

ORANGE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, MAY 14 AND 21

Reported by Wanda Shaffer, LWVNOC

****Sheriff Hutchens responded to the BOS request regarding the impacts of AB109 realignment.** She strongly stated that the media are not telling the story correctly. NO prisoners are being transferred to the county jails nor are any prisoners being released early to the public; they are still under county probation supervision. Property crimes are increasing BUT the increase is not proven to be going up because of realignment. Other factors are the larger 18-25 yr. age group, drug epidemics in communities, fewer officers, and the fact that crime is increasing in many other states without AB109. UCI has been contracted to conduct a study; until then, let's look carefully at the facts. Of the 6,800 county jail populations the new jail population is a bit over 1,000, composed of nonviolent, non-sex offenders. They are parole violators, felony probation violators, non-serious felons, and flash incarcerations. (10 days in jail for parole violations.) The OC jails have 7,175 existing beds. The strategies to cope with AB109 include expansion of the community work program from 287 to 425; developing a memorandum of understanding to have inmates trained at State Fire Camps; implement a supervised electronic confinement program with 140 inmates; and explore more grants for expansion/construction of new jail facilities. Sheriff Hutchens is also piloting a new "transitions from jail to community" involving 25 AB109 inmates. They will be pre-screened, attend cognitive behavior curriculums, GED, and substance abuse classes. After counseling and given a roadmap for transition, there will be a hand-off to the Probation Dept. for a seamless continuation of treatment post-custody. She is excited about this pilot program stating that this is what will "rescue young offenders and turn around the recidivism rate". There are unforeseen/unintended consequences: prisoner litigation for medical and disabled issues; long term inmate health care costs and the necessary associated facility improvements needed; intercepted drugs, contrabands and disciplinary actions by the this more "savvy" population; and a straining of bed issues with the myriad issues of classification and separation issues.

****Once again the BOS is considering whether to have a funding level agreement with ORANGE COUNTY HUMAN RELATIONS**

COMMISSION! YOU ARE ENCOURAGED TO LET OUR SUPERVISOR KNOW YOU SUPPORT THE COMMISSION! The wonderful work they conduct with the schools must have a county coverage in order to work with schools. Of course their annually published hate crime report and work accomplished by the Commission during the Kelly Thomas event should also be reasons to support the Human Relations Commission.

****The Board of Supervisors opposes the State Legislatures' draft that proposes lowering the voter threshold for tax measures from a supermajority (two-thirds to 55%.** Each of the Constitutional Amendments deal with parcel tax, Public Libraries, transportation taxes, local govt. economic development.

Districts 2,3 and 5 get millions more than Districts 1 and 4!
\$2,100,000 approved for purchase of over 11 acres of property in District 3. The land purchased from the Orange Unified School District will give amenities for residents of unincorporated Silverado canyon communities. A children center and library will be included. Dist. 4 Supervisor Nelson was against the idea, "This is only excess real estate. Save dollars for the Parks Dept. My Dist. 4 only gets a \$600,000 budget for the entire year!" District 1 Supervisor Nguyen stated that she only gets \$64,000 for the Old County Courthouse. Does this seem inequitable?!

****\$100,000,000 technology contract with a company that was sued by New York City.** SAIC, Scientific Applications International Corporation, has received a huge county technology contract. Much discussion ensued with Hewlett-Packard asking for another bid submitting opportunity, since they claimed the 20% lower bid by SAIC was only an estimate and new requirements are now asked. SAIC was successfully sued for \$500,000 (historically one of the largest amounts for a city.). SAIC stated they got rid of the "few bad apples" and it's all been paid back. The BOS modified the contract requiring that a Federal monitor be assigned to SAIC. The monitor must provide quarterly clean Bill of Health reports to the Board.