

MINUTES

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

November 19, 2002 – 3:00 P.M.

PRESENT: Gretchen Pierce, Chair; Ron Chase, John Clague, David Factor, David Garnick, Jan Gund, Bob Hickok (for Jan Clements), Grant Nelson, and Rob Rockstroh, members; Susan Sowards, staff.

ABSENT: Mary Ann Bearden, Tricia Hedin, Ilisa Rooke-Ley

GUESTS: Diana Avery, Jean Daugherty, Linda Eaton, Scott Miller, Bob Den Ouden, Scott Miller, Richard Sherman, Anette Spickard, Mark Stevens, Kent Mortimore.

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

Mr. Factor moved, seconded by Mr. Garnick, to accept the minutes of the October 15, 2002, meeting. The motion was adopted unanimously, 9:0.

3. Comments from the Audience

None.

4. Committee Work Plan

Ms. Pierce referred to a document entitled “PSCC – CCC Work Plan – FY 2002-2003” distributed with the agenda of the meeting. She said it was an updated version and included revisions made at previous meetings. She noted that the plan was a portion of the PSCC Work Plan which had not yet been approved. She invited members to discuss the plan.

Ms. Gund moved, seconded by Mr. Clague, to approve the 2002-2003 Community Corrections Committee Work Plan date September 17, 2002. The motion was adopted unanimously, 9:0.

5. Senate Bill 133 Early Disposition Cost/Benefit Analysis

Ms. Pierce referred to copies of a draft memorandum and attachments to Phil Lemman regarding Early Disposition Program information required by Senate Bill 133 distributed at the beginning

of the meeting. She said it was more complete than the copies distributed with the agenda.

Kent Mortimore, Lane County Assistant District Attorney, explained that early disposition programs were a proven means of reducing burdensome court, prosecution, and Indigent Expense Fund costs. He said the intention of the legislation required the reports to determine actual and potential savings. He said Lane County was a leader in Oregon in developing such programs.

Ms. Spickard reviewed information included in the report regarding the Deferred Adjudication Program, Deferral of Charges Program, and Offers at Arraignment Program. She said it did not contain cost estimates for savings of Parole and Probation services.

Mr. Mortimore said the costs identified in the report were not savings, but diversion of resources for the District Attorney's Office and police agencies to other more critical cases.

Mr. Clague said he disagreed because the programs increased the number of cases handled and reduced the cost per case closed expense.

Ms. Spickard explained that information gathered from each Oregon county would be collated and presented to the 2003 Legislative Session and Attorney General.

Ms. Pierce recommended that the report be put into its full context before it was presented to Legislators. She said a cover letter from the Lane County PSCC would be appropriate. Mr. Mortimore said he would prepare a draft of such a letter for consideration.

Ms. Pierce said she was disappointed that the report contained no information about the Lane County Drug Court. Mr. Factor said he believed relevant information was available from a previously conducted study by the Research Triangle Institute.

Ms. Spickard said she had been informed the Drug Court had increased, not decreased, the cost of case services.

Mr. Factor said the report required by Senate Bill 133 specified that Drug Court information should be included. He said he would provide it to Ms. Spickard if he could locate it.

Ms. Pierce requested that the report be revised to include information about the Lane County Drug Court, if available.

Ms. Sowards reported that the PSCC had authorized the Community Corrections Committee to submit the Senate Bill 133 report. She said formal approval was not required, just a record of it having been reviewed.

Members discussed continuing reports of reductions in state revenue.

6. Community Corrections Act Process Assessment

Mr. Stevens referred to a document entitled "Descriptive and Process Assessments of CCA-Funded Organizations in Lane County, Oregon and Community Corrections Programs – Research and Findings" distributed at a previous meeting of the committee. He made a

presentation on national research and cost benefit analysis information it contained. He discussed public perceptions of community corrections and how to change them. He reviewed general and specific findings about sanctions and recidivism in Lane County programs funded with Community Corrections Act (CCA) resources. He reviewed costs and benefits of sanctions and programs using tools developed for the Washington State Legislature.

Members discussed the presentation – the success of programs and their reduction of re-offence rates, the use of best practices, the need to focus on what needed to be accomplished, the need to change the definition of success to related to the CCA Plan adopted.

Ms. Gund moved, seconded by Mr. Hickok, to submit the report to the PSCC for approval and recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners. The motion was adopted unanimously, 9:0.

7. Community Corrections Act Evaluation

Mr. Den Ouden referred to a document entitled “Community Corrections Act Programs in Lane County – Evaluation Report: 2001-2002” distributed with the agenda of the meeting. He reviewed the programs examined, data collection procedures, and data analysis methodologies used. He discussed results of the evaluation – demographic characteristics, program outcome summaries, and recidivism measures for each program. He identified issues and analysis needed in future evaluations.

Members discussed the presentation and the need to look at the different types of risk assessments used by key programs in the adult criminal justice system in Lane County. Mr. Clague observed that he believed success in programs was currently based on program success. He said the group should consider a paradigm shift to look at reducing risk of the likelihood to reoffend as an indicator of success.

Ms. Pierce stated that part of the December committee meeting would be used to consider how to use the evaluations presented to the committee to better educate the full PSCC on key issues in Community Corrections.

8. Ed Latessa Presentations

Ms. Pierce referred to copies of documents entitled “Tracking the Progress of the Oregon Youth Authority and Recidivism” and “Promoting Public Safety Using Effective Interventions with Offenders” distributed with the agenda of the meeting. She encouraged members to study information they contained.

Ms. Pierce noted that the next meeting of the committee was scheduled on December 17.

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Recorded by: C Daniel Lindstrom

LCOG: C:\DOCUMENTS AND SETTINGS\CLAS086\LOCAL SETTINGS\TEMPORARY INTERNET FILES\OLKF8\MINS_20021119.DOC

Last Saved: December 1, 2002