

TO: Board Members

FROM: John J. Talaber, Esq.
Board Secretary

DATE: May 15, 2018

RE: Minutes – Board Meeting
April 18, 2018

In compliance with *Act 175*, known as the *Sunshine Law*, effective September 17, 1976, the Office of Board Secretary provided notification to the public of the scheduled meeting on April 18 2018, of the Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole at the Staybridge Suites, Royersford, Pennsylvania.

The meeting convened at 9:10 a.m. on April 18, 2018, with Chairman Dunn presiding.

Board Members Ted Johnson, Everett Gillison, Maureen Barden, Leslie Grey, Linda Rosenberg, and Tony Moscato attended the meeting. Board Member Mark Koch participated in the meeting via a telephone conference call.

Also in attendance were Alan Robinson, Chief Counsel, Office of Chief Counsel; Chad Allensworth, Chief Hearing Examiner, Office of Hearing Examiners; John J. Talaber, Board Secretary, Office of Board Secretary; Shamekia Smith-Tucker, Administrative Officer, Office of Board Secretary; Victor Wills, Director of Policy and Legislation (via telephone); Dr. Brett Bucklen, DOC Statistical Office; Meghan Dade, Executive Director, Sexual Offenders Assessment Board (SOAB); Janaki Theivakumaran, Executive Assistant to Director Dade; Jennifer Storm, Victim Advocate (via telephone), Office of Victim Advocate; Laura Treaster, Special Assistant to the Chairman; Deborah Carpenter, Executive Assistant to the Chairman; Bill Otis, Executive Assistant to the Chairman, Neal Kokatay, Executive Assistant to the Chairman; Farrah Conjar, Executive Secretary to the Chairman.

The Chairman recognized any guests at the meeting. Board Secretary John Talaber introduced Shamekia Smith-Tucker as the new Administrative Officer in the Office of Board Secretary. Mr. Javier Cintron, Parole Manager, Philadelphia District Office was also in attendance. No other visitors were presented.

I. APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 14, 2018 BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Board Member Gillison made a motion to approve the board minutes as written, which were the February 2018 minutes since the board meeting in March 2018 was cancelled. Board Member Johnson seconded the motion. There was no discussion on the motion and the board unanimously approved the minutes.

II. STAFF REPORTS

All reports referenced in public session were previously disseminated to the Chairman and will be made available upon request. Chairman Dunn expects senior staff to highlight two or three things in their staff reports at the board meeting since the board will no longer receive the reports in writing.

A. Office of Victim Advocate

Victim Advocate Storm reported that Face-to-Face went well, but she had concerns with the review of victim input by the board member in every single case. Victim Advocate Storm noted that there should be an electronic means of notifying board members about the existence of OVA interests and materials. OVA is working with the program developers to ensure the notification is working; otherwise, there will be some recirculation of cases from OVA to the board members until there is an electronic remedy. Chairman Dunn noted that the issue appears to involve the paper review cases, more than the interviews, with the hope that an electronic 361 would solve the issue. Board Member Rosenberg asked if when she was denying parole, does she still need to review the victim information? Victim Advocate Storm asked that in those instances she should still click into the folder. Chairman Dunn noted that missing information sometimes occurs when the board member is later reviewing the case in the voting process. There was a brief discussion among the board members and Victim Advocate Storm about the locations of various victim information and the need to look at the input submitted by the victim. Chairman Dunn reinforced the statement and asked the board members to timely respond to the recirculation requests.

Board Member Rosenberg asked if there was a way to mark the 361 indicating that there was victim information. Board Secretary Talaber replied that it would be challenging since OBS staff does not have access to the victim information. Chairman Dunn noted that when we are totally electronic it will show-up in the case on OnBase. Victim Storm had concerns with victim information becoming public information through the 361. Board Member Johnson raised the issue of why the Board Secretary does not have access to victim information. Chairman Dunn replied that the law limits it to decision makers and OVA staff. Board Secretary Talaber noted that both OBS and OVA staff work closely together.

Board Member Barden asked about the scope of victim information on the 361, and Chairman Dunn replied that even the existence of a registered victim is confidential. Chairman Dunn noted that these issues should resolve themselves with the electronic 361. Board Member Johnson asked how long it was anticipated for the electronic 361 to be in place. Chairman Dunn stated by the end of the calendar year, if not before. Chairman Dunn noted that it

will not be the revised 361 in place, just the current form that can later be revised. Board Member Moscato asked a question related to victim input and the OnBase program, and Chairman Dunn provided an answer through an example. There was a brief discussion among the board members about victim input sometimes being in favor of paroling the inmate.

B. SOAB

Director Dade reported that the next SOAB quarterly training will be on Friday, June 1, 2018. The topic will be Re-Constructing Sex-Offending Treatment for a New Generation, presented by Jill S. Levenson, Ph.D., LCSW. Training time is from 8:30AM to 4:00PM at the Sheraton Harrisburg/Hershey Hotel. The board did not have any further questions for Director Dade.

C. Hearing Examiners Office

Chief Hearing Examiner Allensworth reported from the hearing examiners that: (1) the quality of the 257 series has been declining, and they are rejecting a lot more waivers; (2) the public defenders are sometimes not showing-up to hearings, which has caused issues. Board Member Johnson noted that SCI-Fayette does not send a public defender to the institution. Chairman Dunn requested the Office of Chief Counsel to weigh-in on the discussion. Chief Counsel Robinson noted that historically this has been an issue, and the board does not have the power to appoint counsel. The board's responsibility is to advise the inmate of the right to counsel, and provide them with the means of contacting the public defender. Chief Counsel Robinson noted that the relationship is between the inmate and the public defender. There was a general discussion among the board members about the counties not being able to pay the costs, and the fact that the commonwealth does not fund public defenders. The board did not have any further questions for Chief Hearing Examiner Allensworth.

D. Office of Chief Counsel

Chief Counsel Robinson informed board members that fourth notices have gone out to some employees to complete statements of financial interest, as required by the governor's code of conduct. Chief Counsel Robinson educated some of the members on the electronic process available, and suggested the benefits and convenience of moving away from paper submissions. Submissions are due May 1, 2018. Chief Counsel Robinson offered the assistance of Assistant Counsel Morgan Davis or himself for anyone that might need it. Chairman Dunn also provided some guidance for board members to review their financial interest statement to ensure that some part of the process was not missed, potentially causing a delay in the submission. Some discussion followed regarding paper vs. electronic submissions and common challenges.

Board Member Rosenberg had follow up comments for Chief Hearing Examiner Allensworth regarding hearing examiner prep notes. Board members would like rights to access the folder, as notes are not always with the case. Chairman Dunn added that the new 361 will address this. Chairman Dunn further added that if access is able to be granted, board members should understand that the prep notes may not always be available. Chief Hearing Examiner Allensworth explained that the file is updated weekly. However, notes may not be available if the institution had not completed the acceptance before the weekly update. Chief Hearing Examiner Allensworth will follow up with Gary Holland about granting access. The Board engaged in general conversation about the usefulness of the notes. Board Member Barden asked how the notes are filled out. Chief Hearing Examiner Allensworth explained that system developers have a way to compile information pulled from the ICSA and other data sources.

Board Member Rosenberg asked what is going on with the changes to the ICSA. Executive Assistant Deb Carpenter clarified that there will only be a change to the way the ICSA is completed. The change is to eliminate redundancies. Executive Assistant Deb Carpenter offered an example of how parole and counseling are currently making similar updates. She believes the plan is for consolidation. Parole staff would own the ICSA; counseling staff will only add what is needed from their area for the vote that goes up to the superintendent. Chairman Dunn agreed this was a good point for moving to the report from Executive Assistant Deb Carpenter.

E. Chairman Dunn's Executive Assistants

1. Executive Assistant Deb Carpenter continued to clarify points related to the ICSA consolidation. She explained that any changes or processes impacting the consolidation would always first go through the steering committee. Executive Assistant Carpenter explained that both she and Board Member Johnson sit on the committee and will share with the board the process flow map prior to any changes going into effect. She further explained that the process includes a review of recommendations from sub-committees and a steering committee vote. Changes are not arbitrarily made. Board Member Johnson added that he will bring to the board items pertinent for their review prior to a steering committee vote. Executive Assistant Deb Carpenter expects the steering committee to be able to move from organizing the various pieces that are coming in from the smaller committees and to begin focusing on accomplishments. The results of the work put in by all the committees should start to become visible.

Department of Corrections is all moved in to the Riverfront Office Center. They are located in the former Board Secretary and OVA areas.

Approval has been received for a gym. Executive Assistant Carpenter added that fundraisers will be conducted so that equipment can be purchased. Chairman Dunn asked if everyone present would note that the floor is limited to one shower per gender. Schedules and others' usage should be taken into consideration. Victim Advocate Storm stated that a treadmill will be donated from their office.

Executive Assistant Carpenter reported that Deputy Secretary Christian Stephens reviewed Georgia's parole mobilization system, and Pennsylvania seems to be further ahead.

Executive Assistant Carpenter noted that the Beaver Falls sub-office will be closing, effective on or about June 30, 2018. Instead of moving the Beavers Falls sub-office to North Shores, a pilot will be conducted, involving the entire unit. The pilot will include a mobile supervisor and the agents. The pilot will last for 90 days. Moving forward this will impact how field offices are impacted with the reduction of the real estate footprint. Executive Assistant Carpenter believes that the next consolidation will involve the Erie District office and the Erie CCC. This is not expected to happen until a few months down the road. Board Member Grey commented that she has seen one of the locations firsthand, and does not see how we move forward without a significant investment. Executive Assistant Carpenter responded by stating that site visits have been conducted and considerations made in that regard – they know the challenges they are up against. The board had no further questions for Executive Assistant Carpenter.

F. Office of Policy and Legislative Affairs

Director Wills, reporting by phone, informed the board that JRI 2 bill may move through the Senate today (April 18, 2018), however prospects in the House are tenuous at best. There was a late amendment attempt yesterday that failed. It would have removed the entirety of the short sentence parole portion. It failed, so that is why we do not know if it is moving through the Senate today. When the calendar comes out Director Wills will let everyone know then. Director Wills suggested that short notice might be expected regarding the notification of the potential new board member. Communication for backfilling Board Member Moscato into the vacancy after former Board Member Burke came with very short notice. Director Wills further commented that this may be another situation where this happens very quickly in June.

Board Member Rosenberg stated that they are waiting for the names of some judges for the Compact, and asked Director Will if any names were obtained. Director Wills stated that he was talking with T.J. and has not received any names yet. He will touch base with T.J., again, this afternoon. Chairman

Dunn commented that there are some names. Board Member Rosenberg stated that if names are needed that she has some she would be happy to recommend. Director Wills replied that they do have names, but he thinks it is at the request of Kay and Margaret making sure that they can attend that meeting so that there is a quorum. Otherwise, they may wait until the day after the meeting to announce appointments so that there is no quorum issue. Board Member Rosenberg acknowledged the response by replying, "OK".

Board Member Everett Gillison asked for a summary of the JRI 2 bill, raising these questions for Director Wills: 1. What will the proposed changes mean should the bill pass? 2. What is the impact on the board decision making, if any? Director Wills stated that he sent out the summary before the cancelled snow-day meeting last month. Director Wills stated that he will send the summary, again, this afternoon. Effectively, the bill that deals with us is Senate Bill 1071. It implements short sentence parole for people who have a minimum of under two years, are non-violent offenders; there is a prescribed list of offenses from which they can be paroled from; effectively, they will automatically be paroled at their minimum.

Board Member Gillison asked what that would do to the work flow, from an analysis point of view, currently. He also asked, how that would impact the power of the board's ability to do what they are supposed to do. Chairman Dunn provided this answer: preliminary projections that CSG put together indicate 200 per month that hearing examiners would not need to interview. Board Member Rosenberg commented that the board would never even see these people since they are non-violent offenders. Chairman Dunn clarified that the board might see them on a review case. He further clarified that the board might see the case as a second vote, but would not physically see the person, as they are non-violent cases. Board Member Rosenberg made some clarifying comments indicating these are the cases the board would currently see to sign off on after the hearing examiner has seen the individual. Now the board would no longer need to do this because of the presumptive parole. Chairman Dunn verified with Dr. Brett Bucklen, DOC Statistical Office that this (the passing of JRI 2) would 'wipe out' the number of RRRI cases. Both Dr. Bucklen and Director Wills agreed.

Chairman Dunn added that this would wipe out RRRI for almost all cases – hearing examiner vote only cases would kind of disappear. This would basically be freeing up hearing examiner time, board members would be seeing a few less of paper second votes – V2 cases. Board Member Leslie Grey asked why a signature would be needed. It was clarified by Board Member Linda Rosenberg and Chairman Dunn that the board would not sign. Board Member Rosenberg clarified with Chairman Dunn that an estimated 2400 cases would fall into this scenario, per year. Chairman Dunn concurred that roughly 200 per month, 2400 annually, as described by Board Member Rosenberg, would be automatically paroled that now go through an interview with a hearing examiner and come to the board for consideration. Chairman Dunn stated that Dr. Bucklen's upcoming report for the meeting would give a

different perspective on this. Jennifer Storm, Victim Advocate (via telephone) added that the JRI 2 bill was being couched last night as a victims' rights issue – that this bill would be denying victims' rights; which is completely inaccurate. Victim Advocate Storm stated that she would be making a lot of calls today to help educate senators. Victim Advocate Storm suggested and asked that if anyone gets questions about this that it be noted that it clearly delineates non-violent cases. She added, these are cases that are not subject to personal injury crimes. Chairman Dunn asked Ms. Storm to verify that if any case had victim input that those cases would be flagged; Victim Advocate Storm agreed. Board Member Rosenberg asked Jennifer Storm, about cases where there is victim input that are not considered victim input cases. Chairman Dunn replied that cases like that would be bumped out of the "auto" parole over into a regular review case. Victim Advocate Storm agreed.

Board Member Maureen Barden raised a concern that sometimes a non-violent designation can be misleading to the general public. Her point was in reference to some personal injury cases that are also deemed non-violent. In response to Board Member Barden's example, Chairman Dunn replied that the case would likely not qualify for JRI 2 because there was personal injury involved. Chairman Dunn, deferring to Director Wills and Victim Advocate Storm for any necessary corrections, continued to clarify that for the board's point-of-view and per the legislation, they key is not that a case is non-violent, rather that there is not a personal injury crime involved. Ms. Storm, replied that "yes" that was correct. Board Member Rosenberg asked if a victim still wants to provide input if they still can, the case would go to the board for review and that automatic parole would not occur. Chairman Dunn confirmed that as correct. Victim Advocate Storm added that victim rights are always extended even for cases that are not under personal injury. There were no other questions for Director Wills.

G. Laura Treaster, Special Assistant – Media Relations and Website

Special Assistant Laura Treaster stated that on March 19, 2018, Maria Finn began working over in the DOC press office as the parole-based Press Secretary. Mrs. Treaster outlined her duties now, and noted that she is working alone in the Riverfront Office Center Central Office. Her duties included fielding calls from reporters looking for a board action or wanting to speak with an individual such as the Chairman or a board member. Her primary responsibilities involve work on the consolidated Internet that is currently underway between the board, DOC, and also the SOAB and FETC. Special Assistant Treaster will continue to be the administrator for all the Websites, including the Doc site. Board, SOAB, OVA and FEGC all underwent an upgrade on SharePoint. That was completed last week, with a new look and feel for the navigation on all those sites. She is currently working with the state contractor to bring DOC's Website in on the new platform. Special Assistant Treaster's contact information remains the same. She will be working with Maria Finn for overlapping subjects, for example the

Safe Return project. Board Member Johnson asked who he should be contacting about Safe Return. Special Assistant Treasurer replied to see her regarding board member and hearing examiner involvement. Parole field involvement will be coordinated by Special Assistant Treasurer with Press Sec Maria Finn. Board Member Johnson asked about a date in September. Mrs. Treasurer asked him to continue to send her emails. There were no further questions for Mrs. Treasurer.

III. OLD BUSINESS

A. PCL-R Assessments

The Chairman noted that he has reviewed the budget for the 2018-19 year and the cost to have PCL-Rs done for non-sex offenders that seem to have psychopathic traits. Although there is high interest, it is unaffordable at this point in time. The cost is several thousands of dollars per individual PCL-R that is not attached to a sex offender. It remains a possibility for later down the road. Board Member Maureen Barden asked if there is any other substitute that approximates similar information that is more cost effective. Chairman Dunn stated that there are none that we are aware of at this time. Executive Director Dade is keeping an eye out for things nationally and internationally. Board Member Ted Johnson asked if the reason for the cost is due to the need to contract PCL-R's out for assessment. Executive Director Dade replied that there is a certain expertise required to know how to score the instrument. Board Member Johnson asked if the cost would be lower if we hired our own staff, at some point. Some discussion ensued regarding the staffing requirements necessary to accomplish this – e.g. field staff, investigative staff, board member resources, compilation of data.

Board Member Everett Gillison commented strongly about the cost (an estimated cost of 15x that of the assessment) to keep the individual incarcerated vs. paying for a PCL-R for those exception cases where the analysis would be beneficial to the parole decision. Board Member Johnson asked where the decision needs to be made. He raised for consideration whether monies might be in the DOC budget. Board Member Gillison further added that the board should look for other ways to accomplish this, including going to the Governor. He continued on to suggest that the public would not find it favorable to learn that a decision was made to not use this type of analysis vs. keeping an individual incarcerated. Board Member Gillison asked that his objection become a matter of record. The Chairman acknowledged. Board Member Gillison proposed that the board should meet about these exception cases, decide the case as a board based on what the board already has. The Chairman stated his opinion of how performing the assessment for one-off (exception) cases is not fair to others who are similarly situated, which is unaffordable with the current budget. Further conversation took place around some current cases where having an assessment might be beneficial and cost comparisons. Board Member Johnson asked, again, if this is a conversation that should occur between PBPP and DOC.

Chairman Dunn engaged Dr. Bucklen and asked if any of the instruments currently being considered get us closer to some of the desired information. Dr. Bucklen, DOC Statistical Office, indicated that we do not have data related to psychology. The Chairman offered that taking this issue to the Joint Assessment Committee to do some more background in coordination with SOAB, focused on cost-benefit analysis. Board member Johnson asked that the DOC and any other decision making body be included in the conversation. The board will first need to reply with answers to questions distributed by Chief Counsel Alan Robinson; redistributed during the current board meeting. General conversation continued regarding cost-benefit. The board will review and answer the distributed questions, for review at the next board meeting in May .

B. 361 Discussion

Executive Assistant to the Chairman, Neal Kokatay went over the objectives for re-vamping the 361. Some goals are to create a tool that is quicker to fill out, easier to use, is a better predictor of recidivism and aids in consistency of decision making. The tool takes into consideration facts considered important by board members and hearing examiners. Executive Assistant to the Chairman, Neal Kokatay has been taking input from both and will continue to move forward with that discussion in the coming months. The tool will have a consolidation of decisional factors as they relate to approval and refusal. Executive Assistant to the Chairman, Neal Kokatay continued to explain some of the specific changes that are being considered for the overall tool. The timeline was reviewed, as follows:

January 2019 –	Get this to the Sentencing Commission
June 2018 –	Decision expected for what items are wanted to populate the background section
August 2018 –	Determine list of special conditions
October 2018 –	Decision on weighting for decision factors
December 2018 –	Decision on how decision factors should be weighted
January 2019 – March 2019 –	Legislative approval
March 2019 – June 2020 --	IT implementation
July 2020 --	Parole usage

Regarding the project charter, the Chairman asked that comments be given to Executive Assistant to the Chairman, Neal Kokatay between now and May. Board Member Rosenberg raised an issue about the request for board members to provide input before a discussion about what decisional factors should be used. The Chairman clarified points, a discussion took place regarding the tool, its changes, and decisional factors, afterward the conversation was able to move forward. The conversation continued, in general, about how the initial input was collected by to Executive Assistant to the Chairman, Neal Kokatay. Board Member Linda Rosenberg suggested a board session to talk through the process for these proposed changes to the 361. The Chairman added that the discussion could take

place during an afternoon session. Board Member Mark Koch (via phone) agreed with having a separate session. Chairman Dunn indicated that it would occur after the May board meeting. Board Member Ted Johnson suggested VC for some of the meetings, explaining that board week is already filled with a lot of important business (e.g. victim interviews).

Board Member Johnson added that more regular discussions regarding the 361 should occur. Chairman Dunn added a reminder that public notice must be provided when the board is meeting. He also asked Board Secretary John Talaber and Executive Assistant to the Chairman, Neal Kokatay to coordinate the schedules to discuss the 361. The Chairman informed Dr. Brett Bucklen that he or Michelle should plan to participate by phone. Board Member Linda Rosenberg asked Dr. Bucklen, DOC Statistical Office, to brief the board about the current factors and what the research suggests based on those factors, as a starting point for these discussions. Some further discussion occurred about the logistics for scheduling the discussions. Board Member Rosenberg suggested a meeting to begin at 4 p.m. After the general discussion, board Member Johnson gave a recap.

Chairman Dunn clarified that meetings will be scheduled in-between board meetings, to discuss what factors are to be included in the 361. Chief Hearing Chad Allensworth asked if the Chairman would like hearing examiners included. The Chairman responded in the affirmative. Board members named certain hearing examiners to be included for continuity and rotation. Executive Assistant to the Chairman, Neal Kokatay continued with his general review of the suggested 361 changes. At some point during the update, Board Secretary Talaber advised that the current system's limitations be considered. Board Secretary Talaber emphasized that Office of Board Secretary (OBS) staff be involved in this process. The discussion continued with some focus on the inclusion of OBS staff. Chairman Dunn supported this. After some further discussion, it was agreed that the process needs to consider future system abilities, as well as, considering the current system. The update ended without further inquiry.

C. Data Reports

Dr. Brett Bucklen was asked to identify and provide analysis of two groups; one with a high parole rate and another group with a really low parole rate. His office also looked at the recidivism for those two groups. Copies of the written analysis were distributed to the board for their reference during his update. On the high-end, the group included individuals who generally meet the requirement for the proposed for JRI for automatic parole. This group was granted parole at a rate of 75%. DOC and board definitions of recidivism were considered – the board uses recommitment rate. DOC's definition is 33% recidivism rate within one year, compared to an overall 40% recidivism rate. The parole recommitment rate is 13% for this group, compared to 20% overall. This group's recidivism is lower than the overall DOC and parole recidivism rates, as expected. The low-end group was identified as individuals with negative DOC recommendation, misconducts, and refusal of programming. For this group, there is a 2% grant rate; 64% recidivism

rate, by DOC definition; and 38% recidivism by board definition (recommitment rate). Dr. Bucklen summarized the analysis by stating the high likelihood parole group had a very low recidivism rate; the low likelihood group had a very high recidivism rate.

Dr. Bucklen addressed the earlier question about JRI's impact on the number of cases. He added that this analysis translates into about 200 cases per month or about 11%-12% of the total docket – leaving about 88% of the cases for board review. Board Member Gillison asked for a reminder of what DOC's definition of recidivism is. Dr. Bucklen responded: police re-arrest regardless of conviction or anything, or recommitment to DOC custody or a technical or new conviction. Chairman Dunn added further clarification – think of the historical definition of recidivism, recommitment (new crime or technical). Board Member Gillison asked for further clarification about whether DOC includes conviction or arrest only. Dr. Bucklen clarified that it is arrest only. Board Member Gillison asked if the analysis could be narrowed further in order to use specific data to evaluate board decision making. Dr. Bucklen answered in the affirmative. Board Member Gillison asked for that closer analysis. Dr. Bucklen answered in the affirmative. Dr. Bucklen's handout was reviewed further and some analysis and discussion ensued.

Dr. Bucklen provided a proposed timeline for the white board "wish-list" developed at a prior meeting. Timelines were proposed for two items:

1. Impact to the 361 score if the overt was replaced with the Burke tool – mid May 2018
2. Recidivism rate by board members and hearing examiners – fall 2018 prototype of an annual report completed; early 2019 for the actual report, annually thereafter.

Chief Hearing Examiner Chad Allensworth had a follow up question for Dr. Bucklen. He asked how the recidivism rate would be captured when there are multiple and differing votes on a case. Mr. Allensworth added that a recidivism hit should not count against a decision maker who voted to deny parole if the parolee recommits. Dr. Bucklen suggested that looking at the individual votes should work. The discussion ended for this topic, moving on the Board Member Johnson.

Board Member Johnson suggested that his subject matter be moved to the next meeting. Chairman Dunn acknowledged this and added that there will be a pre-board meeting, next month, on the Tuesday afternoon after F2F is done. Board Members directly involved need to be there; others have a choice to attend.

Board Member Linda Rosenberg provided a follow up on county probation. They have requested that the board continue holding off on auditing them. Some of their evidence-based committee practices conflict with some of the auditing standards that our staff are doing. A meeting took place where Board Member Rosenberg asked the Chief County Probation Officers Association board members to be specific about what they don't like. Board Member Rosenberg referenced a letter she received from the Association, and then recapped what was agreed upon. The

proposed agreement includes that auditing will begin, again, with the provision that the board will hold off on auditing those evidence-based standards defined in the Association's memo until the end of the three-year cycle. Some discussion ensued regarding the specific request to hold off on auditing.

The Chairman asked for a motion that the board put the staff recommendation of restarting the audit cycle on July 1 with the caveat that the evidence-based portion is in the third part of the audit cycle (i.e. the third year). This will allow the first two years of the audit cycle for counties to continue any work they have as far as implementation.

Board Member Johnson suggested, on the second part of the Chairman's recommendation, that the board continue auditing on the section that the counties want cut out, but not make it a part of the official report. Board Member Rosenberg commented that a very high percentage of the counties are in compliance. General conversation continued regarding the scope of the request. After some discussion, the Chairman advised that there were two different motion potentials and asked if anyone wanted to put one or the other on the table. Board Member Everett Gillison moved to put the discussion on the table until the board receives a written report for review at the next board meeting. Board Member Linda Rosenberg seconded the motion. Some discussion on the motion followed. It was clarified that a timeframe was included in the motion. Board Secretary Talaber advised that the next actual board meeting will be a presentation and asked if the board wanted the date of the next monthly board meeting. The motion was amended to the May board meeting. All were in favor, none opposed. Board Member Rosenberg will work with Executive Assistant Bill Otis before sending a draft of the county letter to the board.

Board Member Gillison made a motion to adjourn that was seconded by Board Member Johnson. There was no discussion the motion. The board unanimously voted to adjourn the meeting at 11:56 a.m.

JJT/SST