

MINUTES

Public Safety Coordinating Council
Community Corrections Committee
Hult Plaza Conference Room
401 East 10th Avenue – Suite 500 - Eugene

October 15, 2002 – 3:00 P.M.

PRESENT: Gretchen Pierce, Chair; Ron Chase, John Clague, Jan Gund, David Factor, David Garnick, Tricia Hedin, Grant Nelson, Rob Rockstroh, and Ilisa Rooke-Ley, members; Myra Wall Downing, staff.

ABSENT: Mary Ann Bearden and Jan Clements, members.

GUESTS: Diana Avery, Bob Den Ouden, Linda Eaton, Carole Knapel, Liz Rambo, Richard Sherman, Susan Sowards, Mark Stevens, and Byron Vanderpool.

1. Call to Order/Introductions

Ms. Pierce called the meeting of the Public Safety Coordinating Council (PSCC) Community Corrections Committee to order at 3:05 p.m. She invited those who were present to introduce themselves.

2. Approval of Minutes

Ms. Avery requested that paragraph 3 on page 2 of the minutes of the September 17 meeting be changed to clarify her response, as follows:

Ms. Rooke-Ley asked if assistance for participant costs in the programs was available. Ms. Avery replied that ~~one local program used a~~ **some interest had been shown in a** “community services” approach ~~which are~~ **which are** provided participants with opportunities to pay for the program with assigned work.

Ms. Pierce determined there were no objections to the request and stated that the minutes were amended.

Ms. Pierce determined that there was consensus to accept the minutes of the September 17, 2002, meeting, as amended.

3. Comments from the Audience

None.

4. Probation and Parole Evaluation

Mr. Nelson said he had been asked to identify potential measurements of the success of Parole and Probation. He suggested that any evaluation should begin with the relevant State of Oregon Benchmarks established during the administration of Governor Barbara Roberts – recidivism of those on probation, recidivism of those on parole, positive case closures, and absconds. He said absconds should be measured by offender risk level.

Mr. Nelson said management information regarding Parole and Probation should also be considered – the number of home visits made by officers, employment levels of persons supervised, and other factors available from the statewide data system operated by the Department of Corrections. He described weaknesses in data entry practices in the system. He said officers often prioritized work tasks because of heavy case loads brought on by personnel reductions and position vacancies and that data entry often was given low precedence. He said evaluation should include how officers used their time on high and low risk supervisees.

Ms. Pierce asked if there was a commonly used criterion for assessing the risk level of a Parole and Probation supervisee. Mr. Nelson replied that a uniform assessment was completed on entry to the criminal justice system and that relevant factors influenced its change at six month reevaluations. He explained that Parole and Probation contacts with a supervisee were based on the risk factors. He said risk factor information was included in the data system, along with recommendations for sanctions, and could be used in program evaluation.

Members discussed parole/probation revocations/sanctions.

Ms. Rooke-Ley said it was her experience that there was confusion about what was best for supervisees among Parole and Probation Officers. Mr. Nelson explained that changing paradigms was difficult for officers with decades of experience.

Mr. Nelson said quarterly reports of Parole and Probation Officer activities could also be used as an evaluation tool. Ms. Pierce said activity level was not a true evaluation indicator.

Mr. Nelson said caution was in order when using recidivism to measure the success of Parole and Probation because supervisees were also being influenced by other programs and societal pressures.

Members engaged in a discussion regarding the purpose of Parole and Probation and of the best ways to evaluate its success.

5. Supervisory Authority Team Proposal

Ms. Pierce distributed copies of a recommendation she said had been developed by a small committee formed to investigate the appropriateness of forming a single supervisory authority as directed by the Intergovernmental Agreement for Criminal Justice between the cities of Eugene and Springfield and Lane County. She reviewed the recommendation, as follows:

It is recommended that the Board of County Commissioners appoint a Supervisory Authority Team (SAT) including representation from Parole and Probation and the Sheriff's Office, the current supervisory authorities. The SAT will review and modify policies and procedures affecting the activities of the Supervisory Authority(ies).

Ms. Pierce noted that the recommendation proposed that the members of the SAT be the Sheriff's Office Corrections Division Commander, Parole and Probation Manager, and the Presiding Judge or his/her designated judge. She reviewed the roles and responsibilities of the SAT described in the recommendation, as follows:

- Jointly manage the corrections population by developing and using compatible policies and procedures.
- Review and approve changes in policies or procedures associated with duties assigned to the supervisory authority under Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS).
- Ensure the efficient and appropriate flow of offenders through the system.
- Monitor existing policies and procedures for managing the offender population and, if appropriate, implement new ones based on best or innovative practices.
- Provide regular reports to the Board of County Commissioners and the Public Safety Coordinating Council describing the management of the offender population.

Ms. Pierce distributed copies of a document entitled "Supervisory Authority in Lane County," which she said contained background, definitions and ORS provisions regarding supervisory authority.

Ms. Hedin asked how the recommendation differed from current practices. Mr. Nelson replied that the recommendation put development and approval of policies and practices together, without changing the operational authority of either current supervisory authority. Mr. Clague added that the proposal institutionalized an intention to develop a coordinated response authority.

Ms. Pierce said the Intergovernmental Agreement had included consideration of the issue to encourage more effective handling of the offender population.

Ms. Hedin said she believed it was important to ensure the involvement of the judiciary. Mr. Clague said creation of the SAT would benefit sentencing judges.

Ms. Hedin asked if SAT meetings would be open to the public. Mr. Factor said he did not believe SAT meetings should require posting, minutes, or other elements of the Oregon Public Meeting Law. Mr. Clague said members would bring in resources of the community to assist in its work. Ms. Pierce said it was not intended that the activities of the SAT be hidden from public view.

Mr. Chase suggested that formal re-consideration of the SAT should be scheduled for a specific time in the future.

Mr. Rockstroh said he considered the proposed SAT a work group, not an public advisory group. He said he agreed that participation of the judiciary was essential. Ms. Pierce added that assurance of the participation of judges would need to be received before the recommendation was moved to the PSCC Policy Group.

Members discussed previous experiences of being unable to organize a single Supervisory Authority in Lane County.

Ms. Hedin said she supported setting a time for formal evaluation of the proposed SAT.

Ms. Gund observed that participation in the SAT would involve a significant time commitment.

Mr. Clague said he believed the SAT proposal was the best that could be accomplished at the present time. He said anticipated budget cuts will require quick decisions regarding corrections.

Mr. Factor said the recommendation was an important step that needed to be taken. He said the SAT would develop operational policies for most of the offender population in Lane County. He said the PSCC, Board of County Commissioners, and Community Corrections Committee would continue to have responsibility for oversight of the corrections system, but that he believed the proposal was the most positive step that could be taken for its improvement.

Mr. Factor moved, seconded by Mr. Chase, that it be recommended to the Policy Committee and Public Safety Coordinating Council to submit the recommendation regarding the formation of a Supervisory Authority Team (SAT) to the Board of County Commissioners. The motion was adopted, 10:0.

6. Community Corrections Budget Planning

Ms. Pierce distributed copies of a document entitled "Recommendation for Community Corrections Plan Development and Approval." She said it described a process in which the SAT would prepare the first draft of a Community Corrections Plan Revision to accommodate a budget reduction of \$640,000 that would be required in Lane County if the Oregon Income Tax Surcharge Ballot Referral was defeated by voters in January 2003. She noted that the draft would be reviewed and approved by the Committee before it was forwarded to the PSCC for final review and recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners.

Ms. Pierce said the recommendation provided for timely consideration of cuts that would be required and allow public and private agencies to better plan for service reductions that would result.

Ms. Rooke-Ley said she was concerned that the proposal was being made before the SAT was fully approved and formed. She said she needed assurance that if formation of the SAT was not successful, budget development would continue to be the responsibility of the Community Corrections Committee.

Mr. Rockstroh said he appreciated the proposed budget approval process. He said it was important to emphasize that the SAT would be developing only a draft, which would be reviewed and approved by the Committee, PSCC, and Board of County Commissioners. He said he was concerned that private service providers would not be involved in preparation of the first draft of budget reductions.

Ms. Pierce said she was convinced that the Committee would need to be especially vigilant as the initial screener of a proposal submitted by the SAT.

Ms. Hedin said she felt the proposed plan was a “set up” because it was more difficult to change a proposal after it was made than to affect it during its development. She said she was concerned that the proposals to form the SAT and to have it prepare budget reduction strategies were not presented to members in advance of the meeting. She said the second proposal appeared to be an attempt to bypass the Committee in developing the Community Corrections Plan.

Mr. Nelson said he appreciated the concern of Ms. Hedin, but that he found the recent plan development efforts of the Community Corrections Committee to be “shocking.” He said the most recent plan was not developed until after distribution of available resources was decided upon - the opposite way it should have been.

Ms. Hedin said she was more comfortable with initiation of a budget reduction process in the Community Corrections Committee. She said she was concerned that the proposal was for the two largest recipients of Community Corrections resources were to be the only agencies involved in development of the first draft of a budget reduction proposal.

Ms. Pierce suggested that the proposed process might provide respectability for recommendations developed by the Community Corrections Committee, which had not happened in the past.

Mr. Nelson said any recommendation by the SAT would be based on the current Corrections Plan and on a program’s self described ability to operate with reduced resources.

Ms. Gund said she believed that the proposal was a “step forward.” She said the Committee could change any recommendations made by the SAT and that funded programs would be given more warning of potential reductions that might happen with the defeat of the Income Tax Surcharge Referral.

Mr. Rockstroh said he did not believe it was fair to include a judge in budget development processes because they had little experience in such decision making.

Mr. Chase said he supported the proposal because there was not enough time to follow the process used in developing previous Community Correction Plans. He said the PSCC Policy Committee was not knowledgeable about Community Corrections needs and that the circumstances called for quick action.

Mr. Factor said he appreciated the concerns that had been raised about the proposed process, but that he still favored having the SAT initiate the plan reduction process.

Mr. Clague said any recommendation to reduce the Community Corrections budget by \$640,000 could not be developed in secret.

Mr. Garnick moved, seconded by Ms. Gund, to approve the recommendation to have the SAT prepare draft revisions to the Community Corrections Plan to accommodate potential resource reductions brought on by failure of the Oregon Income Tax Surcharge Referral in January 2003.

Ms. Pierce said that experience gained in following the recommendation would be influential in deciding whether the process should be followed in development of future Community Correction Plans. She said a decision about whether to do so would be made at a later time.

Mr. Garnick said it would be important for the SAT to develop a proposal which would mesh with other significant reductions to be faced by Lane County.

Ms. Pierce said she believed the recommendation was the only practical way to approach a significant problem.

The motion was adopted, 8:2, with Ms. Hedin and Ms. Rooke-Ley voting opposed.

Ms. Rooke-Ley requested that her vote on the motion to recommend formation of the SAT be changed from “yes” to “no.” Ms. Pierce said doing so did not seem possible, or necessary.

Ms. Hedin requested that an accounting of “Timber Funds” use by Lane County be provided to members of the Committee when it begins to consider recommendations regarding reductions in Community Correction allocations.

7. Other

Ms. Pierce invited members to discuss the format for the October 23 special meeting of the Committee with Ed Latessa.

Mr. Rockstroh suggested that Mr. Latessa be asked to begin the meeting with a short presentation on his principles of community corrections.

Ms. Pierce suggested that Mr. Latessa be given one hour to present his “most important points.” She said he would be holding meetings later in the day with Circuit Court judges, representatives of custody services, and the general public, including members of the PSCC.

Ms. Wall Downing suggested that the meeting with members of the committee be more “programmatically” oriented than others.

Ms. Gund suggested that Mr. Latessa be given an opportunity to provide a framework context for his work.

Ms. Pierce expressed appreciation to Ms. Wall Downing for her support in the work of the Committee and wished her well at her new position as Visiting Fellow for the National Institute of Justice in Washington D.C.

The meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Recorded by: C Daniel Lindstrom

LCOG: C:\DOCUMENTS AND SETTINGS\CLAS086\LOCAL SETTINGS\TEMPORARY INTERNET FILES\OLKF8\MINS_20021015.DOC

Last Saved: October 17, 2002