



Drug Policy
Alliance Network

Reason.
Compassion.
Justice.

Expert Recommendations in Prop. 5

Proposition 5, the Nonviolent Offender Rehabilitation Act (NORA), is directly derived from recommendations and research findings by numerous criminal justice and treatment experts, blue-ribbon commissions, academic researchers, and policy makers. A list of the recommendations incorporated into Prop. 5, categorized by policy area, follows.

Treatment

- ✓ Ensure adequate funding for treatment diversion.
- ✓ Get offenders into treatment as quickly as possible.
- ✓ Create tiered treatment tracks with varying levels of supervision and treatment.
- ✓ Base treatment placement on clinical assessments conducted by trained professionals using standardized tools.
- ✓ Seal records for rehabilitated low-level offenders to increase employment and reintegration prospects.
- ✓ Encourage behavioral modification with a system of graduated sanctions and rewards; use severe sanctions such as incarceration only after all other avenues have been exhausted.
- ✓ Expand access to medically assisted treatment.
- ✓ Institutionalize understanding, leadership and oversight of substance abuse issues.
- ✓ Collect and analyze data to measure program efficacy.

Prison reform

- ✓ Provide evidence-based in-prison rehabilitation programming to reduce recidivism.

Parole reform

- ✓ Reduce or eliminate parole for nonviolent offenders.
- ✓ Use community based sanctions and treatment in response to parole violations rather than returning parolees to prison.
- ✓ Expand the availability of community based rehabilitation programming for parolees.
- ✓ Reallocate resources toward monitoring high-risk parolees.

TREATMENT

Treatment Funding

What experts say: Ensure adequate funding for treatment diversion.

- Every dollar spent on Proposition 36, the treatment instead of incarceration initiative passed in 2000 and expanded by Prop. 5, returns \$2.50 in benefits to taxpayers. Funding should be expanded from its current level of \$120 million to \$228 million (University of California at Los Angeles, Integrated Substance Abuse Programs).¹
- “[Cuts in Prop. 36 funding] could ultimately cost the state more than it would save.” (California Legislative Analyst’s Office)²

What Prop. 5 does: Provides increased and permanent funding for treatment diversion. Prop. 5 provides \$150 million for implementation in the first 6 months as well as \$385 million annually for adult treatment diversion. Funding is adjusted periodically for inflation and population growth and is not subject to legislative budget cuts (§36).

Treatment admission

What experts say: Get offenders into treatment as quickly as possible.

- Research suggests that offenders on waiting lists are less likely to enter treatment. The slow journey from the courthouse to treatment is a key reason for high no-show rates (Little Hoover Commission).³
- Collaboration and coordination among court, probation, parole, and drug treatment systems should continue to be improved with the goal of admitting offenders into appropriate treatment in the shortest possible time (University of California at Los Angeles, Integrated Substance Abuse Programs).⁴
- The State should encourage counties to prioritize lowering the number of clients that fail to show up for treatment by collecting and publishing data on such failures (Little Hoover Commission).⁵

What Prop. 5 does: Expedites assessments and holds counties and offenders accountable for ensuring that offenders promptly report for treatment. In order to engage offenders immediately, Prop. 5 allows for assessments prior to charging or a determination of eligibility (§12). Prop. 5 requires defendants to report to treatment within 30 days of being ordered; if they do not, a hearing is held to determine the reason for the delay. If the defendant is responsible, graduated sanctions may be imposed; if the county is responsible, they must document their failure and include it in an annual report submitted to the Oversight Commission.

Treatment levels

What experts say: Create tiered treatment tracks with varying levels of supervision and treatment.

- “The State should work with the judiciary to develop guidelines for best practices for diversion, Proposition 36 and felony drug court programs, including models for screening and assessment, treatment practices and supervision practices, as well as guidelines for moving offenders from program to program, based on their success or failure.” (Little Hoover Commission)⁶
- Offenders with multiple prior convictions should be placed in more controlled treatment settings, such as residential facilities. Heavy drug use warrants increased supervision and involvement from drug court personnel (University of California at Los Angeles, Integrated Substance Abuse Programs).⁷

What Prop. 5 does: Creates a three treatment track continuum of care.

Based on current offense and criminal history, the court assigns offenders to one of three treatment tracks. Offenders that are unsuccessful in lower tracks can be moved to higher tracks which offer increasing levels of supervision and sanctions. Those with a long history of failure in drug treatment will be placed in Track III where they are subject to the highest level of supervision and sanctions (§§ 14, 17, 18).

Treatment placement

What the experts say: Base treatment placement on clinical assessments conducted by trained professionals using standardized tools.

- “The time has come to move to a systemic model which includes: valid, reliable and timely risk-and-needs triaging of drug offenders at the point of arrest; ensuring the assessment results are available in real time for disposition; [and] targeting of individuals into appropriate and cost-efficient programs.” (Dr. Doug Marlowe)⁸
- Risk-and-needs assessment tools before sentencing are fundamental to determining appropriate treatment and supervision needs of individual offenders (The Little Hoover Commission).⁹

What Prop. 5 does: Requires that courts order defendants to appear for clinical assessments and criminal history evaluations and thereafter order defendants attend and complete an appropriate treatment program (§14.i).

Assessments may occur prior to charging or a determination of eligibility (§12); they must be performed by a qualified health care professional or drug treatment professional certified by the state Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs using a standardized tool to determine an individual’s social and educational history, drug use history, addiction severity and other factors indicating the individual’s needs and the appropriate course of drug treatment (§11.g).

Criminal Records

***What the experts say:* Seal records for rehabilitated low-level offenders to increase employment and reintegration prospects.**

- Demonstrated rehabilitation after low-level offenses warrants a sealed criminal record. This accelerates reintegration by providing more employment opportunities (Dr. Joan Petersilia).¹⁰

***What Prop. 5 does:* Seals court records for qualified arrests.** Courts seal all records concerning arrest and detention while defendants are in, or on a waiting list for, a treatment program (§14.h); records remain sealed upon successful program completion (§14.p).

Sanctions and rewards

***What experts say:* Encourage behavioral modification with a system of graduated sanctions and rewards; use severe sanctions such as incarceration only after all other avenues have been exhausted.**

- “Community supervision should be based on the recognition that relapses are unavoidable and not necessarily indicative of failure.” (National Center for Substance Abuse Treatment)¹¹
- Counties should motivate offenders to finish their treatment through the use of rewards as well as a system of escalating sanctions (The Little Hoover Commission).¹²
- “The best available research evidence indicates that jail sanctions can be effective in improving outcomes when they are imposed quickly after an infraction has occurred, are brief in duration, do not interfere with the treatment process, and *are imposed after lesser sanctions have failed to improve conduct.*” (National Association of Drug Court Professionals)¹³
- Jail sanctions should incrementally increase with multiple violations (University of California at Los Angeles, Integrated Substance Abuse Programs).¹⁴

***What Prop. 5 does:* Instructs judges to rely on a system of rewards and graduated sanctions (§14.o) and to use jail sentences only after other options have failed (§17.j.3.C.a.2).** Sanctions are graduated in that they begin with a minimal negative consequence and become more onerous with additional misbehavior, violations or relapses. Examples may include, but not be limited to, requiring additional visits to treatment, increased frequency of drug testing, attendance at a greater number of court sessions or community service (§11.l). Judges are instructed to use jail sanctions only after other sanctions have failed and after carefully considering all the circumstances of the case including the opinion of the defendant’s treatment provider (§11.m). Jail sentences are graduated ranging from no more than two, five, or ten days for the first, second,

and all subsequent violations, respectively. Jail sanctions never indicate an end to treatment.

Medically assisted treatment

What experts say: Expand access to medically assisted treatment.

- The best options for each patient need to be available locally including narcotic replacement therapy. Prescribing methadone should be the first line of attack with opiate addiction (University of California at Los Angeles, Integrated Substance Abuse Programs).¹⁵

What Prop. 5 does: Requires courts to refer defendants to any medication-based treatment recommended by clinical experts (§13.a.2).

Substance abuse advisory council

What the experts say: Institutionalize understanding, leadership and oversight of substance abuse issues.

- Create a policy council to provide a more cohesive, cost-effective statewide substance abuse policy, oversee data collection, and increase system collaboration (Little Hoover Commission).¹⁶

What Prop. 5 does: Creates a treatment oversight commission to oversee policies and programs pertaining to adult treatment diversion and youth programs and data collection and research (§38).

Data collection

What experts say: Collect and analyze data to measure program efficacy.

- “The use of administrative databases has proven essential and productive in evaluating [Prop. 36] and other statewide policies. A concerted, collaborative effort should be made to streamline access to, and use of, centralized state data for authorized policy and evaluation studies.” (University of California at Los Angeles, Integrated Substance Abuse Programs)¹⁷
- The State should require all departments that deal with substance abuse issues to collect standardized data and submit annual substance abuse reports (Little Hoover Commission).¹⁸

What Prop. 5 does: Creates independent oversight commissions to collect, analyze and publish data annually. Prop. 5 creates a division of CDCR responsible for statewide data collection, analysis and assessment of the efficacy of all rehabilitation and treatment programs within the Department to be overseen by the newly created, independent, Parole Reform Oversight and Accountability Board, and an independent oversight commission, the Treatment Diversion

Oversight and Accountability Commission, to serve as a central clearinghouse for all adult diversion and youth program related data (§6.c). Prop. 5 requires that numerous data and reports are made publicly available on an annual basis.

PRISON REFORM

In-prison rehabilitation

What experts say: Provide evidence-based in-prison rehabilitation programming to reduce recidivism.

- Select and deliver a core set of in-prison programs for offenders that cover major offender areas. These include: academic, vocational and financial; alcohol and drugs; anger management; criminal thinking; family; and sex offenses (CDCR Expert Panel on Adult Offender Reentry and Recidivism Reduction).¹⁹
- Expand programs and create incentives such as credits toward early release (Little Hoover Commission).²⁰
- “To better prepare inmates for release, the panel recommends providing inmates with much greater access to in-prison education, vocational classes, life-skills training, re-entry services, and drug treatment. Those efforts should be guided by a research-based needs and risk assessment of each inmate upon entry into prison and should include a programming plan designed specifically to address the inmate’s identified needs.” (Corrections Independent Review Panel)²¹
- Prioritize the delivery of programs that will help address inmates’ profound and widespread problems with substance abuse, inadequate education, and lack of job skills (Dr. Joan Petersilia, Professor of Criminology, Law & Society, UC Irvine; Special Advisor to Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger, 2003-2007).²²
- Effective in-prison substance abuse treatment and aftercare may represent one of the state’s best hopes of reducing criminal behavior, decreasing recidivism, helping relieve the state’s prison overcrowding crisis, and lessening the cost to society of criminal activity related to drug use and addiction (California Inspector General).²³
- In-prison drug treatment programs lower the likelihood of recidivism (Dr. Steven Aos et al.).²⁴

What Prop. 5 does: Makes in-prison rehabilitation a priority by re-organizing CDCR and making re-entry/rehabilitation programming available to all inmates. Prop. 5 integrates the rehabilitative focus for inmates and parolees through the creation of a new Secretary of Rehabilitation and Parole position in the CDCR (§4.a) and new Deputy Wardens of Rehabilitation at each state prison (§29.a). Prop. 5 seeks to implement programs wherever they are needed to prevent future crime (§3.d) creates incentives for all non-violent offenders to participate (§19.b), instructs the Department to base program

admission on a needs assessment, and mandates that all inmates receive re-entry/rehabilitation program for not less than 90 days prior to release (§20.c.1).

PAROLE REFORM

Parole for nonviolent offenders

What the experts say: Reduce or eliminate parole for nonviolent offenders.

- End or dramatically reduce the imposition of parole on those who are least likely to reoffend (Dr. Joan Petersilia).²⁵
- Waive post-release supervision for certain low risk offenders with no history of violence (Little Hoover Commission).²⁶
- Waive post-release supervision for low risk, nonviolent, non-sex offenders (CDCR Expert Panel).²⁷
- Discharge parolees who are determined to be very low risk from parole three months after they are released from prison (Corrections Independent Review Panel).²⁸
- Eliminate active parole supervision (“summary parole”) for nonviolent and low-risk offenders (Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger).²⁹
- Eliminate parole (“direct discharge”) for offenders never convicted of serious, violent, or sex offenses; offering earned early release after five months of clean time for those with prior, but not current, convictions for serious or violent crimes; earned early release after 16 months clean time for violent and serious offenders (Senate Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review).³⁰

What Prop. 5 does: Restructures parole terms to match offenses. Nonviolent offenders – who have already served their full sentences – will serve one year on parole with the opportunity to earn their way down to six months through good behavior and completion of rehabilitative programming (§20.a).

Parole violations

What the experts say: Use community based sanctions and treatment in response to parole violations rather than returning parolees to prison.

- “We recommend that California enact legislation that restricts the use of total confinement (e.g., prison) for technical parole violations to only those violations that are: (a) new felony convictions or (b) technical parole violations that are directly related to the offender’s criminal behavior patterns, specific dynamic risk factors, and that also threaten public safety. All other parole violations should result in intermediate, community-based sanctions other than prison.” (CDCR Expert Panel)³¹
- The use of technical violations threatens public safety and the State should move away from the catch-and-release approach and inmate churning to the greatest extent possible (Dr. Joan Petersilia).³²

- The State should reallocate resources to establish a continuum of alternatives to prison for offenders who violate the terms of post-release supervision, including drug treatment, jail time and other community based sanctions (Little Hoover Commission).³³
- The panel recommends residential treatment as an alternative sanction for technical parole violations (Corrections Independent Review Panel).³⁴

What Prop. 5 does: Provides community based sanctions, including jail, and rehabilitation programming for parolees who commit minor technical violations (§21.c) and misdemeanors (§21.d). Parolees committing felonies would still be subject to return to prison (§21.e).

Treatment for parolees

What the experts say: Expand the availability of community based rehabilitation programming for parolees.

- Select and deliver a core set of community based programs for parolees that cover major offender areas. These include: academic, vocational and financial; alcohol and drugs; anger management; criminal thinking; family; and sex offenses (CDCR Expert Panel on Adult Offender Reentry and Recidivism Reduction).³⁵
- Increase the availability of community based drug treatment and vocational and educational programming for parolees by increasing funding.³⁶

What Prop. 5 does: Provides a continuum of community based rehabilitative services for parolees. Services including, but not limited to, drug treatment programs, mental health services, alcohol abuse treatment, reentry services, cognitive skills development, housing assistance, education, literacy training, life skills, job skills, vocational training, victim impact awareness, restorative justice programs, anger management, family and relationship counseling, and provision of information involving publicly funded health, social security and other benefits (§20.b.3) are made available free of charge for all parolees for the entire duration of their parole term and for up to one year thereafter (§20.d).

Allocating parole resources

What the experts say: Reallocate resources toward monitoring high-risk parolees.

- “Employ parole supervision selectively and in a more concentrated way, so that it targets the most likely re-offenders.” (Dr. Joan Petersilia)³⁷
- Reallocating resources away from low-risk and towards high-risk parolees lowers recidivism across the board (Washington State Public Policy Institute).³⁸

What Prop. 5 does: Reallocates resources toward monitoring high-risk parolees.

Prop. 5 extends parole terms for serious and violent parolees (§20.c.3.C.4) and seeks to reduce overall parole caseloads so that parole officers can focus their efforts on these high-risk individuals (§2.II.k).

¹ University of California Los Angeles, Integrated Substance Abuse Programs, *Evaluation of the Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act 2001-2006, Final Report*, p. 117 recommendation 3.1, available at: <http://www.uclaisap.org/Prop36/documents/SACPAEvaluationReport.pdf>.

² The Legislative Analyst's Office, in its analysis of the 2007-8 budget bill, recommended that the budget be increased \$60 million over the Governor's proposed funding level. (Available at [http://www.lao.ca.gov/analysis_2007/health_ss/hss_03_4200_anl07.aspx#Alcohol%20and%20Drug%20Programs%20\(4200\)](http://www.lao.ca.gov/analysis_2007/health_ss/hss_03_4200_anl07.aspx#Alcohol%20and%20Drug%20Programs%20(4200))).

³ Little Hoover Commission, *Solving California's Corrections Crisis: Time is Running Out*, January 2007, available at: <http://www.lhc.ca.gov/lhcdir/185/Report185.pdf>.

⁴ University of California Los Angeles, Integrated Substance Abuse Programs, *Evaluation of the Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act 2001-2006, Final Report*, p. 117 recommendation 3.3, available at: <http://www.uclaisap.org/Prop36/documents/SACPAEvaluationReport>.

⁵ Little Hoover Commission, *Solving California's Corrections Crisis: Time is Running Out*, January 2007, p. 98, available at: <http://www.lhc.ca.gov/lhcdir/185/Report185.pdf>.

⁶ Little Hoover Commission *Addressing Addiction: Improving and Integrating California's Substance Abuse Treatment System*, March 27, 2008. p. 85, available at: <http://www.lhc.ca.gov/lhcdir/190/Report190.pdf>.

⁷ University of California Los Angeles, Integrated Substance Abuse Programs, *Evaluation of the Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act 2001-2006, Final Report*, Recommendation 2.1 & 2.2, pp. 116-117, available at: <http://www.uclaisap.org/Prop36/documents/SACPAEvaluationReport>.

⁸ "Testimony of Douglas B. Marlowe, J.D., Ph.D. before the Little Hoover Commission," August 27, 2007, pp. 10-11, available at http://www.lhc.ca.gov/lhcdir/AOD_Review/MarloweAug07.pdf.

⁹ Little Hoover Commission, *Addressing Addiction: Improving and Integrating California's Substance Abuse Treatment System*, March 27, 2008. p. 82, available at: <http://www.lhc.ca.gov/lhcdir/190/Report190.pdf>.

¹⁰ Joan Petersilia, *When Prisoners Come Home: Parole and Prisoner Reentry*, 2003, p. 216.

¹¹ Center for Substance Abuse Treatment. *Substance Abuse Treatment for Adults in the Criminal Justice System*. Treatment Improvement Protocol (TIP) Series 44. DHHS Publication No. (SMA) 05-4056. Rockville, MD: Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, 2005, available at: <http://download.ncadi.samhsa.gov/Prevlinedocs/bkd526.pdf>.

¹² Little Hoover Commission, *Addressing Addiction: Improving and Integrating California's Substance Abuse Treatment System*, March 27, 2008. p. iv, available at: <http://www.lhc.ca.gov/lhcdir/190/Report190.pdf>.

¹³ National Association of Drug Court Professionals (NADCP), *Principles of Evidence-Based Sentencing and Other Court Dispositions for Substance Abusing Individuals* (no date), p. 4.

¹⁴ University of California Los Angeles, Integrated Substance Abuse Programs, *Evaluation of the Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act 2001-2006, Final Report*, Recommendation 3.5, available at: <http://www.uclaisap.org/Prop36/documents/SACPAEvaluationReport>.

¹⁵ University of California Los Angeles, Integrated Substance Abuse Programs, *Evaluation of the Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act 2001-2006, Final Report*, Recommendations 3.2 & 5.3, pp. 137-138, available at: <http://www.uclaisap.org/Prop36/documents/SACPAEvaluationReport>.

-
- ¹⁶ Little Hoover Commission, *Addressing Addiction: Improving and Integrating California's Substance Abuse Treatment System*, March 27, 2008. p. vii, available at: <http://www.lhc.ca.gov/lhcdir/190/Report190.pdf>.
- ¹⁷ University of California Los Angeles, Integrated Substance Abuse Programs, *Evaluation of the Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act 2001-2006, Final Report*, p. 118, available at: <http://www.uclaisap.org/Prop36/documents/SACPAEvaluationReport>.
- ¹⁸ Little Hoover Commission, *Addressing Addiction: Improving and Integrating California's Substance Abuse Treatment System*, March 27, 2008. p. vii, available at: <http://www.lhc.ca.gov/lhcdir/190/Report190.pdf>.
- ¹⁹ California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, Expert Panel on Adult Offender Reentry and Recidivism Reduction Programs, *Report to the California State Legislature: A Roadmap for Effective Offender Programming in California*, 2007. p. 29, available at: http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/News/docs/Expert_Rpt/ExpertPanelRpt_.pdf.
- ²⁰ Little Hoover Commission, *Solving California's Corrections Crisis: Time is Running Out*, January 2007, available at: <http://www.lhc.ca.gov/lhcdir/185/Report185.pdf>.
- ²¹ Corrections Independent Review Panel (aka the Deukmejian Commission), *Reforming Corrections: Report of the Independent Review Panel*, 2004. p. 122, available at: http://cpr.ca.gov/Review_Panel/.
- ²² Joan Petersilia, *Understanding California Corrections*, 2006. p. 78, available at: http://www.ucop.edu/cprc/documents/understand_ca_corrections.pdf.
- ²³ Office of the Inspector General, Matthew L. Cate, Inspector General, *Special Review into In-Prison Substance Abuse Programs Managed by the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation*, 2007. p. 1, available at: <http://www.oig.ca.gov/reports/pdf/SubstanceAbusePrograms.pdf>.
- ²⁴ Steve Aos, Marna Miller, and Elizabeth Drake, *Evidence-Based Adult Corrections Programs: What Works and What Does Not*, Washington State Institute for Public Policy, 2006, p.4, available at: <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/rptfiles/06-01-1201.pdf>.
- ²⁵ Joan Petersilia, *Understanding California Corrections*, 2006. p. 78, available at: http://www.ucop.edu/cprc/documents/understand_ca_corrections.pdf.
- ²⁶ Little Hoover Commission, *Solving California's Corrections Crisis: Time is Running Out*, January 2007, available at: <http://www.lhc.ca.gov/lhcdir/185/Report185.pdf>.
- ²⁷ California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, Expert Panel on Adult Offender Reentry and Recidivism Reduction Programs, *Report to the California State Legislature: A Roadmap for Effective Offender Programming in California*, 2007. pp 41-42, available at: http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/News/docs/Expert_Rpt/ExpertPanelRpt_.pdf.
- ²⁸ Corrections Independent Review Panel (aka the Deukmejian Commission), *Reforming Corrections: Report of the Independent Review Panel*, 2004. p. 154, available at: http://cpr.ca.gov/Review_Panel/.
- ²⁹ Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger, *The Governor's 2008-09 Budget May Revise*, available at <http://gov.ca.gov/may-revise/prisons>.
- ³⁰ California Senate Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review, *Meeting on Corrections and Other Open Issues*, June 5, 2008, available at: <http://www.sen.ca.gov/budget/Sub4/060508SBFRKEELY.PDF>.
- ³¹ California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, Expert Panel on Adult Offender Reentry and Recidivism Reduction Programs, *Report to the California State Legislature: A Roadmap for Effective Offender Programming in California*, 2007. p. 48, available at: http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/News/docs/Expert_Rpt/ExpertPanelRpt_.pdf.
- ³² Joan Petersilia, *Understanding California Corrections*, 2006. p. 75, available at: http://www.ucop.edu/cprc/documents/understand_ca_corrections.pdf.
- ³³ Little Hoover Commission, *Solving California's Corrections Crisis: Time is Running Out*, January 2007, available at <http://www.lhc.ca.gov/lhcdir/185/Report185.pdf>.
- ³⁴ Corrections Independent Review Panel (aka the Deukmejian Commission), *Reforming Corrections: Report of the Independent Review Panel*, 2004. p. 122, available at: http://cpr.ca.gov/Review_Panel/.

³⁵ California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, Expert Panel on Adult Offender Reentry and Recidivism Reduction Programs, *Report to the California State Legislature: A Roadmap for Effective Offender Programming in California*, 2007. p. xii, available at: http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/News/docs/Expert_Rpt/ExpertPanelRpt_.pdf.

³⁶ Corrections Independent Review Panel (aka the Deukmejian Commission), *Reforming Corrections: Report of the Independent Review Panel*, 2004. p. 149, available at: http://cpr.ca.gov/Review_Panel/.

³⁷ Joan Petersilia, *Understanding California Corrections*, 2006. p. 78, available at: http://www.ucop.edu/cprc/documents/understand_ca_corrections.pdf.

³⁸ Steve Aos and Robert Barnoski, *Washington's Offender Accountability Act: A First Look at Outcomes*, Washington State Institute for Public Policy, 2005, p. 2, available at: <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/rptfiles/05-07-1202.pdf>.