

Angela Hubbard

From: Perry Huston
Sent: Friday, January 08, 2016 2:27 PM
To: Christopher Culp; Henry Rawson; Dennis Rabidou; mustang@communitynet.org
Cc: * County Commissioners; Lalena Johns; Tanya Craig; Albert Lin
Subject: RE: Martin Hall

Judge Culp,

In terms of your first observation I can only say the BOCC set the 13th as the beginning of their discussion as it was a free spot on their calendar. Since part of the discussion at this point is to arrive at the best way to conduct the discussion I will convey the scheduling conflict to them and will do what I can to find a better time slot.

I have not been involved in the past discussions regarding Martin Hall so can't speak to the depth of the discussion or how the decision was made to not go out of county. In terms of this board the discussions that I have been part of concluded with the decision to put off the discussion to a later time. 2016 is the new year and the BOCC has said they want to engage in an effective discussion and make an informed decision.

To my knowledge the catalyst for the Martin Hall discussion is their request and the Commissioner's concerns with the condition of our physical plant. I will let the Commissioners correct me if I am wrong on this point.

I will suggest the Commissioners consult with counsel regarding what would be a legal contract term in the event they decide to contract for services.

One of the objectives of the discussion the Commissioners have now initiated is to determine the "specific factors" to be weighed to arrive at an informed decision. You will note in my memorandum I have suggested several considerations that I believe must be included in any analysis if it is to go beyond simple dollars. My memorandum does not end that discussion but only begins it. The Deputy Prosecutor charged with Juvenile matters has already offered additional insight which I find quite valuable. As the discussion moves ahead the objectives that must be realized to achieve the "best service and accountability" will be enumerated and the unit(s) of measurement to be employed will be identified.

As the person charged at this point with facilitating the process I appreciate your observations and will use them to the best of my ability to keep the discussion thorough and productive.

I am building a file to record the progress of the discussion and final decision that is made. Your email will become part of the record.

I look forward to working with you on this matter.

Perry D. Huston, Director

From: Christopher Culp
Sent: Friday, January 08, 2016 10:53 AM
To: Perry Huston; Henry Rawson; Dennis Rabidou; mustang@communitynet.org
Cc: Christopher Culp
Subject: RE: Martin Hall

Perry:

For over 30 years, Okanogan County has conducted juvenile court every Wednesday afternoon and criminal jury trials the first two weeks of each month. I tell you this because your setting the Martin Hall discussion with one week notice on Wednesday, January 13, effectively prevents Judge Rawson and/or I from attending unless we choose to hire pro tem judges to take our places. This would cost well in excess of \$1,500 to county taxpayers and use 6% of our pro tem line item. The point is that it appears once again the county is attempting to avoid judicial participation in this critical discussion.

Regardless of the above concern, I'm sending this email (and asking that it be made part of the record) to ask these questions.

First, to my recollection the matter of Martin Hall and detention has been discussed by this and previous BOCC at least 3, maybe 4, times in the last several years. At least twice, and maybe three times, a decision was made NOT to transport to Martin Hall. So my question is this: What is different now in 2016 that warrants this matter again being discussed?

Second, for purposes of understanding why this is now being discussed again, is this matter being addressed because of Martin Hall's request that Okanogan County consider them as an alternative? Or are there entities or groups within Okanogan County that have requested the BOCC look at Martin Hall? If so, who are they?

Third, this BOCC has long maintained the position that it cannot contract for any sort of services for more than a one-year period. If the decision is made to go to Martin Hall, will it be for more than one year? If so, what is the authority for that in light of the claimed lack of authority in other services-related matters? How would it be any different?

Fourth, in your email below, you state the BOCC's goal is to make a decision that provides the best service and accountability to the citizens of Okanogan County. So that there is complete transparency, please enumerate the specific factors to be considered in determining what constitutes "best services and accountability". What are the objective measures to be used and what are the qualitative considerations?

I am specifically not asking that the 13th be moved since a number of others have already made plans to attend and I don't want their time wasted. However, please consider schedules for future meetings that allow for maximum participation by all of the stakeholders. To do otherwise will preclude their interests from being considered.

Judge Culp

PS Mustang in the address line above is Dave Edwards, the Court's Commissioner. I've included him for institutional memory purposes.

From: Perry Huston
Sent: Wednesday, January 06, 2016 7:35 AM
To: Christopher Culp; Henry Rawson; Dennis Rabidou
Cc: * County Commissioners; Lalena Johns; Tanya Craig; Albert Lin
Subject: Martin Hall

Good morning!

The BOCC has decided to move forward with the discussion of in-county versus out-of-county juvenile detention. They have scheduled their first discussion for Wednesday January 13, 2016 at 2:30 p.m. in the commissioners auditorium.

As you know the BOCC initiated a discussion some time ago but in the end decided to postpone the discussion and ultimate decision making to 2016. The BOCC is the earliest stages of the discussion.

The attachment is a memorandum I prepared late last year. The purpose of the memorandum was to offer the BOCC a beginning to the discussion of the framework within which the BOCC would make their comparison of the two options. The memorandum served to identify several items to consider with the goal of avoiding unintended

consequences from any decision they make. The memorandum is not an exhaustive analysis or even a complete list of issues but it serves as a starting point in the conversation.

The BOCC believes your involvement in framing the future discussion is important. Their goal is to make an informed decision that provides the best service and accountability to the citizens of Okanogan County. Please let the BOCC know the most convenient manner in which to schedule the discussions and who in addition to yourselves, if anybody, you wish to designate to receive notices and other materials as they are generated.

I look forward to working with you on this issue. Let me know if you have questions.

Perry