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LETTERS OF SUPPORT
December 15, 2011

To Whom It May Concern:

As Mayor of the City of Thompson and the Chair of the Thompson Economic Diversification Working Group (TEDWG), I have the privilege of writing this letter in utmost support for the initiatives put forth by this group of stakeholders from Thompson and the region. It is the rich diversity of the TEDWG stakeholders that makes this process unique to Northern Manitoba. Their commitment to the TEDWG process enables outcomes, such as this approach to restorative justice in Thompson and the surrounding region, that are unprecedented in the North. Since May 2011, the TEDWG has been working to identify priority issues across our Northern communities. By way of consensus decision-making, the TEDWG has identified five Action Plans through which the group will propose insightful responses to these issues.

This proposal for a Restorative Justice Facility in Thompson is the first of the TEDWG's Action Plans. The Action Plan responds to the justice issues in Manitoba that impact Northerners specifically. The Action Plan also responds to the Province of Manitoba's Adult Corrections Capacity Review Study, and provides options for mitigating capacity issues at both the regional and provincial levels. By identifying key demographic trends across both Manitoba and Canada, the Action Plan highlights a need for an innovative response to the growing Northern, and specifically Northern Aboriginal, remanded and/or sentenced populations. TEDWG stakeholders, through this Action Plan, indicate a critical need for Northern solutions to Northern challenges.

In addition to responding to key issues of justice, recidivism and rehabilitation amongst Northern and Northern Aboriginal populations, the Restorative Justice Facility Action Plan takes hold of a critical opportunity to bring jobs and economic growth to Thompson and the region. Through the development and support of a facility of this type, Thompson can actively expand its role as the Hub of the North, offering increased jobs, housing and overall stability to its population.
The diversity of stakeholders involved in the development of this Action Plan is truly unique. As a City, region and a Province, we have been presented with an unprecedented opportunity to work together with Aboriginal organizations, private industry, and local business in the development of a long-term strategy for Thompson and the region. It is for this reason that I wholly support the TEDWG’s findings and recommendations for a Restorative Justice Facility.

Sincerely,

Tim Johnson
Mayor

xc: Thompson City Council
    Gary Ceppetelli, City Manager
    Lovro Pauic, General Manager, Smelter and Refinery, Vale
    Michelle Drylie, MScPI, MCIP, RPP, Senior Planner, rePlan Inc.
December 15, 2011

To Whom It May Concern:

Re: Correctional Facility in Thompson

I have been given the opportunity to review the proposal and plans for a correctional facility in Thompson. The proposal was prepared by TEDWG (Thompson Economic Diversification Working Group) with the assistance of rePlan. They have done a comprehensive review detailing the needs and requirements of Thompson and the surrounding northern communities.

By way of background, I worked in the criminal justice system in Thompson and remote northern circuit courts during the 1990’s as a Crown Attorney and more recently as a Judge and Chief Judge of the Provincial Court of Manitoba. My extensive experience in the justice system has provided me with an understanding of why a facility for inmates in northern Manitoba is required.

Currently there is not a correctional facility or remand centre in Thompson. The closest jail is in The Pas located 385 kilometres southwest by road. The lack of a correctional facility in the North poses many problems, including access to justice for Aboriginal persons in remote northern communities. More specifically, some of the challenges faced are as follows:

- Accused persons are incarcerated far from family and community supports;
- Prisoner transport back and forth between Thompson and The Pas is hazardous, and travelling can be interrupted by poor weather;
• Frequently court is delayed as a result of prisoner transport issues. Sometimes prisoners miss their trial dates due to being moved to another jail and the resulting breakdown in communication;

• Lawyers do not have adequate access to meet or interview their in-custody clients, resulting in much valuable court time being spent for that purpose;

• The only detention facility in Thompson is the R.C.M.P. holding cells. They are not appropriate, adequate or intended to hold prisoners for longer than a few hours;

• The jail in The Pas (TPCI) is severely overcrowded and prisoners are forced to sleep on the floor;

• The vast majority of those prisoners are on remand, awaiting trial and have not been convicted of the offence charged. They are presumed innocent.

It is for these reasons that I, on behalf of the Provincial Court of Manitoba, strongly support the consideration of a provincial correctional facility near the City of Thompson, in particular one that is designed to meet the specific needs of our northern inmate population.

Regards,

[Signature]

Ken Champagnie
Chief Judge
Provincial Court of Manitoba

cc: Murray P. Thompson
Associate Chief Judge, Thompson Centre
Provincial Court of Manitoba
December 2, 2011

To Whom it May Concern:

I am writing this letter in support of the submission from the Thompson Economic Diversification Working Group, which comprises stakeholders from the City of Thompson and the surrounding region, to the Provincial Government for alternative justice programming and a new facility in the North.

In Northern Manitoba there is only one correctional center and that is in The Pas. Presently, persons remanded in the Thompson circuit court are transported weekly from the holding cells in Thompson to The Pas, a distance of some 400 km. This is a drain on valuable resources, both human and environmental. The cost for four employees – two from Thompson and two from The Pas – to transport prisoners is extraordinary. This cost is in addition to the effect on the persons in custody. Travelling in the back of a panel van for four hours, on rough roads takes an emotional and physical toll.

I had the opportunity to participate in one of the sub-committee meetings for this new facility. I was impressed by the partnership that has been developed between a variety of groups. Representatives from MKO, KTC, MMF, NACC, Vale, Business, Education, and Health all had an equal seat at the table.

The idea of moving away from the traditional “correctional” model to a restorative model is also impressive. It is commonly known that the majority of crime is rooted in social issues. It is also known that persons offending will be returning to the community. It is therefore in the best interest of any justice program to restore the offender to a state where they can be law abiding community members.

Finally, a new facility in Thompson will allow persons who offend to be closer to their home communities thereby increasing the interaction with families which will assist in the rehabilitation process.

Should you have any further questions please feel free to contact me.

Yours truly,

Mayor Alan McLauchlan
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Thompson Economic Diversification Working Group

The need to broaden and diversify the economic base in Thompson and surrounding region is a long-standing priority. Economic volatility in recent years coupled with the November 2010 announcement that Vale will transition its operations in Thompson to mining and milling by 2015, have underlined the need for the City, the region and community partners to tackle this issue head on. The Thompson Economic Diversification Working Group (TEDWG) was formed to spearhead this effort. Launched on May 18, 2011, the TEDWG has a simple mission: to accelerate Thompson’s development as a regional service centre for Northern Manitoba with a strong mining pillar. The TEDWG is chaired by the City of Thompson, and enjoys broad and diverse stakeholder participation with representatives from the Province of Manitoba, Vale, Manitoba Keewatinowi Okimakanak (MKO), Keewatin Tribal Council (KTC), Manitoba Metis Federation (MMF), the Northern Association of Community Councils (NACC), Nisichawayasihk Cree Nation (NCN), Thompson Unlimited, and the Thompson Chamber of Commerce. The Government of Canada and USW Local 6166 have also been invited to participate. TEDWG is being supported by rePlan, a Canadian planning organization that works with resource-based communities in Canada and internationally.

This group is responsible for identifying and pursuing the most promising opportunities to help Thompson and the surrounding region diversify its economy and strengthen its position as an economic contributor in Northern Manitoba. Priority areas identified by TEDWG stakeholders include:

- Restorative Justice
- Education and Training
- Housing
- Health and Wellness
- Fostering a Local and Regional Identity

In addition, TEDWG stakeholders are committed to strengthening the City of Thompson’s governance framework through an updated District Development Plan and Zoning By-Law. The dynamic relationship between the City of Thompson and regional communities will be better defined through another initiative of the TEDWG, the Thompson and Region Infrastructure Plan. When taken together, the District Development Plan, Zoning By-Law and Thompson and Region Infrastructure Plan provide a 20-year strategy to stimulate and manage both economic and population growth through targeted infrastructure development and sustainable land use planning in Thompson and region.

The Thompson Economic Diversification Plan will provide immediate direction on specific priorities, such as Restorative Justice. It will also provide a framework for continued action with regards to economic diversification and development over the long term.

1.2 TEDWG and the Province’s Adult Corrections Capacity Review Committee

In its November 2010 Speech from the Throne, the Province of Manitoba indicated “...our government will begin the process of designing and building new prison facilities” (Province of Manitoba). An Adult Corrections Capacity Review Committee was struck to provide advice to the Province as it carries out its commitment. An announcement released by the Province of Manitoba indicates the Committee is tasked with providing direction on two key questions:

1. How much additional capacity to incarcerate adult inmates should be added to Manitoba’s provincial correctional system over the next five to ten years?

2. What services, programming, and skills training should be made available at provincial adult correctional centres to reduce the likelihood of recidivist behaviour and to ensure inmates are ready for life outside prison?

The information the Committee has been asked to consider when addressing these questions – including the needs of Aboriginal populations; services and programs required to meet the needs of different populations (remand and sentenced); and best practices regarding safety and gang violence in other correctional systems – are ones that stakeholders in the North have long contemplated. Under
the mandate of the Committee, TEDWG stakeholders see a unique opportunity through this document to provide a united Northern and Aboriginal perspective on the challenges the Province of Manitoba is seeking to address.

1.3 Purpose of this Document

This document serves to continue and expand the conversation between Northern and Aboriginal stakeholders and the Province of Manitoba about corrections capacity and justice issues both throughout the Province and in the North specifically. The Vision, detailed in Section 3.0, imagines a ‘Northern Solution by and for the North.’ This document explores possibilities for implementing the Vision by providing options and pre-feasibility analysis for sites and built form that can accommodate the diverse environmental, spiritual, programming, safety, legal, and logistical requirements of a Northern Solution. In Section 8.0, one option for implementation is brought to life in detailed renderings in order to illustrate this uniquely Northern approach.

1.4 The TEDWG Stakeholder Engagement Process and Commitment to Restorative Justice

The approach presented in this document was developed by a diverse range of stakeholders who work in, provide support and services to, or are impacted by the correctional system in Northern Manitoba, including representatives of:

- The City of Thompson
- Manitoba Keewatinowi Okimakinak
- Keewatin Tribal Council
- Manitoba Metis Federation
- Nisichiwayasihk Cree Nation
- University College of the North
- MacDonald Youth Services
- Addictions Foundation of Manitoba
- Thompson Regional Community Centre
- Thompson Regional Airport Authority
- Town of The Pas
- Province of Manitoba Courts
- Royal Canadian Mounted Police – Thompson Detachment
- Manitoba Sheriff’s Office – Thompson
- Vale
- Thompson Unlimited
- Thompson Chamber of Commerce
- Akman Construction

In September 2011, a brainstorming session was held in Thompson to begin a discussion about restorative justice, the need for new and enhanced programming in Thompson and region, and the potential to locate a new facility in Thompson. Questions addressed at this initial session included:

- What should be the mission statement for a new facility?
- What programs could a new facility deliver?
- Where could a new facility go and what should it look like?
- Why Thompson?

Early in the stakeholder engagement process, all stakeholders emphasized the need to adopt a restorative justice approach and to re-think the traditional form and function of a ‘correctional facility.’ The necessity of a restorative justice approach was reasserted in October 2011 during an engagement session with Chief and Council, Elders, community justice workers, social workers, and traditional healers at Nisichiwayasihk Cree Nation. During a final stakeholder engagement session in Thompson in October 2011, stakeholders provided input into the evaluation of site and programming options presented in Section 5.0.
INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT

A review of current literature detailing the shortcomings of both Canada’s and Manitoba’s correctional systems provides two important findings: 1) Northerners, and people of Aboriginal ancestry in particular, are overrepresented in correctional facility populations; and 2) lack of adequate services and programming to meet the specific needs of Northern and Aboriginal populations is not unique to a single jurisdiction; this deficiency is systemic and exists at a national level.

The Province of Manitoba’s correctional system is significantly overcrowded. The system currently accommodates 2,255 beds but is designed for a capacity of only 1,492. Some measures to alleviate pressures caused by overcrowding are in place and, since 1999, the Province has added 520 beds. An additional 262 are under construction and a further 160 will be coming online by 2012. These beds are accommodated through expansions to existing facilities, all of which are located in southern Manitoba, most within a short drive from Winnipeg.

Justice Minister Andrew Swan has indicated the need for a shift in the way capacity issues are addressed (Brandon Sun, 2011). A shift from expansion of current facilities to the creation of new ones reflects the findings of several recent reports, most notably the *Aboriginal Justice Inquiry* (AJI) which calls for a renewed focus on the community in the rehabilitative process. It suggests that creating several smaller facilities in different locations would resolve many of the problems which are an inevitable by-product of the consolidated approach to which Manitoba has long been bound. Currently, the most Northerly institution is The Pas Correctional Centre, a small 70-bed adult male facility with space for an additional seven females and seven youth offenders. Currently, the centre houses 166 inmates – more than twice its design capacity.

The shortcomings of the current system are particularly apparent to those within it. The *AJI* quotes an inmate at the Stony Mountain institution who suggested that “the province should build penitentiaries or learning centres up North, staffed by inmates or native people instead of trying to meet the criteria of the training of correctional officers - start from scratch” (*AJI*, 1991). The *AJI* explores the notion of community involvement in the system and suggests that the best place to house inmates, particularly those of Aboriginal ancestry, is close to home. Currently, The Pas Correctional Centre, located over three hundred kilometers from Thompson and the regional communities that use Thompson as a centre, is the closest facility for many Northerners.

Importantly, the solution is not limited to the creation of a new facility or facilities in the traditional sense. *The Challenge for Change: Realizing the Legacy of the Aboriginal Justice Inquiry Report*, a report focused on the needs of Aboriginal women in the justice system, states that
"simply building a new prison will not resolve the current situation...A restorative justice approach, based on a holistic approach to healing and a community based model that rebuilds the social safety net, would ensure that women are provided with access to the range of multi-faceted services they need" (Lafreniere, Fontaine and Comack, 2005:3). Elizabeth Elliott, an associate professor and co-director in restorative justice at Simon Fraser University agrees, stating that: “Adding a new prison creates another problem because [in doing so] we are saying that we are solving our social problems by locking people up” (The Manitoban, 2009). Although “The Challenge For Change” is largely directed at addressing the unique needs of female inmates, its suggestions can and should be applied more broadly as all inmates benefit from the emotional and cognitive growth which participation in such programs affords.

One of the most prevalent problems identified in multiple reports is that correctional facilities in Manitoba simply take an offender out of society for a period of time. With few programs available, the current system fails to heal, rehabilitate, educate or train inmates. This system also fails to recognize that many inmates enter facilities with serious mental and cognitive deficiencies, as well as alcohol and drug abuse issues, often resulting in high rates of depression and sometimes, suicide. A survey of federal inmates conducted in 2004 showed the extent of the problem. Among other statistics, it found that across Canada 79% claimed to be habitual abusers of alcohol and/or drugs, 79% were ‘poor’ at simple problem solving, 77% of inmates did not have a high school diploma, 70% had unstable job histories and 70% had difficulty making choices (SROCSO, 2005: 9).¹

At the federal level, Canada tracks and compiles statistics on the reduction in criminal behaviour in inmates who have successfully completed programs while incarcerated. A sampling of these includes: 21% reduction in re-admissions for inmates who completed the ABE-10 Educational Program, a 46% reduction in re-admissions in inmates who completed the MMT Substance Abuse Program, a 69% reduction in re-admission in inmates who completed an anger management program, and anywhere from 50% to 70% reduction in re-admissions in sex offenders who completed one of a number of available therapies. These figures indicate that inmates who were able to enrol in a program of treatment were far less likely to reoffend than those who did not receive the same benefit (SROCSO, 2005: 13-17).²

While these statistics support the need for a broad range of programming at the federal level, needs specific to each jurisdiction must also be addressed. The need for people of Aboriginal ancestry to participate in culturally-specific spiritual exercises for example, is almost completely ignored in Manitoba’s current system. A survey of 258 inmates found that 81% of those with Aboriginal ancestry felt that their spirituality was not respected within the institution (AJI, 1991). Additionally, “very few” staff in Manitoba’s correctional system speak an Aboriginal language and few programs are offered in Aboriginal languages (AJI, 1991).³ Whether religious, educational or vocational, the programming currently offered is inadequate to meet the needs of many inmates and is therefore less beneficial to them upon release. The AJI suggests that “inmates will be able to use existing or new programs effectively only if the programs are developed and directed by people from their own culture.”

This Restorative Justice Facility Action Plan (the Plan) presents only a brief summary of the systemic challenges that Aboriginal populations face within the Manitoba and Canadian corrections systems. These challenges can be qualified generally as a significant share of the social cost of these systems. The conclusions drawn from consultation with a diverse range of stakeholders with intimate knowledge of the system is that these social costs are amplified in Northern Manitoba, due to the disproportionate number of Northerners within the system. The potential scale of financial cost of the current system – including significant daily movement of detainees and justice workers from North to South and vice versa – largely due to the absence of appropriate facilities in the North is represented in Figure 5.1. This map illustrates the infrastructure serving Manitoba Sheriff’s Office logistics in managing population movement in Northern Manitoba. In the absence of more detailed analysis, it remains clear that Manitoba Department of Justice operations in the North require significant infrastructure and a considerable number of individual trips on a daily basis. In short, this appears to be an expensive system. These financial costs are compounded by the social cost of the system to Northern communities.

The Plan considers both hard and social costs; however, at the time of writing, financial data had not been provided by the Manitoba Department of Justice. All stakeholders consulted in the development of the Plan were forthright in stating their understanding that the costs were significant. Representatives of communities in the region surrounding Thompson were equally forthright in speaking to the impact of incarceration and the current system on their own communities: burgeoning gang violence which has “migrated North with Northerners returning from terms served in Southern institutions,” persistent substance abuse, low employment rates, and high rates of recidivism. Sections 3.0 through 8.0 present a comprehensive summary of consultation carried out and general conclusions drawn.


from the input of stakeholders. Conclusions point towards a “Northern Solution” for Manitoba with a facility located in Thompson which can serve to both reduce the financial costs to the Provincial government and the social costs borne by Northern communities. A facility in Thompson, while reducing operating costs by limiting the movement of both detainees and justice workers also increases social value by incorporating Northerners and Northern communities into institutional programming and keeping individuals closer to home and family. The Plan also presents an important economic development opportunity for the City and regional communities in the building and ongoing operation of a Northern facility.

**Summary of Recent Manitoba Provincial Ombudsman Annual Reports, 2003-present**

The issues surrounding appropriate accommodation for persons being held for court appearances in Thompson are long standing. They are identified by a case summary contained in the Manitoba Ombudsman 2003 Annual Report under the heading “Manitoba Justice and Attorney General: Housing inmates for court appearances in Thompson poses a problem.” It acknowledges a history of complaints related to conditions endured by inmates, both adult and young offenders. In September of 2001 the Children’s Advocate issued a report citing similar concerns.

The Ombudsman Report notes that in April 2003 they were advised by Corrections that a working group had been established and that there was a commitment to resolve the concerns identified “by working on short-term and long-term solutions.” The report further advises “that resolution required a cooperative, integrated effort from all the parties involved (Corrections, the Courts, Sheriffs and the RCMP). Corrections also reported their belief that they needed to proceed along two separate tracks:

- a short-term solution to alleviate the concerns identified, and
- a long-term solution that would involve some type of facility improvement or construction.”

The Report also states that the Ombudsman’s office received a progress report in July 2003 which advised among other actions that “the working group was seeking direction from the Manitoba Justice Executive Management Committee with respect to pursuing the option of new construction.” The Report notes that the Ombudsman was “encouraged by this report, as it appeared that concerted effort was being made to address the concerns.” Following subsequent complaints in the fall of 2003 Corrections reported in the spring of 2004 that “they felt progress was being made...” Corrections acknowledged that a number of issues remained outstanding, among them, “the development of options for a separate youth holding unit.”

The Manitoba Ombudsman 2004 Annual Report records further complaints which “included a complaint from a male inmate who alleged he observed a strip search of a female prisoner housed in the same area of the facility; and a young person being placed in proximity to an adult he was to testify against in court. The youth alleged that while in the THC he had been threatened by the adult.” It also reiterated a list of general concerns identified in previous reports such as lack of medical services; lack of hygiene products; inadequate showers, lack of bedding; lack of clean clothing; inability to contact outside resources such as legal counsel or the Ombudsman, etc. The Report notes that the “file on this matter remains open.”

In 2007 the Ombudsman Annual Report provides an update noting that in September 2005 the Ombudsman submitted an interim report to the Deputy Minister of Justice concluding that the current facility in Thompson “was never intended to be a remand facility for youth or adults. While all parties involved seem to be trying to make the best of a difficult situation based on our review and findings, we feel alternative solutions need to be found. The conditions under which inmates are transported to and from, and housed at, the THC; are by all accounts cause for concern. An urgent matter which needs attention is the housing of remanded youth with adults. The inappropriateness of this situation is exacerbated by housing remanded youth with intoxicated adults detained by the RCMP at the THC. The practice of holding remanded youth at the THC needs to be addressed immediately.”

The 2007 Report continues with a list reiterating the issues of concern under headings of housing, remand and transport, physical structure, health and well being, and telephone contact. It concludes that while “the department’s efforts are commendable in attempting to reduce the negative impacts of the conditions at THC, they are not a substitute for the long-term solutions that are needed, and should not deflect the pursuit of such solutions. It is my understanding that Justice may be considering whether the construction of a correctional facility in Thompson is feasible. This would require a significant capital expenditure for construction, followed by significant annual operating costs.”

The 2008 Annual Report notes that the Ombudsman’s Office was “unaware of any progress that has been made toward a long term solution to address the concern for the conditions under which prisoners continue to be held at the Thompson Holding Cells.”

There are no further updates in either the 2009 and the latest report, from 2010.
3. VISION

A facility in Thompson is:

A Northern solution by and for the North: The facility reflects both the needs and the strengths of the North and clearly establishes a Northern approach to justice. The facility serves the North and acts as a catalyst for improved treatment of individuals, enhanced community building, expanded educational opportunities, and sustainable Northern economic development.

A centre of restorative justice: The facility is built on the principles of restorative justice; and facility design and programming reflect a holistic, community-based approach. The facility fosters a dialogue between individuals and their communities to develop a shared sense of support and accountability, which continues once residents are released and return to their home communities.

A place of healing and treatment: The facility promotes rehabilitation and restorative justice through specialized programming focused on identifying and treating the multitude of factors that influence behaviour, including: addictions, mental health issues, Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder (FASD), and various forms of abuse. The facility provides a supportive environment for individuals facing these physical and emotional barriers.

A place of repathing and cultural/spiritual awareness: The facility provides a structured environment to support individuals as they redefine their life’s path. Programming is grounded in the traditional knowledge and cultural and spiritual teachings of the North’s diverse Aboriginal population.

A centre for learning and advancement: The facility provides tools for future success through a variety of life skills, upgrading, technology and trades, and advanced education programs. Educational programming is developed in cooperation with local agencies and institutions such as University College of the North. This partnership approach ensures the delivery of a high-quality curriculum and paves the path to other educational and job opportunities for individuals upon reintegration into the community.
A place of reconnection: The facility reconnects individuals to their environment, culture and communities. Its location in the Boreal Forest promotes land-based learning and connection to traditional lifestyles. Spiritual centres are prominent features of the facility’s design and offer dedicated space for reflection, as well as gathering space for families and community members.

A secure and integrated site: The facility securely accommodates multiple populations by design, ensuring maximum integration of services and programs and efficient use of resources and staff time. The facility considers the security and needs of justice workers as well as the step-down levels of security required within each of the resident populations. The design of the facility should ensure that the level of security, for both resident and worker, suits the level of risk and that residents and workers are not subject to unnecessary security infrastructure or restraints on movement and behavior.

“The facility provides a structured environment to support individuals as they redefine their life’s path.”
4. PROGRAMME

The “model” programme for the site was drafted and refined through a series of Restorative Justice Workshops with the TEDWG Restorative Justice Sub-Committee. A primary goal of the sub-committee was to identify a series of programs, that could realistically be provided within the facility, and that could address the multitude of social, physical and mental health; education and training; and restorative programming needs specific to a Northern population, both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal.

The programme developed in consultation with the Restorative Justice Sub-Committee and stakeholders, while hypothetical for the purpose of the Plan, responds to a collective understanding of the needs of Northern communities for a multi-level, mixed population facility. Determining its sufficient critical mass will allow the facility to attract the full spectrum of program services that are required to support the vision of restorative justice, re-pathing and healing.

A short sample of the issues identified as unique, or of particular importance, to the Northern population raised by the sub-committee include:

- Dissociation from family, home communities, and cultural traditions contribute to high incidences of recidivism;

- Lack of access to Elders and traditional teachers;
  - It is important to have the involvement of, or provide access to, Elders and traditional teachers from all Northern communities to address the specific needs of individuals both while in custody and post-release;

- Programming is typically unavailable in traditional languages in correctional institutions;

- Pervasive social and behavioural issues related to broken homes or absence of family or community support structures;

- Lack of resources, financial or physical, to receive academic or technical training;

- Lack of training in trades and vocations suitable to the Northern economy and opportunities in emerging Northern industries;
• Relative shortage of Aboriginal justice workers and Northerners working as justice workers within the correctional system;

• High level of recidivism (repeat offences) due to lack of economic opportunity post-release and absence of community support structure;

• Typically high-security facilities not suitable for youth or offenders convicted, or held in remand, for non-violent offenses.
  – A Northern facility could provide a suitable level of security to the actual level of risk presented by each individual, providing more opportunities for independent living and self-sufficiency while in custody or as a resident within the facility;

• The connection to nature and the land is of particular importance to Aboriginal peoples and the typical sterile or harsh interior and exterior environments of many correctional facilities reinforces a sense of alienation.

The Restorative Justice Sub-Committee was also charged with identifying existing programs, organizations, and institutions that could provide programming within the facility or increase the capacity of the facility to offer programs internally. The sub-committee also discussed a range of existing programs that could extend the restorative capacity of the new facility by extending treatment programs beyond release through in-community counseling, treatment, and ongoing traditional teaching. The following is a list of regional organizations and programs that were suggested by the sub-committee during Restorative Justice Workshops:

• University College of the North (UCN)
• UCN Restorative Justice and Conflict Resolution Program
• Burntwood Regional Health Authority (BRHA)
• Thompson Regional Community Centre
• University of Manitoba
• Addictions Foundation of Manitoba
• MKO Justice Committee
• MMF Justice Committee
• School District of Mystery Lake
• Frontier School Division
• Provincial and Regional Sports Authorities and Recreation Organizations
• FASD (Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder) Connections
• Manitoba Housing
• Vale
• Legal Aid Manitoba
• Manitoba Tourism

The goal is to accommodate all Northern needs in the facility for both remand and sentenced adult males and females, as well as youth males and females. The objective is to also provide a full range of housing from maximum security cellular accommodation through to transitional semi-independent living units. The projected population is derived from an analysis of the statistical information available to date, augmented by local understanding of the scope of the community’s needs.

Suggested Resident Capacity is 220 residents, whose demographic breakdown roughly comprises:

• 136 adult males
• 32 adult females
• 36 youth males
• 16 youth females
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Space</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Gross Unit Area (ft²)</th>
<th>Gross Total Area (ft²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adult Males’ 16-bed Unit</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Adult Males’ 4-bed “Bungalow”</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>9,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Adult Females’ 16-bed Unit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Adult Females’ 4-bed “Bungalow”</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Youth Males’ 12-bed Unit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Youth Males’ 4-bed “Bungalow”</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Youth Females’ 8-bed Unit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Youth Females’ 4-bed “Bungalow”</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Maximum Security Units (Male, Adult/Youth)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Central Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lobby/Public Entrance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Adult/Youth Males’ Visits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Adult/Youth Females’ Visits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Adult/Youth Male’s A&amp;D (Reception)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Adult/Youth Females’ A&amp;D (Reception)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Health Unit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Secure Isolation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Records Office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Central Control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Staff Facilities/Lockers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Central IT/LAN/server</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adult/Youth Males’ Alternate Use Classrooms</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Adult/Youth Males’ Alternate Use Gymnasium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Adult/Youth Females’ Alternate Use Classrooms</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Adult/Youth Females’ Alternate Use Gymnasium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Spiritual Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Indoor Smudging Rooms, Ceremonial Spaces</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Exterior Sweat Lodge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Spiritual Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Industries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teaching Workshops</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Classrooms</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Industries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Shipping/Receiving</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Stores</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Laundry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Project Gross Floor Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>185,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Project Gross Area exceeds typical square footage per inmate due, in part, to adherence to single room occupancies for all populations. Living units will not be subject to the standard practice of double-bunking that is common in provincial facilities. *
DETAILED DRAFT PROGRAMME AND NARRATIVE

Residential Accommodation Organization:
The facility should establish functional, secure, and culturally appropriate forms as basic units of accommodation including dormitories, single- and double- occupancy bedrooms, and detached bungalow units where appropriate. In Section 6.0, the Concept Site Plan demonstrates each population group organized in a circular cluster of units, the majority of which would be connected via an interior corridor. Each population group has a low-security bungalow compound for those considered low risk, those having earned the privilege or those serving late terms of longer sentences. The intention is to create a visual appearance of community and a strong relationship with the exterior environment, while assuring the provision of sufficient security infrastructure to achieve a minimal risk level for residents and staff.

Circulation and Building Form:
Within each population group, consideration should be given to circulation between groupings of units and between individual units via a single-loaded corridor. This circulation “spine” has windows along one side to provide continuous views to the outdoors. Consideration should also be given to the configuration of this “spine.” The circulation and organization of the program areas could be circular or in a curving, free-form. This relates the building to the medicine wheel with the internal plan organization orienting towards the cardinal directions. In sub-committee workshops as well as consultation sessions with Nisichawayasik Cree Nation, Manitoba Metis Federation, Manitoba Keewatinowi Okimakanak, and Keewatin Tribal Council, the significance of the circular form and a building organization that is structured to reference the cardinal directions was a recurring theme.

ADULT MALE:
- 95% communal form of housing, 5% non-communal form of housing representing minimum-medium security and maximum security accommodation respectively.
- The accommodation for each of the resident populations should consider a combination of types of accommodation as described below. It is recommended that adult male should receive a minimum of 25% percent Type D accommodation. The variety of accommodation is intended to address the varying level of risk and needs of different segments of the facility population. The type of accommodation could be provided with a “graduated step-down” option where residents can be assigned as appropriate for brief remand, longer stays, or prior to release. The “finer grain” of accommodation options provides greater flexibility for staff to assign or relocate residents due to personal conflicts, gang memberships, or other behavioural concerns.

Type A:
- 8- or 16-bunk or single-bed dormitories in dorm “wings,” each with individual private washrooms and private showers with access to a living/lounge area, defined dining area, TV watching area, separate reading/programmes room, kitchen, laundry room, and free access to outdoor yard.

Type B:
- 16 bedrooms in bedroom “wings,” each with individual private washrooms and private showers with access to a living/lounge area, defined dining area, TV watching area, separate reading/programmes room, kitchen, laundry room, and free access to outdoor yard.

Type C:
- 8 bedrooms in bedroom “wings,” each with individual private washrooms and private showers with access to a living/lounge area, defined dining area, TV watching area, separate reading/programmes room, kitchen, laundry room, and free access to outdoor yard.

Type D: Residential style stand-alone bungalows of 4 or 8 bedrooms, with or without staff direct supervision, each with individual private washroom, bathroom(s), living room, dining room, kitchen, laundry room and outdoor yard.

Non-Communal (Maximum Security) form of Housing:
- 5% of the total resident population should be reserved for housing of residents determined to be at high risk of violent behaviour at admission. These would be in the form of standard detention cells. The provision of these cells assures the safety of lower risk residents and justice staff. It is critical that high-security detention cells not be used for administrative segregation.

ADULT FEMALE:
- 100% communal form of housing representing minimum-medium security accommodation.
- The range of housing options for females are similar to those described for men, in particular those defined as Types C and D. At least two forms of accommodation for females should be considered, for example:
  - Two 8-bedroom wings located along a central spine leading from the adult females’ reception and administration area, and out to four 4-bedroom bungalows, or;
  - Two 8-bedroom wings located along a central spine leading from the adult females’ reception and administration area, and out to a 16-bed stand-alone cottage, or;
  - Two 8-bedroom wings grouped into a 16-bed stand-alone cottage and four 4-bedroom bungalows.

Given the small number of beds for females, travel distances could be minimized to avoid considering internalized central access.

YOUTH MALE:
- 90% communal form of housing, 10% non-communal form of housing representing minimum-medium security and maximum security accommodation respectively.
- The range of housing options proposed for male youth are similar to those previously defined as Types C and D. At least two forms of accommodation should be considered, for example:
  - Two 8-bedroom wings located along a central spine leading from the youth male’s reception and administration area, and out to four 4-bedroom bungalows, or;
  - Two 8-bedroom wings located along a central spine leading from the youth male’s reception and administration area, and out to a 16-bed stand-alone cottage, or;
  - Two 8-bedroom wings grouped into a 16-bed stand-alone cottage and four 4-bedroom bungalows.

Non-Communal (Maximum Security) form of Housing
- Similar to the adult male population, 5% of the total resident population should be reserved for housing of residents determined to be at high risk of violent behaviour at admission. These would be in the form of standard detention cells. The provision of these cells assures the safety of lower risk residents and justice staff. It is critical that high-security detention cells not be used for administrative segregation.

YOUTH FEMALE:
- 100% communal form of housing representing minimum-medium security accommodation.
- The range of housing options for youth female are similar to those described for adult female and youth male. At least two forms of accommodation for youth females should be considered, for example:
  - Two 8 bedroom wings located along a central spine leading from the youth females’ reception and administration area, or;
  - One 8 bedroom wing located along a central spine leading from the youth females’ reception and administration area, and out to two 4-bedroom bungalows,
  - Four 4 bedroom bungalows.

Given the very small number of beds for youth females, travel distances could be minimized to avoid considering internalized central access.
### Reception Area - Admitting and Discharge (A&D):

The facility will require separate reception areas for adult male, adult female, youth male and youth female, sized according to interim capacity. It should consider potential expansion in the future.

**Sample programme for Adult Male Reception:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Element</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transport Vehicle Sallyport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reception Counter/work space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Area/Room (fingerprinting, photo, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview/Triage Rooms (assessment, booking)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical/Nurse Examination Room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff washroom (single occupant), lockers and Lunch Room with kitchenette</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washroom (single occupant) and shower for use by inmate during interview, assessment and medical examination phase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janitor Room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-cleared (“Dirty”) Holding Cells (1 large – 8-10 person capacity; 2 small – 2-4 person capacity, 1 single)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleared (“Clean”) Holding Cells (1 large – 8-10 person capacity; 2 small – 2-4 person capacity, 1 single)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Remand Booths</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing Storage (for 118 clothing bags on racks)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vault (for resident valuables)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dead Property Storage (for 20 clothing bags on racks)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAC Room (optional)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Main Entrance:

The image of the facility should be established by a prominent and welcoming single public entrance giving access to visiting for all groups, including visitors to the administration offices, as well as serving as the visitor entrance to all of the resident areas past the primary line of security. The entrance should also provide for visitors waiting, both for visits and administration.

Ideally, the lobby and vestibule are free access without locking control. As a public building, the public should have right of access to lobby and reception counters.

- Lobby with Weather Vestibule
- Public Waiting Room
- Public Washroom, Men and Women
- Public Lockers (coin operated with return)
- Public Telephones
- Administration Reception
- Adult/Youth Female Visits Reception
- Adult/Youth Male Visits Reception

### Visits Area:

Separate visiting areas for the four demographic groups, sized according to interim capacity, but not necessarily expandable as capacity can be increased by frequency of scheduling.

**Visits Area for Youth/Adult Male:**

- Secure Non-Contact Visiting Booths
- Open Visits Room (family/friends visit at tables with chairs)
- Private Family Visits Room (family visits living room style lounge seating)
- Professional Visits Room
- Case Management Meeting Room (for resident, family, professional staff, case managers)
- Search stalls
- Resident WC

Programme for visits area for adult and youth females would have the same facilities but be proportionately scaled based on resident ratio. Dual usage is possible with alternately scheduled usage by adult/youth males and adult/youth females either on a daily basis or alternate day basis or similar arrangement. Visits are typically all pre-arranged on a reservation basis with dates and times.

### Health Unit:

Ideally, this unit can be designed to serve all four demographic groups if key treatment rooms have double access so that adult/youth males and adult/youth females can enter from each side. Usage by all four groups would require careful scheduling and management of access to the health unit.

**Adult/Youth Male Zone:**

- Entrance
- Waiting Room(s)
- Resident Washroom (Male)
- Male Examination Room with Washroom
- Health Clinic Bedrooms (with infection control)
- Soiled Linen Holding Room
- Clean Linen Holding Room
- Resident Shower
- Janitor Closet

**Adult/Youth Female Zone:**

- Entrance
- Waiting Room(s)
- Resident Washroom (Female)
- Female Examination Room with Tub Room
- Health Clinic Bedrooms (with infection control)
- Soiled Linen Holding Room
- Clean Linen Holding Room
- Resident Shower
- Janitor Closet

**Shared Zone:**

- Nursing Station (facing into each resident zone)
- Filing / Supplies area
- Medication Room
- Bio-Hazards Holding Room
- X-Ray / Examination Room
- Dental Office / Dental Equipment Room
- Telemedicine Suite / Doctor’s Office
- Dialysis Suite

**Staff Area:**

- Staff Lockers
- Staff Meeting / Lunch Room with kitchenette
- Supply/Storage Room
- Pharmacy
- Janitor Closet

Mental health, psychological counselling, social work counselling, and other similar professional services can be delivered either at the Health Unit with the addition of day offices/interview rooms; or alternatively by providing a few day offices/interview rooms within each housing group.

**Secure Isolation Unit / Segregation Unit:**

Used for isolating a resident for a brief period of time due to disruptive behaviour or in order to remove them from a source of conflict. This facility is not intended for permanent maximum secure accommodation which is included elsewhere in the programme.

Various approaches typically programmed to accommodate up to as much as 10% of resident population are available ranging from stand-alone unit of hard detention cells or to providing a stand-alone unit with additional isolation cells in each housing area enabling a more graduated response.

**Typical Segregation Unit Program:**

- Secure Segregation Cells (up to 22 cells grouped by population)
- Staff counter/workstation
- Staff Washroom
- Mattress Room
- Resident Shower
- Janitor Closet
- Exercise Yards

**Records Office:**

- Office Workstations
- Records Filing Room
- Copy Room

**Central Control:**

- Sallyport Entry
- Control Room
- Staff WC
- Electronic Equipment Room
Operational Staff Support:
- Operational Managers’ Offices (Security, Scheduling, Services, etc. )
- Staff Lockers
- Staff Washrooms/ Showers – Men and Women
- Staff Fitness Room

Administration:
- Superintendent’s Office
- Superintendent’s Boardroom
- Superintendent’s Assistant Office
- Deputy Superintendents’ Offices
- Secure Filing Room
- Secure Storage Room
- LAN Room
- Copy Room/Supplies
- Human Resources Open Office with 5 workstations
- Clinicians’ Offices (recommend 9 or 10 offices)
- General / Clinical Open Office (recommend 7-9 workstations)
- Staff Training Room
- Training Materials Storage Room
- Meeting Rooms (1 large for up to 12, 1 smaller for up to 6)
- Staff Lunch Room with kitchenette
- Staff Washrooms – Male and Female
- Janitor Closet

Education:
Recommend educational facilities that can be shared; one for adult and youth males, and one for adult and youth females. Size, curriculum, and staffing will need to be determined, in consultation with local educational institutions

Sample programme: Adult/Youth Male School:
- Entrance Vestibule
- Staff Offices
- Copy Room
- Staff Lunch Room with kitchenette
- Classrooms (up to 10 desks plus teacher’s desk)
- Computer Skills Classroom
- Art / Craft Room(s)
- Life Skills Classroom (1 with demonstration kitchen)
- Gymnasium (consider including stage for performances with understage seating, storage, and stage lighting)
- Exercise Room / Gym Equipment Storage
- Gym Staff Office
- Gym Staff Washroom
- Gym Resident Washroom

Adult/Youth Female School
The female programme would be similar to the male educational facility with minor variations in terms of additional life skills classrooms including sewing, infant care, hair dressing, etc.

Dual usage of the same facilities is only possible with alternately scheduled usage by males and females either on a daily basis (morning and afternoon sessions) or alternate day basis, or other similar arrangements. Flexibility further increases if gymnasia has two separate entrances with secure sound vestibule such that classes can be held for youth in the morning while adults have gym access and vice versa in the afternoon. Evening gym use is also encouraged on a scheduled basis.

Spiritual / Multi-Faith Worship Centre:
Recommend facilities that can be shared by all resident groups on a scheduled basis. This requires careful siting of the central Spiritual Centre and consideration of access from four approaches. The location of the Spiritual Centre is central within the site plan, located to assure secure and frequent access from each of the resident population areas. It is recommended that multiple places for traditional teaching, ceremonies, and spiritual programming be provided, both interior and exterior, to assure access for each population. Within the model site plan illustrated in Sections 5 and 6, each resident population area is provided with an exterior ceremonial space, sweat lodge, and dedicated access to the primary Spiritual Centre.

Vocational Training:
Recommend facilities that can be shared by all resident groups on a scheduled basis. This requires careful siting and consideration of access for each group.

Sample programme elements:
- Entrance Vestibule
- Staff Offices
- Instructional Classrooms (adjacent to shops)
- Framing Shop
- Millwork Shop
- Drywalling / Plastering Shop
- Painting Shop
- Electrical Shop
- Sheetmetal Working Shop
- Others, as determined by local needs

Shipping / Receiving / Central Stores / Maintenance:

- Shipping Truck Bay
- Holding Bay
- Garbage Holding Room
- Recycling Holding Area
- Receiving Staff Offices
- Central Stores (Storage area)
- Stores Staff Office
- Maintenance Workshop
- Tool Storage Cage
- Secure Storage
- Staff Office / BAS Control Room
- Maintenance Staff Lunch Room with kitchenette
- Janitor Closet
- Staff Washrooms

Food Services / Central Kitchen:
Residents in some bungalow or cottage settings may elect to cook for themselves and “purchase” food from the food service kitchen as part of life skills development. Food for re-heating may also be delivered. All residents may prepare snacks or light lunches in this way. All food can be prepared, trayed, put on carts and delivered to each housing unit, or alternatively a central dining hall for each resident group may be preferred.

Sample central kitchen programme (1,000 meals per day):
- Male Kitchen Staff Washroom, Shower and Lockers
- Female Kitchen Staff Washroom, Shower and Lockers
- Kitchen Office – 10 m²
- Cook’s Office – 10 m²
- Resident Kitchen Work Staff Lunch Room: 12 m² with WC: 2.5 m²
- Dairy Cooler – 12 m²
- Vegetable Cooler – 12 m²
- General Freezer – 12 m²
- Meat Cooler – 6 m²
- Meat Freezer – 6 m²
- Dry Storage – 20 m²
- Secure Storage (Utensils) – 2.5 m²
- Kitchen – 180 m²
- Prep Line – 30 m³
- Cart Wash – 5 m²
- Tray Cart Return – 15 m²
- Dish / Utensil Washing – 25 m²
- Kitchen Chemical Storage – 3.5 m²
- Kitchen Waste Cooler – 10 m³
- Janitor Closet – 1.5 m²
- Kitchen Cart Delivery Van Bay – 45 m³

Laundry Services:
Residents in all residential settings may elect to launder their personal clothing themselves as part of life skills development. Laundering on site does offer additional vocational training opportunities.

Sample Central Laundry programme (200 residents):
- Laundry Office – 10 m²
- Laundry Supplies Holding Room – 12 m²
- Resident Worker Washroom – 2.5 m²
- Laundry Staff Washroom – 2.5 m²
- Soiled Receiving / Sorting Area – 35 m²
- Washer Extractor / Tumble Dryer Equipment Area – 30 m²
- Folding / Sorting Area – 30 m²
- Cleans Issue Holding Area – 30 m²

etc.)

Sample Central Laundry programme (200 residents):
- Laundry Office – 10 m²
- Laundry Supplies Holding Room – 12 m²
- Resident Worker Washroom – 2.5 m²
- Laundry Staff Washroom – 2.5 m²
- Soiled Receiving / Sorting Area – 35 m²
- Washer Extractor / Tumble Dryer Equipment Area – 30 m²
- Folding / Sorting Area – 30 m²
- Cleans Issue Holding Area – 30 m²

etc.)

Sample Central Laundry programme (200 residents):
- Laundry Office – 10 m²
- Laundry Supplies Holding Room – 12 m²
- Resident Worker Washroom – 2.5 m²
- Laundry Staff Washroom – 2.5 m²
- Soiled Receiving / Sorting Area – 35 m²
- Washer Extractor / Tumble Dryer Equipment Area – 30 m²
- Folding / Sorting Area – 30 m²
- Cleans Issue Holding Area – 30 m²

etc.)
5. SITE STATEMENT

The overwhelming justification for the provision of enhanced programming and the location of a new facility capable of serving a demographic specific to Northern Manitoba has been established in previous sections of this report. The justification is largely contingent on the absence of any comparable facility within the vast geographical territory of Northern Manitoba. The argument is strengthened by the proximity of Thompson to the communities of origin of a large portion of individuals who are either sentenced or held in remand within the Manitoba Corrections system. There are also many real operational and logistical benefits for Manitoba Corrections that could be achieved by locating a facility within the financial, infrastructural, and cultural hub of the North.

See Figure 5.1 - Manitoba Infrastructure Map

The City of Thompson is an ideal site for a Manitoba Corrections Facility, a Correctional Service Canada Facility, or a joint facility designed to accommodate the operational requirements and needs of individuals within both streams of detention and rehabilitation. Thompson’s position relative to transportation infrastructure serving and connecting Northern communities, existing and emerging institutions within the City of Thompson that will support facility operations, and robust public support in both the City and outlying communities combine to strengthen the primary argument for this institution laid out in Section 1, our project vision.

Broad, general support aside, there is also a strong argument for the City of Thompson as an ideal physical site for this facility. The City of Thompson rests along the southern edge of the Burntwood River within the Local Government District of Mystery Lake. The compact City-site is surrounded by a significant undisturbed Boreal Forest, muskeg, and lakeland, which rests primarily in provincial ownership. Vale, a key stakeholder in the Plan, retains substantial land holdings to the east and southeast of the City. Vale’s holdings include the company’s three active mine-heads, as well as the smelter and processing operation. Due to, among other things, the cost of servicing, geotechnical constraints, and lack of supportive infrastructure, approximately 50% of land within the existing Thompson municipal boundary remains undeveloped. In short, land availability and ownership are not limiting factors of the Plan and the support of all three primary landowners for the development of a facility assures the relative ease of acquisition for development if purchase or easement is required.
Figure 5.1 - Manitoba Infrastructure Map Showing Sheriff’s Logistics and Access
Figure 5.2 illustrates the extent of urban development within the Thompson area along with the municipal boundary and, in close proximity to the City boundary, the extent of Vale’s holdings.

Through the Thompson Economic Diversification Working Group process, a Restorative Justice Sub-Committee was struck to discuss site selection and facility programming. Participating stakeholders provided recommendations for the facility location. Sub-committee members and their affiliations included:

**CITY OF THOMPSON:**
- Tim Johnston, Mayor, City of Thompson
- Charlene Lafreniere, Director of Institutional Advancement at UCN and Deputy Mayor, City of Thompson
- Gary Cepetelli, Interim City Manager and Director of Planning and Community Services, City of Thompson

**VALE:**
- Lovro Paulic, General Manager, Smelting/Refining and Site Operations, Vale
- Ryan Land, Manager, Corporate Affairs, Vale
- Joe Armstrong, Manager, Maintenance Services & Support, Smelting & Refining, Vale

**ABORIGINAL ORGANIZATIONS:**
- Sharon McKay, CEO of Keewatin Tribal Council
- David Sanderson, Justice Strategy Diversion Program, Manitoba Keewatinowi Okimakanak (MKO)
- Roy Smith, Justice Strategy Diversion Program, MKO
- Julyda Lagimodiere, Minister of Justice and VP Thompson Region, Manitoba Metis Federation (MMF)
- Shannon Allard-Chartrand, Director, Metis Justice Institute, (MMF)
- Les Mulholland, MMF Justice Program
- Jerry Primrose, Chief, Nisichawayasihk Cree Nation (NCN)
- Members of the NCN Council and community

**COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS:**
- Dawn Sands, Executive Director, Thompson Neighbourhood Renewal Corporation
- Katie Isaac, Macdonald Youth Services
- Val Charlette, Addictions Foundation of Manitoba
- Laura Finlay, Thompson Regional Community Centre

**ECONOMIC ORGANIZATIONS:**
- Betty Landego, Thompson Unlimited
- Linda Markus, President, Thompson Chamber of Commerce

**OTHER STAKEHOLDERS:**
- Frank Koreman, Akman Construction
- Bob Day, Akman Construction
- Jason Johannson, Akman Construction
- Curtis Ross, Thompson Regional Airport Authority
- Constable Steve Fassbender, RCMP
- Alan McLauchlan, Coordinator, Law Enforcement Program, University College of the North (UCN) and Mayor, Town of The Pas

Site recommendations and critical discussion were based on a set of criteria stated at the outset of the exercise, primarily:

- ideal location based on operational parameters provided by the consultant team (approximate number of staff trips and prisoner trips per day required between facilities in the City and the site related to Court, maintenance, programming, and day-to-day operations)
- amount of area required
- approximate servicing requirements
- relative security profile of the institution (based on draft programme included in Section 4.0)
- land ownership (private land holdings, aside from those willingly recommended by Vale on Vale-owned land, were not to be considered)
Figure 5.2 – City of Thompson Land Ownership Plan
Figure 5.3 illustrates the nine sites identified by the Restorative Justice Sub-Committee. The sub-committee was also asked to recommend a set of weighted criteria that could be used to evaluate the long list of nine sites to determine priority building sites. The full list of weighted criteria was added to a “Site Selection Matrix” (Table 5.1) which was then used to eliminate sites that were incompatible, insufficient in scale, or extraordinarily constrained (by geo-hydrological constraints). The matrix identifies four sites which were deemed to be compatible with the facility profile and programme requirements. Together, the site selection matrix and critical evaluation by the sub-committee, resulted in a short list of preferred sites which were brought forward to City staff for further review and discussion. The full list of sites, ranked in order of stated preference during sub-committee discussions on September 21, 2011 and October 13, 2011, are presented below (with 1. being the highest ranked site):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>SITE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SITE 7 – Old Ski Hill Road, North of Golf Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SITE 9 – North of Burntwood River, West of City Boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SITE 2 – North of Burntwood River, Within City Boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SITE 8 – Airport Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SITE 1 – Railway Industrial Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SITE 5 – Vale Service Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SITE 6 – Weir Road, East of Norplex Recreation Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SITE 4 – Highway 6, South of Vale Mine Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>SITE 3 – Princeton Drive, East of the Addictions Foundation of Manitoba</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further consultation was carried out with City of Thompson staff, including Interim City Manager and Director of Planning and Community Development, Gary Ceppetelli, to identify any additional planning considerations to be considered during the site selection process. It was determined that proximity to municipal services, or existing capacity of municipal services, was not viewed as a limiting constraint as the City has plans to upgrade municipal servicing infrastructure and utilities within the coming years. In line with preliminary recommendations emerging from a review of the City’s District Development Plan and Zoning By-law, which includes a growth management component, the suggestion that the location of the facility on a strategic unserviced site could catalyze positive urban development by necessitating the extension of services to potential areas of future residential and commercial development was also considered. The potential role of the facility as a catalyst for infrastructure development introduced an additional evaluation tool for assessing preferred sites. The potential for facility development to integrate with the City’s objectives for future development and land use was determined to be an important part of site selection and addition to the matrix.

As mentioned earlier, the Restorative Justice Sub-Committee met on Thursday, October 13, 2011 to review the short-list of priority sites to determine a preferred site, or sites, for further analysis and facility concept design. Sites 2, 7, and 9 were confirmed as the preferred sites and a recommendation was made to verify Vale’s long-term development interest in any of the sites prior to proceeding with the concept design. Of primary importance to the sub-committee in selecting these sites was their relative spiritual purity. The sites were deemed to be “clean.” To the best knowledge of sub-committee members and City staff none of the preferred sites had been previously subject to any form of development or recent long-term human occupation. Each site was suitably sized to accommodate both an initial 200+ bed facility with accommodation for future expansion. Each of the preferred sites also has a strong relationship with significant natural features – the Burntwood River and Boreal Forest – and, as such, each offered opportunities for integration of natural elements within the facility design.

The City of Thompson and surrounding lands present a wealth of suitable sites for potential facility development. For purposes of creating the conceptual design presented herein it was determined to proceed with further evaluation of Site 7. Concerns regarding Site 2 and Site 9 raised during discussion with stakeholders, Vale, and City staff, included the potential long-term value of mineral deposits on the site as well as existing recreational amenities (cross-country ski trails and horse stables). The further evaluation of Site 7 through the conceptual design is intended to demonstrate the scale of the proposed facility, and the facility layout, relative to the municipality as well as existing and proposed infrastructure. It is understood that, should the Province decide to proceed with a determination of site suitability for a facility within Thompson, further evaluation of this and other sites will be required.

To summarize, Site 7 was viewed as spiritually unconstrained and ideal for integration of the Boreal Forest and views to the Burntwood River into the facility design. The site was also deemed to have significant potential for creating additional infrastructural benefits for the City by extending municipal services to the North. Since the site is located within the existing municipal boundary, the proximity of available programming was also seen as a benefit since operational efficiencies would result from core programs (University and College training, physical and mental healthcare, Elder and community visits, traditional teachers, etc.) being available to the facility without the challenges of significant travel distance and associated increased costs.
Figure 5.3 - Nine Selected Sites of Interest with Three Study Sites Highlighted in Bold Red
## EVALUATION CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>WITHIN CITY OF THOMPSON</th>
<th>OWNERSHIP</th>
<th>ON / PROXIMAL TO TRACT &amp; LAND</th>
<th>CLEAN (SPIRITUALLY UNENCUMBERED)</th>
<th>HYDROLOGICAL CONSTRAINTS</th>
<th>POTENTIAL CONTAMINATION</th>
<th>UNUSABLE SITE (PRESERVED USE)</th>
<th>DISTANCE FROM CITY CENTRE (ROAD 391 + THOMPSON DRIVE)</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>NORTH OF RAILWAY INDUSTRIAL LANDS - (EAST OF TOWN BOUNDARY)</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>VALE</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO (RAILWAY)</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>NORTH OF BURNTWOOD RIVER - 1 (SOUTH OF OLD MANITOBA ROAD 391)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>CITY OF THOMPSON</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES (USE- XC-SKI TRAIL SYSTEM)</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>PRINCETON DRIVE - EAST OF APM</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>CITY OF THOMPSON</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>HWY 6 - SOUTH OF VALE</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>PROVINCE</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>PARTIALLY CLEARED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>VALE SERVICE ROAD - (EAST OF TOWN BOUNDARY)</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>VALE</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>TRANSMISSION LINE / MINE SERVICES</td>
<td>PARTIALLY CLEARED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>WEIR ROAD (EAST OF NORPLEX)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>CITY OF THOMPSON</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO - COLD WEATHER TESTING FACILITY</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>OLD SKI HILL ROAD - (NORTH OF GOLF COURSE)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>CITY OF THOMPSON</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>AIRPORT LANDS / BOUNDARY EXPANSION - (SE OF AIRPORT BOUNDARY)</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>PROVINCE (VALE MINERAL LEASE)</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>MUSKEG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>NORTH OF BURNTWOOD RIVER - 2 (WEST OF TOWN BOUNDARY)</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>PROVINCE (VALE MINERAL LEASE)</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5.1 - Site Selection Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>ACCESSIBLE VIA EXISTING ROAD</th>
<th>ON TOWN WATER SUPPLY</th>
<th>ON TOWN SANITARY SYSTEM</th>
<th>SURVEYING SURVEYS REQUIRED</th>
<th>RESTRICTED IN CITY</th>
<th>SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY PLAN</th>
<th>PROXIMITY TO RESIDENTIAL AREA</th>
<th>SITE AREA</th>
<th>DISTANCE FROM CITY CENTRE (ROAD 391 + THOMPSON DRIVE)</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>3.12 KM</td>
<td>CONSTRINED BY SITE CONDITIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT FEASIBLE - LIMITED LAND AVAILABILITY AND UNKNOWN CONDITIONS DUE TO PROXIMITY OF RAIL CORRIDOR AND INDUSTRIAL OPERATIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>3.46 KM</td>
<td>FEASIBLE - MARGINAL CONSTRAINTS WITH EXISTING RECREATION FACILITIES AND FUTURE INTENDED USE FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT FEASIBLE - LIMITED LAND AVAILABILITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>1.96 KM</td>
<td>UNDER 40 ACRES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT FEASIBLE - LIMITED LAND AVAILABILITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>8.66 KM</td>
<td>FEASIBLE - KEY CONSTRAINT IS DISTANCE FROM MUNICIPAL CENTRE AND SERVICING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT FEASIBLE - KEY CONSTRAINT IS DISTANCE FROM MUNICIPAL CENTRE AND SERVICING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>1.77 KM</td>
<td>UNCONSTRAINED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT FEASIBLE - PROXIMITY TO TRANSMISSION LINES &amp; LINEAR INFRASTRUCTURE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>3.31 KM</td>
<td>UNDER 60 ACRES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT FEASIBLE - PROXIMITY TO RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITIES AND LIMITED LAND AVAILABILITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>6.19 KM</td>
<td>UNCONSTRAINED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PREFERRED SITE - ABILITY TO EXTEND DEVELOPMENT TO THE EXISTING NORTHERN LIMITS OF THE CITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>4.45 KM</td>
<td>UNCONSTRAINED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT FEASIBLE - HYDROLOGICAL CONSTRAINTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>3.83 KM</td>
<td>UNCONSTRAINED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FEASIBLE - STRONG PROXIMITY TO CITY, YET IS CONSTRAINED BY INTEREST IN MINERAL POTENTIAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1 - Site Selection Matrix
Figure 5.4 - North of Burntwood River Precinct Map
Figure 5.4 illustrates a conceptual precinct plan for the area to the immediate east of the proposed site North of the Burntwood River. The land uses demonstrated in the plan are consistent with the Thompson and Planning District Sustainable Community Plan, as adopted by Thompson City Council in April 2011. The plan also demonstrates the infrastructural requirements for the facility, including utility connections and a new North-south road connecting to Manitoba Road 391.

Thompson and its surrounding communities together constitute a “willing host.” The frequent stigma associated with correctional facilities and correctional facility sites as anathema to positive urban development is not a hindrance within Thompson and environs where the issues surrounding both youth and adult crime are all too familiar and few families are unaffected. The position put forward within this document is the collective vision of Northern Manitobans who, through the Restorative Justice Sub-Committee of the Thompson Economic Diversification Working Group, have provided guidance and critical contributions to this exercise. The sub-committee has gone to great lengths to ensure that full and equal consideration has been given to both the requirements of Manitoba Corrections as operators of the facility and the home communities from which the resident population of this institution will come. The sub-committee has also gone to great lengths to ensure that the facility, and the site on which it will reside, respects the values and principles of the First Nation stakeholder communities, the Metis and non-status Aboriginal communities, and non-Aboriginal peoples living in the North.
Figure 5.6 - Infrastructural Connections Extend to Proposed Sites
Site selection considered the role of the facility as a “catalyst for infrastructure development... to integrate with the City’s objectives for future development and land use.”
Figure 6.1 - Program Diagram
Figure 6.2 - Conceptual Facility Plan
7. WHY THOMPSON?

As the “Hub of the North,” Thompson’s role as the economic, service and administrative centre of Northern Manitoba continues to grow. Thompson Provincial Court is a centre for a large geographic area stretching from Churchill in the North, to Norway House in the south. Thompson’s judicial district covers fifteen circuits. The central location of Thompson in Northern Manitoba and the accessibility of the city from points both north and south affords all those engaged in the justice system the ability to access services in Thompson.

Thompson is also home to several Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal organizations which offer accessible educational and vocational programs including traditional teaching and healing. Programs such as job/skills training, addictions counselling, mentorship, adult education, youth programs, child services, parenting classes and health awareness programs are offered by a number of organizations in Thompson.

The development of University College of the North’s (UCN) new Thompson Campus also offers culturally-sensitive post-secondary education and training programs. The programs offered by UCN at both Thompson and The Pas campuses uniquely positions the institution to play a major role in developing a Northern workforce to staff a facility located in Thompson as well as providing specific programming within the facility in partnership with the Province of Manitoba and other service providers.
ACTION PLAN #1: RESTORATIVE JUSTICE FACILITY
8. RENDERINGS & VISUALIZATIONS
Figure 8.1 - View Across the Burntwood River
Figure 8.2 - View from Adult Male Housing Courtyard
Figure 8.3 - Exterior View of the Spiritual Campus
Figure 8.4 - View from Male Lounge Space Looking into Adult Male Housing Courtyard
ACTION PLAN #1: RESTORATIVE JUSTICE FACILITY

Figure 8.5 - Aerial View


Lieutenant Governor of Manitoba, Speech from the Throne, Tuesday, Nov.16, 2010.
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