

Salem Area Community Corrections

State clients,
local services,
and policy choices

4-26-91
MPL

127221



Bureau of Governmental Research and Service
University of Oregon

127221

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

Bureau of Governmental Research
& Service/University of Oregon

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

Salem Area Community Corrections

State clients,
local services,
and policy choices

by Karen M. Seidel and Kevin S. Knudtson
with Kenneth D. Viegas

Bureau of Governmental Research and Service
University of Oregon

This report was prepared for the Mid Willamette Valley Council of Governments and funded by four of its member governments:

- City of Keizer
- City of Salem
- Marion County
- Polk County

Bureau of Governmental Research and Service
University of Oregon
P.O. Box 3177
Eugene, Oregon 97403-0177
(503) 686-5232

April 1987

The University of Oregon is an equal opportunity, affirmative action institution.

FOREWORD

An earlier study by the Bureau of Governmental Research and Service indicated that Marion and Polk counties receive a disproportionate share of state correctional clients on leave and parole compared with other regions of the state (see Salem Area Institutions: Correctional and Mental Health Institutions and the Ex-Institutional Population, February 1987). Local government officials in the Salem area share a concern that, because of the large number of offenders and their difficulties in transition from institution to community, offenders on leave or parole place a significant burden on local public and private service providers. To assess the scope of this burden, four local governments contracted with the Bureau through the Mid Willamette Valley Council of Governments to analyze characteristics of offenders released to the Salem area and their use of services. They also requested an analysis of state correctional policies and the Governor's Criminal Justice Initiative in order to identify any adverse impacts on the Salem area and to suggest possible changes in legislative or administrative policy.

Karen Seidel, Bureau Senior Research Associate, and Kevin Knudtson, Bureau Research Assistant, conducted the analysis of characteristics and service use of state correctional clients under supervision of the Marion and Polk counties' community corrections departments. Ken Viegas, associate professor of Human Services and director of the University of Oregon's program in corrections, assessed past, existing and proposed state correctional policy in the context of national changes in the criminal justice system.

Both analyses confirmed that severe overcrowding at state correctional facilities has created significant problems for treatment programs, reentry planning, and service provision, both within the institutions and in the Salem area community. Based on the analyses of Seidel, Knudtson and Viegas, several policy choices are offered. The construction of additional correctional bedspace as recommended in the Governor's Criminal Justice Initiative is the crucial first step. More bedspace alone, however, will not solve the problem for Salem area local governments. Three additional policy objectives also should be considered: (1) decentralized release and treatment programs for all Oregon offenders, (2) improved community corrections programs statewide, and (3) improved sentencing guidelines and risk management strategies.

The many corrections and service professionals who provided information, guidance and other assistance for the study are too numerous to list. The primary burden of supplying data and answering questions fell on the staff of the Marion County Corrections Department (Billy Wasson, director) and the Polk County Community Corrections Department (Larry van Dusen, acting director). Jean Hill, management analyst for Marion County Corrections Department, gave suggestions for the

study design and helped enormously with staff contacts and actual conduct of the research. Corrections Division staff, staff at Marion and Polk counties' health and mental health departments, and many other Salem area service providers supplied comprehensive information about their programs. This study benefited from the same earnest and informed concern that corrections and service agency staffs obviously bring to their work.

In addition, we wish to thank Janice Gotchall, who assisted in data collection and data entry; Joyce Ray, who edited the report; and Bobbette Elliott, who word processed it.

Jeff S. Luke, Director
Bureau of Governmental
Research and Service
April 1987

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title	Page
RESEARCH SUMMARY	i
POLICY CHOICES SUMMARY	v
SALEM AREA STATE CORRECTIONS CLIENTS: THEIR CHARACTERISTICS AND USE OF LOCAL SERVICES	1
Scope and Purpose	3
Methodology	3
Characteristics of Salem Area Offenders	4
General Characteristics	4
Demographic Characteristics	7
Housing and Economic Characteristics	9
Criminal Characteristics	13
Use of Salem Area Services	16
Employment Services	17
Alcohol and Drug Programs	18
Sex Offender Programs	20
Other Health Services	21
Food Stamps Program	21
Housing Services	21
Transportation	22
Other Services	23
Encounters with Local Law Enforcement Agencies	24
Criminal Behavior	25
Location of Encounter	26
Outcome of Encounter	27
Parolee Interviews	27
General Findings	29
Results of Prison Overcrowding	29
Alcohol and Drug Treatment Program--Costs and Demands	31
Cost Analysis of Law Enforcement Encounters	32
Release Policy	32
Referrals	34

Table of Contents (cont.)

Title	Page
CORRECTIONAL POLICY TRENDS AND CURRENT POLICY CHOICES	37
Recent Trends in the United States and Oregon	39
Introduction	39
Rehabilitation and Treatment	39
Punishment	41
Incapacitation and Risk Management	42
Prison Overcrowding and the Oregon Criminal Justice Initiative	43
Current Policy Environment	44
Policy Choices for Correctional Reform in the Salem Area	47
Bedspace Issues	47
Institutional Treatment and Release Program Issues	48
General Problem	48
Correctional Treatment Program	48
Release System	49
OSP and OSCI Release Planning	50
Community Corrections Program Issues	51
Community Corrections Act Participation	51
Corrections Division Subsidy Program	51
Community Corrections Resources	52
Sentencing Guidelines/Risk Management	53
Uniform Sentencing Guidelines	53
Offender-Based Data System	54
Immediate Discussion Regarding Regional Facilities Planning	55
APPENDIXES	57
Appendix 1: Corrections Division's Proposal for Regional Facilities	59
Appendix 2: Governor's Task Force on Corrections Planning	61
Appendix 3: Working Group of the Governor's Task Force on Corrections Planning	63

LIST OF TABLES

Title	Page
Table 1: Sample Clients, by Leave/Parole Status, at Time of Departure from Institution	5
Table 2: Sample Clients, by Active/Inactive Status	6
Table 3: Sample Clients, by Months Under Supervision	6
Table 4: Sample Clients, by County of Sentencing	7
Table 5: Sample Clients, by Age	8
Table 6: Sample Clients, by Sex	8
Table 7: Sample Clients, by Household Type	9
Table 8: Sample Clients, by First- and Last-Month Housing Type	10
Table 9: Sample Clients, by Employment Status	11
Table 10: Sample Clients, by Participation in Corrections Division Subsidy Program	12
Table 11: Sample Clients, by Felony Class, Compared with All 1986 Institutional Releases	14
Table 12: Sample Clients, by Offense Severity Rating, Compared with All 1986 Institutional Releases	15
Table 13: Sample Clients, by History-Risk Score, Compared with All 1986 Institutional Releases	16
Table 14: Service Contacts, by Sample Clients	17
Table 15: Sample Clients, by Possession of Driver's License	23
Table 16: Sample Clients, by Encounters with Law Enforcement Agencies	24
Table 17: Law Enforcement Agency Encounters, by Client Behavior	25
Table 18: Law Enforcement Agency Encounters, by Location	26

List of Tables (cont.)

<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
Table 19: Law Enforcement Agency Encounters, by Outcome	27
Table 20: Sample Clients, by Law Enforcement Agency Encounters, by Household Type	33
Table 21: Law Enforcement Encounters, by Criminal Behavior, by Household Type	34

RESEARCH SUMMARY

Of the 162 Oregon Corrections Division clients who came to Marion County Corrections Department and Polk County Community Corrections Department on long-term temporary leave or parole between May and August 1986, files were examined for 140 sample clients. Of those:

- Seventy-nine percent entered the Salem area on long-term temporary leave, and 21 percent were released directly to parole;
- Slightly over half (54 percent) were sentenced in Marion or Polk counties, and the remaining 46 percent were sentenced in other Oregon counties;
- Nearly 25 percent were under twenty-five years old, 50 percent were under thirty, and 83 percent were under forty;
- Most lived with one or more family members after release from prison (44 percent), but many lived with a friend or fiancé (37 percent), 16 percent lived alone, and one was homeless;
- Over half were employed during some or all of their first six months under supervision in the Salem area, but most jobs were part-time or seasonal, and only a few clients were in job training or were attending school.

Overall, offenders supervised in Marion and Polk counties had slightly more severe criminal characteristics than did all offenders released from Oregon correctional institutions in 1986.

- Using the A-B-C felony classification system as a measure of offense severity, the Salem area had relatively more Class A felons and fewer Class C felons compared with all releases from Corrections Division supervision.
- Using the Oregon Parole Board's offense severity ratings, fewer Salem area clients fell into the least severe crime category than did all releases. Their overall mean and median ratings were slightly higher (more severe) than ratings for all releases.
- Using the Parole Board's history-risk score ratings, the proportion of Salem area clients in the "excellent" and "fair" categories were almost identical to all releases. However, relatively fewer sample clients had "good" scores, and more sample clients had "poor" scores.

A review of clients' files revealed that parole officers arrange for services that are mandated by the Corrections Division or the Oregon Parole Board as a condition of temporary leave or parole. Referrals also are made to a variety of other nonmandated services in the Salem area.

- The services most commonly used by sample clients were state employment counseling and county and private alcohol and drug counseling and treatment programs. Both are routine service arrangements for clients without jobs and for clients with alcohol or drug problems.
- Over 60 percent of sample clients were involved in one or more alcohol and drug programs provided by the state, Marion and Polk counties, or private and nonprofit agencies. Clients with special treatment needs are sometimes referred to programs outside the Salem area.
- The state and federally funded Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime (TASC) program pays for alcohol and drug counseling for clients who need counseling but cannot afford it. The program is praised by parole officers and administrators because it enables more clients to receive treatment.
- Marion County clients who must participate in sex offender counseling are referred to private therapists, since Marion County does not offer such a program. Two parole officers work exclusively with these clients. Polk County Mental Health Department, using state mental health funds, subcontracts for sex offender counseling on a sliding scale for clients in that county.
- While approximately 90 percent of sample clients lived in private housing, 25 percent participated in the Corrections Division's subsidy program, which can pay for a client's rent for the first one or two months. Because the number of landlords willing to accept subsidy clients is very small, corrections clients tend to "cluster" in a few rental properties.
- Nearly two-thirds of sample clients had no valid driver's license. Of these, most relied on public transportation--many with the assistance of state-funded bus passes--while the remainder depended on friends or relatives to provide private transportation.
- A wide variety of additional services are used by clients, such as emergency food and housing, medical care, financial assistance, and legal aid. However, the community corrections departments are generally unable to document their use, since parole officers only inform clients of service availability. Unless mandated as a condition of leave or parole, they cannot require their use.

A total of 144 contacts between sample clients and law enforcement agencies was documented; 54 clients had no contacts, 48 clients had one contact, and 38 clients had two or more contacts. Of those law enforcement encounters:

- Forty percent were due to statutory offenses, 30 percent to property crimes, 20 percent to abscondences or escapes, and 10 percent to person crimes;
- Nearly two-thirds occurred in Marion County, 6 percent took place in Polk County, and 29 percent occurred outside these two counties;
- One-quarter of the clients had parole or leave revoked as a result of law enforcement encounters; other outcomes included jail sentence, citation, release with or without reprimand, and placement on escape/abscond status.

POLICY CHOICES SUMMARY

- Current discussions by state policy makers concerning the overcrowding of state correctional facilities have focused predominantly on the Governor's Criminal Justice Initiative which proposes the construction of minimum- and medium-security beds at EOCI and at new regional facilities around the state. Additional bedspace alone, however, will only be a partial solution and will require additional legislative and administrative changes in three related policy areas:
 - Improved and decentralized release planning and reentry programs
 - Improvements in the Community Corrections Act (CCA) programs
 - Improved sentencing guidelines and risk management strategies
- To reduce problems associated with concentrating services, offenders and treatment programs in state correctional facilities in the Salem area, local governments in the region should participate in the current policy discussions of the Governor's Task Force on Corrections Planning. Policy discussions regarding the Governor's Criminal Justice Initiative should include consideration of the following objectives:
 - Regional facilities should be responsible for prerelease planning and services for offenders incarcerated at those facilities (decentralized release system).
 - Regional facilities also should function as prerelease centers for serious offenders from OSP, OSCI and OWCC (deconcentrated release services for serious offenders).
 - Regional facilities should provide adequate treatment programs for minimum-security offenders (decentralized treatment programs).
 - Additional services and programs necessary for offenders sentenced from, and returned to, the Salem metropolitan area should be provided locally (enhanced initial-commitment and release services for Salem area offenders).
- In addition to these more immediate policy options, several longer-term policy choices could be pursued:
 - Salem area local governments should support efforts to provide incentives for every area in Oregon to participate fully in the Community Corrections Act.

- Salem area local governments should recommend transfer of the Corrections Division subsidy program to community corrections agencies. In addition, subsidy funds and staff to operate the program should be increased to better assist offenders in their transition from institution to community.
- Salem area local governments should seek additional federal or state funding for providing more effective and coordinated services to state correctional clients.
- Salem area local governments should support the Oregon Criminal Justice Council recommendations for uniform sentencing guidelines to be used by judges in felony cases.
- Salem area local governments should support efforts by the Corrections Division and other state agencies to develop an integrated information system of offender-based data for use at both state and local levels.

SALEM AREA STATE CORRECTIONS CLIENTS
THEIR CHARACTERISTICS AND USE OF LOCAL SERVICES

Scope and Purpose of the Study

In 1985, the Salem metropolitan area (Marion and Polk counties) was the region of sentencing for 9 percent of all new court commitments to the Oregon Corrections Division. In the same year, Marion and Polk counties' community corrections departments supervised almost 18 percent of Corrections Division inmates released to parole in the state of Oregon. Not only were almost twice as many Corrections Division clients released into the Salem area as were admitted from that area, the two counties also received a disproportionate number of inmates who departed from correctional institutions in other ways (short- and long-term leaves, escapes).¹

The purpose of this study is to ascertain the impact of offenders living in the Salem area on local public, private and nonprofit social service providers due to (1) their large numbers (relative to Salem area admissions to state correctional institutions), (2) their characteristics and behavior, and (3) their social service needs and demands. To accomplish this, the demographic, economic and housing characteristics and criminal histories of offenders on long-term leave and parole in the Salem area were investigated. Following the determination of offender profiles, data on the use of local public services and other social services in the Salem area were collected and analyzed. Offender behavior that led to encounters with local law enforcement agencies was also tabulated. The process by which this information was gathered is described below.

Methodology

The impact on Salem area resources and services of all inmate departures from state correctional facilities was narrowed to a study of inmates who departed on long-term temporary leave and parole. It is these two types of departures that involve the most persons and the greatest amount of time spent by offenders in the community. Information on their characteristics, behavior and service use was gathered primarily from the files of Marion and Polk counties' community corrections departments. All persons on long-term leave or parole are under the supervision of those departments.²

1. Bureau of Governmental Research and Service, University of Oregon, Salem Area Institutions: Correctional and Mental Health Institutions and the Ex-Institutional Population (February 1987).

2. The Corrections Division may grant long-term temporary leave for a period of up to 180 days preceding an inmate's established parole release or discharge date. Long-term leave supervision is placed in the appropriate field office or community corrections department. An inmate released to parole must be under active field supervision during the first six months of the parole period and cannot be discharged during this period unless the sentence imposed by the court expires at an earlier date.

All 162 persons placed on long-term leave and parole (parolees without immediately prior long-term leave) in Marion and Polk counties between May 1, 1986, and August 31, 1986, constituted the client sample for the study. Of those, files for 140 clients under community corrections department supervision, or 86 percent of the total, were reviewed.³ Because the greatest use of community resources and services occurs during the period immediately following institutional departure, i.e., while the offender is establishing himself or herself in the community and obtaining housing and employment, the files were reviewed for each client's activities and service use during the first six months of residence in the Salem area or until the offender ceased being under field supervision (if that period was for less than six months).⁴

Since all activities involving contacts with service providers were not necessarily recorded in client files, particularly for services that were not mandated as a condition of leave or parole, additional information regarding those service contacts was obtained through interviews with parole officers. Agencies that provide offenders with extensive services also were contacted to learn of their programs.

Characteristics of Salem Area Offenders

General Characteristics

Since the average number of all parolees and leavees under the supervision of Marion and Polk counties' community corrections departments between May and August 1986 (371 persons) was similar to the average number under supervision for the entire year (363 persons), the 162 new clients of the two departments between May and August were assumed to represent approximately one-third of all new state correctional clients coming under field supervision in Marion and Polk counties in 1986.⁵ Therefore, slightly under 500 persons on long-term leave or parole (without immediately prior leave) are estimated to have entered the Salem area during 1986. The following information on characteristics, behavior and service use of community correction department clients is for the 140 clients whose files were reviewed.

3. Fourteen persons (and their files) had been transferred to other field offices. Eight files were not available.

4. During the first six-month period, field supervision may terminate because of parole or leave revocation, discharge, death, escape from temporary leave, or abscondence from parole.

5. The Corrections Division's monthly statistical reports are the source of parole and temporary leave supervision figures.

To obtain estimates of all clients entering the Salem area during 1986, the figures should be expanded by a factor of 3.4 (162 times 3 divided by 140).

Leave/Parole Status. Since the Corrections Division's long-term leave program was established in 1980, most inmates reenter the community from Oregon correctional facilities when long-term leave is granted. If conditions of the leave are met and the leave is successful, the inmate is then released to parole (or discharged because of sentence expiration). Most new Marion and Polk County community corrections departments' clients from state institutions were on leave status when they left the institution (see table 1). Only 21 percent of the sample clients came under field supervision as parolees with no immediately prior temporary leave.

TABLE 1

Sample Clients, by Leave/Parole Status,
at Time of Departure from Institution

Status	Number	Percent of Total
Long-term leave	110	78.6%
Parole	30	21.4
Total	140	100.0%

Note: In this and all following tables, "sample clients" refer to the 140 inmates from state correctional facilities who came under the supervision of the Marion or Polk County community corrections departments between May 1, 1986, and August 31, 1986, and whose files were reviewed.

Active/Inactive Status. As of February 1, 1987, 70 sample clients were still under supervision of the community corrections departments (see table 2). Supervision had ceased for the other 70 clients because of discharge, parole or leave revocation, escape or abscondence, or death.

TABLE 2

Sample Clients, by Active/Inactive Status

Status	Number	Percent of Total
Active	70	50.0%
Inactive	70	50.0
Total	140	100.0%

Months Under Community Corrections Supervision. Information regarding activities and use of services in the Salem area was collected for the first six-month period that sample clients were living in the community. For 70 percent of the clients, this information covered a full six months (see table 3). Supervision over 30 percent of the clients terminated earlier than six months because of parole or leave revocations, escapes or abscondences, or death.

TABLE 3

Sample Clients, by Months Under Supervision

Months	Number	Percent of Total
1	15	10.9%
2	5	3.6
3	7	5.1
4	7	5.1
5	8	5.8
6 or more	96	69.5
Missing	2	--
Total	140	100.0%

Note: In this and following tables, "missing" refers to data that were unavailable or not collected. Missing data are not included in the "percent of total" column.

County of Sentencing. Slightly over one-half of all sample clients under supervision in Marion and Polk counties were sentenced in those counties (see table 4). Of those who were sentenced outside the Salem area, 32 clients, or about half the remainder, were sentenced in the Eugene or Portland metropolitan areas (Lane, Multnomah, Clackamas or Washington counties). All but five of the rest were sentenced in other western Oregon counties.

Although 63 offenders were not sentenced in Marion or Polk counties that does not necessarily imply that they were not Salem area residents at the time they were sentenced. Sentencing generally occurs in the county of the criminal occurrence, not the county of residence. Persons from the Salem area may have committed crimes in other parts of the state. Conversely, some offenders sentenced in Marion and Polk counties may have been living elsewhere at the time the crime was committed.

TABLE 4

Sample Clients, by County of Sentencing

County of Sentencing	Number	Percent of Total
Marion or Polk	75	54.3%
Other Oregon counties	63	45.7
Missing	2	--
Total	140	100.0%

Demographic Characteristics

Demographic data were collected on the age, sex and household makeup of clients on long-term temporary leave and parole. These clients fell within a relatively narrow range of ages: nearly 25 percent were under twenty-five years of age, nearly 50 percent were under thirty, and 83 percent were under forty (see table 5).

TABLE 5

Sample Clients, by Age

Age	Number	Percent of Total
19-24	34	24.3%
25-29	36	25.7
30-34	24	17.1
35-39	22	15.7
40-44	10	7.1
45-49	8	5.7
50 and over	6	4.3
Total	140	100.0%

The sample consisted principally of male clients, who outnumbered females 90 percent to 10 percent.

TABLE 6

Sample Clients, by Sex

Sex	Number	Percent of Total
Male	126	90.0%
Female	14	10.0
Total	140	100.0%

After being released from prison, almost half of the clients lived with family members, such as a spouse, spouse and children, or other relative (parents or siblings). Many moved in with a friend or fiance living in the community. Only one client in the sample was identified as homeless (see table 7).

TABLE 7

Sample Clients, by Household Type

Household Type	Number	Percent of Total
Spouse	14	10.8%
Spouse and children	7	5.4
Other relative	37	28.5
Friend or fiance	48	36.9
Alone	21	16.2
Homeless	1	0.8
Other	2	1.5
Missing	10	--
Total	140	100.0%

Note: Clients listed under "Other" were unable to find housing and were living temporarily in the Marion County Restitution Center.

Housing and Economic Characteristics

Information on housing, employment and training was collected for both the first month the client was out on temporary leave or parole and either the last month the client remained under supervision or the sixth month--whichever came first. While first- and last-month data give some indication of the client's progress over time, many leavees and parolees were highly mobile and changed housing and jobs frequently. Thus, the first- and last-month data represent only snapshots of the client's progress in securing housing and employment and do not illustrate the frequent changes that occurred during this period.

Housing. The vast majority of sample clients came out of prison to privately owned, market-rate housing, usually to live with someone already residing in the Salem area. The balance lived in subsidized public housing, group homes, and temporary emergency housing (see table 8).

Most of those in subsidized public housing participated in the federal Section 8 low-income housing program which reduces tenants' costs to a fixed fraction of monthly income. There is, however, a scarcity of these units, and it is reasonable to assume that the number of clients who utilized public housing was constrained by the lack of subsidized units (see Housing Services, p. 21). Group homes included congregate

housing arrangements, such as the YMCA and residential alcohol and drug treatment programs. Emergency housing, such as the Salvation Army, is limited to short-term quarters for those without other housing options.

TABLE 8
Sample Clients,
by First- and Last-Month Housing Type

Housing Type	First Month		Last Month	
	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total
Private	106	91.3%	91	89.2%
Public-subsidized	2	1.7	5	4.9
Group home	6	5.2	5	4.9
Emergency shelter	2	1.7	0	0.0
Homeless	0	0.0	1	1.0
Missing	7	--	21	--
Total	123	100.0%	123	100.0%

Note: Seventeen sample clients were under community corrections supervision for one month or less and are not included here. "Private" includes clients receiving Corrections Division subsidies toward rent in private housing.

The proportion of clients in each housing type remained relatively stable between the first and last month, although there was an increase in the use of public housing.

Employment. Sample clients were nearly evenly split between those who were employed in the first month of community corrections supervision and those who were unemployed (see table 9). Some found jobs with friends, relatives or former employers, while many others relied on seasonal opportunities for part-time, temporary work, e.g.,

in local canneries and processing plants.⁶ In the last month of supervision, the proportion of employed clients increased, but the increase in missing employment data prevents any conclusions being drawn regarding changes in clients' labor force participation.

TABLE 9

Sample Clients, by Employment Status

Status	First Month		Last Month	
	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total
Employed	60	52.2%	60	58.8%
Full time	9		20	
Part time	41		34	
Missing	10		6	
Unemployed	55	47.8	42	41.2
Job training	1		1	
Attending school	6		5	
Other unemployed	49		36	
Missing	8	--	21	--
Total	123	100.0%	123	100.0%

Note: Seventeen sample clients were under community corrections supervision for one month or less and are not included here.

Of the clients employed in the first month, 18 percent had full-time jobs and 82 percent had part-time jobs. In the last (or sixth) month of supervision, full-time workers had increased to 37 percent, while 63 percent worked part time. Of those unemployed in the first month of supervision, 12 percent were involved in job training or were enrolled in classes at Chemeketa Community College. Of the 42 unemployed in the last month, 14 percent were involved in such programs.

6. Since seasonal farm and food-processing work tends to be more available during summer months, the distribution of employed clients between full- and part-time employment may not be representative for the entire year.

Corrections Division Subsidy Clients. Inmates who have no resources for securing housing, food or transportation, and no family or friends in the community willing to help, are eligible for a subsidy payment from the state Corrections Division. Clients work with their Corrections Division Release Center counselor to obtain the subsidy. Counselors, in turn, interview interested clients to ascertain particular needs (rent, transportation, food) and the amount of the subsidy. By reviewing the client's approved visiting list from the prison, an attempt is made to determine whether the client has family or acquaintances within the community who have an interest in the client and could provide assistance. It is felt that having such interested parties in the community is an important determinant in a client's success, so such placements are preferred to the subsidy program.

If a landlord agrees to participate, a subsidy of up to \$210 a month may be applied toward rent for the client. The duration of the rent subsidy fluctuates with availability of funds. Currently, clients may request two months of rent subsidy; however, it may be extended an additional month in emergency situations (e.g., if a client is injured and cannot work).⁷ Funds also may be supplied for bus passes, food stamps, medical and antabuse costs, and incidental expenses.

One-quarter of the sample clients were beneficiaries of the Corrections Division subsidy program (see table 10). Data from the Corrections Division Release Center show that in October, November and December 1986, 15 percent of the state's subsidy clients came out of prison to Marion County supervision. Since the Salem area receives approximately 17 percent of all long-term temporary leaves and paroles, there is no apparent concentration of subsidy clients in the Salem area.

TABLE 10

Sample Clients, by Participation
in Corrections Division Subsidy Program

Subsidy Program	Number	Percent of Total
Receive subsidy	35	25.0%
Do not receive subsidy	105	75.0
Total	140	100.0%

7. The Corrections Division's goal is for clients to attain self-sufficiency within one month of beginning long-term temporary leave.

Criminal Characteristics

The criminal characteristics and histories of sample clients were measured in three ways: (1) current offense, according to the A-B-C felony classification system; (2) current offense, according to the Parole Board's offense severity rating; and (3) criminal history, according to the Parole Board's history-risk score. Criminal characteristics and histories of Marion and Polk counties' sample clients are compared with all 1986 Corrections Division institutional releases in this section.

Current Offense (A-B-C Felony). The A-B-C felony classification system is one measure of severity of offense.⁸ Approximately half of the current offenses of Salem area clients were Class C felonies, the least severe type of offense for which a prison term can be imposed (see table 11). Class A felonies made up 37 percent of all current offenses. For all statewide institutional releases in 1986, Class A felonies accounted for relatively fewer offenses, and Class C felonies for slightly more. In other words, offenders living in the Salem area appear to have committed slightly more serious crimes than offenders in the state as a whole.

8. Felons are classified as A felons, B felons, C felons, and unclassified felons, as stipulated in ORS 161.535. The particular classification of each felony defined in the Oregon Criminal Code (with the exceptions of murder and treason) is designated in the section defining the crime. This classification may be considered as a general measure of offense severity since, according to ORS 161.605, the maximum term of an indeterminate sentence of imprisonment for a felony is 20 years for a Class A felony, 10 years for a Class B felony, and 5 years for a Class C felony.

TABLE 11

Sample Clients, by Felony Class,
Compared with All 1986 Institutional Releases

Felony Class	Sample Clients		All Institutional Releases	
	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total
A	52	37.1%	992	33.5%
B	17	12.2	334	11.3
C	69	49.3	1,611	54.3
Unclassified ^a	2	1.4	26	0.9
Missing	0	--	25	--
Total	140	100.0%	2,988	100.0%

Source: Data on all institutional releases from Corrections Division.

^aMurder and treason.

Current Offense (Parole Board). The Oregon Board of Parole matrix, an overall sentencing guideline, is composed of an offense severity rating and a criminal history and risk assessment score. For the offense severity rating, all felony crimes are placed in one of seven crime categories according to severity of the offense, with crime category 1 being the least severe (e.g., theft under \$1,000, hindering prosecution, driving while suspended), and crime category 7 the most severe (murder and treason).

Most sample clients and statewide institutional releases fell into crime categories 1, 2 or 3 (see table 12). Relatively fewer sample clients were in crime category 1 (24 percent) compared with all institutional releases (32 percent). Significantly more sample clients, however, were reported as belonging to crime category 3.⁹ Except for category 7, slightly more statewide institutional releases made up the more severe crime categories (4 through 6) than did sample clients in Marion and Polk counties.¹⁰

9. Typical crimes in this category are theft or fraud over \$5,000, manufacture or delivery of controlled substance, sexual abuse, and some types of burglary.

10. Current offenses of Salem area sample clients appear to be somewhat more severe when classified by the A-B-C felony classification system than when classified by the Parole Board's crime categories.

TABLE 12

Sample Clients, by Offense Severity Rating,
Compared with All 1986 Institutional Releases

Crime Category	Sample Clients		All Institutional Releases	
	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total
1	32	23.5%	929	31.7%
2	35	25.7	721	24.6
3	38	27.9	441	15.0
4	13	9.6	382	13.0
5	3	2.2	123	4.2
6	13	9.6	311	10.6
7	2	1.5	25	0.9
Missing	4	--	56	--
Total	140	100.0%	2,988	100.0%

History-Risk Score. The Parole Board's criminal history-risk assessment of each Corrections Division inmate is a composite score ranging from zero (worst score) to eleven (best score). The score is composed of ratings on the following history-risk indicators:

- Number of prior felony convictions as an adult or juvenile;
- Number of prior felony or misdemeanor incarcerations as an adult or juvenile;
- Three years conviction-free in the community prior to present commitment;
- Age at commencement of behavior leading to present incarceration;
- Parole, probation, failure to appear, release agreement, escape or custody violation as factor in present commitment; and

This may be because 30 of the 52 A-felony offenses (see table 11) consisted of Burglary I crimes. The Parole Board places a Burglary I in crime categories 3, 4 or 5 depending on (1) entry into a building, (2) use or threatened use of force, and (3) value of goods taken. Most burglaries by Salem area offenders were rated as crime category 3, the least severe of the three ranks.

- Substance abuse problem within a three-year period in the community immediately preceding commission of crime of present conviction.

The history-risk scores of sample clients were compared with all 1986 institutional releases (see table 13). The proportion of sample clients and all releases were almost identical in the "excellent" and "fair" categories. However, relatively fewer sample clients had "good" history-risk scores, and more sample clients had "poor" scores compared with all releases. Although the sample size is small, these comparisons provide some evidence that, in general, offenders in the Salem area may have slightly worse history-risk scores than all releases.

TABLE 13

Sample Clients, by History-Risk Score,
Compared with All 1986 Institutional Releases

History-Risk Score	Sample Clients		All Institutional Releases	
	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total
Excellent (9-11)	22	16.1%	489	16.7%
Good (6-8)	31	22.6	811	27.7
Fair (3-5)	53	38.7	1,119	38.2
Poor (0-2)	31	22.6	512	17.4
Missing	3	--	57	--
Total	140	100.0%	2,988	100.0%

Use of Salem Area Services

The services a community corrections client uses as part of a leave or parole program are dictated in large part by conditions set out in the leave or parole order. An inmate whose criminal history involved illegal use of drugs or alcohol, for example, usually must complete an alcohol or drug treatment program in order to remain in compliance with his or her leave or parole order. Many community corrections clients are required to take antabuse and to undergo random urinalysis to monitor conformance. Convicted sex offenders also are required to participate in therapy. Clients who are not economically prepared to make the transition to private life are referred to employment counseling, welfare and food stamp offices, emergency housing, and subsidized public housing programs. Parole officers are less likely to make

counseling referrals if referral is not a condition of leave or parole, because it may be difficult to persuade a client to participate without the threat of leave or parole revocation.

Table 14 shows the number of instances in which sample clients used a particular service and the percentage of sample clients who did so. The data in this table came chiefly from client files. However, interviews conducted with parole officers revealed that some referrals are made so routinely that they are not always noted in client files. For this reason, the figures presented are very conservative estimates, particularly in the cases of referrals to state employment counseling and to local food stamp programs.

TABLE 14

Service Contacts, by Sample Clients

Service	Number	Percent of Clients
State employment	46	32.9%
Private employment	2	1.4
State alcohol and drug	7	5.0
County alcohol and drug	61	43.6
Private alcohol and drug	52	37.1
Food stamps	22	15.7
Sex offender counseling	14	10.0
Other counseling	6	4.3
Emergency housing	1	0.7
Housing authority	8	5.7
Welfare	8	5.7

Employment Services

Employment counseling services appear to be used by almost all new leave and parole clients, because most do not have jobs when they leave prison. Parole officers report that referrals to state Employment Division job counselors are routine for new clients who have no prior arrangements for employment. Employment data (see table 9) show that almost half the new clients were unemployed during the first month of supervision. Of those employed during the first month, only a small proportion were employed full time. Thus, over 100 sample clients may have been in need of some employment counseling services.

The state Employment Division maintains an office staffed with two job counselors in the offices of the Marion County Corrections Department in Salem. Begun in 1983, the program is funded from federal Job Training and Partnership Act (JTPA) funds and through a special fund created from federal penalty and interest proceeds from delinquent unemployment insurance payments by employers. The office has access to computerized statewide job listings through which it can access potential jobs, depending on the skills of the client. Office space is provided by the Corrections Department.

Often, the greatest difficulty for parole officers is convincing clients to make, and keep, appointments with service providers. Marion County parole officers report that the location of job counseling in the department makes it one of the most successful services because they can simply take clients into the next office for counseling.

The employment office reported that a great number of their placements are unskilled seasonal jobs at farms, local canneries, and processing plants. The low-paying and labor-intensive establishments in and around the Salem area provide work for many offenders who possess no marketable job skills, high school education, or driver's license.

Clients are also referred to the Mid-Willamette Jobs Council, another JTPA funded project, for job training, and sometimes tools, clothing and other job necessities.

Alcohol and Drug Programs

Parole officer interviews indicated that, after employment services, alcohol and drug treatment programs were used most frequently by sample clients, undoubtedly because these programs are often a condition of leave or parole. Based on information from files, eighty-five clients, or slightly over 60 percent, were involved in one or more programs provided by the state (through the Cornerstone aftercare program), Marion or Polk counties, or private or nonprofit programs. Treatment arrangements made by parole officers are not limited to programs available in the Salem area only. Depending on the client's special treatment needs, referrals are also made to programs in Portland, Klamath Falls, and Kelso (Washington).

In 1985, Marion County Corrections Department received a federal Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime (TASC) grant to fund alcohol and drug counseling for appropriate clients. The grant, matched by the department's state mental health funds, is used to provide free services for clients in Marion County Health Department, B & J Counseling Center, and other private alcohol and drug treatment programs. Client eligibility is determined on a case-by-case basis by department staff, based on the client's employment status, conditions of parole, and motivation. The grant has been extended through June 1987.

The following agencies provide the most frequently used alcohol and drug programs in the Salem area.

Marion County Health Department. Marion County operates a methadone treatment program, which includes evaluation, medication and a mandatory weekly counseling program. About 10 to 15 percent of current participants in this long-term treatment program are estimated to be parolees and probationers. The regular cost of the program is \$125 a month, but clients pay less if they are on food stamps or can document special needs or an emergency.

Marion County also provides a Drug Free Program, which is largely funded by a federal grant. Costs to clients are on a sliding scale based on monthly income and family size. The program is funded for 25 slots (18 adult and 7 youth) and provides weekly counseling sessions for adult men and women. Treatment length is generally between four and six months. Parolees and leavees generally occupy one or two program slots.

Marion County administers alcohol outpatient, residential, detoxification, and DUII education and treatment programs through contracts with White Oaks and B & J Counseling Center in Salem and Salud De La Familia in Woodburn.

Marion County Corrections Department. For all clients with abstinence from alcohol as a condition of leave or parole, participation in the department's antabuse program is required. The program involves regular dispensing of antabuse prescriptions by pharmacies, verification by pharmacies of clients' use of antabuse to parole officers, and random urinalysis to monitor compliance.

Polk County Mental Health Department. Three Polk County mental health counselors provide alcohol counseling individually and in group counseling sessions. The department contracts with a Marion County staff therapist for individual and group drug counseling services. Most clients in these programs are parolees and probationers. Charges to clients are on a sliding scale, and the community corrections department reimburses the county for these programs with its own and state mental health funds. Clients who need methadone treatment are referred to Marion County's program, and DUII offenders are referred to B & J Counseling Center.

B & J Counseling Center. B & J Counseling is a private corporation that contracts with county departments to provide alcohol and drug treatment on a sliding scale to corrections clients. B & J offers programs for individual and group alcohol and drug counseling, independent living skills training, family counseling, counseling for "revolving door" clients, and clients with disabilities. Charges to clients are on a sliding-scale basis and can be as low as \$7 for a counseling session. Marion County contracts with B & J Counseling Center to provide services at no cost to clients under the TASC program and to help subsidize those paying on a sliding scale.

White Oaks. White Oaks is a nonprofit alcohol and drug counseling agency that offers regular and intensive outpatient counseling. Intensive outpatient services require five sessions a week, three hours an evening, and are tailored particularly to those who cannot afford to take time off from work. Sliding-scale fees range from \$5 an hour to \$56 an hour for one-on-one counseling sessions. Prospective clients for the residential treatment program are screened for motivation and then participate in a 30-day program, followed by one year of aftercare consisting of either weekly or monthly sessions.

White Oaks also maintains eighteen beds for alcohol and drug detoxification. Withdrawal from toxicity usually takes from three to ten days and requires the presence of a doctor in an intensive treatment environment. Fifteen of the beds are earmarked for alcoholics, and since November 1986, three have been designated for drug abusers. White Oaks staff reported that all eighteen beds would be available soon for "chemical abusers" of any kind.

Sex Offender Programs

Parolees and probationers under the supervision of the Polk County Community Corrections Department are referred to the county's mental health department for sex offender services. For the past ten years, the county has subcontracted individual and group sex offender counseling to a private therapist. Average group size is about ten, with one to three parolees and the rest probationers. Offenders usually remain in this program for the duration of their parole or probation period. Group counseling sessions are held once a week, and individual sessions, in addition to intake interviews, are provided for high-risk offenders. The community corrections department uses state mental health funds to provide this program, and clients are charged on a sliding scale.

In the Marion County Corrections Department, two parole officers work exclusively with sex offender clients and lead a weekly sex offender support group. Since Marion County does not operate a sex offender treatment program, clients are referred to private therapists for counseling. Clients must be able to pay for these privately provided services unless they also have a substance abuse problem, in which case they are eligible for TASC funds.¹¹

The Correctional Treatment Program's Sex Offender Unit at the Oregon State Hospital is phasing out its aftercare program for released inmates. In February 1987, three offenders, all living in Salem,

11. Except for the community corrections support group, no service is available for indigent sex offender clients who do not have alcohol or drug problems.

participated in this program. Marion County parole officers also work with probationers treated in the OSH Forensics Program who are frequently released to the Salem area for follow-up and aftercare.

Other Health Services

County health and mental health departments provide emergency counseling and some programs for mentally and emotionally disturbed (MED) patients. The state provides aftercare for some inmates released from the Correctional Treatment Program's MED Unit. Emergency medical services are available at Salem Memorial Hospital. Community corrections clients are frequently referred to the West Salem Clinic, which provides medical services on an ability-to-pay basis. In addition, clients on welfare receive a medical card and may obtain free health services.

In February 1987, the Corrections Division was authorized to provide medical, dental and mental health services for all inmates on long-term temporary leave who do not have sufficient resources to pay for care. The standard of care is equal to that provided to institutionalized inmates. A person on long-term leave who has a qualifying medical problem may contact his or her parole officer, who contacts Corrections Division Health Services staff. The Corrections Division then authorizes treatment in the community.

Food Stamps Program

Client files show that nearly one-fifth of the sample clients applied for food stamps. This is probably a conservative estimate, as most parole officers indicate they routinely refer clients who are experiencing difficulty in meeting expenses to the food stamp program. All subsidy clients are eligible for food stamps.

Housing Services

Corrections clients have four principal alternatives for seeking housing on release from prison. They may look for housing on their own in the private market, move in with a relative or friend living in the community, apply for federally subsidized public housing, or seek temporary emergency housing.

According to client files, only one person used emergency housing services during the study period, although this may underestimate use of these services by all clients. The primary sources of emergency housing services in the Salem area are the Salvation Army, the Mission, and, when necessary, the Marion County Restitution Center. Parole officers reported that, thus far, these facilities have been adequate to deal with the need for emergency housing.

Eight sample clients requested subsidized public housing through the housing authority. Salem and Marion County housing authorities reported waiting lists ranging from three to eighteen months for

conventional public housing and existing Section 8 housing programs. These programs, which operate nearly all assisted housing in the area, are limited by federal guidelines to families and to single adults over sixty-two years old. Housing Authority staff reported, however, that unrelated "stable households" also may qualify. The Housing Authority administers a program of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, which can provide up to one month of rent for the purpose of avoiding homelessness. This program has been used by community corrections clients as an extension of their housing subsidy from the Corrections Division.

The remainder of sample clients found housing opportunities in the private market, either on their own or through the assistance of friends or relatives who live in the Salem area. Clients who cannot afford housing on their own, who have no friends or relatives in the community, and who are not able to obtain subsidized public housing must rely on the Corrections Division subsidy program to obtain housing. Because the subsidy program covers rent for only a month or two, and because of the stigma many landlords attach to former prison inmates, it can be extremely difficult to find landlords willing to participate in the subsidy program. The unfortunate outcome of this resistance by most landlords is that the few small apartment complexes that accept subsidy clients have become heavily populated with former inmates. Parole officers believe this "clustering" effect creates a poor and unsupportive environment for their clients. The environment allows clients to fall back into negative behavior patterns and provides disincentives to succeeding on leave or parole.

Unfortunately, few alternatives to the subsidy program exist, and parole officers have no choice but to rely on the few housing units that accept subsidy clients. Currently, three small apartment complexes in Salem and one in Dallas consistently rent to a large number of community corrections clients.

Transportation

Nearly two-thirds of the sample clients did not have valid driver's licenses (see table 15). Because of this, 46 percent of the sample clients relied on public transportation. Of the sample clients who did not have valid driver's licenses, 68 percent used the bus system as their main means of transportation. The rest depended on friends or relatives to provide private transportation. Only 6 percent of those with valid driver's licenses used public transportation.

TABLE 15

Sample Clients, by Possession
of Driver's License

Possess License	Number	Percent of Total
Yes	46	38.0%
No	75	62.0
Missing	19	--
Total	140	100.0%

Clients who do not have a driver's license and cannot afford public transportation may be given a bus pass by the Corrections Division's subsidy program (see Corrections Division Subsidy Clients, p. 12). Eligible clients include those on long-term temporary leave and parolees during the first 90 days after parole. Administered through the Corrections Division Release Center, the bus pass program provides one month of free public transportation. Clients may be given assistance beyond the first month, but such extensions are contingent on availability of subsidy funds.

Other Services

Besides services mandated as a condition of leave or parole and the other widely used services described above, parole officers refer clients to a wide variety of additional service providers in the Salem area. According to one parole officer, "We use every possible resource that we know is available." Most of these referrals are not recorded in clients' files. Although many clients have very limited economic resources when they are released from correctional facilities and are in great need of assistance, parole officers are generally unable to document whether available services have been used.¹² Some common referrals made by parole officers include the following:

12. Since offenders do not need to identify themselves as such when they apply for assistance, it is also impossible for providers to identify offenders as service users.

Legal problems (civil)	Marion/Polk Legal Aid
Education and job training	Chemeketa Community College
Emergency food and household goods	Salvation Army, Gospel Mission, St. Vincent de Paul, Dallas Resources and Referral Service
Financial assistance	Welfare
Family problems	Children's Services Division

Encounters with Local Law Enforcement Agencies

Police reports and other information in sample clients' files were used to determine the number and types of encounters that offenders had with law enforcement agencies during their first six months in the Salem area or until supervision was terminated during the six-month period. Encounters include abscondences from parole and escapes from leave, even if the "encounter" only involved issuance of an Oregon-Only All Points Bulletin. The 140 sample clients had a total of 144 contacts with law enforcement agencies, or slightly over one encounter for each client. Fifty-four clients had no contacts, 48 clients had one contact, and 38 clients had two or more contacts (see table 16).

TABLE 16

Sample Clients, by Encounters with Law Enforcement Agencies

Encounters	Number	Percent of Total
0	54	38.6%
1	48	34.3
2	24	17.1
3	8	5.7
4	6	4.3
Total	140	100.0%

Law enforcement encounters appear to be directly related to the history-risk scores of sample clients; i.e., clients with fair or poor history-risk scores had more encounters than clients with good or excellent scores. Only one-quarter of the clients with excellent history-risk scores had one or more encounters with law enforcement agencies. Half of the clients with good scores had one or more encounters. Encounters were reported for three out of four clients with fair or poor scores.

Criminal Behavior

Client behaviors responsible for encounters with law enforcement agencies were classified according to person, property or statutory offense, or as an abscondence or escape (see table 17).¹³ Forty percent of law enforcement encounters consisted of statutory offenses, and 30 percent were property crimes. The remaining offenses were abscondences or escapes (20 percent) or person crimes (10 percent).

TABLE 17

Law Enforcement Agency Encounters, by Client Behavior

Behavior	Number	Percent of Total
Person offense	14	9.7%
Property offense	44	30.6
Statutory offense	58	40.3
Vehicular	23	16.0
Alcohol and drug	15	10.4
Other statutory	20	13.9
Escape or abscond	28	19.4
Total	144	100.0%

13. If more than one behavior caused an encounter with a law enforcement agency, the most serious behavior was classified.

The principal behaviors that made up the person, property and statutory categories are listed below.

Person	Assault and robbery
Property	Theft and burglary
Vehicular	Driving while suspended
Alcohol and Drug	DUII and drug use or drug possession
Other Statutory	Possession of firearms, failure to appear, and criminal trespass

Location of Encounter

For law enforcement encounters for which information on location of crime was available, almost two-thirds of the sample clients' criminal behaviors occurred in Salem or in other parts of Marion County (see table 18). Six percent took place in Polk County and the remaining 29 percent occurred outside the Salem area.

TABLE 18

Law Enforcement Agency Encounters, by Location

Location	Number	Percent of Total
Salem	61	52.6%
Marion County outside Salem	14	12.1
Polk County	7	6.0
Elsewhere	34	29.3
Missing	28	--
Total	144	100.0%

Outcome of Encounter

While information from sample client files regarding outcomes of law enforcement encounters were frequently incomplete (sometimes because the outcome was still pending), parole or leave was revoked for at least one-quarter of the clients because of a contact or arrest (see table 19). Eighteen clients were still on abscond or escape status in February 1987. The remaining arrests or contacts either resulted in jail sentences, issuance of citations, release with or without reprimand, or results were unknown.

TABLE 19

Law Enforcement Agency Encounters, by Outcome

Type of Encounter	Number	Percent of Total
Arrest	67	46.5%
Parole or leave revoked	25	17.3
Other arrest	42	29.2
Contact (no arrest known)	59	40.9
Parole or leave revoked	12	8.3
Other contacts ^a	47	32.6
Escape or abscond status	18	12.6
Total	144	100.0%

^aAll encounters for which no information concerning outcome could be found were included here.

Parolee Interviews

Direct interviews with parolees under supervision of the Marion County Corrections Department were conducted as part of the study. The interviews were intended to identify parolees' perceptions of their service needs, to verify file information, and to provide a better understanding of service use.

Using standards developed by the University of Oregon and the Marion County Corrections Department, the process was carefully designed to avoid any negative effects to parolees who participated in the study.

A written notice of the study and its purposes was handed out by the receptionist to clients reporting to the department. Parolees who were willing to be interviewed were taken by the interviewer to a separate area and were given an opportunity to review and sign the informed-consent form. Although the interviewer was available on four separate occasions, most parolees were reluctant to volunteer for the interviews, and only five interviews were conducted. While the sample is too small to permit generalization, information gathered from the five interviews is included to provide additional documentation regarding parolees' experiences during reentry into the community from a correctional institution.

The interviews explored each client's experience with social services used during the first six months of long-term leave or parole. The primary problem that emerged was the overall difficulty of leaving an institution and becoming reestablished in an open community. While the degree of difficulty with transition varied among individuals, all agreed that length of stay in prison had a great deal of bearing on the extent of the problem. Short-term imprisonment created fewer dislocations, and relationships in the community were more likely to survive. Long-term incarceration often was associated with severance of family ties and greater deterioration of social skills.

None of the crimes for which the interviewed offenders were incarcerated were committed in the Salem area. Two of the five believed that the Corrections Division preferred, or required, that they complete their parole in the Salem area. One of the five thought that his aftercare treatment required that he stay in the Salem area. Four persons knew someone in the Salem area who would sponsor temporary housing for them on release; of those, three had developed the contact while institutionalized. None of the five had maintained a close relationship with his or her own family.

Only one parolee had a good understanding of available services. That person was sponsored by an organization that advises clients on services and serves as a client advocate.

All five persons interviewed had difficulty securing housing. Three clients in the subsidy program indicated that participation in the program identified them as offenders, and, as a result, housing searches were limited to the very few landlords that rent to subsidy-program clients. Those who received the housing subsidy also believed it was inadequate when compared with rental costs. Housing appeared to be inadequate and temporary for three of the five persons.

Two persons received some disability benefits, and they appeared to be the most financially comfortable of the five. Three persons were temporarily employed and expressed concern about their lack of permanent, reasonably well-paid jobs. All five felt they had received inadequate help with job training or placement.

All persons interviewed were aware of emergency food sources and the food stamp program. Two were active in Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous, and one was participating in private alcohol and drug counseling. Three were not covered by health insurance; two had access to health care as a result of disability benefits.

Four of the five persons were dissatisfied with release planning assistance from the Corrections Division Release Center and Women's Release Unit. One person was prepared for release by the Correctional Treatment Program.

None of the clients' families were intact during the first six months after release. One had had a child and intended to establish a permanent home in the Salem area; another intended to reunite with her child and establish a home in the Salem area.

General Findings

The primary purpose of this study of state correctional clients released to the Salem area was to determine their impact on local service providers. Analysis of information regarding service use and interviews with parole officers led to investigation of broader issues that affect the activities and objectives of community corrections programs in the Salem area. Examination of these broader issues was exploratory, and the findings are therefore tentative. The findings seemed of sufficient importance, however, to include in this report. Additional research is needed to more clearly determine the nature and extent of these problems.

Results of Prison Overcrowding

Parole officer and parolee interviews verified the serious overcrowding problems confronting Oregon's correctional system and the impact of institutional bedspace shortages on community corrections activities and objectives. Between 1980 and 1986, total admissions to state correctional facilities increased from 2,298 to 3,373 (a 47 percent growth rate), and total institutional releases increased from 2,283 to 2,988 (a 31 percent growth rate). As a result of the growth in releases, the total in-state parole case load also has increased--from 1,368 parolees under supervision in 1982 (when the average parole period was reduced from a year to six months) to 1,876 in 1986.

Increases in institutional departures have been felt in Marion and Polk counties, where the average number of parolees under community corrections supervision grew from 184 in 1982 to 280 in 1986. Similarly, the average number of persons on long-term temporary leave in the Salem area grew from 54 in 1983 (the first year for which data are available) to 86 in 1986.¹⁴

14. All figures on admissions, releases and field case loads were provided by the Corrections Division.

The substantial growth in number of offenders being released from state institutions to supervision in the community, plus the continuing lack of institutional bedspace, has had profound impacts on service delivery by state and county corrections staff as well as secondary impacts on community service providers. Clearly, the over 50 percent increase in number of offenders residing in the Salem area over the past five years has created demands for more low-cost housing, unskilled employment opportunities, mental health programs, emergency food, and other services provided within the community.

Parole officers confirmed that prison overcrowding has had many negative results which limit their ability to assist persons on long-term temporary leave and parole in their progress toward becoming healthy, working and law-abiding citizens. The major results and their impacts on local services are:

- Advance leave and parole planning done by Corrections Division Release Center counselors has deteriorated because of the number and rapidity of inmates being granted leave and parole. This has placed much of the burden on parole officers for finding adequate housing, employment and other basic services for offenders. More services are required for clients released to live with friends or alone than for those who live with family members. Parole officers must spend more time dealing with subsistence needs and emergencies, rather than with long-range planning for the client's successful adaptation to life outside the institution.
- Heavy case loads also restrict the time parole officers have for field visits and for noncrisis counseling. Since clients are not inclined to act on referrals for noncrisis counseling in the community, the parole officer is often the only available source for help. With these constraints on their time, parole officers are unable to monitor local service availability and adequacy, which further hampers their effectiveness in providing clients with useful referrals.
- Parole officers' ability to apply sanctions for leave or parole violations or new crime commissions has declined. The lack of available bedspace in the local jail and state institutions causes leave or parole revocation to be limited to very serious violations or crimes.¹⁵ When revocation does occur, some offenders may be returned to the community in a few weeks. Since many clients lack motivation and deny the existence of mental health problems, they may refuse to begin, or to continue, mandated

15. In June 1985, a federal court judgment was placed on the Marion County jail, which prohibited the holding of sentenced offenders in the facility. Marion County voters approved a \$15.3 million jail construction replacement measure in November 1985. Occupancy of the new 255-bed facility is planned for summer 1988.

treatment programs for chemical abusers or sex offenders unless parole officers can threaten them with sanctions for nonparticipation. Multiple contacts with law enforcement agencies also may result when leave or parole is difficult to revoke. Both outcomes of the lack of sanctions contribute to the potential for greater risk to Salem area residents.

Alcohol and Drug Treatment Programs--Costs and Demands

In addition to employment services, alcohol and drug treatment programs are the local services most widely used by offenders in the Salem area. Extrapolations of the four-month data from client files suggest that an estimated 300 persons on leave and parole used one or more alcohol and drug programs during 1986. Many parole officers consider these programs to be extremely important and see a need for additional services, including better alcohol and drug counseling, in-house psychiatric counseling, and a drug detoxification center.¹⁶

Alcohol and drug treatment programs are provided by the state, Polk and Marion counties, and private and nonprofit agencies. They appear to be chiefly financed by federal grants, state mental health funds to community corrections departments, and charges to clients. Marion County community corrections staff considers the federal TASC grant (which expires June 30, 1987) to be an invaluable resource for enabling clients to obtain needed counseling and treatment. Without this source of funding, parole officers believe that indigent clients cannot obtain access to programs, even when treatment is mandated as a condition of leave or parole.

A question that might be considered by local governments is whether, and to what extent, Polk and Marion counties presently use general fund revenue to subsidize alcohol and drug programs (and possibly other mental health programs) used by offenders from state correctional facilities. Such a study might also include probationers to ascertain whether the community corrections program transfers other costs from the state to local government. Other questions that might be raised are: Can TASC grant funding be replaced from a different funding source? If additional alcohol and drug programs were provided, what would be the cost, and who would pay? If fewer inmates were released to the Salem area, would county mental health department expenditures be reduced?

No consensus appears to exist as to whether offenders would be more able and willing to use programs if they were free, or whether they use program costs as an excuse for dropping out. Different philosophies also exist concerning the need to make offenders self-reliant by having the offender pay for program costs versus doing everything possible to get offenders into programs on the assumption that this makes the community a safer place.

16. White Oaks recently made a few beds available for drug abusers.

Cost Analysis of Law Enforcement Encounters

Clients' alleged criminal behaviors that bring them into contact with, or to the attention of, local police departments and sheriff offices represent a use of "services" whose cost is borne entirely by local governments. From information in client files, an estimated 350 encounters with Salem area law enforcement agencies occurred in 1986.¹⁷ Because it is unlikely that all police reports and other incident information were retained in files, this estimate is undoubtedly conservative.

Encounters between law enforcement officers and persons on leave and parole constitute a small fraction of total police activity. For example, over 10,000 arrests were made by the Marion and Polk County sheriff offices and city police departments within the two counties in 1985.¹⁸ However, since some of the contacts between law enforcement officers and offenders recorded in this study may have been only the first step in processing the offender through the local criminal justice system, local costs may be substantial even though they do not represent a significant share of total criminal justice expenditures.¹⁹

Estimates of local law enforcement costs associated with criminal behavior of persons on parole and leave in the Salem area could be made. For example, if names of offenders could be provided by the Marion County Corrections Department, the Salem Police Department has the capability to ascertain how many, and what type of, contacts have taken place between police officers and the named offenders. By estimating the average cost to the department of specific types of arrests, an estimate of total law enforcement costs borne by the city due to the presence of persons on leave and parole could be calculated.

Release Policy

Many corrections clients are aware that having a sponsor in the community who will share his or her home and subsidize living expenses may expedite their release into the community. Some inmates evidently choose to be released into the Salem area because it is easier to find

17. Seventy-one percent of the 144 law enforcement encounters of sample clients occurred in the Salem area, or 102 encounters. This figure was multiplied by 3.4.

18. Source: State of Oregon, Law Enforcement Data System, Report of Criminal Offenses and Arrests, 1985, Section 6 (Salem, June 1986).

19. Expenditures for sheriff and police departments in Marion County and Salem alone totaled \$10.2 million in fiscal 1986. (Source: Bureau of Governmental Research and Service, city and county annual financial survey.)

work and housing locally and, therefore, to be released more quickly to the Salem area than to more distant counties. Additionally, some clients choose the Salem area because they have no family, have no contact with their family, or do not want to return to their home county. These inmates know their release planning may be completed more quickly if they have a local sponsor in the Salem area.

Workers in the Salem area corrections system reported their experience with what parole officers describe as "prison groupies," i.e., women in the community who meet and visit inmates in prison and sponsor their release into the community. Often, these relationships are temporary, and the women form a new relationship with another inmate. Parole officers reported that the names of these individuals are well known because of their repeated sponsorship of new leavees and parolees.

There is no way to know how many sample clients, if any, were sponsored by so-called "groupies." If this practice does exist, it could explain some of the disproportionate influx of offenders into the Salem area. If it is prevalent, it could explain some of the differences in transition adjustment between clients living in family situations and those living with "friends" or "fiances." For example, table 20 shows the number of law enforcement encounters of clients who moved in with a friend or fiance compared with clients who had other living arrangements. A higher proportion of clients living with a friend or fiance had encounters with law enforcement agencies than did clients living with family members.

TABLE 20

Sample Clients, by Law Enforcement Agency Encounters,
by Household Type

Encounters	Family	Friend or Fiance	Alone or Homeless	Total
0	28	19	6	53
1	22	13	8	43
2 or more	8	16	10	34
Total	58	48	24	130

Sample clients living with a friend or fiance were also slightly more likely to have a law enforcement encounter due to person and property offenses than clients living with family (see table 21). Encounters of sample clients who lived with family members were more likely to be caused by statutory offenses, which are considered less serious than person or property offenses.

TABLE 21

Law Enforcement Encounters, by Criminal Behavior,
by Household Type

Behavior	Family	Friend or Fiance	Alone or Homeless	Total
Person offense	3	6	3	12
Property offense	8	22	14	44
Escape or abscond	7	6	9	22
Other statutory offense	23	20	9	52
Total	41	54	35	130

Note: This table refers to the number of law enforcement encounters (n = 144).

Thus, clients living with a friend or fiance were involved in more frequent and more serious law enforcement encounters than clients living with family members. An evaluation of the process of releasing inmates to unrelated individuals in the Salem area would be a practical next step in understanding the causes of Salem's disproportionate share of leavees and parolees from state prisons. If such an evaluation were undertaken, it should identify recurring, unrelated individuals named as local sponsors in inmates' release plans and suggest changes in release policy. Regional minimum-security prisons, coupled with a decentralized release system, could provide a general remedy to the broad problem of the attraction of the Salem area to nonresident Salem area inmates.

Referrals

One of the most apparent results of the increasing number of clients released to Marion and Polk counties is the inability of parole officers to spend the time necessary to collect new information on local

social services and to verify that available information is current. Interviews with parole officers indicated that often each had different information on availability, type and quality of services, and eligibility criteria for clients. For example, fluctuation of the West Salem Clinic's resources seem to make it an unreliable source of medical care for indigent clients. Consequently, one parole officer may refer to this agency, while another officer believes that it is not currently accepting clients. Several years ago, the Marion County Corrections Department developed a comprehensive index of Salem area service providers. Since that time, however, local programs have changed substantially, as some agencies ceased operating and others changed eligibility criteria or location or went out of business.

Parole officers currently have a limited assortment of resources on which to draw as they assist clients in their transition into the community. An updated survey of local social services and their location, costs, client eligibility requirements, and program descriptions would be a cost-effective step toward effectively coordinating services for the many clients of both counties. A volunteer who was willing to communicate with local social service providers on a regular basis could improve the efficiency of service coordination in the Salem area.

CORRECTIONAL POLICY TRENDS
AND CURRENT POLICY CHOICES

Recent Trends in the United States and Oregon

Introduction

The four traditional criminal justice system goals are rehabilitation, punishment, incapacitation and deterrence. Inherent tensions among the goals and the emphasis of one over others have led to very diverse Oregon correctional policies and practices. Although the Oregon Constitution states that "Laws for the punishment of crime shall be founded on the principles of reformation, and not of vindictive justice,"²⁰ the Oregon Criminal Code's purposes are variously stated as public safety, deterrence, rehabilitation, prevention, and imposition of sanctions proportionate to the offense and particular to the offender.²¹ The Advisory Commission on Prison Terms and Parole Standards has emphasized punishment commensurate with the crime. The Oregon Criminal Justice Council recently agreed that the chief purpose of the criminal justice system is protection of the community, with all traditional goals serving as means to accomplish this end.²²

Since the early 1960s, methods to achieve the various criminal justice goals have been partially and imprecisely applied in Oregon. The variety of purposes and goals and the constitutional requirements concerning conditions of confinement have led to confusion and contradictions in corrections practice. Approaches to achieving criminal justice goals in Oregon and the results of these attempts are summarized below.

Rehabilitation and Treatment

Diversion and deinstitutionalization were the principal correctional policy objectives in the early 1960s. The provision of alternative sanctions and treatment programs for offenders was a response to the negative impacts of institutionalizing individuals in large, centralized facilities which studies found confirmed and reinforced deviant behavior. The new policy objective was to regionalize correctional facilities and provide alternatives to incarceration.

The Community Corrections Act. In 1975, Governor Straub established a Task Force on Corrections to study Oregon's criminal justice system and make recommendations to reduce the state's reliance on institutionalization. At that time, state and local correctional facilities in Oregon were already operating at or beyond design capacity, and parole and probation case loads were extremely high. Interest had developed in providing additional resources to local communities to

20. Oregon Constitution, article I, section 15.

21. ORS 161.025(1).

22. Oregon Criminal Justice Council, Annual Report to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Governor (Salem, January 1987).

enable them to provide more effective alternatives to incarceration. The Governor's Task Force replied by adopting the following goal to guide planning for delivery of correctional services:

In order to respond effectively to criminal behavior in Oregon, the Corrections Division should constructively intervene as early as possible in the offender's criminal activity by assuring access to a wide variety of locally operated programs. State programs should be used where community resources are not adequate.²³

A major recommendation of the Task Force was for a statewide system of community corrections to provide alternatives to holding minor felons in secure custody in state facilities. This recommendation was implemented by enactment of the Community Corrections Act by the 1977 legislature. The Act established a local-state partnership for the delivery of sanctions and services to Oregon offenders through state funding of locally developed community corrections plans.

Courts. In the late 1960s, courts expressed concern about the rights and treatment of prisoners and the conditions of prisons and jails in which they were confined. Criticism of sentencing, plea bargaining, and parole practices began in the 1970s. In 1974, the U.S. Supreme Court supported the intervention movement by indicating that a prisoner is not stripped of constitutional protections when he or she is imprisoned (Wolff v. McDonnell).

The explosion of litigation during the 1970s dealt extensively with the constitutionality of confinement conditions. The cases focused on such factors as health and safety hazards, overcrowding, food service, quality and training of staff, incidence of violence, conditions in isolation and segregation, and lack of rehabilitation programs. Courts often entered remedial orders that required governmental bodies to take extensive, and frequently expensive, steps to rectify constitutional violations.

Oregon has not been immune from federal court involvement. Atiyeh v. Capps dealt with overcrowding issues in the Oregon State Penitentiary, and other Oregon cases were related to juvenile facilities and jails. Nineteen county jails in Oregon, including the Marion County jail, are presently operating under federal court orders concerning conditions of confinement or capacity. While recent Supreme Court decisions have signaled a major change in the court's interventionist approach, the likelihood of future law suits remains substantial because of overcrowding and confinement conditions that do not provide adequate basic necessities.

23. Governor's Task Force on Corrections, Executive Summary: Oregon Corrections Master Plan (Salem, November 1976), p. 7.

Punishment

During the last decade, correctional policy has shifted away from a rehabilitation model. This shift resulted from a complex series of social events. One was a tremendous increase in reported crime rates during the 1960s. A second contributing factor was prison unrest and violence, such as the uprising at Oregon State Penitentiary in 1968. A third factor was the loss of confidence in positive societal results from offender rehabilitation. A survey of 231 treatment studies, conducted from 1945 to 1967, led to the conclusion that "with few and isolated exceptions, the rehabilitative efforts that have been reported so far have had no appreciable effect on recidivism."²⁴ These problems and trends, plus the perception that prisons were frequently inhumane and ineffective, led to the general conclusion that "nothing works."

Just-Deserts Philosophy and Determinate Sentences. Because of the perceived failure of rehabilitation efforts and the perception of a rising wave of crime and violence in American society, the emphasis was changed from rehabilitation to punishment. The purpose of the criminal justice system was seen as ensuring that an offender received a sentence based on punishment for criminal conduct. Referred to as the just-deserts model, or "do the crime and serve the time," the nature of the crime and consistently applied sanctions became the most important factors in correctional policy. The purpose and length of sentences became unrelated to rehabilitation. Since correctional institutions were seen as incapable of "correcting" negative behavior, correctional policy became disconnected from offender reform.

Oregon Board of Parole. The just-deserts philosophy was manifested in Oregon when the 1977 legislature authorized the Oregon Board of Parole to fix sentence length. The Board, with the assistance of the Advisory Commission on Prison Terms and Parole Standards, was required to establish presumptive sentencing ranges for each crime in the criminal code. ORS 144.780 outlines the requirements for implementation of a just-deserts sentencing procedure as follows:

- (2) The ranges shall be designed to achieve the following objectives:
 - (a) Punishment which is commensurate with the seriousness of the prisoner's criminal conduct; and
 - (b) To the extent not inconsistent with paragraph (a) of this subsection:
 - (A) The deterrence of criminal conduct; and
 - (B) The protection of the public from further crimes by the defendant.

24. Lipton, Martinson, and Wilks, The Effectiveness of Correctional Treatment: A Survey of Treatment Evaluation Studies (1975).

The length and severity of sanctions are largely determined by political and social inputs, not by precise scientific formulas. Some reformers argued that determined sentences, applied quickly and equally, could be coupled with shorter average sentences. Others in support of just deserts and determined sentences were supportive of increasing sentence length to incapacitate and deter offenders. As the movement developed nationally, the result was extension of sentence length. This has also proved to be the case in Oregon.²⁵

Incapacitation and Risk Management

Increased concern with incapacitation has been related to the emphasis on the criminal justice goal of punishment. This movement has attempted to identify "career criminals" who could be incapacitated, thereby protecting the public and lowering crime rates. However, research has demonstrated that collective incapacitation, i.e., deterministic sentencing that allows no discretion in length of prison sentences, has resulted in only limited reductions in crime and dramatic increases in prison populations.²⁶

Current studies are examining strategies for basing individual sentences on assessments of whether offenders would continue to commit serious offenses if they were not incarcerated. The goal of this criminal justice model is selective incapacitation, a combination of punishment and risk management, in which offenders would be punished equitably and in proportion to their crime, and offenders' freedom would be restricted to the degree necessary to achieve a reasonable level of public safety. Proponents of this model agree that risk assessment development must consider all decision points in the criminal justice system where risk is a relevant factor, including pretrial custody, charging, sentencing, supervision and release. Essential to the success of the risk management model is development of comprehensive offender tracking information systems and risk prediction technology.

Oregon Prison Overcrowding Project. The Oregon Prison Overcrowding Project, begun in 1982 as part of a nationally sponsored demonstration project in four states, was established to develop long-range strategies to relieve prison overcrowding. The Project focused primarily on the need to create an accurate risk assessment methodology and a coordinated punishment-risk management sentencing policy to better assess

25. Oregon Department of Justice, Crime Analysis Center, Outcome Measure and Related Data to Support Evaluation of the Community Corrections Act of 1977 (1985).

26. U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, Incapacitating Criminals: Recent Research Findings (December 1983).

statewide needs for additional custodial space.²⁷ The Project proposed that a Criminal Justice Council be established to develop appropriate information and to conduct studies that could serve as the basis for a state punishment-risk management sentencing policy.

Oregon Criminal Justice Council. The Criminal Justice Council was created by the 1985 legislature and, among its charges, was given the responsibility of studying the use of risk assessment to predict the probability of future criminal conduct by offenders. The Council's Committee on Risk Assessment, after reviewing the capability of Oregon's criminal justice system to provide the data necessary to develop a risk assessment tool, concluded that risk assessment would be very useful for the decision-making process. In September 1986, the Council contracted with the National Council on Crime and Delinquency to develop a risk assessment framework for making parole release decisions. Among the Council's first recommendations were the following:

The Council recommends that maintenance and continued validation of the predictive risk assessment tool developed during 1986-87 to aid in parole release decisions be integrated into the existing criminal justice information systems.

The Council recommends expansion of the methodology used to develop a parole release risk assessment tool to other points in the criminal justice system where it can have a major impact. Construction of predictive models for use in pretrial detention and sentencing decisions is essential.²⁸

Another Council recommendation focused on the need for an integrated and computerized system of offender-based data.

Prison Overcrowding and the Oregon Criminal Justice Initiative

The combination of growing prison admissions, longer sentence length, and federal court orders to reduce prison and jail populations has caused crises in criminal justice administration and management throughout the country. Currently, 38 states are operating one or more prisons under federal court orders related to overcrowding. Solutions to overcrowding problems are generally aimed at providing additional correctional capacity.

27. Oregon Prison Overcrowding Project, Executive Summary--Final Report: Punishment and Risk Management as an Oregon Sanctioning Model (Portland, May 1985).

28. Oregon Criminal Justice Council, Annual Report (1987) (unpaged).

In January 1987, the Oregon Criminal Justice Council identified "the imperative need for additional state and local custodial space" as one of four major problems confronting the state's criminal justice system. The Council supported the Corrections Division's May 23, 1986, proposal to construct additional cells, convert some minimum-security beds to secure beds, and add minimum-security beds at the county level. During the same month, Governor Goldschmidt introduced his Criminal Justice Initiative with the words: "It is fundamental to the Oregon comeback that we begin immediately a practical, cost-effective program to make Oregon safer" (press release, January 7, 1987).

The Initiative proposes that 761 medium-security beds be added to the Eastern Oregon Correctional Institution and that several minimum-security regional facilities containing 700 to 900 beds be constructed.²⁹ These latter facilities would house chronic, low-risk offenders who are now in more secure facilities or are serving much of their sentences on temporary leave. A State Corrections Facilities Planning Task Force has been charged with submitting an emergency siting plan to the Governor by August 25, 1987.

Management plans for the new regional facilities call for treatment programs, job training programs, and community aftercare programs. The initiative would (1) reduce overcrowding at the Oregon State Penitentiary, Oregon State Correctional Institution, Corrections Division Release Center, and Oregon Women's Correctional Center; (2) phase out the Women's Release Unit; and (3) retain some offenders who would otherwise be on leave. It also would provide additional beds for new offenders.

The Goldschmidt Initiative also deals with field services and community corrections programs. Because Ballot Measure 10, passed by Oregon voters in November 1986, will increase parole supervision from 9 to 36 months, the Governor's recommended budget provides for additional parole officers and phases out supervision of misdemeanor probationers. To further reduce Class C felony commitments to state facilities from community corrections programs, new competitive grants will be funded with Class C felony payback revenue.

Current Policy Environment

The present lack of agreement on goals at state and local levels has led to a lack of accountability and coordination. Because the system is driven by decisions regarding arrest, sentencing, incarceration, parole and probation that are made by various state and local agencies and elected officials, development of a statewide goal structure is a prerequisite for producing an approach to corrections that is consistent among localities and between local governments and the state.

29. 1987-89 Governor's Recommended Budget (Salem, January 12, 1987).

Strong support continues to exist in Oregon for the just-deserts philosophy of long-term fixed sentences, with the goals of incapacitation and deterrence. Concurrently, a multitude of lawsuits have added substantial requirements for local jails, leading to a reduction of available jail bedspace. Because of this, space in both jails and state prisons is likely to continue to be used at, or above, design capacity.

However, the system will continue to be required to meet basic human needs, to provide a measure of protection for both staff and inmates, and to operate within professional corrections standards. Consequently, tension is likely to continue between legal requirements governing humane jail and prison conditions and continued overcrowding.

The development of more effective prediction instruments, combined with rational sanctions, should provide a means of selecting offenders for the limited and costly secure bedspaces. Because the resources available to corrections, and the justice system as a whole, are finite, it is imperative that these resources be allocated as efficiently as possible. Targeting prison bedspace for offenders who pose the greatest potential risk is an important objective; it will maximize the use of prison facilities while minimizing the risk to the community.

The ability to distinguish high-risk clients depends on development of an effective risk assessment model that will establish confinement ranges based on severity of offense and criminal history of the offender. Risk prediction technology should be applied at each major decision point in the criminal justice process. The movement to identify high-risk offenders may increase interest in developing interventions to lower the risk. These interventions would emphasize risk control and reduction in a more focused manner.

Services provided in community corrections counties have grown in number and variety, despite budget declines caused by inflation. Community-based services and strategies remain an integral part of the future of corrections in Oregon. Additional funding and flexibility for these local programs, developed within a common statewide framework, would further the coordinated implementation of corrections policy at the local level. Standardized sentencing guidelines also would contribute to such a framework.

The important work completed to date on these issues by the Oregon Criminal Justice Council and other organizations in the state, combined with the arrival of a new state administration which has demonstrated a serious interest in corrections reform, presents an opportunity for important change. Local resources in Salem and throughout the state can, and ought to, be leveraged to promote a rational goal-oriented system.

POLICY CHOICES FOR CORRECTIONAL REFORM IN THE SALEM AREA

It is common knowledge that there are critical overcrowding problems in Oregon's state correctional facilities due to increased admissions and longer sentences. As shown in this report, severe shortages of bedspace have created equally serious problems related to institutional treatment and rehabilitation programs, release planning, and community corrections programs. Because it receives a disproportionate share of inmates departing from state correctional facilities, community problems resulting from the number and behavior of released offenders are intensified in the Salem area.

Current discussions by state policy makers concerning the overcrowding problem have focused predominantly on Governor Goldschmidt's proposal to construct additional minimum- and medium-security beds at EOCI and at new regional facilities around the state. Additional bedspace alone, however, is only a partial solution and will be ineffective in solving the problem without legislative and administrative changes in three related policy areas:

- Improved and decentralized release planning and reentry programs
- Improvements in the Community Corrections Act (CCA) programs
- Improved sentencing guidelines and risk management strategies

The following discussion presents problems facing Salem area local governments in each of these policy areas and provides initial options that can be considered for dealing with them.

I. BEDSPACE ISSUES

Problem

Due to bedspace shortages in state and local correctional facilities, neither the state nor Marion and Polk counties have adequate minimum-security space for housing Class C felons. The result is a "revolving door" policy for Class C commitments to state institutions, early release, inadequate release planning, and lack of sanctions for offender misbehavior while in the community on temporary leave or parole.

Background

Governor Goldschmidt's Criminal Justice Initiative proposes that 761 medium-security beds be added to EOCI and that several minimum-security regional facilities containing 700 to 900 beds be constructed.

If the Initiative is implemented, it may relieve the need for some existing space and programs in minimum-security extensions of state correctional facilities in Marion County.

Recommendation

Salem area local governments should consider using available space at state minimum-security facilities as an alternative resource for offenders sentenced from, and released to, the Salem area. This space could be used for initial commitments, reentry planning, and parole or leave revocations.

Policy Options

1. Work with the Governor's Task Force on Corrections Planning (see Appendix 2) to determine whether existing space at state minimum-security facilities, such as the Farm Annex or CDRC, could be used as a local resource to eliminate the need for constructing any new minimum-security facilities in the Salem area.

II. INSTITUTIONAL TREATMENT AND RELEASE PROGRAM ISSUES

General Problem

Conditions of overcrowding negatively affect the quality of all treatment, rehabilitation and release programs within the institutions and, consequently, reduce the preparedness of offenders for reentry and reintegration into the community. Current centralized programs also tend to create barriers for releasing offenders throughout the state and cause a disproportionate share to enter the Salem area. Three specific issues related to this general problem should be considered by Salem area local governments.

Correctional Treatment Program

Problem

Although aftercare treatment in the Salem area is not mandatory, most offenders in the Correctional Treatment Program at the Oregon State Hospital are in fact released to the Salem area. Almost all their short-term leaves occur in Salem.

Background

The Correctional Treatment Program includes the Mental or Emotionally Disturbed Program, Sex Offender Unit, Social Skills Unit, and Cornerstone Program for chronically dependent recidivist offenders. Some, if not all, of the programs should be capable of providing services on a regional basis.

Recommendation

Salem area local governments should explore the feasibility of decentralizing state treatment programs for offenders. If complete decentralization is not feasible, treatment after release should be included in all county community corrections programs.

Policy Options

1. Ask Salem area legislators to support HB 3092 and to include in the bill the requirement that treatment programs for offenders be available or required at the new regional facilities.
2. Ask the Governor's Task Force to include treatment programs in the services provided at each regional facility.

Release System

Problem

The Salem area receives a disproportionate share of state correctional offenders on leave or parole status. Between 1982 and 1986, the number of persons on leave and parole in Marion and Polk counties increased by over 50 percent. In addition, advance planning by Corrections Division Release Center counselors appears to have deteriorated because of the number and rapidity of inmates being granted leave and parole.

Background

The quality of the reentry process from institution to community is crucial to offenders' success or failure rates. Recidivism and victimization are reduced when the process is improved. Observations of corrections staff and offenders, combined with current recidivism rates, suggest that Oregon's release system needs to be reappraised. A decentralized release system could both improve the effectiveness of the reentry process and reduce the number of offenders currently being released into the Salem area.

Recommendation

Salem area local governments should consider advocating a decentralized release system in which inmates are prepared for release in the regional facilities proposed to be built under the Governor's Criminal Justice Initiative.

Policy Options

1. Ask Salem area legislators to support HB 3092 and to include in the bill the requirement that comprehensive release services be offered at the new regional facilities.

2. Ask the Governor's Task Force to ensure that adequate release services directly related to community services are incorporated into regional facility programs.
3. Propose to the Corrections Division that CDRC release programs be replaced by decentralized release planning by field offices and community corrections departments.

OSP and OSCI Release Planning

Problem

If medium- and minimum-security offenders are placed in regional facilities and at EOIC, offenders based at Oregon State Penitentiary and at Oregon State Correctional Institution will be those who have committed the most serious crimes or have the highest history-risk scores. This hardening of the offender population will have negative impacts on the community if the Salem area continues to receive more than its share of offenders on leave and parole.

Background

Governor Goldschmidt's Initiative will relieve some of the present overcrowding in Salem area correctional facilities and reduce the number of leaves that result from system overcrowding. However, the state's only maximum-security facility (OSP) and one of two medium-security facilities (OSCI) will remain in Marion County.

Recommendation

Salem area local governments should ensure that serious offenders will be placed on leave and parole throughout the state or be returned to their county of origin.

Policy Options

1. Ask Salem area legislators to support HB 3092 and to include in the bill the requirement that release programs for OSP and OSCI inmates be decentralized and provided at the new regional facilities.
2. Ask the Governor's Task Force to provide regional facility bed-space for OSP and OSCI inmates specifically for release planning purposes.

III. COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PROGRAM ISSUES

Community Corrections Act Participation

Problem

Oregon has no comprehensive, statewide system for state and local correctional programs. Counties that lack local resources and services send local offenders to state institutions and thus increase overcrowding and inconsistent use of state facilities.

Background

The Community Corrections Act presently fragments the correctional system. All counties participate in different ways, thereby increasing problems of control, management and resources. Incentives to retain Class C felony offenders in the community, rather than penalties for sending them to state institutions, have the potential to ensure statewide full participation. Such participation would enable local governments to take ownership of programs and to provide sanctions and services for offenders in their home communities.

Recommendation

Salem area local governments should support efforts to provide incentives for every area in Oregon to participate fully in the Community Corrections Act.

Policy Options

1. Amend HB 5028 (the Corrections Division budget) to provide greater incentives for community corrections participation, or otherwise ensure implementation of the Community Corrections Act on a statewide basis without exception.
2. Influence the Corrections Division to fully support community corrections and community alternatives by reallocating existing resources.
3. Recommend to the Governor's Task Force that the community corrections system not only be included as an element of its strategic corrections plan, but that community corrections be a major component of the plan.

Corrections Division Subsidy Program

Problem

The current subsidy program places a stigma on subsidy recipients, which in turn leads to the creation of housing ghettos and unhealthy

living situations in the community. Subsidy levels are inadequate and unpredictable.

Background

Inmates who have no resources for securing housing, food or transportation are eligible for a subsidy payment from the Corrections Division. Because the payment covers rent for only a month or two, and because of the stigma many landlords attach to former prison inmates, few landlords are willing to participate in the program. As a result, subsidy clients become clustered in a few apartment complexes.

Recommendation

Salem area local governments should recommend transfer of the Corrections Division subsidy program to community corrections agencies. In addition, subsidy funds and staff to operate the program should be increased to better assist offenders in their transition from institution to community.

Policy Options

1. Amend HB 5028 (the Corrections Division budget) to provide higher levels of funding for the subsidy program.
2. Discuss state-local correctional plans and programs with the Corrections Division after a new director has been appointed. Subsidy funding could be administratively transferred to community corrections budgets.

Community Corrections Resources

Problem

The community corrections programs in Marion and Polk counties appear to have insufficient resources to provide adequate services for persons on leave and parole from state institutions. Parole officers deal with subsistence needs and emergencies, rather than with long-range planning for the offender's successful adaptation to life outside the institution.

Background

The Salem area has been forced to absorb more than its share of state correctional clients into the local labor force, housing market, and community environment. Offender services provided directly by community corrections staff and indirectly by other local service agencies appear to be underfunded and uncoordinated. This may be a statewide problem of underfunded community corrections programs, or it may be specific to the Salem area. No evaluation has been done to ascertain whether resources are allocated based on service needs.

Recommendation

Salem area local governments should seek additional federal or state funding for providing more effective and coordinated services to state correctional clients.

Policy Options

1. Amend HB 5028 to provide higher levels of funding for the community corrections program.
2. Recommend to the Corrections Division that an evaluation be made of the distribution of community corrections funds relative to the geographic distribution of released offenders and their service needs.

IV. SENTENCING GUIDELINES/RISK MANAGEMENT

Uniform Sentencing Guidelines

Problem

The sentencing decisions of Oregon judges do not result in uniform sentences on similar cases nor in proportional use of state correctional bedspace.

Background

When an Oregon trial judge sentences a felony offender, the judge currently may impose any sentence of confinement within the range provided by law. Sentencing guidelines need to be designed to coordinate sentences with the cell space that the state and citizens of Oregon are prepared to provide, to provide sentence uniformity, and to ensure rational planning and consistent statewide use of the correctional system.

Recommendation

Salem area local governments should support the Oregon Criminal Justice Council recommendations for uniform sentencing guidelines to be used by judges in felony cases.

Policy Options

1. Ask Salem area legislators to support HB 2715, the Criminal Justice Council bill to develop sentencing guidelines for persons convicted of felonies.

Offender-Based Data System

Problem

Comprehensive information on the movement of offenders through Oregon's criminal justice system, essential for rational decisions on charging, trial, sentencing, alternative sanctions, and post-conviction management of individual offenders, is not available.

Background

The establishment of reasonable sentencing guidelines and implementation of risk management strategies require an accurate and comprehensive offender data base. Information on the performance of the offender and the correctional system also is necessary for effective operation of the total intergovernmental criminal justice system. It is essential when planning for, and predicting the effects that may result from, statutory and administrative changes to the system.

Recommendation

Salem area local governments should support efforts by the Corrections Division and other state agencies to develop an integrated information system of offender-based data for use at both state and local levels.

Policy Options

1. Through the League of Oregon Cities and the Association of Oregon Counties, join with other cities and counties to recommend that an independent and objective appraisal of the Corrections Division offender tracking system be made.
2. Consult with the Governor's Office on methods to integrate the currently fragmented criminal justice data bases and recommend that the Crime Analysis Center, the state's only ongoing criminal justice research agency, be given oversight for the development of an integrated information system for management and planning purposes.

IMMEDIATE DISCUSSIONS REGARDING REGIONAL FACILITIES PLANNING

As a part of the Governor's Criminal Justice Initiative, five regional minimum-security corrections facilities are now being considered, which would add 700 to 900 new beds (see Appendix 1). The Governor's Task Force on Corrections Planning, the lead group planning for the new facilities, was asked by the legislative leadership to provide more information prior to any further consideration of the Governor's Initiative. Three items that will be considered by the Task Force and its working group (see appendixes 2 and 3) by the end of April are:

1. "Identify by county or multi-county area the geographic location of each needed facility;
2. "Set forth the number of beds to be available at each facility; and
3. "Set forth the specific use contemplated and the population needs served by each facility." [Memo from Peter Ozanne dated March 27, 1987.]

Salem area local governments should focus on No. 3--specific uses of the regional facilities. To reduce problems associated with concentrating services, offenders and treatment programs in state correctional facilities located in the Salem area, the Task Force's discussions for these regional, minimum-security facilities should consider the following objectives:

- Regional facilities should be responsible for prerelease planning and services for offenders incarcerated at those facilities (decentralized release system).
- Regional facilities should also function as prerelease centers for serious offenders from OSP, OSCI and OWCC (deconcentrated release services for serious offenders).
- Regional facilities should provide adequate treatment programs for minimum-security offenders (decentralized treatment programs).
- Additional services and programs necessary for offenders sentenced from, and returned to, the Salem metropolitan area should be provided locally (enhanced initial-commitment and release services for Salem area offenders).

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX 1

CORRECTIONS DIVISION'S PROPOSAL FOR REGIONAL FACILITIES

The Corrections Division has identified five geographic regions in which regional facilities should be located based on work load:*

	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Co-ed</u>
Portland Metropolitan Area/North Coast (Clatsop, Columbia, Multnomah, Tillamook, Washington)	325	100	
Willamette Valley/Central Coast (Benton, Lane, Lincoln, Linn, Marion, Polk, Yamhill)	200	75	
Southern/Southeast Oregon/South Coast (Coos, Curry, Douglas, Jackson, Josephine, Klamath, Lake)	100		
Central Oregon (Crook, Deschutes, Gilliam, Hood River, Jefferson, Sherman, Wasco, Wheeler)			50 (6 for females)
Eastern Oregon (Baker, Grant, Harney, Malheur, Morrow, Umatilla, Union, Wallowa)			50 (6 for females)
Total	625	175	100

GRAND TOTAL -- 900

* Excerpted from a memo to Governor Goldschmidt from Thomas Toombs dated January 30, 1987.

APPENDIX 2

GOVERNOR'S TASK FORCE ON CORRECTIONS PLANNING

Laird Kirkpatrick, Chair
Professor
School of Law
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403
686-3854

Ray Allen
Director
Community Alliance Program
for Employment
1040 S.E. Division, Second Floor
Portland, Oregon 97202
248-3050

Mike Burton
Oregon State Representative
State Capitol
Room H486
Salem, Oregon 97310
378-8782

Edwin I. Caleb
District Attorney
Klamath County
Klamath County Courthouse
316 Main Street
Klamath Falls, Oregon 97601
883-5147

Mark Cushing
Attorney
Tonkon, Torp, Galen, Marmaduke
& Booth
1800 Orbanco Building
1001 S.W. 5th Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204
221-1440

Clifford L. Freeman
Attorney
Metropolitan Public Defender
630 S.W. 5th Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204
225-1900

John Jelderks
Circuit Court Judge
Wasco-Hood River-Sherman Counties
Hood River County Courthouse
Hood River, Oregon 97031
296-3196 386-2676

Fred Pearce
Sheriff
Multnomah County
12240 N.E. Gleason Street
Portland, Oregon 97230
255-3600

Ann Schmidt
Executive Director
Oregon Council on Crime
and Delinquency
718 W. Burnside, Suite 208
Portland, Oregon 97209-3579
228-5397

Ex Officio Members:

Administrator, Corrections Division

Thomas G. Toombs
2575 Center Street N.E.
Salem, Oregon 97310
378-2467

Chairperson, State Board of Parole (Governor's Appointee)

Vern Faatz
P.O. Box 12
Education Hall
Marylhurst, Oregon 97036
655-8338

APPENDIX 3

WORKING GROUP OF THE GOVERNOR'S TASK FORCE
ON CORRECTIONS PLANNING

Mark Cushing, Task Force Member and Chair
Attorney
Tonkon, Torp, Galen, Marmaduke & Booth
1800 Orbanco Building
1001 S.W. 5th Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204
221-1440

Ray Allen, Task Force Member
Director
Community Alliance Program for Employment
1040 S.E. Division, Second Floor
Portland, Oregon 97202
248-3050

Vicki Gates
Assistant Director
Office of Program Review
Department of Human Resources
Public Service Building, Room 318
Salem, Oregon 97310
378-3154

Clint Goff
Assistant Administrator
Program Planning and Review
Corrections Division
2575 Center Street N.E.
373-1173

Dennis Maloney
Director
Juvenile Department
Deschutes County
1507 N.E. 1st Street
Bend, Oregon 97701
388-6671

Paul Snider
Project Director
Oregon Jail Overcrowding Project
P.O. Box 12729
Salem, Oregon 97309-0729
585-8351

Charles A. Tracy
Professor and Director
Department of Administration of Justice
Portland State University
P.O. Box 751
Portland, Oregon 97207
229-4014

Ken Viegas
Professor and Director
Interdisciplinary Studies: Corrections
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403
686-3896

Billy Wasson
Director
Marion County Community Corrections
220 High Street N.E.
Salem, Oregon 97301
588-5289

Dale A. Weinstein
Program Director
Correctional Treatment Programs
Mental Health Division
2600 Center Street N.E.
Salem, Oregon 97310
378-2348