2009 Innovations Awards Program
APPLICATION

CSG reserves the right to use or publish in other CSG products and services the information provided in this Innovations Awards Program Application. If your agency objects to this policy, please advise us in a separate attachment to your program’s application.

ID # (assigned by CSG): 09-W-21WA

Please provide the following information, adding space as necessary:

State: Washington

Assign Program Category: Natural Resources

1. Program Name: Sustainability Program
2. Administering Agency: Washington State Department of Corrections (DOC)
3. Contact Person: David Jansen, Director of Capital Programs
4. Address: 7345 Linderson Way SW, Tumwater WA 98501
5. Telephone Number: 360-725-8354
6. FAX Number: 360-586-8723
7. E-mail Address: dbjansen@doc1.wa.gov

9. Please provide a two-sentence description of the program.
   In 2003 DOC established sustainability goals that called for DOC to reduce its environmental impact and increase its sustainability through the application of specific numeric objectives and milestones. The DOC objectives range from reducing energy consumption to increasing the use of recycled materials.

10. How long has this program been operational (month and year)? Note: the program must be between 9 months and 5 years old on March 2, 2009 to be considered.
    The sustainability program has been operational since September 2003.

11. Why was the program created? What problem[s] or issue[s] was it designed to address?
    The sustainability program was created to reduce the impact that correctional operations and facilities have on the environment. The Department was entering a period of rapid expansion to address forecasts that projected a significant demand for additional beds. It was an opportune time to ensure that both new facilities and expansion at existing facilities would be as sustainable as possible. Utility and material costs were also escalating and there was an expectation that setting specific objectives could yield cost savings and cost avoidance if facilities and behaviors were modified on a specific schedule. The command and control of corrections also lent itself to a schedule-driven set of objectives. Finally there was some thought that the behavioral modification aspects of incarceration could benefit from a broad based inclusion of greater societal goals such as sustainability. The 2003 sustainability plan can be accessed at the following web site:

12. Describe the specific activities and operations of the program in chronological order.

The plan was issued in September of 2003. The initial focus has been on the prisons system that consumes most of the DOC fiscal resources. Each prison reports their progress in meeting the sustainability goals on a quarterly basis. This data is then compiled and presented in the annual report measuring progress meeting the goals identified in the 2003 plan. Prison leadership meet to exchange ideas since each prison has latitude in determining how to meet the objectives of the plan and a variety of different approaches have evolved over time.

Each biennium, specific physical improvements to prisons that can facilitate sustainability are also identified. These can include public works enhancements such as repair of leaking water system pipes. These improvements are incorporated in the 10-year capital plan for the facilities and in capital budget requests as schedules and budgets allow.

13. Why is the program a new and creative approach or method?

The new and creative aspect of this program derives from setting specific numerical targets for common sustainability measures, but allowing latitude to accomplishing the targets. Prison management is held accountable to these measures.

This was also first DOC effort to construct LEED facilities. These accomplishments include:

- The first LEED Gold building owned by the State of Washington
- The first LEED Gold building in any prison system in the United States
- The first LEED Silver building used to confine inmates in the United States

Information on the latest prison expansion is posted at:

14. What were the program’s start-up costs? (Provide details about specific purchases for this program, staffing needs and other financial expenditures, as well as existing materials, technology and staff already in place.)

The startup costs on this project were relatively minimal. A committee was formed to establish the original plan and the goals contained within that plan. Subsequent expenditures have typically used systems that are already in place. Building information is consolidated in a spreadsheet that measures progress in meeting the various objectives. The work does involve the establishment of a one person sustainability office that is primarily responsible for collating the data, evaluating trends and ensuring that ideas and resources are shared between facilities.

The facilities share five environmental staff located at the major prisons that are available to travel when specialty problems arise at other facilities or to assist the facilities that do not have full time assigned staff. The environmental staff members spend approximately 10-percent of their time on the sustainability program. The remainder of their time is spent on environmental compliance issue specific to permitting, reporting requirements and other day-to-day operations that are overseen by jurisdictional regulatory agencies. So the relative net contribution of these individuals statewide to the sustainability implementation is approximately 0.5 of an FTE.

15. What are the program’s annual operational costs?

The total annual cost is estimated at $130,000 per year.
16. How is the program funded?
The program is considered part of the DOC operational costs and is integrated into funded programs such as regulatory compliance, maintenance, and capital projects.

17. Did this program require the passage of legislation, executive order or regulations? If YES, please indicate the citation number.
The 2003 plan did not require legislation, executive order or regulations; however there have been a series of executive orders (referenced in the 2008 sustainability report) plus legislation that now mandate similar requirements. By initiating this plan early DOC has been able to meet the requirements of these various executive orders and pieces of legislation without significant additional adaptations.

18. What equipment, technology and software are used to operate and administer this program? The DOC billing systems, regulatory compliance systems, and spreadsheets are used to operate and administer this program.

19. To the best of your knowledge, did this program originate in your state? If YES, please indicate the innovator’s name, present address, telephone number and e-mail address. This was a collaborative agency effort; no specific individual can be identified as the innovator.

20. Are you aware of similar programs in other states? If YES, which ones and how does this program differ?
We are not aware of any similar program elsewhere in the United States. Other correctional agencies around the United States have pursued similar sustainability objectives; however we are not aware of any comparably comprehensive plan with specific goals.

21. Has the program been fully implemented? If NO, what actions remain to be taken?
The 2003 plan set objectives and milestones for 2004, 2009, 2014, and 2029. Some of the facilities have already met the 2009 goals for some objectives. However other facilities are still working to accomplish the 2009 goals and all facilities are still working toward accomplishing the 2029 goals.

22. Briefly evaluate (pro and con) the program’s effectiveness in addressing the defined problem[s] or issue[s]. Provide tangible examples.

Pros:
Waste Stream Reductions:
The program has been highly effective in reducing the waste streams generated by prisons. The data in the below summary shows the most significant improvements have occurred in the solid waste streams.

**Sustainability Highlights - Facility Successes**
(All on a per offender basis with the baseline of FY04, except energy, with a baseline of FY03, and additional per square foot basis)

**Reductions in Energy Consumption per square foot:**
Ahtanum View Corrections Center 13.8%
Coyote Ridge Corrections Center 30.2%
Larch Corrections Center 21.4%
McNeil Island Corrections Center 13.2%
Pine Lodge Corrections Center for Women 4.8%
Washington Corrections Center 3.4%
Washington Corrections Center for Women 12.1%

**Reduction in Energy use per offender:**
Ahtanum View Corrections Center 14.1%
Larch Corrections Center 20.4%
McNeil Island Corrections Center 20.4%
Pine Lodge Corrections Center for Women 3.3%
Washington Corrections Center for Women 9.6%

**Reduced Waste Water Discharge:**
Airway Heights Corrections Center 4.16%
Ahtanum View Corrections Center 49.75%
Larch Corrections Center 5.61%
McNeil Island Corrections Center 57.14%
Olympic Corrections Center 8.20%
Washington Corrections Center 1.62%
Washington State Penitentiary 0.81%

**Reduced Potable Water Use:**
Ahtanum View Corrections Center 58.40%
Coyote Ridge Corrections Center 32.16%
McNeil Island Corrections Center 25.19%
Washington Corrections Center 10.56%
Washington Corrections Center for Women 22.59%
Washington State Penitentiary 23.36%

**Solid Waste Reduction:**
Airway Heights Corrections Center 22.09%
Ahtanum View Corrections Center 12.00%
Clallam Bay Corrections Center 49.87%
Cedar Creek Corrections Center 12.94%
Coyote Ridge Corrections Center 24.20%
Larch Corrections Center 52.02%
Monroe Correctional Complex 2.31%
McNeil Island Corrections Center 22.00%
Pine Lodge Corrections Center for Women 50.37%
Stafford Creek Corrections Center 12.17%
Washington Corrections Center 9.93%
Washington State Penitentiary 38.17%

**Paper Use Reductions from Baseline:**
Airway Heights Corrections Center 2%
Ahtanum View Corrections Center 8%
Cedar Creek Corrections Center 17%
Washington Corrections Center 20%
Vehicle fuel use reduced:
- Clallam Bay Corrections Center: 16.5%
- Cedar Creek Corrections Center: 36.3%
- Coyote Ridge Corrections Center: 42.5%
- Larch Corrections Center: 23.5%
- Monroe Correctional Complex: 14.6%
- McNeil Island Corrections Center: 18.4%
- Pine Lodge Corrections Center for Women: 9.6%
- Washington Corrections Center: 20.5%
- Washington Corrections Center for Women: 33.8%
- Washington State Penitentiary: 6.1%

The full report is available at:

Acceptance:
The program has raised the staff level acceptance of newer green features such as those incorporated in the LEED buildings.

Imagination and new ideas:
The program and the publicity surrounding it, has led to new initiatives from staff. One individual noted that Nike was beginning a sneaker recycling program. All of the prisons are now working to recycle used sneakers using existing transportation systems between the prisons. Staff members have also sought out new opportunities, some of which have lead to cost savings (see the article below).

Employee Suggestion Adopted at WCC

By Debra Dobson, WCC Public Information Officer

The Washington Corrections Center Transportation Crew 3 consisting of Sergeant Jerry Hatcher, Officer Dana Carroll and Officer Jim Harvey was recently recognized by the State Productivity Board for their suggestion to recycle used undergarments and towels from offenders discharging from other DOC facilities.

DOC currently classifies used underwear and towels as rags which are either destroyed or donated. The WCC Reception Center spends money to restock their laundry in order to keep up with an in-transit population that destroys the clothing.

WCC Transportation Crew 3 noticed “donate rags” bags at several major institutions. The bags contained used undergarments which were still in serviceable condition. When they were informed that undergarments and towels were not recycled, the Crew requested that the used undergarments be placed on the bus and returned to WCC for reuse. The Laundry Manager at WCC estimates that a savings of $600,000 per year can be gained by removing and re-issuing the usable undergarments.
The Evergreen State College has been working with DOC to add sustainability programs and education to various prisons. The full story of their work can be accessed at: http://acdrupal.evergreen.edu/greenprisons/. Their work is funded in part by a 2008 grant from DOC; however this is not a core cost of the original 2003 sustainability plan.

The Correctional Industries (CI) programs at DOC have been able to respond to a growing customer demand for green products provided in a sustainable manner. Examples include:

- Panel fabrics, chair fabrics, and upholstery items consist of 100% recycled polyester reclaimed from plastic bottles.

- Foam utilized in seating products is without chlorofluorocarbons.

- The extruded aluminum window/open frame component of the systems furniture products has a recycled content of 25% with 10% being post-consumer recycled content.

- Desktops and other components consisting of wood fiber substrate materials are 100% recycled industrial by-products from milling operations practicing sustainable forest management best practices. Desktop cores also comply with NAUF and NAUF - plus standards. NAUF = No Added Urea Formaldehyde.

- Effective in December 2008 CI began using captured recycled paint to replace the standard black powder coat used on the interior bodies, folder bars, and divider plates of all filing and storage cabinet products. The new color is called Eco-Graphite, and is dotted with tiny flecks of other colors. This has eliminated an estimated 2,400 lbs of paint waste per year.

CI has also developed educational programs with other agencies and the private sector. Through such a partnership effort, the Washington State Department of General Administration, the Boeing Company, and CI received the Outstanding Program Award from the National Association of State Chief Administrators for its Green Cleaning Partnership. This unique partnership was developed to promote and educate 277 cleaning organizations and facility managers in best practices and sustainable approaches to cleaning.

Cons:
The impact of a changing climate:
The program has required more sophisticated data analysis than originally anticipated. For example, the impact of climate change in selecting a baseline year was not well understood. Now several years downstream of the base year, it appears like the baseline year of 2004 was a mild year from a climate perspective. We are currently evaluating introducing a climate/weather correction factor to fairly assess progress in reducing energy consumption.

Other Initiatives:
DOC went through the American Correctional Association certification program in 2006/2007. This program required a general cleanout of prisons which resulted in a spike in the quantity of materials that had to be disposed of as hazardous waste. This created anomalous results; however, this should result in a long term drop in those materials in future years, so ultimately these cleanouts will be beneficial in achieving the objectives of the plan.
Overlaps in objectives:
As some objectives are achieved, other objectives may be impacted. For example, reducing paper use can also reduce the amount of recycled materials since there is now less waste available for recycling.

23. How has the program grown and/or changed since its inception?
The program has grown to encompass all 15 prisons. Sustainability is also a core part of the DOC mission statement. The next phase of growth will add the Community Corrections Division programs. The program has also evolved into a major source of pride for DOC. As noted in the 2008 progress report, one news report generated questions from around the world on the agency sustainability program.

24. What limitations or obstacles might other states expect to encounter if they attempt to adopt this program?
The program can be challenging to implement with older facilities. For example, a significant leak from a water supply pipe can obscure progress in water reductions. The inability to address the larger problems can discourage addressing the smaller opportunities.

A community infrastructure may be needed to support the effort. Most of our host communities have recycling programs in place that we can work with in pursuing our goals. One illustrative example is the Nike sneaker recycling program. The Nike recycling center is in Wilsonville Oregon; a location within reasonable driving distance of our central collection point at Washington Corrections Center in Shelton, Washington.

Expectations need to be managed. Hoped for cost reductions in utility costs may not occur if use reductions are overtaken by rate increases. Major prison population changes can also impact measures that are conducted on a per-offender basis.
2009 Innovations Awards Program
Program Categories and Subcategories

Use these as guidelines to determine the appropriate Program Category for your state’s submission and list that program category on page one of this application. Choose only one.

**Infrastructure and Economic Development**
- Business/Commerce
- Economic Development
- Transportation

**Government Operations**
- Administration
- Elections
- Public Information
- Revenue

**Health & Human Services**
- Aging
- Children & Families
- Health Services
- Housing
- Human Services

**Human Resources/Education**
- Education
- Labor
- Management
- Personnel
- Training and Development
- Workforce Development

**Natural Resources**
- Agriculture
- Energy
- Environment
- Environmental Protection
- Natural Resources
- Parks & Recreation
- Water Resources

**Public Safety/Corrections**
- Corrections
- Courts
- Criminal Justice
- Drugs
- Emergency Management
- Public Safety

Save in .doc or rtf. Return completed application electronically to innovations@csg.org or mail to:

CSG Innovations Awards 2009
The Council of State Governments
2760 Research Park Drive, P.O. Box 11910
Lexington, KY 40578-1910

Contact:
Nancy J. Vickers, National Program Administrator
Phone: 859.244.8105
Fax: 859.244.8001 – Attn: Innovations Awards Program
The Council of State Governments
E-mail: nvickers@csg.org

This application is also available at www.csg.org, in the Programs section.

**Deadline: March 23, 2009**