

# MINUTES

## Public Safety Coordinating Council

John Serbu Youth Campus -- Juvenile Justice Center Training Room  
2727 Centennial Boulevard, Eugene

May 9, 2002 – 3:00 P.M.

**PRESENT:** Anna Morrison, Chair; Thad Buchanan, Russell Burger, Jan Clements, Karen Gaffney, Bobby Green, Mike Grover, Lyle Hatfield, Tricia Hedin, Jamon Kent, Kip Leonard, Ted Lewis, Grant Nelson, Gretchen Pierce, Rob Rockstroh, Ilisa Rooke-Ley, Jerry Smith, Lisa Smith, Ken Tollenaar, Ken Viegas, members; Jim Carlson, Mike Kelly, Chief Executive Officers; Myra Wall Downing, staff.

**ABSENT:** Faye Fagel, Jan Gund, Doug Harclerod, Denis Hijmans, Ken Larson, Wayne Laut, Sid Leiken, Nancy Nathanson, John Radich, Jim Torrey, Bill Van Vactor, and Jan Wellman.

**GUESTS:** Bill Bishop, Bill DeForrest, Brett Freeman, Galen Howard, Sue LaMarche, Lynn Reeves, Quinn Sidon, Doug Smith, Susan Sowards.

Ms. Morrison called the meeting of the Public Safety Coordinating Council (PSCC) to order at 3:15 p.m. She invited those who were present to introduce themselves.

### 1. Approval of Minutes

*Mr. Nelson moved, seconded by Mr. Rockstroh, to accept the minutes of the April 11, 2002, PSCC meeting. The motion was adopted unanimously, 20:0.*

### 2. Comments from the Audience

None.

### 3. Senate Bill 555 Update

Ms. Gaffney referred to an Issue Brief regarding Revisions to the Lane County Senate Bill 555 Strategic Plan distributed with the agenda of the meeting. She explained that Phase II of the Plan had not been approved by the Oregon Commission on Children and Families and that the PSCC/Commission on Children and Families' Prevention & Juvenile Justice Committee had developed a template for its revision and requested a team to prepare the necessary changes.

Ms. Smith referred to charts distributed at the beginning of the meeting that provided Data Trends/Analysis, Priorities, Strategies, and Rationale/Research Basis for High-Level Outcomes #13, #14, and #15 of the Strategic Plan. She identified additional information included and described how priorities had been established.

Mr. Rockstroh asked if priorities had been changed in the revision of the Strategic Plan. Ms. Gaffney replied that they had not, but that Strategies had been developed from what had previously been identified as Actions. She explained that Rationale for Strategies had been requested and added to the Plan, but that it contained no other new content.

Ms. Morrison said she believed the original Phase II of the Strategic Plan had been vague in describing outcomes, but that the revision was improved. She asked if it met the requirements of the State. She asked why evaluation of services was not identified as a priority.

Ms. Gaffney replied that the Plan met all of the concerns of the State. She said evaluation was built into all programs and that it was an over-arching priority.

Ms. Morrison asked if the Strategic Plan would be returned to the PSCC for a final review. Ms. Gaffney replied that the altered Plan was to be reviewed by the PSCC, with the final recommendation being developed by the Commission on Children and Families (CCF). CCF would forward it to the Board of County Commissioners for approval and re-submission to the State in the last week of June.

Mr. Leonard observed that there was little in the Strategic Plan that Lane County was not already doing. He said the County's Juvenile Justice system was "state of the art," but that all of its programs were not fully funded. He said those who prepared the Plan were to be commended for its inclusive and clear portrayal of the system.

Ms. Gaffney left the meeting at 4:00 PM

#### **4. Intergovernmental Agreement -- Re-Directed Deployment Report**

Chairperson of the Police Services Committee Warren Weathers referred to a document entitled "Re-Directed Deployment" distributed at the beginning of the meeting. He explained that the issue addressed by the report was how to increase coordination and collaboration between police agencies where incorporated areas bordered unincorporated areas in a fragmented and overlapping manner. He said that currently the most troublesome such area was the Santa Clara/River Road area of Eugene and was specifically addressed in the Report. He reviewed options for providing police services in such areas identified by members of the Co-Deployment Study Team and Police Services Committee, as follows:

1. Keep current procedures.
2. Have Santa Clara area incorporated as a city which would provide police services to the entire area.
3. Annexation of all of Santa Clara/River Road into Eugene and have its Police Department serve the area.
4. Annexation of some of the Santa Clara/River Road area into Eugene (*e.g.* south of Beltline) and have Eugene and the Sheriff's Department provide police services to one or the other areas.
5. Have Eugene contract with the Sheriff to provide urban-level police services to the entire Santa Clara/River Road area.

6. Have the Sheriff contract with Eugene to provide police services to the Santa Clara/River Road area.
7. Create a special law enforcement district for either the entire Urban Growth Boundary area, metropolitan area, or a sub area.
8. Expand the function of the current County Service District (wastewater treatment facility) to include police services.
9. Implement “Re-Directed Deployment” practices in the Santa Clara/River Road area.
10. Executives and Policy Makers review existing annexation practices as the impact public services (fire, medical, police, public works) to reduce service delivery complications.

Mr. Weathers noted that the report presented numerous positive and negative considerations for each option identified. He said the Police Services Committee had determined that it was inappropriate for it to make a recommendation regarding the identified options because they involved complex legal, political, and resource issues which could only be decided by elected officials.

Mr. Tollenaar asked if issues raised by the report were related to discussions being held with Santa Clara/River Road residents. Mr. Carlson replied that representatives of the City of Eugene, Lane County and Santa Clara/River Road Neighborhood Associations had been engaged for 15 months in a parallel process intended to make recommendations regarding all public services in the area. He said a report to elected officials was expected in July.

Ms. Morrison asked if rejection of a request to incorporate by the Santa Clara area by the Boundary Commission meant such an option was permanently impossible. Mr. Carlson replied that the decision to not allow incorporation had been made many years before the current level of urban development and annexation to Eugene had occurred in the Santa Clara area. He said participants in the area discussions had rejected an incorporation option. He explained that incorporation would require approval by the Boundary Commission and by voters.

Mr. Carlson said it was important to recognize that there were not adequate resources to provide an urban level of police services anywhere in the Santa Clara/River Road area. He said one way to raise the needed additional resources was to form a police services taxing district. He said he believed it would be most appropriate to approach a taxing district option from a broader perspective than to support only police services.

Mr. Clements said the problem with examination of the options identified in the report was that the legal authority to make decisions regarding them belonged to elected officials. He suggested that the PSCC make a recommendation to the participating jurisdictions in the Intergovernmental Agreement to extend its authority to investigate and make recommendations about them.

Mr. Tollenaar said the Study Team had done a good job of identifying options and that he believed the only feasible arrangement to provide police services to the Santa Clara/River Road area was to establish contractual arrangements to divide which neighborhoods would be served by the Eugene Police and which would be served by the Sheriff’s Office. He said problems with such a solution were that the two agencies did not have equal resources and that incorporated developments scattered throughout the area had residents paying City taxes for an urban level of police services.

Mr. Carlson said the basic problem was that different level of police services were provided in the county and in the city. He said to make up the difference would require additional resources.

Mr. Clements said an additional complication with contractual solutions to Santa Clara/River Road problems was who would administer the resources involved because they would involve payment of each agency to serve areas for which it currently had no responsibility.

Ms. Pierce asked how the issue of re-directed deployment had been added to the concerns addressed by the Intergovernmental Agreement. Mr. Clements replied that the initial impetus had been to consider development of a metropolitan policing agency and that, in lieu of the feasibility of such a possibility; the current options were developed as the best alternative solutions to the ongoing problem.

Ms. Pierce said Santa Clara/River Road residents who resisted annexation should be required to accept a lower level of public services. She suggested that the options be presented to area residents in a community survey.

Mr. Carlson said a purpose of the discussions in the Santa Clara/River Road area had been to determine if a comprehensive solution to service problems in the area could be devised. He said “piecemeal solutions” would not provide the needed answers.

Ms. Morrison said Santa Clara/River Road was not the only area where “checkerboard” development was taking place. Mr. Jerry Smith said the problems faced by police in the Gateway, Game Bird Park, and Glenwood areas were not as significant or as complicated. He also suggested that a survey of the preferences of area residents might be helpful.

Ms. Morrison said she did not believe an opinion survey would give an accurate reading of the opinions of all of the residents in an affected area. She said an official vote was the only way to establish such an understanding.

Mr. Green said he believed the issues of annexation and levels of police service were inseparable. He asked how a vote would be structured to take into account that some Santa Clara/River Road residents lived in areas already annexed to Eugene.

Mr. Carlson replied that State Law provided an annexation plan for the delivery of services. He explained that a geographic area would be defined for potential annexation and that the residents of that area and of the rest of the city would vote on the proposal and the combined vote of both determined the outcome of the election. He said such an annexation could proceed in phases.

Mr. Tollenaar said he did not believe the PSCC could do anything but accept the report and send it to the Policy Committee for possible further action.

***Mr. Tollenaar moved, seconded by Mr. Rockstroh, that the Re-Directed Deployment Report be accepted and forwarded to the Policy Committee for further action. The motion was adopted unanimously, 20:0.***

Ms. Pierce requested that results of the discussions with Santa Clara/River Road area residents regarding improving public services be made to the PSCC. Ms. Morrison said she would anticipate such a report to be available near the end of summer.

Mr. Leonard left the meeting at 4:05 PM

## **5. Intergovernmental Agreement Call-Taking, Dispatch and Dispatch**

Mr. Weathers referred to a document entitled “Call-Taking, Dispatch and Records” distributed at the beginning with the agenda of the meeting. He explained that the Study Team had prepared the report to provide recommendations about co-location, merger, and closer cooperation between police agencies in call-taking and dispatch support services. He noted that the report described the current situation and identified options, as follows:

1. Co-Location of Call-taking, Dispatch and Records
2. Merge/Consolidation of Call-Taking, Dispatch and Records
3. Call-Taking, Dispatch and Records Brought Into Closer Coordination.

Mr. Weathers explained difficulties identified for the options. He said the Police Services Committee recommended Option #3 and that the report contained suggestions for improving the efficiency of the services, as follows:

- a. Complete AIRS Conversion Project
- b. Develop consensus on common standards for data elements and protocols
- c. Complete Lane County Area Communications Plan to include elements for disaster, back-up, cooperative radio system development and interoperability
- d. Evaluate Circuit Court warrant processes
- e. Review current report writing and routing processes
- f. Improve support for communications disaster planning, coordination, training and exercises

Mr. Weathers briefly described issues related to legislation adopted in 2001 affecting Public Safety Answering Points (PSAP) considered by the Police Services Committee.

Mr. Rockstroh said he believed the most important Homeland Security concern for emergency planning was the lack interoperability of police services radio communications. Mr. Jerry Smith added that it was possible for all area agencies except the Oregon State Police (OSP) to communicate using analogue systems, but that it involved re-programming of involved computers. He said the OSP operated on a completely different system and did not have adequate resources to develop compatibility.

Mr. Buchanan said federal Homeland Security resources might be available to address emergency communications interoperability issues. He said current communications problems could create chaos if there were a multiple-jurisdictional emergency.

Ms. Reeves described technology currently available which would overcome interoperability issues.

Mr. Brett Freeman reported that radio manufacturers were moving toward development of equipment which would solve interoperability issues without resorting to the short term and expensive technology referred to by Ms. Reeves.

Ms. Morrison said Homeland Security resources being sought by Lane County were intended for the AIRS Conversion Project, not emergency communications.

Mr. Rockstroh said there were additional Homeland Security resources for cities that had not yet been allocated and that they were directed to public health and public works emergency planning issues. He said the City of Portland was participating in a pilot project using such an allocation.

Mr. Carlson reported that the City of Eugene had received a Homeland Security allocation for airport security measures.

***Mr. Green moved, seconded by Ms. Pierce, to accept the report and forward its recommendation to the Policy Committee. The motion was adopted unanimously, 20:0.***

Mr. Green said he believed it would be important for the PSCC to be kept informed of progress made in developing closer coordination in call-taking, dispatch, and records management.

Mr. Burger left the meeting at 4:15

## **6. Juvenile Crime Prevention Plan Funding Reductions**

Mr. Green referred to an Issue Brief referring to reductions in the Juvenile Crime Prevention Plan 2001-03 budget distributed with the agenda of the meeting. He explained that the reductions were required by lowered allocations to counties from the State Budget. He reviewed budget reductions recommended by the Prevention & Juvenile Justice Committee and its High Risk Planning Subcommittee contained in the Issue Brief. He said the reductions should result in the elimination of no services or reductions in outcomes.

***Mr. Hatfield moved, seconded by Ms. Pierce that the amended Juvenile Crime Prevention Plan be recommended for adoption to the Board of County Commissioners. The motion was adopted unanimously, 20:0.***

## **7. Police Services Committee Crime Laboratory Endorsement Letter**

Mr. Buchanan referred to a draft letter from the Police Services Committee to the Eugene Budget Committee regarding the need for continuation of the Eugene Forensic Evidence Unit – Crime Laboratory. He reviewed the purpose and content of the letter and said it was a “preemptive strike” to avoid possible de-funding of the Laboratory.

***Mr. Clements moved, seconded by Mr. Jerry Smith, that the PSCC endorse the proposed letter to the Eugene Budget Committee regarding continued funding of the Eugene Police Crime Laboratory. The motion was adopted unanimously, 20:0.***

## **8. Research and Evaluation Committee Report**

Ms. Morrison made a report on the activities of the Research and Evaluation Committee. She reviewed the charge to the committee, as follows:

- To research and evaluation the cost effectiveness of programs and practices that are relevant to the community safety system.
- Review information and research that could improve community safety operations and system performance.
- Make recommendations to the PSCC regarding program evaluations or literature reviews that enhance system effectiveness.
- Monitor the preparation of reports on community safety trends relevant to operations and system performance.
- Review proposed evaluation designs to ensure coordination with other agencies occurs.
- Examine the implementation and progress of current local evaluations to provide feedback and assess sustainability of programs.

Ms. Morrison reviewed how the Committee was involved in coordination of community surveys. She said consistency, uniform standards, sharing of results, and elimination of duplication were encouraged. She said national and local surveys were reviewed to examine community safety trends.

Ms. Morrison reviewed the Committee's Community Safety Benchmark Project. She distributed copies of a draft document which she said was a brochure to be used in public presentations regarding it. She said its goal was to focus policy makers and community members on outcomes and accomplishments that support the charge and goal of the PSCC. She described development of the project. She identified Benchmark Goals, as follows:

1. Reduce Crime in Lane County
2. Hold People Accountable for Criminal Offenses
3. Reduce Offender Risk of Committing a New Crime
4. Increase the Correlation Between the Perception of Safety and the Crime Rate

Ms. Morrison reviewed the work of the Committee in examining evaluations for Community Correction funded programs. She said recent reviews included the Intensive Treatment Program, Drug Court Enhancement Project, Safe Schools/Health Student Evaluation, School-based Partnership Grant, and Lane County Risk Assessments.

Ms. Morrison reviewed work of the Committee in monitoring grant applications, program and system operations.

Ms. Pierce said the Community Corrections Committee was also involved in evaluation of programs. She suggested that increased coordination of the processes be developed. She also suggested that the process for evaluating grant applications be expanded to include those made by the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG).

Ms. Wall Downing said Lane County Administration and LCOG staff had developed a mutually agreeable process for pre-approval of grant applications. She said LCOG was staff to the PSCC and would not submit a public safety related grant application without approval.

Mr. Nelson said that care should be taken about development of an overly cumbersome grant application process because the timeliness of applications was often critical.

Ms. Morrison said she believed the most important issue to be addressed in applying for grants what how the proposed program would be funded when grant support ended.

Ms. Pierce suggested that data regarding public safety trends be included in the brochure describing the Community Safety Benchmark project.

Mr. Kent suggested that the brochure include reference to other PSCC Committees.

Ms. Rooke-Ley suggested that the tense of the verbs in the PSCC Guiding Principles included in the brochure be changed from future to present.

Mr. Lewis requested a list of organizations conducting community surveys as reported by Ms. Morrison.

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

(Recorded by Dan Lindstrom)

LCOG: C:\DOCUMENTS AND SETTINGS\CLAS086\LOCAL SETTINGS\TEMPORARY INTERNET FILES\OLK59\MINS\_20020509.DOC

Last Saved: May 17, 2002