

**Jail Study Committee**  
Special Meeting Minutes (same as Notes) – Approved 1-19-17  
Thursday, October 27, 2016 5:00 PM  
Legislature Chambers

**Attendance**

<b>Attendee Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Status</b>
Rich John	Chair	Present
Martha Robertson	Member	Present
David McKenna	Member	Present
Anna Kelles	Member	Present
James Dennis	Member	Present
Joe Mareane	County Administrator	Present
Patricia Buechel	Probation & Community Justice Director	Present
Dooley Kiefer	Legislator	Present
Michael Lane	Legislator	Present
Michelle Pottorff	Chief Deputy Clerk	Present
Marcia Lynch	Public Info. Officer, County Administration	Present
Lance Salisbury	Supervising Attorney, Assigned Counsel Program	Present
Ray Bunce	Jail Administrator	Present

Guests: Josephine Cardamone, City of Ithaca resident, Ithaca Journal reporter

**Call to Order**

Mr. John, Chair, called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

**Public Comment**

Josephine Cardamone, City of Ithaca, said she had read the Request for Proposal responses online and felt both companies were excellent and noted even one of the companies was relatively local. She said after this step the Committee will need to review proposals from architects and she thinks they will always want to build. She said the Jail does need some renovation to improve the space but thinks a lot of money could be saved by the first step to pay for anything needed in the second phase. She thanked the Committee for its work.

**Changes to the Agenda**

There were no changes to the agenda.

**Discussion: Responses to Request for Proposals - Criminal Justice/Jail Population Trend Needs Assessment**

**Proposals Submitted in Response to RFP (ID #6671)**

Mr. John asked for feedback from Committee members on the written proposals submitted.

Ms. Robertson said although disappointed by the misspellings in its proposal, she felt ILPP's proposal contained a lot of the types of work Tompkins County is looking for and a lot of newer ideas than were contained in the CGR proposal.

Minutes  
Jail Study Committee  
Thursday, October 27, 2016

Ms. Kelles expressed initial support for the ILPP proposal. She felt the CGR proposal was much more traditional with a narrow scope. There were aspects of the ILPP proposal she was impressed with including the mention of medical and community expertise, as well as their interest in creating a collaborative dialogue. They didn't talk solely about the Jail population but had a broader scope and stronger expertise; they also focused on the staff and the support and have recognition that all pieces are important.

Mr. Dennis expressed concern over the misspellings in ILPP's proposal and questioned where ILPP last worked. He also questioned what the top three things Tompkins County wants to get out of the study are and would like each company to make some predictions based on the current population and speak to what it has been over a period of time.

Ms. Buechel spoke of the ILPP proposal and felt their recommendations were outstanding; she likes the practical approach they would have to evaluating all points in the system. Her only concern was that they are an out-of-state company and questions how long it would take them to become knowledgeable about New York State's policies, rules, and regulations. She also has concern over how communication would be handled. She said in reviewing the samples CGR provided for what they had done in Chemung and Steuben counties she didn't find anything new and also had concerns over their estimations for savings.

Mr. McKenna said given the location of ILPP he initially felt ILPP was the more favorable company to conduct the study. After hearing comments he said he would like to hear from each company before choosing who he would prefer.

Mr. John expressed concern over ILPP not having experience working in New York State, the grammar used in the proposal, and said he found the carelessness in the RFP to be bothersome. He said ILPP emphasized they have expertise with minority issues and experience working in college communities. However, he found the promises contained in the ILPP proposal to be bothersome, particularly the statement that "we can do this study to a level of excellence and immediately lower your population" and "the study will solve the facility planning problem". Mr. John said he thinks the issues in Tompkins County may be somewhat similar to what CGR saw in Chemung and Steuben Counties and would like to speak to the references contained in the proposals.

Ms. Kiefer favored the ILPP proposal. She spoke of the CGR proposal and said the studies of Chemung and Steuben counties were in 2005 and 2006 and she doesn't find assurance in what has happened in those counties subsequent to those studies. Ms. Robertson agreed and said it wasn't until then that Chemung County started an electronic monitoring program. She stated Tompkins County has already done the "low-hanging and mid-hanging fruit". To her it appears ILPP's awareness of the system is much more nuanced and extensive to all of the things that Tompkins County is trying to pay attention to such as mental health and homelessness and their proposal provides a much richer set of options.

Ms. Kelles said ILPP recognized the greatest expense with an expansion is not the long-term expansion cost but often the operation of it. She was also impressed on their emphasis on mental health, awareness of the Ithaca Drug Plan, recognition that a detox center needs to be explored, and they distinguished between a detox center and a treatment center. She also appreciated their emphasis on community programs and noted although they clearly are not against expansion they want to exhaust exploring all other options before making that conclusion. In addition to stating that Tompkins County is a leading example in the State, they also recognized that much of the decision comes down to cost effectiveness and she appreciated them being forthcoming with the recognition that that is often what makes decisions.

Minutes  
Jail Study Committee  
Thursday, October 27, 2016

Ms. Kelles referred to a diagram Ms. Robertson used in a presentation that outlined the jail population and costs and investments in alternatives-to-incarceration by county and recalled Steuben and Chemung being in the mid-range of that chart. She said their placement on the chart ten years after having engaged in a study with CGR is of concern.

Mr. Bunce said the components of the ILPP proposal relating to jail processes related to a facility much larger than Tompkins County's jail. He preferred the CGR proposal, particularly because of the firm's location and familiarity with New York State.

Mr. Mareane said he had no preference at this point and suggested members not take a position on either firm until each are given an opportunity to meet with the Committee. He said two things the Committee will want to know are: 1) a projection of what the jail population will be assuming nothing changes, and 2) a projection of what the jail population would be if changes they suggest that are cost-effective are made. The Commission of Correction will want to know what ATI programs and other measures instituted are going to do to get the population down.

Mr. Mareane spoke to the process and said both of the firms are supportive of their proposals being discussed in open session. He said the fee proposals have not been circulated as he felt it was important to keep that separate in order for the Committee to first look at the quality factors. They both said they would be available on November 1<sup>st</sup> for a presentation.

Ms. Kelles referred back to the chart Ms. Robertson had presented and stated since the CGR study in 2005/2006 Steuben and Chemung Counties have among the highest jail population in the State and ATI programs are very low in both. Another concern she has with the CGR proposal is its use of jail expansion as a business model for in-boarding.

Mr. Dennis said he did not have a preference at this time; however, he encouraged members to look into each firm's background and at other places they have worked.

Mr. Salisbury commented that the mission of other counties is sometimes different. He said Chemung and Steuben counties have had a different view toward ATI programs and don't see them as an appropriate resolution in criminal matters. There is a predisposition that incarceration is a preferred way of resolving criminal cases and why there is a higher rate of incarceration in those counties. He said this is a point that the Committee may want to question each of the firms about.

There was consensus that the Committee wished to speak with each firm. Following discussion it was agreed to meet with each firm by videoconference and to have a similar structure for fairness reasons. It was acknowledged, however, that ILPP being from California could be a potential hurdle and they should be asked how they will accommodate the distance issue.

The Committee will meet on November 1<sup>st</sup> at 1:00 p.m. The Committee will review a list of questions for the first half hour. The first interview will begin at 1:30 p.m. with 30 minutes dedicated for a presentation and 30 minutes for the Committee to ask questions. Members were asked to send Ms. Pottorff a list of questions. The interviews will be open to the public.

Mr. Lane said at a recent meeting that was held with Cortland County Legislators to talk about similar problems they expressed interest in speaking with Tompkins County about jail issues. He said a number of years ago Tompkins and Cortland Counties explored the possibility of having a joint jail and asked Mr. John if he would contact the Chair of the Cortland County Legislature to talk about the jail and

Minutes  
Jail Study Committee  
Thursday, October 27, 2016

other things that reduce jail population. It was stated that Cortland County has committed \$1.9 million for a study of constructing a new jail. There was a brief discussion over the differences in philosophy each county has concerning alternatives-to-incarceration but members were agreeable to having a conversation with Cortland County.

At the request of Ms. Kiefer, Mr. Mareane will provide the Committee with the full list of questions that were submitted by the responders.

**Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.