1	Horton v. Williams JI-WA-0002-0020	-15
3		ų ų
4		
5		
6	THE HONORABLE ROBERT J. BRYAN	
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON	
9	AT TACOMA	
10 11	JAMES HORTON, et al., on behalf) of themselves and all others) similarly situated,)	
12	Plaintiffs,) NO. C94-5428 RJB	
13		
14) CERTIFIED STATEMENT OF BOB WILLIAMS, et al.,) KEITH ROSENKRANZ	
15) Defendants.)	
16		
17	I declare and affirm as follows:	ł
18	I am currently employed by the Department of Social and Health	
19	Services, State of Washington, at the Green Hill School. I have been	
20	so employed since 1975. My current civil service job classification	
21	is Juvenile Rehabilitation Supervisor 2. The classified staff at	
22	Green Hill are included in the Institutions Bargaining Unit certified	
23	by the Washington State Personnel Board (now Personnel Resources	e ja
24	Board). The unit's exclusive bargaining representative is the	
25	Washington Federation of State Employees which is Council 28 of the	
26	American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO.	
	SWANSON, PARR, CORDES, YOUNGLOVE & PEEPLES, P.S.	

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

CERTIFIED STATEMENT OF KEITH ROSENKRANZ

.

-1-

I am a shop steward for the local union at Green Hill School and am
aware that the request to enjoin the use of pepper spray is a concern
of all employees at the institution.

As the court is no doubt aware, the institution population includes youths from ages 15 to 21 (including several tried and convicted in adult court). All of the 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.

From 1975 to 1985 my assignment at the institution was as a 11 security officer responsible for crisis intervention, control and 12 movement of out-of-control or violent residents. During this period 13 of time pepper spray was not available. We responded to situations 14 which cottage staff could not control. Many times we were unable to 15 talk the resident into de-escalating and physical force was necessary 16 to control the residents, who were often a danger not only to staff, 17 but to other residents and to themselves. It was the rare situation 18 where despite best efforts, either staff or the resident (as well as 19 other residents or property) was not injured, sometimes seriously. 20

Since approximately 1989 the facility has authorized the occasional use of pepper spray when all other means of negotiation with the resident and physical restraint have failed, and 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. Since 1989 I have

-2-

SWANSON, PARR, CORDES, YOUNGLOVE & PEEPLES, P.S. ATTORNEYS AT LAW EASTSIDE PROFESSIONAL PLAZA, SUITE A 924 EAST SEVENTH AVENUE P.O. 80X 7848 OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON 98507-7846 FACSIMILE (206) 754-9268 (206) 357-7791

CERTIFIED STATEMENT OF KEITH ROSENKRANZ

had the opportunity to observe the use of pepper spray by security 1 2 personnel at the facility on several occasions. I have never seen the spray used simply for punishment. The occasions where it has been 3 used have been situations where the only alternative appeared to be 4 a physical altercation between the resident and staff, and use of the 5 spray was necessary to avoid the types of injuries suffered in the 6 7 past during such confrontations. Although not a justification for its 8 use, residents who in the past had no reservations about challenging staff physically and who in fact felt empowered by being able to 9 10 generate such a response, are reluctant to continue acting out knowing that pepper spray may be used. Often the warning that the spray is 11 about to be used unless the resident de-escalates is sufficient, and 12 13 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.

19 Institutional staff feel that pepper spray is preferable to the 20 alternatives of more serious physical injuries, to residents and 21 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 <u>Olympica</u>, Washington, on November 24 25 KEITH ROSENKR 26 SWANSON, PARR, CORDER YOUNGLOVE & PEEPLES, P.S. ATTORNEYS AT LAW EASTSIDE PROFESSIONAL PLAZA, SUITE A 924 EAST SEVENTH AVENUE P.O. BOX 7846 OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON 98507-7848

CERTIFIED STATEMENT OF KEITH ROSENKRANZ

22

23

-3-

FACSIMILE (208) 754-9268

(206) 357-7791