

Assessment of social effects of the proposed Waikeria prison expansion

For Department of Corrections

**Robert Quigley
Quigley and Watts Ltd.**

Final

Version 5

7 April 2017

Document control

Version of document	Date of revision	Prepared by	Reviewed by
1 – first draft	16 December 2016	Robert Quigley	Sharon Dines, Boffa Miskell Jo Stanbury, Department of Corrections
2 – second draft	26 January 2017	Robert Quigley	Sharon Dines, Boffa Miskell Jo Stanbury, Department of Corrections
3 – final draft	1 March 2017	Robert Quigley	Stephen Quinn, DLA Piper
4 – final for external review	8 March 2017	Robert Quigley	Amelia Linzey, BECA Ltd on behalf of Otorohanga District Council
5 – final for lodgement	7 April 2017	Robert Quigley	

Contents

Executive summary	6
Introduction	6
Approach.....	6
Community profiles	6
Potential population and employment effects from the proposed expansion	6
Potential effects from construction.....	7
Potential effects on housing and commuting	7
Potential effects on education services	8
Potential effects on prison providers and prisoners.....	8
Potential effects on prisoner families and prisoner visitors.....	9
Potential effects on Police and Probation services.....	10
Potential effects on health services	10
Potential effects on community way of life.....	11
1 Introduction	12
1.2 The Waikeria Prison and Site	12
1.2.1 Operation of Waikeria Prison.....	13
1.3 The Proposed Development	14
2 Approach and methodology	15
2.1 Statutory framework	15
2.2 Conceptual framework	15
2.3 Geographic study area.....	16
2.4 Potentially affected groups.....	17
2.5 Consultation	18
2.6 Assessment of effects	18
3 Community profiles	19
3.1 Introduction	19
3.2 Past, current and projected population	19
3.3 Te Awamutu and Kihikihi.....	20
3.4 Otorohanga	21
3.5 Hamilton	21
4 Population and employment – context and potential effects	23
5 Construction	27
5.1 Construction context	27
5.2 Construction – potential effects.....	27
6 Housing and commuting	30
6.1 Context and current situation	30
6.1.1 Prisoner family-specific context	32

6.2 Housing – potential effects.....	32
6.3 Commuting – Current situation and potential effects.....	33
7 Education services	35
7.1 Early Childhood Education.....	35
7.1.1 Context and current situation.....	35
7.1.2 Early childhood centre – potential effects.....	36
7.2 Schools.....	37
7.2.1 Context and current situation.....	37
7.2.2 Schools – potential effects.....	39
8 Prison providers and prisoners	42
8.1 Introduction	42
8.2 Context and current situation	43
8.2.1 Rehabilitation programmes.....	43
8.2.2 Education, training and employment programmes.....	44
8.2.3 Integrated release programmes.....	46
8.2.4 Services for accommodation and housing for released prisoners.....	47
8.3 Providers and prisoners – potential effects.....	48
9 Prisoner families and prison visitors	53
9.1 Context and current situation	53
9.2 Prisoner families moving to the study area – potential effects	54
9.3 Prison visitors – potential effects	55
10 Police and probation services	58
10.1 Context and current situation	58
10.2 Police and probation – potential effects.....	59
11 Health services.....	60
11.1 Context and current situation	60
11.1.1 General Practitioners	60
11.1.2 General medical services at Waikato Hospital	61
11.1.3 Forensic mental health services delivered at Waikeria Prison	61
11.1.4 Community health services.....	62
11.1.5 Acute mental health services provided at the Henry Rongomau Bennett Centre	62
11.1.6 St John Ambulance.....	63
11.2 Health - potential effects	63
11.2.1 General practitioners	63
11.2.2 General medical services at Waikato Hospital	64
11.2.3 Forensic mental health services delivered at Waikeria Prison	64
11.2.4 Community health services.....	64
11.2.5 Acute mental health services provided at the Henry Rongomau Bennett Centre	65

11.2.6 St John Ambulance	65
12 Community way of life	67
12.1 Context and current situation	67
12.2 Community way of life - potential effects	68
13 Mitigation and monitoring	70
13.1 Construction	70
13.2 Housing and commuting	70
13.3 Education services	70
13.4 Prison providers and prisoners	70
13.5 Prisoner families and prison visitors	70
13.6 Police and probation services	70
13.7 Health services	70
13.8 Community way of life	70
14. Conclusion	71
15 References	72

Executive summary

Introduction

The Department has identified the development of an additional prison facility at Waikeria Prison, between Te Awamutu and Otorohanga, as an appropriate response to meet the rising demand for prisoner places in New Zealand over the next decade. The Department therefore intends to give Notice of Requirement to Otorohanga District Council to amend the designation for the Waikeria Prison site to allow up to 3,000 prisoner places on the site. The increase in capacity will enable a new facility for 2,000 male prisoner places (to high-security standard) to be built by 2021 and enable additional facilities to be built if needed to accommodate future demand. No maximum-security prisoner places will be on the site.

The current prison facilities are for 650 prisoner places while the current designation for Waikeria Prison allows for up to 1,250 prisoner places on the site.

This report will be a section in the Assessment of Environmental Effects (AEE) (Boffa Miskell, 2017). The purpose was to assess the potential social effects for the proposed prison expansion and consequent uplift to the maximum prisoner capacity to 3,000.

Approach

A conceptual framework describing the focus of the assessment, the study area and potentially affected groups is available in Sections 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4. The study area was Te Awamutu, Kihikihi, Otorohanga, Hamilton City and the surrounding areas.

Substantial consultation using a mix of face to face and telephone interviews (93 participants), focus groups with Waikeria staff (2), and public open days/meetings (3) has been undertaken. Most participants were from or delivered services to the townships of Te Awamutu, Otorohanga, Kihikihi and the city of Hamilton (and Waikeria Prison).

Community profiles

The townships of Te Awamutu (population 10,760) and Kihikihi (population 3,460), along with Hamilton City (population 141,000) have experienced strong population growth in the past and predictions for the future are the same. In contrast, Otorohanga (population 2,650) has experienced population decline over the past 20 years. All the towns have a good reputation amongst each other, with Otorohanga and Kihikihi having 'turned around' in the eyes of their Northern neighbours to become desirable places to live.

Potential population and employment effects from the proposed expansion

The total number of custodial, management and support staff for the proposed expansion to 3,000 prisoner places is projected to be approximately 1,400 staff. The existing staff of around 350 means hiring approximately 1,050 staff.

Of the approximately 1,050 staff to be hired, half (525) are projected to be hired from the study area, and half as migrants to the study area. The approximate number of migrant staff (525) and their family members (445) who will move to the study area is projected to number approximately 970.

Of the approximate 970 migrants and family members, they are projected to distribute to Otorohanga (194), Kihikihi (49), Te Awamutu (291) and Hamilton (194). The balance (242) are projected to settle in the 23 other townships of the region (and beyond).

The social value of the jobs provided to individuals, their family and the community are immense. Furthermore, most jobs provided by increasing capacity at Waikeria Prison are well above the minimum wage and are likely to be permanent positions.

Potential effects from construction

Overall, this assessment concludes that the construction workforce will affect accommodation within the study area, particularly in Te Awamutu, Otorohanga and Kihikihi. The property market is rapidly inflating (both rentals and sales) throughout the region. All acknowledge the construction workforce is not the driver of the housing change being experienced in the study area, nor will it be the major driver in the future. However, all also acknowledge that the construction workforce “won’t help” with the pressures, because it will add modest population pressures to an already pressured housing sector.

Construction is likely to have a negligible impact on the Department’s release to work programme, even if some work or employment opportunities can be offered to prisoners as part of the Public Private Partnership. Given the timing of this assessment relative to the tendering process, it is not possible to confirm if such opportunities may be available as the construction companies in the private sector consortia are not known yet. If such opportunities are not able to be offered, construction will have no effect on the Department’s release to work programme.

Regarding potential mitigations, the recruitment process of the construction workforce is critical, as achieving a high per cent of people already living in the study area would substantially mitigate potential housing effects as those workers already live in the district.

Secondly, recommended to be incorporated into the designation includes a portal to provide information about the area, including short and long term accommodation (i.e. make it easy for connections to be made between people already living in the study area (who may have a room or home to let) and construction workers who require accommodation (to meet their short-term housing needs), schools, childcare centres, services, etc.

No monitoring is recommended regarding construction.

Potential effects on housing and commuting

Overall, this assessment concludes that the proposed expansion will have a negative effect on housing and accommodation within the study area townships. For many participants, this was a double-edged sword – growth in population was welcomed, but would have a potentially negative effect on affordability for people living in the study area. This assessment has occurred at a time when property prices are rapidly inflating (both rentals and sales). All participants acknowledged the proposed expansion is not the driver of the housing change being experienced in the study area, nor will it be the major driver in the future. However, all also acknowledge that the proposed expansion “won’t help” with the pressures, because it will add modest population pressures to an already pressured housing sector. This is particularly true for Te Awamutu, Kihikihi and Otorohanga, whereas Hamilton City is expected to cope adequately.

It is difficult to judge what will happen in a housing market in four-years’ time when the proposed expansion opens, but both Otorohanga District Council and Waipa District Council acknowledge it is not the Department of Corrections role to provide housing. Instead, each Council is doing all it can to alleviate the potential housing effects (of growth overall, and from the proposed expansion) on their communities through zoning and subdivision activities, which are substantial in each area.

Mitigation recommended to be incorporated into the designation includes developing a housing information package (from existing material) that promotes all areas to help ‘spread the load’ of prison staff around the district, particularly to towns south and east of the Waikeria Prison site which are currently under represented by prison staff. This aspect can also be included in the Department’s recruitment strategy. Secondly, the recruitment process itself is critical, as achieving 50 per cent or more of recruits hired from the study area would substantially mitigate potential housing effects as those staff already live in the district.

Regarding commuting, negative effects on perceived safety are possible on Waikeria Road and the SH3/Waikeria Road corner. For a detailed discussion on this topic and the proposed mitigation, refer to the Traffic Impact Assessment (Traffic Design Group, 2017).

No monitoring is recommended regarding housing or commuting.

Potential effects on education services

Early childhood education: Overall, this assessment concludes that the proposed expansion will have a negligible social effect on early childhood education centres within the study area. All centres welcomed the prospect of the proposed expansion and the potential growth in families (and consequent children) it might bring. Several centres have capacity to cope with any future demand created by the proposed expansion - across Te Awamutu, Kihikihi and Otorohanga. Several early childhood education centres were planning expansion as and when needed.

Primary and secondary schools: Overall, this assessment concludes that the proposed expansion will have a negligible social effect on primary and secondary schools within the study area.

All schools welcomed the prospect of the proposed expansion. Waikeria Prison staff and their families would be spread widely across all of the schools, meaning small and positive roll effects, and no effect concentrated on just one or two schools. Most schools welcomed the potential growth in families (and consequent children) it may bring. Several schools had additional capacity and several other schools had plans for expansion.

Two schools (one primary school in Otorohanga and one primary school in Te Awamutu) did not desire roll growth, and were managing roll growth via their zoning and preference zoning. All schools were constantly assessing their changing rolls and principals were highly experienced at working with the Ministry of Education to get the resources they needed as their roll changed.

Employment of staff was a minor issue for only a few schools, with most schools reporting no issues in attracting and retaining quality staff. Furthermore, principals did not believe their schools or townships suffered stigma from the prison. Prison staff families and prisoner families were welcome at all of the schools. No schools were aware of students from prisoner families who had moved to the area, i.e. the families were existing community members already. For prospective prison staff at the proposed expansion, the quality of schools available to their children is high.

No mitigation or monitoring is recommended regarding education services.

Potential effects on prison providers and prisoners

Overall, this assessment concludes that the proposed expansion will have a positive effect on prison service providers within the study area.

The current programmes cover a broad range of needs and are provided by trained Corrections staff or contracted external providers. Programmes include:

1. Rehabilitation programmes (delivered in-prison):
 - motivational programmes, e.g. tikanga programmes, parenting skills
 - offence-focused programmes e.g. Medium intensity rehabilitation programmes, Maori Focus Unit, etc.
 - drug and alcohol interventions
2. Education, training, and employment programmes (delivered largely in-prison)
3. Integrated release programmes, such as drug and alcohol, accommodation, social support, transport, extended supervision orders, etc. (delivered largely on-release from prison)

All participants stressed the importance of early planning/contracting, adequate funding and appropriate physical spaces. Without an increase in funding, provider capacity would simply not cope.

Importantly, the Department of Corrections has already begun a budget bid process to gain the necessary funding to support enhancements to four of its most successful programmes.

The relationships between Corrections and providers is very good, meaning the ability to plan, negotiate, and contract has been done well in the past, making it plausible that it can be done well in the future. Most providers are willing to scale up and many desire it. Contracts are delivered by paid staff, and potential recruitment of staff was not considered to be overly difficult (with adequate lead-in time). Many providers already had substantial scale (being regional and/or national providers) and described how additional growth was well within their capacity.

For the small number of volunteer providers, finding volunteers in a rural location was considered more difficult, though on hearing that the communities of Otorohanga, Kihikihi and Te Awamutu were supportive of the prison, the volunteer services were considering recruitment from those townships.

Positive benefits to providers and prisoners are concluded to potentially accrue from the proposed expansion, arising from the stable prisoner population. These include a full suite of programmes able to be offered; bespoke staff able to be hired; access to purpose built rehabilitation and training facilities; and prisoners more easily able to access a wider range of programmes, including a substantial industry training programme.

Negative outcomes identified by providers included existing providers potentially not being the providers in the future (due to the 3-5 year term of signed contracts); and smaller providers needing to determine whether they will attempt to grow their businesses, or stick to their core work if the proposed expansion goes ahead.

Identifying rental accommodation and provision of supported accommodation are two services that would be placed under pressure by the proposed expansion. Providers will require substantial lead time, support and planning to address future housing needs within the Waikato Region.

Providers believed the new facility presented an opportunity to improve the current case management at Waikeria Prison. Similarly, the Ministry of Social Development noted the need to work closely with the Department of Corrections on the expansion of their across-region services (where prisoners are reintegrated into regions away from the prison location). The Department has advised it will actively engage with service providers, DHB and MSD working collaboratively to plan for the commencement of operations at the new facility.

For prisoners, positive effects are concluded to accrue from the increase in access to and types of rehabilitation programmes that can be offered to meet their needs.

Mitigation recommended to be incorporated into the designation includes continuing discussions and early planning/contracting, adequate funding and appropriate physical spaces for providers. Particular attention is recommended for: providers who identify rental accommodation and provide of supported accommodation; case management providers; and Ministry of Social Development across-region services.

No monitoring is recommended regarding prison providers and prisoners.

Potential effects on prisoner families and prisoner visitors

Overall, this assessment concludes that the proposed expansion will have a negligible social effect from prisoner families moving into the study area. This is based on the evidence that a few prisoner families have moved into the study area around Waikeria Prison in the past and therefore a small number of additional families would be expected in the future. This finding is supported by substantial New Zealand research with similar findings – little to no effect.

Where individual prisoner families are moving into the study area, they are 'flying below the radar' across a broad range of services within the study area, and consequently having negligible social effect. The only service to encounter prisoner families has been the Police, with two children who were graffiti vandals and the Police dealt with both situations quickly.

While prison visitors driving up and down Waikeria Road is a concern to some residents, prison visitors have not generated any work for Police on Waikeria Road or further afield. Similarly, no evidence exists regarding any social effects from prison visitors on businesses or accommodation providers in the study area. Police have asked residents to report any suspicious activity, or call them if they are feeling unsafe in any way.

For prisoners and prisoner families, the most substantial negative effect will be the continued difficulty of visiting by prisoner families due to the rural nature of the site and lack of public transport.

Mitigation recommended to be incorporated into the designation includes providing adequate facilities to allow certain prisoners and families to communicate via skype (in a controlled environment), and investigate the extension of the PARS transport service (from Rotorua to Waikeria Prison) to begin in Whakatane or Tauranga (if warranted based on prisoner numbers from those areas).

No monitoring is recommended regarding prisoner families or prison visitors.

Potential effects on Police and Probation services

Overall, this assessment concludes that the proposed expansion will have a negligible social effect on Police and Probation services. This is based on the evidence that additional resources for police will be needed for on-site services; and for Probation to deal with the increased number of prisoners; but both can be handled within normal planning.

While one stakeholder had voiced concern about prisoners from out of the region being 'dumped in Hamilton City', this was not the case. Probation and external providers release prisoners back to their home region in nearly all cases. Exceptions exist for displaced prisoners, but they are 'very few', and Hamilton City is just one option from several New Zealand cities where displaced prisoners might be released into supported accommodation or programmes.

No mitigation or monitoring is recommended regarding police and probations services.

Potential effects on health services

Overall, this assessment concludes that the proposed expansion will have:

1. Positive effects on growth for General Practitioner services in the study area. All desire growth and have capacity for growth
2. Negligible effects on service growth for general medical services at Waikato Hospital. While growth is not desired by Waikato Hospital, being the base hospital for a growing region means it has access to the necessary planning and resources to deal with the small amount of additional services needed from prison staff and their families, and from prisoners, from the proposed expansion.
3. Negligible effect on forensic mental health services delivered at Waikeria Prison. While the growth in workload will be major, this can be modelled and planned for, drawing on the solid working relationship between the Department of Corrections and Waikato DHB.
4. Negligible effect on workload for community mental health services and AOD services from the few 'displaced prisoners' being released into supported accommodation in Hamilton city
5. Increase in workload for the Te Awamutu based community mental health provider. The growth will be from prison staff and their families from the proposed expansion. Growth in workload will be small but noticeable, and while growth in services is not desired, this can be modelled and planned for.
6. Unknown level of negative social effect on workload for community mental health services and AOD services due to increased prisoner releases. Waikato DHB are concerned they do

not understand how the proposed expansion might affect their community service provision, and want to work with stakeholders to better understand this potential effect (at the time of writing this report). Expansion of services required in social housing can also be planned, with involvement of multiple agencies required.

7. Negligible effect on acute mental health services provided by the Henry Rongomau Bennett Centre. While the additional workload for the Centre from the additional remand prisoners will be major, and the current service is running at capacity, Waikato DHB are planning for expansion with the necessary stakeholders. The proposed expansion provides Waikato DHB with additional impetus to continue their planning to expand the Centre.
8. Negligible effect on the workload of St John Ambulance. While St John Ambulance do not seek growth in their workload, they are confident in their capacity to handle growth due to the proposed expansion.

Even though point seven (increase in acute mental health services) is a major increase in workload, it was the issue of least concern to Waikato DHB because all concerned had the base understanding of existing effects and could model future effects and plan accordingly.

What was of greater concern to Waikato DHB were the potential effects on point six (community mental health services and AOD services) which was less well understood by all concerned, and the expansion needed in social housing. Therefore, any planning needed to scale up (if needed) is also less certain and will need to be undertaken prior to the facility becoming operational.

Critical to this assessment, Waikato DHB were very pleased that Corrections had engaged so early, and Waikato DHB were very keen to work with Corrections to 'get it right'. Such collaboration would greatly assist Waikato DHB in their planning, but also assist Corrections in ensuring Corrections gets the best design for the proposed expansion, and assist Corrections achieve their goal of reducing reoffending. No monitoring is recommended.

Potential effects on community way of life

Overall, this assessment concludes that the proposed expansion will have a neutral social effect on community way of life, stigma or fear. This is based on the evidence that the local townships well accept the facility nearby, crime related to the existing facility is nil, and the overwhelmingly positive response to the proposed expansion from Councils, Community Boards, non-governmental organisations, schools, ECEs, accommodation providers and community members.

For site neighbours, a few have expressed concerns about safety and security. While such perceptions are difficult to allay, no actual crime is associated with the current prison operation and newly designed facilities are substantially more secure than historic facilities.

The existing Community Liaison Group is functioning well and the Department has proposed it will continue to function during construction and the operation of the expanded facility.

Explicitly including the continuation of the Community Liaison Group into the designation is recommended. No monitoring is recommended regarding community way of life.

1 Introduction

The Department of Corrections (Department) has identified the development of an additional prison facility at Waikeria Prison, between Te Awamutu and Otorohanga, as an appropriate response to meet the rising demand for prisoner places in New Zealand. This approach has been agreed to by the New Zealand Government. The Department therefore intends to give Notice of Requirement to Otorohanga District Council to amend the designation for the Waikeria Prison site to allow up to 3,000 prisoner places on the site. The increase in capacity will enable a new facility for 2,000 male prisoner places to be built by 2021 and enable additional facilities to be built if needed to accommodate future demand. This report will be a section in the AEE.

The current prison facilities allows for 650 prisoner places while the current designation for Waikeria Prison allows for up to 1,250 prisoner places on the site. If the amendment to the designation is confirmed, the Department proposes to construct all new prison facilities on the site within the Building Zone (See Figures 3 and 4, Volume 3 of the AEE).

The purpose of this report is the assessment of potential social effects for a proposed new facility and increase in capacity to 3,000 prisoner places. The overall aim of the assessment of social effects is to support the social wellbeing of local communities by assessing potential positive and negative social effects of the proposed expansion of Waikeria Prison. The assessment will identify and recommend mitigations to minimise potential effects and maximise the uptake of potential social benefits. The objectives are to:

- Draw from and build upon the outputs of the regulatory planning and assessment process (e.g. other assessments) and collect bespoke data from stakeholders
- Identify and describe any potential social effects (positive or negative) from the proposed expansion of Waikeria Prison
- Make evidence based recommendations to maximise positive effects and minimise negative effects
- Work with key social stakeholders to explore potential monitoring strategies for any potential social effects identified.

1.2 The Waikeria Prison and Site

Waikeria Prison was established in 1911 and is located on a 1,278 hectare site at Waikeria, 17 kilometres south of Te Awamutu in the Waikato region. As noted in the Introduction, the designation for the site allows for up to 1,250 prisoner places although the current operating capacity is 650 prisoner places. The prison routinely accommodated 800 to 1,000 prisoners in 2007-2012 prior to the closure of some secure units that were at the end of their useful life.

The site is located in a rural area primarily in the Otorohanga district, on Waikeria Road (a collector road), 8 kilometres from State Highway 3. The underlying zoning for the site in the Otorohanga District Plan is Rural Effects Area (i.e. Rural). There are a few private local roads that dissect the Waikeria site.

The existing prison facilities on the site form several small “nodes” within the site, separated by large areas of farmland. The existing prison buildings are one to two storeys in height and at the closest point are located approximately 400 metres from the site boundary.

Much of the site is used for dairy farming operations and other dry stock purposes run by the Department. Three dairy farms are operational within the site with various other agricultural facilities (e.g. a piggery) present but no longer in use.

1.2.1 Operation of Waikeria Prison

History

The history of the site has had a substantial bearing on the social assessment and is well detailed in the archaeological assessment (Clough and Associates Ltd, 2017). The government acquired the site in 1910 for a reformatory farm. Apart from iwi, the prison was the first institution in the area. For many people, it has '*always been there*'.

Beyond the proposed building zone but within the 1,278 hectare prison site, there used to be Waikeria Village that housed prison staff and their families (see diagram in AEE). Many (existing) local people (from Te Awamutu, Kihikihi, Otorohanga) either grew up in 'the village', knew someone who grew up there, and/or visited the village to play sport against the village residents. A surprising number of local people in positions of authority (now), grew up in the village. Many fond memories exist for the village, far beyond the adjacent area being remembered as a prison.

The Waikeria village had 70 houses for staff (and their families) along with a post office, primary school, Country Women's Institute, play centre, scouts, cubs, brownies, library and Plunket. It had its own sports teams which participated in school and adult leagues. The village operated in the late 1950s to 1970s before being closed. Only the disused school and hall buildings remain on-site.

Past and current prison muster

There were approximately 480 prisoners at Waikeria Prison in the 1970s, and that slowly increased over the years. For the past ten years, the maximum prison muster was achieved in August 2007, with a monthly average of 1,045 prisoners. After 2011, the muster decreased substantially with the progressive closure of several units on the site as they reached the end of their useful life.

In 2016, the average muster was 606 (i.e. the daily average in October 2016). Table 1 below shows the past 10 years of prison muster at Waikeria Prison, with the average of the prison population for each month of October.

Staffing levels also increased and decreased to match the change in muster levels. There used to be approximately 440 staff at the peak muster, while staff numbers are down to approximately 350 in 2016.

Table 1 – Waikeria prison muster average number per October

Year	Average Waikeria prison muster in October of that year
2006	882
2007	989
2008	910
2009	946
2010	980
2011	914
2012	835
2013	665

2014	730
2015	677
2016	606

The components of Waikeria Prison (i.e. units, health centre, coffee shed) and location on a map is presented in the AEE.

1.3 The Proposed Development

The proposal is to amend the designation and obtain construction-related consents to secure for the Department the ability to construct, operate and maintain prison facilities on the Waikeria Prison site to provide up to 3,000 prisoner places. If confirmed, development of the prison will begin with the construction of facilities to provide an additional 2,000 prisoner places which will come into service in 2022. All new accommodation will be built to a high-security standard and be managed and operated by the Department. No maximum-security prisoner places will be on the site.

New prison facilities on the site will include prisoner accommodation buildings contained within one or more secure perimeters (including the existing prison facilities on the site). The secure perimeter includes a primary physical barrier, which may be a wall or fence up to 6 metres high, together with additional fences, a road and a surveillance strip outside the primary physical barrier.

In addition to accommodation buildings, ancillary facilities developed on the site and located inside the secure perimeter will include: a gatehouse for receiving prisoners into the facility; the security management centre; offices; meeting rooms; medical and health facilities; staff rooms and ablution facilities for staff; commercial kitchens and laundries to service the prison; trade workshops and meeting rooms to support rehabilitation programmes; sports facilities such as a sports hall and sports fields to provide for physical training; visitor facilities; and waste management facilities.

Additional ancillary facilities that will be located outside the secure perimeter include: the prison access control gate; administration building, staff training and amenities building; external deliveries store; facilities management offices and workshops; a visitors centre and car parking.

The potential social effects have been described in this assessment of social effects by considering the difference in potential social effects between the proposed increase in capacity up to 3000 prisoner places against a no-change scenario of the current operating capacity of 650 prisoner places.

2 Approach and methodology

2.1 Statutory framework

For this project, the statutory framework for the assessment is provided by the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA). Section 5 of the RMA states the purpose of the Act is “to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources.”

Sustainable management is defined by the RMA as “managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources in a way, or at a rate, which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural well-being and for their health and safety while—

- a) *sustaining the potential of natural and physical resources (excluding minerals) to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; and*
- b) *safeguarding the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil, and ecosystems; and*
- c) *avoiding, remedying, or mitigating any adverse effects of activities on the environment.”*

Accordingly, this social impact assessment is necessary to assist the determination of whether the proposed expansion of Waikeria Prison will enable people and communities to provide for their social well-being and health and safety while avoiding remedying or mitigating any adverse social effects on the people and communities surrounding the site.

2.2 Conceptual framework

Social impact assessment (SIA) is the most common framework used in New Zealand and internationally to analyse, monitor and manage the social consequences of development. SIA can inform the choice of options, design and resource consent applications of projects. The International Association of Impact Assessment (2003; 2015) describes social impacts as impacts on one or more of the following:

- People’s way of life – that is, how they live, work, play and interact with one another on a day-to-day basis
- Their culture – that is, their shared beliefs, customs, values and language or dialect;
- Their community – its cohesion, stability, character, services and facilities
- Their political systems – the extent to which people are able to participate in decisions that affect their lives, the level of democratisation that is taking place, and the resources provided for this purpose
- Their environment – the quality of the air and water people use; the availability and quality of the food they eat, the level of hazard or risk, dust and noise they are exposed to; the adequacy of sanitation, their physical safety, and their access to and control over resources
- Their health and wellbeing – health is a state of complete physical, mental, social and spiritual wellbeing and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity
- Their personal and property rights – particularly whether people are economically affected, or experience personal disadvantage which may include a violation of their civil liberties
- Their fears and aspirations – their perceptions about their safety, their fears about the future of their community, and their aspirations for their future and the future of their children.

SIA cannot start with a checklist of potential impacts however, but must identify the social impacts from an awareness of the project and an understanding of how the project might affect what is important to the project’s stakeholders (IAIA, 2015). Fortunately, substantial data is available on the operation of the existing prison, on the local communities of Hamilton, Te Awamutu, Kihikihi and Otorohanga, and in previous prison SIA to draw on.

A first set of material provided an awareness of the potential project by considering the evidence base about the actual social effects from prisons in New Zealand. These included:

- Literature review of New Zealand evidence about the actual effects of prisons (Quigley and Watts Ltd, 2016a)

- 2015 Annual Monitoring Report of the social effects of the Auckland South Corrections Facility on the local community (Quigley and Watts Ltd, 2016b).

A second set of material considered what might be important to potential stakeholders, by drawing on what has been important to previous stakeholders when new prisons have been built in New Zealand. These included:

- List of possible social and cultural indicators developed during the Proposed Men's Correctional Facility at Wiri (Auckland South Corrections Facility) Board of Inquiry (Board of Inquiry 2011)
- 2016 Social impact Monitoring Plan for the Auckland South Corrections Facility (Quigley and Watts Ltd, 2016c).

Having such current information about actual social effects (of prisons) in a New Zealand environment is a unique situation, allowing empirical evidence to inform the scope and analysis of this assessment.

To complement the above information, site and stakeholder specific information was considered to further understand the proposed project and what might be important to stakeholders. The new information was:

- Discussions with Department of Corrections staff about existing stakeholders and stakeholder relationships
- Site visits to Waikeria Prison (July 2016)
- Discussions with other impact assessors and consideration of draft reports. Particularly cultural (Te Onewa Consultants, 2017), archaeological (Clough and Associates Ltd, 2017), traffic (Traffic Design Group, 2017), economic (Market Economics Ltd, 2016), external lighting (Kern Consultants, 2017), landscape and visual (Boffa Miskell, 2017a) and acoustic (Marshall Day Acoustics, 2017).
- Maps of the Waikato region (Google).

Finally, within a New Zealand setting and for a Notice of Requirement application such as this, it is important to consider the most recent social assessment of a prison, which was the Notice of Requirement associated with Auckland South Corrections Facility (ASCF). The board of inquiry decision for ASCF set out a framework describing what social impacts might be considered in an assessment of social effects from construction and operation of the facility.

Taken together, the above information was used to provide a conceptual basis for this assessment, by answering whether there may be social effects:

- 1) Arising from staff potentially moving into townships close to the prison
- 2) Arising from prisoners and their families potentially moving into townships close to the prison
- 3) On contracted prison providers
- 4) On community relationships
- 5) On community way of life, stigma and/or fear, on sense of place aesthetics and heritage, perception of belonging, security and liveability, and aspirations for the future
- 6) Arising from the transport needs of staff, prisoners, construction workforce, materials, etc.
- 7) Arising from being a direct neighbour
- 8) On tangata whenua.

This social assessment focuses mainly on items 1-5, and 7. Item 6 is largely covered in a transport impact assessment (Traffic Design Group, 2017), though the social consequences of transport are covered in this report. Similarly, item 8 is considered in a separate cultural impact assessment (Te Onewa Consultants, 2017).

2.3 Geographic study area

While potentially affected demographic/interest groups are described in section 2.4, geographic-based groups also need to be determined. There are several considerations to take into account when considering the study area. The first is to identify where existing prison staff live. Initial discussions with Department staff and the Chief Executives from Otorohanga District Council and

Waipa District Council indicated initial thoughts. To confirm these perceptions, a full data set of where staff lived (as at November 2016) was queried and full results are in Appendix 1. In summary, though:

- 36 per cent live in Te Awamutu
- 18 per cent live in Hamilton
- 16 per cent live in Kihikihi
- 5 per cent live in Otorohanga.

Therefore, three-quarters (75 per cent) of all prison staff live in these four centres, with the remaining 25 per cent of staff spread throughout 23 other localities, towns and city – most within the Waikato Region.

As such, the study area was Te Awamutu, Kihikihi, Otorohanga and Hamilton. Te Awamutu and Kihikihi are located in the Waipa District while Otorohanga is located in the Otorohanga District. Hamilton is administered by the Hamilton City Council.

As a second focus, when considering whether the study area should be the rural or urban areas, the Chief Executives of Otorohanga District Council and Waipa District Council were adamant that if any effects were felt, it would be in the urban areas rather than rural because:

- The rural areas have stringent regulations regarding development whereas the urban areas (and the halo's around them) have more permissive planning regulations allowing development
- The rural areas have lightly trafficked roads and low population density.

A third consideration when considering the study area was to understand the potential effects on direct neighbours living close to the Waikeria site (a rural area). Therefore, those who had any land within one kilometre of the site were included (site neighbours) and those who lived along the main access road to the prison were included (Waikeria Road residents).

Finally, regarding Hamilton City, discussions with the City Planning Manager of Hamilton City Council revealed that the city would have no issue dealing with a potential one-off increase of approximately 200 additional staff plus their families. This was because Hamilton has experienced, and is planning for growth of about 2 per cent per annum (equal to approximately 3,000 additional people per year). As such, consultation in Hamilton focussed on Waikeria Prison service providers such as Waikato DHB and Te Wānanga O Aotearoa.

“That level of increase is insignificant given our employment base of over 100,000 people and the growth we have” (Hamilton City Council)

2.4 Potentially affected groups

Drawing on the discussions above in Sections 2.2 and 2.3, the potentially affected groups included in this assessment were:

- Site neighbours
- Waikeria Road residents
- Prison staff
- Contracted prison service providers and volunteers
- Local Government
- Government agencies
- Social, health, education and emergency response providers
- Businesses
- Accommodation providers.

2.5 Consultation

Beyond the information sources listed in Section 2.2 and 2.3 above, the predominant method of gathering information about the existing situation and potential social effects was to ask those with most experience in such matters, be they community members from the townships/city in the study area or national experts. Consequently, a substantial consultation programme was planned and undertaken (October 2016 to January 2017) to seek out information on the above topics, and probe for any other potential impacts not already identified. Using a mix of face to face interviews, telephone interviews, focus groups and meetings, 93 people/organisations were engaged by the social assessor. This 93 did not include those consulted by other team members in the wider consultation (see Section 10 of the AEE). The social assessor engaged with:

- Contracted service providers to Waikeria Prison and volunteers to Waikeria Prison (15)
- Real estate agents, property managers, motel and campground owners (11)
- Social agencies, community groups and churches (3 – note major overlap with contracted service providers, many of whom are local social service agencies and churches)
- Local Police (1)
- Local probation services and probation staff (2)
- Chief Executives and managers from Otorohanga District Council and Waipa District Council; Councillors, Senior manager from Hamilton City Council (6)
- Waikeria Prison, National Office, and Regional Office visits: with existing Waikeria prison staff, Waikeria prison management, regional and national Department of Corrections management (9)
- Waikeria Prison Community Liaison Group (1)
- Childcare centres, primary schools and secondary schools (30)
- Otorohanga Business Development Board and other local businesses (2)
- Waikato DHB, mental health service providers, General Practitioners (10)
- Ambulance and Fire Services (3)
- Neighbours and members of the public (multiple attendees at open days)

A full list of those consulted is provided in Section 10 of the AEE.

Of those participants who represented community organisations, e.g. a school, also lived locally. People speaking directly on behalf of community included local Council staff and Councillors, plus the many community members who attended the open days. The majority of the participants (except contracted service providers and national office Corrections staff) were asked about community stigma and way of life.

2.6 Assessment of effects

Data were considered by the assessor to determine whether a social effect would occur or not. Both positive, negative and neutral effects were considered. Where effects were concluded to occur, the nature of the effect was characterised:

- Severity of effect (serious, moderate; minor)
- Magnitude of effect (many affected; moderate number; few affected)
- Permanence of effect (permanent; medium term, temporary)
- Inequity of effects (effect concentrated to particular groups; unsure but possible inequity; widely distributed, universal effect)
- Likelihood of effect occurring (almost certain; likely; unlikely)
- Ease of mitigation (very difficult, very costly; moderately able; easy to mitigate).

3 Community profiles

As described above, the study area is principally Te Awamutu, Kihikihi, Otorohanga and to a lesser extent Hamilton and the surrounding rural areas. Data for the census area units relating to these areas are described below.

3.1 Introduction

The Waipa District has experienced population growth over the past 20 years, to 46,668 people in 2013 (9.8 per cent growth since the 2006 census). Consequently, the District has a vision and strategy to both build on and manage that growth.

In contrast, Otorohanga District has had a modest decline in population over the past 20 years to 9,138 people in the 2013 census (1 per cent growth since the 2006 census). No growth strategy has been developed as it was seen as 'unrealistic' by the Otorohanga District Council's Chief Executive. Despite such population 'headwinds', Otorohanga has done very well to develop as a tourist destination, maintain and enhance the quality of their schools, offer affordable housing and have a vibrant main street. Participants in this study living in the Waipa District who were asked about Otorohanga all commented favourably about the town and how it had 'turned itself around', and for some 'was a place they'd consider living if they moved to the area now'. High praise indeed from their Northern neighbours.

Waipa District has long seen itself as a place to be. The slogan 'home of champions' sums up the District's pride of place. Growth has come from servicing the rural economy of the Waikato, being in striking distance of Hamilton (and Auckland), having the Hamilton Airport as close to Te Awamutu and Cambridge as it is to Hamilton city, and having high quality retail, hospitality, services and schools.

Kihikihi sits on the southern edge of Te Awamutu, and while it too was previously considered 'a bit dodgy' in the past by some of its northern neighbours – that perception has changed entirely. It is now perceived as a good place to live: the housing is slightly more affordable than Te Awamutu and the schools are very good. Services are largely supplied by Te Awamutu, though the main street of Kihikihi is busy with a small set of shops and one pub/restaurant.

The rural areas surrounding each of the townships are those that can be experienced all over New Zealand. Lightly populated, zoned rural, and a patchwork-quilt of green grass interspersed with small forestry blocks and horticulture.

3.2 Past, current and projected population

Recent work for the Waipa District Council 30 Year Plan (November 2016) provides Waipa and Otorohanga District population data at the census area unit level (presented below in Table 2). The data covers 2006, 2013 and a projection for 2031. Between 2013 and 2031, most areas show low growth (less than 1 per cent per year), and a few census area units show a population decline. The census area units projected to have significant population growth are those units directly around the Waikeria Prison site: Allen Road, Kihikihi and Kihikihi Flat.

The population growth projected in Lake Ngaroto (immediately south west of Te Awamutu) and Kihikihi Flat (immediately south east of Te Awamutu) is exceptionally high, at 14-15 per cent per annum. Allen Road census area unit is immediately south east of Kihikihi, showing the third highest population increase of just over 1 per cent per annum (25 per cent over 18 years). The projection did not consider the proposed expansion of Waikeria Prison, but instead reflects the zoning for the areas, and that much of the population growth surrounding Te Awamutu and Kihikihi is not likely to be within the townships themselves, but instead in the peri-urban areas of the townships. For the Otorohanga census area unit, the decline in population over the past two decades is projected to reverse with population growth of 13 percent over 18 years, while the rural areas around Otorohanga have very low population growth projected.

Table 2 – Census Area Unit, past-population and projection to 2031

CAU name	Population by year			Per cent change
	2006	2013	2031	2013 to 2031
Allen Road	160	220	275	25
Kihikihi	2030	2060	2266	10
Kihikihi Flat	710	820	2317	283
Lake Ngaroto	530	580	1536	264
Leamington East	3850	3990	3669	-9
Pokuru	470	550	579	5
Rotoorangi	1750	2010	2341	16
Te Awamutu Central	3240	3450	3327	-4
Te Awamutu East	2590	2900	3207	11
Te Awamutu South	3030	3040	2914	-4
Te Awamutu West	1260	1370	1473	8
Tokanui	450	460	465	1
Otorohanga	2660	2650	3000	13
Otorohanga Rural East	4100	4180	4269	2
Otorohanga Rural West	1720	1930	1991	3
Te Kawa	430	480	512	7

3.3 Te Awamutu and Kihikihi

Te Awamutu is a town of population 10,760, sitting with the Waipa District. Kihikihi sits just south of Te Awamutu, and together claim a population of 14,220 in 2013. Data from the relevant census area units is displayed below in Table 3.

Table 3 – Te Awamutu, Kihikihi and surrounding area demographics

Census area unit	Aged 65+ (per cent)	Median income	Per cent Maori/European ¹	House ownership (per cent)	NZ Deprivation Index ²
Te Awamutu Central	22	\$26,600	20/83	65	7
Te Awamutu East	20	\$27,300	23/81	67	7
Te Awamutu West	15	\$28,500	26/79	60	7
Te Awamutu South	22	\$25,000	23/81	64	8
Lake Ngaroto	13	\$39,900	8/95	68	2

¹ People can self-identify with more than one ethnic group so totals do not sum to 100

² The NZ Deprivation Index combines census data relating to income, home ownership, employment, qualifications, family structure, housing, access to transport and communications. Meshblocks (the smallest geographic area from census data) are grouped into deciles, where 1 represents the areas least deprived and 10 the areas most deprived.

Census area unit	Aged 65+ (per cent)	Median income	Per cent Maori/European ¹	House ownership (per cent)	NZ Deprivation Index ²
Kihikihi Flat	21	\$35,800	16/90	79	2
Kihikihi	13.5	\$26,000	34/75	69	8
New Zealand	14	\$28,500	15/74	65	5-6 (average)

These data show that compared to the general population of New Zealand, the populations in and around Te Awamutu and Kihikihi are generally older, have a higher proportion of Maori and European people; and are more deprived. The clearest differences are between the peri-urban census area units of Lake Ngaroto and Kihikihi Flat which are privileged, have over 90 per cent self-identifying as European and have substantially higher median incomes than their neighbouring township census area units.

3.4 Otorohanga

Otorohanga is a small town with a population of just 2,650. Taking in the three rural census area units surrounding Otorohanga township brings the District population to 9,240. Data from the relevant census area units is displayed below in Table 4.

Table 4 – Otorohanga and surrounding area demographics

Census area unit	Aged 65+ (per cent)	Median income	Per cent Maori/European ³	House ownership (per cent)	NZ Deprivation Index
Otorohanga (township)	19	\$24,500	40/68	59	9
Otorohanga rural east	9	\$33,500	19/87	59	5
Otorohanga rural west	14	\$29,300	23/83	71	6
Te Kawa	9	\$35,000	24/82	58	4
New Zealand	14	\$28,500	15/74	65	5-6 (average)

These data show that compared to the general population of New Zealand and to the rural areas, the population in the Otorohanga township is generally older, has a higher proportion of Maori, has a lower median income and is more deprived. For three of the Otorohanga census area units, house ownership is generally lower than the average in New Zealand, and lower than areas in Te Awamutu and Kihikihi.

3.5 Hamilton

Hamilton is New Zealand's largest inland city, straddling the mighty Waikato river. The city has a diverse ethnic mix and boasts substantial hospitality and entertainment options. It is also home to large organisations such as the Waikato University and Waikato Hospital. Hamilton is centred at the

³ People can self-identify with more than one ethnic group so totals do not sum to 100

base of the 'golden triangle' of economic development in New Zealand, assisted by its proximity to the seaports of Auckland and Tauranga, the substantial road network, and its relative closeness to Auckland.

The services available in Hamilton City are those expected in any medium sized city in the world, and given the year on year population growth being experienced, the services are growing as well.

As per Table 5 (below), Hamilton city had a population of 141,000 in the 2013 census, which had increased by 9.3 per cent since the 2006 census. It had a relatively young population with just 11 per cent of people aged greater than 65 years, with a median income (\$27,700) similar to the township of Te Awamutu. It had a similar proportion of Maori (21 per cent) to several census area units in Te Awamutu and Otorohanga.

Table 5 – Hamilton City demographics

Census area unit	Aged 65+ (per cent)	Median income	Per cent Maori/European ⁴	House ownership (per cent)	NZ Deprivation Index
Hamilton City	11	\$27,700	21/67	57	A multitude of census areas, therefore not applicable

⁴ People can self-identify with more than one ethnic group so totals do not sum to 100

4 Population and employment – context and potential effects

As discussed in section 2.2, one way the proposed expansion of Waikeria Prison might create social effects is through prison staff moving to the townships/city nearest to Waikeria Prison (the study area). Table 6 below describes the total number of staff that may be needed should 3000 prisoner places be on site. This is an approximate figure because staffing requirements vary depending on the operating model of the prison and other factors such as the proportion of low-security, high-security and remand prisoners.

Table 6 – Approximate number of staff needed to operate a facility with 3000 prisoner places

Facility	Prison muster	Approximate custodial, management and support staff
Existing facility	650	350
Proposed expansion at full number of prisoner places	3,000	1400
Uplift needed	2,350	1050

Identifying potential social effects also requires consideration of what proportion of newly hired staff are existing residents of the study area; and consideration of where newly hired staff (and migrants to the study area) might live.

Prison staff focus groups conservatively estimated about half of current staff lived in the study area. That is, the existing staff did not move into the study area for their job at Waikeria Prison. Some staff members were in teams where all of their colleagues lived in the study area (and the same in the past). Despite this, about half was considered a fair, conservative estimate by the staff.

Taking that conservative approach therefore, it is judged that about half of the future staff might already live in the study area. Hiring within the Waikato Region is also a stated priority in the existing recruitment drive for Corrections staff.

Determining how many additional family members a new employee brings with them (See Table 7) is a matter that neither Department of Corrections, Statistics NZ nor Census have been able to answer. As such, the author has estimated half of staff members will have family members, with an average family size of 2.7 (the NZ average household size).

Table 7 – Staff numbers and family members per staff member

Staff uplift of 984	Approximate number of staff hired	Approximate number of staff hired who will have family aged under 18 years	Additional family members per migrant staff members hired (i.e. number of staff x 1.7)	Approximate total staff hired and family population uplift
Hired in study area	525	262	445	970
Migrants hired	525	262	445	970

The number of family members for existing staff has been calculated in the same manner in Table 8.

Table 8 – Approximate number of family members for existing staff

Staff numbers	Approximate number of existing staff who will have family aged under 18 years	Additional family members per migrant staff members hired (x 1.7)	Total staff and family number for existing staff
350	175	298	648

Taken together, with the 492 staff already living in the study area projected to be hired, the total population attributable to the proposed expansion is described below. Table 9 also shows the proportion who are migrants to the region and those already living in the study area (existing staff and locally hired staff).

Table 9 – Approximate numbers of prison staff living in the study area and prison staff migrating to the study area

Existing, study area or migrant staff (and their families)	Population numbers	Study area or migrant population
Total staff and family for existing staff	350 + 298 = 648	1,618 staff from the study area (and their families)
Total staff hired from within study area and their families	525 + 445 = 970	
Total migrant staff hired and their families	525 + 445 = 970	970 migrant staff (and their families)
Total for 3,000 prisoner places	648 + 970 + 970 = 2,588	-

Regarding where the hired migrant staff (and their families) might live, the best guide can be taken from where existing staff live. The survey of prison staff (n=280) showed staff lived in:

- Te Awamutu (36 per cent)
- Kihikihi (15 per cent)
- Hamilton (20 percent)
- Otorohanga (5 per cent)
- Twenty-three other townships (25 per cent) e.g. Pirongia, Putaruru, Ohaupo, Raglan, Rotorua, Te Kuiti, Tokoroa, etc.

However, as described in Section 6 of this document on housing, housing rental and house prices in Hamilton, Te Awamutu and Kihikihi have increased at a greater rate than those in Otorohanga. Also, prison staff and Real Estate agents described how the townships of Kihikihi and Otorohanga are now more desirable than they were in the past. Staff who lived in Kihikihi and Te Awamutu would seriously look at Otorohanga as an option to live if they were relocating now. In the past, they did not believe Otorohanga had suitable services, however this has now changed according to staff and several interviewees. Also, the recent increases in house prices make Otorohanga more affordable for staff on a Department of Corrections salary, according to prison staff. The drive time from Waikeria Prison to Otorohanga is 22 minutes, versus 16 minutes from Te Awamutu.

Similarly, in discussions with several long standing real estate agents of the area, a figure of 20 per cent of new staff moving to Otorohanga was considered realistic, providing new housing options became available. Given the lack of major housing development planned in Kihikihi (infill is the most common option), Kihikihi would be the area least likely to be able to house additional future staff. As such it was considered that for the purposes of this SIA, the migrant prison staff (and any family members) would distribute in the following manner:

- Te Awamutu (30 per cent)
- Kihikihi (5 per cent)
- Hamilton (20 percent)
- Otorohanga (20 per cent).

The balance (of 25 per cent) of staff are projected to be spread across the 23 other towns in the surrounding Regions and are not further considered in this assessment. The data in Table 10 below shows the distribution of staff and family who already live in the study area, and the projected distribution of migrant staff and family on approximate the population numbers for each town.

Table 10 – Approximate population in the four areas staff reside due to proposed expansion

Total number of staff and family	Existing population from staff and family (approximate)			
	Otorohanga (5%)	Kihikihi (15%)	Te Awamutu (36%)	Hamilton (20%)
Existing - 648	32	97	233	130
	Projected additional population from migrant staff and family (approximate)			
	Otorohanga (assuming future proportion of 20%)	Kihikihi (assuming future proportion of 5%)	Te Awamutu (assuming future proportion of 30%)	Hamilton (assuming future proportion of 20%)
Migrant staff hired and family - 970	194	49	291	194
Staff hired from study area and family - 970	194	49	291	194

The social effects of this employment and migration are potentially substantial. For example, further sections in this study consider the potential effects of migration on the education system, the health system, housing, etc. Other sections do not consider the benefits of employment explicitly, so these are briefly described here.

The social effects of employment are immense: for an individual, the individual's family including children, and community. At the individual and family level, employment contributes to outcomes such as living standards, health and wellbeing, mental health, social connection, personal identity and life satisfaction. At the community level, employment contributes money and resources to a community, social capital and social cohesion, and contributes more broadly to achieving societal goals. Further details are available in *Social value of a job* (Ministry for Primary Industries, 2016).

Of relevance to the increase in capacity of Wakeria Prison, the median income (of most census area units within the local townships) is low, reflecting the predominant low wage economy. While the capacity increase will also create some low wage jobs, most jobs will be at incomes substantially higher than experienced by many living in the study area. For example, a Corrections Officer has a

salary range of approximately \$52,000 - \$61,000. Fifty-nine to 86 per cent higher than the minimum wage salary of \$32,760 (40-hour week, 52 weeks). Furthermore, these jobs are stable permanent positions which increase the likelihood of achieving the individual and family social benefits described above (in contrast to insecure employment).

The total number of custodial, management and support staff for the proposed expansion is projected to be approximately 1,400. The existing staff of around 350 means an uplift of approximately 1,050 staff to be hired.

Of the approximately 1,050 staff to be hired, half (525) are projected to be hired from the study area, and half as migrants to the study area. The approximate number of migrant staff (525) and their family members (445) is projected to be approximately 970.

Of the approximate 970 migrants and family members, they are projected to distribute to Otorohanga (194), Kihikihi (49), Te Awamutu (291) and Hamilton (194). The balance (242) are projected to settle in the 23 other townships of the surrounding regions.

The social value of the jobs provided to individuals, their family and the community are immense. Furthermore, most jobs provided by increasing capacity at Waikeria Prison are well above the minimum wage and are likely to be permanent positions.

5 Construction

5.1 Construction context

Construction of a facility to accommodate 2,000 prisoner places at Waikeria is expected to occur from 2018-2021 (inclusive) and be completed in 2021. Employment equivalent to approximately 1,600 full time job-years in the Waikato Region, spread across the four years. Note most construction occurs in 2019 and 2020 (73%) so 1,168 job-years jobs occur then, with fewer in 2018 and 2021.

The Waikato is not without similarly large scale construction projects (i.e. the Waikato Expressway and the Ruakura Inland Port). Waikeria Prison sits just below the so called 'golden triangle' of Hamilton, Tauranga and Auckland, where most growth in New Zealand has occurred (and is projected to occur). As such, the construction of the proposed expansion can draw on those resources, but either those resources will travel each day, or people will temporarily relocate while they work on the project.

The Department has memorandums of understanding (MOU) with several organisations including some construction companies to establish release to work opportunities for prisoners and employment opportunities for prisoners upon their release. The companies have undertaken to assess applicants on their skills rather than their past convictions. Given the timing of this assessment relative to the tendering process, it is not possible to confirm if such opportunities may be available as the construction companies in the private sector consortia are not known yet.

Holiday park, campground and motel owners were interviewed in Te Awamutu and Otorohanga to assess the availability of short-term accommodation. While each had small numbers of cabins/rooms, and/or a modest number of powered spaces to park caravans, and/or multiple tent sites; they were full with tourists for the three months of summer. Most did not accept long term residents in their campgrounds/cabins over summer as they can charge higher tariffs to tourists. Summer is the time of the year the businesses made the majority of their money to see them through the other nine (leaner) months of the year. Outside the summer months, there is space available at all campgrounds and holiday parks.

5.2 Construction – potential effects

The effect identified by all interviewees as being a potential issue arising from the construction workforce was accommodation. While it was acknowledged that some of the workforce would already live in the Waikato region, it was also acknowledged that many construction workers would not already live in the region, and hence would require accommodation.

As an example, the Auckland South Corrections Facility achieved a local workforce percentage of 45 per cent (i.e. 45 per cent of workers lived in Counties Manukau). Of course, that facility was based in Auckland, where substantial construction activity is common and a large population base exists. Similarly, a construction expert estimated about 50 to 60 per cent of the workforce for the Waikeria Prison expansion would likely come from South Auckland and lower. Workers might travel up to 1.5 hours, but not more. (i.e. within a 1.5 hour drive). As such, at least half of the workforce is not expected to live in the study area (note the study area does not include South Auckland as per the construction expert's estimate) and hence require accommodation.

Experienced project managers have described that when a contract workforce travels to an area to undertake a job, they attempt to stay as close as possible to the work site. When there are no suitable accommodation options available, 'contract staff move to the next town or city up the road'. Similarly, Otorohanga District Council staff believed the most likely place the contract workforce would stay is Hamilton, and prison staff were of the same opinion. Hamilton City Council expected many in the construction workforce will already live in Hamilton as there are several large-scale construction companies in the city. Hamilton City Council said the main effect on their city would not be the accommodation of staff (which was achievable), but instead the potential inflationary pressure on

building and infrastructure contracts throughout the region due to constrained skilled labour. In the interest of not double-counting such effects, these issues are dealt with in the economic assessment.

Given the rural nature of the site, prison staff commented on the potential bottle neck that might be created by construction vehicles getting into the site. Construction traffic is dealt with in the traffic impact assessment.

The Department of Corrections release to work programme has the potential to benefit from the build itself. If companies with existing MOUs bid for the construction, win it, and agree to such an MOU being included in the contract, then there is potential for positive outcomes for release to work programmes.

While holiday park and campground owners were not able to provide accommodation to the construction workforce in the summer months, they did look forward to a potential uplift in non-peak accommodation.

Interviewees were asked for suggested solutions to a construction workforce accommodation and provided the following ideas:

- Re-establish Waikeria village
- Re-establish Tokanui village (approximately 14 kilometres south east of Te Awamutu)
- Promote small regional towns as a destination
- Set up a web portal and basic information/letting agreements to make it easy for local and rural families to advertise rooms/shearing quarters etc. to the workforce
- Live in Hamilton where the infrastructure is larger and more able to cope.

Given the negative social outcomes that are associated with construction workforce villages, it is not recommended to pursue the first two options (i.e. do not re-establish Waikeria village or Tokanui village). The most likely outcome is that once the small supply of short term accommodation in the nearby townships of Kihikihi, Te Awamutu and Otorohanga is taken up (i.e. holiday parks and motels) during the off-season, construction staff will live in Hamilton and commute. Hamilton City Council was not overly concerned about accommodation effects because of their existing plans for substantial growth. Despite the above, construction staff will attempt to rent in Otorohanga, Kihikihi and Te Awamutu and each rental achieved by a construction worker makes it harder for local families to rent.

The features of this potential effect from the construction workforce on local townships have been further assessed as per Section 2.6. Home ownership rates in the towns sit around 60-67 per cent in Te Awamutu; 70 per cent in Kihikihi and 60 per cent in Otorohanga, meaning about one-third of the population rent. Further quantification of the number of people affected was not possible, but it is concluded to be 'many affected' because of the direct effect on local people who find it more difficult to rent, and the flow on effect of price pressures across the entire rental market. Regarding severity of effect: housing is a serious issue that determines many other social and health outcomes. The permanence of the effect is temporary, as the construction is temporary. The likelihood of the effect occurring is almost certain, though those who already have rental accommodation are somewhat insulated, unless they attempt to move rental property. The effect is concluded to range across the spectrum of the renting population because the construction workforce will have the income to rent across the spectrum of rental housing available. The price pressures will also be felt by all, but most keenly by those on low or fixed incomes. The ease of mitigation is 'very difficult' because of the complexity of the current housing situation, which to be fair has not been solved by previous or current governments, agencies or Councils. The Department of Corrections is therefore unlikely to be able to move such an issue to any significant degree.

Overall, this assessment concludes that the construction workforce will affect accommodation within the study area, particularly in Te Awamutu, Otorohanga and Kihikihi. The property market is rapidly inflating (both rentals and sales) throughout the region. All acknowledge the construction workforce is not the driver of the housing change being experienced in the study area, nor will it be the major driver in the future. However, all also acknowledge that the construction workforce “won’t help” with the pressures, because it will add modest population pressures to an already pressured housing sector.

Construction has the potential to have a negligible impact on the Department’s release to work programme, even if work or employment opportunities can be offered to prisoners as part of the Public Private Partnership. Given the timing of this assessment relative to the tendering process, it is not possible to confirm if such opportunities may be available as the construction companies in the private sector consortia are not known yet. If such opportunities are not able to be offered, construction will have no effect on the Department’s release to work programme.

Regarding potential mitigations, the recruitment process of the construction workforce is critical, as achieving a high per cent of people already living in the study area would substantially mitigate potential housing effects as those workers already live in the district.

Secondly the Department should provide a portal to provide information about the area, including short and long term accommodation (i.e. make it easy for connections to be made between people already living in the study area (who may have a room or home to let) and construction workers who require accommodation (to meet their short-term housing needs), schools, childcare centres, services, etc.

6 Housing and commuting

Within the study area, housing-specific interviews were held with real estate agents, rental property managers, short term accommodation providers such as holiday parks and motels, existing prison staff, and Council staff who were involved in planning for sub-divisions including the following:

- Ray White Real Estate, Te Awamutu
- Remax Estate Agent, Te Awamutu
- Road Runner Motel and Holiday Park, Te Awamutu
- 21st Century Realty, Te Awamutu (two interviews)
- LJ Hooker Te Awamutu
- Waipa District Council, Te Awamutu
- Otorohanga Kiwi House and Holiday Park
- Harcourts Real Estate, Otorohanga
- Otorohanga Holiday Park
- Otorohanga District Council

The prison staff focus groups also included specific questions about housing/accommodation and commuting.

The Human Resources team at Waikeria Prison provided data on the townships existing staff lived in, and this analysed data was described to interviewees for their consideration prior to answering any housing/accommodation related questions.

Questions predominantly related to prison staff, though accommodation providers were also asked about prisoner families.

6.1 Context and current situation

Kihikihi real estate and property management is served by Te Awamutu offices, whereas Otorohanga has its own services. All real estate agents said the lack of houses for sale or rent was a substantial concern for the towns/city they worked in. For example, in Otorohanga, one Real Estate agent described having 48 properties to advertise to sell/rent as little as six months ago (March 2016), whereas by October 2016, she had less than 12 to advertise, of which all five of the houses or sections were under offer, leaving only (the more expensive) lifestyle blocks available. She had no rental properties available, which in the past was unheard of. A similar story was told by all Real Estate agents and property managers in Te Awamutu and Otorohanga.

"It's tight out there. Really tight" (Te Awamutu Real Estate Agent).

For prison staff, the accommodation story was the same. Nearly all commented on: increasing house prices which were becoming unaffordable for many; increasing rental prices; scarcity of rentals to live in; and, scarcity of properties to purchase. Finding affordable, appropriate accommodation was considered particularly difficult in Hamilton, Cambridge and Te Awamutu by the prison staff. It is a more recent but now common issue for Otorohanga, Raglan, Kawhia, Ohaupo and Kihikihi. The only exception to this is Tokoroa (1-hour drive east) - the only town that was described by prison staff as having affordable housing, plentiful housing and adequate infrastructure that could easily cope with future growth. However, several prison staff suggested they did not want to move to, or live in Tokoroa, and the town currently suffers from stigma issues by outsiders. Prison staff who live in Tokoroa rate the town highly. The second most affordable town according to prison staff was Putaruru (44 minutes drive east).

Prison staff were asked about what town they would choose to live in now, if they were just arriving from outside the district. Several who lived in Kihikihi and Te Awamutu said Otorohanga would be a much more likely destination. Prison staff said Otorohanga had excellent and affordable medical services; good access to the hospital and A&E in Te Kuiti; two good primary schools; an 'OK college' (some students bus to Cambridge and Hamilton (as with all small-town NZ secondary schools); and

far better retail and cafes than in the past. The price of power line charges (separate from the electricity itself) was considered exorbitant by all Otorohanga staff.

“Otorohanga is where I’d buy now – it’s way cheaper than Te Awamutu” (Prison staff member).

When asked about other factors that might affect the choice of township, prison staff also identified both pros and cons for Hamilton and Te Awamutu/Kihikihi. They were:

Te Awamutu – higher priced medical services and substantial delays to get an appointment with ‘your doctor’ – at least a week, sometimes much longer; house prices rising to levels that are becoming problematic for those on a prison officer salary; good primary schools; OK college (some students bus to Cambridge and Hamilton (as with most small-town NZ secondary schools); more affordable power/rates; access to greater number of services; and excellent access to the airport.

Kihikihi – As for Te Awamutu, but added features of slightly lower priced housing and closer to Waikeria Prison; some staff drive to Otorohanga for medical services to take advantage of the lower costs.

Hamilton – house prices are highest relative to the other towns, but this is offset by substantial access to services according to prison staff who live in Hamilton. Hamilton is the furthest drive to the site relative to other towns.

“There’s way more choice in Hamilton. If you don’t like what you’re getting, you just go to another around the corner” (Prison staff member).

Prison staff from the United Kingdom described how the schools that were described as “OK” in New Zealand were very good compared to the United Kingdom. They mentioned class sizes of 45 in the United Kingdom, with security fencing not dissimilar to a correctional facility.

“The school might just be OK in their eyes, but compared to where I came from, it’s paradise” (Prison staff member).

“The ERO report for the school is really good” (Prison staff member).

The above comments regarding property and rental prices are borne out by the increase in median property prices and rents across all of the towns in the study area (Quotable Value, November 2016) as seen in Table 11 below.

Table 11 – Property and rental prices

Area	Median value November 2016	Increase in value in last 12 months	Median weekly rent (November 2016)
Hamilton city	\$537,388	+25%	\$370
Te Awamutu	\$394,900	+ 20%	\$330
Otorohanga	\$233,000	+13%	\$220
Kihikihi	\$322,500	+23%	\$340

6.1.1 Prisoner family-specific context

From an emergency accommodation perspective, it is important to consider whether the current prison was having any effect on short term accommodation such as camping grounds, motels and holiday parks. These accommodation providers have the lowest cost short-term accommodation available. The owners of all facilities in Te Awamutu and Otorohanga did not have any released prisoners staying at their facilities, nor prisoner families.

6.2 Housing – potential effects

Regardless of whether the capacity of Waikeria Prison is increased or not, all stakeholders believed that housing and rental affordability would only continue to worsen in the future. This is due to many factors, the majority outside the control of anyone in the district i.e. loose global money supply and Auckland property market investors pushing south, and Hamilton property investors leveraging off their own property price rises. The only factor in control of Waipa District Council and Otorohanga District Council is zoning rules and processes for new housing/subdivisions. Most participants, particularly Council staff welcomed the growth, though a number of participants also expressed concern that housing prices/rental prices were out of step with study area incomes.

For Otorohanga District Council, because there has been population decline of 0.5% per year for the last 20 years, there has been no growth pressures and no substantial planning for new subdivisions. The most recent subdivision plan was promoted just prior to the Global Financial Crisis in 2008, after which the plan was shelved. As the Chief Executive of Otorohanga District Council said *“We haven’t been planning for growth, or developing grand vision statements, as it was believed to be unrealistic”*.

However, pressures on housing have now arrived and Council are ‘dusting off’ the previous subdivision plans, with the potential for release of up to 60 lots by September 2017. A further 60 lot subdivision is possible beyond that, and another 30 within three years, if needed (total of 150 lots x 2.7 people per house = 405 new residents). Otorohanga District Council is in an unenviable situation. Despite the current housing pressures, no private developer wants to take the risk of development and so the Council is considering stepping in to take some of that risk to progress development. This appears wise given the projection of 20% of all staff and their families, who would inhabit 144 of the potential 150 houses based on the likely population discussed in section 4.

In contrast, Waipa District Council has been experiencing growth for some time and has consequently developed a 30-year plan for growth. Previously developed subdivisions still have some capacity left (for sale), and as they sell, additional planned areas are developed. Two subdivisions are zoned already and they are fully serviced with utilities, providing approximately 250 lots. Further growth cells are provided for in the 30-year plan, if needed. The 581 staff and family predicted to move to the district from the proposed expansion would inhabit 215 of those houses.

In contrast, there are no large subdivisions planned for the small community of Kihikihi, though small scale subdivisions and infill will continue as private developers work with land owners.

The features of this potential effect from the operational workforce on housing in local townships have been further assessed as per Section 2.6. Home ownership rates in the towns sit around 60-67 per cent in Te Awamutu; 70 per cent in Kihikihi and 60 per cent in Otorohanga, meaning about one-third of the population rent. Further quantification of the number of people affected was not possible, but it is concluded to be ‘many affected’ because of the direct effect on local people who find it more difficult to rent, and the flow on effect of price pressures across the entire rental market. Regarding severity of effect: housing is a serious issue that determines many other social and health outcomes. The permanence of the effect is permanent, as the operation of the prison is ongoing. The likelihood of the effect occurring is almost certain, though those who already have rental accommodation are temporarily insulated, until they attempt to move rental property. The effect is concluded to range across the spectrum of the renting population because the operation workforce will have the income to rent across the spectrum of rental housing available. The price pressures will also be felt by all, but

most keenly by those on low or fixed incomes. The ease of mitigation is 'very difficult' because of the complexity of the current housing situation, which to be fair has not been solved by previous or current governments, agencies or Councils. The Department of Corrections is therefore unlikely to be able to move such an issue to any significant degree.

6.3 Commuting – Current situation and potential effects

Directly related to housing is commute time. Prison staff described how it was typical for Waikeria staff to drive up to an hour to work at Waikeria Prison. This leads to a particularly wide catchment area in which the prison staff might live. This was confirmed by the analysis of existing home towns of staff (see Section 4) which showed three-quarters of staff lived in Hamilton, Te Awamutu, Kihikihi and Otorohanga; whereas the other 25 per cent lived in 23 other localities, many at significant distance to Waikeria Prison.

While it was not unknown for staff to cycle to Waikeria Prison (especially when staff were training for an event), it was considered extremely uncommon. Instead, staff drive their own car or share driving with other staff to the site. For example, staff from Cambridge drive from their own home to a central meeting point in Cambridge, and then share one vehicle to Waikeria prison and back. This is dependent on staff rostering. Staff believed that the number of staff at the site who carpooled was somewhere less than half, though everyone had a car. Car-pooling was available for those staff (rosters dependent) living in Hamilton, Otorohanga, Rotorua, Putaruru and Tokoroa. Car-pooling did not operate from Te Awamutu or Kihikihi (due to proximity).

Waikeria Road is the main route to the prison from SH3 and as such all traffic passes down this road. Neighbours and prison staff already describe the road as busy, and all are concerned about the future increase in traffic on this rural road. People living on Waikeria Road are particularly concerned about the safety of children (whether cycling or pedestrians) if the proposed expansion is approved. Another area of concern is the Waikeria Road/SH3 corner where several staff and residents described the existing corner as 'unsafe'.

The potential effects of traffic are covered in the traffic impact assessment and are not repeated here to avoid double counting. The social consequences of traffic are therefore restricted to a decrease in perceived safety for Waikeria Road residents (all modes) and drivers using the SH3 corner.

Overall, this assessment concludes that the proposed expansion will have a negative effect on housing and accommodation within the study area townships. For many participants this was a double-edged sword – growth in population was welcomed, but would have a potentially negative effect on affordability for people living in the study area. This assessment has occurred at a time when property prices are rapidly inflating (both rentals and sales). All participants acknowledged the proposed expansion is not the driver of the housing change being experienced in the study area, nor will it be the major driver in the future. However, all also acknowledge that the proposed expansion "won't help" with the pressures, because it will add modest population pressures to an already pressured housing sector. This is particularly true for Te Awamutu, Kihikihi and Otorohanga, whereas Hamilton City is expected to cope adequately.

It is difficult to judge what will happen in a housing market in four years time when the proposed expansion opens, but both Otorohanga District Council and Waipa District Council acknowledge it is not the Department of Corrections role to provide housing. Instead, each Council is doing all it can to alleviate the potential housing effects (of growth overall, and from the proposed expansion) on their communities through zoning and subdivision activities, which are substantial in each area.

Potential mitigations that fall on the Department of Corrections include developing a housing information package that promotes all areas equally to help 'spread the load' of prison staff around

the district, particularly to towns south and east of the Waikeria Prison site which are currently under represented by prison staff. This aspect can also be included in the Department's recruitment strategy. Secondly, the recruitment process itself is critical, as achieving 50 per cent or more of recruits hired from the study area would substantially mitigate potential housing effects as those staff already live in the district.

Regarding commuting, negative effects on perceived safety are possible on Waikeria Road and the SH3/Waikeria Road corner. For a detailed discussion on this topic and the recommended mitigation, refer to the Integrated Traffic Assessment (Traffic Design Group, 2017).

7 Education services

7.1 Early Childhood Education

7.1.1 Context and current situation

Within the study area, face to face interviews were held with head teachers, managers or owners at the following early childhood education centres:

- Te Awamutu Playcentre
- Central Kids Kindergarten, Te Awamutu
- Mini Miracles Educare, Te Awamutu
- Central Kids Kindergarten, Te Awamutu
- Crackerjacks Rewi Street (childcare centre), Te Awamutu
- Rosetown Crackerjacks, Te Awamutu
- TopKids George Street Childcare, Te Awamutu
- Creators Educational Trust, Te Awamutu
- Te Awamutu Montessori Preschool, Te Awamutu
- Central Kids Kindergarten, Kihikihi
- Kainga Tamariki Early Learning Centre, Kihikihi
- Hopscotch Early Learning Centre, Otorohanga
- Hopscotch Preschool, Otorohanga
- Little Kiwis Corner, Otorohanga
- Learning Adventures, Otorohanga
- Central Kids Kindergarten, Otorohanga
- Otorohanga Playcentre.

Due to their proximity, Te Awamutu and Kihikihi early childhood centres had an overlapping geographic catchment of townships and rural areas. For example, some Te Awamutu centres had Kihikihi families, and vice versa. The catchment for Otorohanga childcare centres was based on the township and extended into the surrounding rural area.

About half of the centres had a full roll (i.e. were at their maximum licensed capacity), whereas the other half had unused capacity. At the centres with full rolls, the managers described how the waitlist at each centre was usually only a few children, to a maximum of 2 months, which was considered by the centre managers as a short wait-time. The centres offered different philosophies of care, different daily hours of operation, and some were open all year whereas others closed for school holidays.

One-third of the centres had children of prison staff currently attending. Three childcare centres had children with parents currently in custody at Waikeria prison, and/or parents who were electronically monitored; all of whom were locals. Staff described how these families were part of their community and they were happy to provide a service to such families.

For the above data, there were no substantial differences reported between early childhood centres in Otorohanga versus Te Awamutu and/or Kihikihi.

All centres were asked about any stigma or negative attitudes about the prison, and none were described by interviewees. In contrast, the response to this question was positive, with interviewees talking about the employment offered and the normality of having a prison on the site and prison staff in their community.

See Table 12 (below) for capacity details on each centre.

Table 12 – Childcare centre capacity

Childcare centre	Maximum licensed capacity	Unused capacity
Centre 1 (TA)	30	Two mornings a week unused
Centre 2 (TA)	40	0
Centre 3 (TA)	48	6
Centre 4 (TA)	40	0
Centre 5 (TA)	80	0
Centre 6 (TA)	35	0
Centre 7 (TA)	75	17
Centre 8 (TA)	36	0
Centre 9 (TA)	50	14
Centre 10 (K)	40 (AM) 30 (PM)	0 0
Centre 11 (K)	25	5
Centre 12 (O)	35	3 on two days
Centre 13 (O)	30	2
Centre 14 (O)	40	0
Centre 15 (O)	39	2 on two days
Centre 16 (O)	33	0
Centre 17 (O)	30	18 on day 1, 1 on day 2, 21 on day 3

7.1.2 Early childhood centre – potential effects

When projecting into the future, most staff at the centres with capacity acknowledged the likelihood of modest growth in their roll, whereas those centres with a full roll believed their roll would remain full into the future. Staff commented that prison staff families would be very welcome at their centres and all commented favourably on the proposed expansion and the new families it may bring to the area.

Centre staff described how the children moved into and out of the service as the children aged, and a full centre can quickly have space when a ‘bulge of children move to school’. One centre described 22 children moving in one term (to school and out of the area). Five centres had thought that future expansion was possible (either additional days, additional licenced numbers or a whole additional centre). Three of those five centres were adamant that expansion would occur if demand was shown.

Over the last three years, several centres had opened, showing that growth to match demand occurs in this sector.

Overall, this assessment concludes that the proposed expansion will have a negligible social effect on early childhood education centres within the study area. All centres welcomed the prospect of the proposed expansion and the potential growth in families (and consequent children) it might bring. Several centres have capacity to cope with any future demand created by the proposed expansion - across Te Awamutu, Kihikihi and Otorohanga. Several early childhood education centres were planning expansion as and when needed.

7.2 Schools

7.2.1 Context and current situation

Within the study area, face to face interviews were held with the following schools:

- Kihikihi School (primary)
- Korakonui School (primary, rural, south-east of Waikeria prison)
- Kio Kio School (primary; rural, south of Waikeria prison)
- St Patricks Catholic School, Te Awamutu (primary)
- St Mary's Catholic School, Otorohanga (primary)
- Te Awamutu College
- Te Awamutu Primary School
- Otorohanga Primary School
- Otorohanga College
- Waipa Christian School, Te Awamutu (primary)
- Pekerau Primary School, Te Awamutu.

The catchment areas for primary schools between the townships of Te Awamutu, Kihikihi and Otorohanga did not typically overlap, except for the dual medium Maori/Pakeha Kihikihi School which drew Maori students from Te Awamutu (and children 'graduated' to Te Wānanga O Aotearoa in Te Awamutu for their secondary education). Many of the primary schools had enrolment zones placed on them by the Ministry of Education to ensure that local students went to local schools (to make best use of the facilities available across the Ministry's school network). For the colleges, some students from Te Awamutu went to Cambridge or Hamilton, and similarly Otorohanga students also went to Te Awamutu or further. Both colleges had broad rural and coastal catchment of students. Zoning did not operate at either college. See Table 13 for school years catered for, student roll numbers and zoning.

Table 13 – School years, roll and zoning

Name	Years	Roll	Zoned
Otorohanga College	9-13	385 (end of year) (incl. 65 boarders)	No
Te Awamutu College	9-13	1,170	No
Kihikihi School (primary)	0-8	170	No
Te Awamutu Primary School	0-6	470	Yes

Name	Years	Roll	Zoned
Otorohanga Primary School	0-8	54	No
Korakonui School (primary)	0-8	199	Yes
Kio Kio School (primary)	0-8	135	Yes
St Patricks Catholic School, Te Awamutu (primary)	0-8	291	Preference zoning, 90% Catholic
St Mary's Catholic School, Otorohanga (primary)	0-8	37	Preference zoning, 90% Catholic
Waipa Christian School (primary)	0-8	59	Preference zoning, 90% Christian
Pekerau Primary School (Te Awamutu)	0-6	350	Yes

Regarding the number of students that could be expected at each school, each principal was informed about the past population growth/decline for their area, the projected growth (without the prison) and the number of additional staff expected to live in their town.

Staffing was not a substantial issue for Te Awamutu College or Otorohanga College. Related to staffing however, the recent pressure on rental housing availability was raised as an issue by the Principal of Otorohanga College. He described the difficulty he had in being able to use the nine Ministry of Education houses in the Otorohanga for recently appointed staff, as the houses were allocated to others by the Ministry. For the primary schools, again staffing was not a substantial issue, with recent job advertisements at one primary school receiving 50 applicants who had diverse teaching experiences. Kihikihi School said it was more difficult finding staff fluent in Te Reo. Finding relief teachers in Otorohanga was considered challenging.

Both colleges had rolls which in the past had declined but had been steady in recent years. Both colleges had excellent recent ERO reports and were looking forward to this flowing through into increasing rolls.

For the primary schools, rolls were generally either maintained or increasing. For example, Kihikihi School has had roll growth from 93 to 170 over several years, while Te Awamutu Primary School had a relatively stable roll of 470 over the past three years (slow drift up). The roll at Otorohanga Primary School has turned around and increased from 39 in June 2015 to 54 in November 2016, but this follows a previously long decline from a roll of over 300 in the 1960s. Korakonui School, Pekerau School and St Patrick's Catholic School were at their maximum roll given the current number of classroom spaces available.

Several schools had firm plans to react to roll change. It was commented by nearly all Principals that they were constantly watching their rolls to plan for change, whether increasing or decreasing. This is a constant feature of NZ schooling. For example, Pekerau School had over 400 students and had substantial pressure on its classroom spaces, so the Ministry imposed a stricter zone to bring relief to

the school. Pekerau School is considering removal of two 'Board-funded' prefabricated classrooms from their site to further control their roll. While most schools were 'up for growth', some were less keen, such as Pekerau School (as above), and St Mary's Catholic School which described itself as being in a 'sweet spot' for numbers. St Patrick's Catholic School has a 10-year plan to add two additional classrooms, and could bring that forward if needed. Waipa Christian School in Te Awamutu was undergoing rapid growth; 37 in 2015; 59 in 2016; and 74 expected in 2017. This was put down to the 'feeder' pre-school next door, and the brand new school being attractive to parents. The Board and Principal expected further roll growth due to the large subdivision occurring on their boundary. Kio Kio School has had a small drop in their roll following the dairy downturn, but the roll is increasing again now.

Prisoner families were not an issue at either college, and both colleges catered to the children of prison staff. The same was true at the primary schools, where the Principals were either unaware of any children being from prisoner families, or were aware of a small number of children who had a parent in Waikeria Prison (all local families, none from families who had moved into the area because their father was in the prison). Several principals with prison families in attendance, unprompted, described how the prison families were welcome at their school and were 'still great families'

"Just because dad's made a bad decision in the past, we're not going to punish his whole family for that. And they're great families too, great kids. We need a good relationship into every family, prisoner families included" (Primary school principal)

"We used to have heaps of prisoner families, but not now" (Primary school principal)

About half of the primary schools had a child or children of prison staff on their school roll, with Kihikihi School having the most prison-staff families (about 4). This is not surprising given the location of Kihikihi School relative to the prison itself. Schools had different 'catchments' of students. For example, Korakonui School largely drew on rural families due to its rural zoning, whereas the catholic schools drew on a mix of rural and urban families because of their preference zoning.

Regarding potential stigma from the prison on the community, none of the principals believed it existed. Instead, principals said the prison was a normal part of the community, with a lot of staff well known in the townships, substantial positive news stories in the local press about the rehabilitation work at the prison, and "no prisoners going rampant" at Waikeria Prison, etc.

"Having the prison at Waikeria is just a boring fact for us. I haven't heard anyone talk about it except when it was going through the downturn" (College principal).

"When I first heard you wanted to interview me I thought, why does he want to talk to us, the prison doesn't affect us. We never talk about the prison" (Primary School Principal).

"Everything's positive. It's certainly not a negative" (Primary school principal).

7.2.2 Schools – potential effects

All Principals were asked about the potential effect on their colleges and schools from the proposed expansion. All were positive about the new families the proposed expansion might bring into the area. Most were not daunted in any way by the numbers proposed because of the large number of existing students (i.e. the increase was minor in contrast to existing rolls), and the number of potential schools the students might go to.

For the colleges, due to previously higher rolls, both colleges had substantial physical infrastructure for roll growth. Otorohanga College also has plans to further expand their boys/girls boarding house.

“It bodes well - we’ve got the capacity to cater for that growth” (College principal).

“New people bring new perspectives into our community. That’s great” (Primary school principal).

For the primary schools, again capacity for growth existed in most schools. For example, Te Awamutu Primary School had a roll of 470, with three ‘classroom spaces’ (as defined by the Ministry of Education) that would need to be used before any additional classrooms (or modular transportable buildings) would be considered (if there was future roll growth). The Te Awamutu Primary School principal also described how an uplift to a roll of 500 would be a substantial benefit to the funding of the school, taking it out of the top of the 400-500 roll milestone bracket and into the bottom of the 500-600 roll milestone bracket. The Acting-Principal of Otorohanga Primary School said they would cope with any increase ‘very easily’, though it would also depend on what number the roll growth stabilised at. As with Te Awamutu Primary School, being at the top of a roll milestone was hard, at the bottom of a roll milestone was far easier. For St Patrick’s Catholic School, with approximately 10 per cent of New Zealanders being catholic, the uplift in the likely roll of the school was said to be small (and other Christian schools the same).

At Kihikihi School, roll growth is already occurring and is welcome. The principal is hoping this will “top-out” at about 200 or so (currently 170) so that they can “still keep a small school feel”. Based on existing staff percentages in Kihikihi and Te Awamutu, there is potential that Kihikihi School could see a higher growth than that desired by the principal if future staff move to that area in the same ratio. While the Waipa District Council subdivision plans for Kihikihi are ad-hoc and small-scale, and many prison staff families are likely to settle elsewhere (Te Awamutu, Otorohanga, Hamilton and beyond), the demographic growth projections for the rural area around Kihikihi are substantial even without the proposed expansion. However, growth at Kihikihi School will be tempered somewhat by it being a dual medium (Maori immersion/English) school. The principal noted how many Pakeha families do not consider sending their children to the school, despite the school’s excellent Education Review Office report. Therefore, it is concluded the new housing subdivisions in Te Awamutu will predominantly send children into other primary schools, and it is likely that the increasing population in the rural area will also strongly consider other schools over Kihikihi School for the same reasons. Overall, the Kihikihi School principal believed the proposed expansion would only have a positive effect on the school.

Kihikihi School are interested in engaging more fully with Waikeria Prison, noting they have a marae learning centre project, and environmental projects, where assistance from prisoners would be welcome in building/creating physical infrastructure. Kihikihi School is also becoming a community hub, with a medical visit from Te Awamutu Medical Centre once per week, and plans for Sport Waikato, the Te Awamutu Library, Maori Women’s Welfare League and others to potentially use the site. Such hubs typically present excellent outcomes for the school, parents, children and wider community. This presents a good opportunity for Waikeria Prison to further cement its good reputation in the area by engaging with the school to see how it can help/participate.

“We’d love to grow, it’s heathy for us” (Primary school principal).

“I’m not here to grow the roll, but if the community needs us to expand, then we will serve their needs” (Primary school principal).

“Prison staff are great members of our school community. I think it’d be great” (Primary school principal).

Some schools were less keen on growth as their rolls were already high, with zones being shrunk to manage their growth. Despite that, the principals at those schools said that part of their job was to manage any change in their roll, which they described as a constant feature. For those schools that

are zoned, they have a requirement to take any additional children within that zone, and as such will react to roll growth as and when it occurs. For Otorohanga, the proposed subdivisions are spread across the township, meaning that roll growth is also dispersed and not concentrated in any one primary school.

Korakonui School was the only school concerned about potential escapes (the school is closer to Waikeria Prison than any other). The principal was not overly concerned about escapes per se, but knew the Board would expect a solid communication plan to be in place, prior to any potential incident at Waikeria Prison. Such systems are already in place at Waikeria Prison.

From the perspective of the future prison staff who might move into the study area, all of the schools had excellent ERO reports. While perceptions remained from some in the community that certain schools were not performing, any issues (real or perceived) are unfounded. All of the schools are examples of New Zealand's high quality education system.

Overall, this assessment concludes that the proposed expansion will have a negligible social effect on primary and secondary schools within the study area.

All schools welcomed the prospect of the proposed expansion. Waikeria Prison staff and their families would be spread widely across all of the schools, meaning small and positive roll effects, and no effect concentrated on just one or two schools. Most schools welcomed the potential growth in families (and consequent children) it may bring. Several schools had additional capacity and several other schools had plans for expansion.

Two schools (one primary school in Otorohanga and one primary school in Te Awamutu) did not desire roll growth, and were managing roll growth via their zoning and preference zoning. All schools were constantly assessing their changing rolls and principals were highly experienced at working with the Ministry of Education to get the resources they needed as their roll changed.

Employment of staff was a minor issue for only a few schools, with most schools reporting no issues in attracting and retaining quality staff. Furthermore, principals did not believe their schools or townships suffered stigma from the prison. Prison staff families and prisoner families were welcome at all of the schools. No schools were aware of students from prisoner families who had moved to the area, i.e. the families were existing community members already. For prospective prison staff at the proposed expansion, the quality of schools available to their children is high.

8 Prison providers and prisoners

8.1 Introduction

There are several different types of service providers in the prison network. Those of interest to the social assessment are:

1. Rehabilitation programmes (delivered in-prison) including:
 - motivational programmes, e.g. tikanga programmes, parenting skills
 - offence-focused programmes e.g., Medium intensity rehabilitation programmes, Te Tirohanga (Maori Focus Unit), etc.
 - drug and alcohol interventions
2. Education, training, and employment programmes (delivered largely in-prison)
3. Integrated release programmes, such as drug and alcohol, accommodation, social support, transport, etc. (delivered largely on-release from prison)
(http://www.corrections.govt.nz/working_with_offenders/prison_sentences/employment_and_support_programmes.html)

The purpose of this part of the assessment is to understand the current services offered, while also determining whether and how the services might be able to scale up to meet the increased demand from a 3000-prisoner facility; and the consequent effect on prisoners.

Department of Corrections staff at National Office and at Waikeria Prison were interviewed to provide an overall picture, while phone and/or face to face interviews were held with contracted providers. The Department interviewees were:

- Nigel Banks – Principal Advisor, Offender Training and Education, Department of Corrections
- Stephen Cunningham – Director, Offender Employment and Reintegration, Department of Corrections
- Zoe Henley – National Manager, Programmes and Interventions, Department of Corrections
- Juanita Ryan – Director, Programmes and Interventions, Department of Corrections
- Rawiri White – National Manager, Programmes and Interventions, Department of Corrections
- Julie Wilson – National Manager, Employer Partnerships, Department of Corrections
- Puhi Mauriohooho – Waikeria Prison Contracts Manager, Department of Corrections

Provider interviews were held with:

- Prison Fellowship NZ
- Prison Chaplaincy Services Aotearoa
- Anglican Action
- Workwise (Hamilton)
- The Howard League for Penal Reform
- Prisoner Aid and Rehabilitation Service (Waikato)
- Salvation Army
- Te Wānanga O Aotearoa
- Goodwood Park Healthcare
- Care NZ
- Open Polytechnic
- Presbyterian Support Northern
- Ministry of Social Development
- Vertical Horizons Ltd

8.2 Context and current situation

All contracted providers use paid-staff to deliver the programmes. A few programmes have a small volunteer base to support the paid-staff roles e.g. The Howard League for Penal Reform.

8.2.1 Rehabilitation programmes

1a. Motivation and basic skills programmes, e.g. tikanga programmes, skills for life, parenting skills

These programmes are designed to motivate prisoners to be willing to undertake rehabilitation and offender focussed programmes. For example, the tikanga programme motivates prisoners by reconnecting Maori prisoners with a Maori worldview and Maori values. The tikanga programme is delivered seven times a year to up to 20 prisoners by external contractors (Mahi Tahi Akoranga Trust).

The Skills for Life Programme is not therapeutic or rehabilitative but simply teaches some basic life skills to prisoners, such as completing tenancy agreements, setting up bank accounts, etc. The course has 15 prisoners per programme and is run on a needs/cost basis, contracted to either Forward Focus Solutions Ltd (Hamilton) or Waikato Enterprises (Huntly).

Presbyterian Support Northern deliver the Parenting in Prison programme. It is a regional contract, which complements Presbyterian Support Northern's reintegration contract in all three of the women's prisons in NZ. They also run many other services that target families and children (not Correction's contracts), so typically have a workforce that is predominantly female. Delivering the Parenting in Prison programme to the male prisoners at Waikeria created some initial anxiety amongst management and staff of Presbyterian Support Northern due to safety concerns about their female workforce, but the feedback has been all positive since beginning the contract in early 2016. The relationship with the Department of Corrections is very good – described as helpful and thoughtful. While there are some minor operational issues, as would be expected, the relationship overall at the national office and at the Waikeria Prison level is described as very good.

1b. Offence-focused rehabilitation programmes e.g. Medium intensity rehabilitation programmes, Maori Focus Unit, etc.

A substantial suite of treatment programmes delivered at Waikeria Prison are the offence focussed programmes:

- Medium Intensity Rehabilitation Programme (MIRP)
- Short Motivational Programme (SMP)
- Short Rehabilitation Programme (SRP)
- Family Violence Programme

These are delivered by Department of Corrections staff, many of whom are counsellors and psychologists, delivering a range of offender and rehabilitation programmes e.g. family violence, youth offending, etc. The programmes are designed to change the thoughts, attitudes and behaviours that lead to offending. Courses run for 13 weeks and each programme has approximately 10 prisoners.

The Maori Focus Unit at Waikeria Prison has 60 prisoners, running a range of programmes that target the causes of offending and seek to rehabilitate the prisoner. Programmes are run four times per year (10 prisoners per programme) by an external provider and are similar in intent/design to the Medium Intensity Rehabilitation Programmes run elsewhere in the prison, except they are delivered from a Maori worldview. Te Wahiroa (Level 2 NZ Certificate in Tikanga) is also delivered in the Maori Focus Unit by Te Wānanga O Aotearoa (further described below in education and training section).

1c. Drug and alcohol interventions

Drug and alcohol interventions include:

- Alcohol & Other Drugs Brief Support Programme – delivered by Department of Corrections
- Alcohol & Other Drugs Intermediate Support Programme – delivered by Department of Corrections
- Drug treatment unit and intensive drug treatment programme – currently out for tender
- Drink driving brief intervention –delivered by Care NZ, national contract
- Alcohol and other drugs 8-week intensive course – delivered by Salvation Army, national contract.

Care NZ has the contract to provide drug treatment unit services for nearly all prisons in New Zealand, and deliver a brief drink driving intervention. The Waikeria Drug Treatment Unit (DTU) has 33 beds where prisoners are separate from the rest of the prison for the 6 month programme. The contracted staff (clinical manager and three practitioners) work in a collaborative manner with the custodial staff to provide a supportive environment within the unit. The relationship with Corrections, nationally and regionally, was described as very good by Care NZ. Employment of staff was a modest challenge at Waikeria, but Care NZ indicated that if they had certainty of contract, they would recruit ahead of time.

An alcohol brief intervention (screening) undertaken by Department of Corrections staff (via the prison health service staff, custodial staff or the case manager) is the initial application of the ASSIST tool to determine the severity of any alcohol issue and whether the prisoner was willing to enter into a programme. Following that, prisoners may be eligible for the brief, intermediate or intensive support programme.

8.2.2 Education, training and employment programmes

Education, training and employment are separate programmes within the Department of Corrections (2017), though there is substantial overlap between the three, and they do not fit into exclusive categorisations.

There are several external organisations who are contracted to provide education, training and employment programmes at Waikeria Prison.

Across the education, training and employment programmes, there is a mix of internal Department of Corrections staff that deliver the programmes/courses (and moderation), supported by the external providers. The external organisations which deliver or co-deliver education courses, employment and training programmes are contracted to provide paid-staff to deliver the programmes/courses. Additionally, Department of Corrections staff solely run some programmes/courses themselves to help prisoners get ready for work, for example self-directed learning programmes using secure online computers, and CV writing. The Department of Corrections staff who deliver or co-deliver the courses (education tutors and employment instructors) are also paid roles.

For all NZQA courses, external moderation and standard-setting is provided by Industry Training Organisations or the polytechnic.

2a Education and training programmes currently offered

Education courses at Waikeria Prison are funded by the Tertiary Education Commission and are delivered by the Open Polytechnic and Te Wānanga O Aotearoa. Both are long-standing education and training providers in New Zealand. Courses currently offered at Waikeria Prison include:

- Te Wahiroa, Level 2 NZ Certificate in Tikanga (Te Wānanga O Aotearoa)
- Everyday skills programme, adult literacy and numeracy (Te Wānanga O Aotearoa)
- NZ Certificate in Employment Skills (Open Polytechnic).

One issue raised by the Department about the TEC funded courses is that it can sometimes be hard for the Department to maintain the prisoner on the course (say for 17 weeks) when the prison churn is so substantial. This issue was also raised by a provider.

Te Wānanga O Aotearoa described their relationship with Corrections as 'very strong, collaborative, productive'. The relationship between the Department and Te Wānanga O Aotearoa was described as excellent by the Department, despite recent issues with the quantity of services delivered at Waikeria Prison by the Wananga. The Department and providers all believe the quality of the courses provided by Te Wānanga O Aotearoa and the Open Polytechnic have been very good.

Literacy and numeracy tutoring is also provided by volunteers from The Howard League for Penal Reform. The Howard League for Penal Reform, a national organisation, provide two volunteers to undertake one on one numeracy and literacy courses with Waikeria prisoners (particularly those for whom a group setting is not appropriate). The numeracy and literacy volunteers deliver a 2 hour per week course for 12 weeks, allowing a strong bond to build between the volunteer and prisoner. The Department described how matching prisoner availability with volunteer availability is a modest but complex task for the Department. There are also individual volunteers, from time to time, managed by Waikeria Prison's volunteer coordinator.

2b Employment and training programmes currently offered

For employment and training, again several different strands of activity occur:

- Industry training on the prison site
- Release to work, sometimes at employers throughout the region
- Employment support services and recruitment services.

Starting with on the industry training, Vertical Horizons Ltd runs short-courses which target specific needs of prisoners, such as unit standards or 'trade tickets'. These courses are those judged by the Department to be highly useful for prisoners gaining work after their release, such as:

- First aid
- Health and safety
- Working at heights
- Traffic control,
- Forklift driving, etc.

Vertical Horizons describes their relationship with the Department of Corrections as 'really mature', having successfully worked together for over 6 years. Vertical Horizons delivers courses to 25,000 students nationally, of which Waikeria Prison is just one of their clients. Their staff are based 'all over', in Hamilton, Auckland, etc. and respond as needed by travelling to Waikeria to deliver the necessary courses (say a 2-day course).

Industry training providers also offer longer-term courses which also include practical/'hands-on' training alongside some bookwork, leading to a NZQA qualification for the prisoner. For example, for horticulture, arboriculture, tractor skills, dairy, engineering, kitchen, laundry, bakery etc. These include level 2, 3 and 4 courses. While not at Waikeria Prison, the industry training facilities at the newly built Auckland South Corrections Facility were referred to by both the Department and providers as an excellent example of on-site industry training. For example, Placemakers provide electronic files of house frame designs, and the prisoners make the entire house frames/trusses on-site, which are then shipped to home building sites throughout Auckland.

Related to this, the number of prisoners on 'release to work' has dropped substantially following an incident where a prisoner absconded and left the country while on temporary release. Nationally there would have been 250 prisoners on release to work prior to that case, now there are approximately 70. At Waikeria Prison the decrease has been just as severe (from 32 to five). The Department of Corrections acknowledges that the opportunities for release to work at Waikeria are limited to what is occurring at present due to the lack of large industries nearby, the distances that need to be travelled and the recent restrictions on the number of prisoners being released to work. The progression to release to work is seen as very important by the Department of Corrections, as it is a step where prisoners show trustworthiness and good decision making.

Workwise have an employment support service contract with the Department to help prisoners find employment and to support the prisoner in their job for up to six months after release. They work with prisoners, WINZ and employers prior to release, to try to place released prisoners in long term employment. A full package would include placing a person in employment and 'holding their hand for the next six months' while they readjust to life outside of prison; a reduced package involves just 'holding their hand for the next six months' (as a job would have been arranged by someone else). Based out of a Hamilton, Workwise also has a staff member based in Te Awamutu, and two full time equivalent staff (FTEs) with an outcomes based contract for Waikeria Prison services. Workwise describe their relationship with the Department as excellent at the national level and good at the regional level. Workwise hopes to grow its services in the future, and as such sees the proposed expansion as 'potentially great'. Workwise acknowledges the contract they have will be up for tender in mid-2017, but if they re-win that contract, they believe they can upscale their workforce to match. With the potential growth to the region overall, Workwise suggested it would make placements easier in the future (due to more construction and other regional developments). The only risk identified was the potential for their staff to be enticed to take up prison staff roles.

Other recruitment options to find jobs for prisoners (prior to release) include Work and Income (Ministry of Social Development) and the Department of Corrections working together, where the Ministry of Social Development can act as an employment broker for prisoners about to be released. The Ministry of Social Development currently provides an 'across regional boundaries' service, where a person released from Waikeria is supported to find work in their home area. Another recruitment channel is the Offender Recruitment Coordinators, a recently created service at the Department of Corrections to act as a recruitment service specifically for prisoners – to find them employment.

8.2.3 Integrated release programmes

A number of external agencies provide integrated release programmes for offenders released from Waikeria Prison. Some work with prisoners prior to release to assist at the time of release, while others work with the offenders once they are released. The types of integrated release programmes include:

- drug and alcohol programmes
- supported accommodation
- reintegration services, such as arranging accommodation, bank accounts etc.
- social support for the offender and/or family
- extended supervision orders of offenders.

Prisoner Aid and Rehabilitation Service (PARS) (Waikato) work under a grant from the Department rather than a contracted service. PARS prefers the grant to its previous contractual relationship, which due to compliance requirements meant PARS lost a number of volunteers. PARS delivers reintegration services – helping people reintegrate back into their original community. It is worth noting the difference between a reintegration service (which is a 'light touch' contract) and a rehabilitation service (which has a treatment/therapeutic aspect to the contract). PARS help by finding accommodation, setting up bank accounts, getting benefits arranged, providing clothes and initial setup of food etc. PARS described their relationship with the Department as very good. Being based

in Hamilton, it is a 100km round-trip to the prison, so if a booking with a prisoner does not work out, it is a lot of lost time. Over time, PARS have shrunk their service from a contract model back to a grant, to carry out their core social service functions.

“National office make a real effort with relationships” (Provider).

While not a reintegration function, PARS also has a prison transport service, running buses between Auckland, Hamilton and Spring Hill/Waikeria prisons for visitors, typically once per week. PARS (Rotorua) run a transport service to Waikeria once per week, but there is no transport service from the Whakatane/Tauranga to Waikeria Prison (where many of the prisoners at Waikeria come from).

Goodwood Park is an Auckland based out of gate provider with an office in Te Awamutu. Goodwood Park provides reintegration services similar to PARS (above). While Goodwood Park staff are meant to start work with the prisoner up to 5-6 weeks prior to release i.e. create a plan, test it, etc., this rarely occurs. Over 70 per cent of their referrals occur with less than 2 weeks of a sentence remaining.

Salvation Army provide contracts across a range of services, including integrated release programmes. These include 14-week alcohol and drug programmes, social housing in Hamilton city and community ministries (budgeting, advocacy, benefits, clothing etc.). The Salvation Army has reintegration contracts for 300 prisoners per year, but would like to do more. Salvation Army describe their relationship with the Department as ‘sometimes fractious’, but at the same time, both parties indicate that each is trying hard to work with the other for the best outcomes.

Monitoring of released prisoners under extended supervision orders requires substantial staff commitment per released prisoner. For example, up to five staff may be needed to cover a 24-hour line of sight supervision order on one offender. Anglican Action who has this contract with the Department has described the relationship with Corrections as excellent. The Director of Anglican Action describes how the Department is willing to work in multi-disciplinary teams, and is cognisant that quality teams take time to put in place.

Accommodation services are also provided by Anglican Action. Approximately 30 beds are available throughout Hamilton for high risk offenders, at which Anglican Action also run reintegration programmes for those offenders. Anglican Action described how the offenders are typically originally from Hamilton and are relocated back to Hamilton on release. The joint goal of the Department and Anglican Action is to try to reintegrate offenders back into the communities they come from, as that is where the offenders typically have most family/whanau support. Anglican Action described this as an important commitment to hold to, going forward with the proposed expansion.

Residential support for women with children is also available in Hamilton from Anglican Action, and they have plans to expand this service. This service targets all women and children in the area, and Anglican Action does have clients who need a home away from an offender or prisoner, and consequently a few women and children from other areas are placed in Hamilton (and vice versa).

“If we work together [with Corrections and other agencies] to plan for the increased demand, it’s doable, we can do it” (Provider).

8.2.4 Services for accommodation and housing for released prisoners

For housing and accommodation service providers, several methods are used to get prisoners into stable accommodation:

- Reintegration services delivered by external providers
- Urging (by Corrections) and by reintegration service providers to make Housing NZ applications, however HNZ has its usual wait list

- Wraparound services in Hamilton, for difficult prisoners, where multiple providers (i.e. health, Housing NZ, MSD, Corrections, etc.) wrap services around a released prisoner.

Attempting to find accommodation for released prisoners has been described as a ‘constant challenge’ by providers of reintegration services and supported accommodation providers. This has been made more difficult by the current house price increases and rental accommodation scarcity being experienced by the upper North Island (see Section 6 (housing and commuting) for additional information).

8.3 Providers and prisoners – potential effects

All provider interviewees described how the increase in prisoner numbers arising from the proposed expansion needed a commensurate increase in resources to run the prisoner programmes and courses. Simply, with the expansion of Waikeria Prison leading to an uplift of an additional 2000 prisoner places - this number would overwhelm existing programmes, both the budgets and staffing.

When external providers and the Department were asked if they had the ability to expand the number of paid staff, all responded positively and were willing to expand. Of course, this was dependent on adequate planning, carried out well in advance to give surety of contracts, and the consequential additional budget.

For example, Te Wānanga O Aotearoa noted how their Te Awamutu and Hamilton sites set them up well to provide additional services to Waikeria, and their national delivery also meant they were “easily able to scale up”. Goodwood Park Healthcare said that instead of 50 prisoner releases per month, there might be 300 prisoner releases per month, and they said ‘we can recruit staff to deal with that, but finding accommodation is just getting harder and harder’. Similarly, Department of Corrections staff acknowledged the need for time and planning to allow providers to scale up. When asked, what would happen if for any reason a provider could not scale up appropriately, or did not want to?, the Department described how other providers could be sought to work alongside existing providers in the first instance, and replace providers where needed.

“We’re already delivering a good service, across multiple sites. Progress, scaling, that will be OK for us” (Provider).

“We need to be working with our providers at least 12 months out, so that when the prisoners turn up, we can start programmes straight away. We don’t want prisoners sitting around doing nothing – that’s just trouble” (Department of Corrections).

Prior to this SIA beginning, the Department signalled in the Cabinet paper submitted in Oct 2016 that it would seek funding for enhancements to four of its most successful programmes being drug treatment, specialised treatment, education interventions and reintegrative services. The budget 2017 bid was submitted in 2017 and Cabinet’s decision on whether the bid was successful is expected to be made in April.

“We can scale up, but not overnight. We’d need to work with the Department to plan that, and they’ve been good at that in the past” (Provider).

For nearly all the providers, the relationship with the Department of Corrections was described as good to excellent. Only one provider described the relationship as ‘sometimes fractious’, but even that provider acknowledged both sides were working hard to get the best outcomes for prisoners. Because relationships are in such good condition, it increases the likelihood that the planning needed will happen.

Regarding staffing, while providers acknowledged staffing was always an issue, most were very positive about their ability to cope given nearly all services are contracted, and the central region was seen as having a reasonable workforce to draw on. Even the volunteer service, for whom recruitment

was likely to be most difficult, were heartened by the positive community response to the prison and expressed an interest in specifically recruiting in those townships.

“We haven’t recruited in Te Awamutu or Otorohanga specifically. That’s good to hear they’re receptive to the prison” (Provider).

“Yes it can be challenging hiring staff, but the central region is actually OK. If we were talking Auckland, then that’d be a problem’ (Provider).

The Department of Corrections (and some providers) expressed the hope that the proposed expansion would allow major changes that might positively affect how providers work and programmes are delivered. These included:

- Stabilising the prisoner population to allow consistent referral to providers, meaning prisoners who start a course are less likely to be moved from a site mid-course, and Corrections are more likely to be able to fill the course places available
- Being able to provide a full suite of programmes on site (due to scale)
- The scale of the individual courses delivered might allow providers to hire a bespoke person to deliver the service, rather than rely on existing staff. For example, they might have enough clients to hire a male for a particular role, or a Maori male where appropriate. Furthermore, it would also be more likely that staff would have enough to do locally so that they move to the study area instead of commuting from elsewhere.
- The potential for purpose built facilities to be provided. This was an exciting prospect to the providers. For example, Care NZ described the purpose built DTU at Hawke’s Bay prison as an excellent place to work; while the Department of Corrections noted new facilities would likely contribute to the easier running of the programmes. Similarly, if teaching forklift driving or tractor driving, the necessary space to do it could be provided. Providers regularly offered to help with any design requirements should Corrections ask.

Other positive effects predicted were:

- If more resourcing was forthcoming, nearly all providers expressed substantial interest, willingness and/or desire to expand
- At present, provider entry into the prison was time consuming. Experience with other new prisons around the country suggested to providers that if the design was good, their speed of access would improve.
- Providers queried whether they would have specialist space on site. Clearly for some e.g. DTU, educational providers, chaplains it is a basic requirement. Office space was also requested, beyond just practice space, with providers having experienced losing office space in other prisons as capacity had expanded. One provider suggested rented space would be useful.
- Similarly, the amount of physical space available in the proposed expansion was raised as providers (and the Department) described how moving prisoners around a site to attend a course/programme was time consuming, and put pressure on custodial staff. Instead, one interviewee suggested having adequate teaching/employment spaces in each unit, as that would allow educators/trainers to move around the site, rather than prisoners.
- Waikeria Prison was described by two providers as a prison further along the journey from a custodial focus to a rehabilitation focus than other prisons in NZ. The proposed expansion was projected to cement and improve that further.
- With larger sites, providers are often able to provide staff closer to the facility (hence cutting down on travel time/costs) e.g. a move from Auckland to Hamilton, or Hamilton to Te Awamutu, or Te Awamutu to on-site.

Post-build, the number of prisoners on release to work is not expected to increase according to the Department of Corrections. Despite more prisoners being on site, the tightening of criteria (following

the incident where a prisoner absconded and left the country while on temporary release discussed above) and the maintenance of employers nearby, would mean no substantial change in the number of prisoners being released to work. Opportunities will be generated from creating substantial industry training programmes by bringing partner industries into the prison e.g. Placemakers at Auckland South Corrections Facility. Such programmes will develop partnerships with companies that can deliver constructed products into their supply chain.

The skills taught would not necessarily relate to the needs of the central region, but instead be NZ-wide (as that is where prisoners would be released too). A challenge is getting the prisoner to the units to do the work, so having units co-located with prisoner accommodation is considered ideal. This would require a design that considered rehabilitation just as much as incarceration. The industry training spaces need to be large, and provide flexible options, as what is needed in 2020 may not be what is needed in 2030. Auckland South Corrections Facility is considered a good example of an industry training site; as was the Manawatu Prison where the multiple fences allowed employment partners to still access their materials even when the prison was in lockdown (very important for time sensitive materials).

Negative issues of relevance to the proposed expansion were also described by providers:

- Recruiting volunteers to visit the prison was seen to be harder in a rural area compared with an urban area. However, the local towns of Te Awamutu, Kihikihi and Otorohanga, which are overwhelmingly positive about the presence of the prison, had not been overtly targeted for volunteers up to this point by several of the volunteer agencies, and one volunteer agency was interested in pursuing that.
- Current case management (i.e. assessment and planning for release of prisoners by staff) at Waikeria was considered to be poor by some providers. This was claimed to be due to the staff being stretched, and focused on administration rather than one to one work with the prisoner; high staff turnover; regular changes to what frontline workers can/can't do; employing the wrong people; staff not having the assessment, reintegration/rehabilitation understanding and/or plan development/writing skills; staff lacking motivation; and management not dealing with poor performance. Providers said that Waikeria Prison was a well-run prison when compared to other prisons in New Zealand, with case management its one weak point. Providers saw the proposed expansion as an opportunity for the Department to improve case management. This statement was contentious with some staff at the Department of Corrections who had the opposite opinion of Waikeria Prison – being ahead of other sites; and others who acknowledged that there was always more work to be done.
- Continuous changes in the competitive contract environment mean that a current provider is not necessarily going to be the provider in late 2020.
- Smaller organisations will need to assess any potential opportunities that might arise, and decide if they will try to build their business (based on the opportunities) or stick to their core work.

Again, while reintegration into the community was a major concern voiced in the Board of Inquiry (2011) report about the building of Auckland South Corrections Facility, this issue was not considered by Providers to be a concern for Waikeria Prison. Providers nearly unanimously described how the focus of all is to reintegrate the prisoner into his previous community where he is most likely to have family/whanau to support, not to reintegrate into the immediate geographic area around the prison. One provider raised a concern about the potential for the prison expansion to change the make-up of the community i.e. prisoner families moving into the area and consequent increase in domestic violence services etc. On discussion and follow up emails with the providers' staff, it was identified that such a situation did not occur at Waikeria Prison.

Prisoners being released into their home regions (not in the study area), while ideal, does raise its own issues. The Ministry of Social Development acknowledged that with the expansion of Waikeria

Prison (and the consequent increase in prisoners from other regions being placed at Waikeria, and hence released from Waikeria back to their home region), their across-region service would also need to expand to meet that need. The larger scale however was described as potentially making it easier for them to direct bespoke resources from each of the surrounding regions to serve Waikeria Prison, which at present was difficult. The Ministry of Social Development would welcome further discussions with Corrections on this – particularly to capitalise on the industry training and educational opportunities that would also arise with the proposed expansion.

Finally, identifying stable housing for released prisoners is likely to become increasingly difficult within the Waikato region as the numbers requiring rental and supported accommodation increase. Providers were unsure whether they would be able to source additional rental properties to place released prisoners into. Similarly, supported accommodation providers described the need for additional spaces to house the expected increase.

Overall, this assessment about services offered concludes that the proposed expansion will have a positive effect on service providers within the study area. For prisoners, positive effects are concluded to accrue from the increase in access to and types of rehabilitation programmes that can be offered to meet their needs.

The current programmes cover a broad range of needs and are provided by trained Corrections staff or contracted external providers. Programmes include:

1. Rehabilitation programmes (delivered in-prison):
 - motivational programmes, e.g. tikanga programmes, parenting skills
 - offence-focused programmes e.g. Medium intensity rehabilitation programmes, Maori Focus Unit, etc.
 - drug and alcohol interventions
2. Education, training and employment programmes (delivered largely in-prison)
3. Integrated release programmes, such as drug and alcohol, accommodation, social support, transport, extended supervision orders, etc. (delivered largely on-release from prison)

All participants stressed the importance of early planning/contracting, adequate funding and appropriate physical spaces. Without an increase in funding, provider capacity would simply not cope. Importantly, the Department of Corrections has submitted a Budget 2017 bid to Cabinet to fund enhancements to four of its most successful programmes.

The relationships between Corrections and providers is very good, meaning the ability to plan, negotiate, and contract has been done well in the past, making it plausible that it can be done well in the future. Most providers are willing to scale up and many desire it. Contracts are delivered by paid staff, and potential recruitment of staff was not considered to be overly difficult (with adequate lead-in time). Many providers already had substantial scale (being regional and/or national providers) and described how additional growth was well within their capacity.

For the small number of volunteer providers, finding volunteers in a rural location was considered more difficult, though on hearing that the communities of Otorohanga, Kihikihi and Te Awamutu were supportive of the prison, the volunteer services were considering recruitment from those townships.

Positive benefits to providers and prisoners are concluded to potentially accrue from the proposed expansion, arising from the stable prisoner population. These include a full suite of programmes able to be offered; bespoke staff able to be hired; access to purpose built rehabilitation and training

facilities; and prisoners more easily able to access a wider range of programmes, including a substantial industry training programme.

Negative outcomes identified by providers included difficulty in families visiting prisoners due to lack of public transport and rural nature of Waikeria Prison; existing providers potentially not being the providers in the future (due to the 3 to 5 year term of signed contracts); and smaller providers needing to determine whether they will attempt to grow their businesses, or stick to their core work if the proposed expansion goes ahead.

Identifying rental accommodation and provision of supported accommodation are two services that would be placed under pressure by the proposed expansion. Providers will require substantial lead time, support and planning to address future housing needs within the Waikato Region.

Providers believed the new facility presented an opportunity to improve the current case management at Waikeria Prison. Similarly, the Ministry of Social Development noted the need to work closely with the Department of Corrections on the expansion of their across-region services (where prisoners are reintegrated into regions away from the prison location). The Department has advised it will actively engage with service providers, DHB and MSD working collaboratively to plan for the commencement of operations at the new facility.

9 Prisoner families and prison visitors

9.1 Context and current situation

The Board of Inquiry (2011) for Auckland South Corrections Facility highlighted the potential social effects prisoner families might have on communities. For this social assessment, substantial effort has been made to fully understand potential effects of prisoner families on study area communities. All community and social service provider interviewees were asked whether they provided services to prisoner families who had moved into the study area, or not. For example, in Te Awamutu, Kihikihi and Otorohanga:

- property managers, letting agents and real estate agents were asked about whether they have previously or currently let or sold property to prisoner families moving into the study area
- Early childhood education, primary school and secondary school principals were asked about whether children of prisoner families who have moved into the study area are at their centres/schools
- Medical centres were asked about whether prisoner families have moved into the study area and are using their services
- Motel and campground owners were asked about whether prisoner families are staying long term or short term at their accommodation
- Police were asked about prisoner families moving into the study area and prison visitors
- Social service providers were asked about prisoner families moving into the study area and using their services
- Prison staff were asked about whether non-local prisoners are being released into the study area
- Kihikihi bar staff were asked about whether prisoner families or visitors are frequenting their establishments and/or causing trouble
- Business associations and Grey Power were asked about experiences of prisoner families causing trouble or not
- Probation staff who directly place offenders back into the community were asked about where non-local prisoners get placed on release

In addition, site neighbours and Waikeria Road residents at the community open days made comments on this matter that have been incorporated into the assessment.

Therefore, instead of relying on anecdote or perception the assessment drew on first-hand experiences.

9.1.1 Flow of prisoners into and out of prison

Offenders may be placed on remand while awaiting trial. Not all offenders awaiting trial are remanded in custody and there are many factors for the Judge to consider before an offender is bailed before trial. The trial will lead to a conviction, or not. If a person goes to trial and is not convicted, they are released to the community. Out of gate services are available for a released person who has been on remand for at least 60 days.

If convicted, the offender is either released on bail or remanded in custody to await sentencing. Probation contacts the prison to undertake a pre-sentence report with the offender. The pre-sentence report covers prisoner risk, offending needs and options for rehabilitation. This pre-sentence report highlights to the Judge, the sentencing options and recommends a sentence. Upon consideration of this pre-sentence report (and other information), the Judge will sentence the offender. Regardless of whether a community based sentence or prison, the judge may place conditions on the sentence. For example, if a non-custodial sentence is given (i.e. home detention), the judge may still require an alcohol and other drug programme to be part of the conditions of the home detention sentence. If so, the probation officer would then refer the offender to the appropriate community programme.

Once in prison, the primary goal for most prisoners is to address offending, and there are many treatment programmes available (as discussed in section 8). Following that, the next stage is to consider life skills, work skills and reintegration. Again, many programmes address these factors. Corrections described it as *'pointless to release the prisoner to live anywhere – we need to support them on release to make the most of that investment'*. Consequently, for high risk offenders in particular, substantial effort goes into helping determine where that person will live on release.

There are three types of prisoner release: 'release on conditions' if the prisoner was sentenced to less than two years imprisonment; or 'parole' if sentenced to greater than two years imprisonment; or release at sentence end date for long term prisoners not paroled. For release on conditions, a prisoner is automatically released after serving half of their sentence and a Judge will nearly always consider the treatment programmes the prisoner had received in prison, and require assessment and/or continuation of those programmes as part of the release on conditions. The same would be true of the parole board for a prisoner released on parole. Length of sentence (i.e. less or greater than two years) is not necessarily a good indicator of risk of reoffending, hence the need for conditions regardless of sentence length.

On release, all prisoners on parole must undertake an induction with Probation within 72 hours. Finally, any programmes needed would be delivered by community providers on release, and any release conditions would be monitored by the Department of Corrections.

9.2 Prisoner families moving to the study area – potential effects

In nearly all cases above, across over 90 interviews, very few prisoner families were currently known to be using any of the services. Several interviewees described that prisoner families had moved to the study area in the past, but this had stopped in recent times. No service providers (e.g. property managers, schools, ECEs, medical services, etc.) could recall any prisoner families moving into the study area within the past 6 years, many recalled longer timeframes. Interviewees' described this change was because of:

- Increased transport options of prisoner families i.e. cars were more reliable and cheaper than ever, and free transport was available for prison visitors (from social service agencies, from some towns/cities)
- Increased remand prisoners at Waikeria Prison, meaning prisoner churn did not made it worthwhile for prisoner families to move to the study area (note, a substantial proportion of muster growth in the proposed expansion is projected to be driven by remand prisoners)
- Increased requirements being placed on visitors (i.e. pre-vetting including security checks; prisoners needing to authorise visitors; visitors having to book in advance rather than just turn up).

In contrast to the above, Police in Te Awamutu knew of two families who had moved to the area about two years ago, from Whakatane, after their partner had been placed at Waikeria Prison. In both situations the partners could not drive and wanted to be able to visit their partners (using the free transport). Both families were made up of one mother and one child, and in both situations each of the children came to Police attention for graffiti vandalism. For those people who had businesses and fences vandalised, the effect was described as 'extreme annoyance' rather than fear from being targeted. The Police described that 'the offending was never more than minor', and the Police got on top of it quickly once they identified the vandal (took two-three weeks). This is not to downplay the effects of graffiti vandalism within the study area, nor the effects on people affected by graffiti vandalism, but it does highlight that any issues are not strongly driven by prisoner families who have moved to the area.

To complement the above interview data, substantial New Zealand research has allowed a literature scan to focus on the social effects of prisons (Quigley and Watts Ltd, 2016). The New Zealand research was:

- Taylor Baines and Associates Ltd who undertook four case studies on the siting and social impact of prisons on their host communities over the course of several years in New Zealand (Taylor Baines and Associates Ltd, 2001a, 2001b, 2002a, 2002b, 2002c, 2002d, 2003)
- A Connell Wagner Ltd (2000) report as part of a socio-economic assessment of Corrections activities in Turangi (Tongariro and Rangipo prisons for male prisoners)
- Waldegrave's (1999) study on whether family members of long term inmates had relocated to be nearer inmates (Rimutaka and Wanganui)
- Otago Corrections Facility research on the new prison built near Milburn, Otago (Phoenix Research, 2005, 2012; Corydon Ltd 2013).

Importantly, no effect or no substantial effect was identified in New Zealand research resulting from prisoner relocation, prisoner family relocation, or released prisoners staying in the area (Quigley and Watts Ltd, 2016). This correlates well with the evidence for Waikeria Prison where a few prisoner families have moved into the study area. Interestingly, Police have become aware of two families, but not other organisations or institutions in the area. This reflects that if other prisoner families have moved into the study area, they are largely flying below the radar.

Finally, the Board of Inquiry (2011) for Auckland South Corrections Facility set up a social impact monitoring programme to determine whether prisoner families are moving into the South Auckland area. The most recent (2015) Annual Monitoring Report identified no data to support the belief that prisoner families might move into the local area, though further study is underway to monitor whether this continues over time (Quigley and Watts Ltd, 2016).

9.3 Prison visitors – potential effects

Prison service providers described the difficulty for families to visit prisoners due to the remoteness of Waikeria Prison and lack of public transport. This was on top of increased security and processes families and prisoners must undergo prior to/during visits.

This was believed to exacerbate the loss of connection with the prisoner's family/whanau, who are valued for their rehabilitation influence and role in reintegration following prisoner release. Skype connections were suggested by one volunteer provider as a partial substitute for visiting (for example there is an audio visual connection with the probation office in Gisborne to allow a Gisborne-based family to easily see and talk to their family member in prison); as were transport options from where prisoners were from i.e. Whakatane, Tauranga.

Regarding community views on prisoner visitors, three community members at the open day (who lived on/near Waikeria Road) described how they sometimes saw 'dodgy looking people' driving up and down Waikeria Road (the main road to the prison). The three Waikeria Road residents had a fear of their houses being 'checked out' for potential robbery, but confirmed that none knew of any prison visitors actually casing out houses or conducting robberies. Naturally, the three residents were concerned about greater numbers of such people driving past their houses. Corrections staff offered to speak to the community police officer on their behalf to identify if crime on Waikeria Road was an issue, and if so, who was causing it. The three residents also said that not much could be done to stop people driving up and down their road.

The community police officer confirmed that the types of issues described by the Waikeria Road residents were not issues that had been identified to Police (or by Police) about Waikeria Road. Police said they were more than happy to come out and 'check out' such vehicles if anybody contacts them.

“Checking out vehicles of concern is one of our key roles. That’s what we do. If they call us, we’ll check it out.” (Police)

Another resident on Waikeria Road was approached by a group of people (in a car) asking for petrol, and living alone she felt unsettled by this. Again, she was concerned by the possibility of such a situation occurring again. Again, the community police officer was unaware of this event, and said they would see responding to and investigating this type of event as a core piece of their work. Police requested members of the public to report such events to allow them to check out what is going on, if anything.

Regarding burglaries on Waikeria Road specifically, Police described that the two burglaries that had occurred there in the past were related to ex-farm employees, and nothing to do with Waikeria Prison. Police also commented that a resident who was on parole lived nearby, which might explain why other residents were seeing Police cars in the area at all hours (checking parole conditions were being met). Furthermore, Police described that no crime in Te Awamutu, Kihikihi and Otorohanga has been ascribed to prison visitors, and this was seen to be highly unlikely.

“Dealing with prison visitors? Nah, not much.” (Police)

Based on community concerns arising from the Board of Inquiry (2011) for Auckland South Corrections Facility, specific questions were asked of Police about whether Waikeria prison visitors had been associated with specific issues/crimes and the response from the community police officer is below:

- No sleeping in cars
- No abandonment of cars
- No car-jacking
- No petrol drive-offs
- No petty crime or business break-ins.

The Otorohanga Business Development Board did not believe prisoner families were causing any issues for the businesses they represented. The same was said by Grey Power. At an individual business level, The Star (the Tavern and TAB closest to the prison) was also asked about potential trouble from prison visitors as this was hinted at by one community member at an Open Day. On interview the Manager at The Star said that the few prison visitors they did get were lovely people and none had caused any trouble.

“We’ve got new owners and we don’t get any trouble around here anymore”
(Manager, The Star).

Similarly, motel and Holiday Park/Campground owners were asked about prisoner families visiting. None had let rooms to families/friends visiting prisons, nor reported any trouble.

From a Police perspective, prison visitors did create a very small additional workload for them at Waikeria Prison itself (rather than in the community), but this could be handled within normal rosters. The types of roles Police carried out in relation to prison visitors included:

- Dealing with attempted trafficking of cellphones, drugs, tobacco etc. into the prison by visitors
- Staffing a road block to search all cars entering the site. This is an infrequent operation, either randomly run or based on operational intelligence.

A number of site neighbours (those with land within 1 km of the designation, or on Waikeria Road) were visited by Department of Corrections staff, landscape, lighting, traffic and noise specialists. Each specialist asked the site neighbours about potential social effects (beyond visual, noise, traffic and

light) and the effects raised were similar to above (fear of prisoner escape and fears related to prison visitors). None of the site neighbours who were visited had actually experienced any negative outcomes.

Overall, this assessment concludes that the proposed expansion will have a negligible social effect from prisoner families moving into the study area. This is based on the evidence that a few prisoner families have moved into the study area around Waikeria Prison in the past and therefore a small number of additional families would be expected in the future. This finding is supported by substantial New Zealand research with similar findings – little to no effect.

Where individual prisoner families are moving into the study area, they are ‘flying below the radar’ across a broad range of services within the study area, and consequently having little social effect. The only service to come into contact with prisoner families has been the Police, with two children who were graffiti vandals and the Police dealt with both situations quickly.

While prison visitors driving up and down Waikeria Road is a concern to some residents, prison visitors have not generated any work for Police on Waikeria Road or further afield. Similarly, no evidence exists regarding any social effects from prison visitors on businesses or accommodation providers in the study area. Police have asked residents to report any suspicious activity, or call them if they are feeling unsafe in any way.

For prisoners and prisoner families, the most substantial negative effect will be the continued difficulty of visiting by prisoner families due to the rural nature of the site and lack of public transport.

10 Police and probation services

10.1 Context and current situation

At present Police undertake a small amount of work related to prison visitors (as described in Section 9), whereas most Police work related to Waikeria Prison is at the prison itself. The work relates to:

- Offences e.g. assaults by prisoners
- Death in custody (suicide or natural causes)

Serious assaults and death in custody require police investigations to be undertaken. These can range from minor inquiries to major inquiries. Deaths require substantial investigations, though the number of deaths from natural causes in prison is low because prisoners are typically transferred to hospital, hospice or home prior to death.

Police have a specific liaison officer who works with Waikeria Prison to handle the majority of the work, meaning that Waikeria Prison work typically fits into normal rosters.

The role of probation officers has been described previously in section 9.1.1, but in summary it is to help understand the needs of the prisoner (pre-sentencing report), support the reintegration of the prisoner on release, and ensure the offender complies with any community based sentences or orders.

Where do released prisoners go? Are they 'dumped' in Hamilton?

There is a 'practice policy' by Corrections to return the prisoner back to their own community. This is the case with nearly all prisoners. However, a few released prisoners do move to Hamilton (being the nearest large city to Waikeria) because they are displaced. Such prisoners have 'burned their bridges' in the (typically small) communities they are from, and have nowhere to go. While there is no hard data on these high risk offenders, such offenders come to the attention of Probation management who describe the number of these high risk offenders moving to Hamilton as 'very few'.

Accommodation is attempted to be sourced for displaced offenders by a reintegration service provider (usually an external provider) prior to release, or the offender is released into supported accommodation e.g. from Waikeria Prison by Anglican Action in Hamilton. Anglican Action also confirm that very few 'out of region' prisoners are placed in their supported accommodation.

North Island supported accommodation also exists in Auckland, Napier and Wellington. Therefore, the few displaced prisoners (from around the country) who are not released back to their home region, do not just come to Hamilton – there are other options for Corrections.

Police carried out a review in 2015 regarding the 'previous home region' of child sex offenders known to be living in the Waikato. Of those, 80 per cent were originally from Waikato and a further 10 per cent were from the surrounding regions: Bay of Plenty, Lakes and South Auckland. Probation described this as '*showing the system is working to return offenders to their home region*'.

For the few prisoners who were displaced, Corrections said it would be highly unusual for such prisoners to be placed in Te Awamutu or Otorohanga as there are no supported accommodation service providers based there.

Probation described how getting actual numbers on how many prisoners are released to Hamilton City from another region (beyond the qualitative description 'very few') would be difficult. Case notes are held separately in the case management system and it would be a manual task to identify such data. Such an exercise was judged to be not worthwhile given Corrections and an independent provider both described the numbers as 'very few'.

Questions were raised by a few stakeholders about whether specific types of prisoners were being released to Hamilton rather than returning to their home regions. Therefore, the following answers were provided by Probation:

- Sentenced prisoners would rarely be released to the Henry Rongomau Bennett Centre for acute mental health care as their need is low (unlike the remand population).
- Sentenced prisoners who are receiving mental health services at the prison, on release, would go back to their home town to receive continued care, unless they were also displaced (as above).
- Sentenced prisoners who have received an alcohol and drugs course in prison, on release, would go back to their home town and may take part in maintenance programmes, unless they were also displaced (as above)

For the last two bullet points, Corrections knows that 95 per cent of prisoners have alcohol and drug, and/or mental health issues. Therefore, Corrections has providers of these services throughout the country. *“Relying on one city to deliver those services just simply wouldn’t work, we need to provide alcohol and drug, and mental health services in lots of places”*. Therefore, it is concluded that Hamilton City is not a ‘dumping ground’ for prisoners from Waikeria Prison.

10.2 Police and probation – potential effects

Police described that the expansion at Waikeria Prison would likely require an increase in their resources to deal with the consequent increase with on-site offences. This would occur as part of their annual review of services and was not seen as problematic. Police did not expect any increase in community crime from the proposed expansion.

At the time of this assessment, management at Probation was asking themselves ‘how the proposed expansion might affect their service?’ and have set up a specialist group to consider their response. There are no findings because it is ‘early days’, however some potential effects identified included:

- Increased staff requirements, which in turn had the potential for an improved career path for staff because there would be additional advancement options from these larger teams
- Undertaking future recruitment in a different manner to now, as using the same approaches/intensity of recruitment would be unlikely to provide the uplift in number of probation staff needed
- A lack of office accommodation at the new Community Corrections Hub (replacing six existing Hamilton sites) where probation staff are based. This centre is already close to capacity. Additional office accommodation would likely be needed.

Overall, this assessment concludes that the proposed expansion will have a negligible social effect on Police and Probation services. This is based on the evidence that additional resources for police will be needed for on-site services; and for Probation to deal with the increased number of prisoners; but both can be handled within normal planning.

While one stakeholder had voiced concern about prisoners from out of the region being ‘dumped in Hamilton City’, this was not the case. Probation and external providers release prisoners back to their home region in nearly all cases. Exceptions exist for displaced prisoners, but they are ‘very few’, and Hamilton City is just one option from several New Zealand cities where displaced prisoners might be released into supported accommodation or programmes.

11 Health services

11.1 Context and current situation

The health sector is one of several sectors potentially affected by the proposed expansion. To ensure good coverage of the sector, interviews were undertaken with:

- Waikato DHB, Executive Director, Mental Health and Addiction Services
- Waikato DHB, Director, Adult Mental Health Service
- Waikato DHB, Director, Midland Region Forensic Psychiatry Service
- Waikato DHB Community Mental Health Service
- Te Awamutu Medical Centre Ltd
- Mahoe Med Ltd (Te Awamutu)
- Otorohanga Medical Centre Ltd
- St John's Ambulance

The health sector was impressed the Department of Corrections was engaging with them early about the proposed expansion and the potential to plan accordingly, with enough time to do so.

"It's great that Corrections has come to talk to us so early" (Waikato DHB).

"There's a real opportunity to get this right if we're all in the room together"
(Waikato DHB).

Health providers are largely funded by the District Health Boards (along with numerous other sources, e.g. ACC; private patients, etc.) Some funding is provided by Corrections for specific health services, e.g. general medical service contract at Waikeria Prison.

11.1.1 General Practitioners

Te Awamutu Medical Centre Ltd is the largest of the two GP practices in Te Awamutu. Their roll is just over 14,000 clients (with Mahoe Med Ltd at 10,000). Te Awamutu Medical Centre has 12 doctors, 10 nurses, 2 physician assistants and 10 administrative staff. They are based in the town centre of Te Awamutu, open Monday-Friday (8:00AM to 6:00PM) and Saturday (9:00AM to 12:00PM). They also run a once/week satellite clinic in Kihikihi, and another in Ohaupo. They provide general practice services, nursing clinics and provide space for visiting specialists.

At present Te Awamutu Medical Centre have 'just enough capacity' in their GP services. For example, to ensure adequate winter GP services, planning is one year in advance to source an appropriate number of additional locum GPs. The Business Manager described how this reflects that their practice is experiencing similar effects to the rest of New Zealand regarding a general GP shortage.

Mahoe Med is the second largest GP practice in Te Awamutu, with 10,000 enrolled patients and 9 doctors. Mahoe Med is open 8:00AM-8:00PM Monday to Friday, and 9:00AM-3:00PM on weekends and public holidays. They provide general practice services, nursing clinics and x-ray/fracture clinic.

Mahoe Med are managing their growth – rising from just 6,000 patients four years ago to 10,000 now. Mahoe Med have an additional GP and two more consulting rooms coming online in 2017 to accommodate expected growth. Mahoe Med is a teaching facility, and therefore have a better chance than most to attract young doctors as they graduate. So while acknowledging the general shortage of GPs in New Zealand, Mahoe Med were confident of their ability to find appropriate staff. Hamilton is also planned to become a rural GP training facility, which will further help the Waikato regions access to GPs.

Mahoe Med have a contract to provide medical services to Waikeria Prison. These are:

- GP clinic at Waikeria Prison for prisoners (four mornings per week - by two GPs two mornings a week each)
- Acute medical care for prisoners (at Mahoe Med) – for those conditions which are too serious or unable to be dealt with by nurses e.g. fractures, injuries, medical conditions etc. This prevents these prisoner patients presenting at Waikato Hospital, and matches the health systems desire to treat patients in the community, rather than at hospital. Mahoe Med have an ambulance bay around the back of the clinic, and can keep the prisoner separate from the general public waiting area.
- 24-hour phone service where Prison staff can talk to a GP about a prisoner.

Prison staff described how it is becoming increasingly difficult to get an appointment with 'their GP' in Te Awamutu, regardless of which medical centre is attended. One staff member described how it takes 3 to 4 days before they can get an appointment with 'their GP'. Regarding the service for prisoners at Mahoe Med, staff said a prisoner can wait for several hours to see a doctor (prison staff focus group 1 and 2).

Otorohanga Medical Centre is the only large GP practice in Otorohanga. Their roll is approximately 5300 patients, with 3.5 FTE doctors. They are open Monday-Friday 8.00AM to 5.00PM with a late night to 7.00PM on one night. The centre receives funding to be able to offer low cost medical access, unlike Te Awamutu Medical Centre which typically has substantially higher patient costs. Prison staff in the focus group described how staff travel from Te Awamutu and Kihikihi to attend the Otorohanga Medical Centre because of its lower cost access.

11.1.2 General medical services at Waikato Hospital

As a large base hospital, Waikato Hospital provides services to a population of 403,000 people in the Waikato region. The population the DHB serves has been growing at 0.9 per cent per annum since the 2006 census, this has translated into 3,250 additional people each year. The hospital also serves populations further afield, for example acute mental health services cover the entire central region (Bay of Plenty, Taupo and Taranaki etc.), whereas community mental health covers a large but slightly smaller region. Like all DHBs, they are dealing with a range of drivers of their services, such as an aging population, increased chronic conditions (i.e. obesity, diabetes) and increasing drug and alcohol presentations.

Waikato DHB is rolling out their Smart Health initiative where patients are dealt with less in the hospital, and more often at home or by their GP. This has implications for the prison as it is hoped to be the future model by which the DHB engages with Corrections.

11.1.3 Forensic mental health services delivered at Waikeria Prison

Moderate to severe mental health conditions are treated in prison by Waikato DHB staff. Treatment mirrors the type of adult mental health services delivered in the community i.e. treating people with depression and/or at risk of self-harm and all other major mental illnesses i.e. bipolar, schizophrenia, etc.

At present, the DHB believes there is a greater demand for services within Waikeria Prison than can be serviced by the DHB. A major reason for this is the layout/design of the existing facility. For example, the DHB believes there is a shortage of interview rooms in the accommodation areas of the prison, and a shortage of group rooms at the prison. This means three clinicians might not be able to share a car to the prison as there won't be three rooms to see three prisoners at one time; also group therapy which is as effective (but more efficient) than single therapy cannot easily be offered due to lack of space.

Funding for 'Forensic patients in prison' is via Corrections, so any increase will be covered internally.

11.1.4 Community health services

The DHB also provides alcohol and drug services for the region serving people at the most severe end of the spectrum (e.g. methadone programme), some of whom are ex-prisoners. Contracted alcohol and drug treatment providers in the community are also contracted to provide additional services for people with moderate to severe addictions. The DHB were complementary about the gains that were made by prisoners in the in-prison drug treatment units, but said it further highlighted the existing lack of support for prisoners on leaving prison. While excellent programmes existed at the DHB and in the community (e.g. Project 20; joined up planning for prisoners across agencies) to help reintegrate/wrap services around released prisoners, many prisoners still missed out on continuation of services. What is becoming less clear is the boundary between where Corrections stops, and the DHB takes over. Traditionally, community based services are funded by both Corrections and the DHB and data is lacking over the movement of prisoners through each of the service providers.

Mental health services; are also provided by Waikato DHB in the community. These services also treat moderate to severe mental ill health conditions, such as those depressed and at risk of self-harm and all other major mental illnesses i.e. bipolar, schizophrenia, etc. Again, released prisoners may be referred into these services alongside other members of the public.

The geographic reach of the community health services is substantial: South to Ruapehu, west to Kawhia and east to Tokoroa. Such a large catchment would almost certainly capture most prisoner releases and prison staff (and their families).

The Community Mental Health Service provider in Te Awamutu noted there was a small homeless community (5 people) in Te Awamutu, all of whom had history of severe mental health issues, but none were released prisoners.

Prison staff and their families are also users of community health services. The Te Awamutu based community mental health service was currently treating 3 Corrections staff, 2 children of Corrections staff and 1 partner of a staff member (total of 6 people). With 300 people on their books, this equated to 2 per cent of their community mental health workload. The service said prison staff and their families were at no more risk of mental ill-health than anyone else in the population.

11.1.5 Acute mental health services provided at the Henry Rongomau Bennett Centre

There are 45 forensic psychiatric beds available at Waikato DHB, of which 12 are acute beds, 12 are sub-acute beds and 21 are rehabilitation beds. These beds deal with the most severely mentally unwell people in the region, including acutely unwell prisoners. About 60 per cent (7) of the 12 acute beds at the DHB are typically in use by prisoners – from both Spring Hill Corrections Facility and Waikeria Prison. The DHB noted that the main driver of acute bed use was from remand prisoners. At present, there are 450 remand prisoners across the two prison sites (260 Spring Hill Corrections Facility; 190 at Waikeria Prison). The DHB described that while the generally held principle is that 6-10% of prisoners require acute mental health services, this increases to the 10% end of the spectrum as the number of remand prisoners increases. Non-remand prisons have far lower acute mental health service needs.

Demand for acute beds at the Henry Rongomau Bennett Centre outstrips supply and the typical wait is about one week, usually with 1 or 2 people waiting at any given time. If prisoners are very acute, a space can usually be made available within 24 hours. For sub-acute the wait time is about three weeks. This compares with the Mason Clinic (Auckland) waitlist where there are up to 20 people on the waitlist.

A prisoner is generally in the acute unit for about 45-60 days, whereas people admitted from the community can be in the acute unit for 2-4 years. So generally, the turnover of prisoners through the unit is faster than the general population.

One GP queried whether Corrections should rely on the Henry Rongomau Bennett Centre for seriously unwell mental health patients. The provider had experience of working to section a patient at Waikeria Prison (i.e. the GP believed the prisoner should have been transferred to the Henry Bennett Centre), but there was no capacity to take the person and several other prisoners were also waiting. The provider believed such situations would only become more common as additional remand prisoners (who are well known to suffer very high rates of mental ill-health) are held at Waikeria Prison.

11.1.6 St John Ambulance

St John Ambulance has two ambulances in Te Awamutu. One ambulance is crewed 24 hours a day, while the second is crewed 09:00-21:00. Nearby, Cambridge, Otorohanga and Te Kuiti each have one ambulance. Te Awamutu also has a third (less equipped) ambulance for events such as school visits. The service responds to an emergency with the nearest available ambulance, regardless of where the ambulance is based.

“There is plenty of capacity for Waikeria Prison in our service” (St John Ambulance).

The service is always looking for volunteer drivers to support two-person crews. At present, about 89 per cent of callouts are double crewed. Some callouts only require one crew member and other times only one crew member attends because the service is short-staffed. St John Ambulance are introducing a new policy in 2018 where 2-people per crew will be standard. Government funding will be needed for this to occur.

On average, St John Ambulance sends one of its five vehicles to the prison every three-four days. St John Ambulance acknowledges that the work is ‘lumpy’, i.e. there might be three trips in one day, and then nothing for weeks.

One St John Ambulance volunteer is a custodial officer at Waikeria Prison. He undertakes one shift per fortnight. St John Ambulance describes his experience of the prison environment and his experience with prisoners as very helpful.

11.2 Health - potential effects

11.2.1 General practitioners

Otorohanga Medical Centre described how they have enough staff capacity to grow to 5,800 patients without taking on additional staff, and they have no substantial issues attracting and retaining staff. Otorohanga Medical Centre is also considering renewal of the building they occupy, and consequent expansion of services to include physiotherapy and pharmacy. As such they consider they are well placed to deal with any potential increase from prison staff families moving into the area.

Mahoe Med described they have the capacity to deal with the potential uplift in prison staff and their families who settle in Te Awamutu. They are already planning for growth and they would welcome the additional numbers. Regarding the prison services Mahoe Med provides, again they welcome the growth. Mahoe Med described how an uplift of 2000 prisoner places is effectively one FTE GP, on top of the existing services provided (four mornings per week). A GP would normally provide services to about 1500-2000 people. However, Mahoe Med would not recommend that role be taken by a single GP as it would be a difficult full time environment and the GP would lack collegial support. Instead a rostered system was suggested. Mahoe Med also hoped the new facility might increase the efficiency of how prisoners are brought to the GP. In the top jail (at present), the GP can be left with no patients because of difficulties in separating prisoners and custodial officer availability to escort prisoners. Mahoe Med said that they would appreciate consideration being given to how prisoners flow to the consulting rooms in the design of the new facility.

11.2.2 General medical services at Waikato Hospital

Waikato DHB described how the addition of about 950 staff/families from outside the region '*doesn't give us the shakes*'. Simply, the DHB needed to know the approximate number to help them in their future planning, which is continuous for such a large base hospital. The DHB is dealing with growth of several thousand patients each and every year, regardless of the proposed expansion of Waikeria Prison.

Due to Waikato DHB's Smart Health initiative, coupled with an aging prison population and their consequent chronic conditions, the DHB believes there may be less transports to GPs and the hospital in the future, as the prisoner's health issue could be managed by the prison health staff instead. This has implications for the design of the health centre, as it will be expected to do more to manage prisoner health issues on site than what occurs now.

11.2.3 Forensic mental health services delivered at Waikeria Prison

Because of the current layout issues with Waikeria Prison for their staff, Waikato DHB believed that the current workload at the prison for the forensic mental health services did not reflect the likely future demand, which would be substantial. This increased demand would be on top of the growth in prisoner numbers.

While the major growth in workload is not desired by Waikato DHB, this can be modelled and planned for, drawing on the solid working relationship between the Department of Corrections and Waikato DHB.

The DHB acknowledged that with the expansion of the forensic mental health services offered by the Department of Corrections, the DHB may lose staff to Corrections (as Corrections pays more). This was not raised in a negative manner, just as a statement of fact.

11.2.4 Community health services

Waikato DHBs major concern related to the increased number of prisoners released into the study area, particularly Hamilton City. They realised that most prisoners were released back to their home communities, but wanted additional assurance that this was also happening with prisoners who were previously managed by mental health services in prison (to prevent any consequent effect on community mental health services), and prisoners previously on alcohol and other drug (AOD) programmes (to prevent any consequent effect on their AOD providers). The DHB assumed that many would be released to Hamilton, regardless of their home region, due to continuation of services/access to services. For example, a prisoner undergoing forensic treatment in prison would very likely require adult mental health services on release. Fortunately, Probation services were able to answer this question and described how the fears of Waikato DHB were largely unfounded as only very few prisoners from outside the region are settled to Hamilton City or elsewhere in the Waikato Region (see section 10: Police and Probation services, for a full description).

The geographic reach of the community mental health service provider based in Te Awamutu would catch most of the prison staff increase from the proposed expansion. As such, the manager noted the proposed expansion would lead to a small but noticeable increase in service provision for the Te Awamutu based community mental health services from those additional staff and their families.

However, with the increase in imprisonment overall (in the upper North Island), Waikato DHB were concerned about the effect on social housing. This was said to be because of the increased number of released prisoners from the proposed expansion, as social housing was already considered to be under pressure and the DHB noted significant investment from multiple agencies would be needed to increase social housing to the scale needed.

Growth in the workload for community mental health services and AOD services due to increased prisoner releases from the proposed expansion has not been able to be determined. Waikato DHB

and the Department of Corrections are unsure at this stage how the existing prisoner releases from Waikeria Prison effect such community based services. As such, Waikato DHB were concerned they would be less able to plan for the likely increase from the increased number of prison releases. The features of this effect have been further assessed as per the method in Section 2.6. This assessment was not able to quantitatively determine the number of people affected, but it is likely to be few directly affected (i.e. the people needing additional services), but a moderate number indirectly affected because of the flow on effect of mental ill-health, alcohol harm and harm from other drugs for their family and communities (if services are not optimal). Regarding severity of effect: Mental ill-health, harm from alcohol and harm from other drugs are serious conditions. The permanence of the effect is hopefully temporary, as planning to mitigate for the increase in demand, occurs. The likelihood of the effect occurring is not well known, but considered to be likely by the interviewees. The effect is also concentrated to specific, already vulnerable, groups: those leaving prison and their families (mostly) and to a lesser extent the wider community. The ease of mitigation is 'moderately able', via good understanding of the root issue and consequent planning.

11.2.5 Acute mental health services provided at the Henry Rongomau Bennett Centre

Waikato DHB described how there would be a substantial increase in need for acute mental health services. However, there is good past experience (i.e. lessons learned from Spring Hill Corrections Facility) to calculate the expected increase. For a rough estimate: Remand prisoners (approximately 450) from Waikeria Prison and Spring Hill Corrections Facility) currently use 60 percent (or seven) of the acute beds at the Henry Rongomau Bennett Centre; and consequent sub-acute beds. At present it is not known what number of remand prisoners may be placed in Waikeria Prison if the expansion goes ahead.

Waikato DHB have said they will undertake additional evidence based planning, along with their Funding and Planning team, the Ministry of Health, and Corrections to better estimate the effects of the new facility on acute mental health services. At the time of writing this assessment, Waikato DHB were unaware of whether existing Ministry of Health funding formulas provided a top-up for prison populations in a region.

11.2.6 St John Ambulance

St John Ambulance described that with the proposed expansion they would expect to attend an emergency about once per day. The Area Manager said 'Adding one trip into a day isn't a big issue for us'. This was also confirmed by a St John Ambulance Board Member.

St John Ambulance described how they react to increased demand by reviewing their services, and adjusting accordingly. Being in a region with substantial population growth has led to constant consideration of resources by the service, and the service was very comfortable with that situation.

When queried whether the new prison staff might be approached to volunteer for the service, St John Ambulance described that recruitment drives were a poor way to attract volunteers and that the best volunteers approached the service of their own free will.

Overall, this assessment concludes that the proposed expansion will have:

1. Positive effects on growth for General Practitioner services in the study area. All desire growth and have capacity for growth
2. Negligible effects on service growth for general medical services at Waikato Hospital. While growth is not desired by Waikato Hospital, being the base hospital for a growing region means it has access to the necessary planning and resources to deal with the small amount of additional services needed from prison staff and their families, and from prisoners, from the proposed expansion.

3. Negligible effect on forensic mental health services delivered at Waikeria Prison. While the growth in workload will be major, this can be modelled and planned for, drawing on the solid working relationship between the Department of Corrections and Waikato DHB.
4. Negligible effect on workload for community mental health services and AOD services from the few 'displaced prisoners' being released into supported accommodation in Hamilton city
5. Increase in workload for the Te Awamutu based community mental health provider. The growth will be from prison staff and their families from the proposed expansion. Growth in workload will be small but noticeable, and while growth in services is not desired, this can be modelled and planned for.
6. Unknown level of negative social effect on workload for community mental health services and AOD services due to increased prisoner releases. Waikato DHB are concerned they do not understand how the proposed expansion might affect their community service provision, and want to work with stakeholders to better understand this potential effect (at the time of writing this report). Expansion of services required in social housing can also be planned, with involvement of multiple agencies required.
7. Negligible effect on acute mental health services provided by the Henry Rongomau Bennett Centre. While the additional workload for the Centre from the additional remand prisoners will be major, and the current service is running at capacity, Waikato DHB are planning for expansion with the necessary stakeholders. The proposed expansion provides Waikato DHB with additional impetus to continue their planning to expand the Centre.
8. Negligible effect on the workload of St John Ambulance. While St John Ambulance do not seek growth in their workload, they are confident in their capacity to handle growth due to the proposed expansion.

Even though point seven (increase in acute mental health services) is a major increase in workload, it was the issue of least concern to Waikato DHB because all concerned had the base understanding of existing effects and could model future effects and plan accordingly.

What was of greater concern to Waikato DHB were the potential effects on point six (community mental health services and AOD services) which was less well understood by all concerned, and the expansion needed in social housing. Therefore, any planning needed to scale up (if needed) is also less certain and will need to be undertaken prior to the facility becoming operational.

Critical to this assessment, Waikato DHB were very pleased that Corrections had engaged so early. Such collaboration would greatly assist Waikato DHB in their planning and assist Corrections achieve their goal of reducing reoffending.

12 Community way of life

12.1 Context and current situation

As set out in the section 2.2 (Conceptual Framework) it was considered important to understand how the proposed expansion might affect issues such as community stigma and/or fear, sense of place aesthetics and heritage, perception of belonging, security and liveability, and aspirations for the future. Over 70 interviewees (i.e. not including contracted service providers and national office Corrections staff) were asked such questions, and the community open days and focus groups with staff also queried these issues.

These issues have been touched upon throughout the document and this section draws them together into one place.

Waikeria Prison is unique. Its long history, along with the lasting memories of Waikeria Village, backed up by the lack of serious incidents on the site has meant that the surrounding communities have normalised having a prison in their area. A low proportion of New Zealanders know where Waikeria Prison is, and so do not associate it (rightly or wrongly) with any of the townships nearby. Consequently, regardless of who was interviewed, no negative associations were placed on the townships from the presence of the prison. This is a remarkable finding, and was not expected given the level of concern raised during the Board of Inquiry (2011) for Auckland South Corrections Facility by the communities of South Auckland.

The long history of Waikeria Prison meant that many participants described the prison 'has always been there'. The perception was that it belonged in the landscape. The working farms associated with Waikeria Prison conjured up images of prisoner rehabilitation in some participants, despite most participants having not visited the site, nor ever seen the site. The extremely large site was also seen as a positive factor by several community members, as it provided a substantial buffer to the surrounding land uses. No one expressed antagonism towards Waikeria Prison itself, though many participants bemoaned the growth in prison numbers overall and commented negatively about how this reflects on New Zealand society. These statements reflect that most in New Zealand have no idea about Waikeria Prison itself, and participants from the surrounding townships have positive views of Waikeria Prison itself.

In contrast, some Waikeria Road residents have negative comments about Waikeria Prison. However, most are supportive of the site and supportive of the expansion as evidenced by the comments received at the Open Days.

Many participants questioned 'who would be running the prison?', and all were visibly relieved to hear that the Department of Corrections would operate the prison. Of those participants who expanded on their comment, they were pleased to hear it was not going to be run by a private operator.

Regarding security specifically, again, those living in the surrounding townships expressed no fears for their security. Perhaps not surprisingly, only those living and working closest to the prison questioned the security status of Waikeria Prison and their personal safety. Historically, there were up to 30 escapes per year in the 60's and 70's. A long serving prison staff member described how *'everyone worked back then, and you'd load a group onto a truck and drive off to dig ditches somewhere, and someone would run off down the road'*. The staff member described how a phone tree was used to tell neighbours to lock their doors. Often, neighbours would ring Waikeria Prison *'and they'd*

tell us they'd seen someone legging it past their house'. The staff member described that in those days 'there weren't many bad buggers and nothing much came of escapes'.

A breakout is where a prisoner has breached security measures and has physically left the area contained by the outermost perimeter security fence, or, if there is no such fence, from the prison building. In the last ten-years there have been 8 breakouts from Waikeria Prison, with the last in 2011/12. Security systems and protocols have further changed radically since then, and there have been no breakouts since.

While a few Waikeria Road residents were concerned for their security because of prison visitors (see Section 9), no prison visitors have committed any crimes according to Police or businesses in the study area. Waikeria Road residents were somewhat reassured when they heard that it is extremely rare for a prisoner to breakout from a newly built correctional facility in New Zealand. This has occurred once, at the Otago Corrections Facility in 2014 due to a design flaw with a drainpipe, which was immediately rectified and all other prisons checked to ensure the flaw did not exist on other sites.

Regarding aspirations for the future, much of the positive sentiment about Waikeria Prison was related to the jobs it brought to the study area, both in the past and hopefully in the future. Many people knew someone who worked at Waikeria Prison. Staff often wore their uniform about town, doing the grocery shopping at the end of a shift, reinforcing the normalcy and acceptance of the Prison by the communities in the study area.

12.2 Community way of life - potential effects

Most participants did not believe the new facility would change the way communities in the study area felt about the prison, nor bring negative stigma to the surrounding townships/city. Instead, participants responded positively to questions about potential stigma, by saying the proposed expansion signalled investment in the region, more jobs and a stable future for the staff who work there now. Nearly all were positive about the proposed expansion, and those who had reservations were predominantly those who lived closest to the site.

Those living closest to the site expressed security concerns related to increased prison visitors and greater risk of prison escapes from the proposed expansion. Local Police wanted to impress on residents the importance of contacting them regarding any 'odgy characters' and 'suspicious behaviour.' In addition, new correction facilities are extremely secure and breakouts are rare – certainly the risk of breakout from a modern facility is a far lower risk than from historic facilities.

The potential effects on site neighbours from biophysical changes from visual, traffic, external lighting and noise effects have been considered in the respective technical assessments.

Regarding the Landscape and Visual Assessment (Boffa Miskell, 2017a), the report concludes a range of adverse visual effects depending on the location of the viewpoint the type of viewing audience. However, once the mitigation planting has time to become established, which is estimated to be between 3-5 years it was considered that these effects will reduce to a low to very low level for most locations, apart from the few locations which may remain moderate. As such, any potential social effects arising from landscape and visual were considered to be minor.

Regarding traffic, the transportation assessment (TDG Consultants, 2017) has recommended several improvements to the road network to mitigate current operational.

It is further concluded that these that the positive benefits provided by the proposed upgrades would continue, during and following the development. As such, the proposed expansion will improve the safety of the road network for residents, prison visitors and staff.

Regarding external lighting the external lighting proposal will comply with the requirements of Otorohanga District Plan standards 18A and 18B. Artificial Lighting used for the illumination of the respective elements that form part of the site, and the effects of the new lighting will be minimal (Kern Consultants Limited, 2017). As such, any potential social effects arising from external lighting were considered to be negligible.

Regarding noise, for both construction and operational activities have been modelled and comply with the noise performance standards. The acoustic effects of the proposed development would be negligible and that the increase in prisoner numbers would be barely noticeable at the nearest dwellings (Marshall Day Acoustics, 2017). As such any potential social effects arising from noise were also considered to be negligible.

Only council staff and Department of Corrections staff specifically mentioned the Community Liaison Group, and it appeared to fly below the radar for other participants. Based on interviews with Corrections staff and one non-Corrections member, the existing Community Liaison Group is functioning well and the Department has proposed it will continue to function, with the current membership, during construction and the operation of the expanded facility. Explicitly including the continuation of the Community Liaison Group into the designation is recommended.

Overall, this assessment concludes that the proposed expansion will have a neutral social effect on community way of life, stigma or fear. This is based on the evidence that the facility is well accepted by the local townships nearby, crime related to the existing facility is nil, and the overwhelmingly positive response to the proposed expansion from Councils, Community Boards, non-governmental organisations, schools, ECEs, accommodation providers and community members.

For site neighbours, a few have expressed concerns about safety and security. While such perceptions are difficult to allay, no actual crime is associated with the current prison operation and newly designed facilities are substantially more secure than historic facilities.

The existing Community Liaison Group is functioning well and the Department has proposed it will continue to function during construction and the operation of the expanded facility. Explicitly including the continuation of the Community Liaison Group into the designation is recommended.

13 Mitigation and monitoring

13.1 Construction

Regarding potential mitigations, the recruitment process of the construction workforce is critical, as achieving a high per cent of people already living in the study area would substantially mitigate potential housing effects as those workers already live in the district.

Secondly the Department should provide a portal to provide information about the area, including short and long term accommodation (i.e. make it easy for connections to be made between people already living in the study area (who may have a room or home to let) and construction workers who require accommodation (to meet their short-term housing needs), schools, childcare centres, services, etc. No monitoring is recommended regarding construction.

13.2 Housing and commuting

Mitigation recommended to be incorporated into the designation includes developing a housing information package (from existing material) that promotes all areas to help 'spread the load' of prison staff around the district, particularly to towns south and east of the Waikeria Prison site which are currently under represented by prison staff. This aspect can also be included in the Department's recruitment strategy. Secondly, the recruitment process itself is critical, as achieving 50 per cent or more of recruits hired from the study area would substantially mitigate potential housing effects as those staff already live in the district.

Regarding commuting and mitigating the negative effects on perceived safety, please refer to the Traffic Impact Assessment (Traffic Design Group, 2017). No monitoring is recommended regarding housing and commuting.

13.3 Education services

No mitigation or monitoring is recommended regarding education services.

13.4 Prison providers and prisoners

Mitigation recommended to be incorporated into the designation includes continuing discussions and early planning/contracting, adequate funding and appropriate physical spaces for providers. Attention is needed for providers who identify rental accommodation and provide of supported accommodation, case management providers, and Ministry of Social Development across-region services. No monitoring is recommended.

13.5 Prisoner families and prison visitors

Mitigation recommended to be incorporated into the designation includes providing adequate facilities to allow certain prisoners and families to communicate via skype (in a controlled environment), and investigate the extension of the PARS transport service (from Rotorua to Waikeria Prison) to begin in Whakatane or Tauranga (if warranted based on prisoner numbers from those areas). No monitoring is recommended regarding prisoner families and prison visitors.

13.6 Police and probation services

No mitigation or monitoring is recommended regarding police and probation services.

13.7 Health services

No mitigation or monitoring is recommended regarding health services.

13.8 Community way of life

Explicitly including the continuation of the Community Liaison Group into the designation is recommended. No monitoring is recommended.

14. Conclusion

The social effects of prisons have been well studied in New Zealand. Such studies show that any perception of negative social issues (where it exists) is generally not matched by evidence of actual social issues. This is also concluded to be the case for the proposed expansion of Waikeria Prison. Furthermore, the long-standing positive association between locals and the historic prison, the excellent relationship between the prison and local communities (past and present), and the lack of any substantial negative outcomes from prison operation (past and present) have contributed for few social concerns.

What is more prominent is that local people look forward to the jobs and income from the Waikeria Prison expansion, especially given the low median incomes in many of the surrounding areas. Furthermore, the social benefits of employment are immense, at the individual, family and community level.

However, potential social issues arising from housing the construction workforce and operational staff are almost certain to occur, and planning by local councils is underway to address housing as best as it can be.

Both the positive effects of employment, and the negative effects on housing, affect many in the local communities. Though the effects (both positive and negative) will be most keenly felt by people on low incomes.

Similarly, community mental health services, community alcohol and drug services and social housing may be stretched. This effect would largely be experienced by local offenders released back to their local communities, due in large part to the rising numbers of offenders overall, and therefore independent of the capacity increase at Waikeria Prison. The respective agencies are now aware of this possibility and can further research the causes, and therefore plan to prevent the effect. The delivery of such complex services requires planning by multiple agencies.

Overall, the proposed increase in capacity of Waikeria Prison is projected to positively contribute to the way of life of local communities.

15 References

- Board of Inquiry (2011). *Final report and decision of the Board of Inquiry into the proposed men's correctional facility at Wiri. Final report and decision produced under section 149R of the Resource Management Act. Volume 2 of 2.*
- Boffa Miskell (2017). Waikeria Prison Capacity Expansion Project. Notice of Requirement and Assessment of Environmental Effects.
- Boffa Miskell (2017a). *Waikeria Prison capacity expansion. Assessment of landscape and visual effects.* Auckland: Boffa Miskell.
- Clough and Associates Ltd (2017). *Prison capacity project phase 2: Waikeria Prison, Waikato: Archaeological assessment.* Auckland: Clough and Associates Ltd.
- IAIA (2003). *International principles for social impact assessment.* Fargo: International Association for Impact Assessment.
- IAIA (2015). *Social impact assessment: Guidance for assessing and managing the impacts of projects.* Fargo: International Association for Impact Assessment.
- Market Economics Ltd (2016). *Waikeria Prison Expansion. Economic Effects Analysis.* Auckland: Market Economics Ltd.
- Marshall Day Acoustics (2017). *Waikeria Prison expansion. Assessment of environmental effects – Acoustics.* Auckland: Marshall Day Acoustics.
- Ministry for Primary Industries (2014). *The social value of a job.* Wellington: Ministry for Primary Industries.
- Quigley and Watts Ltd (2016a). *The social effects of prisons on local communities: A literature scan to inform a logic model.* Wellington: Quigley and Watts Ltd.
- Quigley and Watts Ltd (2016b). *Auckland Region Women's Corrections Facility and Auckland South Corrections Facility – Kohuora. Social Impact Monitoring: Third Annual Report 2015.* Wellington: Quigley and Watts Ltd.
- Quigley and Watts Ltd (2016c). *Social Impact Monitoring Plan to understand the potential social and cultural effects of ASCF & ARWCF operations on the local community.* Wellington: Quigley and Watts Ltd.
- Te Onewa Consultants (2017). *Cultural Impact Assessment of the Proposed Waikeria Prison expansion.* Tauranga: Te Onewa Consultants.
- Traffic Design Group (2017). *Department of Corrections – Waikeria Prison. Integrated Traffic Assessment.* Wellington: TDG.