



## Governor's Re-Entry Council, Steering Committee Minutes – Meeting #5 – June 4, 2008

Steering Committee Members Attending: Todd Anderson, Martin Burrows, Ron Chase, Ginger Martin, Tom McClellan, Pegge McGuire, Mark Royal, Clyde Saiki, Nancy Sellers, Ross Shepard, Scott Taylor, Heidi Steward, Cindy Booth, Mark Cadotte, Denise Taylor

Guests: Mary Leftridge Byrd, Armando Mendoza, Candy Curl, Patty Katz, Sharon Darcy, Hank Harris

Item	Discussion	Action
Welcome and Introductions		
Review of Minutes from the May 7, 2008 Meeting		Members are asked to send corrections/revisions to Denise Taylor by early July.
Announcements and Updates from Members	<p>Ginger Martin asked members to share those things that are being worked on in relation to re-entry outside the priorities of the steering committee and work groups. Ginger began by reviewing the May 29th judiciary hearing on re-entry which was a general education session for members of the Joint Interim Committees on Judiciary, and the Public Safety Strategy Sub-committee.</p> <p>National presenters spoke about evidence-based practices; what's going on around the country with regard to re-entry efforts; and the building blocks for re-entry projects.</p> <p>Electronic copies of presenter PowerPoints are provided with these minutes.</p>	<p>May 29, 2008 Joint Interim Committees on Judiciary, Informational Meeting: <u><a href="#">Work Shop on Reducing the Recidivism Rates for Offenders Returning to the Community.</a></u></p> <p>Presenters/PowerPoints:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Dr. Kenneth Robinson, Correctional Counseling, Inc.</li> </ul> <div style="text-align: center;">  </div> <p>Dr. Robinson - What Works Oregon Legisla</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Richard P. Stroker, Center for Effective Public Policy</li> </ul>

Item	Discussion	Action
		 <p>Re-entry - Richard Stroker ppt.pdf</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Peter Sprengelmeyer, Oregon Social Learning Center</li> </ul>  <p>Dr. Sprengelmeyer.ppt</p>
<p>Washington State Department of Corrections</p> <p>Presentations by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mary V. Leftridge Byrd, Assistant Secretary, Offender Treatment and Re-entry Programs</li> <li>Armando Mendoza, Field Administrator, Community Corrections Division</li> <li>Candy Curl, Transition Coordinator, Offender Treatment and Re-entry Programs Division</li> </ul>	<p>Representatives from the Washington State Department of Corrections (WDOC) were invited to present on “Washington’s Re-entry Initiative.” Mary Leftridge Byrd, Assistant Secretary for Offender Treatment and Re-entry Programs in Washington, began the presentation with an overview of progress and planning, to date. They provided copies of a comprehensive overview document (electronic copy of PowerPoint presentation attached) highlights from discussions prompted by the presentation, are noted below.</p> <p><b><u>Washington DOC 101</u></b></p> <p>Mary Leftridge Byrd explained that her division, the Offender Treatment and Re-entry Programs (OTARP), was established from the former Programs Division to highlight the department’s commitment to re-entry as an initiative requiring focused attention, and a philosophy for approaching their work. During the process of creating OTARP, the executive team defined the division’s mission and core activities including staff retention and safety as high priorities.</p> <p>Structure (see map on page 3 of PowerPoint):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>15 Institutions</li> <li>15 Work release facilities</li> <li>132 Field offices, community justice centers, COP Shops and outstations</li> </ul>	<p>Washington State Department of Corrections PowerPoint presentation – Re-entry Initiative</p>  <p>Oregon Reentry Council 6-4-08.ppt</p> <p>Washington State extends an open invitation to Steering Committee members who wish to learn more.</p> <p>The last page of the PowerPoint presentation is a contacts list.</p>

Item	Discussion	Action
	<p>Washington State currently incarcerates 18,000, has 27,000 on supervision, and there are 8,000 low-risk offenders (not being supervised). Between 1990 and 2006, Washington State's prison population went from 6,166 to 18,184 and community supervision caseloads from 11,250 to 26,451.</p> <p>Over the years, Washington State's legislature has created more than 31 different ways to supervise offenders. This has a major impact on both the supervisory authority and the offenders. Scott Taylor, Steering Committee member, asked Ms. Leftridge Byrd to explain Washington State's probation and parole supervision structure since it differs from that in Oregon. She confirmed that county community corrections is not involved, which means the state community corrections officers interact frequently with local law enforcement (see illustrations on page 7 – incarceration timeline, and page 8 – community supervision timeline.)</p> <p><u>Focus on Re-entry:</u></p> <p>In 2007, the Washington Legislature allocated nearly \$26 million (total over a ten year period) to DOC for re-entry (ESSB 6157) to begin addressing some of the historical challenges to re-entry:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited Funding</li> <li>• Lack of Available Housing/Shelter</li> <li>• Limited Access to Housing</li> <li>• Lack of Available Health Services</li> <li>• Lack of Strong Support Networks</li> <li>• Family Disengagement</li> <li>• Mental Health</li> <li>• Chemical Dependency</li> <li>• Employment</li> <li>• Prior Legislation</li> </ul>	

Item	Discussion	Action
	<p>ESSB 6157 (2007) provided for the creation of reception diagnostic centers; increased numbers of community justice centers and enhancement to the programming offered; increased chemical dependency treatment capacity. In addition, services to offenders with mental health issues is a focus, as is offering violence reduction services both in prison and in the community. Finally, it provides for focused family –centered programming.</p> <p>The Offender Treatment and Re-entry Programs (OTARP) division oversees numerous offender programs and re-entry efforts helping to bridge some of the prison-to-community gaps that most often lead to reoffending behaviors. Mary Leftridge Byrd summarized her philosophy of re-entry by saying she believes in sharing the responsibility with partner agencies. Re-entry is public safety, and collaboration is the key.</p> <p>OTARP's Offender Programs (broadly):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sex Offender Treatment Program (SOTP) including a community component</li> <li>• Educational Programs</li> <li>• Chemical Dependency</li> <li>• Law Enforcement Notifications</li> <li>• End of Sentence Review/Civil Commitment</li> <li>• Resource Program Management (RPM)</li> </ul> <p>OTARP's Re-entry Programs (broadly):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community Mobilization</li> <li>• Family Services</li> <li>• Transition</li> <li>• Religious Services</li> </ul> <p>Ross Shepard, Steering Committee member, asked how Washington State established relationships in the faith community. Ms. Leftridge Byrd explained WDOC recognized the faith community to be one of the biggest contributors to the institution</p>	

Item	Discussion	Action
	<p>volunteer effort, so they worked with the WDOC Administrator of Religious programming to reach-out to this community's leadership and ask for their help to develop system changes the faith community could also help support.</p> <p>Scott Taylor, Steering Committee member, asked for an explanation of the Washington State probation model and the involvement of judges. Ms Leftridge Byrd explained that judges are not involved with probation. Mr. Taylor said it is his understanding that when an offender is sentenced in Washington State, the custody and oversight of the sentence moves to the WDOC. They do not stay under the judges' probationary authority, but come under the authority of the WDOC. Ms Leftridge Byrd confirmed that to be true. However, the Sentencing Guidelines Commission is looking differently at sentencing practices and the involvement of judges.</p> <p>Mr. Taylor shared that he had done some work in Washington State last year and having come to understand the differences between Oregon and Washington, believes it important that steering committee members understand the significant difference between the two states.</p> <p>Ms. Curl said that 70% of their revocations come from the jails in Washington State. Ms. Martin said a difference between Oregon and Washington (and just about every other state) is that when an offender is revoked in Oregon, they don't return to prison. Washington's recidivism rate of 37% includes revocations. Oregon's recidivism rate of 31% (which is defined as reconviction for a felony within 3 years) does <i>not</i> include revocations. Ms. Martin further explained that Oregon's system doesn't track revocation data.</p> <p>Nancy Sellers, Steering Committee member, added that 11% of offenders in Oregon are under the Board of Parole and Post-Prison Supervision (BOPPPS) release authority, and they <i>can be</i> revoked back to prison; however, that is a BOPPPS decision.</p> <p>Mr. Taylor noted that in Oregon probation and parole violators, not including the local control population, is approximately 24%. If you include the local control population, recidivism is 37%. Oregon's local control violators are mostly probationers, which is similar to Washington's revocations to prison.</p>	

Item	Discussion	Action
	<p><b>Community Supervision</b> - Armando Mendoza provided an overview (included in PowerPoint). He explained that what happens on supervision is dependent upon the conditions of sentence and identified offender needs.</p> <p>Mr. Mendoza explained that Community Justice Centers are an important community supervision design because they serve as 'one-stop' centers for offenders and their families to receive comprehensive services, referrals and monitoring. Services offered include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offender change programs</li> <li>• Chemical dependency services</li> <li>• Employment services</li> <li>• Mental health services</li> <li>• Education services</li> </ul> <p>CJC's allow for the consolidation of services; more programs, staffing during flexible hours (open later); and drop-in services.</p> <p>Ron Chase, Steering Committee member asked how they address having children present when there are sex offenders in the center. Mr. Mendoza said the staff know who the sex offenders are and they are closely monitored. Most sex offenders go to private sex offender group treatment, have jobs, and are not frequenting the CJC's. Mr. Chase asked if Washington State sex offenders have "no contact with minors" as a condition of release. Mr. Mendoza confirmed that they do.</p> <p>Overcoming objections of the police and the city council is a challenge to siting any CJC. Sheriff Todd Anderson, Steering Committee member, inquired about how they address transportation issues. Mr. Mendoza said siting a CJC near a major transit center is key. There are also several out-stations around the county where a community corrections officer will work a couple of days a week, usually in a police sub-station. While there, offenders can report, submit UA's, etc.</p> <p>Mr. Mendoza gave a brief overview of the law requiring offenders be returned to the county of conviction upon release. Heidi Steward asked how their county of release was determined prior to ESSB 6157 and learned that it used to be up to the offender – wherever they wanted to go. Patty Katz asked how they determine the county</p>	

Item	Discussion	Action
	<p>of release when a felony occurs in transit and the offender's family, job, etc., are in another county. Mr. Mendoza said they always try to put the offender in the best place possible, so in such a situation, the offender would be returned to their county of residence. Mr. Shepard asked how many counties currently have Community Justice Centers – there are currently six CJC's (one in Clark County). Legislation requires that two CJC's be opened every 2 years. Mr. Shepard asked if they are located mainly in urban areas and Mr. Mendoza said, yes. In rural areas, needed services are offered and data is being studied to determine which services are needed in which counties. Two CJC's also have mental health professionals coming in on a daily basis to provide evaluations. They refer rather than prescribe and treat.</p> <p>Ms Curl added that ESSB 6157 mandates employment services by the State Employment Security Department in each of the CJC's and additional partner agencies are being invited to participate in the CJC's.</p> <p><b>Prisoner Re-entry Initiative (PRI) Grant – Handout</b></p> <p>Candy Curl provided a handout with information on the Prisoner Re-entry Initiative (PRI), funded through the US Department of Justice. (Oregon's community partner for the PRI grant is SE Works.)</p> <p><b>Identification for Offenders</b></p> <p>Ms. Curl explained that the WDOC has developed a partnership with the Washington State Department of Licensing (WADOL) to assist offenders in obtaining a drivers license or ID card at release. (See attached "snapshot" of SB 6157 &amp; IGA-includes DL application form). They will be starting the process at intake, soon, and the WADOL is working on a law change to enable representatives from WADOL to go into the institutions to meet with offenders and complete forms.</p> <p>Conversations about how Washington State has apparently overcome many of the hurdles Oregon is facing were numerous. Issues such as the department of licensing accepting WDOC-issued identification cards, the ability to confirm SSN's, etc., are specifics that Oregon will further explore. Tom McClellan, Steering Committee member said he would make contact with the</p>	

Item	Discussion	Action
Presentation to Community College Presidents	<p>Department of Licensing in Washington.</p> <p>Ginger Martin shared that DOC Director, Max Williams, addressed the presidents of the community colleges organization on re-entry with an emphasis on education. He proposed that all of the community colleges agree on a similar package of college level courses that would enable an inmate in our system to continue that same course of education anywhere in our system. The materials would be standardized to make getting the materials into the institutions easier because of security concerns.</p> <p>Ms. Katz asked about getting higher education counseling for offenders. Ms. Martin explained that DOC does direct the community college instructors to facilitate, help, encourage, etc., inmates to start or continue their higher education in prison. However, DOC does not provide college courses with tax dollars. For those with other resources we encourage, facilitate, help; but DOC does not provide in any way.</p>	
2008 Byrne Grant Partnership Opportunity	<p>Federal Judge Aiken talked with the Oregon Association of Community Corrections Directors (OACCD) about concerns over the lack of opportunities for offenders in Oregon who are on federal parole. Employment concerns being one. Judge Aiken identified a Byrne Grant opportunity and proposed a state/federal partnership to address the issues on two levels:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Sponsoring employment fairs in identified communities (in Portland, Eugene, Medford and Klamath Falls – Klamath Falls because there is an employer who is very interested in assisting.) The grant funds would be used to contract with a person or entity to organize the employment fairs.</li> <li>2) Creating virtual one-stop centers that are community-specific.</li> </ol> <p>DOC agreed to help write the grant proposal and the chief federal probation officer will be included as an associate member with the OACCD.</p> <p>This is seen as an excellent opportunity for relationship building with our federal counterpart. Ron Chase said Sponsors, Inc. is also negotiating a contract with federal parole and probation to combine Sponsors' job development services with theirs over a four year period for the people who come out of the work release center in Eugene. Willie Blasher is the regional Parole and Probation</p>	

Item	Discussion	Action
	<p>Supervisor for the US District Court and is on the Sponsors, Inc. board of directors and has been very helpful in facilitating the agreement. Sharon Darcy asked Mr. Chase if it has been his experience that the federal offenders get more assistance, financially and housing, when released. Mr. Chase said, no; although, they go to the work release center and have more opportunity to save money, they don't get more assistance with housing than state released offenders.</p>	
<p>Certifying Measure 17 Work Programs</p>	<p>Ms. Martin said a meeting was held with Oregon Corrections Enterprises, Measure 17-Work Program staff and Workforce Development. These are the entities in the prisons which are involved in some type of work activity and discussed the consistencies in job application processes and a consistent method of certifying work skills. We do this with trades programs, but it doesn't happen in the largest pool of offenders in the Measure 17 Work Programs. The issue is being worked on by a workgroup to certify work skills – both hard and soft skills and to provide work references.</p>	
<p>Oregon Offender Information Search</p>	<p>At the last Steering Committee meeting, the offender search application came up and an opportunity to provide input was requested. Max Williams and other DOC staff met with representatives from Sponsors, Inc., Citizens United for Rehabilitation of Errants (CURE), American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), Defense Lawyers Association and the Partnership for Safety and Justice to hear the concerns. At the end of this meeting, Mr. Williams indicated he wanted to take the concerns back to the DOC policy group before moving forward. Ron Chase brought a copy of a Bureau of Prisons model that Mr. Williams is reviewing. Mr. Chase said they agreed to disagree about some issues and to work on others.</p>	
<p>Steering Committee Member Updates</p>	<p><b>Ron Chase – College Registration and Financial Aid</b>            Ron Chase said Sponsors, Inc. has developed a program with Lane Community College (LCC) where LCC helps offenders negotiate their way through registration and financial aid. Now they are discussing a non-credit offender program that would have two phases: 1) a college orientation which would have modules that would teach people how to enroll, how to get help, etc. for first time students; and, 2) facilitating groups of offenders discussing those</p>	

Item	Discussion	Action
	<p>issues with someone who is knowledgeable.</p> <p>This should be functioning by next fall. Ms. Katz asked if there is someone to help them with financial aid. Mr. Chase said they have been helping offenders navigate applying for financial aid.</p> <p><b>Scott Taylor – Multnomah County Budget</b></p> <p>Scott Taylor said Multnomah County is finalizing the budget and there is \$500,000 earmarked for re-entry from jail. Mr. Chase asked if Multnomah County would be developing a jail re-entry handbook; there is one by the Urban Institute. Mr. Taylor said he was shown one while at an Urban Chiefs meeting recently that was done for Alameda County that was comprehensive. Ms. Katz said there is a resource guide that is updated each year and the Multnomah County Library publishes a foldable sheet with housing, shelters, places to eat, places to get clothing and health care.</p> <p><b>Mark Royal – New Transition Network</b></p> <p>OACCD approved the creation of a transition network comprised of representatives from county community corrections agencies and DOC’s Transition and Release Unit.</p> <p><b>Patty Katz – Child Support Issues</b></p> <p>Ms. Katz requested that information regarding child support suspension while incarcerated be included in the intake packets. Ms Martin said the information was included at one time, but is not currently. Sharon Darcy said she believes that the offenders are overwhelmed at intake and a little later time would be more effective. She offered to present the information during the programming again. Ms. Steward said there is a short film that covers requesting suspension of child support payments and adding the documents to the packet would reinforce the issue. Offering the information during programming will also help get the message out.</p> <p><b>Todd Anderson – Federal Timber Reauthorization</b></p> <p>Mr. Anderson said the federal timber reauthorization bill is most likely going to be vetoed by the president and those counties</p>	

Item	Discussion	Action
	<p>depending on those funds are going to be greatly impacted. Lane County is going to close down all but 24 beds and lay off 126 staff. Some people have been recruited by other agencies.</p> <p><b>Heidi Steward – Centralized Supervision of Release Counselors/Counselor Caseload Management Initiative</b></p> <p>Ms. Steward explained the reorganization of the release counselors through the Counselor Caseload Management Initiative. There are two types of counselors: institution counselors and release counselors. They currently report directly to the superintendent of the institution. As of July 1, 2008 the release counselors' supervision will be moved into the Transitional Services Division's Transition and Release Unit. There are 20 release counselors across the state. Hank Harris has just been hired to directly supervise those positions. She will keep the Steering Committee updated as to new processes and procedures which will most likely come from the Transition Network that Mr. Royal spoke about earlier. Ms. Martin said the work of the release counselors is clearly the mission and priority of the Transitional Services Division and this will give us an opportunity to re-think the role and provide a more consistent message of the role.</p> <p><b>Cindy Booth – DOC Birth Certificate Process</b></p> <p>Cindy Booth talked about the DOC birth certificate coordinator's success over the last year. The job rotation position began work in July 2007. Inmates at intake are assisted with completing an application for obtaining a copy of their birth certificate. In addition, institution counselors are working with those inmates who are coming up for release in the next 6 to 9 months to ensure an application is made. DOC pays the fees to obtain the documents and the birth certificates are held on file until the release date. Since July of 2007, over 7,000 applications have been processed and 5,392 replies have been received – either receipt of the birth certificate or a communication acknowledging the request and explaining why they could not issue a certificate.</p> <p>DOC has learned much through this process. Some states will not issue birth certificates simply because the person is incarcerated. Colorado is particularly difficult to obtain birth certificates from. Ms. Booth said the birth certificate coordinator has been working with</p>	

Item	Discussion	Action
	<p>those states with difficult processes to determine how/if they can be overcome.</p> <p>Beginning July 1, 2008 the job duties of the birth certificate coordinator will be moved to the newly formed Inmate Services Unit for DOC.</p>	
Update on Reentry Work Groups	<p>Ms. Martin announced that the Council has been offered technical assistance from the Center for Effective Public Policy (CEPP). Oregon is a model state for the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) Re-entry Initiative. They have offered technical assistance to our process in helping the workgroups create a work plan and organize their work. The first interaction with the CEPP will be the week of July 21<sup>st</sup>.</p> <p>Ms. Martin reported the Employment Workgroup has been populated; however, the convener has not been appointed and has not met. Ross Shepard is convener of the One Stop Workgroup, which has met once and has another meeting scheduled. Pegge McGuire said she and Ron Chase are sharing the role of convener of the Housing Workgroup and they have met. To date, they have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reviewed a variety of best practices that we know are working for immediate and transitional housing and some long-term housing</li> <li>• Identified barriers that currently exist</li> <li>• Checking into ORS changes</li> <li>• Researching options for geriatric and parenting situations, as well as a rural focus</li> <li>• Researching alternative release needs</li> <li>• Next meeting: getting placement data from Linn, Marion and Lane counties and presentation from Marion County Re-entry Initiative.</li> </ul>	
Next Steering Committee Meeting	The July, 2008 Steering Committee meeting (scheduled for Wednesday, July 2, 2008) is cancelled to allow the workgroups to convene and meet with the CEPP technical assistance provider.	Next meeting: Wednesday, August 6, 2008