2

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

SWANSON, PARR, CORDES.

THE HONORABLE ROBERT J. BRYAN

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA

JAMES HORTON, et al., on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

BOB WILLIAMS, et al.,

v.

Defendants.

NO. C94-5428 RJB

CERTIFIED STATEMENT OF

JEAN BROOKS

I declare and affirm as follows:

I am currently employed by the Department of Social and Health Services, State of Washington, at the Green Hill School. I have been so employed since 1992. My current civil service job classification is Juvenile Rehabilitation Supervisor 2. The request to enjoin the use of pepper spray is a concern of all employees at the institution, even to those, such as myself, who are not personally involved in its use.

The institution population includes youths from ages 15 to 21 (including several tried and convicted in adult court). All of the

> YOUNGLOVE & PEEPLES, P.S. ATTORNEYS AT LAW EASTSIDE PROFESSIONAL PLAZA, SUITE A 924 EAST SEVENTH AVENUE P.O. BOX 7848 OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON 98507-7846 FACSIMILE (206) 754-9268 (206) 357-7791

residents have been adjudicated as having committed felonies. Green Hill is the maximum security facility in the state's juvenile detention system. The institution population includes youths which the other state institutions have been unable to control because of aggressive or violent behavior. Even during my brief employment it seems that the population has become increasingly more dangerous and unpredictable. Many of these residents are physically mature and extremely strong.

During my employment the use of pepper spray has been available in crisis interventions. I have seen pepper spray used only when all other means of negotiation with the resident and appropriate physical restraint alternatives have failed, and then only with the specific approval of the institution superintendent. Use of the spray is pursuant to a specific policy (Green Hill Policy #4) and used only by specifically authorized and trained staff.

I have never seen the spray used simply for punishment. The occasions where it has been used have been situations where the only alternative appeared to be a physical alternation between the resident and staff, and use of the spray appeared necessary to avoid more serious physical injuries. On at least one occasion its use was necessary to protect one resident from an attack by one or more other residents, after other means had failed.

Although not used for that reason, the threat of the use of the spray is a deterrent to continued violent behavior. Residents who perceive confrontations with staff as "macho" behavior often respond to the threat of the use of pepper spray. Often the warning that

SWANSON, PARR, CORDES,
YOUNGLOVE & PEEPLES, P.S.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
EASTSIDE PROFESSIONAL PLAZA, SUITE A
824 EAST SEVENTH AVENUE
P.O. BOX 7846
OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON 98507-7846
FACSIMILE (206) 754-9268
(208) 357-7791

the spray is about to be used unless the resident de-escalates is sufficient, and the use of the spray is unnecessary.

The use of pepper spray is effective. Staff appear to be able to obtain immediate control after its use. As soon as control is obtained, the procedures include removing the resident from the spray environment, showering and cleaning up, and a checkup by the institutional medical staff.

Institutional staff feel that pepper spray is preferable to the alternatives of more serious physical injuries, to residents and staff, which were suffered in the past before it was available.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that the foregoing is true and correct.

Signed at Olympia, Washington, on November 18, 1994.

JEAN BROOKS

SWANSON, PARR, CORDES,
YOUNGLOVE & PEEPLES, P.S.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
EASTSIDE PROFESSIONAL PLAZA, SUITE A
924 EAST SEVENTH AVENUE
P.O. BOX 7846
OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON 98507-7848
FACSIMILE (206) 754-9268
(206) 357-7791