



Governor's Re-entry Council, Steering Committee Minutes – Meeting #6 – August 6, 2008

Steering Committee Members Attending: Walt Beglau, Cindy D. Booth, Martin Burrows, Mark Cadotte, Kevin Cameron, Val Conley, Faye Fagel, Phil Lemman, Ginger Martin, Tom McClellan, Pegge McGuire, Jerry Moore, Joe O'Leary, Mark Royal, Clyde Saiki, Nancy Sellers, Ross Shepard, Heidi Steward, Patrick Vance, Vicki Walker

Guests: Krissa Caldwell, Marilyn Callahan, Patty Katz, Lauren Mitchell, Paul Solomon

Item	Discussion	Action
Welcome and Introductions		
Review of Minutes from the June 4, 2008 Meeting		Copies were distributed for review at a later date. Members are asked to send corrections/revisions to Denise Taylor.
Announcements and Updates from Members	<p>Ginger Martin asked members to share those items that are being worked on in relation to re-entry outside the priorities of the steering committee and work groups. Ginger began by saying that the ongoing work with the DMV and the new requirements around qualifying for driver license and state ID cards, add to the difficulty offenders have transitioning to the community and has heightened communication between DMV, Community Corrections Offices and the Department of Corrections. The increased communication has resulted in a better understanding of the process and also the difficulty offenders experience when attempting to get driver licenses and state ID cards.</p> <p>The DOC has submitted a Byrne Grant application at the request of the federal probation system. The federal system is dealing with the same issues as the state and, in the past, the two systems have not worked closely together. The goal is to establish a virtual 'one-stop' on the internet to make it easier to learn about and access more resources. There is an employment component, as well. Ms. Martin commented that, in the past, the state and the federal systems have had little interaction; this can be a change in which both agencies and those they serve will benefit.</p> <p>The Steering Committee's workgroups have received technical assistance from the Center for Effective Public Policy (CEPP).</p>	

Item	Discussion	Action
	<p>A recent change has been made in the process for providing medication to offenders releasing with a detainer so those needing medication are given a 30-day supply – which is the same as provided to those being released on parole or probation. Persons releasing from prison who have a detainer are usually people who are release to a jail for a very short period of time (sometimes only a day or two). In some situations, they are released immediately because of overcrowding or they clear up the detainer.</p> <p>Ginger asked Heidi Steward to talk about the new Transition Network and the Release Unit. Heidi explained that the Transition Network was convened by the Oregon Association of Community Corrections Directors (OACCD) in collaboration with the DOC. It is a network focusing on re-entry and how community corrections and DOC can better work together. One of the first goals of the network is to identify those things that can be changed without additional resources or funding. Workgroups were convened on the topics of: Release Planning; Supervision; Intake; and Training. While there is great interest in the network, only DOC and Community Corrections staff are involved at this time working to address internal release and transition processes.</p> <p>The DOC Transition and Release Unit officially became operational on July 1, 2008. All DOC release counselors report to one statewide supervisor. Before July 1st, release counselors reported to the superintendent in the institution in which they worked resulting in little consistency regarding transition efforts. Release counselors still work in the institutions, but are centrally-supervised by one manager. Ms. Steward noted that release counselor roles will be influenced by work of the Transition Network, as well as the workgroups convened by this committee.</p> <p>Ross Shepard reminded us to pay attention to the two ballot measures that will affect corrections in November, 2008: Measure 57 and Measure 61.</p> <p>Nancy Sellers announced that, in connection with the discussion of the DOC offender information being made available on the internet, there was an article in the Sunday New York Times about a free search engine: criminalsearches.com that allows entry of a name to obtain information from all states. The site lists date of birth, addresses, traffic infractions, etc.</p> <p>Ginger followed up on the discussion of the offender information that will be made available on the DOC website. This was discussed at the last steering committee meeting and a subsequent meeting with a number of representatives from other interested groups and individuals. The decision was made to <u>not</u> include criminal history or information for individuals who are on supervision in the community. The information that will be available on the site is the 'public information' that is currently listed and available on the Corrections Information</p>	

Item	Discussion	Action
	<p>System (CIS): name, DOB, height, weight, hair and eye color, institution placement, crime(s) of conviction for current incarceration only, earliest release date, and the inmate's photo. The system should be implemented by Fall, 2008.</p> <p>Joe O'Leary said he had a meeting with the Juvenile Rights Project (JRP) which has a program that focuses on school enrollment issues for youth in the dependency and/or delinquency systems. Youth offenders releasing from OYA facilities or county detention facilities who need to get enrolled in school are having a difficult time, especially in the Portland area. This program began with funding from a Byrne Grant and in the first year assisted with 50 cases. They currently have over 600 cases to be worked. Children in foster care are often moved from jurisdiction to jurisdiction and have a difficult time getting enrolled in school. The JRP is looking for assistance in funding this program and expanding it to other counties, which is why Joe is bringing the issue to the attention of the Re-entry Council Steering Committee.</p> <p>Joe brought the Re-entry Council to the attention of a workgroup of the Psychiatric Security Review Board on which he and Walt Beglau are serving. The Psychiatric Security Review Board is responsible for those individuals who have been found guilty except for insanity. The workgroup is tasked with improving the process of moving those people from the Oregon State Hospital to the community. Members of the workgroup reviewed the data on the crimes of conviction, recidivism, where they go upon release. That data was compared with DOC and local jail populations and found the small population of PSRB clients has an extremely low recidivism rate as compared to prison inmates with moderate to severe mental illnesses.</p> <p>The next area of interest to this committee in which Joe O'Leary is involved is an effort being spearheaded mainly by Representative Jeff Barker, Paul Evans, Governor's Policy Advisor and Marion County Judge Dennis Graves for assisting veterans in the courts. This effort is working to ensure the county veterans' coordinators are identifying the veteran population and assuring the full flow of benefits available to veterans are being properly directed.</p> <p>The impact of ballot measures 57 and 61 on the state's general fund is being watched very closely by the governor's office via the Economic Development Office. The economy of those states that are doing badly, include states that rely heavily on sales taxes and real estate taxes, which is not the case in Oregon. Export states like Oregon are faring fairly well, Mr. O'Leary reported. Nevertheless, the impact of expensive policy decisions, like these two ballot measures, has a negative effect.</p> <p>Patty Katz asked if we know what the fiscal impact will be if SB 1087 passes. Mr. O'Leary said the Criminal Justice Commission is working on the estimates for Oregon and their best estimate at this time is \$150 million the first biennium for SB 1087 (Measure 57). That amount</p>	

Item	Discussion	Action
	<p>is for treatment, jail beds, supervision, and DOC operations. Ballot Measure 61 is between \$250 million and \$400 million per biennium depending on the hypothesis of how district attorneys will apply the measures to their prosecution of crimes.</p> <p>Salem Police Chief Jerry Moore asked what affect the measures will have on DOC. Mr. O’Leary said both will have an impact. The measure that gets the most votes will go into effect. DOC is working to develop three budget scenarios. The measure that wins in November will go into effect quickly and have an impact on DOC very quickly. Ms. Martin said that from an operational standpoint, the more people who go to prison, the more people are released and therefore, more resources are taken out of the system for the kinds of preparation we do right now. Heidi Steward added that space in the prisons to provide treatment will also be reduced.</p> <p>Mark Royal gave an update for community corrections. He said the Transition Network is creating excitement across the state. In Union County, the City of Pendleton had a long-standing agreement with DOC (dating back to the conversion of EOCl to a prison from a mental hospital) that prohibited inmates from being taken outside the secure perimeter of the facility. DOC Director Max Williams met with officials from the City of Pendleton and worked out an agreement that allows inmates from the Two Rivers Correctional Institution (TRCI) in Umatilla and the Eastern Oregon Correctional Institution (EOCI) in Pendleton to be released to participate in a pilot program in the Umatilla County jail. The offenders are provided programming at the jail and are transitioned into a structured living environment at a program center. Throughout, they are under the supervision of the local supervisory authority.</p> <p>Ginger said Max Williams recently addressed the presidents of Oregon’s community colleges. Mr. Williams believes that inmates should have the ability to transfer their college course credits to any community college. While in prison, inmates who take college courses pay for their own college courses (or their family pays) and when the inmates are transferred from one prison to another, they often have to transfer from one community college to another. Director Williams would like to see basic courses developed that the inmates can transfer from college to college when transferred mid-course between prisons, and then transfer those credits when they are released and continue their education during their transition and community supervision phase.</p>	

Item	Discussion	Action
<p>Presentations from Workgroups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Housing presented by Pegge McGuire (attached) 	<p>Ms. McGuire reviewed the workgroup's tasks per the charter; which are to identify existing successful housing practices; identify barriers and identify achievable systems improvements.</p> <p><u>Successful Models Identified:</u></p> <p>Level 1: (Staffed and service enriched for immediately released offenders)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sponsors, Inc. • YWCA housing • Corrections' sponsored housing: Central City Concern – Multnomah County <p>Level 2: (Unstaffed, unsupervised, drug free w/o additional services)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oxford Houses • United Community Action Housing in Roseburg • Other: • Ready to Rent Programs (reach-in and subsequent to release) • Sympathetic private landlords (several are workgroup members) <p><u>Barriers Identified:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient rental assistance funding • Insufficient development funding • Need to change the mind-set of the public and private system • Transportation • Special needs population, i.e. aging population, families, disabled, language, spirituality, cultural and social challenges • Limited emphasis on alternative release programs • Counties with limited resources • Lack organizations for support • Lack options for transportation, employment, housing • Rural communities' special needs often overlooked • Private sector has limited motivation to change • HUD rules prohibit specific resource use for offenders • Some Oxford Houses in foreclosure; others struggle to continue operating • Limited financial support must focus on those likely to remain <p><u>Achievable by January 2009:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marion County Re-entry Initiative; developing program similar to Sponsors, Inc.; funding this effort is recommended • Incorporate housing into newly developed Transition and Release Unit work • Recruit a VISTA volunteer to teach Ready-to-Rent program in institutions • Train the trainer could be accomplished by OHCS <p><u>Achievable within the Next Few Years:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develop a pool of experts to act as technical assistants to communities that want to create transitional housing. ▪ Place more emphasis on transitional housing as part of each county's required 	<div style="text-align: center;">  Housing Report </div>

Item	Discussion	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment Presented by Martin Burrows (attached) 	<p>This group is scheduled to meet again before the next Re-entry Council meeting. The first meeting (July 2, 2008) was spent mainly reviewing the workgroup's charter and produced recommendations for amending the charter.</p> <p>Meeting #2 (July 24, 2008) with Peggy Burke from the Center for Effective Public Policy, National Institute of Corrections in Washington, DC reviewed each goal.</p> <p>Goal #1 is an overarching goal of which many others are a part.</p> <p>Increase employment of offenders by private sector businesses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consider value of job developers & incentives for employers ▪ Review the Welfare-to-Work program as a model and programs from other states. <p>What is working well?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Subsidized employment with TANF recipients (Jobs Plus Program) ▪ Vocational Rehabilitation and Veterans Vocational Rehabilitation subsidized employment ▪ Job developers and former inmate counselors <p>Barriers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Offender motivation ▪ Supervision practices conflict with offender work schedules ▪ Negative language by DOC to employers regarding offenders employment ▪ Oregon not participating in federal bonding program (Example: Washington State) ▪ WOTC is complicated and used mainly by large employers ▪ Restrictions of offenders not known to employers ▪ Preconceptions by employers ▪ Application check-box to indicate conviction of a felony <p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ OJT through local WIA systems (costly) ▪ Marion County creating legislative initiative with employer incentives ▪ PowerPoint presentation available from Marion County focus groups to help develop marketing strategy <p>Goal #3: Provide skill development and educational opportunities for DOC inmates.</p> <p>What is working well?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oregon Corrections Enterprises (OCE) employs about 10% of inmates. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Must have a GED ○ Must apply (just as outside) ○ Job skills developed 	 <p>Employment Report</p>

Item	Discussion	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Certification provided ○ Work areas include: laundry; metal work; print shop ○ Taught “soft skills” and effort made to increase motivation ▪ Workforce Development Unit (DOC) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Develops needed math and reading skills ○ Provides tutoring ○ Provides a small welding apprenticeship program <p>Barriers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Miss certain inmate populations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Short time to release ○ No GED ▪ Moves to releasing institutions disrupt jobs and training ▪ Significant number of offenders releasing without job skills ▪ Inconsistent admission criteria between institutions (efforts to standardize ongoing) ▪ Lack of motivation ▪ Lack of employment readiness assessment <p>Workgroup identified areas of ‘best’ or ‘promising’ practices and members volunteered to research specific areas. They are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identify package of employer incentives: Kimberly Allain <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Tax incentive ○ Job retention incentive ○ Employment subsidy ○ Bonding ○ Soft skills development ○ Workers’ compensation credit ▪ Develop a marketing/education strategy: Carl Jaber <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Methods ○ Media ▪ Develop a strategy to assure offenders who have worked successfully in prison have skill verification: Andy Parker <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide references and/or certification ○ Possibly use Department of Labor skill inventory ○ Develop a portfolio ○ Use iMatch skills program ○ Support from OCE supervisor (currently discouraged) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Job retention strategies: Chris Murfin ○ Keeping the job as important as getting the job ○ Support for employees and employers ○ Look to Welfare-to-Work for best practices 	

Item	Discussion	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Job replacement strategies: Heidi Soderberg <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ First job may, necessarily, be short-term ○ Provides immediate income and stabilization ▪ Collaboration of key stakeholders: Kimberly Allain <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Parole and Probation Officer ○ Employer ○ Job Developer ○ Employee ▪ Lessons from Welfare-to-Work: Chris Murfin ▪ Job developer message should be: Dale Nobisch <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Asset-based ○ Positive ○ Balanced: present offender in positive light/candor with employer ○ More focus on Welfare-to-Work <p>Resource: Oregon Employment and Training Association (OETA) Job Development Network</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bring more business community representatives to the table: Chris Murfin and Kimberly Allain <p>Report from DOC indicating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How offenders get employment services ▪ What employment services are available ▪ Number (%) of inmates considered job ready by DOC at release ▪ Number of inmates working jobs & what are those jobs ▪ Criteria for admission to specific programs ▪ Is programming available with emphasis on soft skills and/or job readiness <p>Low hanging fruit;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Job experience and skill level verification at release ▪ Allow input into and explanation of release planning by DOC ▪ State-issued identification with photograph at release – absolute essential. <p>When asked for comments regarding presentation to the full council, Marilyn Callahan expressed concern about the required treatment and reporting required by offenders that frequently conflicts with work.</p> <p>Heidi Steward suggested summarizing the list of barriers when reporting out to the council. Focus more on the direction the workgroup is headed and on the work going to be done. Mr. Solomon asked about the status of providing birth certificates. Ms. Steward said DOC has applied for over 7,000 with more than 5,000 responses received. She also reported that DOC, along with all other state departments of corrections, has received a memo of understanding (MOU) from the Social Security Administration which explains a process for providing Social</p>	

Item	Discussion	Action
	<p>Security cards in batches. Ms. Steward is reviewing the MOU.</p> <p>Patty Katz reiterated the importance of the messaging done by DOC and others in communications with regard to employment and housing. Pegge McGuire suggested that the presentation to the full council should be consolidated into common themes to create a report that is concise and easily digested because there is so much information and yet many overlapping issues and ideas. Senator Walker supported this approach of condensing the information and keeping the presentation focused.</p> <p>Ms. Martin requested steering committee members send suggestions to her and she will prepare the report for the Council. She will send the draft report to the steering committee members for comment about a week prior to the Council meeting. She said it is important to let the Council know what your decision making process has been up to this point.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continuity of Care presented by Patrick Vance (attached) 	<p>Mr. Vance said the workgroup is a diverse, enthusiastic group, some of whom have worked with one another on various issues in the past, and were quick to engage in discussion focused on the tasks as laid out in the charter. The workgroup has met only twice, the first meeting just three weeks ago. The first meeting began with a short, yet fast-paced, brainstorming session. The second meeting was facilitated by Peggy Burke from the Center for Effective Policy at which they brainstormed and put ideas on paper. This dove-tailed well with the work at the first meeting.</p> <p>Mr. Vance explained that the workgroup decided early on that they were not going to be self-limiting; that they would raise all the issues they know to be challenges and then refine their focus. They asked themselves the question, What are the things we think are necessary to be considered and what questions might come up about how you advise someone about continuity of care for incarcerated people?</p> <p>Changes in the charter were discussed based on the necessity to have open communication between the entities involved to foster continuity of care. It was determined the charter should also address key populations and key needs of those populations such as dental care, substance abuse and chemical dependency. Although the workgroup understands the current work is to be focused on offenders returning from prison to the community, their interest extends to those returning from jail and those on supervision having never been incarcerated.</p> <p>We identified the need for a framework to assist in understanding the complexities of the needs and barriers and to effectively communicate those in order that they are proactively addressed.</p>	 <p>Continuity of Care Report</p>

Item	Discussion	Action
	<p>The following goals and specific barriers were identified:</p> <p>Goal #1: Offenders will leave custody with medication and an appointment with a community provider.</p> <p>Barriers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Difficulty in finding a provider in the county system. ▪ Lack of pro bono and other providers willing to take patients who lack insurance and have a history of criminal involvement. ▪ Lack of funding and/or insurance coverage. Persons not covered by the Oregon Health Plan do not receive many benefits. ▪ Some state, local and/or private resources do not view this population as a priority for services. ▪ Lapses in state funding make programs less reliable and constant. ▪ Rules for Oregon Medicaid are problematic <p>Goal #2: Offenders will leave custody with a birth certificate and state-issued identification and established eligibility for appropriate benefits.</p> <p>Barriers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ DOC system is inconsistent from prison to prison particularly where pre-release application for benefits is concerned. Staff turnover disrupts the process and there are no formal, appropriate procedures within DOC. ▪ A DHS-based pre-release process is in place, but does not have adequate funding and staffing to handle the number of claims that will be generated when the DOC process is fully implemented. <p>Goal #3: A similar treatment approach will be used in custody and in the community.</p> <p>Barriers:</p> <p>The workgroup felt that this goal really means that quality treatment should be available while an offender is in custody, and should also be available in the community upon release. To accomplish this requires getting treatment to the patient – not vice versa – and the system is not geared to do this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A lack of education among community providers regarding the criminal justice system and its clients. ▪ A lack of knowledge about evidence-based practice models regarding community treatment with the population. Forensic community treatment teams could be a model approach here; also, mobile crisis teams for mental health emergencies. <p>Goal #4: In-custody medical records must be easily accessible to health care providers in the community and vice versa. Electronic medical records should be considered to</p>	

Item	Discussion	Action
	<p>facilitate information sharing.</p> <p>Barriers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lack of an electronic medical records system at DOC ▪ Cost ▪ Different systems/bureaucratic barriers ▪ Confidentiality (the group states there are solutions to this perceived barrier) <p>Goal #5: Ideally, community treatment providers should have some contact with the patient prior to release.</p> <p>Barriers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lack of capacity and time among providers. <p>Resource:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Perhaps this could become part of routine discharge planning so contacts, as appropriate, would be made as part of the overall release planning effort. In many cases, contacts can be made by phone or video-conferencing. <p>Goal #6: An advocate in the institution and in the community to assist with the application process for state and federal benefits.</p> <p>Barriers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Social Security Administration. There is no one in the Salem office available to participate on this workgroup. <p>Resource:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seek cooperation from local SSA offices around the state, which have shown to be more cooperative and helpful because they are familiar with local issues. <p>Goal #7: In addition to coordination of care, there is a need for additional access to dental treatment in and out of custody. The workgroup should explore models for improving dental care in custody settings and in the community, including developing pro bono work arrangements and creating tax credits.</p> <p>Barriers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Diet in the institutions exacerbates dental health problems. ▪ DOC lack of resources and capacity to provide adequate dental services. ▪ Dental care, as a basic need, has lagged behind other medical care in the general society – and it has lagged behind within corrections, perhaps as a reflection of the larger attitudes about the offender population within the community. ▪ Societal funding paradigm doesn't fit within corrections – ratio of patients to dollars per dentist – because incarcerated population's dental pathologies are so extremely 	

Item	Discussion	Action
	<p>widespread.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pro bono resources in private offices are not likely to be viable. ▪ No clarity about standards of care for dental care in correctional institutions. <p>Possible resources/models:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Learn qualifications for county public health dental clinics. ▪ Dental schools and schools of dental hygiene ▪ Medical Teams International (MTI) ▪ Dental Foundation of Oregon ▪ Northwest Foundation ▪ NW Dental Van – community-based services, also serves Umatilla County Jail. <p>Targeting scarce resources (see table page 3 in attached report).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How should we manage those at low risk to re-offend with high health needs? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Workgroup to address further <p>Central Thematic Challenge</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How do we develop a safety net below the societal safety net for the re-entry population? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Society funds programs to help meet basic needs ○ Those with the greatest needs are assisted first (children, elderly, single parents) <p>The Gaps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Those with emergent medical, mental health and dental needs often require ongoing monitoring and maintenance and have an extensive history of involvement with criminal justice system. ○ Often ineligible for services available within the traditional safety net system. ○ Compete for the same services and resources. <p>One concept emerging is the need for a seamless re-entry process designed to address unique needs and challenges of the population that ensures links to post-release services are created early in transition planning and meaningful communication and information sharing become the norm. The workgroup will develop specific recommendations to support multi-disciplinary discharge planning based on the Counselor Caseload Management Initiative. (See page 6)</p> <p>Short-term Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Establish Medicaid Eligibility for all (or at least more) of those re-entering offenders who meet Social Security disability criteria. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Currently, only a small number of offenders are being processed during transition. 	

Item	Discussion	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ DHS does not have the staff or funding available to hire and train staff to process all of the offenders releasing who meet the disability criteria. ▪ Adopt a practice within DOC, that every offender being released from prison—who is currently and appropriately receiving medication—will have with them a 30 day supply of such medication, and an appropriate connection to a community provider. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Transition planning includes supplying 30-day supply of meds. ○ Applications be completed and submitted for the Oregon Prescription Drug Program when applicable. ○ Indigent medication programs be utilized by community corrections agencies ▪ Expansion of Oregon Health Plan Standard <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Adopt a formal position of support to the funding proposal currently being considered to expand the number of individuals eligible for the Oregon Health Plan. ○ Explore options to ensure other stakeholders support this position, as well. <p>Ms. Martin asked for feedback and comments on the report. Ms. Fagel said this discussion is important when talking about individuals most likely to reoffend and compare those people to someone with high health needs, but low risk to reoffend. Without addressing the health issues, the person may become more likely to reoffend. The Council will need to make the decisions of how to utilize the limited resources most effectively and identify the target population.</p> <p>Ms. Martin will summarize the information from the workgroups and any other information provided to pass on to the Council. Clyde Saiki will provide information to Ginger on the proposed changes to Medicaid, which the Council can review for working with our federal representatives in Washington, DC. Ms. McGuire asked if the Continuity of Care Workgroup has done any research into best practices found to be successful in other states. Mr. Vance said they will meet again before the Council meets and should have some information to provide to the Council in that area. Ms. Martin requested information regarding the current eligibility for county mental health care.</p> <p>Mr. Vance said he had the opportunity to attend the US Public Health Service Scientific Conference and met with Captain Beverly Dandridge after her presentation. The Federal Bureau of Prisons' health care is provided by the US Public Health Service. Captain Dandridge was able to provide some information about some of the same issues we are trying to resolve and those best practices will be provided to Ms. Martin for inclusion in her report to the Council.</p>	

Item	Discussion	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One Stop Workgroup Presented by Ross Shepard 	<p>This workgroup's last meeting included the facilitator from the Center for Effective Public Policy, Peggy Burke. This group was the last of the four workgroups with which Ms. Burke met. The discussion she led helped the workgroup clarify their role in the process as a coordination point for the other three workgroups. They came to their recommendations by consensus.</p> <p>Mr. Shepard did not have a written report, but referenced the workgroup's meeting minutes (attached) as his presentation notes. The "low-hanging fruit" identified by this workgroup is the same as the other three workgroups. The one stop as described by the workgroup is the establishment of a physical site, readily accessible by public transportation where all of the resources available within the jurisdiction, most likely a county, although it could be a region, would be available.</p> <p>The workgroup based their list of services on what is currently available in the Multnomah County one stops. The employees work for non-profit community organizations and would be responsible for reach-in prior to release.</p> <p>The One-Stop Work Group recommends one-stop sites incorporate the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assessment and planning – including reach-in ▪ Identification – birth certificate, social security card and state photo ID ▪ Education – GED, vocational, etc. ▪ Employment – skills development and assessing job readiness ▪ Physical, dental, and mental health evaluation and referrals ▪ Housing ▪ Family and Community ▪ Legal – Oregon State Bar (Ross has a proposal where pro bono services could be offered in return for free CLE credits). Also consider reduced rate lawyers ▪ Alcohol and drug assessment/treatment ▪ Transportation (bus tokens and schedules) ▪ Cognitive behavior therapy ▪ Disability and eligibility for benefits (SSI, food stamps, etc.) ▪ Basic needs – Food, clothing, furniture, etc. ▪ Parole and Probation Officer contact – responses to violations ▪ Faith-based community volunteers – establish one-on-one relationships <p>This workgroup envisions the one stop as a coordinating and service delivery point; which can be a virtual place or a physical place or both. Developing a messaging strategy is believed to be extremely important for garnering support from businesses, private citizens, the faith community and non-profits, as well as local public agencies. A broad base is needed along with collaboration of stakeholders. Integrated case management should involve Parole and</p>	 <p>One Stop Report</p>

Item	Discussion	Action
	<p>Probation Officers, community based organizations and access to inmates' DOC transition plan. We should develop pilot projects that are consistent with the principles in the Integrated Case Management Supervision Model (ICMS) emerging from the National Institute of Corrections' Transition from Prison to the Community Initiative.</p> <p>There are currently two strong programs; one in Multnomah County and one in Marion County. There is also a nascent program in Lane County. Lane Community College is exploring the possibility of using the downtown branch of the community college as the one stop. The Marion County program is a wonder collaboration of the jail, Community Corrections and Catholic Charities. Multnomah County has a program well coordinated by ROAR (Re-entry Organizations and Referral), which is a collaboration of non-profits. The coordinating member for this project is Mercy Corps which is an international, national, not faith-based, non-profit corporation. They are interested in providing the coordination and administration of this effort, possibly statewide. Multnomah County has applied for and is expecting to receive a large grant from United Way to fund the one stop. They have also applied to other private foundations and have received some favorable feedback. This is the kind of public/private partnership the citizens of Oregon would support if we could replicate that program.</p> <p>Across the country, there are a few one stops in other large, Eastern, urban areas, such as Philadelphia, Baltimore, New York City, Washington, DC. We didn't find much to duplicate in those programs.</p> <p>We urge the Council to develop a messaging program for all of these needs and release strategy that would include editorial boards, messages directed toward landlords, employers and the public. The workgroup developed the idea of a legislative bill that would require each county to have criteria in place to receive funding. The funding, on a per capita basis, would not be from the Community Corrections Grant, but from outside the restrictions of SB1145. This proposal does require further research and the workgroup plans to have completed the research prior to the next Council meeting. This is an ambitious idea, which holds a huge amount of promise for reducing recidivism that would pay for itself.</p> <p>Ginger asked for feedback. Senator Walker asked if the workgroup had discussed the virtual one-stop that Judge Aiken has proposed. Mr. Shepard said he had spoken to Judge Aiken and the DOC has applied for a Byrne Grant to finance the establishment of a one stop at Sponsor's, Inc. in Eugene. However, many offenders are not familiar with computers, so the web-based one-stop can be a first step. The smaller populations in counties outside the valley, along with transportation challenges, make access of a stationary one stop difficult. The idea of state agencies and federal agencies working together on the virtual one stop is a unique approach that could lead to other joint projects.</p>	

Item	Discussion	Action
	<p>Pegge McGuire said every county in the state is served by a community action agency and they administer a number of the same services we're discussing. The services are paid for, in part, with block grant money. She suggested placing a parole officer into the current service provider offices and sharing the information and resources. Mr. Shepard said they did discuss that possibility.</p> <p>Ms Martin asked if the workgroup had discussed ways to further the ideas about ease of access to services that don't require funding. Mr. Ross said it is in the list of low hanging fruit. Multnomah County is definitely going to proceed with their plans and Marion County is also going forward. Mr. O'Leary said that if we have a successful, working model to which we can direct the attention of the legislature, we can build the momentum from there. Ms. Martin said that now that the Second Chance Act has passed, we should be hearing soon about the criteria for funding and how much money is available in each area. Mr. Solomon asked if Ms Martin had an update on the status of the Second Chance Act funding. Ms Martin said she had some very general information, but no criteria or dollar amounts. Mr. O'Leary suggested that we would not know anything definitive until after the general election in November. Areas they intend to fund are workforce development, employment, drug and alcohol treatment, mentoring programs, among others. Some funding streams can go only to governmental bodies, some only to non profits, there is a grant to Department of Labor and replicates a grant Multnomah County has and there are a number of topical areas that match very nicely the issues we are working.</p> <p>Patty Katz explained a program she is working with that has brought together 24 agencies and organizations. They asked each one how many people they can provide complimentary services to and created a large map with the information. This can be shared with the workgroups. Mr. Shepard said that there are a number of different programs ongoing in Multnomah County working on the housing issue, but there wasn't much coordination and that is what this group can provide. Ms. Katz invited everyone interested and available to attend their next meeting the following day.</p> <p>Mr. O'Leary suggested that the more we can couch this concept as a coordinating function and managing existing resources and existing places, rather than as creating a new layer requiring new funding, the more successful the prognosis is going to be.</p>	
Next Steps	<p>Ms. Martin will prepare the presentation for the Re-entry Council meeting on August 27, 2008, by combining information from each workgroup's presentation. She recommends including some the "what's working" models. The steering committee agreed with Ms. Martin's assessment of doing an overview with a more global approach. Ms. McGuire suggested presenting a number of themes of recommendations, such as legislative concepts; future funding concepts; and interagency cooperative efforts, etc. Ms. Martin</p>	

Item	Discussion	Action
	intends to include praise of the incredibly talented, diverse workgroups that are coming with a wealth of knowledge from many perspectives and relate to the council that the right people are at the table. Ms. Martin will also include re-entry efforts being accomplished around the state.	
Next Meeting	The next meeting will be September 3, 2008 (Subsequently cancelled)	