulting in 6 categories: enhancement, reparation, targeted intervention, treatment, partial confinement, and total confinement. Many of the interventions require resources, which are not available due to budgetary constraints. The Guide has become complicated and it is presently under review for modification. This review will be completed by July 1, 2005.

It should be noted that the Department of Corrections' Hearing Unit was not involved with either the Haggerty or the Shirihama case. Prior to the incident under review in the Rodriguez case, Mr. Rodriguez served sanctions longer than 60 days. On one occasion, the court sentenced him to 80 days confinement, and another time the court sanctioned him to 120 days confinement, and yet another time, the court sanctioned him to 150 days confinement. These increased periods of confinement did not serve to change his behavior.

On page 26 of the report, the last paragraph suggests that the agency should better articulate the circumstances under which an exceptional sanction can be ordered. The Department's Hearings Unit has generally followed the same examples as those provided in the Adult Sentencing Guidelines Manual, per RCW 9.94A.390.

Recommendation Number 11:
The current hearing process represents a significant negative morale issue within the internal culture of DOC. Discussion and possibly reorganization of the hearing process should occur very soon. All DOC staff need to understand the hearing process better. Hearing Officers need to better understand the frustrations of CCOs and at the same time, CCOs need to

better understand not only the role of Hearing Officers, but also the constraints they work under. It would be most desirable if the hearing process for probationers could return to the Superior Court. Sanctioning prison releasees by a separate agency may be another solution. Providing the supervision and sanctioning of offenders within the same agency leads, as it currently does, to the potential for counterproductive conflict.

Discussion:
We concur with this recommendation as far as staff morale goes. We do not concur that the process should be returned to the court or to another agency. The tension identified by the report is inevitable and will exist no matter where the sanctioning authority is located. The same tension existed when the courts conducted the hearings; however, the tension was heightened because of the time delays experienced by the courts.

The Department acknowledges and is committed to improving the relationship between line staff and Hearing Officers. The agency will assemble a workgroup as a means to begin to address this important issue. Helping staff to better understand the hearing process will serve to alleviate some of the frustration that staff now experience. This workgroup will be launched in July of 2005.

By way of background, since 1988, the Department has been involved in the sanctioning of released offenders on Community Custody status. The hearings process was fairly simple for both the CCO and the Hearing Officer. That changed, however, with a March 2000 court decision in the Personal Restraint Petition of Samuel McNeal. Staff regularly equate the impact of the McNeal decision with the implementation of the OAA, but they are not the same.

Prior to that decision, the Department followed the due process requirements of Wolff v. McDonnell and likened the hearings to an “inmate disciplinary proceeding.” No written report was required of the CCO, no discovery process was required prior to the hearing, and the standard of evidence requirement was low.

The McNeal decision mandated the same procedural protections established under Morrisey v. Brewer. These standards include: a) written notice of claimed violations, b) disclosure of evidence to be used against the offender, c) opportunity for the offender to be heard in person and to present documentary evidence, d) the right to confront and cross-examine adverse witnesses, e) a neutral and detached hearing body such as a traditional parole board member -- members of which need not be judicial officers or
lawyers and, f) a written statement by the fact finders as to the evidence relied upon and the reasons for revoking parole.

All of these requirements were new to CCOs and caused a great deal of additional work. In addition, it caused the hearings process to be much more formalized and technical. At the time of this decision, OAA implementation efforts were just beginning. Had staff had more time to embrace the philosophy of OAA, prior to the rendering of the McNeal decision, perhaps the

impacts of the McNeal decision may have been lessened, thus reducing the internal conflicts and the morale issues that staff experienced.

Page 25 of OFM's report states: "Taking on the responsibility of hearings for the Superior Court has essentially lifted the post-sentence responsibility from judge's shoulders." This has added significant "weight" to the decision-making process for CCOs who must deal with the offender in the community. CCOs are less likely to use alternative sanctions such as treatment, when they feel the burden of "responsibility" for the decision and its outcomes." It should be noted that under the OAA, CCOs are responsible for making recommendations for sanctions, just as they did previously with the courts.

Recommendation Number 12:
All categories of staff be reviewed, especially the financial obligation units, safety units, hearing examiners and the large number of staff associated with the LSI-R function for possible reassignment to offender supervision.

Discussion:
We concur with this recommendation.

Implementation of the OAA occurred in 2000. It is time to review positions and roles. This review will commence in July of 2005 and will be an expectation for the new Deputy Secretary for Community Services.

Recommendation Number 13:
Use supervisors to provide coverage for line staff when line staff is not available to the offender for reporting.

Discussion:
We concur with this recommendation in that it recommends that supervision be covered when staff are not available, similar to recommendation #4. This recommendation highlights a significant problem facing the Department.

As mentioned in response to recommendation #4, Supervisors organize the work of their unit to ensure supervision requirements for RMA and RMB offenders are met. While it is certainly possible to make some adjustments to supervisors' availability to provide greater coverage for line staff, this recommendation does not acknowledge the assistance supervisors currently provide to staff. How much more or how to improve the coverage is a question the agency will pursue. See recommendation # 14 for more discussion.

Recommendation Number 14:
As previously urged, the supervisor's role needs to be more clearly described in a consistent, measurable manner to include timed and defined case audits, expectations for in-house training, role of the supervisor as a backup for line staff, and clear expectations for the supervision of staff and the effective running of field offices.

Discussion:
We concur with this recommendation.

This is one of several recommendations that suggest reviewing the roles and responsibilities of Supervisors. The Department will embark on such a review in July of 2005 and make modifications where possible, to ensure the greatest use of this limited resource.

As indicated in response to recommendation #3, Supervisors complete monthly Risk Management Quality Assurance Review (RMQAR) audits to identify strategies for supervising high-risk offenders and areas needing improvement.

The real issue is that the Department does not have enough Supervisors. The workload studies do not measure the time necessary for Supervisors to provide proper supervision and monitoring of staff performance, nor do they measure the work Supervisors are not able to complete. Supervisors have many responsibilities, to include serving as back up to staff, conducting case audits, training and mentoring staff, networking and responding to internal and external stakeholders/interests, monitoring budgets, and ensuring the smooth operations of a physical building. The Department of Personnel has indicated that best practices suggest a Supervisor to staff ratio of no more than 1:8, however, 1:6 is preferred. The Department's ratio of field Supervisors to staff is 1:14. More Supervisors are needed and will be requested in the next budget cycle.

Recommendation Number 15:
The Department provide more training and management development for supervisory staff, including areas of diversity and cultural awareness.

Discussion:
While we certainly support cultural awareness and diversity, we do not concur with this recommendation.

Among the training that Supervisors are required to attend, 3 separate management training courses (which total 64 hours) include diversity as a topic. Other opportunities exist for supervisors to participate in additional training offerings that also include diversity. Field offices and facilities are encouraged to discuss and celebrate diversity on a regular basis. Many offices host diversity events throughout the year. Some locations have instituted "Talking Circles."

Recommendation Number 16:
The LPRT's recommendations under this section total 5. For ease in addressing each recommendation, we have added a letter next to each.

These recommendations would be valuable and of assistance to staff and the agency. However, there are no additional agency resources to dedicate to these IT endeavors. The agency's primary

focus at this time is dedicating our limited resources toward the implementation of OMNI Phase 2.

That automation and the electronic medium be used to:

Recommendation Number 16a:

Facilitate the creation of semi-automated PSI's from the OAP for all offenders. The current semi-automated RAR could form the basis for such an instrument that goes to the judge. This is despite an assertion by DOC that the judges maintain they don't need that level of information.

Discussion:
We concur with this recommendation.

To accomplish this, a change request would be required for OMNI Phase 2 (which is not advised by external consultants) but not the current system. Greater exploration into this recommendation is necessary for the agency to adequately assess the IT impacts.

Recommendation Number 16b:
Allow CCOs to collect data on changes in offender dynamic risk via PDAs in the field. Create software that will permit the CCO to quickly use the PDA to ascertain the terms and conditions of the offender's sentence. Ensure that the OAP and PSI are included on the PDA for each offender under the CCO's supervision.

Discussion:
We concur with this recommendation.

A mobile device may be a good strategic direction. Resources remain an issue. It is estimated that implementation of this recommendation would cost approximately 1 FTE and $1.5 million.

Recommendation Number 16c:
Create reports and generate statistics by importing standard language and offender ID information from file notes to eliminate repetitive, time-consuming data entry tasks.

Discussion:
We concur with this recommendation.

This requires a data warehouse (for offender information) and business intelligence software. Cost estimate is 1 FTE and $1 million.

Recommendation Number 16d:
Automate reports by importing standard language and offender ID information from file notes. Generate statistics from file notes that mirror supervision goals and outcomes.

Discussion:
It is unclear how this recommendation differs from the previous one. If it is aimed at extracting OBTS chronos, on-line forms and middleware software are required. Cost estimate is $700k for software and contracting services. Resource noted above would be utilized.

Recommendation Number 16e:
Use WI-FI technology to allow CCOs to connect to network programs from the field.

Discussion:
We concur with this recommendation.

This technology is now available, but is limited in range. The Department will continue to explore technologies that will connect CCOs in the field with the Department's network.

I would be glad to meet with you and/or answer any questions you may have. I can be reached at 360-753-2500.

Sincerely,

Harold W. Clarke
Secretary

HWC:tko
cc: Eldon Vail, Deputy Secretary
Tracy Guerin, Deputy Secretary
Kathy Gastreich, Risk Management and Safety Administrator