

MINUTES

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

November 4, 2002 - Noon

PRESENT: Anna Morrison, Chair; Thad Buchanan, Jan Clements, Doug Harclerod, Denis Hijmans, Jamon Kent, Ken Larsen, Kip Leonard, Nancy Nathanson, Gretchen Pierce, Ken Tollenaar, Jim Torrey, members; Jim Carlson, Bill Van Vactor, advisory members; Byron Vanderpool, staff.

ABSENT: Bobby Green, Lyle Hatfield, Mike Kelly, Sid Leiken, Jerry Smith,

GUESTS: John Clague, Bob Clayton, Myra Wall Downing, David Factor, Jan Gund, Sue LaMarche, Susan Sowards.

1. Call to Order/Introductions

Ms. Morrison called the meeting of the Public Safety Coordinating Council (PSCC) Policy Committee to order at 12:10 p.m. She invited those who were present to introduce themselves.

2. Approval of Minutes

Mr. Tollenaar requested that Sentence 3 of Paragraph 2 on Page 4 of the minutes of the September 30, 2002, meeting be changed, as follows:

In response to a question from Ms. Morrison, he suggested that “Integration of Adult Criminal Justice Services” was a project he did not consider significant.

Ms. Morrison determined there was no objection to the request and stated that the minutes were amended.

Mr. Van Vactor moved, seconded by Mr. Tollenaar, to accept the minutes of the September 30, 2002, meeting. The motion was adopted unanimously, 12:0.

3. Supervisory Authority Team Proposal

Ms. Pierce referred to a document entitled “Supervisory Authority in Lane County” distributed with the agenda of the meeting. She reviewed background and statutory information it contained. She noted that it contained a recommendation from the Community Corrections Committee, as follows:

... 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 Authorities.

Ms. Pierce said the Committee had acted on a recommendation of a subcommittee which had deliberated extensively and recommended that the members of the SAT be the Sheriff's Office Corrections Division Commander, the Parole and Probation Manager, and the Presiding Judge, or his/her designated judge.

Ms. Pierce noted that the recommendation identified roles and responsibilities of the SAT, as follows:

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

Ms. Pierce explained that the recommendation was for a conceptual, not structural change in the currently designated Supervisory Authorities in Lane County, since no reporting or authority modifications were involved. She said formation of the SAT would require the approval of the Board of County Commissioners.

Mr. Torrey moved, seconded by Ms. Nathanson, (1) to approve the recommendations of the Community Corrections Committee regarding formation of a Supervisory Authority Team, and (2) to recommend that the Public Safety Coordinating Council recommend that the Board of County Commissioners approve and implement the recommendations.

Ms. Nathanson said she strongly supported formation of a SAT. She asked if there was a reason that a representative of municipal police or judiciary were not included in its membership. Ms. Pierce replied that doing so was one of many membership configurations the subcommittee had considered in creating the recommendation, but that it had concluded that it would be most effective if it only involved those who currently had supervising authority and ability.

Mr. Clague explained that offenders remanded to custody from municipal courts were misdemeanants who used beds contracted for by the cities. He said the SAT would deal with management of the larger number of more serious offenders who occupied the rest of the beds in the jail. He said the work of the SAT would relate to offenders who had been convicted, but that a study was currently underway to determine possible savings at other "decision points" in the corrections system.

Mr. Hijmans asked if there would be cost involved with operation of the SAT. Ms. Piece replied that members of the team would participate as a function of their regular duties.

Mr. Kent asked to whom SAT would make recommendations. Mr. Clague replied that recommendations would be made to whoever had authority to make needed decisions – the Board of County Commissioners, District Attorney, Court, Sheriff’s Office, or elected officials.

Mr. Tollenaar said Oregon Revised Statutes appeared to anticipate that counties would have a single Supervisory Authority. He suggested that formation of the SAT would be an opportunity to examine establishing one in Lane County.

Ms. Pierce said the recommendation of the Community Corrections Committee did not include the suggestion of Mr. Tollenaar because it had been thoroughly considered previously and been rejected.

Mr. Tollenaar suggested that the implementation of the SAT might make it be more possible to give the possibility serious consideration.

Mr. Clements said he was a firm believer that “form should follow substance.” He said budget restraints encouraged a single Supervisory Authority, but that there did not appear to be the “political will” to bring it about. He said the SAT was a good first step.

Mr. Tollenaar asked if there would be value in including the County Administrator and/or Director of the Health and Human Services Department as members of the SAT. He said they would bring expertise on the fiscal and service impacts of decisions made.

Ms. Pierce said it was agreed to recommend that only those able to make system changes be part of the SAT because of the many others who could legitimately be included. She said it was an attempt to bring those with day-to-day authority together to make necessary decisions.

Mr. Clements said he believed the interests of County Administration and Health and Human Services would be represented in the members proposed to participate.

Mr. Harclerod said he was supportive of the recommendations. He said the District Attorney had some relevant authority regarding corrections, but that he did not feel it would be important for him to participate in the SAT.

The motion recommending formation of a Supervising Authority Team was adopted unanimously, 12:0.

Ms. Pierce referred to a document entitled “Recommendation for Community Corrections Plan Development and Approval.” She stated that the Community Corrections Committee was recommending that the SAT develop a proposed amendment to the current Community Corrections Plan to reflect anticipated budget reductions. She said the proposal would be submitted to the Committee for comment and recommendation and that it would then be reviewed, acted upon, and submitted to the Board of County Commissioners for approval by the PSCC.

Ms. Pierce said the amendment process might need to be reinitiated in January, if the Oregon Income Tax Surcharge Referral was not approved by voters. She said she believed the recommendation was an efficient way to proceed and could deflect difficulties previously encountered in the planning process.

Ms. Pierce said the process did not need approval of the Policy Committee, but that it was presented in the interest of full disclosure. She said if it worked well, it was likely that it would also be used in development of the Community Corrections Plan for the next biennium.

Mr. Harclerod said he supported any change which would improve processes used in the past.

Ms. Morrison said she believed the Community Corrections Committee had moved beyond its adversarial style of the past to do more cooperative work. Ms. Pierce added that the committee now had data-based evaluations on which to develop its plan.

Mr. Harclerod moved, seconded by Ms. Nathanson, to approve the recommendation of the Community Corrections Committee to have the Supervisory Authority Team prepare a proposed amendment to the current Community Corrections Plan. The motion was adopted unanimously, 12:0.

4. 2002-2003 PSCC Work Plan

Ms. Wall Downing referred to a document entitled "PSCC FTE Work Plan FY 2002-2003" distributed with the agenda of the meeting. She said the Work Plan had been approved in the spring and that current discussion was to prioritize its projects to enable funding reduction decisions.

Ms. Wall Downing said she believed evaluation of programs was more possible than it had ever been before because of the accessibility of information previously unavailable. She noted that the final page of the Work Plan document entitled "Community Safety Staff Budget" included allocation of staff supported by grants, but not of Indirect Payments required.

Ms. Wall Downing invited members to discuss information it contained.

Ms. Morrison reminded members that the document being considered had been prepared in response to Policy Committee requests for additional information. She said she believed some, but not all of her questions were answered, such as why staffing was assigned to the Community Corrections Evaluation project.

Ms. Wall Downing explained that staffing assignments were estimates of how much support each activity would require. She said that with baseline data available, evaluation efforts would be greatly streamlined. She said she would provide additional information regarding the staffing for the project at the November meeting of the Community Corrections Committee.

Ms. Pierce said she believed it would be a mistake to not continue collection of program data for evaluation processes already begun.

Ms. Morrison asked if staff support for the SAT had been considered. Mr. Clague replied that staff support had not been anticipated and that he would prefer to not incur any administrative expense.

Ms. Pierce said she believed staff had much useful information and data that would support the work of the SAT and that its value should not be under estimated.

Mr. Carlson noted that the Work Plan was for 2002-2003 and that it was nearly half gone. He asked if the SAT concept had been developed with the support of staff, and if that wasn't the budgeted amount shown in the Workplan. Ms. Pierce replied that it was.

Members engaged in an extended discussion of the value of evaluation.

Mr. Torrey said he believed it would be helpful to base evaluation of programs on effectiveness ratings developed elsewhere, such as in Washington State. He using such research would avoid re-conducting evaluation processes. Ms. Wall Downing replied that doing so is a more frequent practice, but that the issue of staff support related to overseeing expenditures of funded programs.

#6 Data Warehouse

Ms. Wall Downing said continuing work on the Data Warehouse was important. She said it had been a long time in development and was nearing completion. She explained that staff allocation to the project was for ongoing maintenance of the program.

#7 Decision Point Population Analysis

#8 Criminal Justice System Data Modeling Grant

Ms. Wall Downing explained that the Decision Point Population Analysis project and Criminal Justice System Data Modeling grant were tied together in the funding, implementation, and staffing.

#9 Sex Offender Technical Assistance Planning Project

Ms. Wall Downing explained that the Sex Offender Planning Project was staff matching time.

#10 Benchmarks Project

Mr. Hijmans said what he hoped to accomplish in the Benchmarks Project was not reflected in its description in material distributed earlier. He explained that he wanted to have the benchmarks that "engaged" the economy, schools and the criminal justice system. He said they should tell what the PSCC is going to do and what it should do.

Ms. Pierce said actually setting benchmarks was the most essential element in the project.

Mr. Tollenaar said the Benchmarks Project was a "work in progress." He suggested that the strategy for developing them.

Ms. Morrison said that not enough time remained to complete the discussion of the Work Plan and suggested that it be continued at the next meeting.

Ms. Nathanson said she believed it was important for staff to be available as support for PSCC. She said she depended on their neutral assessment and advise in preparation for her decisions as a member. She said staff support keep information available, on track, and balanced. She said she was concerned that without their support a more fragmented approach to criminal justice would develop.

Mr. Kent suggested that a different format for presentation of staffing of the PSCC Work Plan was needed. He said the presentation should not be a justification for work done, but truly built on its goals, timeline, and available resources. He said he would be happy to offer such a format.

Mr. Clements said it would be important to prepare for conflicting agency work plans as fiscal realities come into play in the near future. He said he hoped that when the PSCC Work Plan was approved, it would not be inviolate.

Ms. Morrison said she did not believe many members had an understanding of the Work Plan and that it needed to be reduced to a simple description.

Ms. Morrison said a recommendation for a vice chairperson able to assume the duties of chair in January was needed. She said she would appoint members to a Nominating Committee.

Mr. Van Vactor said he would like to consider a Work Plan format change and would be willing to cooperate with Mr. Kent in its preparation.

Ms. Morrison said it was likely that the December PSCC meeting would be postponed.

Ms. Morrison stated that a study of the Senate Bill 1145 County Reimbursement Formula prepared by the Association of Oregon Counties' was available and that she would have it distributed to members.

Ms. Morrison said the agenda of the December 4 Policy Committee meeting would include further discussion of the Work Plan and of the Research Capability and Protocols for Data Systems.

Ms. Pierce said she hoped it would be possible for there to be consideration of new PSCC goals before the New Year. Ms. Morrison said she questioned whether certain assumptions about statutorily imposed responsibilities were accurate.

The meeting adjourned at 1:35 p.m.

(Recorded by Dan Lindstrom)

*LCOG: C:\DOCUMENTS AND SETTINGS\CLAS086\LOCAL SETTINGS\TEMPORARY INTERNET FILES\OLKF8\MINS_20021104.DOC
Last Saved: November 18, 2002*