

## MINUTES

### **REGULAR MEETING ILLINOIS CRIMINAL JUSTICE INFORMATION AUTHORITY**

**September 7, 2007, 9:15 a.m.  
120 S. Riverside Plaza, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Chicago, Illinois**

#### **Call to Order and Roll Call**

Chairman Sorosky convened the regular meeting of the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority and asked Jack Cutrone, the Authority's General Counsel, to call the roll.

In addition to the Chairman, other Authority members in attendance were:

Sheriff Thomas Dart  
Sheriff Jerry Dawson  
State's Attorney Richard Devine  
Ms. Barbara Engel  
Director Norbert Goetten, State Appellate Prosecutor  
Director Theodore A. Gottfried, State Appellate Defender  
Ms. Ellen Mandeltort, Attorney General Designee  
Mr. Eugene Murphy, Jr.  
Ms. Maryana Spyropoulos  
Interim Superintendent Dana Starks  
Mr. John Toscas

#### **Approval of the Minutes of the June 1, 2007 Authority Meeting**

{Mr. Toscas made a motion to approve the minutes, subject to correction of a typographical error. The motion was seconded by Ms. Spyropoulos and approved by unanimous voice vote.)

#### **Chairman's Remarks**

Chairman Sorosky welcomed everyone to the meeting, and moved on to the business to be conducted, calling on Executive Director Lori Levin to make her remarks.

#### **Executive Director's Remarks**

Director Levin welcomed Chicago Police Department Interim Superintendent Dana Starks to his first meeting on the Authority Board and said that she and John Chojnacki met with him at headquarters a week or so earlier. She then reported that the IIJS

Summit in Springfield was very successful, due in large part to Clerk Brown and the Outreach Committee. She also complimented Herb Johnson and Nicole Sims for their help in coordinating the event. In addition, she mentioned that Kim Burke and Jessica Ashley were involved in presenting an Authority BARJ course, and that along with the Associate Director for Research and Development, they were involved in arranging a multidisciplinary juvenile justice conference.

Director Levin next commented that VOI/TIS will end on September 29 and that a Victim Services Ad Hoc Committee meeting will be held on October 9, followed by a Budget Committee meeting. She reiterated that VOCA funding was cut, but made up for a year using one of the Authority's additional JAG amounts. She added that the thinking was to recommend cuts or a game plan. In addition, she mentioned that the Victim Services Ad Hoc Committee, co-chaired by Becky Jansen and Ellen Mandeltort, both of whom she complimented for their efforts last year, will be working to try to deal with the reductions.

She further reported that Becky Block, who some Board Members may recall had retired, is back working at the Authority for the 75 days allowed every year after retirement.

The Director then turned to addressing the Authority budget. She asked staff in attendance to please hold any questions until after the Board Meeting concluded when she and the Executive Staff would be holding a meeting to discuss budget-related issues. She explained that there were two member initiatives originally added to what has been a record overtime budget. One, an appropriation of \$250,000 for the capital punishment task force, which has been generally added annually at \$150,000 over the last two or three years. She explained that the increase was for the Authority to operate a database dealing with capital punishment, but was subject to a line item no longer in the budget. She said that the other member initiative was for the downstate innocence project operated by UI Springfield, which is the only undergraduate innocence project in the country. It was a line item veto and also no longer in the budget.

She continued to explain that not last year, but over the prior past several years, the Authority used to provide match for state agencies, but was told to eliminate that amount from the budget and did. However, a line item termed federal assistance support for \$810,000 was included, representing a large part of the Authority's general revenue budget at 25 percent. She said that line item was vetoed because it erroneously was thought to be for the eliminated state match for other state agencies. Thus, the Authority now does not have the appropriations to match its own federal funds.

The Director reported that she met with Bob Greenlee who was formerly with the Governor's Office of Management and Budget to discuss this issue and would be meeting with Colonel Jill Morgenthaler, Deputy Chief of Staff for Public Safety, and Deputy Governor Louanner Peters to further address ways to deal with the situation based on some of Bob Greenlee's ideas. She added that she had called CMS to have them pay this month's rent because the Authority could not afford it. She said she was hopeful that the discussions with the Governor's office would be fruitful in determining ways for the

Authority to continue to pay its bills. She said that while other agencies may have had budget cuts, the Authority's reduction was more serious because it cannot expend the federal funds without a match nor sources to pay the match.

The Director stated that she and Mr. Cutrone met with the Executive Staff to try to ascertain ways to respond. She apologized for the delay in meeting with line staff but said that she wanted to talk with Mr. Greenlee first for some ideas, and that meeting took a longer time than anticipated to arrange. She added that even former Authority CFO Ted Miller, who is now with the Tollway, was called for his thoughts given his experience in working with the Authority budget for the last three years. She indicated that one plan for the time being, which would need to be explored with the Justice Department to see if it would be permissible, is to have other sources pay certain items for the Authority and having that count as match. She added that there were a number of other possible remedies for consideration, but thought that such a discussion would more productive at another time. However, she said that she felt she needed to bring the situation to the Board's attention forthwith.

Chairman Sorosky asked if there were any questions or comments, with Mr. Gottfried responding. He commented that his office also experienced cuts and thus he had great sympathy for the Authority. He asked whether the cuts that the Governor made affect the day-to-day employees or do they just affect grants. Ms. Levin responded that they affect both. She then stated for the record that State's Attorney Devine arrived and reiterated the three line item vetoes previously discussed. She said that eliminating the \$810,000 federal assistance support line item which was the Authority's GR match to its federal funds has the biggest impact on the Authority. She explained that it affects more than the Grant Unit because most of the Authority's Research Unit is run by a federal grant.

She said that a couple of research staff are on General Revenue. But some people are actually being paid for in the Research Unit and in the Grant Unit at various times under the match that comes under the GR match. Mr. Gottfried then inquired as to whether the Board would want to ask the Governor's office for an explanation of the cuts. Ms. Levin said that as she referred to earlier, she thinks that the Governor's Office thought mistakenly that this amount was the match to the other state agencies that the Authority was told to eliminate and has been doing so for the last couple of years.

Chairman Sorosky then asked Director Levin that assuming the cut was an unintentional error, if she knew what the chances are of it being corrected. Ms. Levin stated that she had not yet met with the Deputy Governor, that she only saw her briefly when she was in Springfield to meet with Bob Greenlee, who is now the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations. She said that he suggested other agencies that might be providing match to the Authority for either a grant administration being able to pay various costs. She said that he asked her to call CMS which she did. She reiterated that CMS would need to pay the Authority's rent this month because that came out of the match, as does the Authority's moving money, which she said is another issue.

Director Levin continued to say that there were a number of different ways to approach the situation. Some of the match could come in and the Authority could get it appropriated next year, but the question would be whether or not the Authority has the actual working cash to still operate. She said that the Authority may be able to get the match on the back end. State's Attorney Devine asked what would be the best thing to do if the Board wanted to act, with Mr. Murphy asking Director Levin for her recommendation. Director Levin stated that she was notifying the Board of the situation but, since she was the Governor's appointee, had no recommendation. Mr. Murphy inquired as to what Board members could do either individually or collectively, stating that perhaps a letter could start the process for getting a meeting toward helping to correct the mistake.

Chairman Sorosky inquired that based on the suggestion of a letter, would it be wise to have one drafted, signed by all the Board Members and addressed to the Governor, Speaker Madigan, and Senate President Jones telling them, and perhaps even the two minority leaders Senator Watson and Representative Cross, the importance of this issue. Mr. Devine said the Board is willing to do anything to be productive, with Chairman Sorosky requesting any thoughts or suggestions.

In response, Ms. Engel asked if there were an analysis of what federal money the Authority would be losing as a result of not having the match. She said her inquiry was based on whether the Authority should seek public awareness of the federal money that will not be flowing to Illinois because of the \$810,000 cut and why this is so critical. Director Levin said that Mr. Cutrone was meeting with Acting Fiscal Officer Ronald Litwin to analyze this issue. She explained that the total Authority budget was essentially \$122,700,000, which OMB agreed originally to have the Authority submit, then cut the amount to which they agreed.

Ms. Engel continued by saying that she thought a letter was only the beginning, that there should be a brief statement that highlights the seriousness of the loss of federal funds that need to be Illinois, followed by a face-to-face meeting. She then added that she believed in the power of the media. Director Levin stated that in her meeting with the Governor's office last week, they indicated that they might take money out of the budgets of DHS, DOC and ISP to pay ICJIA employees, but it was not certain.

Ms. Mandeltort reiterated the thinking of the Board that it was understood that other budgets were reduced and everyone has to make adjustments. But the difference with the Authority budget cut is that the \$810,000 is the vehicle for getting millions more into the State of Illinois. She said that was the message the letter or whatever public campaign must emphasize. The focus should be that while it appears to be just a veto like others, without those funds, any avenue for federal funding for myriad projects throughout the state could be basically eliminated, such as those for defense, victims, prosecution, and police. She concluded by saying that the point is particularly important if the veto was made through a misunderstanding of the purpose of the \$810,000 appropriation.

Chairman Sorosky added that perhaps the letter should convey that the Authority would not question the veto if it had no other effect, but since it has the serious consequences described by Ms. Mandeltort and Ms. Engel, the Board is requesting a re-examination of the cut. Mr. Murphy then offered to help draft the letter and suggested a two week timetable to distribute it to Board Members for their comments, changes and additions. He said the sooner the better so that momentum is not lost, aiming to have a final version within 30 days.

Mr. Dart cautioned that care should be taken in how the letter is drafted given the current circumstances in Springfield. Mr. Murphy agreed, followed by the decision that the letter should come from the Board, and not Director Levin. Mr. Gottfried underscored the importance of showing the public how the reduction affects the state's whole justice system, saying he has seen other comments about vetoes in the news media but nothing about this cut. Along those lines, he asked whether the Authority should participate in hearings that were going to be held around the state and in Chicago, and urged that the Authority try to get the money back.

Chairman Sorosky said that time is of the essence in sending the letter, and recommended it be done this week. He added that it must be explained that the Authority's entire operation is affected because the whole system of federal grants is based on a matching state commitment. Mr. Toscas then asked if the total that the cut affects is about \$1.6 million and said that it was important that the Board know exactly what the impact is before a letter is written so that the actual seriousness of the situation can be expressed.

Director Levin then introduced Mr. Ron Litwin, the Authority's acting CFO for his comments regarding the exact amount the State of Illinois would lose in federal funds. Mr. Litwin said about \$2.5 million. He explained that the match is approximately 25 percent so it would be \$810,000 times three, 75 percent federal funds and 25 percent state. Mr. Toscas then remarked that this amount should be used, which is more meaningful than the \$810,000.

Mr. Murphy added that he thought the other focus of the letter should be the various programs that would be impacted, such as victim, appellate and prosecutorial. In addition, he stated that the fact that the \$810,000 opens up more money for the State that may not have to come from somewhere else was another persuasive argument that should be included. Ms. Engel asserted that based on the facts that were expressed, the letter should be sent before 30 days, with Chairman Sorosky agreeing. Ms. Engel further stated that key people with whom to speak should be identified, with Sheriff Dart reiterating that political sensitivity should be exercised. In response, Chairman Sorosky re-stated his suggestion that the letter be sent to all five of the main legislative leaders. In the discussion that followed, Mr. Toscas suggested that it be distributed to every legislator, but afterwards, agreed with Chairman Sorosky that it just be sent to the Governor, the Speaker, the Senate President, and the two Minority Leaders.

In discussing the content, Mr. Gottfried said that the letter should only address how the cut affects the Authority and not be of a political nature. Chairman Sorosky added that

first it should relate the financial loss to the State; two, all the programs it impacts; and three, the long-range consequences in that it could cost the State more in the future. Sheriff Dawson asked if it would be possible to name specific programs that would be eliminated, with Chairman Sorosky responding in the affirmative. Director Levin gave some examples and Chairman Sorosky emphasized the importance of explaining what the programs do and how they help people.

State's Attorney Devine then remarked that subsequent to drafting and sending the letter, there needed to be a point person to coordinate a follow-up and strategy in order for it to be effective. Chairman Sorosky and Mr. Murphy both agreed to undertake that effort, with Mr. Devine offering to call people.

Director Levin asked if there were further questions about any of the other reports in the Board mailing, stressing that much time and energy was devoted to addressing the veto. She added that she had met with Cook County Board President Todd Stroger to acquaint him with the Authority Board and hoped he was going to be at today's meeting, but something unexpected prevented his attending.

#### **Budget Committee Report by Chair Eugene E. Murphy, Jr.**

With no further questions for Director Levin, Chairman Sorosky thanked her for her remarks and called upon Mr. Murphy for his Budget Committee report. Mr. Murphy stated that there had been a Budget Committee meeting the previous week. He said that the Committee is staying with its plan to have more frequent meetings to deal with issues as they develop and encouraged participation by as many people as possible if not in person, by conference call. He reported that there would be an announcement of an October meeting. Director Levin added that it would be held after the Victim Services Ad Hoc Committee meeting. She also explained that she spoke with State's Attorney Devine's Chief of Staff Adrienne Mebane as to when their budget has to come in for the County Board so if there are VOCA cuts people can plan in advance for victim assistance.

Chairman Sorosky asked for comments or questions and not receiving either, returned to the topic of the letter stating that the goal would be to have it out within a week to ten days covering the points he mentioned earlier. Director Levin said that because she would be out for two days to observe the Jewish holiday, she would ask Mr. Cutrone to work with Mr. Murphy in drafting the letter, with her reviewing it. Mr. Murphy invited everyone to give their ideas. Ms. Engel added that somebody on the staff would need to put together brief bullet points relating the correct details of the cut's impact as cited previously. She also mentioned that the bullet points could be useful for conveying this information in contacts with various groups and people, with Mr. Gottfried agreeing.

Chairman Sorosky then called for a motion that the Board as a whole draft the letter as discussed.

{Mr. Toscas moved that Chairman Sorosky and Mr. Murphy, and whoever else needs to be involved, be authorized to prepare a letter on the Board's behalf to the five leaders referenced in discussion. Ms. Spyropoulos seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous voice vote.}

Chairman Sorosky then asked if there were any other business or topics that anyone wanted to raise about the budget or financial aspects. With no response, he called upon Ron Litwin, for his fiscal report.

### **Fiscal Report by Acting Chief Financial Officer Ron Litwin**

Mr. Litwin called attention to financial exhibits for the fiscal year 2007, encompassing the Authority's actual expenditures plus obligations for the period July 1, 2006 through July 30, 2007. He explained that in the general revenue section, the expenditures were less than budgeted in the personal services area due to several vacant positions. He added that the associated line items of retirement, FICA and group insurance were less than budgeted as well.

He moved down the general revenue schedule to the contractual line showing that expenditures were less than budgeted by \$184,000, and referred to building lease expense, which was favorable by approximately \$52,000 due to allocation differences. He covered a favorable miscellaneous \$79,000 in the not elsewhere classified contractual line item variance and other expenditure line items that made up the remaining favorable amount of \$53,000. Mr. Litwin then reported that there was still one month of lapse expenses, which were not included because of the timing of the August close, and would slightly affect the reported numbers.

Moving to the Criminal Justice Information Systems Trust Fund, he pointed out that the expenditures have increased approximately \$15,000 since the last meeting due to payment of telecommunication charges. He explained that expenditures for the total columns are well under budget because of the privatization of the Criminal Justice Information System Trust Fund activities. Under the Criminal Justice Trust Fund, he said that federal spending through July 30 was at 86 percent of the budgeted levels which represents an increase of 4 percent over the last year.

The next section discussed was the General Revenue match expenses where the budget error occurred for FY08. The miscellaneous category represents Capital Punishment Reform Committee spending. The Shared Services line item represents the work of transferring certain Fiscal and Human Resources functions of the agency as a statewide cost savings measure. The Authority spent 81 percent of what was budgeted in this category. Mr. Litwin then reviewed the Criminal Justice Information Products Fund where \$400,000 was budgeted but only had expenditures of \$64.00 because this category is nonfederal money and the revenue did not materialize. Finally, he commented that expenses remained below budget levels under the juvenile accountability category. Mr. Goetten then asked what portion of the \$540,000 under General Revenue was anticipated to lapse, with Mr. Litwin responding \$400,000.

Chairman Sorosky thanked Mr. Litwin and asked if there were any additional questions or comments concerning the fiscal report. In response, Director Levin gave an update on the IPSAN move stating that they still have not re-located, although they have a site in Rosemont. She recounted that IPSAN owed the Authority close to a quarter of a million dollars, which the Authority owed CMS. She said that telecommunications charges made up the vast majority of that amount, which CMS was crediting the Authority, and the Authority will pay only for the rent because of its still occupying the space. She said that the Authority and IPSAN networks were being separated and that the hope was that IPSAN would be moving the end of September.

She added that the Authority is supposed to move the end of December but does not have a space, although it is certain that it will be a downtown location. She recounted being offered suitable quarters, but CMS changing course and giving it to another agency, then offering the Authority other space that was not sufficient. She said that this was a topic she would be discussing with the Governor's office next week.

She reiterated that what is currently being offered is not suitable, and money is an issue as well. Summarizing the discussion, Chairman Sorosky said that the move involved the following points: space that is large enough to accommodate the staff, a reasonable rent, the requirement now that it must be in some form of government building as opposed to a private building, and at a location that is accessible by adequate public transportation for staff. Ms. Levin emphasized that it would be a downtown location and again said that she would be discussing the move with the Deputy Governor next week.

### **Update and Evaluation of Sheridan Correctional Center by Dave Olson**

Chairman Sorosky then called upon Dave Olson to give an update and evaluation on Sheridan Correctional Center. Mr. Olson explained that the Sheridan Correctional Center is a 950 bed medium security prison located about 75 miles southwest of Chicago, operating as a prison-based therapeutic community. In response to a question by Chairman Sorosky as to whether there is any extra space at the Center, Mr. Olson said it will expand to 1,300 beds, made possible by VOI/TIS funds.

He outlined several unique features of the Center saying that it not only combines the Illinois Department of Corrections and their staff and resources, but has extensive contractual relationships with a variety of organizations that provide programming ranging from substance abuse treatment to vocational training, and includes nonprofit as well as some business associations. He added that every inmate at the Sheridan Correctional Center has been identified as in need of substance abuse treatment and receives treatment within the prison, which is different than other programs across the country.

Those he said are usually units within larger prisons, tending to be smaller scaled. Another unique point about Sheridan is the characteristics of the population being the most serious offenders. It is an all male, adult facility, with inmates ranging from 17

years of age up to their fifties and sixties. They must have a verified need for substance abuse treatment and projected to serve at least nine months up to 24 months in prison.

Mr. Olson explained that during the early evaluation of how well inmates performed after release, it was found that if they were not there for at least nine months, it did not appear to have any benefit to them with respect to recidivism. He clarified that the nine month period may contradict other programs, but that those programs deal with less serious offender populations. Other inmate requirements are that they need to be appropriate for a medium security facility, which means not convicted of murder or sex offenses; they cannot have severe mental illness; and they have to volunteer to attend or participate.

Explaining how inmates get accepted, Mr. Olson said they first need to be sentenced to the Illinois Department of Corrections because judges in Illinois do not sentence an inmate to a particular prison. It is DOC's responsibility to determine the appropriate facility. After being admitted to the Department of Corrections, they go through the reception classification process and are assessed to determine if they need substance abuse treatment.

He emphasized that this assessment did not exist systematically in Illinois prior to the development of the Sheridan Correctional Center and has had a dramatic impact not only on that particular institution and those inmates, but have had an effect systemwide within the prison system. It is now Department of Corrections policy that every inmate admitted be assessed for their substance abuse treatment needs.

If the inmate is Sheridan eligible, he signs paperwork indicating he is volunteering for it and then is transferred to Sheridan if space is available. If slots do not exist the inmate is put on a waiting list. Mr. Olson remarked that before Sheridan when inmates were not routinely assessed for treatment needs, even when it was known that this was an issue, there was no process to actually identify and put an inmate on a waiting list for treatment. He attributed this situation to the fact that there are roughly 45,000 inmates in the Illinois Department of Corrections and the ability to modify its information system for such tracking can be a lengthy process. As a result of Sheridan, an improved, quicker tracking capacity now exists.

Mr. Olson then described the more comprehensive assessment and treatment plan along with the orientation phase when inmates arrive at Sheridan. Those efforts, he said, include job assignments within the correctional facility and participation in employment readiness programming conducted by service providers. Prior to release, inmates go through a prerelease planning phase involving the treatment provider; TASC which provides the clinical case management in the community; the Safer Foundation, which assists in obtaining employment; parole agents who are responsible for supervising the inmate; and the DOC counselors who are at the institution. He pointed out that this prerelease model also is unique to Sheridan and is being replicated systemwide.

After release, inmates are on very intensive parole supervision, more than a typical parolee would experience, which can last anywhere from one to three years and involving

urine testing and employment verification. They are also required to participate in after care treatment and additional treatment services if deemed necessary. In addition, in several areas of the state, inmates can go to community support advisory councils which assist returning inmates, and which did not exist prior to Sheridan. Mr. Olson said these councils were developed in recognition that in order for inmates to succeed, there has to be that support and capacity within the community.

Mr. Olson further explained that if conditions of the inmate's parole are violated, there will be a response by the parole agent. But the difference with Sheridan is that a determination is made as to the most appropriate response, rather than historically just returning the parolee to prison. Giving some numbers of Sheridan performance, Mr. Olson recounted that the facility opened on January 2, 2004, with more than 4,000 inmates having been admitted and 2,300 inmates graduated since then. At the end of this fiscal year, Sheridan population was around its capacity of 950.

He then talked about nondisciplinary and disciplinary removals, the former being those inmates determined to have a serious mental illness after acceptance. The latter can include inmates who request to leave because they agreed to participate and were fully informed about the program, which is considered a disciplinary infraction. In a detailed discussion that followed about profile characteristics of the population, he said that the majority of inmates have children but are not married or essentially not in a stable relationship.

A majority do not have a high school diploma or a GED. All of them are substance abusers, a majority using multiple substances on a daily basis prior to their incarceration. On average, those at Sheridan have been arrested 20 times prior to their arrival, and also the majority of inmates have never participated in substance abuse treatment before. About 80 percent of those who are discharged from Sheridan do so under a successful discharge meaning they complied and completed the institutional phase of the program.

He related that research found certain characteristics that predict who are likely to be disciplinary removals, such as younger inmates with fewer prior prison sentences who do worse within the program. On the other hand, those with the most extensive violent criminal histories, the majority of them completed the program. The average amount of time spent at Sheridan has been 11 months. If an inmate is determined to have relapsed and test positive for drugs, parole agents again have a wide range of discretion. They can return them to prison or they can also refer them a detoxification program.

As for inmates following release, 80 percent entered treatment, with 20 percent not, meaning the latter were in violation or were not able to access treatment for a variety of reasons, such as unavailability in certain areas of the state. Based on early data, of those who actually entered treatment, 70 percent successfully completed the program. As a result of Sheridan and its services, Mr. Olson stated that inmates are being employed at a higher rate than the state's typical parolee, meeting one of the goals of the program to improve employment prospects. He said that about half of all Sheridan parolees were

employed, as compared to less than 40 percent of other parolees, which is significant given their extensive criminal histories and felony convictions.

In response to Interim Superintendent Dana's question about recidivism rates of Sheridan inmates, Mr. Olson said in general, the Sheridan parolees were less likely to be rearrested for a new crime and less likely to be returned to prison. He said that the finding was based on an analysis of 1,500 inmates released from Sheridan through June 30, 2006 and in the community for at least one year compared with a non-Sheridan group of twice the number of inmates for this period having similar major characteristics and risk factors. He said another finding is the longer inmates spent at Sheridan, the lower their chances of recidivism or rearrest, which is consistent with research literature and why nine months is the minimum length of time inmates must serve at Sheridan.

Another positive effect is the success of Sheridan inmates who access and complete treatment once they are in the community. Their reduced likelihood of rearrest was 44 percent lower than the comparison group, with the same or even larger percentage not returning to prison. He said that with the institutional program in place, the challenge is determining how to increase access to treatment in the community and treatment completion. He added that it is only the combination of Sheridan plus aftercare that reduces recidivism. He said that it is a criteria of RSAT that if programs are developed for institutional populations, there has to be aftercare as a component and issues were being addressed to assure that requirement can be met.

He said the general conclusion is that Sheridan is not only having a very positive effect on those individuals served by the program, but systemwide within the communities where the capabilities are being developed and implemented. A discussion then ensued about care for methamphetamine users, who were described as much harder to treat. It was noted that there was a section at the East St. Louis or St. Clair County facilities strictly for that purpose. Mr. Olson said that those inmates will be separated and dealt with in a different way than the typical population. He added that if they come from rural areas, they pose a challenge because aftercare is going to be more difficult to access.

Responding to a question by Mr. Starks as to the areas of the state from which the individuals with methamphetamine problems are coming into the Department of Corrections, Mr. Olson stated that based on the Authority's research, the largest numbers of inmates were concentrated in a handful of rural jurisdictions. Interim Superintendent Starks added that lately there seemed to be a huge increase of methamphetamine use within the city and wondered if there would be enough beds to deal with the problem. Mr. Olson concluded by saying that these were issues that were being addressed. He again reiterated that thanks to VOI/TIS funds, Sheridan will expand to 1,300 bed, making it the largest such program in the country.

Chairman Sorosky thanked Mr. Olson for his presentation and asked if there were any additional comments or questions. With no response, he reminded everyone that the next Authority Board meeting is December 7, which is the first Friday of the month, and the

regular time for holding the four Authority Board meetings per year. Chairman Sorosky then called for a motion to adjourn.

{Mr. Toscas' motion to adjourn was seconded by Ms. Spyropoulos and passed by unanimous voice vote.}

