

**Minutes of the Board of Commissioners
Multnomah Building, Board Room 100
501 SE Hawthorne Blvd. Portland, Oregon**

Tuesday, Sept. 22, 2015 @ 10:00 am

BOARD BRIEFINGS

Chair Deborah Kafoury called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m. with Commissioners Loretta Smith, Judy Shiprack and Diane McKeel present and Vice-Chair Jules Bailey excused.

Also attending were Jenny Madkour, County Attorney, and Lynda Grow, Board Clerk.

B.1 Board Briefing on the Multnomah County Justice Reinvestment Program and Related Mid-Year Budget Adjustment and Related Grant Application. Presenters: Abbey Stamp, LPSCC Executive Director; Rod Underhill, District Attorney; Linda Yankee, MCSO Chief Deputy, Ginger Martin, Deputy Director, Department of Community Justice; Suzanne Hayden, Executive Director, Citizens Crime Commission; Linda Yankee, Chief Deputy, MCSO; and, David VanSpeybroek, Partner, Sussman Shank.

Chair Kafoury: Hello everyone and welcome to today's briefing on the Justice Reinvestment Program. Abbey, welcome.

Ms. Stamp: Thank you, Madam Chair, Commissioners. I would like to invite a few of the Justice Reinvestment Steering Committee members up to the table. I will do introductions and get us kicked off for the morning. We have about a half hour and my goal is to get through our content in 20 minutes to leave plenty of time for questions that you might have. So, what we're going to try to cover in 20 minutes is a very brief background of the Multnomah County Justice Reinvestment Program. I know you are familiar with the nuances, but to bring you up to date and in addition to that, a few outcomes. But the main reason we're here today is talk about the fiscal year '16 adjustments now that the state budget has been finalized and what that means for our ongoing work. Per the original Governor's budget, we used an approximate number of about \$6 million as a total number for our program offers labeled HB 3194 to complete all of the services, treatment, and administration necessary to continue with the Justice Reinvestment Program. Now that the budget is \$4 million or \$2 million less, we needed to make adjustments. What this presentation is telling you is what the adjustments were and in anticipation and preparation for the budget modifications which will be held October 10th. This is the background for that. The Justice Reinvestment Steering Committee fully approved the recommendations and so did the LPSCC Executive Committee. So, just as a reminder, the vision of House Bill 3194 and Justice Reinvestment is really about reducing the number of offenders we as a County and also the entire state of Oregon sent to our prison system. And all of our work has boiled down to a common saying that I have been hearing a lot recently. The right person at

the right place at the right time. So, who are the people that we can safely and meaningfully supervise in our community rather than send to the Department of Corrections for incarceration? So, that means that we need to be effectively using our public dollars, justice reinvestment grant dollars, using effective interventions and data-driven as we move forward. I am going to have first Ginger Martin from DCJ, Rod Underhill, District Attorney, and Suzanne Hayden, Chair of the Justice Reinvestment Steering Committee and David VanSpeybroek come up to kick us off and make a few comments. Rest of the folks in the room today so that you know, are Lane, Executive Director of Metro Public Defenders, is here today, and the Executive Director of CODA, providing a valuable voice from the treatment community. I saw Chief Deputy Linda Yankee, and Donna Henderson, Assistant Chief of Portland Police. And Caroline from the District Attorney's office, and Shea, from the Sheriff's office, and along with Tim from DCJ who I don't think is here but is the LPSCC project manager. That is the team that has been working on this and I will stop talking and let folks take over. So, Ginger.

Dr. Martin: Good morning. I want to give you a bit of an overview of our Justice Reinvestment Program. First of all, the program included some pretty significant changes in the sentencing process for certain offenders who are facing a prison term. So, the District Attorney's office identifies the eligible individuals and then from that point, DCJ probation parole officers go into the jail or meet with clients not in the jail and do an assessment of that individual's risk to re-offend and their particular criminal risk factors. We look at if they have been on supervision before, how did that go? What is their criminal history? What resources do they have to support them in the community? And what kinds of interventions would they need and do we have those interventions available? All of that information is then included in a report that goes to the judge, the District Attorney, and the defense so that everyone has that information prior to a judicial settlement conference and all of that information can then be used in making the sentencing decisions. Probation parole officers also attend those judicial settlement conferences which is a new role for us. The second big part of justice reinvestment has to do with changes in supervision and services for the offenders who are sentenced to the program. So, we front load services for the folks that are going to be supervised in our justice reinvestment; probation, parole officer, we have housing available to them. We refer them to alcohol and drug treatment, if necessary. We have employment services and parenting skill services to offer in an individualized way based on the individual's particular needs and risk factor we've also changed the way that we supervise these folks. We are providing an intensive supervision for them for at least the first 120 days of their probation sentence. Our Officers have small caseloads so that they can spend a lot of time with people, either supporting or referring them as necessary or providing consequences to violations of the conditions of their supervision. And then after 120 days, they go on to regular supervision depending on their risk to re-offend. We've also in our justice reinvestment program funded the infrastructure that is necessary to keep this pretty complex set of changes moving. We are seeing hundreds of cases moving through the system and there have been changes in every piece of the criminal justice system associated with our approach. We have Coordinators in the Court System, in the District Attorney's office, in the working for the defense, and we have staff within DCJ who coordinate all of the changes that need to happen and all of

the scheduling that needs to happen to make this approach that we have developed work. And then finally, an important part of justice reinvestment in Multnomah County continually looking at the data so that we know what is happening with clients or offenders as they move through the system so that we have data to make sure that we know what's going on, we can track progress or problems, we can use that data to make decisions about -- and adjustments to policies and operations and eventually we will have the data we need to evaluate the results of our approach.

DA Underhill: Good morning Chair and Commissioners. Rod Underhill, your District Attorney here in Multnomah County. One of the questions we're dealing with is this program working? One of the measures identified have we seen a reduction in individuals being sent to the state institution, to the department of corrections out of Multnomah county? The simple answer is yes. And it has been a significant success in that area. We have other markers of success, but let me talk about those reductions up front. So, a couple of things to keep in mind. 3194, and that body of law, focused on certain areas of crimes, right, in the state of Oregon? Hyper focused or focused on drug and property crimes and also short-term transitional leave and an increase from 30 to 90 days. Those are the three biggest components that are going to result if implemented correctly in reductions in prison intakes. I want to talk about that as I talk about the MCJRP because we take that area of HB3194 and also expand it. Let me start with the HB3194 numbers and a little bit of data reflecting whether we are as a result of the program sending fewer individuals to prison and then another question is going to be are we doing it safely as well. Let's start with question number one. You see the numbers, July, 2013 to June 2014 and you see 541. Those are the numbers of individuals that have been -- we will contrast that with the second set of numbers. The 356. Keep in mind that the MCJRP program began July 1st of 2014. And out of the drug and property crimes that are HB 3194 numbers, we have seen a reduction of nearly 200 individuals in that cohort amongst that group that have not gone to prison. We believe we can tie it directly to the program itself, MCJRP. Nearly 200 of our individuals within our community that a year ago essentially would have gone to prison, have remained here in the community and are being worked with, receiving treatment, receiving services, those kinds of things. Another way of looking at that is pre-MCJRP program. This community sent out this presumptive prison-bound group, the MCJRP program is made up of crimes that are presumptive prison and out of that group, we sent, as a community, and as my office, about 55% received prison sentences. In other words, 45% received probation. Since MCJRP began July 1st of '14 and through this first, we now have a full year of data. We now know that only 25% have been sent to prison. In other words, 75% receiving probation. That is increase, and those numbers, that is more than the 185, and we're going to turn the page here in a minute and look at that, to look at the MCJRP program as opposed to the 3194 exactly impacted group. So, by all measures of success -- let me go ahead to the next slide. By all measures of success, Multnomah County, relative to referrals to prison, is doing an outstanding job. So, let's expand it from the 3194 body of law to the program that we have adopted which is more expansive than just drug and property crimes. So, as of June 30th, of this year, so, again, one year of the implementation of the MCJRP program, we have identified just over 1,000 eligible individuals. Again, recalling these are individuals that according to

our Oregon sentencing schemes are presumed to receive a prison term. Out of that group, we have now assessed -- we've done an assessment that ginger summarized for all of you on just about 600 of those, or the balance of those are still in the queue, right? Once a person is identified as eligible, we have a time line that varies, but think to yourself 90 to 120 days. That is a range of a shelf life of most of these in the system. Up to this point, we sentenced 531. When you do the math, we have broken it down for you -- 284, for example, are receiving the 120-day intensive supervision. We have sent 134 to prison. That's about that 25% number. And then another group, 113 have received other forms of local sentences, such as start programs and other types of things. That results in back to an increase, not just that 185 are in the community, but, in fact, more than that we are going to find in the community. In other words, take that round number of 1,000, and when those people that are in the queue work through our system, you are going to see if we keep with that 75%. You will see in the neighborhood of 700 to 750 receiving probation. As contrasted, before the program, about 450, right? So, that's the difference with respect to the MCJRP program is a tremendous number of individuals staying here locally. So, how are we doing that? And the answer is in part through collaboration. There have been a tremendous number of participants, not just in the state conversation, which I will get to in a minute, but here locally. The court system. Deep and meaningful participation by our court system, DCJ, supervision contributions, prosecution, my office. Law enforcement, the business community, defense contributions, treatment providers, and victim services. It has been in this community the best example, you know, that I think many of us can recall in our careers of deep collaboration. That does not mean that we have 100% always agreed on everything. But, frankly, that's what makes it good and has made what we think is a good program is we have spirited debates and try to get to the right place for both division of savings and doing it safely and protecting both victims and individuals that make up the groups. Data team, significant contribution, aspect of what we're doing. Local public safety coordinating council contributes work to this and takes a lead, in fact, on coming up with data reports that are deeply meaningful to us. DCJ, my office, sheriff's office, statewide leadership. I'll be quick. It is robust. Getting the money up to the nearly \$40 million that has now been available for grants was a statewide effort like none certainly that I have ever seen as far as everybody in public safety conversation was lobbying, pitching to support this same common goal. That's an unusual thing. ODAA, Oregon District Attorneys Association - an organization that I'm a member of, sheriffs and chiefs were glad to be participants in help that happen together with victim services and defense services, really across the board treatment providers. So, it has been a success by all measures. We need to keep an eye on things and make sure that downstream, right, we keep an eye on recidivism rates and those things that continue to measure. One year into it we don't have full data at this point. Let me turn it over to Sue.

Ms. Hayden: Good morning Chair Kafoury and Commissioners. I'm also a member of the local public safety coordinating council executive team and I want to spend my time this morning just speaking to the uniqueness of the collaboration that Rod touched on. I have for the past 2 1/2 years; I've chaired the justice reinvestment effort here. It is a committee that has been meeting almost every Friday at 7:00 A.M. For that 2 1/2 years. And that meeting is made up of the major leaders of our criminal justice system, and

they have planned and implemented this MCJRP that rod and ginger have mentioned. It has been a unique and transform transformative experience. That was touched on by rod. It has been a unique experience, as rod mentioned, this marks a milestone for us because it has been implemented for one year, and it's one year of more informed decision-making by our justice leaders in our community, and really using the data that is available to us to make those decisions. I believe what distinguishes this effort from the long history of collaboration that this county has enjoyed is really based on the challenge that we confronted of doing something better than what we already did, as opposed to problem solving. This was an effort to how can we do better? And the leaders each brought their expertise, their resources from their individual organizations, and their efforts aligned around a shared vision a goal to do better, to reduce recidivism, to decrease our use of prison, to protect public safety, and really hold offenders accountable. so the funds that the state provided towards this effort really helped us set that vision in motion, and it involved the sheriff, probation, the DA, public defenders, judges, Portland police, other law enforcement agencies, treatment providers, victim services and rights expertise, and community and business community representatives. All of the decisions were based on a collective of our data, shared data. Making decisions as a system, as opposed to a collection of organizations or agencies takes more time, thus the 2 1/2 years. But early results are very promising and outcomes for the community and for offenders and for victims are improved. Having data analysts from all system partners working shoulder-to-shoulder is imperative for our understanding of this complex system. I want to turn the rest of my time over to David, a partner with a law firm and a business attorney. He has the unique perspective -- he has been a part of our discussions for that whole entire time and his unique perspective is one that is born of no real experience that I'm aware of from the criminal justice system. He really has got that lens of being outside of the criminal justice system to our decision making that occurs in our steering committee. I want to turn it over to him for a few comments.

Mr. VanSpeybroek: Thank you, good morning, Commissioners. I got involved in this and I think I mentioned this to you guys before the experience of being there on a civil case. And the parking lot being full, and just that got me thinking about how expensive all of this was. Also a member of rotary and I have heard endless rotary members talking about how downtown is not the way it should be, that people feel a little bit under siege. People talk about, you know, walking four blocks and getting panhandled 20 times. People talk about the bus malls and how those are great facilities that we spent all of this money building and yet they're unpleasant to walk down because of the population that is there. So, what I saw was a system where we were spending a lot of money but we were not getting a very good result. This system -- and it's early -- but it has shown tremendous promise. And I think I'm a bit of a pessimist. My wife thinks I am and she is usually right. But I'm optimistic about this. We are spending much less than we are saving. So the financial case is easy for it. And the outcomes appear to be much better. We have the graduation ceremonies here. I have been to two of those. They are moving. And if you haven't been, you should go. You will get job satisfaction out of it. Instead of people coming out of correctional facility or jail bitter with no skills, going right back to kind of the way their life was before, we have people who have a job, have a

place to live, and have skills that hopefully will allow them to change their lives and not recidivate. It is early. This is a tough population. We are going to have things go wrong. Having said that, overall it seems to be a much better result. I think that this is a system that can become a model for other counties, and I think if Multnomah County can roll out a program that is successful and that become a model for other counties, that's very good for the county. I'm very optimistic about this. I want to commend the other members of the committee and my time on the committee. I have seen a -- in my time on the committee, I have seen a marked change in behavior and attitude that has been very positive and I am proud to work with a very talented group of flexible thinkers who I think have done a good service to the county. Thank you.

Mr. VanSpreyboeck: The budget that you passed was based on the Governor's recommended budget for justice reinvestment, and that resulted in, as Abbey said, \$6 million share for Multnomah County for this fiscal year. Budget that you saw before was based on that level of funding. Legislatively approved budget was not at that level. We're looking at our share this fiscal year will be \$4 million rather than close to six. Overall, the dollars go toward our program that we described to you, and then there are a couple of set-asides that are required in -- required by senate bill 3194. One is that 10% of the funds go towards services to crime victims as provided by community nonprofits, and the other requirement is that 3% be set aside for research and evaluation. Okay. So, some of the things that we included in our budget originally that will continue or we would like to see continue into the next fiscal year based on the actual funds that we have available, we will be able to continue everything we had in place before and then there is some additional money that can allow for us to make some additional improvements to what the first is the treatment readiness.

Good morning. I'm Linda Yankee, Chief Deputy for the Sheriff's office.

Chair Kafoury: Good morning.

CD Yankee: Good morning. And I am here today to talk with you a little about what a treatment readiness storm would look like. So, during our many 7:00 am Friday Mornings -- thanks Suzanne -- we had talked about what can we do to make people more successful. How can we get a better success rate out of treatment? So one of the things that came up was -- is that some of our failure rate is from people showing up at treatment under the influence, and the other is they leave early. They walk away from treatment. During our discussions we talked about how can we make -- how can we be more successful. We as a group had talked about a treatment readiness dorm what that might look like. We have been in many discussions with DCJ about how we could work together and create an environment in one of the dorms at Inverness within the existing footprint, a treatment readiness Dorm, where we would be partnering with DCJ and partner providers and our program staff to better prepare people as they leave for treatment. Everybody is involved to making sure that we're selecting the right person that is ready for the treatment bed. So, we continue to work on what that would look like in putting plan together. The best thing I see in it for me is that this model allows us so that the offenders meet with treatment providers so when they leave, we talk about a

warm hand drop-off. When they leave jail, they're connected with a person and they know -- they know when they leave that someone is there to pick them up, that they have already met, that they already know, that understands what needs to happen. I'm excited to do this.

CD Yankee: Three other investments that we as a committee hope to make in fiscal year '16 is to fund a DCJ supervisor for the 12 probation parole officers that work with the program. We have borrowed a supervisor from another one of our units to carry out this function. But that means we have an understaffed function within our department. So, it really is a full-time job to supervise the 12 POs, and also this individual participates in various multidisciplinary groups around guiding the continuous development of the justice reinvestment process. We're not done working through how we want to see our program working and there are decisions that need to be made really every week in terms of tweaks to our procedures. We also have proposed a half-time FTE in the district attorney's office who will be completing criminal histories. This is a necessary part of our pre-sentence assessment and we think it -- the most efficient place to do that kind of work is in the district attorney's office. And then, finally, we have proposed support for DSSJ. The data is important to our implementation, our decision-making, to make course corrections and eventually to do evaluation. Much of that is being hand tallied now. The every growing number of offenders touched by the program. You can see it is over 1,000. We can't sustain the hand counting part of our data analysis and evaluation. So, having a person come in to work with DSSJ and bring that infrastructure up to the state that it can actually automate a lot of these processes would be really necessary.

Budget office handed you hard copies of what the revised budgets look like down to the FTE and change of funding. What we hoped to walk you through was a short little graph so that you could see the specifics.

Let me try to explain in the -- in budget language what is different from the budget that you passed to the funding that we actually have available and the budget amendment. With community justice, there is a reduction of six FTE and about \$1.7 million. We had proposed funding five additional POs to work in the program. We actually have 12 now. Four of them are funded through justice reinvestment and we had hoped to add five additional funded through justice reinvestment dollars. Those come off the table. And then also one corrections technician comes off the table, and some additional housing and mentors that were in our original budget. For the district attorney's office, there is a reduction in FTE. Again, the budget that we originally had proposed included one FTE victim advocate. Part-time research analyst and a half time district attorney to handle probation violations. The changes to the local public safety coordinating council line item, are really a direct result of the change in the overall budget and then the companion reduction in that 10% for crime victim services. It just means the 10% got smaller because the overall total got smaller. And then a very small change in the sheriff's department. There is a new position that we would like to see as part of our treatment readiness dorm in the sheriff's office, coordinator, program supervisor position, and as we looked ahead, we realize we didn't really need 12 months of funding

because it is going to take some time to contract the services out. We reduced the funding to three-quarters of a year as opposed to 12 months. Those are the major changes in the budget based on the governor's budget to the actual budget that we have to work with.

Ms. Stamp: thank you for helping me get through that, Ginger. I apologize for that snafu. This is Abbey Stamp, Executive Director of LPSCC. I will take you quickly through the 10% we have been speaking to around victim services. Per the criminal justice commission, the dollars are to be used to funnel through the LPSCC to community-based organizations who provide trauma-informed services for victims of crime in underserved communities. And in order to do that, what we needed to do was create an RFP process, working with contracts back in early spring. And we had several meetings with internal stakeholders, external stakeholders, public outreach event to gather input from victim services organizations and advocates about what to include in the RFP. Several organizations completed proposals and we went through a scoring and allocation process and what you have here are the three agencies that we recommend allocation to. Those notices just went out to them. So this would not be a surprise coming to this board briefing. Impact northwest, just over \$41,000. They provide a parent/child program, families involved in the DHS, child welfare Gresham branch, for families experiencing domestic violence. Services specifically for the children to have been witness to that domestic violence. Lutheran family services northwest -- serving victims of all other crime from robbery to theft to you name it. And formally -- because of their area of expertise, intentionally focusing on underserved community, immigrant communities and providing services in other languages. Oregon Crime Victims Law Center asked for a bit more funds but this is all what we had left. Wanting to -- two attorneys, gateway center out in gateway. One attorney to provide general support and another one specifically speaking Spanish to serve our Spanish-speaking population. Oh, ginger.

This is the 3% required to be set aside for evaluation. And I covered kind of our need for an analyst to work with DSSJ and to bring that system up to the state where it actually is going to help us automate some of the data collection and analysis that we're doing. Specifically we will propose to the criminal justice commission to evaluate peer mentoring. This is something that we expect to be useful. Not only to us, but to other counties. Lots of counties have included peer mentoring as part of their approach. So, the strange thing about this, we need to apply for this money. And this is a bit of a next steps in a calendar for you. All of these components are being put together in a narrative with Sherri Campbell from Government Relations to apply to the DCJ for these moneys. Ands due on October 14th. Prior to that, folks will be coming before you to do the budget modifications on October 8th. Once that application is pushed through, barring no problems, we anticipate being notified of our award fund on December 4th. And then mid-December, actually having funds in hand. And that is when agencies can get their funds to continue the programming, in addition to executing contracts and exchanging funds with our victim services agencies. The other piece of information that I did want to share, David mentioned, the milestone ceremony. The next one October 1st here in this room at 6:00 P.M. It is a pretty amazing sight. It is a lot of folks

graduating from their 120-day supervision period and other milestones in their supervision. It is great to watch our policies and practices in play making a difference. We took just over a half hour. But I'm curious, Madam Chair, Commissioners, whether you have any questions for us.

Commissioner Smith: Madam Chair, I have a question. First I want to say thank you for meeting on these early Friday mornings for the last 2 1/2 years. That shows a lot of commitment and dedication to what we're doing here. I so appreciate that. A couple of things that jumped out at me. I noticed of the \$2 million, 633 was taken away from the housing stabilization. Can you explain that to me?

Ms. Stamp: I will hand that to Ginger. That was part of the department of community justice budget.

Ms. Martin: when we looked at the reduction in the amount that we had available, this was really a steering committee prioritization, and of the services, we thought the treatment readiness of the system, we thought that was our greatest need. We do have clean and sober housing d stabilization housing available in our system. We would like to see more, but we thought as a group, that the highest need that had sort of emerged in our first year of practice was the fact that people were being referred to people and immediately dropping out because they were not ready. In order to maximize that resource, we thought that was the best investment.

Commissioner Smith: I'm trying to reconcile this issue around treatment readiness. Listening to Ms. Yankee talk about folks they were under the influence, are these people in jail or are they on parole or probation that were not ready when they came to check in?

Ms. Martin: You know, I think it is a mix of both that maybe they came right to jail and left and still were not ready. You know, still were --

Commissioner Smith: and they were still intoxicated?

Ms. Martin: I mean, it could be they could immediately come in and get right back out.

Commissioner Smith: I like what you've done, but I want to see a little bit more put into housing. I think that is so critical. It is so tough for regular working folks, middle class folks to get housing. We're talking about a populace that is underserved and they're not going to be the top of anybody's list of getting housing out here in this Portland metro area. We need to do more to help them get housing, more bids out there in the community. I would try to figure out some ways that we can put some of that \$633 back -- \$633,000 back into the system if there is something else. I mean, I'm not totally convinced -- because we don't have any data on it -- that this treatment readiness is going to be the answer, but I tell you what, if you put these folks back out into the community and they go back to where they came from, you rest assured they are going to be doing the same thing because they need some stable housing. And if we have an

opportunity to do that right now we need to take this opportunity and figure out how to, you know, sharpen our pencils to switch the money around, whether it be taking some of the employment piece back, the new additional, DA, half time DA, I don't know. Because I know we put a lot of that into their budget for fiscal year '16 already. So, it seems like we're doubling and tripling up when we should be spending our money on housing. That is just my opinion. You can talk to the rest of the group about it but that is what stuck out to me, that 633, it was just glaring.

Chair Kafoury: one of the things that came up for me when I was looking at this document was there is not really a comparison of what we spent, 3194 dollars on the first go-around. This is allocated in '16, and then now that we're going to be revising, but I don't know -- I don't remember -- I just thought it would be a nice comparison if we had what we had spent it on prior so that we could look -- you know, what lessons did we learn? Where are we changing things around? It sounds like your group came to the conclusion that this treatment readiness was a piece that was missing. It would be nice to have the dollars lined up for me.

Ms. Martin: Sure. Be happy to work on that.

Chair Kafoury: questions or comments?

Commissioner McKeel: Chair, thank you. Thank you for all of your work and 7:00, I have said this before, 7:00 in the morning every week on a Friday is amazing. You all deserve credit for that. And I also appreciate that you have included the community and business at the table as well. I think that is an important voice that we sometimes forget about including and so I appreciate that. I just had a couple of -- I just had a question about we have one chart that says we're down six positions, and then another that says we're down 7.8. Could you kind of explain that? I probably haven't had enough coffee and I'm not reading this right. Could you kind of explain that a little bit?

Ms. Stamp: So, this is Abbey Stamp, Director of LPSCC again. Commissioner, when I was working with the budget office to get more budget-friendly documents ready for you today, there is -- it's part of what is hard to tease out is what is specifically funded through 3194, versus what departments and agencies are providing simply because they know it is important. (staff approach) Hi. Oh, thank you. That's a beautiful thing. Thanks for being in the room. Commissioner, the grand total is the overall decrease of FTE, 7.8, specifically for DCJ was six and the district attorney, 1.8. Those together, are 7.8.

Commissioner McKeel: got it. Because one chart says six. There is one in here that says six and there is another that says 7.8. Just clarifying. I get it. 7.8. I think the DA one wasn't on this one chart. So, yeah. Thank you. Anyway, thanks.

Commissioner Shiprack: Madam Chair.

Chair Kafoury: Yes.

Commissioner Shiprack: I want to comment on my way in this morning, I heard a really excellent piece on NPR about just the entire national momentum towards jail and prison reform in this country. And they quoted President Obama, which is pretty good like place, I suppose, in terms of the top-down, or we could be like the grass roots so now we have from the bottom up and from the top down going from this. They quoted President Obama saying what outrage it is that the United States has 5% of the world's population, and 25% of the world's prisoners. And I really am pleased with the work that you have done, and I know that you take pleasure from it as well. It is a tremendous opportunity to make a really important change. David, you're absolutely right. It is -- if you just look at it as a fiscal model, it's an important change for the community. And I completely agree with Commissioner Smith, not as a criticism of your prioritization, because you had to prioritize into a landscape of shortfall, but I completely agree that this board needs to take up housing for these difficult populations. A couple of weeks ago, we took care of the need for housing for people who earn 80% of median income. So, now we have an opportunity to look providing housing for people who -- whose median family income is way, way, way below 80%, who are sleeping on the sidewalks in Portland, who are the ones who are approaching, you know, our family and friends when they visit the city, you know, and asking for a handout. And they need a handout. So, this is a way that I think as Commissioner Smith just pointed out, that probably this commission can work directly to provide assistance, funding assistance through contingency that May be available, and I intend to take a look at that specifically for housing this group.

Chair Kafoury: I want to thank you as well. I don't think we can thank you enough for the work that you have done over the past 2 1/2 years and the work that I know that is still to come because this is a great start, but we still have a long way to go. But the mere fact, and I know that several of you have mentioned it, but it needs to be mentioned again, that all of the major players in our public safety system come together and really get down to brass tacks about where -- what changes need to be in our community and I have been hearing the series as well that Commissioner Shiprack referenced, this sense of pride that we are out there in f these conversations that other communities are struggling with and that's because you guys have done a lot of the hard work of having these conversations already. I want to tell you all as well I am really excited about this treatment readiness concept. I think it is potentially a real missing piece in how we are helping -- in the investment that we're making in our drug and alcohol treatment programs. People aren't ready to participate, we know that they won't be successful. That being said, I am in complete agreement, which will not be a surprise to anyone this in room, with Commissioner Smith's astute observation which is also a clear sign and clear indicator of failure is when people don't have a place to live. And we can have lots of money spent on treatment. We can put them in jail, do whatever, but if they don't have a place to go home, they're not going to be successful in our community. I look forward to working with my colleagues and all of you to address all of these root causes of crime and criminality that I think for far too long were not discussed in our community. Anybody else have questions or comments? Thank you very much.

Adjournment: 10:55 am

Chair Kafoury: and seeing no further business, we are adjourned.

This transcript was prepared by LNS Captioning. For access to the video and/or board packet materials, please view at:

http://multnomah.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=3

Submitted by:

Lynda J. Grow, Board Clerk and
Marina Baker, Assistant Board Clerk
Board of County Commissioners
Multnomah County, Oregon