

MINUTES

Public Safety Coordinating Council
Juvenile Justice Center, Carmichael Room
2727 Centennial Boulevard–Eugene, Oregon

May 22, 2003 3 p.m.

PRESENT: Gretchen Pierce, Chair; Thad Buchanan, Russ Burger, Jan Clements, Faye Fagel, Jan Gund, Doug Harclerod, Alicia Hayes, John Radich, Ilisa Rooke-Ley, Rob Rockstroh, Lisa Smith, Ken Tollenaar, members; Jim Carlson, Bill Van Vactor, *ex-officio*; Jamon Kent, staff.

ABSENT: Stu Burge, Bob De La Vergne, Bobby Green, Mike Grover, Jim Torrey, Nancy Nathanson, Ivan Hernandez, Tricia Hedin, Mike Kelly, Denis Hijmans, Ken Larsen, Kip Leonard, Ted Lewis, Bert McClintock, Anna Morrison, Grant Nelson, Jerry Smith, Ken Viegas, Warren Weathers. John Woodrow.

GUESTS: Ron Chase, Linda Eaton, Jackie Mikalonis, Susan Sowards, Mark Stevens, Sue LaMarche

1. Call to Order Introductions

Ms. Pierce called the meeting of the Public Safety Coordinating Council (PSCC) to order at 3:12 p.m. She said that the council would not have a quorum of members and could take no official action on any of the items on the agenda. She said that while the PSCC could not take official action on the main item of business, the Juvenile Crime Prevention Plan and Juvenile Accountability Incentive Bock Grant Plan, it could hear a report. There was brief discussion regarding whether to proceed, and the PSCC agreed to a suggestion from Mr. Rockstroh that at minimum, the council hear about the cuts that would occur. The council agreed to a brief staff presentation.

2. Approval of Minutes

Due to a lack of a quorum of members, approval of the minutes of April 8, 2003, was deferred.

3. Comments from the Audience

There were no comments from the audience.

3. JCP/JAIGB Plan

Ms. Sowards provided an overview of the Juvenile Crime Prevention and Juvenile Accountability Incentive Bock Grant Plan, noting it had already been approved by the Policy Committee. She reviewed the framework used to revise the plan. Ms. Sowards briefly noted the revisions that had been made to the plan.

Ms. Smith noted that the assessment element had been moved to basic services. Assessment would be maintained but there would be a reduction in shelter beds. Ms. Smith reported that joint notices would be sent out to those currently holding contracts informing them that if there was no State budget in place on June 30, programs would be suspended until more was known about the status of State funding. She said that no one had the funds to continue the programs on faith. Regarding the best practices Request for Proposals (RFP), Ms. Smith reported that due to budget reductions, that would not be released until it was known that funding was available.

Ms. Smith reported that official notice was received that the Oregon Youth Authority custody cap was reduced from 44 to 34.

Ms. Sowards solicited questions or comments about the plans. She said if the budget moved, staff must be ready to forward the plans to the board.

PSCC members had no comments.

Ms. Pierce suggested that the PSCC could take unofficial action in the absence of a quorum. She requested a motion.

Mr. Harclerod, seconded by Mr. Radich, moved to approve the plan. The motion passed, 12:2; Ms. Rooke Ley voted against the motion and indicated that she had Ms. Hedin's proxy to vote against the motion as well.

4. SAT Update on Community Corrections Plan

Ms. Pierce noted that no member of the SAT was present for the item. She determined from Mr. Clements that he expected the plan to be completed within ten calendar days. Mr. Clements said that following review, a recommendation on the allocation of money for the biennium would be forwarded to the PSCC. Ms. Pierce determined from Mr. Clements that negotiations were stalled and would be resumed soon. She asked the source of the disagreement and the parties to it. Mr. Clements said that participants assumed a certain amount of money was available, but the formula was adjusted so more money was available. While there was agreement about some additions, there was not universal agreement. There was no agreement between Patrol and Probation and the Sheriff's Department about the allocation. Mr. Clements anticipated that the parties would come close to agreement, with Judge Karsten Rasmussen resolving the ultimate recommendation.

Ms. Pierce asked if there were technical issues involved in the delay. Mr. Rockstroh said yes. He said that the County was encountering problems with the contracts because of the budget reductions

that had been made, and an answer was needed soon about the allocations to do the administrative work needed to write the contracts. Ms. Rooke-Ley said it appeared that the issue was one of internal disagreement, not contract funding. Mr. Clements said that was not precisely true; some of the reductions could affect agencies such as Sponsors and the Drug Court. He emphasized that the allocation of the add-back was being worked out.

Ms. Rooke-Ley said that what she had feared would happen, that is, two parties fighting over a pot of money with no one else at the table to participate, had occurred. Mr. Rockstroh pointed out that the parties involved would submit a final proposal. Ms. Rooke-Ley said that at least Mr. Rockstroh had heard about it.

Ms. Pierce asked Mr. Van Vactor to discuss next steps in the process. Mr. Van Vactor said that once the SAT figured out its recommendation, there would probably only be time to take it to the Board of County Commissioners, and no time to bring it to the PSCC. Mr. Clements suggested the council meet via e-mail and ratify the plan and include input that could be forwarded to the board.

Mr. Harclerod suggested that as soon as the SAT had the Plan, it be mailed to all PSCC members. Mr. Kent indicated he would be happy to distribute the plan when he received a copy. Ms. Rooke-Ley expressed concern that the PSCC was not taking action on the Plan. Ms. Pierce concurred, and noted that the PSCC was statutorily required to adopt the Plan. She asked when that could occur. Mr. Harclerod suggested a June meeting be held.

Mr. Clements believed that the situation was created by the State legislature. The budget time line had been very altered and the local community had insufficient information to make decisions. He encouraged members to offer input to the Board.

Mr. Kent questioned what happened if the PSCC did not review the plan but it was forwarded to the Board and adopted. Ms. Sowards said that in the past, both bodies' review was required. Ms. Pierce asked Mr. Van Vactor if the Board's meeting schedule could be changed to accommodate a PSCC meeting. Mr. Van Vactor said yes and that the Board's last scheduled meeting in June was June 25. The PSCC members agreed to meet to consider the plan on June 17, 2003, at 3 p.m. at the Juvenile Justice Center. Ms. Pierce asked that the date be set immediately and members be contacted by Jamon to ensure that there was a quorum for that date.

At the request of Ms. Pierce, Mr. Van Vactor discussed the future of PSCC. He said that the Budget Committee reduced a management analyst position to balance the budget, and there was \$27,000 left over to contribute to the PSCC. Staff would meet soon to discuss other possible sources of funding for PSCC. Regarding the member reappointment process, he reported that would begin the following week. He wanted some time to go by between the time resignations were requested and the time reappointment notices were sent out. Mr. Van Vactor the reappointment process would be complete by early to mid July, and by late July the reconstituted group would be established. He hoped to have some recommendations regarding PSCC staffing for the next fiscal year but ultimately that decision would be up to the PSCC.

Responding to a question from Ms. Pierce about the future of the courts and indigent defense in the

near-term, Mr. Harclerod described Circuit Court's plan for addressing its budget shortfalls, which would include five days of operations, an emphasis on criminal work, and a cessation of much civil work. The indigent defense budget would run out of money on June 9. Staff was being told to take pay cuts and to work without pay. He anticipated a massive criminal call on June 5 to determine if those cases could be resolved prior to July 1. Mr. Harclerod noted that as of July 1, the chief justice would no longer be in charge of that budget, and the person replacing the chief justice would have no choice but to appoint lawyers with whatever money was available, until it ran out. Mr. Harclerod said that the program needed \$172 million for two years. The governor has \$168 million in his budget, which could be made to work, and the house co-chairs have \$151 million, which would not work.

Responding to a follow-up question from Ms. Pierce, Mr. Harclerod said that civil work would not cease completely. He said that the judges would not be cut, but their support staff would be.

Responding to a question from Ms. Rooke-Ley, Mr. Harclerod said his office faced \$500,000 in cuts. However, his office would have a greater capacity to work than the public defenders office. He noted that the police continued to provide his office with 150 cases weekly.

Responding to a question from Ms. Pierce, Mr. Harclerod said that often, arrest was as effective for first-time offenders and offenders such as shoplifters as the remainder of the criminal justice process.

Ms. Rooke-Ley said her office had no contract and had not had one for a while. The office would close down in June, and no one would be paid, in addition to the four weeks of unpaid holiday that attorneys had already taken. Mr. Harclerod noted his belief that the legislature could have acted to avoid the situation.

The PSCC had cake in honor of what was originally believed to be its last meeting as currently constituted.

Ms. Pierce said that she thought much had been accomplished over eight years, and the community was better off than it would have been if the PSCC had never been convened. She hoped all members went forward with good feelings about what had happened and that the community could get through the next few years in difficult times. She thought there was light at the end of the tunnel. She supported the continuation of PSCC.

5. Next Meeting

The PSCC members agreed to meet on June 17, 2003, at 3 p.m. at the Juvenile Justice Center.

The meeting adjourned at 4 p.m.

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)

Mins_20030522.doc

LCOG: \\CLSRV111\LGS\PSCC\COUNCIL_GEN\AGENDAMINS\MINS_20030522.DOC Last Saved: June 11, 2003