

## Policy Team Meeting – #3 Meeting

**Minutes**
**Wednesday, August 5, 2015, 12-1:30pm**
**Attendance:**

Debroah Kafoury	County Commissioner	Chair
Nancy Bennett	Chair's Office	Chief of Staff
Israel Hammond	Chair's Office	Intern
Mathew Lashua	District 3	Chief of Staff
Nan Waller	Circuit Court	Presiding Judge
Julie Franz	Circuit Court	Chief Criminal Judge
Ed Jones	Circuit Court	Judge
Kevin Modica	Portland Police Bureau	Assnt. Chief
Mary Lindstrand	Sherriff's Office	Captain
Shea Marshman	Sherriff's Office	Director of Research & Planning
Jay Scroggin	Dept. Community Justice	Manager Senior
Jeff Howes	District Attorney	Deputy DA First Assnt.
Caroline Wong	District Attorney	Deputy DA
Joanne Fuller	Health Dept.	Director
Ebony Clarke	Mental Health & Addiction Services Divs.	Assnt.Divs. Director
Sara Roberts	Mental Health & Addiction Services Divs.	Program & Communications Specialist
C.J. Robins	City of Portland, Black Male Achievement	Director
Justin Robinson	City of Portland, Black Male Achievement	Intern
Lane Borg	Metropolitan Public Defender	Executive Director
Ben Duncan	Office of Diversity & Equity	Director
Abbey Stamp	Local Public Safety Coordinating Council	Executive Director
Christina Youssi	Local Public Safety Coordinating Council	Executive Assnt.
Lindsay Stover	Mental Health & Addiction Services Divs.	Program Specialist Senior

**A.) Introductions:**

Partners stated organization and role.

**B.) Summary of Site Visit #2:**

Abbey asked for feedback and comments:

- We continue to clarify and drill down what reducing the local jail population means. Equally, we continue to struggle with how to go about that along with decreasing the populations we have chosen to target: Racial and Ethnic Disparities (RED), individuals with Severe Behavioral Health issues, and frequent fliers of the system.
  - Jail reduction and our populations of focus – what is the sweet spot? This needs to be clarified before we move on to next steps and develop our strategies.
  - Aggregate Data Template will be completed by 8/6 and distributed soon. This snapshot will assist us in clarifying these strategies.
  - Question of whether or not the template will allow us to spit out what would happen if we went down the path of x strategy? Shea answered that this is a beginning conversation of how DSSJ should be restructured and what we want out of a database in terms of getting us the data to inform policy decisions. Template will not do this.

- Feedback from site coordinators: every jurisdiction is struggling with similar issues around these difficult discussions.
  - Reminder: this effort is focusing on strategic, long-term solutions. MacArthur has recommended that the 15-20% reduction in jail beds is what they are looking for and our plan will focus on creating a reduction that is meaningful for our public safety system over the length of the funding period. We will be focusing on the populations that are within our control, strategies that ensure public safety, and achievable/ thoughtful improvements that are sustainable for the long-term.

#### Other discussion points:

- SJC Data Team will develop a summary sheet of data-related gaps and recommended solutions. Team is meeting on 8/6 and will share the developed document by the end of the week.
- Length of stay is an important place to look at in terms of reduction in jail beds.
- Philosophical considerations: focus on *how* and *who* are we reducing vs. gross number of reduction in beds. Will our application be as competitive if we focus on these difficult populations, as opposed to just focusing on largest gross reduction?
  - Abbey will follow-up with Site Coordinator, Lore Joplin, to get further clarification.

Summary: Next steps are to overlay the completed Aggregate Data Template along the System Map and 7 Decision Points; Calculate the Relative Rate Index (RRI) of Racial/Ethnic Disparities at each of the Decision Points; and Prioritize Decision Points. This work will help to prepare us to develop a Logic Model during the third Site Visit.

#### **C.) Low Level Inmate Definition and Prioritization:**

Abbey led the group in a prioritization exercise.

- Team reviewed/ edited language and list:
  - Law Enforcement Options
    - Non-booking options
  - Pretrial Policy Holds
    - Pre-Trial release improvements (processes, PJO, staffing, efficiencies, etc.)
  - Sentenced Misdemeanants
    - Using more jail time than their felony counterparts
  - Bench Probationers
    - Decrease the number of bench probations and develop “appropriate use” for formal and bench probations: Sorting and supervision of misdemeanor probationers
    - List of 43 misdemeanors for which a person can be placed on bench probation
- Individual members voted on how the four areas should be prioritized (1-4, with 1 being the top priority and 4 being the last priority).
- Project coordination team will tabulate results and share at next meeting.

#### Other discussion points:

- All throughout the system, data collection and analytics needs improvement.
- Prioritization considerations:
  - Input
  - Volume
  - Control
  - Public Safety
  - Complexity
  - Overlapping impact with RED and BH
  - Funding implications
  - Victims Rights
  - Public Perception
  - Existing Community Resources



#### **D.) Community Input Process:**

MacArthur strongly recommends that we develop a process to ensure community input is included in our planning process. We need to quickly develop a plan to include input from community partners, providers/stakeholders, consumers, peers, and supporters (not just professionals or partners, but community members).

#### Discussion Points:

- Levering existing tables or stakeholder groups, eg: Partnership for Safety and Justice (PSJ) has forums that we could tap, we could invite them to host an evening event and they could invite their folks to come in – so we don't have to invent something (Lane Borg).
- We need folks who have experienced disparities and consumers of the MH system to provide input. We need to be very clear about the area we are asking them to have input into and how we intend on using it.
- Informed input is difficult to get from community input processes – how can we provide enough education around the topics we are concerned with in this limited time, to ensure quality input so it is a respectful process.
  - Need to have specific, focused questions and good facilitation.
- MCJRP: Offenders and Treatment Providers were the most important groups the team talked to about the project to get feedback.
- STRIVE past surveys and collected information: review this information and pull any feedback applicable to this process.
- Existing tables to leverage:
  - Black Male Initiative – Justice Reform Committee
  - COAB (PPB)
  - Victims Groups
  - 2 Mental Health Advisory Committees that are half consumers
  - Community Peace Collaborative
  - Partners: law enforcement, lawyers, bench, treatment providers, etc.
  - Community Health Workers
  - Peers and peer-led organizations
- 2 roles: (1) informing as to the decisions we have been made and why; (2) share what they would like to see in a re-envisioned system.
- Should we try to put together a survey and utilize technology to get some wider feedback as well as detailed feedback?
  - Multiple strategies may work best for this process.
- Geographic considerations on feedback are important as it will change the feedback around the purpose of jail and policing.
- Procedural fairness survey will begin in Sept. all parts of the public safety service system building in customer service feedback loops. This is happening and should be coordinated with SJC.
  - Ask people what the feedback loop should be to build into the proposal going forward.
- Decolonizing research from Health Department employee (Dr. Lau) what are the questions to ask to frame the conversation. This is an important concept to keep in mind.

#### Next Steps:

1. Utilize input already collected through STRIVE.
2. Utilize additional sources of information: Procedural Fairness Survey (when it's complete), Board Briefings on Culturally Specific Services and Budget Briefings, etc.
3. Put together a plan for a feedback session and leveraging other tables to ask people targeted questions around: "what should the ongoing input process be for this project and the overall Public Safety system?" Community outreach at the community level centered on defining what those research questions will be, instead of asking canned questions. This feedback will be used to design a meaningful engagement process in the implementation plan.



### **E.) Next Steps and Closing:**

- Update from Lore: RED – monitor the impact of strategies (outcomes) on communities of color and disparities, rather than targeting groups of people and trying to get them out of jail.
  - Aligns with our plan to analyze the Relative Rate Index (RRI) to identify disparities along the decision points.
  - Equity and Empowerment Lens utilized to develop strategies and analyze 5 P's.
- All Sites Meeting in October (6<sup>th</sup> – 8<sup>th</sup>): 8 people can attend per site.
- ISLG Site Visit: AUG 11<sup>th</sup> – 13<sup>th</sup>
- Next Policy Team Meeting: AUG 19<sup>th</sup>, 12pm-1:30pm, Multnomah Bldg., Room B14
  - a. Goals: RRI for all decision points – great place to use the Equity and Empowerment LENS to consider 4 P's and guide our strategies
- Site Visit #3: SEPT 2<sup>nd</sup>, 8am-2pm, Multnomah Bldg., Room 315

