

MINUTES

Public Safety Coordinating Council
Policy Committee
Lane Council of Governments – 4th Floor Large Conference Room
99 E. Broadway, Suite 400 – Eugene

February 3, 2003 - Noon

PRESENT: Jim Torrey, Chair; Thad Buchanan, Jan Clements, Bobby Green, Doug Harclerod, Denis Hijmans, Mike Kelly, Kip Leonard, Anna Morrison, Nancy Nathanson, Gretchen Pierce, Jerry Smith, Warren Weathers, members; Jim Carlson, Bill Van Vactor, advisory members; Jamon Kent, staff.

ABSENT: Stu Burge, Ken Larsen, Sid Leiken, Ken Tollenaar,

GUESTS: Bill Bishoff, John Clague, David Factor, Jan Gund, Tanya Heaton, Galen Howard, Carole Knapel, Julie Losco, Grant Nelson, Rob Rockstroh, Lisa Smith, Susan Sowards, Mark Stevens, Byron Vanderpool, Linda Wagner,

1. Call to Order/Introductions

Mr. Torrey called the meeting of the Public Safety Coordinating Council (PSCC) Policy Committee to order at 12:05 p.m.

Mr. Torrey invited members to join in a moment of silence in memory of Committee Chair Lyle Hatfield. He announced that a memorial service would be held in his honor on February 4.

Mr. Torrey invited those who were present to introduce themselves.

2. Member Concerns

Ms. Nathanson said she had been alarmed by the cancellation of the Lane County Citizen Emergency Network Service (CENS) by the Board of County Commissioners. She said the reverse-911 disaster and incident reporting system had been the first in the nation. She said it was reported to US House of Representative Member Peter DeFazio and that he was seeking to have Homeland Security resources made available for its funding.

Mr. Van Vactor stated that CENS had never been included in the Lane County Budget, but had been developed through a combination of grant funding and contributions from local corporations. He said when funding of it was considered by the Board of County Commissioners, the policy of not providing budget resources for projects started by grants was put forward.

Mr. Carlson said it was his understanding that the project had been started as a three-year pilot funded by public and private funds which expired in December. He said Lane County, Springfield, and Eugene had been approached to provide resources for its continuation.

Mr. Torrey reported that he had been informed by a representative of the company that developed and supplied the CENS service at a recent meeting of the US Conference of Mayors. He said the representative had expressed an interest in helping continue the project, perhaps with an infusion of financial resources.

Mr. Hijmans said he was concerned that it was being proposed to eliminate staff support for PSCC committees. Mr. Kent explained that the proposal was to reduce the number of committee meetings. He said the topic was scheduled to be discussed at length later in the agenda.

3. Approval of Minutes

Mr. Weathers moved, seconded by Ms. Pierce, to accept minutes of the January 7, 2003, Policy Committee meeting. The motion was adopted unanimously, 11:0, Mr. Buchanan and Mr. Smith being non-voting members.

4. Community Corrections Act Evaluation Report

Mr. Kent referred to Agenda Item support material entitled “Community Corrections Programs in Lane County – Evaluation Report 2001-02” and a document entitled “Community Corrections Act Programs in Lane County – Evaluation Report 2001-2002” distributed with the agenda of the meeting. He reviewed background and development of the report. He said it was presented to the Policy Committee for information only.

Ms. Pierce stated that the effort to evaluate Community Correction Act funded programs had begun two years previously with an unsatisfactory review process. She said the Community Corrections Committee (CCC) had instituted a system of quarterly reports and customized the evaluation standards for each program. She said the current report provided no “profound conclusions,” but would serve as a base for future evaluations.

Ms. Pierce explained additional information for evaluation of programs was being determined and comparison to national data being made. She said it had been agreed that it was impossible to compare one funded program with another in the evaluation. She said it also had been agreed that some type of evaluation of CCA funded programs should continue.

Mr. Van Vactor asked what was the cost of maintaining the data used in the evaluation. Mr. Kent replied that the cost was included in the budget for staff in the Community Corrections Plan project in the 2003-2005 PSCC Work Plan to be considered later in the agenda. He explained that development of the evaluation also required continuation of the Data Warehouse project in the Work Plan.

Ms. Morrison said she would like to set aside time at a later meeting to discuss items in individual program evaluations included in the report, specifically as the CCA Budget for the coming biennium was being prepared.

5. 2002-2003 PSCC Work Plan

Mr. Kent referred to Agenda Item support material entitled “Resolution #030203-03: 2002-03 PSCC Work Plan” distributed with the agenda of the meeting. He explained the format and reviewed information contained in a document attached to the Resolution entitled “PSCC 02-03 Work Plan Status Report as of January 28, 2003” and a spreadsheet also attached entitled “PSCC Work Plan FY 2002-2003 – January 28, 2003.”

Ms. Morrison moved, seconded by Ms. Pierce, to adopt Resolution #030203-03, approval of recommended PSCC Work Plan for fiscal year 2002-2003.

Mr. Carlson asked what effects proposed CCA Budget Reductions would have on the Work Plan. Mr. Kent replied that the reductions would not directly affect the Work Plan, which was based on a contract for services between Lane Council of Governments (LCOG), Lane County, Eugene, and Springfield. He said the proposed reductions would affect the Intergovernmental Agreement between the jurisdictions and would need to be re-negotiated.

Ms. Morrison said she was concerned about continuing study of the Failure to Appear issue in the Work Plan. She said such a study had already been completed by the Community Corrections Committee. Mr. Kent replied that continuing the study was proposed as a high priority of the Police Services Committee.

Mr. Weathers said representatives of law enforcement agencies on the Police Services Committee did not believe the conclusion of the previously concluded study provided a full understanding of the issue. He said members suggested that different questions needed to be asked and more data that are complete needed to be included.

Ms. Pierce said she was concerned that the request for continued study of the Failure to Appear issue implied that the data used was being questioned. She said the same data would be used in any additional study, but that it would be analyzed in different ways.

Mr. Buchanan said he believed the Police Services Committee wanted to look at a different and more complete application of the available data in the study.

Ms. Morrison expressed concern that the Work Plan included completion of the Juvenile Crime Plan and Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant Plan. She said both plans had already been approved by the Board of County Commissioners and submitted to the State of Oregon. PSCC staff Susan Sowards explained that the uncompleted status of the project in the Work Plan reflected the work that needed to be completed in the fiscal year on the plans for the next biennium.

Mr. Weathers said he had a number of concerns about the Work Plan, as follows:

- The Police Co-Deployment project was included when work on it had been suspended in the current year.
- The Single Public Safety Answering Point project was included even though it had already been dealt with and it had been decided to rely on influencing the State Legislature regarding repeal of the statutes involved.

- The Emergency Vehicle Operations Course project was included even though it had not been given a high priority ranking by the Police Services Committee because it was felt that development of such a track was possible through a public/private partnership.

Mr. Weathers said Work Plan savings could be created by elimination of the projects.

Mr. Hijmans asked if anything had been cut from the Work Plan. Mr. Kent replied that the proposal reflected a rearrangement of projects, but none had been eliminated.

Mr. Hijmans said he would vote against adopting the Work Plan, because he did not believe there was an effort to reduce its budget.

Mr. Clements asked if approving the Work Plan would authorize the budget. Mr. Kent replied that the budget would not be affected by the Work Plan since it was based on the contracts with LCOG. He said a shortage in resources to complete the Work Plan would trigger a re-negotiation of it.

Ms. Pierce said the proposed Work Plan was a statement what had been agreed to six month previously. She said the time to debate reduction scenarios was after it was adopted. She said not voting to approve the Work Plan was meaningless.

The motion to adopt Resolution #030203-03, approval of the 2002-2003 PSCC Work Plan, was adopted, 10:1, with Mr. Hijmans voting no.

6. Community Corrections Act Budget Reduction

Ms. Pierce referred to Agenda Item support material entitled “Resolution #030203-04 Community Corrections Act – Budget Reduction Report” distributed with the agenda of the meeting. She described development of the recommendation by the CCC to implement Lane County CCA funding reductions brought about by failure of voters to approve the temporary income tax increase included in Ballot Measure 28. She reviewed a document entitled “FY 2002/03 CCA Budget Reduction Recommendation” attached to the support material.

Mr. Kent said the Intergovernmental Agreement for Criminal Justice Services did not provide for negotiation of the contract for services with LCOG by a PSCC committee. He said the major issue involved was how the Policy Committee would carry out its work, not administration versus direct public safety services. He noted that LCOG had already accepted a \$38,000 reduction in support for its services and that additional reductions were anticipated to result from lower than anticipated State Revenue Forecasts.

Ms. Pierce said it was her understanding that any further changes in the contract providing for LCOG of PSCC work would need to come from negotiations between it and Lane County, Eugene, and Springfield.

Ms. Pierce moved to adopt Resolution #030203-04, but no member seconded the motion.

Mr. Carlson said he interpreted the proposed CCA Budget Reduction Recommendation to mean that support for LCOG work on CCA projects would be eliminated.

Ms. Pierce said the proposal also meant that required matching funds for grants would be eliminated. Mr. Kent said he agreed and that he believed doing so would put LCOG in default and require that funds received for the Sex Offender Management Technical Assistance Planning Project and the Data Warehouse projects would be required to be returned.

Ms. Pierce said she believed it would be possible to maintain the grant funding through re-negotiation of the contract for LCOG support for PSCC operations.

Ms. Morrison said re-negotiating the contract could salvage the grant support, but that reductions would have to be made in other projects. She said the proposed cuts suggested that the CCC would not be able to operate for the remainder of the fiscal year.

Ms. Nathanson said she was concerned that the proposed reductions might require grant funds to be returned and efforts to implement public safety “best practices” would be seriously impacted.

Mr. Van Vactor said it was difficult for him to understand how when State revenue was reduced it was not possible to reduce the services provided by that support.

Mr. Clements said it was wrong to assume that all planning and administration of grants would end if support for LCOG filling those functions ceased. He also said the proposed reductions would not mean the CCC would not meet, but that some other source for its support would need to be found.

Mr. Clague said the Budget Reduction recommendation initiated by the Supervisory Authority Team (SAT) had adopted as a guiding principle using CCA funding for direct services, versus administrative overhead. He noted that the PSCC budget was supported by more than CCA resources. He said he did not believe searching for public safety “best practices” was necessary, since they were already well known and being implemented locally.

Mr. Carlson said he did not believe it was an error to use CCA funds to provide matching funds for grants since the practice provided additional revenue. He said he agreed that Lane County could assume managing the development and coordination of the CCA plan since it was officially the responsibility of the Board of County Commissioners.

Ms. Pierce said if Lane County assumed management responsibilities for the CCA, it would require resources that appear to be not available.

Mr. Clague said the SAT that developed the initial recommendation regarding the CCA plan had no staff support and that the role of the PSCC would be only to formulate a recommendation about its adoption for the Board of County Commissioners.

Ms. Nathanson said she believed the SAT had encouraged valuable discussion by its proposed CCA Budget Reduction plan. She said she did not believe Lane County would be able to provide management of CCA programs since it was unable to support other concerns of common interest. In addition, she said, she appreciated management of PSCC affairs by a “neutral party” such as LCOG, rather than having it as a “subsidiary” of Lane County.

Mr. Clements said Senate Bill 1145 made counties responsible for PSCCs and management of CCA programs. He said there was no requirement for contracts for such matters and that he was unaware of practices in other counties.

Ms. Morrison said it was true that Lane County had financial difficulties, but that mandated services would always be provided. Mr. Van Vactor said that before enactment of Senate Bill 1145 management of CCA programs was entirely the responsibility of Lane County.

Ms. Pierce moved, seconded by Ms. Morrison, to adopt Resolution #030203-04, recommending that the PSCC recommend to the Board of County Commissioners that the proposed Community Corrections Act Budget reductions be approved; with the exception of those identified as “Administration – PSCC Operations and Evaluations” which would be implemented through negotiations of the Intergovernmental Agreement for Community Corrections Act funds.

Ms. Pierce suggested that any negotiated decision affecting “Operations and Evaluations” in the CCA Budget be returned to the Policy Committee for feedback before it was implemented. She said if the proposed reductions were put in place as proposed, there would be very significant negative consequences in the operation of the PSCC.

Mr. Van Vactor said the time available for implementation of CCA Budget cuts was extremely limited and that any delay could create operational difficulties for service providers.

Ms. Pierce said the significance of eliminating grant programs in place could not be overstated. She said the motion took any decision about them out of the control of the PSCC and Policy Committee. She said she believed implementing the CCA Budget reductions as proposed would end the PSCC, as it has been known.

Mr. Clements said he did not believe the proposed CCA Budget reductions would eliminate grant programs. He said that if administration costs were not reduced, reductions for other direct services provided by CCA funds would be required. He said he believed it was wrong to preserve support for the administration of the PSCC at the expense of direct services.

Mr. Clague said LCOG had already agreed to accept a \$38,000 reduction in CCA support for “Operations and Evaluations.” He suggested that that reduction be implemented without waiting for negotiations of the Intergovernmental Agreement for Criminal Justice Services, as stated in the motion.

Mr. Torrey determined that there was no objection to changing the motion to incorporate the suggestion of Mr. Clague to implement immediately a \$38,000 reduction to the “PSCC Operations and Evaluations” line of the CCA Budget and the motion was amended.

Mr. Green said he would like to discuss how the PSCC would be given staff support. Mr. Torrey said an opportunity to discuss the issue would be given later.

Mr. Carlson said he believed the motion was seeking to enable operation of CCA supported programs through the remainder of the fiscal year and if there would continue to be a PSCC.

The motion to approve Resolution #030203-04, recommending that the PSCC recommend to the Board of County Commissioners that the proposed Community Corrections Act Budget reductions be approved, with stipulations, as amended, was adopted unanimously, 11:0.

Mr. Leonard left the meeting at 1:15 p.m., Mr. Factor assuming the position of his proxy.

7. Juvenile Crime Prevention Plan Fund Reductions

Mr. Green distributed copies of Agenda Item support material entitled “Resolution #030203-05 Juvenile Crime Prevention Plan – Budget Reduction Report.” He described budget reductions in the plan required because of voter rejection of Ballot Measure 28 and anticipated because of December budget shortfall projections. He reviewed a Budget Balance Recommendation adopted by the Prevention and Juvenile Justice Committee included in the support material.

Mr. Green moved, seconded by Mr. Hijmans, to adopt Resolution #030203-05, recommending that the PSCC approve the Juvenile Crime Prevention Budget Balance Recommendation approved by the Prevention and Juvenile Justice Committee. The motion was adopted unanimously, 11:0.

8. 2003-2004 PSCC Work Plan

Mr. Kent referred to Agenda Item support material entitled “Resolution #030203-06 2003-04 PSCC Work Plan” distributed with the agenda of the meeting. He explained that the proposed plan had been compiled from prioritized lists of projects submitted by each standing committee. He reviewed details of four options for the plan attached to the support material. He said the plan needed Policy Committee approval and to be submitted to the PSCC for information. He said Lane County, Eugene, and Springfield would be informed of the plan to incorporate its implementation in their budgets.

Mr. Van Vactor expressed appreciation for the preparation of the Work Plan proposal. He said Lane County administrators had determined that budget recommendations would be prepared for the Board of County Commissioners that would enable them to “buy” services using a “Zero-Based Budget” planning process. He said the plan could lead to the possibility of some PSCC programs being unfunded. He said he would like to work through the proposed plan and prepare recommendations about it for the Policy Committee.

Ms. Morrison said Senate Bill 1145 included an option for counties to opt out of its various requirements and returning them to the State. She said she had learned that many counties were considering such action. Mr. Clements added that the Oregon Sheriffs’ Association was considering advocating the repeal of Senate Bill 1145.

Ms. Morrison said she liked the option included in the plan that reduced the number of PSCC and committee meetings. She said it would allow more resources to be used for direct services.

Ms. Nathanson said she believed it would be interesting to learn Lane County’s priorities. She said since PSCC was a cooperative body, it would be helpful if city managers/administrators

were given a similar opportunity to prepare recommendations. She said it would be important to continue the multi-jurisdictional nature of PSCC.

Mr. Hijmans recommended that an “extremely conservative” level of PSCC expenditures be adopted and that Lane County, Eugene, and Springfield submit lists of what should be included in its Work Plan.

Mr. Clements said he agreed that stakeholders should be involved in the development of a PSCC Work Plan, not just Lane County. He said many of the proposed work projects of the Police Services Committee could be eliminated and have not yet been fully discussed.

Mr. Carlson said he was concerned that if Lane County made an “internal decision” about the implementation of Senate Bill 1145, all multi-jurisdictional coordination of public safety would be endangered. He said the cities were providing the bulk of the funding used for PSCC programs. He said there needed to be a core amount of funding available to maintain PSCC functions. He suggested that cutting individual programs could eliminate all support staff.

Mr. Torrey said there appeared to be agreement to continue discussion of the 2003-04 PSCC Work Plan at the next meeting.

9. PSCC/Policy Committee Meeting Topics for 2003

Mr. Kent referred to a document entitled “PSCC Policy Committee/PSCC Meeting Topics for the Year January 1, 2003 – December 31, 2003” distributed with the agenda of the meeting. He noted that the schedules did not include monthly PSCC meetings.

10. Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant (JAIBG)/Juvenile Crime Prevention (JPC) Plan Quarterly Reports

Mr. Kent referred to JAIBG and JPC Quarterly Reports distributed with the agenda of the meeting. He said they were provided for review only and that no action was required.

11. World Wide Web Site

Mr. Kent reported that preparation of a Lane County PSCC World Wide Web (www) site was nearly complete. He said it was in a test phase, that feedback would be appreciated, and that a demonstration would be provided after the conclusion of the meeting.

Ms. Pierce said she was concerned that PSCC would gain a new public presence at the same time as it was about to disappear.

The meeting adjourned at 1:35 p.m.

(Recorded by Dan Lindstrom)

LCOG: \\CLSRV111\LGS\PSCC\POLICYCMTE\MINS_20030203.DOC

Last Saved: February 26, 2003

STAFF TO DO LIST

1. I continue to be confused about the status of Warren Weathers. He is not on the PSCC, but is sometimes listed as an *ex officio* member. I don't know on whose authority and in what capacity he attends and participates in Policy Committee meetings. (He even makes motions.) Can you straighten me out?
2. ***“Resolution # . . .”***
Assigning numbers to group actions is a good idea. To call them “resolutions” and to have the minutes record that resolutions are adopted doesn't make sense, however, without there being a resolution (by definition: any declaration by a meeting). They can be as simple as suggested wording for a motion to accept a document to a pages-long formal “Whereas . . . therefore . . .” I don't think it is so important that you to make up resolutions for this meeting, but if something important is planned for the PSCC meeting next week, maybe it would be good to have them.
3. ***“Mr. Weathers said he had a number of concerns about the Work Plan . . .”***
As I recall, questions he raised accurately reflect how the Police Services Committee prioritized its activities. Maybe you should check it with Doug Smith for the amount of effort that should be put into Co-Deployment, PSAP, and EVOC.
4. ***“. . . shortage in resources to complete the Work Plan would trigger a re-negotiation of (the Intergovernmental Agreement for Criminal Justice Services).***
Just in case you forget, you'll have to get the ball rolling on “re-negotiating,” whatever that means.
5. ***“Ms. Pierce moved . . . to adopt Resolution #030203-04 . . . that the proposed Community Corrections Act Budget reductions be approved; with the exception . . .”***
The motion I wrote doesn't correspond exactly with what you were anticipating in the Issue Brief for the PSCC Meeting. You might check this out and re-write the motion, or get yourself ready for some questions about it at the meeting.

Which brings up another concern about Resolutions. You can't have the same numbering system for Policy Committee and PSCC actions. They might decide different things. Adding some letters to the designations of either, or both, would solve the problem.
6. ***“Mr. Van Vactor . . . said Lane County administrators had determined that budget recommendations would be prepared for the Board of County Commissioners that would enable them to “buy” services . . . could lead to the possibility of some PSCC programs being unfunded. He said he would like to work through the proposed plan and prepare recommendations about it for the Policy Committee.”***
How can you prepare for the City/County battles that will come from this kind of action?
7. Will you be responsible for officially informing contractors about the cuts in their CCA funds when they are approved by the BCC?
8. ***. . . Resolution #030203-05, recommending that the PSCC approve the Juvenile Crime Prevention Budget Balance Recommendation . . .***

Is it true that it doesn't have to also be approved by the BCC?

9. ***Ms. Morrison said she would like to set aside time at a later meeting to discuss items in individual program evaluations included in the report, specifically as the CCA Budget for the coming biennium was being prepared.***

(Recorded by Dan Lindstrom)

LCOG: \\CLSRV111\LGS\PSCC\POLICYCMTE\MINS_20030203.DOC

Last Saved: February 26, 2003