

SBOC Option Tables

SBOC Board Meeting

Tuesday, April 23, 2013

4/22/2013

DRAFT

Option 1: Somerset County Jail Receives 3rd Quarter Payment

Elements of the option

- Allows SCJ to transfer federal boarder revenue from operations budget to pay down debt services;
- SCJ receives a 3rd Quarter payment of \$280,442) in exchange for non-Somerset County inmates;
- Determine SCJ Budgeted Capacity: 192 vs. 165 for FY14 and beyond;
- Somerset's 4th Quarter payment contingent on available investment fund monies.

Pros/Cons

- **Pros**
 - ❖ Somerset County to supplement county generated tax revenue to pay down debt;
 - ❖ SCJ immediately begins housing non-Somerset inmates;
 - ❖ No need for CCL or YCL to incur additional costs due to pod opening;
- **Cons**
 - ❖ **Legality of SCJ activity;**
 - ❖ Use of revenue to offset expenses;
 - ❖ Potential for SBOC to assume financial responsibility for overruns;
 - ❖ Potential for tax cap reduction;
 - ❖ Budgeted capacity still unclear;
 - ❖ Continued conflict with Somerset County

Option 2: Somerset County Jail doesn't receive 3rd Quarter Payment

Elements of the option

- Board votes to withhold SCJ 3rd Quarter payment based on the jail's illegal use of federal boarder revenue;
- Investment Fund maintains \$280,442 to redistribute to other jails to offset costs/deficits/housing non-native inmates;
- Somerset County Jail operates independent of collaborative system;
- Board votes to determine use of SCJ's CCA funding;
- Alternative housing needed for approximately 40-50 inmates;

Pros/Cons

- **Pros**
 - ❖ SBOC Investment Fund not used to augment SCJ's operations expenses and assist in debt service reduction;
 - ❖ Investment Fund is bolstered by \$280,440; \$280,440 to be redeployed for housing and programming;
 - ❖ Strengthening of collaborative system;
- **Cons**
 - ❖ Strain on jails currently receiving non-native inmates;
 - ❖ Sustainability of option due to limited amount of available beds and funding;
 - ❖ Lack of centralized management of county jail perpetuates bed placement problem;
 - ❖ CCJ or YCJ incur additional costs with pod openings.

Option #2A: Detachment from Somerset County and Cumberland County Jail Pod Opening

Elements of the option

- Board votes to fund CCI to open up 46 person pod (\$839,397);
- Personnel Costs - \$443,897;
- Add'l medical costs - \$300,000;
- Add'l food costs - \$54,400;
- Pod supplies - \$16,100;
- Utility costs - \$25,000;withhold SCJ 3rd Quarter payment based on the jail's illegal use of federal boarder revenue;
- Need to consider CWG's recommendation to return Franklin County Detention Center to full service operation;
- Need to consider CWG's anticipated review of Oxford County Jail's request for full service status.

Pros/Cons

- **Pros**
 - ❖ Provides additional bed space to answer inmate overflow;
 - ❖ Reduces CCI's per capita cost with increased population;
 - ❖ 49 miles – Oxford County Jail to CCI;
 - ❖ 38 miles – Androscoggin County Jail to CCI;
 - ❖ HUB system to reduce transportation costs.
 - ❖ \$893, 397 reflects appropriate level of cost
- **Cons**
 - ❖ Available funding to assist CCI open pod;
 - ❖ CCI and contract requirement (commitment);
 - ❖ 46 beds not sufficient;
 - ❖ Lack of centralized management of county jail beds;
 - ❖ 95 miles – Franklin Detention Center to CCI.

Option #2B:

Detachment from Somerset County and Beds managed from centralized location

- **Elements of the option**
 - Bed placement is no longer done by current “call around” approach;
 - Bed placement handled by one department or person (e.g. MDOC, Kennebec County Jail);
 - Possible MOU between SBOC and centralized location;
 - Placement is done during normal business hours and BARS (inmate reporting system) is used as primary resource;
 - 72 Hour holding requirement to be applied consistently throughout the system;
 - Review of reclassification systems and jail’s adherence to Maine Jail Standards;
 - Consideration of mission changes for Franklin and Oxford.
- **Pros/Cons**
 - ❖ Enhanced logistics (efficiency) due to centralization;
 - ❖ Improved coordination and communication;
 - ❖ Reduction in jail staff time/stress with elimination of “call around” approach;
 - ❖ Less financial strain on Investment Fund due to minimal cost associated with strategy;
 - ❖ Improved data and reporting methods
- **CONS**
 - ❖ Increased workload for centralized location;
 - ❖ Business hours placement due to limited staff;
 - ❖ Previously voiced rejection from various Sheriff’s and JA’s on strategy;
 - ❖ Pending mission change requests may negate need for centralized management.