



# **Public Safety Coordinating Council Executive Committee Meeting**

***Tuesday, February 2, 2010  
7:30 to 9:00 a.m.  
Multnomah Building - Room 315  
501 S.E. Hawthorne Blvd.***

## **Agenda**

<b>Introductions, Announcements &amp; Approval of the December 1, 2009 Meeting Minutes</b> <i>Chair Ted Wheeler</i>	5 minutes
<b>Discussion of Corrections Grand Jury Report</b> <i>Council Members</i>	60 minutes
<b>Crime Victims United Report and Response</b> <i>Dave Koch</i>	15 minutes
<b>Discussion of Juvenile Crime Prevention Plan Planning Process</b> <i>Dave Koch</i>	5 minutes
<b>Future Direction of RJ-Net (CJIS)</b> <i>Mike Schrunck</i>	5 minutes

**NEXT MEETING – TUESDAY, MARCH 2, 2010**



# LPSCC Executive Committee Meeting

## *Summary Minutes for February 2, 2010*

### **I. Introductions, Announcements, and Approval of Minutes**

#### **LPSCC Executive Committee**

##### **Members In Attendance**

Multnomah County Chair Ted Wheeler,  
LPSCC Co-Chair  
Lt. Jason Bledsoe, Oregon State Police  
Lane Borg, Director, Metropolitan Public  
Defenders  
Karl Brimmer, Director, County Mental  
Health Services  
Judge Julie Frantz, Chief Criminal Court  
Judge  
Joanne Fuller, Director, Department of  
County Human Services  
Judy Hadley, Citizen Representative  
Chief Ken Johnson, Fairview Police  
Chief Craig Junginger, Gresham Police  
Chief Phillip Klahn, Port of Portland  
Police  
Judge Jean Maurer, Presiding Circuit  
Court Judge  
Diane McKeel, Multnomah County  
Commissioner, District #4  
Rob Milesnick, Director, Citizen's Crime  
Commission  
Michael Schrunk, District Attorney  
Lillian Shirley, Director, County Health  
Department  
Dan Staton, Multnomah County Sheriff  
Michael Ware, Director, BPI

##### **Other Attendees**

John Bradley, MCDA  
Joe Brookins, County IT  
Drew Brosh, MCSO  
Jann Brown, DCJ  
Shannon Callahan, Commissioner  
Saltzman's Office  
Nancy Cozine, Oregon Judicial  
Department  
Christian Elkin, Budget Office  
Chuck French, MCDA

Carl Goodman, DCJ  
Eric Hall, Oregon Judicial Department  
Michael Hanna, AFSCME Local 88  
Rachel Hardesty, PSU-Restorative  
Justice  
Carol Hasler, MCSO  
Glenna Hayes, Center for Family  
Success  
Jay Heidenrich, MCSO  
Barry Jennings, Oregon Judicial  
Department  
Dave Koch, DCJ  
Matthew Lashua, Commissioner  
Shiprack's Office  
Beckie Lee, Commissioner Kafoury's  
Office  
Chet Lee, Citizen  
Bobbi Luna, MCSO  
Steve March, County Auditor's Office  
Scott Marcy, District Attorney's Office  
Shea Marshman, County Auditor's Office  
Gail McKeel, County IT  
Jana McLellan, Chair's Office  
Tim Moore, MCSO  
Elise Nicholson, County IT  
Peter Pincetl, ROAR Alliance  
Monte Reiser, MCSO  
Tom Rinehart, Chair's Office  
Rhys Scholes, Chair's Office  
Tom Slyter, MCSO - retired  
Jacquie Weber, County Attorney's Office  
Carol Wessinger, Citizen  
Corie Wiren, Commissioner McKeel's  
Office  
Linda Yankee, MCSO  
Wanda Yantis, MCSO

##### **LPSCC Staff**

Peter Ozanne, Executive Director  
Elizabeth Davies, Public Safety System  
Analyst

Council members approved the December 1, 2009 minutes.

## **II. Discussion of Corrections Grand Jury Report**

This agenda item focused on the December 2009 Corrections Grand Jury Report. Ted Wheeler opened the conversation by providing a brief overview of the mandated annual process that empanels twelve citizens every year to evaluate the Multnomah County jail system for safe conditions, effective operations, and humane treatment of inmates and then generate a report detailing their assessment and recommendations. Chair Wheeler remarked that LPSCC provided a good venue for discussing the report and identifying priorities, challenges and opportunities in the current jail system. He also expressed hope that this discussion will inform the Board of County Commissioners during the budget process.

### **The Process**

Representatives of the DA's office provided background information on the Corrections Grand Jury, placing its reports in the context of other routine jail evaluations performed by the Oregon State Sherriff's Association (OSSA), the Oregon Department of Corrections (DOC), and the Board of County Commissioners. Additional evaluations and audits of the jail system are performed as needed; for example, in 2006 the Board of County Commissioners requested that the DA's office examine the operations and management of County jails. Chuck French noted several Grand Jury recommendations that have been implemented over the years, including:

- renegotiation of US Marshal contract,
- renegotiation of juvenile detention contacts with Washington County,
- increased Board oversight in the operation of the jails,
- investigation into the use of sick time and overtime,
- contracting jail medical services and
- matrix releasing post-arraignment inmates first in the event of a jail population emergency

The DA's Office recognized that jails are constantly changing and believes the Corrections Grand Jury process allows public safety leaders to identify emerging trends within the system.

Chet Lee, foreman of the 2009 Corrections Grand Jury, discussed the process from his perspective. He pointed out that juries do not represent an accurate cross-section of the population, because individuals who have families or jobs that require constant presence will not be able to serve. When Chet assumed his position as foreman, he knew virtually nothing about the jails but approached issues that he encountered with the business perspective he brings to his company: how are we going to save money today? How can we change to be more efficient and effective?

Ted Wheeler asked how cost estimates were derived for the report. Chet Lee responded that he collected the estimates from testimony and then tabulated everything together. Chair Wheeler requested that in the future, Grand Jury reports include a list of cost assumptions and calculations. Chair Wheeler also noted that there needs to be some consensus on when a topic or recommendation has been exhausted; for example, the Sheriff's Office has already deemed some recurring Grand Jury recommendations not feasible, and there needs to be some recognition of this fact in future reports.

Ted Wheeler asked if grand jurors were aware of statutory and other limitations on their recommendations. John Bradley responded that the DA's office tries to provide jurors with as much information as possible to develop recommendations; this grand jury wanted to focus on the adult jail system.

## **The Issues**

In his letters to Sheriff Dan Staton and District Attorney Mike Schrunk, LPSCC Director Peter Ozanne asked that each come prepared to discuss the following issues mentioned in the Corrections Grand Jury Report: Cost of a jail bed in Multnomah County, US Marshal inmate housing, the use of retirees and civilian employees to fill various posts within the jail and the use of FMLA/OFLA leave.

### *Jail Bed Costs*

Sheriff Staton remarked that he will look at US Marshal cost estimates in greater detail. Steve March informed the Council that his office examined the cost of jail beds in 1994 and focused on personnel costs because these represent the single largest variable cost within the system. Recently, though his office did not perform a formal audit, auditors used a similar jail bed costing methodology and found that there have been improvements in personnel costs. He recommended that any workgroup that convenes to discuss jail bed costs look specifically at the number of personnel hours and the number of over-time hours as those measures relate to the number of inmates incarcerated.

### *Use of Retirees and Civilian Employees to Fill Posts*

Sheriff Staton is worried about SB 400 issues and does not believe he has much flexibility in changing staffing levels within the jail. He remarked that the overall concern of the Sheriff's Office is public safety and remarked on how well-trained, educated and exceptional his staff is.

### *Use of FMLA and OFLA*

Sheriff Staton pointed out that FMLA and OFLA regulations govern the Sheriff's policy decisions.

### *Other Issues*

The DA's office discussed the need to look at the state of the jails as an outcome of the entire system – influenced by police activity through bookings (in-flow) and by court proceedings through length of stay (out-flow). For example, John Bradley mentioned the impact of case "set-overs" (cases that must be rescheduled) on the length of time between issuing and disposing a case. Judge Maurer agreed on the need to decrease the time to disposition and recommended video conferencing as a means to expedite the process.

## **Next Steps**

Sheriff Staton extended an invitation to members of the Grand Jury to participate in a workgroup tasked with sorting through the key issues raised during the LPSCC discussion. This workgroup represents only one of the steps in Staton's overall strategy for responding to the recommendations, which include:

1. Providing an initial response to the report
2. Addressing the Board of County Commissioners
3. Establishing a workgroup to study and implement recommendations
4. Reporting back to the Board and the DA's office

### III. Crime Victims United Report and Response

This agenda item focused on the Juvenile Justice Council's response to the Crime Victims United Report's report "The State of the Multnomah County Juvenile Justice System."<sup>1</sup> The Council's response directly addresses the fifteen recommendations contained in the CVU report and also coincides with organization's recent publication of a third addendum to the original report.

Dave Koch summarized the process<sup>2</sup> by which this final response was crafted, which included extensive conversations between representatives of Crime Victims United and representatives of the Juvenile Justice Council and public safety agencies. Dave remarked that these discussions helped reveal common misconceptions, differences in opinion and opportunities for collaboration between the agencies. For example, the CVU report called attention to law enforcement's overall lack of confidence in juvenile justice system. Although discussions with command staff in Gresham and Portland helped to correct some of the misconceptions that "nothing happens" when a youth is arrested, agencies could not agree on how severe the consequence should be for certain criminal activities. Ted Wheeler aptly summarized these conversations as a difference more in belief about the success of juvenile detention than in the data included in the CVU report or DCJ's response.

Questions were raised by Council Members as to the degree of comparability between Multnomah County and other counties within the state. Although DCJ is similar to other counties in Oregon in many respects (all agencies responsible for juvenile justice receive money from the state, use the same risk assessment tools, and have adopted statewide, evidence-based practices), the key difference lies in the populations served in Multnomah County:

- Risk-level: Dave Koch and Joanne Fuller brought up the point that although Multnomah County has a smaller number of youth on probation than other counties, they have a significantly higher portion of high-risk youth. Joanne described this circumstance as the result of a conscious policy decision, based on evidence-based practices, to concentrate limited resources on those youth who are the highest-risk and most in need of services and treatment. She noted that other counties have a much larger number of youth on probation and that many of these youth do not need that level of intervention. Dave noted that despite the high risk level of DCJ's youth population and the relatively low number of beds available in the detention center, recidivism rates have steadily declined for the past seven years, calling into question CVU's contention that "more beds would reduce recidivism."
- Diversity: Multnomah County also has an incredibly diverse population that tends to inflate the state average. Joanne Fuller described the department's commitment to hold youth accountable while offering treatment and services that address those youth's unique background and cultural needs. These services are part of a larger commitment by the

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.crimevictimsunited.org/issues/juvenilejustice/multcoaddendum3.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> At LPSCC's September 2008 meeting, the Council accepted JJC's recommendation that it meet with CVU over the coming months to review CVU's report assessing the County's juvenile justice system. JJC and CVU agreed that representatives of CVU and JJC's Executive Committee would undertake this review process. During the next nine months, representatives of JJC and CVU met five times, discussed each of CVU's recommendations, reviewed relevant data and policies, and discussed their differing perspectives with regard to CVU's assessment.

department and by other public safety agencies in Multnomah County to reduce minority over-representation and disproportionality in the system. The CVU report does not appear to place as high of a value on culturally-specific services and combating disproportionality as does Multnomah County. Mike Ware pointed out that although the Department of Community Justice continue to grow, it has made cuts to culturally specific services.

Overall, Dave felt that this process has helped to reenergize work between DCJ and area law enforcement to hold youth more accountable. He hopes that these initial conversations will lead to closer collaboration between all justice partners. The Juvenile Justice Council has extended an invitation to Crime Victims United to participate in its meetings.

#### **IV. Discussion of Juvenile Crime Prevention Plan Planning Process**

Dave Koch invited council members and attendees to participate in the Multnomah County Juvenile Crime Prevention Strategic Planning Process. This planning process sets the direction for Juvenile Crime Prevention in Multnomah County in the coming years, assuring a comprehensive, balanced strategy to fight crime and keep our community safe. Through this process members of the community will identify how to address public safety issues with existing resources and target service gaps for future development. The plan ultimately belongs to the community and hence the process is designed to be inclusive.

#### **V. Future Direction of RJ-Net (CJIS)**

Mike Schrunk distributed a handout on CJIS, but there was not sufficient time to discuss this agenda item in depth.