

FILE NOTE March 6, 2008

By: Teresa J. Wilson, County Counsel
David Garnick, Budget and Financial Planning Manager
Greta Utecht, Human Resources Manager

Agenda Item: ITMO Transferring Lane County Parole and Probation Services from the Department of Health and Human Services to the Department of Public Safety and Restructuring the Supervisory Authority Team

The Sheriff's Office has spent considerable time and effort in preparation of this agenda item, and in processing the concept with a variety of those groups who would be impacted by it, for which they should be commended. Ultimately, this is a policy choice for the Board, who must weigh and balance authority, service delivery and fiscal issues with what is in the best interests of the citizens for both the short term and the long term.

1. Legal Issue: Does the Board want to retain any authority over the placement of the parole and probation function under the Home Rule Charter?

The Home Rule charter provides as follows:

Section 22. CHANGES IN ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENTS.

(2) Any action

(a) to combine the department of public safety or the department of assessment and taxation with each other or with another administrative department of the county,

(b) to abolish either department, or

(c) to take from either any of its functions may have no legal effect until approved either (a) by the head of the department or (b) by the legal voters of the county at a regular or special county election.

What this means, in a practical sense, is that if the Board approves the transfer as presented, then in the future, it would take either approval of the voters or the agreement of the then-sitting Sheriff to move that function elsewhere. As the Board is aware from our own organizational history with the fleet services function, a well-intended commitment to review and evaluate a program in the future does not necessarily mean that the review will occur timely. For the review to actually occur depends significantly on the then-existing capacity of the budget and personnel resources at the time, as well as the political will to effect the review.

Options for the Board to retain authority to locate the parole and probation function:

Option 1 - Approve the transfer now, subject to written agreement with the Sheriff that the function automatically returns to H&HS (or any other department except Assessment and Taxation) at the end of his term. That would mean at the end of this year. The Board could then approve a new transfer at the first of next year, again subject to the written agreement of the incoming Sheriff that it automatically return at the end of the term. Because you do not know the outcome of the election, and because a present Sheriff can't bind a future one, this is probably the best immediate option to accomplishing a transfer and preserving the authority of the Board for the future.

Option 2 - Approve the transfer now effective January 6, 2009, subject to written agreement with the then-sitting Sheriff that it automatically returns to H&HS (or any other

department except Assessment and Taxation) at the end of his term. This preserves the authority of the Board for the future, but also permits a more lengthy trial period without the abbreviated one of Option 1.

Option 3 - Rely on a future vote or agreement of the then-sitting Sheriff to make a change in the location of the parole and probation function, and approve the transfer now. This is the choice recommended by the Sheriff in the packet.

2. Implementation Issues. There are a number of issues that are either unaddressed in the agenda cover memo or for which the background isn't provided that would permit the Board to make a determination if the savings and efficiency projections are reasonable and provide a sound basis for making an informed decision to transfer the parole and probation function.

a. Trial Period/Accountability - the suggestion for a review in three to four years has no teeth; at best this is an offer to report back to the Board. To provide the desired certainty to employees and the citizens that this action is accomplishing its intended goals, does the Board want a more definitive review/evaluation of the success of the transfer? Stated differently, does the report back feature, coupled with the inherent budget authority of the Board, provide the desirable level of accountability for the Commissioners in making this decision for the reasons provided, recognizing that the Sheriff's accountability is ultimately with the voters?

b. Make-up and function of SAT - The Sheriff's Office is recommending one of two options. The memo indicates either is acceptable since they both eliminate representation from more than one department. However, there appears to be a mistake, since option 1 does retain the H&HS department director. It is unclear, then, the basis for the recommendation. There is an additional suggestion for bringing the SAT membership up to five, (Rockstroh's memo) which is not addressed. Lastly, it is unclear if the SAT is to continue to make recommendations on allocation of Community Corrections Act funding; if so, it would seem that the H&HS Director should be a participant as a recipient of and therefore interested party in this funding stream.

c. Community Corrections Plan - The agenda memo is silent with respect to who will be responsible for coordination with the SAT in preparing and administering the biennial Community Corrections Plan. This is a critical administrative function which includes the service planning, funding allocations, billing, and outcome reporting requirements, and results in significant funds to the County. See also, the comments below regarding costs. The Board should be assured that those functions can be appropriately performed and evaluated.

d. Timing and Capacity to Manage Transition - No timeline is suggested. This is problematic from a budgetary and financial point of view since entire organizations/programs will have to be modified and/or moved to a new fund, and staff will need to be appropriately trained in the new expense and revenue codes. If the Board desires to accomplish the transfer this year, then the recommendation in the Rockstroh memorandum may provide a reasonable method. This would mean a change in the Board Order to direct the transfer of all employees effective April 1, 2008 and to complete the budgetary transfers to be effective July 1, 2008 commensurate with the start of the new fiscal year. Unaddressed, though, is the administrative capacity of the organization (Sheriff's office, parole and probation, and all affected support services departments) to manage the transition in a timely way with the current budget environment.

e. Costs - Though asserted that there will be efficiencies gained through consolidation that will result in more than \$100,000 in savings which can be used to pay for an additional

parole and probation officer, there is no backup information detailing exactly what duplication exists that would be eliminated, nor accounting of where they anticipate the savings. Apparently, the expectation is that the administrative support would be provided to the parole and probation office by the current staff of the Sheriff's office without any addition. What is not addressed is what the type and level of administrative support is currently provided to the parole and probation function and whether there is that same capacity to provide that support in the Sheriff's office. If the Sheriff believes that level is not needed, what would no longer be provided is also not described or evaluated.

f. Redundancy in operations – There are assertions in the memo to the effect that there will be a consolidation of resources by having the Sheriff's office and parole and probation use the same assessment tools. While the same tools may provide some transferable information, each stage of the process requires additional and different information, and each stage will still have to occur. It is unclear how there will be a consolidation of resource in that case. Similarly, there is an assertion that consolidating the programs will allow an increase in persons under electronic supervision from 49 to 90 without the need to add staff, but it there is no explanation of how or why that can occur with an increase of only six additional bracelets.

g. Redundancy for support service functions -There is an assertion that there will be a reduction in redundancy for County Counsel in answering the same questions for the Sheriff's office and parole and probation. While that is theoretically possible, in fact County Counsel staff cannot recall when there has been a redundancy of issue to which that would apply. Similarly, there is a statement that resources would be conserved in dealing with the bargaining units concurrently. What is meant by that is unclear. If there is an expectation that negotiations would occur with the two unions concurrently, then the likelihood of that depends on whether the bargaining units would agree to concurrent sessions. The individual unions have the right to decide what issues they want to take up during negotiations. While the Sheriff's office could assign the same staff to work with each union, whether there could be concurrent negotiations is an unknown.

The assumption that managing the relationships concurrently with the two strike-prohibited unions would be beneficial to the County also does not take into consideration that the tendency for "me too" bargaining would be greatly increased. It will be much harder for the County to bargain with each union independently when they are in the same department and dealing with the same authority, budget and administration. The County may save on administrative costs but could end up spending far more on compensation packages. There will be intense pressure on the Sheriff to equalize the' working conditions, materials and supplies, benefits, premium pays and other benefits of the parole and probation officers to those now granted to the deputy sheriffs in LCPOA.

h. Sanction versus Rehabilitation – Rob Rockstroh's memo discusses the dual role that parole and probation officers play. They are neither fish nor fowl with regard to the duality of enforcement and rehabilitation. Any change in the location of parole and probation should address the need for a balanced focus on those two roles, and the need to differentiate between the type of skills needed to be an effective parole and probation officer versus those needed for an effective deputy sheriff.

cc: Sheriff Russ Burger
Jeff Spartz
Rob Rockstroh

W. H. a.



AGENDA COVER MEMO

AGENDA DATE: March 12, 2008

TO: Board of County Commissioners
DEPARTMENT: Department of Public Safety/Sheriff's Office

PRESENTED BY: Sheriff Russ Burger

AGENDA TITLE: ORDER ____/IN THE MATTER OF TRANSFERRING LANE COUNTY PAROLE AND PROBATION SERVICES FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES TO THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY AND RESTRUCTURING THE SUPERVISORY AUTHORITY TEAM

I. MOTION

Move approval of Order # ____/In The Matter of transferring Lane County Parole and Probation from the Department of Health and Human Services to the Department of Public Safety and restructuring the Supervisory Authority Team.

II. AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

The Board is being asked to reassign Lane County Parole and Probation from the Department of Health and Human Services to the Department of Public Safety (Sheriff's Office) and to restructure the Supervisory Authority Team.

The "Parole & Probation Division" is really STS – the Supervision & Treatment Services Division in H&HS. That division includes the following seven programs:

P&P (the official name in Community Corrections (or CC) Supervision Services)
Subcontracts
Community Corrections (this is a just a holding account for the \$365,277)
Domestic Violence Monitoring
Methadone
Sex Offender
DUI/Offender Eval Unit (often called ADO by H&HS)

ALL PROPOSED FOR TRANS
PART PROPOSED TRANS
ALL PROPOSED FOR TRANS
NOT PROPOSED FOR TRANS
NOT PROPOSED FOR TRANS
NOT PROPOSED FOR TRANS

Summary of all STS programs discussed with regards to a transfer and CCA funds:

P&P	<u>Does</u> receive CCA Funds	Part of STS Division	<u>All</u> proposed for transfer
Sex Offender	<u>Does</u> receive CCA Funds	Part of STS Division	<u>Not</u> proposed for transfer
Mental Health	<u>Does</u> receive CCA Funds	<u>Not</u> part of STS	<u>Not</u> proposed for transfer
Subcontracts	<u>Does</u> receive CCA Funds	Part of STS Division	<u>Part</u> proposed for transfer
Drug Court Emergence	<u>Does</u> receive CCA Funds	<u>Not</u> part of STS	<u>Not</u> proposed for transfer
Community Corrections	<u>Does</u> receive CCA Funds	Part of STS Division	<u>All</u> proposed for transfer
Domestic Violence Monitor	Does <u>not</u> receive CCA Funds	<u>Not</u> part of STS	<u>All</u> proposed for transfer
DUII/ADO	Does <u>not</u> receive CCA Funds	Part of STS Division	<u>Not</u> proposed for transfer
Methadone	Does <u>not</u> receive CCA Funds	Part of STS Division	<u>Not</u> proposed for transfer

III. BACKGROUND/IMPLICATIONS OF ACTION

A. Board Action and Other History

In the late 1980's, under ORS 423.550, counties were given three options for administering community corrections, including parole and probation services:

- The State of Oregon would continue to administer the community corrections program and parole and probation services;
- The State would administer parole and probation services and the county would administer community corrections programs;
- The county would administer the community corrections program and parole and probation services.

Lane County chose the second option, transferring administration of the funds provided through Oregon Community Corrections to County Administration under Justice Services, a program within County Administration. Parole and probation services continued to be administered by a local branch of the Oregon Department of Corrections.

Lane County continued to operate under this system until the State Legislature passed SB 1145 in 1996, which amended the ORS. The bill replaced ORS 423.550 with ORS 423.549 which states that all state positions in community corrections branches of the Oregon Department of Corrections are abolished and responsibility and funding for administering both Community Corrections Act programs and parole and probation services are transferred to counties.

One of the requirements of SB 1145 was for the Board to establish the Public Safety Coordinating Council (PSCC). The PSCC appointed a Parole and Probation Task Group to develop a proposal for moving administration of parole and probation services from the Oregon DOC to a locally administered model. The Task Group looked into two issues:

- Where in county government should parole and probation services be housed as a placeholder while the PSCC developed a long term public safety and justice system plan? and
- How should the parole and probation unit be transferred?

After review and analysis of organizational alternatives by the Public Safety Coordinating Council (PSCC) and the PSCC Parole and Probation Task Group, the Board established the Parole and Probation Unit in the Health and Human Services Department (Board Order 96-6-4-1), temporarily.

On January 31, 2008, the Public Safety Coordinating Council Adult Community Safety Committee met. The "Adult Committee" invited other members of the Public Safety Coordinating Council to attend in order to discuss the Parole and Probation issue.

In summary, via consensus, those attending the meeting were in favor of transferring Parole and Probation to the Sheriff's Office. They believed a sunset date and/or trial periods were not in the best interest of continuity or stability, but agreed the program location should be reviewed after three or four years or at the end of the biennium (2011). Also, by consensus, they agreed that the Board of County Commissioners should review and restructure the make-up and mission of the Supervisory Authority Team.

The Sheriff concurs with the consensus of the Public Safety Coordinating Council and recommends the Board amend the make-up of the Supervisory Authority Team and not consider a sunset date for the reorganization.

B. Policy Issues

Supervisory Authority Background

In November 2002, the Board adopted ORDER 02-11-26-1 creating a Supervisory Authority Team Model for the Adult Corrections System. The Intergovernmental Agreement between Lane County, the City of Eugene, and the City of Springfield directs the PSCC to review and make recommendations regarding the integration of the adult corrections system, including addressing the dual supervisory authority in Lane County.

It was recommended that the Board of County Commissioners appoint a Supervisory Authority Team (SAT) including representation from Parole and Probation and the Sheriff's Office, who were the current supervisory authorities.

Consistent with the recommendation of the PSCC, the Sheriff recommends reviewing the mission; and restructuring the Supervisory Authority Team to continue to be inclusive and equitable. With a reorganization, parole and probation functions would be located in the same department as law enforcement and adult corrections.

The Sheriff recommends choosing between two models:

1. The restructured SAT would include the Sheriff, the Presiding Judge, and the Health and Human Services Director;

Or

2. The Sheriff, the Presiding Judge, and a County Commissioner serving on the Public Safety Coordinating Council.

Either of these two configurations would even out the representation and bring diverse view points to the group and eliminate representation from more than one county department.

The SAT reviews and modifies policies and procedures affecting the activities of the Supervisory Authority. In recent years, they have also taken on the responsibility of recommending the allocation of the Community Corrections Act funding to the PSCC and subsequently to the Board of County Commissioners.

The newly constituted SAT will recommend a proposed budget to the PSCC, who will forward the recommendation to the Board of Commissioners.

The original role and responsibility of the SAT included:

- Jointly manage the corrections population by developing and using compatible policies and procedures;
- Review and approve changes in policies or practices associated with duties assigned to the supervisory authority under Oregon Revised Statutes;
- Make recommendations that will ensure the efficient and appropriate flow of offenders through the system;
- Monitor existing practices and strategies for managing the offender population and, if appropriate, implement new policies and strategies based on best practices; and
- Provide regular reports to the Board of County Commissioners and the Public Safety Coordinating Council describing the management of the offender population.

Original P & P Placement Designated a Temporary Placeholder

In 1996, the Board ordered PSCC to continue their work to develop a long range strategic plan which included permanent placement of parole and probation services.

During the same year, the PSCC recommended that the location within Lane County where parole and probation services landed, should be temporary and considered a "placeholder" until the PSCC was further along in development of their comprehensive plan and had time to look at parole and probation services from a systems perspective.

In order to reevaluate the temporary assignment of the Parole and Probation unit to the department of Health and Human Services, it's helpful to look at Lane Manual and the Home Rule Charter.

Lane Manual Policies

Lane Manual 3.034 (1) states that as recommended by the County Administrator, Lane County departments shall be organized and employ personnel that most efficiently and economically carry out the functions of the departments and discharge their responsibilities in the best interest of the people of Lane County.

Both the Sheriff's Office Corrections Division and H&HS parole and probation administer adult corrections programs and manage the same adult corrections population within the county. Eliminating redundancies in the management of these separate corrections functions will help streamline operations for staff that deal with the same offender population and work with the same public safety agencies.

Lane Manual 3.044 (1) states the Department of Public Safety shall have the functions of the County Sheriff under general State law, except the functions of the Sheriff regarding the collection of taxes, and further functions as have been allocated and assigned to the Sheriff that are not allocated and assigned to the Department of Assessment and Taxation by the Board.

This policy does not preclude the Board from reorganizing functions and placing additional public safety operations within the Public Safety Department.

Home Rule Charter

The Lane County Home Rule Charter Chapter IV, Administration, Section 22, Changes in Administrative Departments states that the Board of County Commissioners can prescribe the functions of any department, but may not take any functions from the Department of Public Safety without approval of the Sheriff, or by a vote of the people.

Lane County Home Rule Charter:

Section 22. CHANGES IN ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENTS.

(2) Any action

(a) to combine the department of public safety or the department of assessment and taxation with each other or with another administrative department of the county,

(b) to abolish either department, or

(c) to take from either any of its functions may have no legal effect until approved either (a) by the head of the department or (b) by the legal voters of the county at a regular or special county election.

C. Board Goals

Lane County's Strategic Plan encourages county government to seek reorganizations which reduce expenditures, increase efficiency, and eliminate duplications of effort.

Lane County's Core Strategies as stated in the Lane County Strategic plan have an overall strategic theme: To build and maintain credibility and respect we must both perform well and remain accountable to the public for our performance. We must continually improve services and allocate resources wisely. We must listen carefully to citizens and do our best to effectively inform them how our actions are addressing their concerns.

Specific strategies are outlined in several areas within the plan including the area of service improvement.

Strategy A1 is "Evaluate reorganization opportunities." "Reorganization" as defined, includes the host of restructuring and re-engineering opportunities including but not limited to: consolidation; contracting with or depending upon another provider; and co-location;

The Strategic Plan says Lane County Government will actively seek to improve the efficiency, effectiveness, and quality of public services by considering reorganization of service delivery systems both within county government and across government agencies. The plan encourages Lane County to examine areas where similar or closely related services exist in different organizational units.

Section A -- Service Improvement, under A1: Evaluate Reorganization Opportunities of the Strategic Plan, also calls for evaluating possible reorganizations across County departments, specifically including **Public Safety corrections services and Health and Human Services parole and probation.**

Trial Period

Although the Sheriff is recommending the reorganization, from an organizational view point, the Sheriff and PSCC suggest a review of the reorganization in three to four years or at the end of the biennium.

This should ensure sufficient time for the Board and the Sheriff to evaluate the efficiency and value of this consolidation. The staff from both departments would benefit from certainty, consistency, and predictability.

D. Financial and Resource Considerations

The 2007-09 Community Corrections Plan budget for Lane County totals \$21,208,780. These funds are received through an intergovernmental agreement with the Oregon Department of Corrections. ORS 423.505 was amended to declare the state's legislative policy to be that counties will be the provider of these services (new language in bold print): **Because counties are in the best position for the management, oversight and administration of local criminal justice matters and for determining local resource priorities.** This change established

The Sheriff's Office can absorb the administrative duties in support of the parole and probation with the amount of administrative support now paid by the programs being proposed for transfer. In addition, the Sheriff's Office will add 1.0 parole and probation officer with the available funding. (The Parole and Probation and Subcontract programs currently pay approximately \$225,386 in department overhead. The Sheriff's Office will not need all of these funds for department overhead, and will therefore be able add 1.0 parole and probation officer.)

The goal of the transfer is to seek efficiencies and eliminate duplicative functions between the Sheriff's Office and Parole & Probation. From a financial and resource perspective, this should be very achievable.

E. Analysis

The proposed reorganization would make the programs that deal with local offenders more effective and would lead to better service delivery through the elimination of redundant efforts and duplicative programs. Merging parole and probation services with other corrections services within the county would improve the use of limited resources, by combining like operations and economically utilizing support and administrative resources.

The existing programs would benefit by eliminating duplication of effort and increasing coordination. Examples of efficiencies gained and opportunities to communicate more effectively are outlined below.

Additional Parole and Probation Staff

Because of the efficiencies gained through the consolidation of resources, there will be an estimated savings of more than a hundred thousand dollars that would be utilized to fund an additional Parole and Probation Officer. It is well known that the ratio of probationers to Probation Officers in Lane County is substandard. Although it would take adding around 20 Probation Officers to bring Lane County in line with national standards, adding one P.O. is a step in the right direction. A decrease in individual P.O.'s caseloads means closer supervision and greater offender accountability.

Strength Through Diversity

A merger will better facilitate the cross sharing of knowledge and experiences from members of both agencies. This will especially benefit officer safety, and inmate management. P&P is in possession of a wealth of knowledge regarding special needs of offenders in the community and Corrections is very familiar with the offender population.

Consistent Communication with Offenders

Specific, proven, practices for reducing recidivism indicate that consistency in communication and motivation techniques with offenders is important. Creating uniformity in one department with both functions will enable this opportunity.

Communication Between P.O.s and Deputies

Some of the offender population takes advantage of situations in systems where

an ongoing partnership between the state and the counties with regards to the statewide financing of corrections and parole and probation services with appropriations from the state's General Fund.

The Lane County Sheriff's Office combines Community Corrections Act funds with revenue from several other sources to provide services in its Corrections Division.

The Lane County department of Health and Human Services similarly combines Community Corrections Act funds with other revenue to provide Parole and Probation services. In the case of Parole & Probation services, most of the funding is provided by the State of Oregon through the Community Corrections Act.

The current budget for Parole and Probation Services in the Department of Health and Human Services is \$5,781,060. The entire program, with 54.22 FTE, would move to the Sheriff's Office unit if this transfer is approved. The \$5.8 million budget includes \$4,065,489 in Community Corrections Act funding as well as \$1,715,571 in other revenue.

Health & Human Services also receives \$1,239,335 in Community Corrections revenue that is subcontracted outside of the department. The subcontracts proposed for transfer are related to the pre and post trial supervision of offenders and inmates. These funds, along with \$280,349 in service related funds (for a total of \$1,519,684) will also transfer to the Sheriff's Office.

There is \$365,277 of unallocated CCA funds in each year of the biennium (budgeted in the Community Corrections Program, a holding program, in Health & Human Services). These funds were set aside to cover any unanticipated needs including potential salary increases for the FOPPO (Federation of Oregon Parole and Probation Officers) and/or LCPOA (Lane County Peace Officers Association) bargaining units. These funds will also transfer to the Sheriff's Office, but the disposition of these funds will be at the discretion and recommendation of the Supervisory Authority Team.

The total amount of Community Corrections funds proposed for transfer to the Sheriff's Office is \$5,670,101. In the current CCP this will leave \$478,273 of Community Corrections funds in the Health and Human Services Department. The programs in Health and Human Services that will continue to receive Community Corrections funds are the Sex Offender Treatment Program, the Mental Health Program and the Drug Court Emergence Contract Program (see ATTACHMENT 1 for a detail of the proposed budget changes in all affected programs).

If the transfer of Parole and Probation and related pre and post trial supervision services to the Sheriff's Office is approved, the Sheriff's Office does not intend to change the program structure set-up by Health and Human Services. The current program structure and funding will stay intact and will be separate from all other Sheriff's Office funding.

information is not consistent and where gaps are unintentionally created due to multiple agency efforts. Managing inmates consistently, where all phases of their sanctions and rehabilitation are coordinated and collaborated upon will help close gaps in offender management issues. Combining both areas of custody and supervision will help all staff be on the same page regarding inmate and offender management.

Unified Mission

A unified mission and goals will serve to enhance efficiency. Occasionally, P&P and Corrections approach issues differently but are ultimately trying to accomplish the same goal of sanctioning offenders. Housing these separate, but similar functions will allow the county to target offenders who repeatedly offend, with collaboratively formed case management plans that are designed to reduce recidivism.

Use of Same Evidence Based Programs for Offenders

Combining the two divisions in one department will bring increased efficiency and fidelity of implementing evidence-based programs. As part of the Defendant and Offender Management Program (Sherman Center) goals, the intent is to provide evidenced-based programs and practices that have been shown to reduce failure to appear rates, reduce recidivism or reoffense rates, and improve assessment of danger to victims and the community.

Use of the Same Assessment Tools

There are several programs and assessments performed by the Lane County Circuit Court Pretrial Services, Sheriff's Office, and Parole & Probation. These assessments are similar in content and aims. Merging P & P into the Sheriff's Office would assist in reducing redundant services and programs and improve efficiency and communication between Sherman Center partners, as well as provide a seamless process for defendants and offenders as they enter the system, serve sentences, participate in programs, and transition back to the community.

Two Electronic Surveillance Programs

Currently, the county runs two electronic surveillance programs; one through the LCSO and one through P&P. The current number of electronic surveillance clients served monthly by the LCSO is 43 on average. The number targeted by Parole and Probation is six, for a total capacity of 49 offenders between the two programs. If Parole and Probation transfers to the Sheriff's Office, there would be a consolidation of resources, reducing duplicative services while at the same time gaining efficiency. With restructuring and combining these two programs we will double capacity to over 90 offenders with no additional staff required.

Common Utilization of County Support Services: County Counsel / HR / Fiscal/ Other Admin Support:

There are redundant efforts going on in support and administrative services that could be combined under one department. There are times when the same issues dealt with by County Counsel effect both law enforcement staff in the SO and

Parole Officers in H&HS.

Common Training Needs and Coordination

Lane County Parole and Probation and Sheriff's Office staff conduct separate but similar training in the following areas: Weapons qualification, Defensive Tactics, Self Defense, Basic Life Support, First Aid/CPR, Blood-borne Pathogens, Use of Force and Arrest, and Detention Protocols. Most of these trainings are mandatory for certification by the Oregon Department of Public Safety Standards and Training (DPSST). The Sheriff's Office operates a training section that coordinates all training and education efforts for all SO staff and would do so for all P&P staff. Monetary savings, time savings, and more efficient and effective training will occur by consolidation.

Records

Communication between the Sheriff's Office and Parole and Probation has greatly increased since two Probation Officers were assigned to the Sherman Center. Similarly the Sheriff's Office Records section is already working with Parole and Probation on entering local control warrants for offenders that fail to comply with their court orders. Combining the Sheriff's Office with Parole and Probation would serve to further enhance communication between all of those who are involved with the same pool of offenders. This reorganization would allow the Sheriff's Office Records Section to have direct access to databases which would provide 24-hour access to critical information. Better access to information will provide for increased accuracy when determining the intent of warrants and sanctions initiated by Probation Officers.

Labor Relations and Internal Affairs

Lane County was concerned about bargaining unit issues when parole and probation first transitioned from the State to the County in 1996. At the time, the Parole and Probation Officers were represented by AFSCME. Department of Public Safety sworn staff were and still are represented by the Lane County Peace Officers Association and are subject to binding arbitration. The concern at the time regarding placement of P&P Officers in Public Safety was that a case might be made for parole officers to become part of LCPOA and become subject to binding arbitration. For the last two years, P&P Officers have been represented by the Federation of Oregon Parole and Probation Officers (FOPPO) and are subject to binding arbitration, so that is no longer an issue. Because both the Lane County Peace Officers Association (LCPOA), and the Federation of Oregon Parole and Probation Officers (FOPPO) have similar working conditions and issues, are strike-prohibited, and subject to binding interest arbitration, and are represented by the same law firm, it would be beneficial for the County to manage these relationships concurrently and be easier to administer the contracts.

Both organizations devote significant management resources to collective bargaining, grievance resolution, and internal affairs including personnel issues.

These important but time-consuming functions would be handled under one administrative unit on behalf of the combined organization. The Sheriff's Office is in the process of organizing an Office of Professional Standards (OPS) with existing resources. That office would assume responsibility for labor relations including collective bargaining, grievance resolution, and personnel issues. All these issues would be managed in a consistent manner with the same procedures and timelines.

There is a Memorandum of Understanding between the County and FOPPO, which states: the County agrees if Parole and Probation is moved to the Lane County Sheriff's Department or any other County department, FOPPO may reopen the contract for bargaining on working conditions only which are mandatory subject to bargains. FOPPO will provide notice to the County of its intent to reopen within twenty-one days of the official notice of the move. Negotiations will last no more than 90 days.

Treatment and Custody

Because Parole and Probation is a component of the Supervision and Treatment Services Division, it includes the Alcohol, Drug and Offender Program. Concurrently, the Sheriff's Office Corrections Division is looking towards evidence-based practices utilizing limited resources to work with offenders.

The trend in corrections practices is leaning away from jail beds and the county's ability to finance jail beds for local offenders is decreasing. The mission of the Sherman Center/DOMC is the way of the future for corrections and criminal justice. Practices in corrections demonstrate that utilizing evidence-based programs in order to change behavior through alternative methods combined with utilizing jail beds as a sanction can be effective.

Research shows that jail beds alone will not reduce re-offense rates. However, the combination of programs demonstrated to be effective, along with jail beds and adequate research-proven transition programs work. To that end, combining the resources of the Sheriff's Office and P & P as well as utilizing the philosophy and research the DOMC is based upon are the most efficient use of agency resources both financially and organizationally.

A consolidation of Parole and Probation with the Sheriff's Office creates an excellent opportunity to coordinate services, and to clinically consult together. This coordinated effort, in conjunction with the Sherman Center/DOMC and the development of the Criminogenic Needs Assessment Tool (CNAT) will help dispel the notion in the community that treatment and custody must be mutually exclusive.

Accountability

The Sheriff would become responsible for the both programs' outcomes. Currently, the Sheriff does not have responsibility for parole and probation services, and although he has developed partnerships and important working relationships with that unit, he is not accountable for the program's outcomes. This merge would put the accountability of the program and its partner programs under one roof.

Support

Attached are letters demonstrating support for the transfer of services to the Department of Public Safety.

Organizational Fit

A 2003 LCOG study called "Lane County Parole and Probation: A Look Within the Organization" included management interviews regarding the internal organization of P&P. LCOG asked P&P management what they felt was not going well regarding the overall functioning of P&P as an organization. Management listed the following:

- Relationship with the Sheriff's Office
- Understaffed due to financial constraints
- Morale
- Not enough in-house and outside training
- Not seen as an equal partner in the criminal justice system because they are under H&HS
- Supervision was not consistent and supervisors not held accountable
- Intensive Case Management not being utilized to capacity
- Organizational culture was not a fit with H&HS

In the past 4 years, some of these issues may have been addressed, however several of those issues including relationship with the LCSO, training, perception as equals in the system, and consistency in supervision are issues that are more easily facilitated within the Sheriff's Office for the parole and probation program than if it were to be housed in another department or stand on its own. Because the parole and probation manager position is vacant, consideration of parole and probation becoming a separate, independent department is not prudent at this time. Administrative and other support for the parole and probation services are available within the Sheriff's Office that would not be available if P&P became a separate department.

Other counties in Oregon have placed their parole and probation services within their Sheriff's Departments including Marion, Curry and Tillamook Counties. Both officers of each discipline are licensed through the state by DPSST. Both need access to safety and communications equipment and both are dealing with the same population and the same public service agencies.

In 1996, the PSCC's Parole and Probation Task Group looked at the DA's Office, County Administration, Youth Services, Public Safety, and Health and Human Services. One of the concerns with placement in H&HS was mission compatibility.

IV. Alternatives/Options

1. Approve the motion.

If the motion is approved, Lane County Parole and Probation will be transferred from the Department of Health and Human Services to the Department of Public Safety. Both departments approach similar issues and are ultimately trying to accomplish the same goal. Housing these separate, but similar functions within the same department will allow the county to target offenders who repeatedly offend, with collaboratively formed behavior plans. Several mission compatibility issues including relationship with the SO, training, perception as equals in the system, and consistency in supervision are issues that are more easily facilitated within the Sheriff's Office for the parole and probation program than if it were to be housed in another department or stand on its own. Additional parole & probation staff are recommended if the cost savings and efficiencies are realized with the move.

The transfer will be reviewed in three to four years.

2. Do not approve the motion.

If the Board chooses to not approve the motion, the Parole and Probation function will remain in the Health and Human Services Department, where mission and function of the program are not as well matched as they would be within the Department of Public Safety. Efforts to merge common functions and the ability to better unite the parole officers and deputies who manage the same adult corrections population will be hindered.

V. Timing/Implementation

The proposed transition will be managed by a team made up of staff from both departments. They will propose a reasonable timeline, identify issues and strategies to address needs related to the transition, and ensure that the public will not experience a disruption in services during the transition from one department to another.

VI. RECOMMENDATION

The Sheriff's Office recommends reassigning Lane County Parole and Probation from the Department of Health and Human Services to the Department of Public Safety.

VII. FOLLOW-UP

A transition team will be formed to develop a timeline and identify and address the organizational issues associated with moving a division from one county department to another.

VIII. ATTACHMENTS

Board Order
Programs Proposed For Transfer Spreadsheet
Letters of Support

IN THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF LANE COUNTY, OREGON

ORDER 08-) **IN THE MATTER OF TRANSFERRING LANE COUNTY**
) **PAROLE AND PROBATION SERVICES FROM THE**
) **DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES TO THE**
) **DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY AND RESTRUCTURING**
) **THE SUPERVISORY AUTHORITY TEAM**

WHEREAS, ORS 423.549 states that all state positions in community corrections branches of the Oregon Department of Corrections are abolished and responsibility and funding for administering both Community Corrections Act programs and parole and probation services are transferred to counties.; and

WHEREAS, the Public Safety Coordinating Council recommended that the location within Lane County where parole and probation services initially landed, should be temporary and considered a “placeholder;” and

WHEREAS, the Home Rule Charter Section 22 provides that the Board of Commissioners has full authority to prescribe the functions of any department, however, any action to take a function from the Department of Public Safety may have no legal affect until approved by the Sheriff or the voters at county election, and

WHEREAS, Lane Manual 3.034 (1) states that as recommended by the County Administrator, Lane County departments shall be organized and employ personnel that most efficiently and economically carry out the functions of the departments and discharge their responsibilities in the best interest of the people of Lane County; and

WHEREAS, the Lane County Strategic Plan, calls for evaluating possible reorganizations across County departments, specifically including Public Safety corrections services and Health and Human Services parole and probation; and

WHEREAS, both the Sheriff’s Office Corrections Division and Health & Human Services parole and probation administer adult corrections programs and manage the same adult corrections population within the county; and

WHEREAS, the proposed reorganization would make the programs that deal with local offenders more effective and would lead to better service delivery through the elimination of redundant efforts and duplicative programs; and

WHEREAS, the PSCC and the Sheriff recommend restructuring the Supervisory Authority Team (SAT) to continue to be inclusive and equitable; and

WHEREAS, with a reorganization, parole and probation functions would be located in the same department as law enforcement and adult corrections; and

WHEREAS, the Supervisory Authority Team reviews and modifies policies and procedures affecting the activities of the Supervisory Authority; and

WHEREAS, in recent years, the SAT has taken on the responsibility of recommending the allocation of the Community Corrections Act funding to the PSCC and subsequently to the Board of County Commissioners; and

WHEREAS, the SAT jointly manages the corrections population by developing and using compatible policies and procedures; and

WHEREAS, the SAT makes recommendations to ensure the efficient and appropriate flow of offenders through the system;

NOW THEREFORE IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, that the Board of County Commissioners transfer Lane County parole and probation services from the Department of Health and Human Services to the Department of Public Safety, and it is further

ORDERED that the Board of Commissioners will restructure the Supervisory Authority Team.

Dated this _____ day of March, 2008.

Chair, Lane County Board of Commissioners

January 16, 2008

TO: Board of County Commissioners

RE: In the Matter of Transferring Parole and Probation 1/23/08 Agenda: Comments

FM: Rob Rockstroh, Director H&HS

OVERVIEW OF PAROLE AND PROBATION OFFICERS (POs)

Placement of P&P staff has been an on-going issue here and in other parts of the state. I believe some of the issue and complication is driven by the fact that POs are not strictly law enforcement, as police officers are, nor are they social workers. They are hybrids that include the skill sets of both, and their primary work is involved in supervising offenders, most of which are felons.

If you look at the knowledge requirements in the PO class specifications you will see that an entry-level PO must have knowledge of social/behavioral sciences, intervention and counseling techniques, criminal law and the justice system, and law enforcement, constitutional issues, and corrections programs geared toward rehabilitation and reformation.

I am not opposed to the transfer as proposed by the Sheriff's office, but I do have some concerns, none of which would lead me not to support the requested transfer. For ease of reading, my first comments will follow the sequence of the Sheriff's agenda memo. The end of this memo will be additional comments that I hope aid in making a decision.

COMMENTS ON AGENDA MEMO

In the middle of page 3, there are two recommended structures for the Supervisory Authority Team (SAT). I think either one could work, but I believe that 3 persons are not sufficient for a comprehensive dialogue. I do have to recognize that they have done good work. One function of the SAT has been as the initiating committee for budget recommendations for the community corrections funding received from the Oregon Department of Corrections. The SAT makes budget recommendations to the Adult Community Safety Committee, who makes recommendations to the full Public Safety Coordinating Council (PSCC), who makes recommendations to the Board of Commissioners as the final authority.

I would prefer a five-person committee that could include one of the County Commissioners serving on the PSCC, the Sheriff or designee; the Presiding Judge, or designee; the H&HS director, or designee, and the Chair of the Adult Safety Subcommittee or the Chair of the PSCC. The preference would be not to use designees.

Near the top of page 5 a "trial period" is noted. I understand the concept, but I do have a concern about giving some stability and certainty to staff. The charter language may preclude giving more than a trial period. I wouldn't recommend sending the unit back to H&HS. I would hope that we would create a separate Department of Corrections within our Lane County structure. I know there are costs associated with this; this is a programmatic structure I have supported for many years.

The *Analysis* section (pages 7-12) has many sections and I want to highlight only a few of them. On page 8, I am very pleased to see that a PO position can be added. I appreciate the Sheriff's work to accomplish this.

Also on page 8, I do like the issue of better communication to improve things. It has worked within the Defendant/Offender Management Center (DOMC), commonly called the Sherman Center, and perhaps this could be expanded to more staff.

On page 8, I applaud the work that has gone on to use the same assessment tools. We need to have consistency and commonality about how we define risk in our community. The Sheriff's Office has done a great service to the community in initiation and maintaining the DOMC with all of the involved partners. I think an enhanced DOMC has the greatest potential to improve the local community corrections system.

Page 10 discusses labor relations issues. I think it is significant that POs are now strike-prohibited and subject to binding interest arbitration. The fact that they are represented by the same law firm, should make it easier to operate out of one labor relations staff in the Sheriff's Office. The Sheriff is an elected official and a co-employer, a status that I do not have. I like the idea of the Office of Professional standards and I do think consistency would be very helpful.

On page 11, the memo comments on the Sherman Center/DOMC as being the future for corrections and criminal justice. I thoroughly agree. As the memo says, it is an excellent spot to coordinate services and I also think it will help dispel the notion that treatment and custody must be mutually exclusive.

The issue of accountability is important. On page 11 there is a brief paragraph about the Sheriff being responsible for both of the programs' outcomes. There is a value in having one authority for accountability. Also, the Sheriff, as an elected official, has discretionary immunity and is a co-employer, which can give him more direct accountability and responsibility for policies and personnel issues.

On page 12, the memo points out that support services that the Sheriff's Office provides would not be available if P&P became a separate department. Both the SO and H&HS require support staff who can accomplish a variety of complex tasks. A stand-alone Lane County Department of Community Corrections would have to create and maintain their own support. This is an important issue for what I consider a preferred model of Community Corrections.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Insufficient Funding

The criminal justice/law enforcement system is lacking significant money to be able to hold offenders accountable. I do not see a current system redesign that will result in a significant increase in savings or accountability, but the possibility of some consolidation and tighter accountability may help on the margin. Given our current fiscal situation in the general fund, even a marginal increase should be looked at.

Intergovernmental Agreement Goals

As a piece of background, the current intergovernmental biennial agreement with the Oregon Department of Corrections provides Lane County with over \$21 million for the 2007-2009 period. These funds are the prime source of money for Parole & Probation and a significant source for the Sheriff's Office. All of the IGA goals will be the responsibility of the Sheriff with a transfer of the P&P function and the related DOC funding. In the IGA under *Duties and Responsibilities of County* it says that the "County will meet the goals for community corrections in Oregon described below."

1. *Reduce criminal behavior*; this has two indicators for recidivism related to felonies.
2. *Enforce Court, Board of Parole and Post-Prison Supervision, and Local Supervisory Authority*; this has two indicators for positive case closures.
3. *Assist Offenders to Change*; this has a measure for employment rates and one for rate of participation in treatment programs.
4. *Provide Reparation to Victims*; this has indicators for restitution/fines collected and for community service hours.

Initiative 40

We have a potential issue with Initiative 40, which is Kevin Mannix' mandatory prison sentencing proposal. I have heard that DAs are looking at an alternative to this initiative. Recently I received a document from DOC that shows an estimated reduction in community corrections by \$16.5 million for the 2009-2011 biennium. I do not know if the potential cut triggers the "opt-out" language that allows counties to have the P&P functions revert back to the state. We may have to look at this in the near future.

Office Space

We have the opportunity to rethink space requirements now. Currently H&HS is in the process of remodeling Charnelton Place as the replacement for the Public Health Annex and to consolidate some H&HS services.

For years the old Courthouse has been overcrowded. What has been discussed informally over the years has been the possibility that H&HS Admin and Human Services Commission Admin could move somewhere else and that the District Attorney's Office could move to the H&HS space. That would leave additional room in the Courthouse for potential growth of the Court. In the informal discussions there has been no funding specified for this.

If the Sheriff were to take P&P under his umbrella, it may make more sense for P&P not to move to Charnelton Place as planned. The anticipated move date is May 2009.

If the H&HS staff were to move to Charnelton this would consolidate services and create more efficient processes through a better redesign of work areas that could be shared space or shared staffing. This is not meant to be any sort of analysis, but I do see potential in such a consolidation. I do not know all the financial implications related to funding the Charnelton Building purchase, but P&P does come with some of its own funding. It has paid commercial rates to the State for years and that funding could be used to assist in the lease/purchase of other space. This would leave a gap in funding of the Charnelton Place building, and we would have to figure out how to reallocate costs to the programs moving into the remodeled building.

Lane County Department of Community Corrections

My preferred model for community corrections would be to establish a stand-alone Lane County Department of Community Corrections. I have this concept in writing since March 2000. It gets complicated because of funding and charter issues, but I believe that a separation between law enforcement and supervision may offer some healthy system tension. I do not believe that we are ready to create a separate Department of Corrections. I think that a separate unit within the Sheriff's Office, the Division of Community Corrections, may be a step in the right direction.

If the transfer were to be approved, I believe we could administratively transfer all P&P employees effective April 1, 2008 and we could complete the budgetary transfers to be effective July 1, 2008.

**Federation of Oregon Parole and Probation Officers
Lane County Chapter**

January 25, 2008

Lane County Board of Commissioners
125 East 8th Avenue
Eugene, Oregon 97401

RE: Placement of Parole and Probation under the Sheriff's Office

Dear Commissioners:

On behalf of the Federation of Oregon Parole and Probation Officers, as the Lane County Chapter President, the union supports Parole and Probation functions being moved under one Supervisory Authority, Lane County Sheriff's Office, Community Corrections Division. If the Board approves this move, Lane County will be able to provide comprehensive adult corrections sanctions and services for all Lane County defendants and offenders.

All of corrections share the same mission and provides a common value to society: the protection of the community through supervision and rehabilitation, using motivational interviewing and best practices, intermediate sanctions, incarceration, and deterrence of criminal behavior. Our aim is to develop a system of community protection in which incarceration, supervision, sanctions and services are employed more effectively. Parole and Probation currently has two full-time Parole and Probation Officers working at the jail in the Defendant Offender Management Center (DOMC), known as the Sherman Center. They serve sanctions, conduct hearings and serve as liaisons between our two separate agencies. Parole and Probation also now utilizes the Sheriff's Office for property destruction and evidence storage for Court, and for their Community Service and Road Crew programs. Combining Parole and Probation with the Sheriff's Office and forming one Community Corrections Division will provide several important benefits, eliminate duplicity of services now being offered separately by both agencies, cut costs and improve the overall service to the community. With such a merger, the DOMC/ Sherman Center would also act as the Day Reporting Center for Parole and Probation, eliminating that duplicity. Currently both agencies provide separate electronic surveillance services, so those two programs would become one, providing expanded surveillance capability at a decreased cost to the County. A merger of the jail with Parole and Probation will enhance offender information sharing, stabilize operations, bring more efficiency to the application of the inmate risk tool, more accurately assess offender needs, cut costs and make the most effective use of available resources.

The following programs would be made more efficient:

Work Release Program (CCC)	Forest Work Camp	Road Crew
Community Service Program	Learning Center/GED Classes	
Hearings & Sanctions	Inmate Risk/Needs Assessment	
Parole and Probation Supervision Planning and Transition Services		

The following programs and services could combine for cost savings:

Staff Training Budgets

Equipment Budgets

Sherman Center (DOMC) with the P&P Day Reporting Center

Electronic Surveillance

Local Control-1145 Program

Probation Violation Arraignment (in conjunction with the Court)

Pre-Trial Monitoring (under parameters set by the Court)

Treatment Referral/ Treatment while Incarcerated/ Aftercare in Community

Supervision and Treatment Planning (while in custody)

These increased efficiencies would also result in Parole and Probation having more latitude in imposing sanctions and services that more accurately fit offender risk and needs.

We should pursue choices that are the least expensive for the citizens of Lane County. If Parole and Probation is placed under the Sheriff's Office, the benefits include merging the two existing separate Supervisory Authorities into one, stabilization in operations, more efficient information sharing, more effective programs and services, more accurate inmate risk and needs assessment which should result in improved reformation of the offender population, the most effective use of available resources, and enhanced protection of the public. For too long, the jail and Parole and Probation have been viewed as individual and separate components, independent of the other and serving different purposes. In fact, we are interdependent and by joining forces we can work better together within a more efficient adult correctional system.

Respectfully,

Linda Hamilton, Lane County Chapter President
Federation of Oregon Parole and Probation Officers (FOPPO)

ATTACHMENT 1

**PROGRAMS PROPOSED FOR TRANSFER
FROM LANE COUNTY HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES
TO THE LANE COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE
(ALL FIGURES ESTIMATED AFTER SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET #1)**

HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES NOW

Health & Human Services programs with Community Corrections Act funding in FY 07/08:

PROGRAM	FTE	CCA FUNDING	OTHER REVENUE	GENERAL FUND	TOTAL BUDGET
Parole & Probation	54.22	\$4,065,489	\$1,396,267	\$319,304	\$5,781,060
Sex Offender Treatment	4.08	292,185	36,244	97,414	425,843
Mental Health	30.00	96,088	3,589,075	455,983	4,141,146
Subcontracts	0.00	1,239,335	3,517,420	275,244	5,031,999
Drug Court Emergence Contract	0.00	90,000	269,496	0	359,496
Community Corrections	0.00	365,277	0	0	365,277
Total	88.30	\$6,148,374	\$8,808,502	\$1,147,945	\$16,104,821

Health & Human Services programs with no Community Corrections Act funding in FY 07/08:

PROGRAM	FTE	CCA FUNDING	OTHER REVENUE	GENERAL FUND	TOTAL BUDGET	
Domestic Violence Monitoring*	1.00	**	\$0	\$201,617	\$0	\$201,617
DUII/Offender Eval Unit	4.76	0	359,100	104,281	463,381	
Methadone Treatment	4.39	0	498,270	52,751	551,021	
Total	10.15	\$0	\$1,058,987	\$157,032	\$1,216,019	

* Current grant ends June 30, 2008.

** This is a FOPPO represented employee. Domestic Violence Monitoring services are consistent with the other supervision services proposed for transfer to the Sheriff's Office.

The yellow highlighted programs are the programs that are affected if the transfer is approved.

HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES IF THE TRANSFER IS APPROVED

Health & Human Services programs with Community Corrections Act funding in FY 07/08:

PROGRAM	FTE	CCA FUNDING	OTHER REVENUE	GENERAL FUND	TOTAL BUDGET
Parole & Probation	0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Sex Offender Treatment	4.08	292,185	36,244	97,414	425,843
Mental Health	30.00	96,088	3,589,075	455,983	4,141,146
Subcontracts	0.00	0	3,237,071	275,244	3,512,315
Drug Court Emergence Contract	0.00	90,000	269,496	0	359,496
Community Corrections	0.00	0	0	0	0
Total	34.08	\$478,273	\$7,131,886	\$828,641	\$8,438,800

Health & Human Services programs with no Community Corrections Act funding in FY 07/08:

PROGRAM	FTE	CCA FUNDING	OTHER REVENUE	GENERAL FUND	TOTAL BUDGET
Domestic Violence Monitoring	0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
DUII/Offender Eval Unit	4.76	0	359,100	104,281	463,381
Methadone Treatment	4.39	0	498,270	52,751	551,021
Total	9.15	\$0	\$857,370	\$157,032	\$1,014,402

ATTACHMENT 1

**PROGRAMS PROPOSED FOR TRANSFER
FROM LANE COUNTY HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES
TO THE LANE COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE
(ALL FIGURES ESTIMATED AFTER SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET #1)**

SHERIFF'S OFFICE NOW

Sheriff's Office programs with Community Corrections Act funding in FY 07/08:

PROGRAM	FTE	CCA FUNDING	OTHER REVENUE	GENERAL FUND	TOTAL BUDGET
Electronic Supervision	2.10	\$25,000	\$139,000	\$113,184	\$277,184
Jail Security	101.25	2,688,841	4,780,974	3,825,544	11,295,359
Medical Services	17.15	35,106	213,179	2,307,385	2,555,670
Population Management	10.55	350,845	0	852,597	1,203,442
Community Service	2.05	156,458	21,000	32,735	210,193
Forest Work Camp	19.25	297,935	2,448,332	459,462	3,205,729
Community Corrections Center	15.30	901,831	557,500	721,767	2,181,098
Parole & Probation	0.00	0	0	0	0
Subcontracts	0.00	0	0	0	0
Community Corrections	0.00	0	0	0	0
Total	167.65	\$4,456,016	\$8,159,985	\$8,312,674	\$20,928,675

Sheriff's Office program previously in H&HS with no Community Corrections Act funding in FY 07/08:

PROGRAM	FTE	CCA FUNDING	OTHER REVENUE	GENERAL FUND	TOTAL BUDGET
Domestic Violence Monitoring	0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total	0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

SHERIFF'S OFFICE IF THE TRANSFER IS APPROVED

Sheriff's Office programs with Community Corrections Act funding in FY 07/08:

PROGRAM	FTE	CCA FUNDING	OTHER REVENUE	GENERAL FUND	TOTAL BUDGET
Electronic Supervision	2.10	\$25,000	\$139,000	\$113,184	\$277,184
Jail Security	101.25	2,688,841	4,780,974	3,825,544	11,295,359
Medical Services	17.15	35,106	213,179	2,307,385	2,555,670
Population Management	10.55	350,845	0	852,597	1,203,442
Community Service	2.05	156,458	21,000	32,735	210,193
Forest Work Camp	19.25	297,935	2,448,332	459,462	3,205,729
Community Corrections Center	15.30	901,831	557,500	721,767	2,181,098
Parole & Probation	54.22	\$4,065,489	\$1,396,267	\$319,304	\$5,781,060
Subcontracts	0.00	1,239,335	280,349	0	1,519,684
Community Corrections	0.00	365,277	0	0	365,277
Total	221.87	\$10,126,117	\$9,836,601	\$8,631,978	\$28,594,696

Sheriff's Office program previously in H&HS with no Community Corrections Act funding in FY 07/08:

PROGRAM	FTE	CCA FUNDING	OTHER REVENUE	GENERAL FUND	TOTAL BUDGET
Domestic Violence Monitoring*	1.00	**	\$0	\$201,617	\$0
Total	1.00	\$0	\$201,617	\$0	\$201,617

* Current grant ends June 30, 2008.

** This is a FOPPO represented employee. Domestic Violence Monitoring services are consistent with the other supervision services proposed for transfer to the Sheriff's Office.