

STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT PLANNING AGENCY

FOR SLEPA USE ONLY

DISTRICT	FUNCTIONAL CATEGORY
PROJECT #	DATE RECEIVED
TRANS. #	DATE APPROVED

APPLICATION FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTION GRANT
 (Under Part C Title I Public Law 90-351)
 (As amended by Public Law 91-644)

PART A - PROJECT DATA

- PROJECT TITLE Rocky Butte Jail Improvement
- TYPE OF APPLICATION (check one) Initial Revision Contin.
- APPLICANT AGENCY Columbia Region Association of Governments
- ADDRESS 6400 S.W. Canyon Court, Portland, Oregon 97221
- LOCATION OF PROJECT 9755 N.E. Hancock Drive, Portland, Oregon 97220
- PROJECT DURATION From: July 1, 1975 To: June 30, 1976
- PROGRAM AREA (see instructions) P.L. 93-83, Section 451

- DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT (describe in detail on ATTACHMENT 1)
- BUDGET (see instructions--provide itemization as called for on ATTACHMENT 2)

10. TOTAL ESTIMATED COSTS (Including non-federal share)

SOURCE OF FUNDS	FY 75-76		FY _____		FY _____	
	%	Amount	%	Amount	%	Amount
FEDERAL	90	500,850				
STATE						
LOCAL GOVERNMENT	10	55,650				
OTHER						
TOTAL		556,500				

11. SPECIFY HOW NON-FEDERAL SHARE WILL BE PROVIDED: Multnomah County
will supply hard cash matching funds.

12. PROJECT DIRECTOR
 Name Lt. John A. Brown Title Chief of Corrections
 Address 222 S.W. Pine Street Tel. No. (503) 248-5116
Portland, Oregon 97204

ATTACHMENT 1

PART A - ITEM 8. DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

(a) The Problem

In 1967, the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice published the results of a comprehensive survey of nation-wide correctional operations.¹ This overall picture of American corrections showed, among other things, that the word "corrections," used to characterize the terminal phases of our criminal justice apparatus, is largely a misnomer: "For a great many offenders . . . corrections does not correct. Indeed, experts are increasingly coming to feel that the conditions under which many offenders are handled, particularly in institutions, are often a positive detriment to rehabilitation."²

While acknowledging the conflict and uncertainty, among professionals and the public alike, surrounding the theories behind and the goals of corrections, the Commission did seem to make a case for rehabilitation when it asserted that, "A major goal of corrections is to make the community safer by preventing the offender's return to crime upon his release."³ Given this acknowledgement of the need for rehabilitation, the Commission went on to make an argument for community-based corrections and to recommend: "Correctional authorities should develop more extensive community programs providing special, intensive treatment as an alternative to institutionalization for both juvenile and adult offenders."⁴

Despite the Commission's opinion that institutions tend to both physically and psychologically isolate offenders from society and that institutional commitments can cause more problems than they solve, it certainly did not propose the abolition of our nation's prisons and jails. The Commission stated, "Clearly, there is a need to incarcerate those criminals who are dangerous until they no longer are a threat to the community."⁵ Further, and in a positive vein, the Commission stated that the special jail environment can allow opportunities for rehabilitative treatment which cannot be duplicated in the community. The Commission concluded, "For many offenders, institutionalization can be an extremely valuable prelude to community treatment."⁶

Last fall, some six years after the President's Commission's report was published, the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals (NAC) reaffirmed many of the former's recommendations on corrections.⁷ The emphasis of this report was on rehabilitation, rather than simple detention or punishment, and on community-based programs, rather than institutionalization. For example, Standards 2.9 (Rehabilitation Programs) and 11.3 (Social Environment of Institutions) both addressed the goal of rehabilitation, one suggesting that offenders' right to rehabilitation be fulfilled, the other recommending that offenders be stimulated to change their behavior and participate in reintegrative programs. Further, Standards, 7.1-7.4 and 16.14 made it clear that the NAC desires to see an emphasis on planning to facilitate the development of community-based corrections programs, whether at the state or local level.

ATTACHMENT 1 (Continued)

Not unlike the President's Commission, however, the NAC explicitly recognized that institutions are here to stay. Many of its recommendations, primarily in Chapters 2 (Rights of Offenders), 9 (Local Adult Institutions), and 11 (Major Institutions), dealt directly with state prisons and local jails. The overwhelming emphasis of these suggestions was on more humane treatment of inmates in custody and significant improvements in their custodial living conditions.

The American Bar Association Project on Standards for Criminal Justice also addressed, at least indirectly, the corrections component of the criminal justice system.⁸ As part of its recommendations on sentencing, the ABA demonstrated support for the concepts of rehabilitation (Standard 2.2 General Principles: Judicial Discretion and Standard 2.6 Special Facilities) and community-based corrections (Standard 2.4 Partial Confinement), but at the same time made it clear that institutionalization will remain a major sentencing alternative (Standard 2.5 Total Confinement and Standard 2.1 General Principles: Statutory Structure).

A survey of the correctional situation in Multnomah County demonstrates that, measured by the aforementioned national standards and goals, we are in substantial compliance with the spirit of these suggestions, if not with all of the specific recommendations.⁹ In this county, "corrections" is primarily the responsibility of the Department of Human Services, Corrections Division.¹⁰ That this organization is committed to the goal of rehabilitation is clear in policy stances, as well as in all of its many corrections plans and programs. Additionally, a decided emphasis on rehabilitation can be discerned from sentencing patterns of the Circuit and District Court judges in this county.

Similarly, among County corrections administrators and planners and the judiciary alike, there is apparent a preoccupation with finding, developing and utilizing alternatives to incarceration. Programs such as the District Court's Alternative Community Service Program (coordinated by County Probation and Parole) are typical of the increasing trend of community involvement in Multnomah County corrections.

In spite of adherence to the concepts of rehabilitation and community-based corrections, the County still must operate two high security detention facilities: an intake and holding facility in the County Courthouse and a "pretrial/sentence jail" located at Rocky Butte. The Butte houses federal, state, and county prisoners (maximum capacity = 350) and, despite gradual reductions in its average daily population over the last 18 months, there is absolutely no chance that this institution can be phased out. Thus, Rocky Butte Jail remains an integral part of the overall Multnomah County corrections scheme.

The problem we face, the one which serves as the basis for this grant request, is that Rocky Butte Jail is physically and programmatically unsuited for our present and future correctional demands and

ATTACHMENT 1 (Continued)

needs. This facility was built in the early 1940's, during an era when the emphasis was on institutional incarceration instead of community treatment and when the goals of simple detention and punishment took precedence over rehabilitation. Although we feel Rocky Butte, which has been renovated in part,¹¹ is one of the best local jails in the country, it must be further physically remodeled to keep pace with the current trends in corrections.¹²

In short, today Rocky Butte Jail is not physically consistent with the broad correctional goals of rehabilitation and community reintegration. Our jail administrators believe that these related processes must begin very early in the custody of the offender and that, of course, our jails are integral to those processes. However, at Rocky Butte it is extremely difficult to provide either the type of living conditions and treatment or the type of programs which will contribute to these broad correctional goals. This fact is partially due to the transitory nature of the Butte's inmate population, but mostly due to physical inadequacies of the plant.

For example, the inmate living quarters at Rocky Butte Jail could not fairly be called inhumane, but it is hardly an atmosphere which is conducive to attitudinal change. A visit to the facility leaves one with an impression of drabness, uncleanliness, and lack of privacy. Colorless steel and concrete design predominates, giving even a casual visitor a feeling of hopelessness and depression. It is easy to understand how an inmate's attitude could degenerate in such a setting.

Besides the living conditions themselves, the jail design furnishes relatively little opportunity for an individual approach to inmates' needs. For instance, though an average daily inmate population is composed of an extremely wide variety of personality types, representing various degrees of criminality (including several who are not criminals at all), the physical plant forces corrections officials to treat all inmates alike. Enlightened inmate segregation and classification plans cannot be implemented in this jail situation. This random mixing of inmates only adds to their attitudinal problems.

Additionally, despite eagerness on the part of the Rocky Butte Jail administration to develop and implement programs dedicated to positive attitude and behavior modification, the physical setting in fact prevents such a programmatic approach. Because adequate facilities do not exist, Rocky Butte remains a mere detention facility, one in which inmates cannot make constructive use of their time.

In conclusion, by making certain physical plant modifications we feel we can significantly improve Rocky Butte Jail. Despite the fact that it will remain a pre-trial/sentence detention facility into the foreseeable future, we expect to create a setting which will contribute to the long range goals of rehabilitation and community reintegration.¹³ We owe as much to the inmate population and, perhaps more importantly, to the tax paying community which we ultimately serve.

ATTACHMENT 1 (Continued)

(b) Goals and Objectives

The goal of this project is a jail facility which is consistent with the dual correctional goals of rehabilitation and eventual community reintegration, as well as public safety. Specific objectives and accomplishments sought are as follows:

- I. To improve inmate living quarters/conditions.
 - a. To encourage positive attitudinal adjustment on the part of the inmates.
 - b. To encourage positive attitudinal adjustment on the part of the correctional staff.

- II. To provide staff with opportunity to take a more individual approach to inmates' needs.
 - a. To allow development of enlightened inmate segregation and classification systems.
 - b. To enhance positive attitudinal adjustment on the part of both inmates and staff.

- III. To provide staff with opportunity to develop and implement programs in support of inmate needs.
 - a. To allow for implementation of a pre-release counseling capability.
 - b. To allow for improved inmate recreational opportunities.
 - c. To allow for improved educational and religious programming.

- IV. To provide for retention of high jail security capability.
 - a. To retain adequate capacity for inmate incarceration.
 - b. To retain secure setting for inmates, staff and public alike.

(c) Project Activities

- I. Remodel existing open bay "D Dormitory" (main floor, south wing).
 - a. Create four separate cells, plus a dormitory control center.
 - b. Reduce inmate capacity for that dormitory from 85 to 74.

- II. Remodel basement of south wing.
 - a. Create one large inmate recreation room.
 - b. Create one combination classroom-chapel.

- III. Renovate upper floor of west wing by constructing private area for jail counseling.

It is anticipated that work will be undertaken simultaneously on these three separate projects. Attached is a "work schedule chart" showing the amount of time necessary to complete each task.

ATTACHMENT 1 (Continued)

(d) Project Management

The Project Manager will be Chief of Corrections, Multnomah County Division of Public Safety, John A. Brown. He will be responsible for on-scene project direction, held accountable for project success or failure, and will report in turn to County Sheriff, Louis P. Rinehart.

(e) N/A

(f) N/A

(g) Participating Agencies

The Multnomah County Division of Public Safety will be responsible for project administration and Multnomah County will provide all local match funds.

(h) Project Evaluation

The construction and remodeling work which characterizes this grant request will most likely take place during the first six months of the grant year. During that period, only matters of procurement and construction completion deadlines will be of evaluation interest. Upon completion of the project, we plan to evaluate the impact of the physical jail improvements upon jail administration. Because we have stated a set of goals and objectives which include such phrases as "rehabilitation," "community reintegration," "attitudinal change," the evaluation will consist largely of subjective judgments. That is, while it is an easy matter to count the number of assaults on corrections officers, on other inmates, and the number of jailbreaks, it is quite another matter to objectively measure the positive impact of physical jail improvements on the inmates. Thus, we will have to rely heavily on opinion surveys of corrections staff and the inmates themselves. On the other hand, to the extent that we can provide better facilities for recreational, religious, and counseling endeavors, evaluation can be based on a count of the number of participants in those programs and the participants' accomplishments.

(i) Alternative Methods

There is no way we can accomplish all of the physical modifications we desire at Rocky Butte relying solely on money from Multnomah County taxpayers. If we are not able to secure federal money for this project, modification of "D" Dormitory is out of the question. Our alternative would be to attempt to secure local funds for construction in the south and west wings over the next few fiscal years. In conclusion, failure to secure federal money for this project will largely frustrate our desire to adapt Rocky Butte Jail to present and future correctional demands.

ATTACHMENT 1 (Continued)

(j) Assumption of Costs

This will not be a continuing project. After the budgeted federal and local funds are expended in FY 1976, the project will terminate. No assumption of costs will be necessary.

Footnotes:

1. Task Force Report: Corrections The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. (U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington: 1967).
2. The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice (U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington: 1967)
3. IBID. page 165
4. IBID. page 171
5. IBID. page 165
6. IBID. page 172
7. NAC: Corrections
8. Standards Relating to Sentencing Alternatives and Procedures (Approved Draft, 1968), pages 43-129.
9. Multnomah County Assessment of the Criminal Justice System: Report on Corrections, Department of Justice Services, March 13, 1974.
10. This executive department is responsible for all adult misdemeanants, juveniles, and women offenders, as well as all probation services.
11. A joint federal-county remodeling project was completed in early 1974, resulting in, among other things, a new "C Dormitory". This grant requests funds to recreate "D Dormitory" in the same fashion.
12. We wholeheartedly support Standard 9.10 (Local facility Evaluation and Planning) of The Corrections Task Force of the National Advisory Commission, which lists elements to be considered in evaluating existing or planning new facilities. We also support the spirit of Standard 11.1 which discourages the building of new state adult institutions.

ATTACHMENT 1 (Continued)

13. "County and local jails are the first contact with the correctional world for most offenders. Most people in jails are awaiting trial and have not been sentenced or convicted of any crime. Some are serving short sentences for minor offenses. The need for the rights of inmates to be considered and protected in all levels of correctional facilities is evident, but the situation in jails is particularly poor. Yet, the initial and often lasting impressions toward corrections and our system of criminal justice are formed in these institutions." Marshalling Citizen Power to Modernize Corrections (Chamber of Commerce of the United States: 1972).

ATTACHMENT 2

PART A - ITEM 9. FIRST YEAR BUDGET DETAIL (Estimate)

(If additional space is needed, use BUDGET EXPLANATION page)

COST ELEMENT				FEDERAL SHARE	STATE/LOCAL SHARE	PROJECT TOTAL
a. SALARIES AND WAGES						
<u>Position</u>	<u>% of time</u>	<u>Monthly salary</u>				
N/A						
Sub-Total Salaries				\$	\$	\$
Employee Benefits @ _____ %				\$	\$	\$
Total Salaries				\$	\$	\$
b. CONSULTANTS (List by individual or type)						
N/A						
Total Consultants				\$	\$	\$
c. TRAVEL, TRANSPORTATION, SUBSISTENCE (Itemize)						
N/A						
Total Travel				\$	\$	\$

ATTACHMENT 2 (Continued)

COST ELEMENT	FEDERAL SHARE	STATE/LOCAL SHARE	PROJECT TOTAL
d. OFFICE SUPPLIES, POSTAGE, PRINTING, ETC. (Itemize)			
N/A			
Total Office Supplies	\$	\$	\$
e. FACILITIES, OFFICE SPACE, UTILITIES, EQUIPMENT RENTAL (Itemize)			
1) Renovation of "D" Dormitory	274,350	55,650	330,000
2) Modification of third floor	25,000		25,000
3) Modification of basement	175,000		175,000
Total Facilities	\$	\$	\$
474,350	474,350	55,650	530,000
f. EQUIPMENT (Itemize)			
N/A			
Total Equipment	\$	\$	\$
g. INDIRECT COSTS			
(5% of \$530,000)	26,500		26,500
Total Indirect	\$	\$	\$
26,500	26,500		26,500
TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	\$	\$	\$
	500,850	55,650	556,500

ATTACHMENT 2 (continued)

BUDGET EXPLANATION (use if additional space needed)

e. Facilities, Office Space, Utilities, Equipment Rental

Included here are excerpts from a letter sent to Multnomah County concerning anticipated construction costs at Rocky Butte Jail. Information in this letter served as the basis for our grant cost estimates.

STUART B. MOCKFORD
ARCHITECT, A.I.A.
723 Washington Street
Oregon City, Oregon 97045

Multnomah County, Oregon
Mr. David D. O'Brien
Justice Planner
Department of Justice Services
Rm 1730 Georgia-Pacific Building
Portland, Oregon 97204

19 June 1974

RE: Estimates for future
construction, Rocky Butte
Jail, Portland, Oregon

Dear Mr. O'Brien:

On 30th May, we met and I reviewed for you the completed and future remodeling projects at Rocky Butte Jail insofar as I know the situation.

You asked me to give you my opinion as to how much money Multnomah County should reasonably budget for various contemplated projects at Rocky Butte to commence not earlier than 1 July 1975.

First addressing the remodeling of "D-Dorm" along the lines of the now completed remodeling of "C-Dorm":

1. The "C-Dorm" Contract was let to E. Carl Schiewe, General Contractor, 11 January 1973, for \$182,480.78 including Change Orders. Furnishings made by Oregon Prison Industries, \$11,028.00. Architectural Fees (including Engineering Fees) \$21,285.00 for a total cost of \$214,793.78.
2. "C-Dorm" area was 118'-6" x 43'-2" or 5,115.6 sq.ft.
3. $\frac{\$214,793.78}{5,115.6 \text{ s.f.}} = \$41.99/ \text{ sq. ft. say } \42.00
4. There are two pertinent Federal Government Indexes that I consulted. (Both are based on 100 in 1967).
 - a. "Wholesale Cost of Building Materials", published by the Oregon Bureau of Labor, which in January, 1973, stood at 129.4.

ATTACHMENT 2 (continued)

BUDGET EXPLANATION (use if additional space needed)

- b. "Composite Cost Index of Building Construction", published by the Oregon Department of Commerce, which in January, 1973, stood at 144.
5. In the 16 months of record since January 1973, the WCBC-BoFL has increased from 129.4 to 156.8 or 27.4, or an average increase of 1.71 per month.
6. In the 16 months of record since January 1973, the CCIBC-DofC has increased from 144 to 160 or 16, or an average increase of 1.00 per month.
7. Considering that there are 31 months from January 1973 to July 1975, using the average monthly increases only, projected forward:
- a. Using WCBC-BoFL, $31 \times 1.71/\text{mo} = 53.01\%$ increase \times $\$42.00/\text{sq. ft.} = \$64.26/\text{sq. ft.}$ in July, 1975.
 $5,115.6 \text{ sq. ft.} \times \$64.26/\text{sq. ft.} = \underline{\$328,728.46}$.
- b. Using CCIBC-DofC, $31 \times 1.00/\text{mo.} = 31.00\%$ increase \times $\$42.00/\text{sq. ft.} = \$55.02/\text{sq. ft.}$ in July, 1975.
 $5,115.6 \text{ sq. ft.} \times \$55.02/\text{sq. ft.} = \underline{\$281,460.31}$.
8. I would take the higher figure and round it off at \$330,000.00 to complete "D-Dorm" in July 1975. Actually the curves are going up at an ever-increasing rate and if they continue at the rate of climb of the last three months until July, 1975, the amount indicated will be nowhere near adequate. The work will be so expensive, you will not be able to afford it. I wish my crystal ball would let me predict the situation more accurately.

Now looking at the ground floor, South Wing, and assuming a minimum of Security Hardware. Judging from recent work in this office, I would say today this could be altered throughout for around $\$28.00/\text{sq. ft.}$ Applying averages again for twelve months $12 \times 1.71 = 20.52/\text{sq. ft.}$ $\$28.00 \times 20.52\% = \$5.13 = \$33.75/\text{sq. ft.}$ $\$33.75/\text{sq. ft.} \times 5,115 \text{ sq. ft.} = \$172,631.25$. For the lower floor, South Wing, round it off at say \$175,000.00. This, of course, is subject to averages holding good and the curves not going through the sky.

f. Indirect Costs

This calculation was made pursuant to LEAA's formal approval in July, 1974, of an A-87 Plan for Multnomah County. According to that Plan, there are no "Indirect Costs" included in this grant request. All of the "Direct Costs" are capital improvements and serve as the basis for the Indirect Costs calculation. Although, normally, capital expenditures are to be exempted from the "Direct Costs" category, to be fair to all parties, we applied a 5% rate to those capital expenditures to arrive at an Indirect Cost figure.