



MULTNOMAH COUNTY OREGON

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
ROOM 605, COUNTY COURTHOUSE
1021 S.W. FOURTH AVENUE
PORTLAND, OREGON 97204

GLADYS McCOY •	Chair	• 248-3308
PAULINE ANDERSON •	District 1	• 248-5220
GRETCHEN KAFOURY •	District 2	• 248-5219
RICK BAUMAN •	District 3	• 248-5217
	District 4	• 248-5213
JANE McGARVIN •	Clerk	• 248-3277

AGENDA OF
MEETINGS OF THE MULTNOMAH COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
FOR THE WEEK OF
May 1 - 5, 1989

Tuesday, May 2, 1989 - 9:00 AM - Legislative Briefing . . Page 2
9:30 AM - Planning Items followed by
Informal Briefings

Tuesday, May 2, 1989 - 1:00 PM - Executive SessionPage 4
1:30 PM - Joint Emergency Policy Board/
Board of Commissioners Meeting
followed by Informal Briefing
and Informal Review of Formal
meeting May 4

Thursday, May 4, 1989 - 9:30 AM - Formal. Page 5

Tuesday, May 2, 1989 - 9:00 AM

Multnomah County Courthouse, Room 602

1. Legislative Briefing (if needed) - Fred Neal, Howard Klink
2. Informal Review of Bids and Requests for Proposals:
 - a) SE 242nd Drive
 - b) Developmental Disabilities Program/Earl Intervention Services
 - c) Administrative Services for Multnomah County's Medical, Vision and Dental Benefits Plans

FORMAL ACTION REQUIRED

3. In the matter of Decisions of the Planning Commission of April 10, 1989 for acceptance and implementation by Board Order:

- PR 2-89 Approve, requested change in the Centennial Community Plan, redesignating this property from Urban Medium Density Residential to Neighborhood Commercial; and
- ZC 2-89 Approve, subject to a condition, amendment of Sectional Zoning Map #400, changing the described property from MR-3, medium density residential district to NC, neighborhood commercial district, all for property at 14815 SE Division Street
- ZC 4-89 Approve amendment of Sectional Zoning Map #73 and #74, changing the described property from MUA-20, multiple use agricultural, to EFU-76, WRG, exclusive farm use, Willamette River Greenway, all for property located at 14730 NW Gillihan Road
- ZC 5-89 Deny requested amendment of Sectional Zoning Map #415, changing the described property from LR-10, Low Density Residential District, minimum lot size of 10,000 square feet, to LR-7, Low Density Residential District, minimum lot size of 7,000 square feet; and
- LD 6-89 Deny tentative plan for a Type III Land Division, all for property located at 4146 SE 141st Avenue

In the matter of the decisions of the Planning Commission of April 10, 1989, reported to the Board for acknowledgement by the Presiding Officer:

- CU 5-89 Approve, subject to conditions, conditional use request to add a boat lift and repair facility at Lucky Landing Moorage; and
- WRG 3-89 Approve requested WRG, Willamette River Greenway Permit, all for property located at 12900 NW Marina Way
- CU 4-89 Approve, subject to conditions, conditional use request to develop the subject property with a non-resource related single family residence, for property located at 46317 E Larch Mountain Road

INFORMAL BRIEFINGS

4. Briefing on progress by Assessment & Taxation in defining neighborhoods as part of the appraisal process for the 1989-90 tax roll - Janice Druian
5. Presentation of Youth Planning Document, which incorporates demographic trends, service gaps, services provided, and emerging issues for youth in Multnomah County - Duane Zussy, Michael Morrissey

PUBLIC TESTIMONY WILL NOT BE TAKEN AT INFORMAL MEETINGS

Tuesday, May 2, 1989 - 1:00 PM

Multnomah County Courthouse, Room 602

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Executive Session regarding pending litigation (allowed under ORS 192.660 (1)(h))

JOINT EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES POLICY BOARD
AND
MULTNOMAH COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

1:30 PM (following Executive Session)

EMS Public provider concept, financial implementation plan

Testimony shall be limited to five (5) minutes

The following will be heard at the conclusion of the Emergency Medical Services Hearing:

INFORMAL BRIEFING

Present findings in relation to a four year research project on Probation Management in Multnomah County which was funded by the Edna McConnell-Clark Foundation - John Angell, Todd Clear (Rutger's University)

Informal Review of Formal Agenda of May 4

PUBLIC TESTIMONY WILL NOT BE TAKEN ON INFORMAL BRIEFINGS

Thursday, May 4, 1989, 9:30 AM

Multnomah County Courthouse, Room 602

Formal Agenda

REGULAR AGENDA

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

- A
- R-1 In the matter of the appointment of Sharon Nesbit (Troutdale/Gresham), Dutch Holub (County Technical Staff), Marge Schmunk (Troutdale), and Robert C. Wiggin (Troutdale) to the Edgefield Task Force
 - R-2 Proclamation in the matter of Proclaiming the week of May 7-13, 1989 Be Kind to Animals Week in Multnomah County

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

- R-3 Resolution in the matter of Substituting Light Rail Transit in the I-205 Freeway (for bus lanes allowed when freeway was built) [Continued from April 20]

DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES

- R-4 In the matter of ratification of an Intergovernmental Service Agreement with Washington County Juvenile Department and Multnomah County Information Services Division, for the providing of computer time for the Tri-County Juvenile Information System, for period January 1, 1989 to June 30, 1989

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

- R-5 In the matter of ratification of an amendment to an Intergovernmental Agreement with Oregon Health Sciences University, to restate terms and conditions in the existing agreement to manage and authorize payment for involuntary hospitalization of patients diverted from Dammasch State Hospital, due to overcrowding, and allowing payment for emergency holds occurring on or after April 1, 1989
- R-6 In the matter of ratification of an Intergovernmental Agreement with Oregon Health Sciences University, to provide emergency hold services to patients in pre-commitment status, for period May 1, 1989 to June 30, 1990

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE SERVICES

- A
- R-7 In the matter of ratification of an intergovernmental agreement with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, for the Sheriff's Office to enforce Federal/State laws and regulations in the National Forest, for period May 25, 1989 to September 4, 1989
 - R-8 Notice of Intent from Office of Women's Transition Services to apply for federal grant (Office to Substance Abuse Prevention: Public Health Service) (\$182,480) for a project to coordinate services to substance abusing pregnant women

THE FOLLOWING WILL BE HEARD FOLLOWING THE FORMAL AGENDA

WORK SESSION

Approximately - 10:00 A.M.

1. Department of Justice Services Reorganization

Thursday Meetings of the Multnomah County Board of Commissioners are recorded and can be seen at the following times:

Thursday, 10:00 PM, Channel 11 for East and West side subscribers

Friday, 6:00 P.M., Channel 27 for Rogers Multnomah East subscribers

Saturday 12:00 PM, Channel 21 for East Portland and East County subscribers

SUPPLEMENTAL AGENDA

THURSDAY, MAY 4, 1989

THE FOLLOWING WILL BE HELD BE UNANIMOUS CONSENT:

- R-9 Proclamation in the matter of Proclaiming the Week of May 7-13, 1989 as Municipal Clerk's Week 89-80
- R-10 Proclamation in the matter of Proclaiming the week of May 7 through 13, 1989 as National Corrections Officer Week 89-81
- R-11 Proclamation in the matter of Proclaiming May 6, 1989 as National Nurses' Day in Multnomah County 89-82

DATE SUBMITTED 4-24-89

(For Clerk's Use)

Meeting Date _____

Agenda No. _____

REQUEST FOR PLACEMENT ON THE AGENDA

Subject: Probation Management Research Project

Informal Only* May 2, 1989
(Date)

Formal Only _____
(Date)

DEPARTMENT Justice Services DIVISION Administration & Planning

CONTACT John Angell TELEPHONE 248-3701

*NAME(s) OF PERSON MAKING PRESENTATION TO BOARD John Angell/Todd Clear (Rutger's University)

BRIEF SUMMARY Should include other alternatives explored, if applicable, and clear statement of rationale for the action requested.

Present findings in relation to a four year research project on Probation Management in Multnomah County which was funded by the Edna McConnell-Clark Foundation.

(IF ADDITIONAL SPACE IS NEEDED, PLEASE USE REVERSE SIDE)

ACTION REQUESTED:

☒ INFORMATION ONLY ☐ PRELIMINARY APPROVAL ☐ POLICY DIRECTION ☐ APPROVAL

INDICATE THE ESTIMATED TIME NEEDED ON AGENDA 30 minutes

IMPACT:

PERSONNEL

☐ FISCAL/BUDGETARY

☐ General Fund

Other _____

SIGNATURES:

DEPARTMENT HEAD, ELECTED OFFICIAL, or COUNTY COMMISSIONER: John Angell

BUDGET / PERSONNEL _____ / _____

COUNTY COUNSEL (Ordinances, Resolutions, Agreements, Contracts) _____

OTHER _____
(Purchasing, Facilities Management, etc.)

NOTE: If requesting unanimous consent, state situation requiring emergency action on back.



MULTNOMAH COUNTY OREGON

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE SERVICES
1120 S.W. FIFTH AVENUE
ROOM 1500, THE PORTLAND BUILDING
PORTLAND, OREGON 97204
(503) 248-3701

GLADYS McCOY
COUNTY CHAIR

MEMORANDUM

TO: Commissioner Gladys McCoy, Chair
Commissioner Pauline Anderson
Commissioner Rick Bauman
Commissioner Gretchen Kafoury

FROM: John Angell
Director

DATE: April 25, 1989

SUBJECT: PROBATION DEVELOPMENT PROJECT EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BOARD OF
COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
1989 APR 27 AM 10:38
MULTNOMAH COUNTY
OREGON

Attached is the Executive Summary of a report Todd Clear prepared as a result of the Edna McConnel Clark Foundation research in Multnomah County. His briefing to the Board next Tuesday will deal with this and other material related to the research project.

0389ttm

attachment

c: Bob Skipper
Harley Leiber
Wayne Salvo
Bill Wood
Doug Bray

The PROBATION DEVELOPMENT PROJECT:
SUCCESES, FAILURES, AND QUESTION MARKS

Program Resources Center
Rutgers University
School of Criminal Justice
Newark, New Jersey

November, 1988

Carol Shapiro, Director
Program Resource Center

Todd R. Clear, Professor

Ellen F. Chayet, Ph.D.
Assistant Director,
Program Resource Center

Suzanne Flynn, Consultant

This report was made possible by a grant funded by the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation. Points of view or opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the policies or positions of the Foundation.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Probation Development Project (PDP) was a 48-month effort in Multnomah County (Portland), Oregon, designed to demonstrate probation's potential as an alternative for high-risk, incarceration-bound offenders.

The organizational change program of the PDP had two elements. There was a conceptual basis for supervision which promised to provide the type of supervision needed by high-risk, incarceration-bound offenders. There was also a change program to develop the specifics of a program which would meet the needs of the agency and community.

The conceptual basis for the project was the notion of "risk management":

- o The establishment of a valid risk assessment system.
- o The development of supervision priorities based on levels of risk.
- o The classification of supervision conditions as based on risk control and punishment requirements of the case.
- o The limitation of conditions to the minimum needed either to control risk or to punish.
- o The development of enforcement methods for ensuring compliance with conditions.
- o A policy of full enforcement.

The change aspect of the project was a policy of "involvement," based on established principles of a organizational change using an "applied research" model.

Two advisory groups were created -- a Community Advisory

Board (CAB) composed of leaders in the criminal justice system and Multnomah County, and a Probation Task Force (PTF), composed of probation officers. These groups met nearly monthly for the duration of the project, and became the central policy actors in the PDP, providing structure and guidance to the project, while representing their various constituencies. The use of advisory groups was designed to improve commitment to the project and develop "fit" between the idea of risk management and the agency/community context. The role of the advisory groups was to develop project policy and to respond to and make use of the 10 separate problem studies (using 8 uniquely developed data bases) that formed the procedural heart of this project. The advisory groups were the consumers of the applied research design.

THE CHANGE PROGRAM

We incorporated into the design of this project most of the lessons suggested by literature on organizational change:

- o Enter by invitation from key leadership.
- o Develop the contract for the change process and objectives mutually with the organization.
- o Involve all levels of the organization in all stages of the problem, from definition to solution to evaluation.
- o Use consensus models of decision-making whenever possible.
- o Integrate the internal change process to the external environmental pressures.

- o Incorporate an interactive process of unfreezing/ changing/refreezing.
- o Be open to opportunities that allow problem redefinition for more effective problem-solving.

To these general guidelines were added the specific orientations of a socio-technical system model of organizational change:

- o Conduct systematic assessments of the organization prior to action.
- o Focus change efforts on human/technical systems of work.
- o Expect resistance due to problems of technical change.

We can divide our learning into two general areas. Six lessons relate to the overall principles of organizational change and provide a perspective on the process of change. Other lessons are particular to the PDP, itself, and help to explain why it ultimately failed as an implementation of organizational change, even though it was a successful probation experiment.

SIX LESSONS OF THE CHANGE PROCESS IN THE PDP

- o Commitment to Process Creates Costs in Terms of Content. A commitment to process encourages an emergent, not static methodology. The aim is to pursue involvement, work for consensus, and continually consider the change context. For the PDP, this meant slow, sometimes painfully slow progress and often tedious, repetitious work to develop project consensus.

- o Altering the external context of the project can create contingencies. When the Corrections Director who

originally agreed to the PDP resigned and was replaced with someone who had little active support for the project, it was the CAB that provided the support to keep the project alive despite the lack of corrections support. Nonetheless, alignment with a previous correctional administration meant that the PDP was without a correctional system sponsor for much of the history of the project.

- o Altering the internal context of the organization is very difficult. The most difficult problem facing any organizational change program is altering the organization's tradition and replacing it with new approaches. The PTF was unable to alter the negative work context of the agency.

- o Gathering data as a means of conflict resolution can divert attention from the larger agenda. The PDP was rooted in the belief that providing detailed information about local sentencing and probation practices, leads to better planning and better policy decisions. The research tasks and data they yielded soon became the central focus of the project, in particular for the CAB. The larger agenda, that of changing probation, was given lesser significance.

- o Linking change to current actors carries baggage. When the state's original leadership who sponsored the PDP in Multnomah County resigned, many thought the project slated for expulsion. Local corrections management was left with ambiguous signals from the new central office as to how much to support the work. Those within the agency who were hostile to the prior administration defined the project as

an initiative of the purged leadership, and sought to have the PDP closed down. Local community leaders intervened in the form of the CAB and provided strong support for the continuation of the project. This made the PDP a protectorate of the CAB, operating in a somewhat hostile environment. The only residual sources of support were the members of the CAB and the local corrections management. Here, the project took on baggage of local political contexts.

- o Political context acts as a random variable. The PDP was a case study in how the political context works as a random variable. Three political issues were of paramount influence on the PDP: the resignation of a corrections director, a gubernatorial election, and a political ground for building new prisons and keeping parolees under supervision for longer periods of time.

THE SUPERVISION PROGRAM

The PDP Unit was able to successfully implement the principles of risk management. The number and function of conditions were limited to the risk management rationale and were more carefully enforced. Group decisions on both policies and individual cases were superior to individual decisions. Supervision was considerably more intense. The operations of the PDP demonstrated that:

- o Risk management can be applied to a high risk population of incarceration-bound offenders.
- o Community supervision can operate effectively even under conditions of extremely limited institutional space.

- o There are substantial advantages to commencing supervision planning prior to sentencing.
- o Careful enforcement of conditions can occur without routine resort to incarceration.
- o Probation staff can change their traditional approach to supervision.

THE DIVERSION OF OFFENDERS FROM INCARCERATION

The PDP project demonstrated that the diversion model contains two problematic assumptions. First, it is assumed possible to identify a tightly-defined group of offenders bound for some incarcerative term. Second, it is assumed possible to establish a selection process to move those offenders into a division program. Straightforward as these assumptions seem, both proved complicated in Multnomah County.

The diversion process in the Probation Development Project was a product of both policy considerations and practical limitations. Policy considerations resulted in restricting the pool of eligible offenders only to high or moderate-risk clients convicted of crimes of low or moderate seriousness. Practical considerations resulted in a loss at screening of a large number of cases who fit the criteria and who would otherwise be suitable. As a result, of 1183 offenders screened for this project, only 55 were diverted to the PDP.

Our research suggests that the practical problems are all potentially solvable. The diversion of offenders from incarceration in Multnomah County is primarily a problem of

coordination and management. Among the most important results are these:

- o The existence of sentencing disparity in Multnomah County makes it imperative that a careful client selection process be established for any diversion project if it is to avoid widening the net.
- o Over one fourth of the incarceration bound offenders of moderate-to low-crime seriousness level are low risk. ✓
- o The Multnomah County justice system cycles many offenders through a series of hearings, and this cycling process, taken together with organizational fragmentation in the justice system, results in loss of over 80% of the cases eligible for diversion. ✓
- o If the necessary administrative arrangements could be made to improve the client selection process, there could be a diversion of approximately 200 offenders per year. This would result in an annual saving of tens of thousands of jail cell days and prison cell days per year, and would return over a quarter of a million dollars enhancement funds per year.
- o The main impediment to effective diversion in Multnomah County is not the lack of appropriate offenders but the failure to make the administrative arrangements necessary to carry out diversion.

SUPERVISION OUTCOMES OF PDP

A study was conducted of the cases admitted to the project, comparing their performance to a similar group of clients not admitted to the project (both probationers and prisoners); they were followed for 12 months. This study found:

- o PDP cases received considerably greater levels of supervision than regular probation or parole cases.
- o PDP cases were afforded greater enforcement of conditions than prison or probation comparison

cases in their criminal activity level.

- o Differences in performance under supervision favor PDP cases, especially when considering major offenses and especially when controlling for time-at-risk of criminal conduct.
- o PDP cases cost significantly less to process than either the probation or prison comparison group, mostly because they experienced significantly less incarceration.

The findings presented above raise a critical issue concerning the use of resources for convicted offenders. An intensive supervision experience poses no greater risk to the community than regular probation (with its initial period of incarceration in jail) or prison. It is also true that the intensive program is less costly (an average of \$4.11 per day) than either probation with jail (\$2.08 per day for probation, but \$50.24 for each day spent in jail) or prison (\$38.29 per day) It is also more humane. How then, can reliance upon harsher sanctions in the initial portion of an offender's sentence be justified? The PDP experience has strengthened the argument for continued development of ways of managing high risk cases in the community.

RETROSPECTIVE ON THE FAILURE OF THE PDP TO CHANGE PROBATION

In spite of its adherence to organizational change principles, the investment of considerable resources and the promising results with a small sample of offenders, the PDP failed in its mission to develop probation as an alternative to jail and prison for high risk offenders.

- o The PDP never became owned by local leadership.
- The project emphasis on a process of "involvement", never

succeeded in mitigatingⁱ the perception that this was a "Rutgers" project run by outsiders.

- o The PDP degenerated from an organizational development Project to a research study. The original proposal to develop probation's capabilities to supervise high risk incarceration-bound offenders became subverted to the study of a PDP units' work.

- o The PDP failed to link to the severe crowding issues in Oregon. No coalition developed to support the project as an important initiative to help solve Oregon's correctional institution crowding.

- o Project assumptions and goals contradicted local and state correctional momentum. The underlying assumptions of the PDP favored greater and different use of community supervision. This directly contradicted the momentum in Oregon to expand jail and prison capacity.

- o The PTF was unable to overcome internal hostility to the project. The daily pressure of the traditional frame of reference in the agency was less tractable than we believed, and was certainly impervious to a "special research project," as the PDP was perceived to be. In the face of this pressure, the PTF never came to see the innovative work of the PDP as a way of escaping what was commonly felt to be malaise.

- o The problems of implementing a change process were different and more difficult than anticipated. The large combination of political and historical events that occurred

over the four years of the project meant that too many issues were confronting the outside consultants.

- o Local project staff lacked decision-making power. This meant that when Rutgers staff were absent, meetings often lacked the authority needed for the project to maintain and proceed as needed.

- o Distance by project staff, in conjunction with a leadership void, created time lags. Because local support was ambivalent, the distance and infrequent, on-site work, slowed down the change process. Ultimately, this project took too long to complete.

5/2/89
Jmf -
55

TABLE 6

Cases With at Least One Incident in the
Community Over 12 Months

	PDP		Probation		Prison	
	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
misdemeanor	8	(16.7%)	23	(47.9%)	6	(22.2%)
felony arrests	9	(18.4%)	22	(45.8%)	5	(18.5%)
misdemeanor convictions	2	(4.1%)	4	(8.0%)	1	(3.7%)
felony convictions	1	(2.0%)	7	(14.0%)	0	(0)
major police (a) contacts	14	(51.9%)	26	(68.4%)	5*	(22.7%)
minor police contacts (a)	9	(33.3%)	9	(23.7%)	4*	(18.2%)

(a) Percentages appear high due to the relatively large number of missing cases resulting from the creation of this variable.

*Figures for months 6-12 only.