



Retreat Agenda

Local Public Safety Coordinating Council

February 1, 2011, 7:30am – 10:00am

- 7:15 *Gathering & morning refreshments*
- 7:30 **Openings**
- Welcome and introductions – *County Commissioner Judy Shiprack*
 - Executive Director comments
 - Review agenda and “products”
- 7:50 **Why Do We Meet? – Current Benefits**
- How does LPSCC currently benefit you and your organization?
 - How does LPSCC currently benefit the broader community?
 - What are LPSCC’s current strengths?
- 8:10 **What Is Your Vision for LPSCC?**
- What is LPSCC’s role?
 - What should LPSCC’s activities be?
 - What improvements might there be in how we meet?
 - How would you describe the culture you want to foster at meetings?
- 8:30 *10 minute break*
- 8:40 **What Do We Do When We Meet?**
- What items do you want on LPSCC’s standard agenda?
 - What do you want to get out of those items?
 - How do you want members to be engaged?
- 9:10 **How Can We Have the Most Productive Meetings Possible?**
- Preparation for meeting - agenda development, member preparation
 - At the meeting – how meetings are run, how members engage
 - Meeting follow-up – follow-up, completion of tasks, support from LPSCC staff
- 9:20 **Issues/Initiatives for LPSCC’s 2011-2012 Plan**
- What topics do you want to suggest?
 - What do you want to accomplish?
- 9:50 **Closings**
- Follow-up & agenda items for next meeting
 - Retreat evaluation
- 10:00 *Adjourned*

LPSCC

Executive Committee Meeting

Summary Minutes for January 4, 2011

I. Introductions, Announcements, and Approval of Minutes

LPSCC Executive Committee

Members In Attendance

Sam Adams, LPSCC Co-chair, Mayor of Portland
Judy Shiprack, LPSCC Co-chair, Multnomah County Commissioner, District #3
Lane Borg, Director, Metropolitan Public Defenders
Karl Brimner, Director, County Mental Health Services
Bill Feyerherm, Vice Provost for Research and Dean of Graduate Studies, Portland State University
Judge Julie Frantz, Chief Criminal Court Judge
Joanne Fuller, Chief Operating Officer
Karen Gray, Superintendent, Parkrose School District
Judy Hadley, Citizen Representative
Deborah Hansen, Regional Director, Oregon Youth Authority
Suzanne Hayden, Citizens' Crime Commission
Dwight Holton, Acting U. S. Attorney
Judge Jean Maurer, Presiding Circuit Court Judge
Chief Mike Reese, Portland Police Bureau
Chiquita Rollins, Domestic Violence Coordinator
Michael Schrunck, District Attorney
Scott Taylor, Director, Department of Community Justice

LPSCC Staff

Peter Ozanne, Executive Director
Matt O'Keefe, Analyst
Tom Bode, Research Associate
Ryan Pelkey, PSU Systems Science

Other Attendees

Joslyn Baker, CSEC - Collaboration Specialist, DCJ
Dave Braaksma, MCSO
Doug Bray, Circuit Court Administrator
Drew Brosh, MCSO
Jann Brown, DCJ
Nancy Cozine, Oregon Judicial Department
Rachel Hardesty, PSU-Restorative Justice
Glenna Hayes, Center for Family Success
Jason Heilbrun, County IT - Public Safety
Pam Hiller, MCHD
Rob Ingram, Office of Youth Violence Prevention
Neal Japport, Oregon Judicial Department
Barry Jennings, Oregon Judicial Department
Matt Jones, PSU
Matthew Lashua, Commissioner Shiprack's Office
Kate Lieber, Mayor's Office
Shea Marshman, County Auditor's Office
William Nunley, Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law
Charlene Rhyne, DCJ
Wayne Wakeland, PSU
Mary Zinkin, Citizen

Announcements

Peter Ozanne announced that Elizabeth Davies has left the County and is now living and working in Washington DC. The position of LPSCC System Analyst has been filled by Matt O'Keefe, who previously held a position with the County as an analyst for DCJ.

II. LPSCC Retreat

Materials: LPSCC agenda template

Judy Shiprack opened the meeting. Peter Ozanne introduced Dana Brown, a professional facilitator brought in to run the retreat. She recently worked in the county as Chief of Staff to Commissioner Barbara Willer. The traditional purpose of the retreat is to identify the priority efforts of the council for the coming year. However, this year the retreat will examine the process of LPSCC meetings and attempt to improve on it. Ozanne suggested issues to consider, including council membership, meeting process, level of inter-agency coordination, and use of data.

Dana Brown outlined the agenda and some of her expectations for how the retreat discussion was to proceed. She began the reflection process by posing three questions aimed at identifying the core values of LPSCC:

- How does LPSCC currently benefit you and your organization?
- How does LPSCC currently benefit the wider community?
- What are LPSCC's greatest strengths?

Council members were given two minutes to discuss these questions with a neighbor.

Responses to the question "How does LPSCC benefit you and your organization":

- Jean Maurer: the opportunity to interact with other people is crucial
- Julie Frantz: being able to catch somebody who it may be difficult to get in contact with otherwise; identify who holds what position
- Karl Brimner: gives context to the issue of mental health and its importance to public safety
- Suzanne Hayden: helps be informed about what are important issues
- Mike Schrunck: the group has broad informational value; also the opportunity to meet with people before and after; this group feeds into CJAC which is more of an operations group that can "get stuff done"

How does LPSCC benefit the community

- Scott Taylor: in many other communities, you would not have all of these folks sitting in the same room being civil – this allows for members to be aware of the actions of other members
- Judy Hadley: the public is heartened to know that people from different departments are willing to come together and discuss things on a general basis; the dialogue in the past used to be "flinty" but its more civilized now
- Joanne Fuller: there seems to be a missing link between this group and the community – there isn't a group that has a broad community perspective. Members must pursue their own way to reach community dialogue – this is a place for a professional dialogue, but not so much community dialogue.
- Lane Borg: fewer changes that cause huge disruptions in the system: for example, open booking was anticipated
- Mike Reese: LPSCC forces communication

What are LPSCC's current strengths?

- Drew Brosh: because of who is represented at the table

Please contact Matt O'Keefe with questions, comments, or concerns.

Email: matthew.g.okeefe@multco.us

Phone: (503) 988-5002

- Avoid unintended consequences
- The knowledge that we meet once a month and have the opportunity to problem solve or identify problems and solve them outside of the meeting
- The collegiality of the meeting is good
- Information sharing occurs at the same time and
- What works is generally interesting
- Because many of the members have been involved for a while, there is a high level of general knowledge
- Judy Shiprack: from the perspective of budgets, which are constructed and evaluated from a perspective of “silos” LPSCC offers a place for the agencies come together
- Schrunk: one of the strengths is the differences of the members: there are so many independently elected people who come to this table, but they all come together here because all of their work touches on the other people

The next question is to think about a “vision” for LPSCC: is it information sharing, is it decision and action based – what are the activities and the culture at the table that you want to focus on.

- Lane Borg: we become the GAO of public safety, evaluating ideas of public safety
- Bill Feyerherm: The mutual support system to communicate with the public
- Debrah Hansen: more joint planning, for example,
- Scott Taylor: knowledge bank – too much of the knowledge around the table is looked up in dusty binders. If this was available for members to share, that would be good
- Drew Brosh: focus more on the local offender, rather than the ones who are sent away
- Joanne Fuller: this is place to identify problems and opportunities and create common understanding
- Sam Adams: having a performance dashboard, having a feeling of the status of the whole system; for example knowing about the gang violence before it was in the newspaper. Not necessarily more data, but more insight. Having a consistent set of data points in front of everyone at every meeting that gives them a “view of the system”
- Karen Gray: educating people and prevention efforts, moving away from being so reactive
- Judy Hadley: more action and decisions come out of the council’s discussions and the reports provided each month – recommendation to the county board and the city council as appropriate. Not letting information just hang out there.
- Peter Ozanne: we’re too polite – we should acknowledge our differences and the agencies that are at cross purposes. The city generates the business for the county public safety system by arresting people – we need to bring out these differences and cross purposes so they can be aired. One way to do this is a dashboard, showing the resource impacts – is the system right sized? So that all the agencies are operating at a similar level of capacity. Data should be the vehicle for looking at this
- Chiquita Rollins: LPSCC should look at social justice issues and not just criminal justice issues: so the interaction of social justice issues (race, poverty, education) and the criminal justice system.
- Julie Frantz: being open to receiving the impact on other entities.
- Jean Maurer: Many of the criminal justice issues are decided at the ballot box, having a profound impact on the criminal justice system – the public may have a very different view from the people around the table about how to best administer justice. To the degree that the public and the agency heads disagree, that should be aired and decided. (the judiciary can do education but it cannot take sides)

- Suzanne Hayden: a unified, informed voice on criminal justice policy. This group is “the smartest people in the room and if they can vet an issue and present it to the public unified, that is very powerful. This group can present issues to the public
- Mike Reese: looking at the underlying causes of what is driving criminal behavior (may be social justice or system efficiencies) and implementing ideas that actually work. For example, drug abuse drives a lot of property crime – so what are we doing to help prevent people from becoming drug addicts
- Karl Brimner: this group should play more of a role in making recommendations to policy makers
- Mike Schrunk: like the knowledge bank idea of Scott Taylor. This group needs to have information about the cutting edge and always looking forward. Jumping off of what Suzanne said, we need to have a better link with the public, so that we know what the public wants. Sometimes, there is a big disconnect between what the public wants and what is being performed. An education process (transparency) helps the public understand.
- Judy Shiprack: We are walking a line between what the evidence tells us and what the public perception is. This raises the question: who are the decision makers? Do we bow to public perception or attempt to change public mind. Education. Prevention. Disassociate LPSCC with the process of punishing good behavior.
- Scott Taylor: how to create a speaker's bureau so that more than one point of view is presented when one member speaks
- Chiquita Rollins: victims should be more involved in what we do

Staff will take these ideas, organize them into themes, and allow you to decide what the future role of LPSCC should be.

Break

1:34:42

What do we do when we meet

How does the meeting start?

- Suzane Hayden: advance notice (at the beginning of the meeting or on the agenda) of any action items that the council will be voting or acting on in an upcoming meeting

How you share information with each other about current activities?

- Sam Adams: our work should be grounded by insight – agenda selection should be based on a need to discuss it.
- Peter Ozanne: A lot of agenda development is done by staff – should it be developed by staff or the chairs
- Adams: would prefer to have the agenda development influenced by the data – in other words, what is really important for us to know
- Dwight Holton: connect action items to what we ought to be doing. We could potentially create a list of “principle challenges” that form the “curriculum” for the next six months, and those topics become the main topics for each of the next meetings.
- Lane Borg: what about a rotating “agenda committee” that will develop the agenda? Membership could be rotated
- Adams: that might be good, but it might also be good that the “data people” get together before and say that the data shows something (leaves; replaced by Antoinette)

Please contact Matt O'Keefe with questions, comments, or concerns.

Email: matthew.g.okeefe@multco.us

Phone: (503) 988-5002

What does the group think about preparing the agenda?

- Karen Gray: an agenda committee is a typical way to set an agenda for a meeting like this. There are a lot of people that want to present to a group like this, but we should limit those types of presentations. I support the idea of a small agenda group.
- Joanne Fuller: there are two kinds of agenda items: emerging critical issues and ongoing issues that group has identified as a priority. The executive committee could establish the larger issues for a year and the agenda group could be the gatekeeper for the emerging issues. Meeting time could be divided between the types of agenda items.
- Judy Shiprack: A reminder: this is the executive committee. The process of making an agenda is similar to a process that the committee board undertook when identifying goals and issues. We are the agenda committee
- Scott Taylor: it would be helpful for me to know when is my opinion a just “checking in” opinion and when is it actually a discussion genuinely looking for input. Being aware of the purpose of a discussion – will there be closure, that is, will the topics discussed be followed up on? Example, passing the city’s ordinance: the city had already passed it, so there was no point in having a real discussion about it.
- Julie Frantz: following up on what Scott said. Can we and do we speak as a group? Should we anticipate that we will make unified recommendation? We come together to network and problem solve, but it doesn’t mean that we will all agree.
- Karen Gray: to me, there’s two agendas. The “big” agenda and the meeting agenda. The big agenda is obviously set by the group. The meeting agenda should not be set by the staff, it should be set by a smaller group. I love the idea that there are some set of data we all look at, so that the recommendations this group makes comes from the data. A data dashboard would be very helpful, spanning from prevention to rehabilitation.

Dana Brown held a vote on whether the group wants to explore a smaller group that would help put the agenda together – most people liked the idea, no one disliked the idea, and a few weren’t sure.

- Peter Ozanne: there have been numerous ways in which the agenda has been set in the past. The staff should not make the agenda as it currently does.
- Dwight Holton: setting out a “core curriculum” for the next 6 months would allow members to plan better on how to contribute to the upcoming meetings. Having different parts of the agenda, one which would be set out in advance and the other which would be more able to respond to emerging issues
- Jean Maurer: 1) Look at the statues, 2) Look at the public safety plan that we made a few years ago established a number of issues with wide agreement around the table and we shouldn’t just ignore that
- Judy Shiprack: this discussion around the agenda reminds of the arc of the public safety system – people come from somewhere when they are arrested and go somewhere when released. The agenda needs to include at the end, a preview of coming attractions.

Dana Brown: staff will produce a document about the agenda, expectations for the meeting, and a proposal for creating an agenda committee

Topics for the coming meetings:

- Budget
- Antoinette: Race
- Child Welfare – what’s feeding arrests?

- Scott Taylor: make sure that dashboards / data are appropriate and showing the right data
- Peter Ozanne: maybe we need a data dashboard group. Reminder that Matt O'Keefe is a system analyst, who serves as an analyst not just to LPSCC but to everyone. Also he should continue to convene meetings of other public safety analysts in the county.
- Karen Gray: drugs and alcohol in schools
- Chiquita Rollins: lots of things are not represented in the brief. Also, when is the time to talk about the issues in the brief?
- Drew Brosh: I like the idea of a dashboard subcommittee. Or at least a point of contact in each agency that produces data. Understanding the context of the data is important
- Judy Shiprack: Salem should be a topic, seasonally. Prison population forecasts should be included as an indicator and evaluated for how much Multnomah County contributes to that
- Lane Borg: we should have a meeting where we review the legislative changes when the session is over
- Dwight Holton: we should take a look at reentry programs. Judge Akin in Eugene has an interesting reentry program in Eugene
- Antoinette: closing the loop of communication with the public
- Dana: you may have to spend time on topics that don't directly relate to public safety, but that are necessary to the functioning of the group, like communication with the public
- Joanne Fuller: there is a lot of action happening in the workgroups that doesn't come to the council. Every workgroup should not come present to the council, because that is a waste of time, but we should stay connected. Second, social justice, race, alcohol and drugs, etc, are all of a piece with public safety – decisions that the county makes regarding those social justice issues influence who ends up in the public safety system
- Scott Taylor: an inventory of the work that is going on, to prevent parallel groups from working on the same thing without being aware of what else is going on.
- Mike Schunk: we have so much data, we need to know what it means – that's the analyst's part: there's 3 ways: immediately, moderate level, and long range consequences.

Wrap Up:

- Summary of issues need to be compiled
- Inventory of subcommittees and working groups – what is out there
- Historical perspective for the newer members – Peter, the website is good
- Orientation for newer members – they should also get the public safety plan that happened two years ago, (for Reese)
- Defining the purpose: what is our role, are we all going to agree
- The statutes were written prospectively, when the legislature didn't know what a LPSCC was; many of the agency heads in this room cannot speak for the actions or policies of their employees, eg judges, attorneys
- Transparency – we have lost touch with the public

Evaluation:

- Peter Ozanne: we need more time on this kind of level to
- It was good to have engagement and time for discussion
-