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ICCA Policy Position on Siting Community Corrections Facilities

I. INTRODUCTION

In order for residential reentry centers and other community correctional programs to provide services to offenders and promote public safety, private and public agencies must have a fair opportunity to site such programs within communities. Recent history suggests, however, that automatic neighborhood opposition, media involvement, political interference, land use regulations, and zoning practices in many communities have made the process to site such facilities protracted, litigious, expensive, and in some jurisdictions, nearly impossible.

II. BACKGROUND

As noted by the American Correctional Association, “Community corrections programs are an integral component of a graduated system of sanctions and services” (ACA, Policy Statement on Community Corrections). Yet, in many communities around the country, it is increasingly difficult for public and private agencies to gain agreement for local governments and community groups to site such programs.

Strong, organized resistance to siting of community corrections programs and facilities within neighborhoods is all too familiar to providers, correctional agencies, local jurisdictions and the public. Despite public opinion surveys that demonstrate public support for the general concept of community corrections, when a specific proposal to site a future halfway house or other community corrections program in a particular area becomes known, almost inevitably community opposition develops. Such opposition is frequently successful in terminating, or at least delaying, such programs that are needed for the increased numbers of prisoners who are returning to our communities every year.

Two of the most frequently voiced concerns by community members concerning the siting of a community corrections program are the presumed negative impact on property prices and the presumed increase in crime in the neighborhood. Both presumptions are contrary to the facts and the best research in the field. For example, a literature review conducted by the Center for Community Corrections and Doble
Research Associates found: “the existing studies involving correctional cost impact indicate that property values nearby do not decline and that they may even increase as a result of location of a facility,” and “the overwhelming majority of studies show that there is no negative effect on public safety in the vicinity of a correctional facility” ([Public Outreach and Halfway Houses, August 2002]).

In 2008 alone, approximately 760,000 adult prisoners were released from state and federal prisons alone. The real question is not whether the inmates are coming back to communities, but rather are they being provided an opportunity to successfully transition through a structured and well supervised program.

III. STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

- The public needs to be engaged and better educated concerning the need for increased community corrections programs. The research that confirms they do not contribute to higher crime rates or declining property prices, and that in fact the contrary is true; reentry and other community correctional programs enhance public safety by reducing the recidivism rates of those who receive services. Additionally, those programs save taxpayers both by reducing crime and through delivery of correctional supervision less costly than incarceration.

- Public confidence in community correctional programs will be increased when providers of such services ensure they are well-managed, reflect high levels of professionalism, and provide essential services to offenders including alcohol and drug treatment and job placement.

- Community correctional programs need to solicit early input from the community and provide an ongoing opportunity for community involvement, such as a community advisory board that can provide linkages to needed services and improved communication with the neighborhood.

- Local jurisdictions, including cities and counties, should not be able to preclude community correctional programs from being sited or making it so arduous, litigious and expensive to do so that the result is a de facto denial.

- Local jurisdictions should allow the opportunity to site programs serving populations in proportion to the people convicted of crimes in that jurisdiction.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

- State laws governing growth management as implemented by local governments
should ensure that community corrections and reentry facilities are identified as essential public facilities that cities and counties must afford an opportunity for zoning. State law should provide the procedural due process requirements of consideration of such matters, including a timely appeal process.

- The land use and zoning codes of cities and counties should fairly allow for the opportunity to site community correctional programs in their jurisdictions, should recognize that they provide essential public services, and should never impose moratoria or unrealistic burdens on providers who are trying to site such programs.

- Proposed providers of community correctional programs should carefully assess which neighborhoods are most appropriate for such programs, solicit early input from communities and neighborhood associations, identify ways to provide ongoing community involvement, and make enhancements to neighborhoods, such as improved lighting, well maintained buildings and landscaping, and community service projects, as well as providing well-managed programs that hold residents accountable at all times for their time and behaviors.

- Providers of community correctional programs and the public correctional agencies that they contract with must be dedicated to providing more than “housing” to residents in those programs. Such programs should provide assistance to residents in obtaining employment, access to substance abuse and mental health services, family reconciliation, and other evidence-based programs and practices.

- Providers and their associations should provide accurate and generic educational materials describing the purposes, methods and benefits of reentry centers and other community correctional programs.

- More research needs to be funded by federal agencies and private foundations on siting community correctional programs, including overcoming the NIMBY syndrome. For example, very little research has been conducted on programs where neighbors have been accommodated and impacts mitigated.
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1. INTRODUCTION

In order for residential reentry centers and other community correctional programs to provide services to offenders and promote public safety, private and public agencies must have a fair opportunity to site such programs within communities. Recent history suggests, however, that automatic neighborhood opposition, media involvement, political interference, land use regulations, and zoning practices in many communities have made the process to site such facilities protracted, litigious, expensive, and in some jurisdictions, nearly impossible.

2. BACKGROUND

As noted by the American Correctional Association, “Community corrections programs are an integral component of a graduated system of sanctions and services” (ACA, Policy Statement on Community Corrections). Yet, in many communities around the country, it is increasingly difficult for public and private agencies to gain agreement for local governments and community groups to site such programs.

Strong, organized resistance to siting of community corrections programs and facilities within neighborhoods is all too familiar to providers, correctional agencies, local jurisdictions and the public. Despite public opinion surveys that demonstrate public support for the general concept of community corrections, when a specific proposal to site a future halfway house or other community corrections program in a particular area becomes known, almost inevitably community opposition develops. Such opposition is frequently successful in terminating, or at least delaying, such programs that are needed for the increased numbers of prisoners who are returning to our communities every year.

Two of the most frequently voiced concerns by community members concerning the siting of a community corrections program are the presumed negative impact on property prices and the presumed increase in crime in the neighborhood. Both presumptions are contrary to the facts and the best research in the field. For example, a literature review conducted by the Center for Community Corrections
and Doble Research Associates found: “the existing studies involving correctional cost impact indicate that property values nearby do not decline and that they may even increase as a result of location of a facility,” and “the overwhelming majority of studies show that there is no negative effect on public safety in the vicinity of a correctional facility” (Public Outreach and Halfway Houses, August 2002).

In 2008 alone, approximately 760,000 adult prisoners were released from state and federal prisons alone. The real question is not whether the inmates are coming back to communities, but rather are they being provided an opportunity to successfully transition through a structured and well-supervised program.

3. STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

• The public needs to be engaged and better educated concerning the need for increased community corrections programs. The research that confirms they do not contribute to higher crime rates or declining property prices, and that in fact the contrary is true; reentry and other community correctional programs enhance public safety by reducing the recidivism rates of those who receive services. Additionally, those programs save taxpayers both by reducing crime and through delivery of correctional supervision less costly than incarceration.

• Public confidence in community correctional programs will be increased when providers of such services ensure they are well-managed, reflect high levels of professionalism, and provide essential services to offenders including alcohol and drug treatment and job placement.

• Community correctional programs need to solicit early input from the community and provide an ongoing opportunity for community involvement, such as a community advisory board that can provide linkages to needed services and improved communication with the neighborhood.

• Local jurisdictions, including cities and counties, should not be able to preclude community correctional programs from being sited or making it so arduous, litigious and expensive to do so that the result is a de facto denial.

• Local jurisdictions should allow the opportunity to site programs serving populations in proportion to the people convicted of crimes in that jurisdiction.
4. RECOMMENDATIONS

- State laws governing growth management as implemented by local governments should ensure that community corrections and reentry facilities are identified as essential public facilities that cities and counties must afford an opportunity for zoning. State law should provide the procedural due process requirements of consideration of such matters, including a timely appeal process.

- The land use and zoning codes of cities and counties should fairly allow for the opportunity to site community correctional programs in their jurisdictions, should recognize that they provide essential public services, and should never impose moratoria or unrealistic burdens on providers who are trying to site such programs.

- Proposed providers of community correctional programs should carefully assess which neighborhoods are most appropriate for such programs, solicit early input from communities and neighborhood associations, identify ways to provide ongoing community involvement, and make enhancements to neighborhoods, such as improved lighting, well maintained buildings and landscaping, and community service projects, as well as providing well-managed programs that hold residents accountable at all times for their time and behaviors.

- Providers of community correctional programs and the public correctional agencies that they contract with must be dedicated to providing more than “housing” to residents in those programs. Such programs should provide assistance to residents in obtaining employment, access to substance abuse and mental health services, family reconciliation, and other evidence-based programs and practices.

- Providers and their associations should provide accurate and generic educational materials describing the purposes, methods and benefits of reentry centers and other community correctional programs.
More research needs to be funded by federal agencies and private foundations on siting community correctional programs, including overcoming the NIMBY syndrome. For example, very little research has been conducted on programs where neighbors have been accommodated and impacts mitigated.
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ICCA Policy Position on Community Responsibility and Engagement

1. INTRODUCTION

When community leaders and members understand how they can become actively involved in community corrections and what is to be gained by doing so, justice ceases to be a process that is severed from the mainstream of society. When justice is not integrated into the community, it becomes something that is meted out without reference to those who were harmed by criminal behavior. With community engagement, leaders no longer have to count exclusively on professionals outside of the community to ensure accountability, rehabilitation and public safety. Community members will be empowered by learning how community responsibility and citizen engagement can make our system of justice more efficient, effective and meaningful.

When the justice process is isolated from the community, the formerly incarcerated become outsiders who present a threat rather than individuals returning to a role as citizens of the community. The formerly incarcerated who are able to recognize that they retain a sense of dignity and value even though their crimes caused harm to that community are more likely to invest the personal effort necessary to negotiate the challenges of reentry and restoration. As most of these individuals return to the community from which they came, it is in the best interest of the community to facilitate remorse and restoration and it is the community that is in the best position to reinforce the principles of accountability and forgiveness.

2. STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

The community has a responsibility to facilitate reintegration by assisting both the victims and offenders who are among their members. Victims can be assisted through crisis intervention, immediate assistance and emotional support, practical assistance in reestablishing a normal life, access to resources, and case management to provide ongoing assistance. They can also benefit from affording offenders an opportunity to make amends for the harms they have caused to them and the community.

The community has a responsibility to make it possible for the formerly incarcerated to achieve successful reentry by forming a reintegrative community. The range and depth of barriers to reentry must be recognized and these counterproductive, discriminatory barriers
must be removed. The community can work to reduce the adverse impacts of these barriers on successful reentry by arranging for short-term and long-term supports. Short-term supports address the essentials for survival (e.g., food, shelter, clothing, transportation, drug treatment, identification cards, drug treatment). Long-term supports address the elements of a stable life (e.g., employment, transportation, housing, healthcare insurance, health care, educational development, social services, accepting their civic participation, capacity to form and maintain a family, etc.).

3. **RECOMMENDATIONS TO FACILITATE COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT**

There are a great many steps that can be taken to facilitate community acceptance of responsibility and community engagement in the justice process. Those who are involved in the business of community corrections need to open their doors (figuratively and literally) and invite community member involvement. Below is a list of steps that can be taken to accomplish citizen engagement:

- Initiate community meetings/Community Relations Boards before specific organizational needs or problems arise;

- Hold regular Open Houses to get neighbors and other stakeholders into community corrections facilities, thereby increasing their knowledge and comfort levels while reducing fear based on lack of familiarity;

- Encourage agency leader and staff representation on local councils and boards of other agencies and associations;

- Make agency experts available for consultation with nonprofits and governmental entities on program and grant development;

- Ensure active participation/leadership in local, state and national advocacy groups;

- Sponsor and/or conduct presentations at community educational events (e.g., impact of legislation, new procedures/techniques, conference kickoff receptions, staff/client presentations) for a wide variety of stakeholders/community groups;

- Organize Community Resource Fairs to bring local service providers face-to-face with the formerly incarcerated;
• Conduct presentations at local universities and colleges;
• Conduct presentations on behalf of the local United Way or other charitable organizations;

• Promote client and staff member involvement in community charitable events;
• Encourage client participation on Victim Impact Panels;
• Support staff and client involvement in neighborhood and community projects (e.g., clean-up, tree planting, graffiti removal); and

• Publicize agency involvement in the community through local media.

When reaching out to specific community members or community groups with the intention of educating them regarding the benefits of citizen involvement in the justice process, there are a number of steps that should be taken:

• Prepare presentation materials that outline the impact of active community involvement on recidivism and public safety;

• Find community opinion leaders that agree with or are at least willing to get others to listen to the notion that communities must accept part of the responsibility for its citizens returning from correctional institutions;

• Ask community opinion leaders to set up meetings with neighborhood associations/other neighborhood leaders, business groups, as well as other people of influence to learn what this means and how the community can play a role;

• Promote informed discussion about the reentry issue and the responsibilities of the community to reduce pressures toward crime and barriers to reentry; and

• Describe the public safety benefits of providing support services to assist the formerly incarcerated to handle the basics of life outside prison (paying bills, buying a car, maintaining a vehicle, buying fuel, buying groceries, healthy family relationships, etc.)

Restorative justice and community justice approaches support community engagement in the criminal justice system. Unlike the traditional justice system approach that is based on the belief that more punishment results in less crime, restorative justice focuses on the
harm caused by crime and emphasizes the repair of this harm. Restorative justice elevates the position of victims and the community to direct participants in the justice process instead of relegating them to the status of bystanders. It brings together all of those affected by the criminal act to determine what harm was caused and how it should be repaired. Citizens should identify and support changes in local, state and federal laws that promote earned redemption among those returning from prison by:

- Reducing legal barriers to employment, housing, access to education, etc;
- Promoting restorative principles and practices for responding to non-violent crimes
- (i.e., most cases) at the front end of the justice system;
- Promoting restorative principles and practices as elements of post conviction sentencing decision makings;
- Promoting restorative principles and practices as elements in pre-release programming and post release supervision;
- Expand the use of parole to provide post-release supervision and support aimed at increasing successful reentry among the formerly incarcerated; and
- Expand the use of restitution rather than incarceration.

4. RESPONSIBILITIES OF COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

Fostering community engagement and responsibility requires that community corrections agencies manage the offender population in an ethical, responsible manner which fosters community support.

- Community Corrections has the responsibility to ensure swift and certain response to violations of rules or supervision expectations.

- Community Corrections has a responsibility to collaborate with community partners. Community partners are defined as government agencies, law enforcement, non-for profits, treatment providers, business community and community stakeholders.

- Community Corrections has the responsibility with the offender to identify positive, productive relationships which will assist and support the offender’s reintegration efforts.
Community Corrections has the responsibility to work with the academic community to identify through research and statistical data supervision practices which have proven to affect positive offender success.

Community Corrections has the responsibility to define and not defend effective offender management and supervision practices.

Community Corrections has the responsibility to seek opportunities to educate the community through public relations events to include public speaking and educational forums.

Community Corrections has the responsibility to acknowledge that we do not “own” the problem or solution to the issue but rather share the responsibility to collaborate with the community to develop a healthy and safe community.
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A STEP BY STEP GUIDE TO SITING COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PROGRAMS

I. The ICCA Tool Kit

A. Introduction. Gathering the collective wisdom of veteran community correction professionals from within its own membership, the International Community Corrections Association has created a Tool Kit for siting new or expanded community corrections programs and facilities. This Step-by-Step Guide to Siting is an integral part of the ICCA Tool Kit and materials cited in this Guide are included on the CD-ROM and on the ICCA website, www.iccaweb.org

If you are new to the community corrections business and are just starting up, please consider contacting ICCA to enlist a Siting Coach to provide you with personal technical assistance.

B. Case Studies. The Case Studies (on the Tool Kit CD-ROM) represent a sampling of true stories from your colleagues and their “lessons learned” for your review before taking the next steps:

- Bellingham, Washington: “Caution! Throw a Wide Net” (contact: jane.jackson@p-h-s.com)
- Dade County (Miami), Florida: “Picking the Right Site – and the Right Broker” (contact: Dr. Dave McGriff, mdp@advocateprogram.com)
- Green Bay, Wisconsin: “Complying with Current Zoning: More of the Same” (contact: Kathy Johnson, kjohnson@correctionalservices.org)
- Harlem: “Storming the Castle: Housing for Formerly Incarcerated Individuals” (contact: gmartin@fortunesociety.org)
- Manchester, New Hampshire: “Confrontation in the Courts: A Five Year Battle” (contact: John Larivee, jlarivee@cijjustice.org)
- Northeastern Colorado: “Rural Location: Special Considerations” (contact: joe.starmen@comcast.net)
- Ottawa, Ontario: “Consultation on the Relocation of the Ottawa Parole Office” (contact: Sonya Spencer, sspencer.slst@rogers.com)
II. Site Selection

A. Consult our local Land Use Planners (seek Planning and Land Use Departments online) to determine where residential facility siting is permitted. Research their past actions to get a sense of their general stance on community residences.

B. Identify local land use lawyers in the event their assistance is required. The American Bar Association has a land use planning division which might be a starting point in your research (www.americanbar.org)

C. Research local and state zoning statutes and regulations (can be done online through Google)

D. Research local transitional housing licensing requirements

E. Visit City Hall to secure a copy of the city/county’s Master Plan for future development to avoid potential conflicts with scheduled revitalization projects in your targeted neighborhood.

F. Examine model statutes included in the Tool Kit CD-ROM
   • City of Louisville

III. Community Assessment

A. Generate a Map of the your targeted Neighborhood(s)
   1. Show schools, transportation routes, churches, parks, rec. centers, day care centers, and police stations.
   2. Determine the density of halfway housing and other social service programs already in existence. (A sample map of Portland is included in the Tool Kit CD-ROM.)
Action Steps:

- Access land use department information, also “department of neighborhoods” in most municipalities, also other social service agencies
- Visit the National Atlas of Sentencing and Corrections at http://justiceatlas.org to see a ZIP-code level view of where prison inmates, probationers, and parolees are from; the number of people in prison, the number released from prison each year, and the number on probation or parole. Includes data on income level, employment status, the number of single-parent households, and racial demographics for each jurisdiction.
- Identify, communicate with, and join any existing Reentry Council or Reentry Team at the local, regional or state levels. Some even have staffed offices out of City Hall.

B. Identify Potential Community Resources for your Client
   1. Identify Medical clinics, One Stops/Employment services, government offices, transportation routes, educational and training programs and facilities, social service agencies, libraries, and recreation centers.

C. Check out state/local registration laws, especially those applying to sex offenders. Entering “Criminal Registration Laws” into Google Search yields most results by state.

D. Identify Community Leaders. Check out the local City or County Council members to see who has supported residential programs of any kind in the past. By talking to them, you’ll learn much about the local zoning situation.

IV. Research Package

A. One-page synopses of existing research are available in the Tool Kit CD-ROM
   - On efficacy/cost-effectiveness of community reentry programs in general
   - On reduction of recidivism pertaining specifically to halfway houses
   - On the impact of halfway houses on crime and property values

B. Generate your own local data, especially on property values and crime rates

   Action Steps:
   - Go to the local police department to request comparative crime data
   - Go to the local real estate association to request data, or
   - Hire local house appraisers to compile a report comparing neighborhoods
over time

- Create a bank of local experts

C. Work with local university faculty in criminal justice, political science, sociology, social work, and/or demography to obtain research support on relevant local issues as well as state and national trends. Faculty may also provide influential testimony at critical stages in the siting process.


E. The Tool Kit CD-ROM includes a growing library of Testimonials (quotes, statements, letters of support) from a variety of stakeholders: police officers, victim advocacy groups, successful reentry clients, etc.

V. Creating Allies/Developing Relationships.

A. Read the article Tool Kit “Building Bridges” as a foundational background for your community outreach efforts.

B. Board and Staff Preparation

1. Ask Board members whom they personally know among local representing the general community and the specific target neighborhood(s)
2. Prepare and provide each Board member with a brief “elevator presentation to assure accuracy and consistency in portraying the agency. The message should define who you are, not defend your activities.
3. Provide Board and staff member with “Frequently Asked Questions” (samples are in the Tool Kit). Prepare for their private consumption a list of the “Ten Worst Questions” that might be asked.
4. Remind staff that they are public representatives of the organization and to behave with professional discretion in sharing any information about
clients.

5. Promulgate an Agency policy on responding to media queries and questions from the public. All inquiries should be directed to one, single official spokesperson for the agency. (The spokesperson should designate an emergency back-up contact person.)

**Note:** The nature and structure of your local community will dictate the order in which you approach the various audiences mentioned below. In many cities, your first contact should be with the Mayor. In other communities, you will first approach County government. In others, you may wish to begin at the grassroots with representatives of the neighborhood you are approaching. Before approaching them, review their mission and vision statements to see how they stack up against your own.

C. Law Enforcement Engagement

1. Approach the local Chief of Police to explain your intentions to open or expand a program or facility in their jurisdiction, answer any questions, and solicit his public support. Share with him a summary of the RFP to which your bid responding, as well as your organizational history.
2. Approach the County Sheriff to seek his support.
3. Consult with Probation and Parole officials operating in the targeted jurisdiction.
4. Reach out to law enforcement officials in the surrounding communities as well, to apprise them of your plans to open or expand a facility or program.

D. Obtain written endorsements, testimonials, or letters of support that you may share with the public

E. Formally thank each law enforcement ally for their time and support. Maintain contact with all law enforcement personnel you have approached throughout the siting process to assure their continuing interest and support.

F. Neighborhood/Community Associations

1. Outline in writing and distribute widely a list of benefits to the community offered by the program or facility, which includes increased police protection, employment opportunities, infrastructure upgrades, community service projects, etc.
2. Contact other service agencies in the neighborhood, other halfway houses, and treatment providers, to explain your intentions and solicit
their engagement and support.

3. Notify University or college criminal justice programs in the community of your plans; they see community corrections programs as an asset for internships and other learning and research opportunities.

G. Government Officials

1. Consult first with the City Council representative for the targeted neighborhood to explain your plans and answer questions. Check beforehand to see where they are in their election cycle. (Don’t overlook business and faith leaders – see more on this below.)
2. Consult with the Zoning Board (see the Tool Kit Case Studies for insights on this).
3. Create Talking Points for your allies to use.
4. Bring some allies (business leaders, faith leaders) to meetings with local political leaders and officials. Include family members of formerly incarcerated people.

H. Churches, Synagogues, Mosques and other Religious Institutions

1. Create and distribute widely a “We Need Your Help” tool explaining how churches can provide bridges back home for incarcerated people returning to their homes and families.
2. Provide contact information to local churches for national resources on prisoner reentry, such as the Prison Fellowship.
3. Co-present at neighborhood meetings with a pastor.
4. Reach out to local churches to provide spiritual support or even mentoring.
5. Ask local churches to consider providing direct services such as counseling or treatment programs to your clients
6. Those not interested in providing direct services may invite client participation in their other programs such as clothes closets, bus passes, money for GED testing, or for medicine.

I. Schools Within 500 Feet of the Proposed Facility

1. Create and share “Myths and Realities” Fact Sheets on reentry
2. Visit school Principals and PTA Presidents to provide reassurances concerning the safety of the facility and the accountability standards to which clients will be held
3. Share the agency’s security protocols with school leaders
4. Exchange contact information with school leaders
J. Business Leaders, Civic Organizations, and Local Economic and Industrial Development Organization
   1. Generate and circulate Economic impact data Fact Sheets
   2. Share information on “Myths v. Realities” of reentry
   3. Explain the Costs of Recidivism vs. Crime Prevention
   4. Share information about new job opportunities for the community, and the contributions to be made by tax-paying former clients
   5. Co-present to local business and civic groups with a supportive business/civic leader
   6. Maintain ongoing relationships with these organizations over time

VI. Communications Plan: Media Education and Response

A. Media Kit:
   1. Assemble an agency Media Kit that includes brief and succinct program descriptions, reentry fact sheets, and research summaries for ready distribution to the Press.
   2. Sample press releases, program descriptions, reentry fact sheet (FAQ), research summaries, sample op-ed articles/letters to the editor, and newspaper ads may be found in the Tool Kit.

B. Communications Plan
   1. Consult with a media specialist to strategize, sequence, frame, and create targeted messages addressing problems and issues behind potential public opposition.
   2. Adopt an agency media policy (sample can be found in the Tool Kit)
   3. Write and adopt an agency communications plan (see sample in the Tool Kit).
   4. Prepare and send Mailers for Key Leaders (a paper package of essential information).
   5. Schedule and present your program goals to your local newspaper’s Editorial Board. Co-present with an influential community leader(s).
   6. Cultivate friends within multiple media – radio, TV, newspapers.

C. Crisis Communications Plan
   1. A crisis communications case study is included in the Tool Kit. *Crises can arise at any point in the process, including incidents arising after you have successfully established a new program. One single stakeholder or one single negative incident can flare up very suddenly. Be prepared in advance with options for making appropriate responses.*
   2. “Do’s and Don’ts“ Tips are included in the Tool Kit.
Action Steps:
  o See NIC’s six-hour training session, “Public & Media Relations: Take Control of Your Message” at http://nicic.gov/Library/022948
  o Write a “case statement” explaining who you are, what your agency does, why you are unique. Study the “Writing Your Case Statement” guide in the Tool Kit.

VII. Engaging Effectively in Community Meetings

A. Approaches for consideration:
   1. Consider being proactive and doing your own invitational meeting. Meetings can be formal, invitational, providing an open forum. Choose as your venue the facilities of a friendly host.
   2. Send hand-written (or at least hand-addressed) invitations to key players. Have a neighborhood resident (preferably a member of the faith community) deliver them door to door.
   3. Arrange to have a friendly Moderator run the meeting.
   4. Pass around sign-up sheets to verify that the meeting took place and how many people attended.
   5. Emphasize crime control issues to address the primary concerns of future neighbors. Discuss the social benefits of a community corrections program as a secondary issue; make clear its linkage to building stronger and more livable communities.
   6. Organize your allies; Co-present the meeting with somebody who has standing in the neighborhood (faith leaders may be best).
   7. Connect with people through story-telling, humanizing the situation. Arrange for testimony from selected clients or their family members, especially those from the neighborhood. Include supportive victims’ rights representatives and faith leaders.
   8. Respond respectfully to emotional outbursts or hostile opponents, but do not engage in arguments. Rehearse your presentation ahead of time, asking a friend to play the role of an angry meeting participant to practice your repertoire of responses. Stay cool and collected.
   9. Consider investing in videotaping the meeting, which tends to dampen rude behavior.
  10. Serve refreshments (cupcakes are a popular favorite!)
  11. Reactions will settle in over time; the meeting gives people food for thought. Provide means of continuing dialogue through feedback loops, and by sharing contact information.
B. Power Point
   1. The Tool Kit includes a professionally produced Power Point presentation, “Returning Home” which describes mass incarceration, the reentry crisis, and sets forth recidivism research data findings, the nature of community corrections programs and facilities, and much more.
   2. Carefully review the Power Point and enter your local recidivism and crime statistics data in the “template” slides provided for this purpose.
   3. The Power Point is probably best suited for explaining community corrections issues to a “cool” audience (as compared to an agitated neighborhood community meeting), such as Rotary Clubs and other civic groups, business leaders, the City Council, state legislative committees, development planners, and for other general public presentations.

C. Review Your Agency Website
   1. Review your website with a dispassionate eye, from the perspective of the general public. Enlist friendly reviewers who are not in the community corrections business to join you in your review.
   2. Keep an eye out for dark and dangerous messages you might unintentionally be sending out to the community.
   3. In all your images and messages, strike a balance between accountability and rehabilitation.
   4. Invite the community to engage with your agency. Include a “Contact Us” section eliciting meaningful input.

D. Social Networking
   1. Seek out neighborhood bloggers and monitor their campaigns.
   2. With the help of a college or graduate degree intern, create and maintain your own social networking presence on Facebook and Twitter.

VIII. Being the Best Neighbor You Can Be

Once you have opened your new program or facility, secure your position in the community by attending rigorously to neighborhood improvement issues.

- Keep up the facility’s landscaping.
- Maintain your building’s appearance.
- Invite local neighbors to serve on a Community Advisory Board, or on the agency’s Board of Directors.
- Create a Neighborhood Advisory Committee of 6-month duration including a mix of those supportive and opposed to the facility to aid in transition.
• Join the Neighborhood association membership.

• Join the local business association membership.
• Engage in community service projects, such as neighborhood cleanup; graffiti removal or neighborhood park upkeep; engage local residents when possible.
• Rake lawns and shovel snow for elderly neighbors.
• Create a community garden and donate produce to the local food pantry.
• Host Open House, picnic and tour functions: formal activities with food and informal dialogue with staff and selected clients.
• Consider hosting a community circle process with area residents and facilitate dialogue with returning offenders.
• Provide opportunities for jobs, internships, and volunteers.
• Spend your money in the neighborhood!
• Be accountable to neighborhood stakeholders; publish quarterly newsletters reporting on projects, client, staff and program successes.
• Don’t over-promise!
How to Use the ICCA Siting Tool Kit

Background and Rationale

“Second Chances: Keeping Neighbors Safe” is a project of the International Community Corrections Association funded by the Public Welfare Foundation operated by a committee of ICCA leaders who are veterans of many siting campaigns. The Second Chances Tool Kit offers the collective wisdom of the ICCA membership representing the many “lessons learned” over decades of building community support for prisoner reentry.

By sharing its vast wealth of wisdom and experience with siting campaigns, ICCA intends to smooth the pathway to creating new programs and expanding existing programs and facilities. The resulting Tool Kit will benefit community corrections programs, probation and parole offices, treatment centers of all types, and the broader world of criminal justice.

Expanded community capacity is needed to meet the needs not only of reentry efforts, but also the expanding realm of diversion programs that serve as alternatives to incarceration in the first place.

Intended Audiences

The ICCA Siting Tool Kit is intended for local prisoner reentry partners, i.e.

- CEOs and business developers within community corrections agencies, including halfway houses and other residential programs; day treatment centers; work release programs, etc.
- Chief Probation and Parole Officers
- Sheriffs and jail administrators
- Treatment facility operators
- Community mental health providers
- Public Health agency personnel
- Job training and employment placement professionals, esp. One Stops
- TANF administrators and providers
- District Attorneys
- Police Chiefs
- City Council members and other elected officials
- City and County Zoning, Planning, and Budget Department Heads
- Veterans Affairs providers
- Homelessness and affordable housing advocates
- Faith leaders
- School and other social workers

There is no individual “tool” that will accomplish all you want to achieve for your program. Instead, the Tool Kit offers an array of useful elements from which to choose, employ as you see fit, and return to repeatedly for inspiration and support.

Suggested Uses

- Muster all the Tool Kit products to plan and carry out a major siting campaign.

- Pick up helpful tips and warnings about potential pitfalls from selected Case Studies, testimonials, or research synopses.

- Prepare a press kit highlighting selected research abstracts on cost effectiveness and impact on neighborhood property values, and hold a press conference to enlist the support of the media in communicating your message to the public.

- Use the Power Point presentation, “Returning Home,” inserting your own local program statistics and data, as an informational tool at meetings of your local Rotary, City Council, Zoning Board, or neighborhood association.

- Using the hard-earned and sage advice in the Step by Step Guide to Siting, Section VII “Engaging Effectively in Community Meetings,” host a town meeting to discuss the merits of community-based corrections programs with neighborhood leaders, supporters and opponents alike.

- Distribute information packets to state legislative committee members highlighting research findings and testimonials supporting community corrections.
A GUIDE TO THE CD-ROM CONTENTS

Chapter I – About the ICCA Siting Project

The first chapter of the CD-ROM contains ICCA Position Statements on the subjects of community corrections, siting, and building community engagement. These well-researched and thoughtful statements of principles provide strong arguments for making your case in the community. Study and share these policy statements with your partners and your message targets, e.g., your state legislative representative.

You will also find a narrative-style Power Point presentation that explains in some detail the background and scope of the “Second Chances” project and its products. Read through the presentation for your own information, and if your organization is undertaking a siting campaign you might want to show the Power Point as a presentation to your Board and staff members.

Chapter II – Step by Step Guide to Siting

This 8-page document is the core of the Siting Tool Kit. It encapsulates hard-won lessons learned from real-life experience of veteran leaders of the community corrections movement.

Study this document carefully and keep it handy as a reference throughout your siting campaign. As you read it, begin to strategize the ways in which the various elements of the Tool Kit, such as the Research Synopses, might be helpful to you in conveying your message to your community.

Chapter IV – Case Studies

The Case Studies represent a sampling of true stories from your colleagues and their “lessons learned” for your review before taking the next steps. For more detail about situations that especially interest you, contact the person named below:

1. Bellingham, Washington: “Caution! Throw a Wide Net” (contact: Jane Jackson, jane.jackson@p-h-s.com)

2. Dade County (Miami), Florida: “Picking the Right Site – and the Right Broker” contact: Dr. Dave McGriff, mdpmh@advocateprogram.com)

3. Green Bay, Wisconsin: “Complying with Current Zoning: More of the Same” (contact: Kathy Johnson, kjohnson@correctionalservices.org)
4. Manchester, New Hampshire: “Confrontation in the Courts: A Five Year Battle” (contact: John Larivee, jilarivee@crjustice.org)

5. New York: Harlem: “Storming the Castle: Housing for Formerly Incarcerated Individuals” (contact: gmartin@fortunesociety.org)

6. Northeastern Colorado: “Rural Location: Special Considerations” (contact: joe.starmen@comcast.net)

7. Ottawa, Ontario: “Consultation on the Relocation of the Ottawa Parole Office” (contact: Sonya Spencer, spencer.slst@rogers.com)

8. Riverside, California: “Heart-Breaking Change of Heart” (contact: Linda Connelly, lconnelly@lcaservices.com)

9. San Antonio, Texas: “Moving to the Convent: Zoning Change Required” (contact: kevin.downey@crosspointinc.us)

10. San Francisco, California: “Knocking on Every Door” (contact: Linda, Connelly, lconnelly@lcaservices.com)

Chapter V – Research on Cost Effectiveness

Synopses of research findings of special interest to community corrections programs are included in this chapter. Brief abstracts summarize important findings and the research paper from which the material is drawn is referenced all on one page. The full research paper may be found on the ICCA website if you need to download the cited material.

Seven research papers on the cost effectiveness of community corrections are included. The “Step by Step” paper from the Vera Institute gives instruction on how to calculate cost-effectiveness. These findings may be especially persuasive to audiences responsible for public fiscal responsibility, e.g., Budget Department heads or state legislative committees.

Chapter VI – Research on Recidivism

Synopses of additional research findings of special interest to community corrections programs are included in this chapter. Brief abstracts summarize important findings and the research paper from which the material is drawn is referenced all on one page. The full research paper may be found on the ICCA website if you need to download the cited material.
Nine research papers on the impact of community corrections programs on recidivism rates are included. These reports represent findings at the state level for various states, and also include two papers reviewing recidivism literature on a national scale. *These findings are important in establishing that community corrections programs work to reduce crime.*

Chapter VII – Research on Property Values and Crime Rates

In many ways, the eight studies cited in this chapter are the most valuable and important elements of the Tool Kit because *they refute the popular misconceptions that community-based corrections programs drive down property values and increase crime in a neighborhood.* All the studies shown indicate the exact opposite, that community-based corrections programs either have a neutral or positive effect on both property values and on reducing crime rates.

Again, the studies (which are mostly specific to local communities) are abstracted and referenced on one page, with full reports available on the ICCA website.

Chapter VIII – Position Papers and Testimonials

Quotes, excerpts, and abstracts from many sources offer “outside voices” to back up your claims regarding the safety and success of community-based corrections programs. Here are well-researched position policy statements from the U.S. Conference of Mayors and the American Planning Association (APA), along with statements of support from politicians on both sides of the aisle. Notable is the voice of victims as expressed by the King County Sexual Assault Resource Center, and the ruling of the Supreme Court of the State of New Hampshire. (A number of these testimonials also appear in the PowerPoint presentation, “Returning Home.”)

There are 17 items in this section. *Select and share those “voices” most pertinent to your audience.*

Chapter IX – Fact Sheets, Q & As

Thirteen items describing specific community corrections agency programs, community corrections in general, “halfway houses,” prisoner reentry, managing sex offenders and much more offer exemplary program models, evidence-based practice guides, and research *findings to support your case.* The program model descriptions also serve as *a sample upon which to base the creation of your own documents and materials.*
Chapter X – Community Analysis

Here you have a series of “Community Assessment Action Steps” that will help you build your own local mine of facts and data to support your case with research-based arguments.

Also provided is a population density map from the City of Portland showing the exact location of “Persons Living in Group Quarters” which you might try to replicate for your own target neighborhoods.

Chapter XI – Building Community Allies

Dr. Kevin Downey, Immediate Past President of the International Community Corrections Association and veteran of vigorous local siting campaigns, contributes an article here entitled “Building Bridges.” Real-life experience informs his excellent suggestions and advice.

Also included in this chapter is the action guide for “Creating Allies/Developing Relationships.”

Chapter XII - Media Strategies

Twenty assorted items provide model communications plans, sample media communiqués, sample program publicity materials, and tips for working with the media. Browse, use and model your own documents on those you find here.

POWER POINT – “RETURNING HOME”

This professionally produced Power Point presentation conveys much of the materials contained in the Tool Kit in graphic format. It is intended for your use with public audiences especially interested in research data, factual information, and a broad understanding of the nature and scope of community corrections programming. It should be especially useful in formal meetings of the City Council, local business groups, zoning and planning boards, budget offices, state legislative committees, or state and regional conferences.

The presentation contains slides intended for you to insert your own data and statistics.
In Bellingham, Washington, located in the Northwest corner of the continental United States, Pioneer Human Services succeeded in getting approval to house up to 34 men and women, in the custody of Federal Bureau of Prisons. The process was relatively easy, since the Bellingham facility had previously housed a county work release program.

**Contacting Key Decision Makers**

First, Pioneer wrote to the County Executive, the Mayor, the City Council Chair and the Police Chief. Then, Pioneer met with the Mayor and all city department heads. Finally, Pioneer met with the local neighborhood association. Final approval came from the city's Planning Department. Once Pioneer gained the Mayor's support, the city department heads were generally cooperative. The City of Bellingham, home of Western Washington University was more welcoming than other communities might have been. Also an existing organization, the Whatcom County Reentry Coalition, supports the Pioneer facility.

**A Bump in the Road**

Even though the facility was in the city's jurisdiction, the county sheriff lodged objections. Pioneer learned about the sheriff's reservations from a report in the local newspaper. The sheriff mistakenly anticipated that gang members from Southern California would be sent to the facility. Once Pioneer explained how the Bureau of Prisons would select people for the facility, the sheriff withdrew his objections and wrote a letter of support.

**Maintaining Community Support**

At the new facility's opening ceremonies, the president of the local neighborhood association and the city council member in whose district the facility is located, both were featured speakers and voiced support for the program. The organization has established a Community Relations Board and appointed a full-time Social Services Coordinator, who along with the facility Director, interacts with the community on a daily basis.
Lessons Learned

Pioneer found it particularly helpful to identify a facility that had been used for a similar purpose as well as to cultivate the support of the Mayor and the city department heads, the county reentry coalition, and the local neighborhood association. Also, Pioneer was surprised by the initial opposition voiced by the county sheriff, but was pleased that he eventually supported the program.
In Miami-Dade, probation is a big business, and a busy one. Advocate Program, Inc., a private non-profit corporation, contracts with Miami-Dade County to provide probation services, in four locations, to 24,000 non-residential clients a year. This includes individuals on state and county probation as well as pretrial diversion clients from the State Attorney's office.

Using top real estate brokers is key to siting success. Advocate Program, Inc. (API) utilizes brokers who know what probation does and who are its clients. These brokers then find properties that meet probation's needs:

**Zoning**
Brokers avoid problems by seeking properties already zoned for probation's needs.

**Avoiding Conflicts with Other Tenants**
API prefers stand alone buildings. If one is not available, it looks for buildings where other tenants should have similar clients (for example, state probation and parole, social security, and unemployment offices).

**Parking**
Adequate parking is a must. At one site, API overwhelmed parking capability by bringing over 800 clients and staff to the building on the first day. For this site, probation had to use shuttle buses to transport staff to and from remote parking.

**Addressing Landlord Concerns**
Since API rents its space, landlord concerns is an issue. One landlord, for example, raised concerns about shoplifters on their property.

From starting to look for a new space to moving in takes over a year. Once API was able to do this in less than a year; another move took over two years.

When looking for a new site, API spreads the word among its partners and colleagues in the criminal justice system. However, it relies most heavily on competent brokers.
Green Bay, Wisconsin

Complying with Current Zoning: More of the Same

Forewarned by previous failures to overcome local opposition to community-based residential centers in the county, ATTIC Correctional Services took a collaborative approach that embraced the needs of those already in the community needing structure and substance abuse treatment services. Their strategy focused on locating and purchasing an existing licensed facility serving this same need-area population with similar areas of disability.

For sale was a licensed 15 bed community-based residential facility (CBRF), pretty much ideally located in an economically moderate neighborhood, near bus lines and other community resources and zoned multi-family bordered by apartment complexes and major highways. The facility had been State licensed for over a decade to provide services to individuals with mental health, alcohol and drug, developmental and other areas of physical and mental disability. It turned out that several of these residents had been on probation or parole.

Government Outreach: Public Hearings Avoided

With the help of legal counsel and through a series of meetings and written correspondence, City officials (mayor's office, planning and zoning director, corporate council) were informed of ATTIC's intent to purchase the facility and provide services to both correctional and non-correctional clients. ATTIC was able to share with City officials the news that, pending a successful proposal response, the Wisconsin Department of Corrections would purchase 8 beds at the facility for offenders struggling with substance abuse issues.

As a result of these successful collaborations with City officials, it was determined that NO conditional use permit was necessary because ATTIC's intended use of the property would be essentially the same as currently allowed. This was a win/win situation avoiding potential negative public pressure. City officials were able to support a service program essential to the community; ATTIC, having cleared the zoning issue, was able to move forward with plans to purchase the facility. ATTIC continued to educate and build support by discussing plans with local justice personnel, law enforcement, alderpersons and State representatives.

Acquiring a License to Operate: Community Outreach

The next step involved ATTIC acquiring the needed license to operate the facility as a CBRF. The State licensing application was completed and returned, accompanied by required operational policies and procedures. City officials received a State notice allowing them to object to the licensing if there was reason to believe the facility
would have a negative impact to the community. The City cited no objections and proceeded to perform the required facility fire inspection and provided ATTIC with an occupancy permit.

Licensing requirements included the establishment of a neighborhood advisory committee, so ATTIC’s existing community advisory committee was expanded to incorporate the new facility neighbors interested in serving.

Additional community outreach included:

- An Open House featuring written invitations facility neighbors, forthrightly stating the program’s goals;
- Distribution of literature detailing the agency’s extensive experience in providing substance abuse counseling and correctional services, and also outlining the new facility’s planned room and board services, treatment services, resident rules and accountability procedures;
- Facility tours for interested persons highlighting how daily operations would support the residents, enhance public safety and benefit the community at large;
- Distribution of contact information;
- Addressing physical plant and yard upgrades to enhance property value;
- Recruiting neighbors willing to serve on ATTIC’s community advisory committee.

**Lessons Learned**

ATTIC emphasizes the value of continuous legal council in their efforts to defray the need for a conditional use permit. In addition, legal guidance ensured that the whole process met legal standards and fundamentally upheld that individuals having areas of disability must have opportunity to access needed services.

Setting the stage for a win/win situation is essential. Government officials should be afforded the chance to support a worthwhile project without having to undergo negative public pressure.
Storming the Castle:  
Housing for Formerly Incarcerated Individuals

For forty years, it stood abandoned in New York's West Harlem. Dubbed “The Castle” for its Gothic-style architecture, this building attracted trash and drug dealers.

The Fortune Society reclaimed the building as emergency and phased-permanent housing for up to 62 homeless formerly incarcerated individuals. Even though the abandoned building was a blight on the neighborhood, The Fortune Society met considerable community opposition in its efforts to retake the Castle.

Site Selection

Since 1967, the non-profit The Fortune Society has been providing such Alternative-to-Incarceration and reentry services as

- Education and vocational training,
- Family Services and drug and alcohol treatment,
- Anger management and life skills counseling, and
- HIV/AIDS and other health services.

However, Fortune realized that until its clients could locate safe and stable housing upon leaving jail or prison, they could not gain the traction necessary to rebuild their lives.

In searching for housing, Fortune visited 22 possible locations, screening them for

- price,
- zoning and
- transportation.

Because it was in a state of ruin and a host to an illicit drug business, The Castle was affordable. Also, it was already zoned for congregate housing, and it was close to public transportation.
Community Outreach

Fortune anticipated opposition from the well-organized, middle-class residents whose homes were near The Castle. In addressing community opposition, Fortune had the benefit of time. It would take many months to complete financing and renovation, and Fortune used that time to build community support.

However, before reaching out to the community, Fortune contacted public officials who had worked with the organization or who knew its reputation. The officials provided advice, but most would not get out ahead of their constituents.

Then, Fortune approached neighborhood organizations:

- The local Community Board,
- The tenant's association for the building next door,
- The Council for the 30th Police Precinct and
- The Friends of (the nearby) Riverbank State Park.

For its outreach work, Fortune hired as its community liaison someone who

- lived in the neighborhood,
- was a pillar of society,
- had significant experience with programs for the formerly incarcerated, and
- who was a great presenter and a better listener.

Accompanying the community liaison was a former Fortune client. The two of them gave Fortune's outreach legitimacy and authenticity.

In addition, both Fortune's Board President and its Executive Director met one-on-one with influential individuals. These individuals were from groups likely to support Fortune as well as from groups likely to oppose it. As Fortune's Executive Director said

“*It was about building a bucketful of individual relationships. We gave out our phone numbers, even our home numbers.”*

In community meetings, Fortune stressed how supportive housing promotes public safety. For people returning from prison or jail, supportive housing is a safer alternative than leaving individuals unsupervised and on the streets.

Fortune invited its opponents to visit the organization's other facilities; and it conducted and attended six to eight community meetings every month for five years straight.
From the start, Fortune was a good neighbor,
- clearing garbage that had accumulated in the building,
- clearing ice off the sidewalks,
- taking care of a noise problem,
- evicting its tenant at the parking lot next store to the Castle (because he was
- selling drugs not parking spaces), and
- getting National Historic Landmark status for the Castle – thus making the
  building a source of neighborhood pride.

Fortune continues to be a good neighbor. It still participates in six to eight community
meetings a month. Also, next door to The Castle, Fortune is constructing brand-new,
mixed-use, permanent supportive and affordable housing; and Fortune will reserve 50
of the units there for low-income members of the local community. Due to its “green”
features ad its proximity to The Castle, the new building is aptly named, Castle Gardens.

The Child Murderer

The Castle faced an important challenge when someone who had been convicted of
murdering a child came to live there. News leaked out and triggered demonstrations –
day and night.

Fortune asked the person to leave because he did not follow the rules, but in the
process the organization learned an important lesson. Many of the protestors were
immigrants from the Dominican Republic; and Fortune had not targeted its outreach to
the neighborhood’s somewhat less organized Dominican and Latino communities.
Fortune learned the need to reach out even to stakeholders who may be
disenfranchised or less engaged politically.

Another Lesson Learned

Gaining acceptance for The Castle was an important social change. Fortune
accomplished this change by
- identifying key stakeholders,
- honoring their reactions and responding in meaningful ways,
- creating opportunities for ongoing dialogue, and
- insuring that the stakeholders understand how The Castle benefits them.
Manchester, New Hampshire
Confrontation in the Courts: A Five Year Battle

Community Resources for Justice (CRJ) successfully operates several halfway houses in Massachusetts. In addition, in New Hampshire it operates programs for individuals with developmental disabilities. Nevertheless, CRJ had to spend five years in court challenges before securing permission to establish a residential community corrections center in Manchester.

For three times in a decade, the Federal Bureau of Prisons solicited bids to establish a halfway house in New Hampshire. The first two solicitations failed because neither CRJ nor any other bidder could secure zoning approval.

A Rocky Beginning
CRJ focused on Manchester because it is in the part of the state where most Federal offenders return. CRJ's abandoned first building choice in Manchester after an outcry from the community and on local officials' advice to select a different section of the city.

CRJ worked hard to build support:
- consulting with the Police Chief and City Council members, first approaching the member in whose district CRJ would locate its facility.
- attending a City Council meeting with a group of supporters that included local employers.
- soliciting support from local service and halfway house providers,
- meeting with individual and commercial neighbors,
- soliciting and gaining support from a U.S. Senator, and
- utilizing a local attorney to review the zoning code and help prepare a variance application.

Nevertheless, the Mayor and City Council voted against CRJ's opening a program. CRJ encountered negative media attention. Also prospective neighbors and a low income housing provider objected.

Court Challenges
CRJ did challenge the City of Manchester's rejection in the courts. Eventually, CRJ won a New Hampshire Supreme Court decision ordering the City to approve the zoning variance. CRJ successfully argued that their facility would have no negative impact on either public safety or property values.
The U.S. Probation Office, which sends clients to CRJ, stood with the organization throughout its battle. In addition, the Federal Bureau of Prisons waited for the court decision and awarded a long-term contract to CRJ.

Building Community Support
The CRJ Board of Directors and staff held an open house during first month of the New Hampshire operation, inviting all local officials: police, probation, social service providers. A local paper, The Manchester Union Leader, ran a story about the facility and an invitation to the public to attend the open house. Over 80 guests attended, including several neighbors, offering these comments:

Now that we have met you and seen the inside of your building, we feel much better about having you next door.

We already feel safer in the neighborhood, because of the lighting on your building and knowing your staff are there 24/7.

CRJ established a Community Advisory Board including
- a local substance abuse program,
- a treatment provider,
- an engineering firm,
- the County reentry program,
- community police,
- a defense attorney and
- US Probation.

Also, CRJ improved the appearance of the building, installing new windows, planting flowers and maintaining the grounds.

Lesson Learned
CJR would have filed its court suit earlier. Their assessment is that no amount of meetings or information was going to turn community opposition in their favor:

We should have moved through the community notice and discussions rapidly, placed our application in the hands of the Board of Zoning Appeals as soon as possible, and lodged our court appeal immediately on receiving the denial. With that in mind, having an attorney assured that every step taken buttressed our legal arguments.

Another point worth noting: Staying the course through years of litigation is expensive. Consequently, only organizations with sufficient resources should engage in protracted court challenges.
**Northeastern Colorado**

**Rural Location: Special Considerations**

In rural, northeastern Colorado, a community corrections organization won zoning approval for constructing a 100 bed facility. The community corrections organization built a facility that accommodates 70 beds as well as a non-residential program.

Because of the rural location, some particular siting issues came into play.

**Distance from Residential Communities**

The residential community corrections center was nowhere near any residential community, and this helped to minimize objections from the public.

**Water and Sewer**

Given the center's construction in a rural location, water and sewer issues had to be addressed.

**Economic Contributions**

In this community, the center's economic impact was particularly significant. Whenever it could, the center invested its resources in the local economy – from banking to construction.

**Costs**

In the rural location, real estate was more readily affordable.

In establishing its program, community corrections center also utilized many approaches that are also common for urban and suburban sites.

**Support from Government Leaders**

State and local government leaders recognized the need for the center. The State of Colorado provided some funding and the area Community Corrections Board lent its support. The center also worked for the support of the local sheriff, the County Commissioners, and the heads of the Zoning, Public Works and Fire Departments. Involving all the major players early on was key to the project's success.
Community Outreach

The center had to educate the local community about the nature and benefits of community corrections. At two public hearings on its zoning request, the center emphasized the benefits of community corrections, including job creation, availability of treatment programs in the community, benefits to the courts and the county, and the cost-efficiency of community corrections over prisons or jails. In the local newspapers, positive comments outweighed negative ones.

The center grows community support through inmate volunteer programs, community service and neighborhood cleanups. Center management attends local board meetings and is proactive should concerns come up.
Correctional Service Canada (CSC) enlisted the Ottawa community to help find a new location for the Ottawa Parole Office that considers the needs of the community and allows CSC to carry out its legal obligation to safely reintegrate and manage offenders in the community.

**Town Hall Meetings and Online Feedback**

In December 2008 and March 2009, CSC conducted public consultations to both inform and consult the local community regarding the selection of potential sites. The consultation included a town hall meeting, an online consultation tool and a 1-800 phone line for stakeholders’ feedback. CSC advertised the consultation on their Web site, issued a media advisory, and distributed invitation flyers to residences, businesses and post office boxes located within 250m around the proposed sites, as well as to schools, childcare, elected officials, chief of police and NGOs.

The online consultation tool provided information on the Ottawa Parole Office: how it contributes to enhancing public safety, how it operates, the number of staff, the number of parolees being supervised, and how it collaborates with the police and the community.

CSC hired a consulting group to write up detailed reports on the meetings which were shared with the public.

**Moving on to “Plan B”**

Hundreds of public comments expressed strong opposition to the program’s location within a proposed residential area. After narrowing down the options to locations within a defined geographical area downtown, CSC hosted another public meeting to provide the local citizens an opportunity to learn more about the parole office and Correctional Service of Canada and to express their views on the proposed locations. The meeting was well attended and the feedback indicated support for locating the parole office within the recommended geographical boundaries, and within a government-owned building.

**The Value of Community Outreach**

CSC values public participation in our efforts to contribute to the safety and well being of communities, and listened to the public’s feedback in making their site selection. A supportive community is key to the successful reintegration of offenders on conditional release and we look forward to developing strong supportive relationships with the Ottawa community in order to enhance public safety.
An effort to open a residential correctional facility for homeless parolees in Southern California began with a visit to the Chief of Police. Leaders in Community Alternatives (LCA) presented the chief with their plans for renovating an abandoned police station that had been vacant for 4 or 5 years. The 40,000 square foot building was surrounded by a brick wall with electronic gates and was ideally located near bus lines but apart from residential neighbors; an animal shelter was the closest neighbor. There would be no external changes to the building.

The Police Chief assured LCA that if they operated in a business-like manner and did a good job, the residential facility was okay by him. If the facility created problems, he would shut it down. So warned, the zoning process began in earnest.

**Next Steps**

LCA canvassed the immediate neighbors, distributing handouts describing the agency, the proposed facility, and “Q&A”s to nearby businesses.

The agency contacted the Mayor and other members of the Board of Supervisors and gained their support.

LCA carried letters of support with them as part of their presentation to the Planning Commission, and brought a graduate of their program with them to testify. One of the commission members stated “It is our responsibility to ‘step up to the plate’” because there were no residential services in the community for the thousands of parolees who lived there. The Commission voted 6-0 in favor of the facility.

**Show Down**

The final arbiter of the approval process was the City Council. LCA went into the meeting with the Mayor’s support; 3 of the council members expressed support while 2 others were sitting on the fence, saying that if there was no opposition, they would be ok with it. One community person after another spoke in support of the project. Not one neighbor spoke in opposition.
And then, the Police Chief (yes, the first person to come on board with the facility) rose up and expressed his concerns about the safety of having such a facility in the community. He was concerned about having 100 parolees living in the community under one roof – of course he ignored the fact that there were thousands living in the community completely unsupervised and without any support.

The Council voted 3-2, against.

**Recouping the Losses**

This completely unanticipated outcome cost the agency dearly, nearly $250,000 having been expended on plans and other preparations for opening the facility. LCA responded by suing the city on grounds of discrimination against people with substance abuse addictions under the Americans with Disabilities Act, and won! Lost were months of effort, and the heartbreak of opening a program desperately needed for the community, but the cash outlays were recovered.

**Lesson Learned**

Achieving community support is more a matter of keeping plates spinning than checking items off a checklist. In retrospect, the Police Chief should have been kept involved throughout the process from beginning to end. He never believed they would get the support of the community, and when they did, he didn’t want the program “on his watch”, and decided to oppose.
San Antonio, Texas
Moving to the Convent: Zoning Change Required

In San Antonio, Texas, Crosspoint, Inc. had a chance to move to a five acre property that housed an 86,000 square foot convent. The building was perfectly adaptable to Residential Community Corrections Center (RCC) needs, now and in the future. The RCC encountered - and overcame - heavy community opposition.

Building on Existing Support

The RCC first approached those who were most likely to support its move.

The nuns selling the convent had moved into a new facility just across the street. The nuns welcomed the RCC and prayed for its success in getting the needed zoning.

The RCC then approached a county commissioner who was a long-time supporter of the RCC.

The RCC CEO wrote to the local law enforcement association and got a written endorsement, and he used his zoning attorney as an intermediary with local politicians.

The RCC continued contacting likely supporters ahead of others. In roughly the following order, the RCC approached political leaders, criminal justice faculty at a university's local branch, law enforcement, community activists, business leaders, a local public relations firm, non-profit and civic groups such as the Rotary, and neighborhood associations.

The RCC did not contact the media until it was necessary to respond to claims made by move opponents.

Community Meetings

The RCC hosted and controlled three smoothly run community meetings at its proposed new site. Later, the RCC participated in two additional meetings that move opponents called on their own turf. These last two meetings, highly negative and chaotic, showed the advantage of an RCC's hosting its own meetings.

Making the Case for the RCC

The RCC readied facts to counter objections. University faculty published local research showing
that establishing a halfway house in a neighborhood could help improve property values and lower crime rates. Also, the RCC developed a variety of written materials including

- an "elevator speech" (a very succinct case for the RCC move),
- a Frequently Asked Questions guide,
- a "Myth vs. Fact" sheet for staff and board members use, and
- a series of newspaper articles and ads.

In addition, the RCC prepared a four page pamphlet, with photos, that described the RCC's history, its relationship with the nuns, and client success stories and relevant statistics.

The Outcome

The RCC prevailed, with the City Council voting 9 to 2 in favor of the zoning change. The RCC continued to build good relations with the community. For example the RCC placed ads in city and district newspapers, reintroducing itself.

The RCC established a Neighborhood Advisory Committee, composed of neighbors, local business owners and members of the faith community. It included about 8 people who supported the RCC's move, and 4 who had not. The Advisory Committee encouraged the RCC to

- provide free outpatient care to certain local residents,
- buy within the community,
- organize clean-up efforts for elderly neighbors and
- host a neighborhood picnic.

Finally, the RCC is working with its zoning attorney to modify overly restrictive zoning provisions.
San Francisco, California
Knocking on Every Door

The opportunity arose in 1998 for Leaders in Community Alternatives (LCA) to open a new, 100-bed residential correctional facility located 10 blocks away from an existing facility that had been operating as a halfway house since 1980. To generate support in the new neighborhood, a supportive neighbor from the existing halfway house location was recruited to go door to door with information about the new facility. He knocked on every door within a 300 foot radius, handing out agency literature and detailing his experience with the halfway house being a good neighbor that provided a needed community service.

When the agency appeared at the conditional use hearing, they carried with them letters of support from community members in the original halfway house neighborhood. (The agency wrote the letters and had the neighbors sign them.) Because of the successful door-to-door campaign in the new neighborhood, there was not one opponent at the conditional use hearing, and the permit was awarded.

Déjà vu

The State of California has embarked on a county-based community corrections initiative, moving state money to the county level for contracting residential correction services. San Francisco will be putting out bids for new residential bed.

LCA is responding to the bid by going back to the original 1980 halfway house, which is vacant and in the process of a major remodel because of a fire, with plans for re-opening the facility for 75-80 clients under the new contract.

The sitting strategy this time around involves utilizing the current zoning of the building which allows the criminal justice population, by right. However, recognizing that there are some new neighbors since 1998, a few of whom who were very opposed to the building being used even as a residential hotel, LCA will be a good neighbor, and once again begin knocking on doors. They will go right to the naysayers, first with the 1998 letters of support from the neighbors who are still here. Having proper zoning certainly strengthens the argument, but failing to talk to neighbors and gain support could derail the program with the bad publicity and new problems – not worth the risk!!
Cost Effectiveness: Understanding Boston


This report examines efforts of various states to reinvent their corrections systems in more innovative ways informed by data and best practices. Several states are enacting major policy changes to reduce the practice of incarceration and lower the cost of corrections. The result has been not only more cost-effective government, but also, even more importantly, improved public safety.

Corrections budgets nationally and locally have exploded over the past twenty years at the expense of other investments. Corrections budgets nationally have increased nearly 300 percent over the past 20 years. Over the past ten years in Massachusetts, Corrections budgets enjoyed double digit growth while Higher Education budget was cut by 7.5%. Meanwhile, corrections populations largely remained constant, rising less then 5 percent overall.

The states with reform initiatives in place have reduced their prison populations, focused resources on those most likely to re-offend and saved millions of dollars – helping to offset budgetary impacts on other state services. Michigan for example, has closed 13 corrections facilities and saved $500 million since it began a corrections reform initiative in 2003. It has also continued to see reduced levels of re-offending.

Massachusetts must begin, based on proven models, to build a system that reduces recidivism and improves public safety. Recommended solutions include:

- Making the reduction of recidivism the collective goal of the criminal justice system.
- Establishing uniform data collection and information sharing.
- Using science to guide policy-making.
- **Examining laws and practices that restrict access to supervised reentry programs in the community for non-violent individuals.**
- Collaborating with multiple stakeholders in the communities to which prisoners return and using the existing community capacity to improve reentry outcomes and reduce the risk of re-offense.
• Reconsidering resource allocations that direct significant resources to prison and jail infrastructure and proportionally far fewer resources to programs and services that are proven to reduce recidivism.
• Directing corrections resources to managing and preparing higher-risk prisoners for successful transition into the community.

These actions will lead to lower prison and jail populations, a less expensive corrections system and improved public safety outcomes with fewer ex-prisoners returning to crime.
Cost Effectiveness: The Extravagance of Imprisonment


The premise of this study is that there are compelling reasons to consider alternatives to incarceration for nonserious offenders:

- US jail and prison populations are the largest in the world, and its incarceration rates are the highest.
- Admissions continue to increase each year.
- “Get tough on crime” laws result in an increasingly larger percentage of inmates convicted of less serious crimes.
- Local and state coffers are low or empty.
- Alternatives to prison proven to protect public safety, reduce recidivism, and save taxpayer money are already in use across the country.
- Polls show the public supports alternatives.

This report analyzes prison and jail populations in the US as a whole and in four key states—California, Florida, New York, and Texas—to determine 1) how many prisoners are nonserious offenders and what it costs to lock them up, 2) what proven effective alternatives are in use and what they cost, and 3) what offenders were sentenced to alternatives instead of prison and jail.

This report is based on a hypothetical of adopting alternatives for 80% of the nonserious, nonsexual prison and jail population. Each type of nonserious offender was assigned a level of supervision and treatment or rehabilitation appropriate for the type of offense committed. The alternatives selected are electronic monitoring, reporting programs (day reporting centers and work release programs), drug treatment, and drug courts—all currently in use in the four chosen states. All are shown to be effective.

The potential savings across the U.S. is $9.7 Billion – $2.4 Billion in Texas alone.
Cost Effectiveness: High Cost of Incarceration


This report first documents the high and rising rates of incarceration in the United States, comparing the U.S. prison and jail population to the rest of the world and to our own historical experience. The report then reviews the main causes for the rise in incarceration and analyzes the relationship between incarceration and national crime rates. The final section of the report quantifies some of the direct financial costs of incarceration and discusses the scope for budgetary savings, particularly for state and local governments.

The United States currently incarcerates a higher share of its population than any other country in the world. The U.S. incarceration rate – 753 per 100,000 people in 2008 – is now about 240 percent higher than it was in 1980.

A reduction by one-half in the incarceration rate of non-violent offenders would lower correctional expenditures by $16.9 billion per year and return the U.S. to about the same incarceration rate of 1993 (which was already high by historical standards). The large majority of these savings would accrue to financially squeezed state and local governments, amounting to about one-fourth of their annual corrections budgets. As a group, state governments could save $7.6 billion, while local governments could save $7.2 billion.

A review of the extensive research on incarceration and crime suggests that these savings could be achieved without any appreciable deterioration in public safety.

Other findings include:

- In 2008, one of every 48 working-age men (2.1 percent of all working-age men) was in prison or jail.
- In 2008, the U.S. correctional system held over 2.3 million inmates, about two-thirds in prison and about one-third in jail.
• Non-violent offenders make up over 60 percent of the prison and jail population. Nonviolent drug offenders now account for about one-fourth of all offenders behind bars, up from less than 10 percent in 1980.
• The total number of violent crimes was only about three percent higher in 2008 than it was in 1980, while the total number of property crimes was about 20 percent lower. Over the same period, the U.S. population increased about 33 percent and the prison and jail population increased by more than 350 percent.
• Crime can explain only a small portion of the rise in incarceration between 1980 and the early 1990s, and none of the increase in incarceration since then. If incarceration rates had tracked violent crime rates, for example, the incarceration rate would have peaked at 317 per 100,000 in 1992, and fallen to 227 per 100,000 by 2008 – less than one third of the actual 2008 level and about the same level as in 1980.
Cost Effectiveness: Lower Crime, Lower Cost


This report details some of the criminal justice reforms undertaken by the State of Texas since 2003 by strengthening alternatives to incarceration for adults and juveniles. The State has achieved significant reductions in crime while avoiding more than $2 billion in taxpayer costs that would have been incurred had Texas simply constructed more than 17,000 prison beds that a 2007 projection indicated would be needed. Similarly, juvenile crime has markedly declined at the same time Texas has reduced the number of youths in state institutions by 52.9 percent.

The report concludes that an increased emphasis on policies that are both tough and smart has enabled the state to turn the tide and reduce crime while controlling costs to taxpayers. Given the strain on the state’s budget, policymakers will likely face a new challenge of not merely avoiding the massive costs of new lockups, but actually trimming the corrections budget while continuing to enhance public safety. Fortunately, solutions are available, such as realigning corrections spending to strengthen cost-effective community corrections programs that prevent re-offending, fostering the use of evidence-based supervision practices in all probation departments, and enacting targeted sentencing reforms. Policymakers must also evaluate the effectiveness of programs to rehabilitate inmates before they are released, ensuring those that keep inmates from returning are not eliminated. By continuing to build upon the initiatives that are successfully reducing both crime and incarceration rates, Texas can achieve further crime reductions and lower its corrections budget through the closure of unneeded adult and juvenile correctional facilities.
Cost Effectiveness: Outside the Cell (Texas)


The Texas Public Policy Foundation embraces the principals of individual responsibility, free enterprise, limited government, and private property rights. They note that Margaret Thatcher reduced the prison population of Great Britain by 20%. The Right and Left unite on justice goals: reduce crime, empower and restore victims, prioritize limited resources. Currently, 88% of State Corrections funds go to prisons, harming the front end of the justice system and taxpayers.

Texas reforms in 2007 shifted resources from prison building to strengthening juvenile and adult probation and parole, saving a half billion dollars and sending $57.8 million to counties to handle youth misdemeanants once sent to institutions. In 2008, adult parolee crimes declined 7.6% and juvenile adjudications declined 10.3%


Principles of reform include victim restitution; alternatives with accountability; probation with work programs, drug testing, GPS monitoring and using risk/needs assessment tools. Focus prison on dangerous offenders, conduct cost-benefit analyses of budget expenditures, and use performance measures. Promote successful reentry through the use of halfway houses which can cost less than half of prisons.

Inmates ranked equivalent time in seven different alternative sanctions such as day reporting, intensive supervision, probation and community service as tougher than prison.

Conclusion: America is ready for enlightened, data-driven solutions to reduce crime, empower and restore victims, and control costs.
Cost Effectiveness: Restorative Justice


This presentation outlines the shortcomings of traditional, punitive justice approaches in the United States which has proved ineffective and self-perpetuating. Proposed are two alternative systems, namely, Restorative Justice, which is victim-based, and Community Justice. The former repairs harms to people; the latter improves neighborhood quality of life.

In exploring the deficiencies of incarceration, the presentation examines the cost implications of recidivism (re-offending) and revocation (being sent back to prison for violation of conditions of probation).

•Within 3 years -69,116 Were Returned to Prison (Langan & Levin, 2002)
  –51.8% were returned for technical violations

•Equivalent to Demand for 69.1 New Prisons of 1000 beds
  –Mid-Range Cost for Construction about $60,000/bed = $60,000,000/prison
  • 69.1 prisons = $4,146,000,000 (i.e., $4.1 Billion)
  –Mid-Range Operating Costs/Year ($30,000/bed) = $30,000,000/prison
  • 69.1 prisons = $2,073,000,000 (i.e., $2.07 Billion)
  –Life Cycle Costs (30 years)
    • (Construction Costs) + (Operating Costs/yr.)(30yrs) = Life Cycle Cost/Prison
      • ($60,000,000) + ($30,000,000) (30) = $960,000,000/prison for 30 years
      • (69.1 prisons ) ($960,000,000) = $66,336,000,000 (i.e., $66.3 Billion)

Among the costs of punishment oriented Justice in the U.S., in 2007:

• 26,191 more people were admitted to prison than released.
  Equivalent to 26.2 new prisons with 1000 beds each.
  • Construction Costs @ $60,000,000/prison x 26.2 prisons = $1.52 BILLION
  • Annual Operating Costs @ $30,000,000/prison/yr. x 26.2 prisons = $786,000,000/yr.
  • Life Cycle Costs for 30 Years for 26.2 Prisons
    Construction + (Annual Operations) (30yrs.) = Life Cycle Costs
    $60 Million + ($786,000,000) (30) = $23,640,000,000 $23.6 BILLION
• 26.2 Prisons
Cost Effectiveness: Step by Step Guide


This quick guide comprised a series of two, 60-minute webinars introducing the Cost-Benefit Knowledge Bank for Criminal Justice found at www.cbkg.org.

The series is designed to train participants to assess their jurisdiction’s return on investment from criminal justice expenditures; explain the costs of crime and benefits from crime avoided; and consume and produce high-quality cost-benefit analyses.

The Guide examines the impact of incarceration on crime, i.e., a 10% increase in the incarceration rate leads to a 2.6% reduction in crime. The resulting cost benefit ratio of incarceration ranges from $.91 to $2.78.

The cost-benefits of various interventions to reduce crime are examined, e.g., Functional Family Therapy (for juvenile offenders) reduces crime by 18.1 % at a cost savings, per person, of over $54,000 with a net savings to each taxpayer of $17,000+.

The lessons of cost benefit assessments are that incarceration reduces crime; there are diminishing returns to incarceration; crime costs are influenced by type of crime and how resources are used to arrest, convict, and sentence offenders. Also, using effect sizes, CBA can provide a framework to compare across policy choices.
Research Synopsis: Colorado


In a 2006 study, the Nicole Hetz-Burrell and Kim English, researchers for the State of Colorado, noted several benefits from its use of halfway houses:

*Offenders in halfway houses across the state paid more than $2.6 million in state taxes and approximately $6.7 million in federal taxes between FY00 and FY04. They earned more than $115 million and paid over $36 million in room and board during that period.* . . .

*Escape rates and technical violations were greatly reduced – sometimes by half – for offenders who participated in substance abuse, mental health, sex offender, domestic violence, cognitive, family or budget services.* . . .

*Of all offenders who successfully completed community corrections in the five year period, 85 percent remained crime free after being at risk for 12 months and 75 percent remained crime-free after being at risk for 24 months.*

The Colorado studies show the wide range of benefits that can come from the use of residential community corrections.
Research Synopsis: Connecticut


This study assessed reconviction rates by utilizing data collected electronically from the Department of Correction and the Connecticut Judicial Branch. Data were collected for the 9,501 inmates who were released from Department of Correction facilities and supervision between January 1, 2000 and December 31, 2000.

Over one-half of the inmates (64%) were discharged because it was the end of their prison sentence. Fifteen percent of the inmates were released to parole, 8% were released to transitional supervision, and 9% were released to furloughs or halfway house programs. (The 3% sent to other state or federal agencies were not included in this study.)

The overall reconviction rate was 39%, end of sentence inmates had the highest (47%) and the DOC-Community inmates the lowest (24%). Parolees had a 31% reconviction rate and transitional supervision inmates had a 35% reconviction rate. The average days to re-arrest (that led to a new conviction) was 255 with inmates released to DOC-Community being out the longest (343 days) and end of sentence inmates averaging the shortest (238 days) amount of time prior to re-arrest.

The most significant factor in predicting which inmates would be reconvicted following their release from prison was the type of release they experienced: those transitioning through Community programs were much more successful.
Research Synopsis: Literature Review


For the purpose of this survey of research literature, only research conducted since 2000, by independent researchers not employed by the agency being evaluated, has been included.

A fair reading of the research suggests that community residential reentry centers, although underutilized in many jurisdictions, can play a critical role in promoting public safety and offender reentry success, especially during the period of time that offender risk and needs are highest—the first six months to one year following release from prison.

This study comprises:

- Three national studies, two from the United States and one from the United Kingdom, that support the efficacy of halfway houses and other reentry programs; and
- Two statewide studies of work release, one from Washington State and one from Ohio, that document program effectiveness and low re-arrest rates.

**Conclusion: Treatment Works**

Especially in light of the incorporation of the “What Works” literature in corrections, which focuses on the principles of risk, need, and responsivity and the growing use of validated risk need assessment instruments, such as the Level of Service Inventory-Revised (LSI-R) instrument, we can conclude, as a recent review of the literature on community-based residential facilities in Canada did, that “treatment is effective.”
RESEARCH SYNOPSIS: COLORADO DIVISION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE


An exhaustive review of the literature on effective recidivism reduction programs and effective early prevention programs identifies evidence-based approaches.

In its findings regarding the impact of incarceration, the study finds that employment, aging and marriage contribute to the termination of criminal activity, and that these pay a more important role in recidivism reduction than incarceration and surveillance-oriented supervision. Further, research shows that when supervision is service-oriented and focuses on the individual offender’s deficits that are related to criminal behavior (such as addiction, employment problems, unstable living arrangements, pro-criminal attitudes and associates), recidivism can be significantly reduced.

Programs that work to significantly reduce recidivism include:

- Education and vocational programming
- Substance abuse treatment, especially therapeutic communities and after-care
- Drug Courts
- Sex Offender Treatment
- Cognitive Behavioral Treatment
- Crisis Intervention Teams for mental health issues
- Interpersonal skills training for juveniles
- Community-based family style group homes for institutionalized juveniles
- Multi-systemic therapy
- Family Based programs such as Functional Family Therapy, Multi-Dimensional Treatment Foster Care and Multi-Systemic Therapy

Highly effective prevention programs include:

- Nurse/home visits
- Nurse Family Partnerships
- Parent Management training
- Child social skills training
- School based programs (anti-bullying, etc.)
- Community-based after school and mentoring programs

Essential to all success is maintaining high degrees of fidelity to program design, and sufficient investment to operate programs correctly.
Research Synopsis: Ohio


In the State of Ohio, some individuals about to be released from prison participate in a Halfway House program; others do not. Professor Edward Latessa, head of the criminal justice program at the University of Cincinnati led a study that compared the recidivism of halfway house participants with the recidivism of similar individuals who did not go to a halfway house.

Dr. Latessa's study found that people who successfully completed halfway house programs had a lower recidivism rate than those who did not go to a halfway house: 22.1 percent compared to 27.9%.

Furthermore, the study showed that the positive effect of halfway house “treatment” was most significant among individuals with the highest risk of recidivism. This poses a dilemma for a community interested in enhancing its safety.

The community might be more willing to accept what Ohio calls a halfway house, if the facility supported only low-risk offenders.

However, the greatest impact of Ohio's Halfway House programs was in reducing the likelihood of recidivism among high-risk offenders.
Research Synopsis: Washington County, Oregon


In Washington County, Oregon, the Community Corrections Department provided ex-offenders with substance free transitional housing. An evaluation of this endeavor showed positive results from the use of such housing:

*Longer lengths of stay in any transitional housing ... (over and above the other services participants received) resulted in less substance abuse at follow-up and in decreases in stress over time.*
RESEARCH SYNOPSIS: TEXAS (CJPC)


In 1992, the State of Texas established a Substance Abuse Felony Punishment Program for

• offenders,
• under community supervision,
• with substance abuse problems and
• whose participation is a condition of probation.

The Program includes three components:

1. Nine to 12 months of intensive treatment in a secure facility,
2. then 3 months in a residential treatment facility, and
3. finally, 3 to 9 months of outpatient counseling.

The Program's evaluation reports remarkable results:

Participants who completed all phases of the program had a 7% recidivism rate, significantly lower than the 32% recidivism rate of the comparison group.

Furthermore, the Texas Criminal Justice Policy Council estimated that for every 100 people placed in the Substance Abuse Felony Punishment Program, the state avoided $770,000 in incarceration costs.

The Program shows that residential community corrections can link treatment during incarceration with crime-free life after incarceration.
Research Synopsis: Texas (TDCJ)


The State of Texas utilizes Restitution Centers to reintegrate ex-offenders into society. The Centers provide structured living, treatment, education and employment opportunities.

A report by the Texas Department of Criminal Justice shows the financial benefits that come from the employment of the Restitution Center residents. In Fiscal Year 2001, from their earnings, center residents paid out over $4.5 million:

- $988,000 in restitution
- $260,000 in dependent support
- $415,000 in probation fees
- $302,000 in fines and
- over two and a half million dollars in room/board and other facility fees.

In addition, Restitution Center residents contributed another $600,000 worth of community service.
Research Synopsis – Washington State


At the direction of the state legislature, the Washington State Institute for Public Policy evaluated work release programs of the state’s Department of Corrections. In 2007, the DOC operated 15 such facilities for 700 residents state-wide.

In its measure of “total recidivism,” the Institute For Public Policy included a new conviction for any felony or misdemeanor. Compared to those who did not participate in a work release facility, the study found that participation in work release “lowers total recidivism by 2.8%.”

Furthermore, the Institute for Public Policy determined that the benefits of residential work release facilities far outweigh the costs. Based on felony recidivism findings, the Institute calculated that

*participation in work release generates $3.82 of benefits per dollar of cost. The benefits (about $2,300 per work release participant) stem from the future benefits to taxpayers and crime victims from reduced recidivism.*
June 9, 2005

Mr. Paul Biever  
Executive Director  
Crosspoint, Inc.  
420 Baltimore St.  
San Antonio, TX 78215-1936

Dear Mr. Biever:

I have recently learned of the public resistance your organization is receiving from local business owners near the proposed location of a new halfway house facility your organization plans to build at 1000 N. Alamo St. for federal offenders returning to the San Antonio area. As I understand it, the primary concern of local business owners seems to be a perceived threat presented by the residents of the halfway house to property values and public safety. Crosspoint, Inc. has operated a facility within a half-mile of the 1000 N. Alamo St. address for many years without any adverse impacts on either crime or property values. Although, the anxieties of the business owners are understandable, their views are probably due to a lack of information and understanding about the issues involved. Perhaps, my comments below will help reduce their anxieties.

As a criminologist, one of my research interests is the relationship between adverse social conditions and patterns of crime patterns in San Antonio. This research uses the geographical location of all homicides between 1977 and 2003 as a proxy measure for street crime because homicide is the most accurately recorded index crime and, when aggregated across several years, provides an excellent indicator of neighborhood crime rates. Violence can occur anywhere in the city; however, it does not occur everywhere equally. Neighborhoods where homicides frequently occur stand out and are typically...
characterized by high rates of crime in most or all other street crime categories. Those neighborhoods with higher concentrations of homicides also have higher concentration of overall street crime. Those with the least homicides are the neighborhoods with the lowest crime rates.

When multi-year patterns (1978-1982, 1983-1987, 1988-1992, 1993-1997, 1998-2003) are examined, none of the areas around (or near) the halfway houses operated by Crosspoint, Inc. are associated with high crime areas of our city. In fact, it is quite the opposite. These neighborhoods have been and continue to be low crime areas. Additionally, there is no indication of a spike, or increase, in crime rates during the time periods examined in areas close to any of the Crosspoint, Inc. facilities.

As a member of the Greater San Antonio Crime Prevention Commission, I have attended all but two meetings over the last 30 months. At each of these meetings the Manager of the Strategic Analysis and Crime Mapping Unit of the San Antonio Police Department presents local crime density patterns for the last 30 to 90 days. None of these crime density presentations has identified a spike in crime associated with areas close to the halfway houses operated by your organization. However, occasionally there is an increase in crimes along the southeast edge of San Antonio College where a few bars are located along N. Main Ave. between E. Myrtle St. and E. Laurel St. The most common crimes associated with these spikes are burglary of vehicles, simple assault and drug possession. This area is about a half-mile away from the closest of the Crosspoint, Inc. halfway houses, which are in the opposite direction -north and east of San Antonio College.

In short, neither my research nor SAPD monthly crime patterns support the assertion that higher neighborhood crime rates are associated with the presence of Crosspoint, Inc. halfway houses. Furthermore, I am unable to find any documented evidence of increased crime rates associated with halfway houses in the published research literature. In fact, Daniel Lauber (1996, p. 386) in an article in the *John Marshall Law Review* (vol. 29) notes research findings that are just the opposite reduced crime rates in neighborhoods around halfway houses.

Another concern on the minds of area business people is that the presence of the halfway house will negatively impact property values. Again their fears may be understandable but are unlikely to be realized for several reasons. First, after doing an exhaustive search of the research literature in criminal justice, criminology, business, and real estate disciplines I was unable find research evidence of a negative association between halfway houses, group homes, or prisons and property values. However, Daniel Lauber (1996, p. 385-386) also notes that:
"More than fifty studies have examined ... [the impact of halfway houses (added)] on property values. All of them, despite differing methodologies, have discovered that group homes and halfway houses have no effect on property values, even for houses adjacent to community residences [i.e., halfway houses or group homes (added)]. Conversely, studies have shown that community residences are often the best maintained properties on the block. Moreover, most neighbors within one or two blocks of the home do not even know that a group home or halfway house is nearby."

Second, Crosspoint, Inc. has operated halfway houses for many years to assist ex-offenders as they reenter society and reestablish their lives. To my knowledge residential or business property values near these facilities have not lost value. Third, over the last two decades rural communities have aggressively sought to have public prisons, private prisons and other justice related facilities located within their communities.

Finally, halfway houses provide a crucial service that benefits our neighborhoods, our city and the society at large. The programs and services provided by Crosspoint, Inc., and other agencies that operate halfway houses, assist offenders during this difficult transition and make it less likely they will fail. In this way, halfway house residents receive the support and supervision they need until they are in a better position to be successful. The barriers to successful reentry are enormous. Returning offenders are restricted in where they can work, the types of work they can pursue, whom they can associate with, where they can go, and what they can do. Without assistance and support these barriers can become overwhelming and could quickly lead to frustration and re-offending as a way to either meet basic needs or return to prison. If that were to happen, public safety would be threatened. Recidivism harms everyone and is extremely expensive. Consequently, it is in the public interest to assist the formerly incarcerated with their reentry. The greatest risk to public safety and public resources is to not assist them and further isolate them from society. Halfway houses help turn the odds of becoming a contributing member of society in the offender's favor.

The best evidence available indicates that the presence of a halfway house presents little risk to either public safety or property values in the area; and, halfway houses provide important social services and produce important social benefits. The site your agency has selected for the new facility is close to an ideal location. It is about a block away from major bus routes. It is in the downtown area where essential services, needed by residents, are located. There are no homes adjacent to the site. It is located next to a highway over pass and the lot has space for a facility that would provide housing and programming for residents and their families. A facility located at this site would improve
the ability of Crosspoint, Inc. to realize its mission by providing a broader array of services and programs to those returning to society from prison and their families.

I hope this letter is useful in calming the resistance of the business owners in the areas around the 1000 N. Alamo 81 location of the proposed facility.

Best regards,

Michael J. Gilbert, Ph.D. Associate Professor of Criminal Justice
Property Values: Literature Review


This research literature review focused upon the effects on a community of siting a correctional facility. Four criteria were considered: crime and public safety, property values, local economic impact, and quality of life. Most of the existing research focuses on siting prisons, but studies were also included focusing on minimum security, work release, pre-release or other community correctional programs.

Over fifty references in the literature were found, including national surveys as well as studies conducted in California, Florida, Wisconsin, Oregon, Michigan, and Washington.

The primary thrust of the recent empirical research suggests positive impacts to communities in which correctional facilities are placed. Fears concerning increased crime rates, plunging property values, declining quality of life, and negative local economic impacts are clearly unfounded based on a fair assessment of the existing research literature. In fact, many communities report improvements in the variables considered.
Property Values: Alberta, Canada


Community resistance to halfway houses may be based on the fear that the presence of a house full of offenders will negatively impact property values in a neighborhood. There does not, however, appear to be any research to support the conclusion that halfway houses drive down the value of real estate in neighborhoods where they are located.

In six major studies of communities where halfway houses were opened, no significant change in average housing prices could be found. One study of over 4,400 real estate transactions in Ontario neighborhoods revealed that, in 5 out of 9 neighborhoods where halfway houses opened, average housing prices two years after opening were equal to or higher than average housing prices one year before opening.

In 1995, the British Columbia government formed a task group to study changes to property values in British Columbia communities that had “non-market housing” (which includes halfway houses). In all seven cases studied, the task group found no evidence that the presence of non-market housing negatively affected housing prices in impact areas. **In 5 of the 7 projects examined, the average annual sale price increased more in the impact areas than in their control areas.**
Property Values:  Boston, Massachusetts


The report studied condominium sales over a 5 year period in two locations within the City of Boston. The first location in the South End is in proximity to a pre-release facility operated by Community Resources for Justice; the second location is in the Fenway area is close to a second, similar facility.

Data was collected representing a sampling of unit sales. The evidence shown is that substantial appreciation in value was achieved on each transfer of ownership.

There is no evidence that the presence of a halfway house/pre-release facility in either of these neighborhoods had a negative impact on property values. The rapid and significant increase in prices for residential condominiums has been the trend during the time frame analyzed. The unit sales in the neighborhoods sampled appear to have exceeded the trend in terms of appreciation of value.
May 5, 2006

Kevin J. Downey, Ph.D.
Chief Executive Officer
Crosspoint of San Antonio
420 Baltimore
San Antonio, TX 78214-1936

Dear Dr. Downey:

This is in response to your letter dated 14 March 06, in response to the Federal Bureau of Prison's request for proposals for residential services for federal offenders, specifically, the "Augusta House" at 605 Augusta, the "Blackburn House" at 201 E. Courtland, the "Hall House" at 1502 N. Pan Am and the "Pryor House" at 2321 N. Main. These houses have clearly been a part of their neighborhoods for some time.

I asked my staff to conduct a survey of the neighborhoods surrounding the locations of the four facilities. The surveys included a 3-year trending in all major categories of violent and property crimes, as well as the creation of density maps to reflect this data. The results do not indicate a pattern of crimes related to the halfway houses. In addition, officers visited the locations and learned that these houses provide reintegration to inmates who have less than 10% remaining on their sentences and are on work release programs. These residents have curfews and are checked regularly for drug use and work hard not to jeopardize their status. Though crime does occur in these neighborhoods, we have not associated any of the crimes with the halfway houses or their residents.

I have no concerns regarding this matter.

Sincerely,

William P. McManus
Chief of Police

WPM:ar

cc:  Sheryl L. Sculley, City Manager
     Erik J. Walsh, Assistant City Manager
Property Values: Concord, New Hampshire


The purpose of this report was to compare general residential property values in the neighborhood surrounding the North End House with the general residential property values of similarly situated neighborhoods in Concord to determine if there are trends in values that may be attributed to the proximity of the North End House, a minimum security state prison facility.

The scope of the research included a visual inspection of the neighborhood; a market survey of historical sales data of residential sales in the Concord area over the prior 5 year period; previous appraisals of properties in the area; and interviews with residents of the neighborhood, real estate brokers and a real estate developer. Also, an extensive survey was made of the subject’s competitive market area to find sales data of residential homes.

The data was statistically analyzed to determine trends and differences in property value indicators that may be potentially affected by the proximity to the North End House in the neighborhood. The primary value indicators analyzed were the average sales price, median sales price, and average days on the market.

In general, the average selling price over the prior five years of residential properties in the subject neighborhood is approximately 2 to 5 percent higher than similar properties in the general Concord area. The overall marketing time of properties appears to be between 30-60 days greater than that of similar properties in the general Concord area.

The report concludes that properties in the subject neighborhood require a slightly longer marketing and exposure time before selling. However, this does not appear to affect the price of the sale. There does not appear to be any positive or negative impact on residential property values that can be attributed to the North End House facility. The values of properties appear to be competitive with similar type properties in other neighborhoods of Concord.
Property Values: New York City


Findings show that the values of properties within 500 feet of supportive housing (including that for ex-offenders) show steady growth relative to other properties in the neighborhood in the years after supportive housing opens. Properties somewhat further away (between 500 and 1,000 feet) show a decline in value when supportive housing first opens, but prices then increase steadily, perhaps as the market realizes that fears about the supportive housing turned out to be wrong.

The city, state, and providers of supportive housing must continue to maximize the positive effects of supportive housing and ensure that supportive housing residences remain good neighbors. But the evidence refutes the frequent assertions by opponents of proposed developments that supportive housing has a sustained negative impact on neighboring property values.

It was also found that the effects on neighboring property values do not depend on the size of the development (number of units).
Studies on Halfway Houses: Washington, D.C.


The full report is available from the Justice Policy Institute, Washington, DC. January 1, 2002.

A study of halfway houses in Washington, DC challenged myths about property values and crime rates in neighborhoods that include residential community corrections facilities.

With respect to housing prices, the study identified the following findings:

*All of the neighborhoods with halfway houses and community based facilities experienced an increase in housing values for single family homes between 1997 and 2002, both on the street and within the zip code where the facilities are located over the past five years. This finding was true in neighborhoods in Northwest, Northeast and Southeast. In some neighborhoods studied, the houses directly around facilities had greater growth than those in the zip code as a whole. In other neighborhoods, houses directly around facilities experienced less of a growth in value than in the neighborhood as a whole.*

*Even homes that sold within a one-block radius of the facility experienced an increase in housing values over the past five years. Some homes within a couple of blocks of a facility actually doubled in value, or rose as much as $100,000.*

*Community based facilities have not contributed to a decrease in housing values in the neighborhoods where numerous facilities are located over the past five years.*

In addition to studying Washington, DC property values, Lisa Feldman examined crime rates in neighborhoods that included residential community corrections facilities and related transitional housing.

Her study showed that “there is relatively little serious crime around community based facilities and halfway houses.” She reported “Between 1997 and 2001, reported crime in the areas surrounding community based facilities and halfway houses remained fairly constant, and crime declined around these institutions about as much as it has around places that may not normally be considered high crime areas.” The studies findings are
The number of crimes committed has not changed significantly over the past five years in neighborhoods that house community based facilities and halfway houses. The numbers of overall crimes in neighborhoods with community based facilities and halfway houses are actually quite low over the past five years.

Crime trends in neighborhoods with community based facilities and halfway houses are similar to those in neighborhoods with services that people would not normally associate with crime.
TESTIMONIAL: No Effect on Neighborhood Safety

American Planning Association

“Findings:

“1. Community Residences are a residential use of land...

“2. Community residences have no effect on neighborhood safety.

“A handful of studies have also looked at whether community residences compromise neighborhood safety. The most thorough study, conducted for the State of Illinois, concluded that the residents of group homes are much less likely to commit a crime of any sort than the average resident of Illinois…”

- APA Policy Guide on Community Residences
POSITION PAPER: No Effect on Property Values

American Planning Association

Community residences have no effect on the value of neighboring properties.

More than 50 studies have examined their impact on property values probably more than for any other small land use. Although they use a variety of methodologies, all researchers have discovered that group homes and halfway houses do not affect property values of even the house next door. They have no effect on how long it takes to sell neighboring property, including the house next door. They have learned that community residences are often the best maintained properties on the block. And they have ascertained that community residences function so much like a conventional family that most neighbors within one to two blocks of the home don’t even know there is a group home or halfway house nearby.

- APA Policy Guide on Community Residences
POSITION PAPER: Special Use Permit Not Needed

American Planning Association

“Zoning is essentially performance oriented. When officials select the uses that are permitted as of right in each zoning district, they make the implicit assumption that these land uses belong in the district and do not generate adverse impacts on the surrounding properties. Special or conditional uses are those that belong in a district, but are known to produce adverse impacts under certain conditions unless precautions are taken. The extensive research on the impacts of community residences shows that they generate no adverse impacts on the surrounding neighborhood as long as they are licensed and not clustered on a block. There is no need to subject community residences to special use permit procedures because the licensing and spacing threshold issues are purely factual questions that can be determined administratively and do not require the extra scrutiny of a special use permit hearing.”

- APA Policy Guide on Community Housing
POSITION: New Hampshire Supreme Court Ruling

“The trial court found that the City’s actual purpose in banning federal halfway houses is not to prevent a concentration of correctional facilities in Manchester, but, more specifically, to address its concerns that the federal prisoners housed at the halfway house would either pose some threat to the surrounding community, engage in recidivism, or affect surrounding property values. However, the City presented no evidence that these concerns were founded in fact. As the trial court stated, “the City has provided no factual evidence beyond mere speculation demonstrating that federal halfway houses present a danger to the community such that the City needs to protect its residents from recidivists.” In contrast, the record contains substantial evidence that the proposed use will provide an important social benefit and not pose any risk to the safety of the neighborhood, and includes letters from police, community and religious leaders, law enforcement experts including a United States Attorney, a United States Marshal and the United States Probation Office, indicating overwhelming support for the proposed halfway house...

“Here the trial court made detailed findings regarding the reasonableness of the proposed use including: that the City has a large number of individuals who are required to return following the termination of their federal sentences and that there are currently no services to help such individuals with their transition to society; that the property at issue is particularly suitable for a halfway house, because of its proximity to public transportation, support services and commercial enterprises offering job opportunities; that property values will not be adversely affected; that it will not change the character of the neighborhood; that the proposed use will incorporate the very purpose of the ordinance by allowing residents to take advantage of and contribute to the mix of commercial services in the area; that evidence shows that these transition centers are considered “good neighbors”; that CRJ specifically outlined numerous safety precautions that are part of the proposed use; and that the halfway house will not pose a safety risk to the residents.

“We hold that the record supports the trial court’s finding…”

- The Supreme Court of New Hampshire
Community Resources for Justice, Inc., v. City of Manchester
Opinion issued April, 2008
POSITION PAPERS: Unlock Kids and Savings

Texas Public Policy Foundation

“Dallas and Harris counties implemented the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) in 2007. Since then, Dallas has reduced its detention population by 48 beds, resulting in an annual savings of $1 million. Similarly, Harris County closed a detention center and reduced detention costs 25%...”

A “component of JDAI is alternatives to detention. Among those used in Dallas is a day reporting center, in-home probation officer visits, GPS monitoring, and home detention. Only 4.5 of Dallas youths in an alternative program have re-offended prior to adjudication, compared to 10 percent of youths not in a program. At the four original national JDAI sites, juvenile arrests fell between 37 and 54 percent following implementation.”

TESTIMONIAL: It Works for City Police

City of San Antonio Police Department

“I asked my staff to conduct a survey of the neighborhoods surrounding the locations of the four [residential community corrections] facilities” which have “clearly been a part of their neighborhoods for some time. The surveys included a 3-year trending in all major categories of violent and property crimes….The results do not indicate a pattern of crimes related to the halfway houses. In addition, officers visited the locations and learned that these houses provide reintegration to inmates who have less than 10% remaining on their sentences and are on work release programs. These residents have curfews and are checked regularly for drug use and work hard not to jeopardize their status. Though crime does occur in these neighborhoods, we have not associated any of the crimes with the halfway houses or their residents.”

- William P. McManus, Chief of Police
TESTIMONIAL: Governor Granholm

In support of community corrections...

Reduce prison populations by 10% with nonviolent and geriatric release; invest in probation and parole staff and reentry. “Decide who we’re afraid of and who we’re mad at.”

- Michigan Governor Jennifer Granholm
TESTIMONIAL: Louisiana Governor Bobby Jindal

Supporting work release, day reporting centers...

“Without education, job skills, and other basic services, offenders are likely to repeat the same steps that brought them to jail in the first place. This not only affects the offender, but families and our communities as well. This is a problem that needs to be addressed head-on. We cannot say we are doing everything we can to keep our communities and our families safe if we are not addressing the high rate at which offenders are becoming repeat criminals. By implementing this reentry program, we can curb the cycle of repeat offenders and thereby reduce the burden on our prisons and help offenders create a place in society that adds value to their lives while keeping our communities safe for our families.”

- March, 2009 press release
TESTIMONIAL: Texas Governor Rick Perry

2007 State of the State Address:

“I believe we can take an approach to crime that is both tough and smart. ... [T]here are thousands of non-violent offenders in the system whose future we cannot ignore. Let’s focus more resources on rehabilitating those offenders so we can ultimately spend less money locking them up again.”

Since Texas strengthened supervision and treatment for adult offenders in 2007 instead of spending $1 billion to build and operate 17,000 new prison beds that were projected to have been needed, there have been more than 1,000 fewer annual crimes alleged against parolees. Following the 2007 changes to redirect youth misdemeanants from more costly state lockups into local probation programs that emphasize rehabilitation, preserve families, and restore victims, juvenile adjudications have declined 10.3 percent. Since Texas’ reforms began with a measure in 2003 to divert drug possession offenders with less than a gram of a controlled substance and no prior felony from state jails, the state’s crime rate per 100,000 residents has declined 12.8 percent.
TESTIMONIAL: Connecticut Governor M. Jodi Rell

December 2009 press release:

“We are closing a prison because of “a decline in the inmate population, the agency’s success with a number of post-release programs, and the need to find savings and efficiencies in state government ... Any decision such as this must always be made with public safety foremost in our minds ... We face an extraordinarily difficult budget situation—a challenge unlike any we have known in modern memory ... While other states—including states facing even more severe budget problems than our own—are being forced to build new prisons, we can make the most of our successes by building on these achievements.”

This prison closure, which will save $3.4 million, is a result of Connecticut’s effective policies to reduce re-offending. Since the state began its justice reinvestment initiative in 2003 to strengthen probation supervision and treatment, more offenders are successfully completing their probation and the crime rate has declined 6.3 percent.
TESTIMONIAL: It Works for Heather

Heather’s Story

“I have wanted to change my life ever since I became a mother in my junior year of high school. As I proceeded with my life it seemed that no matter how hard I tried, I was not good enough or family issues occurred and I started losing hope. Alvis House gave me back my understanding and hope for a successful life by breaking down the barriers and teaching me the steps to move forward. I have been working since I was 14, holding jobs here and there and never really succeeding. I really wanted a career. Alvis House helped me start the steps to pursue college, which I was always afraid of doing because of finances, and my intelligence level and fear of failing or not being good enough. The staff didn’t accept those things as excuses or reasons, they just gave me a boost and guided me where I was afraid to go and now I have applied to start college...The staff of Alvis House showed me respect and patience and guided me back to the path of self worth.”

- Alvis House
  Columbus, Ohio
TESTIMONIAL: Michael

Like many offenders with mental health issues and co-occurring substance abuse, Michael was not an intentional criminal. Now a client at the Alvis House Reflections Program, Michael, his wife, Christina and their children all participate in the family support program that is enabling Michael to lead a productive life.

“Coming to this program is one of the best things I could have done. I have a path to a new way of living now and my family and I understand each other a little better, too.”
TESTIMONIAL: Treat the Addict, Cut Crime

“In a Delaware work-release research study sponsored by the National Institute on Drug Abuse, those who participated in prison-based treatment -- followed by ongoing post-release care -- were seven times more likely to be drug-free and three times more likely to be arrest-free after three years than those who received no treatment. Other studies report similar findings. The Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration reports that substance-abuse treatment cuts drug abuse in half and reduces criminal activity by as much as 80 percent...

“Some courts and communities have...resisted offering comprehensive treatment because of fears of high costs. But recent studies show it is actually less expensive for communities to treat drug-abusing offenders than to let them sit in jail or prison. It is estimated that every dollar invested in addiction treatment programs yields a return of $4 to $7 in reduced drug-related crimes. Savings for some outpatient programs can exceed costs by a ratio of 12 to 1...

“Providing drug-abusing offenders with comprehensive treatment saves lives and protects communities.”

- Dr. Nora Volkow, Director
  National Institute on Drug Abuse
  August 19, 2006
TESTIMONIAL: President George W. Bush

In support of Second Chances...

“We know from long experience that if [former prisoners] can’t find work, or a home, or help, they are much more likely to commit more crimes and return to prison. ... America is the land of the second chance, and when the gates of the prison open, the path ahead should lead to a better life.”

- 2004 State of the Union Address
TESTIMONIAL: Representative Bobby Scott

“Prisoner reentry programs that work are the key to sustained public safety”

“We know prevention programs work and save money. We also know that, evidence based rehabilitation and treatment programs have been shown to reduce crime, as well, and save more money than they cost. For example, a study of the Drug Court treatment program showed an average cost of $25,000 for those sent to jail compared to an average of $1,600 for those sent to the program. Drug rehabilitation programs, in general, have been shown to save between $7 and $10 in reduced crime and health care expenses for every dollar spent.

“Comprehensive, evidence-based prisoner reentry programming, starting at the time an offender enters prison and following through a reasonable period after his return to the community, makes sense. It makes sense not because of a desire to coddle criminals, but because it means that you and I, and everybody else, are less likely to be a victim of crime from recidivism.”

- U.S. Representative Robert C. “Bobby” Scott
  Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism and Homeland Security
  U.S. House Judiciary Committee, Speech, 2006
TESTIMONIAL: It works for Victims of Crime

Sex Offender Management (SOM) Team in King County

“SOM promotes public understanding that “not in my neighborhood” is not a viable solution. Instead, communities that are aware and monitor convicted sex offenders are safer and more empowered. An offender who is invisible to the neighborhood is a threat in hiding. Increased visibility and ties to the community help make sex offenders more accountable for their actions and decreases the likelihood of re-offending.”

- King County Sexual Assault Resource Center
  Seattle, Washington
  http://www.kcsarc.org/
TESIMONIAL: It Works for City Mayors

The U.S. Conference of Mayors

“WHEREAS, the U.S. Conference of Mayors has a long established policy of promoting the successful re-entry of people leaving prison or jail; and

“WHEREAS, post-incarceration re-entry programs are haphazard and often nonexistent, undermining public safety and making it extremely difficult for formerly incarcerated people to become full, contributing members of society; and...

“WHEREAS, the [National Criminal Justice] commission’s purview would include making recommendations to reduce incarceration, reform U.S. drug policy, eliminate racial and gender disparities, improve re-entry efforts, and expand access to substance abuse treatment, mental health services and healthcare—goals that this Conference strongly supports;

“NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the United States Conference of Mayors affirms its support for the National Criminal Justice Commission Act of 2011 and calls upon the United States Congress to enact the National Criminal Justice Commission Act of 2011 in the 112th Congress.”

- ADOPTED RESOLUTIONS
79th Annual Conference Of Mayors
Baltimore, MD - June 17-21, 2011
Why KCSARC is working with communities on the issue of sex offenders

Fit with our mission

Our mission is: To assist victims and their families recover from the trauma and through education and training, eliminate sexual assault. We look to a time when there are no more victims.

As increasing numbers of offenders are released to the community, KCSARC has a unique role to play. We assist communities to hold offenders accountable for their behavior by facilitating dialogue between communities and the criminal justice system.

- **We are committed to end the silence about sexual assault.**

We believe that only with full and accurate information about sexual assault, the conditions that lead to it and those who commit this crime, can we end the violence facing our communities. We have a stake in communities knowing what is happening – not only the specific individuals who are moving/returning, but also about the larger issues of sexual assault, and sexual violence that are occurring. We believe that we should not underestimate the capacity of a community to effectively confront this difficult information. To do so, it is important to treat members of the community with respect and as well as to provide tools and resources to allow them to develop their own unique solutions.

As community based agency, KCSARC can stay in the community for an extended time. We can hear people’s pain, fear and anger. We can facilitate a dialog, build skills, assist the community in putting new systems in place that reduce risk and assist them in holding offender accountable

- **We are committed for the long term to helping communities face this crisis.**
KCSARC is an agency well versed in responding to crisis. Whether that is the crisis of an individual or family or the larger crisis of a community, KCSARC has considerable experience in responding with assistance and solutions.

Our region is in a crisis. The considerable media attention on this issue has begun to inform the public that sex offenders reside in all neighborhoods. When individuals are afraid of sex offenders in their neighborhoods, they cannot distinguish between levels of threat (the difference between level 1, 2, 3, and sexually violent predator). Nor do they access the risk to themselves and others between a child molester versus an individual who rapes adult women.

**Key reason this is important to us:**

**We represent the voice of victims.** Decisions are made for the individuals victims (people who are victimized by this specific offender) as well as for the larger group of people who have been sexual victimized. It is essential that their voice be heard from their perspective, not from the perspective of the offenders, or Department of corrections. There are times when we facilitate having the victim present at hearings, etc, etc. There are other times when it is our voice, reminding the offender and the offender’s supporters, of what his actions did to this person.

**Who cares?**

Communities care. People want to trust the information that they receive on this issue, and know that their interests, as individuals, families and communities, are being taken into account. They want offenders to be held accountable, and they want to feel safe and secure in their own communities. When communities believe that decisions are made that are not in their interests, when they feel that their safety will be compromised, they are understandably fearful and angry. Victim concerns (represented by KCSARC) are typically parallel to the concerns of communities; hence KCSARC can be seen as a community advocate.

**What Expertise do we bring?**

We have 35 years of experience in assisting thousands of victims and their families, we know what victims face, how they feel and what they may need.
We also have considerable experience in helping groups of people (schools, businesses or communities) deal with the crisis of sexual assault. Our skills in facilitation of difficult processes and knowledge of the way people learn can directly apply to communities grappling with this issue.

**What is our vision for a community 1-10 years out?**

It is our vision that the community (however defined) will be able to talk about sexual assault in an on-going, healthy and proactive way. We want to see communities where universal precautions are part of the culture. Finally, we want to see communities talking about and acting on those preconditions that lead to sexual assault.
1. **Rising crime rate if in District A?**  
   Research conducted at University 123 shows that crime in areas with Company XYZ facilities diminishes. Crime rate is the same or lower in neighborhoods in which a Company XYZ facility is located (as compared to demographically similar neighborhoods with no Company XYZ facility) *(Supply backup documents)*

2. **Sex Offenders in house?**  
   City of ABC’s Uniform Development Code prohibits transitional housing (such as Company XYZ) from housing individuals with sexually-oriented convictions. Company XYZ provides no residential services for sex offenders.

3. **Violent criminals?**  
   Company XYZ takes no one with any prior murder convictions (also a UDC prohibition).

4. **Length of stay?**  
   Average 95 to 121 days for residential clients.

5. **Will property values drop?**  
   No change in property values on current locations. Company XYZ facilities are clean, safe, and well-maintained.

6. **Enhanced risk of such a large facility?**  
   Each floor will be fully and appropriately staffed. Will continue using time-tested and respected accountability techniques to monitor and control client movement in the facility and in the community.

7. **Number of beds and population?**  
   (Redacted)

8. **Security provided?**  
   Programs are staffed 24-7 by residential monitors who have been thoroughly trained in accountability procedures. Electronic accountability system in use to track resident movement. Company XYZ is nationally accredited by the American Correctional Association as a residential service provider.

9. **What benefits do we get from having you there?**  
   Company XYZ will initially employ more than a dozen individuals at this facility, with the potential of 40 or more in the future. We are always seeking the opportunity to offer employment to eager and motivated individuals interested in working in an environment designed to build individual self worth and respect for everyone. Company XYZ also makes every effort to conduct routine business in our immediate neighborhoods, including purchases of supplies, food and services.
Company XYZ facilities will also be made available when possible for neighborhood activities and Company XYZ’s leadership looks forward to being an active participant in neighborhood organizations.

Company XYZ also maintains a Community Relations Board that meets regularly and is open to members of the community and all stakeholders. (use PR Activity list for examples)

10. Freedom of movement?
    Client movement in the community is allowed after client has completed an “orientation” phase, but it is limited and strictly monitored using procedures developed from Company XYZ’s ## years of experience and contract standards.

11. Who do they go to when there is a problem?
    Community members may contact Company XYZ administration or relevant emergency service or law enforcement as appropriate. All staff members are trained in crisis management. Facilities are staffed 24-7.

12. 24/7 coverage?
    At least three levels of staffing at every facility. Residential Monitors are on duty 24-7. A member of upper leadership also on-call 24-7.

13. Why did you pick this neighborhood?
    19% of our clients come from District-X. We think we should be in a variety of neighborhoods as our clients are from virtually every zip code in City of ABC. Company XYZ currently operates facilities in the Neighborhood One, Neighborhood Two, Neighborhood Three, and Neighborhood Four. Until recently we also operated a veterans program in the medical center district as well.

14. Riding the bus with us?
    Our clients are from City of ABC and like many citizens, most use public transportation throughout the city. Our clients are working to prepare for their return to home and family and are most interested in getting to and from work. (Company XYZ staff will explore current bus service to the area, including having staff ride buses on these routes to estimate our clients’ potential impact on ridership. If it seems likely our programming will create challenges to the existing services we will work with Transportation Company to improve these.)

15. Consequences of undesirable behavior?
    Our clients clearly understand that the consequences of inappropriate interpersonal behavior carry a greater penalty for them than for most other citizens. Misconduct will swiftly result in loss of program privileges and
restrictions from access to the community, in addition to the potential consequences all citizens face when they engage in inappropriate behavior. *(Be careful on this. Do not stress their involvement in CJ system. Our clients come to for a variety of reasons from a variety of circumstances.)*

16. How many times is City Police Dept. called?
   Rarely needed, but our staff are trained to know the level of intervention needed and would not hesitate to call police when appropriate. We have averaged approximately two calls per year in recent years.

17. Positions in facility?
   Facility Director, Case Manager, Residential Monitor and counselors for mental health and addiction. Main office staff include Chief Executive Officer, Director of Operations, Quality Assurance Administrator, Residential Corrections Administrator, Clinical Specialist, Quality Assurance Specialist, Community Services Specialist, Office Manager, Executive Assistant, Accountant, Support Clerks, Receptionist, Driver, Maintenance.

18. Client/staff movement in and around neighborhood?
   Company XYZ will have numerous staff on-site who will work in 8-hour shift rotations. Residents rarely own vehicles and most of their time is spent at work or involved in Company XYZ activities. Community activities other than employment will include visiting family and shopping for basic needs. The only other traffic coming into the site will be a limited number of visitors and outpatient clients.

19. Service types (in-house, Home Detention, outpatient)?
   Service types: residential transitional living and counseling, outpatient mental health and addiction treatment, employment and vocational assistance (primarily for residential clients).

20. Visiting hours?
   Most visiting occurs during daylight hours on weekends with limits in place to ensure numbers of visitors on site do not create safety or security problems. Some weekday visitation during evening hours is allowed based on program needs.

21. Will these residents be using drugs in the community?
   Residents are randomly and regularly drug and alcohol tested, w/ severe consequences for any use. The presence of alcohol or illicit drugs in test samples, or possession or use of substances will almost always result in temporary or permanent removal from the program.

22. Changes that will be made to the new facility?
   Company XYZ will make internal renovations such as installing sprinklers, cameras, door alarms, etc. We have no plans for expansion of parking areas or significant changes to the exterior of the buildings.
23. Will families of resident’s be moving in the community?
   Since the length of stay in our programs is less than 180 days in most cases, few if any families will relocate to the immediate neighborhood. (This has not occurred in relation to any existing Company XYZ facility.) Almost all Company XYZ clients are residents of City of ABC and DEF County and they are part of this program with the goal of returning to their community as productive citizens.

24. What occurred in the October 2004 incident at the __ facility?

   In ## years of services this has been the only instance of serious violence occurring in a Company XYZ facility. Our staff, clients, neighbors and law enforcement know that client accountability, safety and security are cornerstones of our organization. It is also important to remember that our clients share our goal for each individual to return to a productive life with reestablished and stronger bonds to families and the community.

   (DO NOT bring this issue up in conversation unless asked about it first.)

25. Why are you bringing such a large halfway house program into District A?
   Not a halfway house. We are bringing in a Social Services Center that will provide a variety of services. Besides services to the formerly incarcerated, we will provide outpatient mental health services, substance abuse services, employment assistance services and veterans services.
Community Benefits of Having Residential Treatment Program in Mountain View*

- Over 35 new full-time employment positions created for members of the community.
- Over $4 million dollars of taxable revenue is generated annually for the community.
- Community receives between 2,000-3,000 hours of community service it designates and needs every month.
- Over 300 Santa Clara County parolees per year are afforded the opportunity to address their issues and become productive members of society rather than draining communities of scarce resources.
- Parolees provided structured program with 24-hour accountability rather than unstructured, unaccountable time in the community.
- The community is safer and crime drops in communities operating a structured residential treatment facility with 24-hour awake presence.
- LCA operates its programs as a "good neighbor" listening to community needs and working with the community as partner to ensure cooperation.
- As resources permit, LCA offers programs and services to members of the community.
- Close cooperation with Mountain View Police Department
- LCA maintains an open door policy and establishes a community advisory board to ensure ongoing open lines of communication.

* Based on 150 beds
Fact Sheet: Community Concerns / Canada

In Ottawa, town hall meeting and online feedback focused on the following four questions:

1. What are some characteristics of your neighbourhood that Correctional Service of Canada should consider in making a decision about the location of the Parole Office?
2. What are your specific expectations or concerns with regard to potentially locating the Ottawa Parole Office at 116 Albert Street?
3. What role do you feel that you as an individual, and/or the community should play in offender reintegration?
4. How can we work together to help alleviate concerns and ensure public safety?

- The location should provide:
  - easy access to public transit;
  - proximity of support services that parolees need to access;
  - proximity to good and affordable rental housing;
  - proximity to work locations, availability of work for parolees.

- Consider the following criteria:
  - avoiding residential areas, and presence of seniors, families, children, etc.;
  - locating in a business district or industrial park;
  - locating in a stand alone building in proximity to the police station;
  - locating away from elementary schools and children’s parks.

- The effective management of facilities which offer services to offenders represents one of the key elements supporting a successful interaction with the community. Decision House was cited as an example: the fact that it is well run has generated a high level of trust within the community.

- Many people and organizations work and volunteer to support the effective integration of offenders in the community, in collaboration with the Parole Office (e.g. the John Howard Society, the Elizabeth Fry Society of Ottawa, etc.).
• Providing information and education to community members on issues particular to parolees and on the role of parole offices would be useful; a positive attitude from the community should be encouraged.
• Supporting social services and reintegration through tax contribution.
• Ensuring that offenders are not placed in situations where they are at risk of re-offending.
• Providing employment.
• Volunteering with the parole office or with organizations that assist reintegration of offenders (e.g. circles of support re-entry programs). Provide information to the public to dispel misconceptions and to alleviate concerns.
• Events such as open houses could be helpful.
• Consider broadening the offering of social services and social housing to other parts of the city in order to address the perceived concentration of service offerings in a small geographic area downtown Ottawa.
• Provide communication and education to enhance public awareness:
  o to educate and reassure people about having a parole office in their neighbourhood;
  o to educate people on what to do, should they notice something unusual;
  o to reduce the amount of misinformation which creates a negative attitude in the community.
• Take measures to ensure public safety: e.g. police presence, locating the parole office in a suitable area.
• Consult parolees on the facilities and services they need in proximity of a parole office to assist in the selection of a suitable site for the Ottawa Parole Office.
Reentry Fact Sheet

Research findings on adverse social conditions and crime patterns in San Antonio was released by Dr. Michael Gilbert, Assoc. Professor of Criminal Justice at UTSA in 2005.

When multi-year patterns (1978-1982, 1983-1987, 1988-1992, 1993-1997, 1998-2003) are examined, none of the areas around (or near) the halfway houses operated by Crosspoint, Inc. are associated with high crime areas of our city. In fact, it is quite the opposite. These neighborhoods have been and continue to be low crime areas. Additionally, there is no indication of a spike, or increase, in crime rates during the time periods examined in areas close to any of the Crosspoint, Inc. facilities.

As a member of the Greater San Antonio Crime Prevention Commission, Dr. Gilbert also attended commission meetings during each of which the Manager of the Strategic Analysis and Crime Mapping Unit of the San Antonio Police Department presented local crime density patterns for the last 30 to 90 days. None of these crime density presentations identified a spike in crime associated with areas close to the halfway houses operated Crosspoint.

Dr. Gilbert concluded that neither SAPD monthly crime patterns nor his research supported the assertion that higher neighborhood crime rates are associated with the presence of Crosspoint halfway houses. Furthermore, he was unable to find any documented evidence of increased crime rates associated with halfway houses in the published research literature, but did in fact find just the opposite. In a John Marshall Law Review article (1996), Daniel Lauber’s research found reduced crime rates in neighborhoods around halfway houses.

In May 2006, Chief of Police William McManus, wrote to Crosspoint CEO in response to the organization’s pursuit of a new federal contract. Chief McManus conducted his own research and his letter included the following findings:

I asked my staff to conduct a survey of the neighborhoods surrounding the locations of the four facilities. They surveys included a 3-year trending in all major categories of violent and property crimes, as well as the creation of density maps to reflect this data. The results do not indicate a pattern of crimes related to the halfway houses. In addition, officers visited the locations and learned that these houses provide reintegration to inmates who have less than 10% remaining on their sentences and are on work release programs. These residents have curfews and are checked regularly for drug use and work hard not to jeopardize their status. Though crime does occur in these neighborhoods, we have not associated any of the crimes with the halfway houses or their residents. I have no concerns regarding this matter.
Some opponents to residential reentry centers claim their presence causes property values to drop. The research says otherwise. A literature review conducted by the Center for Community Corrections and Doble Research Associates found: “the existing studies involving correctional cost impact indicate the property values nearby do not decline and that they may even increase as a result of location of a facility,” and the overwhelming majority of studies show that there is no negative effect on public safety in the vicinity of a correctional facility” (Public Outreach and Halfway Houses, August 2002).

According to research done by the Furman Center at New York University (2008),

Findings show that the values of properties within 500 feet of supportive housing (including that for ex-offenders) show steady growth relative to other properties in the neighborhood in the years after supportive housing opens. Properties somewhat further away (between 500 and 1,000 feet) show a decline in value when supportive housing first opens, but prices then increase steadily, perhaps as the market realizes that fears about the supportive housing turned out to be wrong.

The city, state, and providers of supportive housing must continue to maximize the positive effects of supportive housing and ensure that supportive housing residences remain good neighbors. But the evidence refutes the frequent assertions by opponents of proposed developments that supportive housing has a sustained negative impact on neighboring property values.

It was also found that the effects on neighboring property values do not depend on the size of the development (number of units).

In 2008, approximately 760,000 adult prisoners were released nationwide from state and federal prisons alone. According to research cited by Dr. Michael Gilbert at the Crosspoint zoning hearing in September 2009:

- Over 7,000 formerly confined persons will return to San Antonio this year. Most will have little or no support and struggle to obtain housing, employment, and food.
- San Antonio and Bexar County have the lowest capacity for reentry program beds of any major metropolitan area in the nation. This condition is a direct threat to public safety.
- Transitional support and treatment sharply reduce recidivism and new victimization.
  - Without support systems about 66 percent are rearrested within 3 yrs.
  - With treatment and support systems recidivism drops to 20-30% in that time frame.
OFFENDER REENTRY is the process through which an individual goes to prison and returns, trying to establish a crime-free life, reconnect with family, and contribute to his or her community.

Between 2002 and 2007, 2,295 offenders on average have returned from prison to Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency (CSOSA) supervision.

The core of CSOSA’s mission is to increase public safety and prevent crime by reducing recidivism. To do this, CSOSA works to reduce rearrests, improve education levels, increase employment rates, and reduce drug use among the population it serves.

Pursuing these goals requires strategic coordination between CSOSA, other government agencies, and community-based organizations through three stages of reentry — prison, transition, and community integration.

PRISON: During the first stage of reentry, the Federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP) incorcerates DC offenders in facilities located across the United States. The BOP works to place DC offenders within 500 miles of the District.

The BOP provides a number of reentry programs for eligible offenders. Service areas include vocational training, substance abuse education and treatment, health and nutrition, employment, personal finance/consumer skills, information/community resources, release requirements and procedures, and personal growth and development. For more information, see www.bop.gov.

To increase the opportunities for DC offenders, CSOSA has facilitated videoconference Community Resource Days for offenders at the Rivers Correctional Institute in Winston, North Carolina, the BOP facility with the largest number of DC offenders (approximately 1,000 of more than 6,000 DC inmates). The videoconferences enable DC-based housing, healthcare, employment, and education providers to present information to soon-to-be released offenders.

TRANSITION: Roughly half of DC inmates returning from BOP custody to CSOSA supervision transition from prison to the community through a Residential Reentry Center, commonly referred to as a halfway house.

CSOSA places Community Supervision Officers (CSOs) from its Transitional Interventions for Parole Services (TIPS) units in five Residential Reentry Centers located in Washington, DC and operated under Bureau of Prisons contracts.

Community Supervision Officers assigned to TIPS begin assessment and case planning with offenders prior to release. Transition through a Residential Reentry Center increases an inmate’s opportunity to develop a sound reentry plan and connect with necessary services in the community.

COMMUNITY INTEGRATION: The most intensive portion of CSOSA’s direct role in reentry takes place after release from prison while an offender is on parole or supervised release. CSOSA emphasizes offender accountability and opportunity through risk and needs assessment, close supervision, treatment and support services, and partnerships designed to increase CSOSA’s resources to supervise offenders and meet the diverse needs that the population presents.

Risk & Needs Assessment

CSOSA SCREENER & CASE PLANNING: CSOSA assesses each offender’s risk to the community and social needs. The results of the assessment comprise a supervision plan intended to guide the reentry process.

Close Supervision

HIGH LEVELS OF CONTACT: Offender risk level, determined by the CSOSA screener, guides the frequency with which offenders must report to Community Supervision Officers.

CSOSA-LAW ENFORCEMENT PARTNERSHIPS: Community Supervision Officers and police officers (from the Metropolitan Police Department and the DC Housing Authority Police) routinely share information on high-risk offenders, conduct Accountability Tours — in which a CSO and a police officer visit offenders in the community, and host Mass Orientations — in which police and CSOs meet with offenders just released.

SURVEILLANCE DRUG TESTING: Frequent contact with CSOs is supplemented by drug testing, ranging from twice weekly to once monthly.
GRADUATED RESPONSES: Swift and certain sanctions for rule breaking are a key to successful supervision. Sanctions include increased in-person contacts, day reporting, electronic and Global Position System (GPS) monitoring, increased drug testing, community service, and short-term residential placement.

REPORTING VIOLATIONS: New arrests and repeat violations of parole or supervised release conditions result in reports of alleged violations to the United States Parole Commission or the appropriate releasing authority.

Treatment and Support Services

SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT: CSOSA assesses high-risk offenders’ addiction severity to make clinically appropriate treatment placements. The agency’s fiscal appropriation allows for CSOSA to meet 25% of the population’s addiction treatment need. CSOSA refers lower-risk offenders to the DC Department of Health, Addiction Prevention and Recovery Administration (APRA), the agency primarily responsible for addressing the substance abuse treatment needs of eligible District residents.

REENTRY AND SANCTIONS CENTER: CSOSA opened its Reentry and Sanctions Center in February 2006. The Reentry and Sanctions Center provides offenders with a 28-day assessment and treatment preparation program prior to placement in residential or outpatient programming.

VIOLENCE REDUCTION PROGRAM: The Violence Reduction Program (VRP) is a three-phase treatment intervention for men, aged 18-35 with histories of violent, weapons, and/or drug distribution convictions.
- Phase I: Assessment and Treatment Readiness
- Phase II: Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy
- Phase III: Aftercare and Community Reintegration

EDUCATION & EMPLOYMENT: The Vocational Opportunities for Training, Education, and Employment (VOTEE) unit assesses and responds to the individual educational and vocational needs of offenders. The unit also provides adult basic education and GED preparation courses at one of four learning labs staffed by CSOSA Learning Lab Specialists. In addition, VOTEE actively maintains partnerships with the State Education Agency, Adult Education Office in collaboration with the University of District of Columbia to provide literacy services. The DC Department of Employment Services provides employment training, and placement services.

Community-Based Support

COMMUNITY SUPPORT/SOCIAL NETWORKS: The CSOSA Faith Community Partnership is designed to provide mentors for returning offenders and establish a network of faith-based institutions that may have housing, employment, substance abuse, or other resources that can benefit returning offenders.

RESIDENCE: CSO’s routinely counsel offenders to seek a healthy residential environment and encourage offenders to move, if necessary. According to DC Housing and Community Development, household income needs to reach almost $40,000 per year (or $19-20 per hour) to pay market rate rent for a two-bedroom apartment in the District. Forty-five percent of DC households report less than $35,000 in annual income. The city has an affordable housing shortage that makes residential stability a significant challenge for offenders.

MENTAL HEALTH: CSOSA refers offenders to contract psychologists for mental health screening to determine need for more in-depth psychological evaluation and treatment. The DC Department of Mental Health provides mental health psychological screening and evaluations, counseling, and community-based support services for offenders with diagnosed mental health disorders.

ID & BENEFITS: CSOSA verifies an offender’s address to assist him or her in obtaining non-driver’s identification from the Department of Motor Vehicles. CSOSA also directs offenders to appropriate DC Department of Human Services offices to apply for social services or healthcare insurance for self and/or family.

PHYSICAL HEALTH/DISABILITY: CSOSA does not provide any direct health-related services. The agency does counsel offenders to register for the DC Healthcare Alliance or Medicaid if they are eligible. DC Healthcare Alliance provides insurance coverage for residents who meet income requirements. DC Department of Health offers primary healthcare at neighborhood clinics operated by the DC Health and Hospital Public Benefit Corporation.
HALFWAY HOUSES:
BASIC FACTS AND FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS
John Howard Society of Alberta

A halfway house is a community based residential facility for offenders who, having been sentenced to a term of incarceration, have been allowed to serve a portion of their sentence under supervision in the community.

Typically, offenders live in halfway houses while they work, find a job, go to school or attend treatment or other programming.

In Canada, halfway houses may also be called Community Based Residential Facilities, Community Based Residential Centres, Community Residential Centres or Community Residential Facilities. In the United States, they may be known as Residential Reentry Centers.

Halfway houses are considerably less expensive than prisons. Halfway houses create an important bridge between institutional care and the community. They provide needed rehabilitative and residential services. They provide an opportunity for unique and innovative programming that is tailored to the needs of residents and the community.

How do most offenders end up in halfway houses?

Most offenders return to the community before they have served their entire sentence of incarceration. Release into the community before the end of a prison term is called conditional release.

How does the parole board or other granting authority decide that an offender is ready to go to a halfway house?

Just because an offender becomes eligible for day or full parole does not mean that parole will automatically be granted. The decision to release an offender to a halfway house is part of a process that is commonly known as “risk assessment.”
Before an offender can be released to a halfway house, the halfway house must approve the offender as a resident in their facility. Halfway houses can refuse offenders for a variety of reasons, including availability of resources and the potential risk of the offenders.

Are offenders free to do as they please while they are in halfway houses?

No. Offenders in halfway houses are still serving sentences. Offenders in halfway houses are simply on conditional release from prison. These conditions may include a requirement to obey a set curfew, to abstain from alcohol or other drugs, to attend substance abuse or other treatment, to attend school or other programming or to stay away from certain neighbourhoods or people.

In addition to conditions of release, all offenders in halfway houses are expected to follow house rules. House rules may include shared cleaning tasks or maintenance of one’s personal living and sleeping area. Offenders may be required to pay a certain room and board fee toward the cost of maintaining the house. Halfway houses that grant weekend passes may also require offenders to follow certain rules regarding coming and going on weekend passes.

What happens to offenders who do not obey the conditions of their release while they are in halfway houses?

Offenders who do not follow the conditions of their release can have their release revoked and will be returned to prison if they are believed to present an undue risk to the public.

Isn’t it dangerous to have a halfway house full of offenders in a residential area?

While there are no guarantees that halfway house residents will comply fully with the conditions of their release, halfway houses in general do not jeopardize community safety. Indeed, research suggests that halfway houses actually contribute to community safety by offering gradual, appropriately supervised reintegration combined with necessary treatment. Offenders who experience gradual reintegration back into the community through halfway houses have the greatest success both while on parole and after their sentence is completed.

Success rates are excellent for offenders who are released back into the community through halfway houses. Even among offenders who do not successfully complete
periods of conditional release, the majority of offenders fail because they violate a condition of the release (such as failing to attend school or other programming or failing to return to the halfway house before curfew time), not because they commit a new crime.

Do halfway houses affect the value of real estate in the neighbourhoods where they are located?

There does not appear to be any research to support the conclusion that halfway houses drive down the value of real estate in neighbourhoods where they are located.

In six major studies of communities where halfway houses were opened, no significant change in average housing prices could be found. One study performed in Ontario neighbourhoods revealed that, in 5 out of 9 neighbourhoods where halfway houses opened, average housing prices two years after opening were equal to or higher than average housing prices one year before opening.

In 1995, the British Columbia government formed a task group to study changes to property values in British Columbia communities that had “non-market housing” (which includes halfway houses). In all seven cases studied, the task group found no evidence that the presence of non-market housing negatively affected housing prices in impact areas. In 5 of the 7 projects examined, the average annual sale price increased more in the impact areas than in their control areas.
Fact Sheet: Managing Known Sex Offenders

**Do all sex offenders go on to commit additional sex crimes?**

No. Current research varies, but overall the data tells us that between 12% and 24% (or between one and three of every ten offenders) are known to have repeated their crimes. However, these rates are commonly believed to be underestimated, since we know that sex crimes often go unreported. It is important to understand that sex offenders pose varying levels of risk to reoffend: in other words, while some offenders are unlikely to offend again, others are significantly more likely to do so.

**What makes one sex offender reoffend and another not?**

It depends. The likelihood of a sex offender committing additional sex crimes in the future varies from person to person. Research tells us it is not typically a single issue that makes someone more likely to reoffend, but a combination of factors that might include problems in relationships, difficulty dealing with emotions such as anger, having antisocial values, hostile attitudes toward women, or being sexually attracted to behaviors that involve children. These are just a few examples. But again, because sex offenders vary in many ways, so does their risk to commit new sex crimes or other crimes.

**Can sex offenders be “cured”?**

No. Sex offending isn’t like an “illness” that will simply go away with a certain type of medication or treatment. This doesn’t mean that sex offenders cannot control their behavior. Specialized treatment can help sex offenders to develop important skills that can help them manage their behavior over time, which can reduce their chances of sexually abusing in the future. But whether someone will be successful depends on the person, and whether or not they are motivated to change their behaviors.

**Aren’t most sex offenders in prison?**

No. The courts can impose a variety of sentences for sex offending behavior, depending upon the offender, the facts of the case, and an individual state’s laws. While some offenders are sentenced to prison or jail, others are sentenced directly to community...
supervision (e.g., probation). For those sentenced to prison or jail, some are released (with parole or probation supervision), while others are released from prison or jail with no supervision at all. The bottom line is that the overwhelming majority of sex offenders will ultimately return to our communities. While many are sentenced to prison each year, between 10,000 and 20,000 sex offenders are released to the community annually.

Are there rules sex offenders must follow if they are under probation or parole supervision?
Yes. If a sex offender is allowed to stay in the community under supervision – or is released from prison and returns to the community under supervision, restrictions and rules are always set. Some of the rules or expectations might include the following:

- No contact with victims;
- No or limited contact with minors;
- Attend sex offender-specific treatment;
- Limited or no Internet access;
- No use of alcohol or drugs;
- Restrictions on where they can live and work;
- Restricted movement within the community and within and across state lines; and
- Report to probation/parole officer as required.
Questions & Answers About
Multi-Service Center in Mountain View

1. What is Leaders in Community Alternatives, Inc., (LCA)?

LCA is a criminal justice/social service agency which works with men and women as they release from prison to help them reintegrate successfully back into their community. By providing a structured transition we increase public safety and decrease the risks of re-offending behavior.

LCA operated a licensed residential treatment facility in San Francisco for ten years from 1991 – 2001 under contract to the State Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. The program, MILESTONES, gained citywide, statewide and national recognition for its impact on halting the revolving door syndrome for homeless parolees, and for its positive impact in the neighborhood including valuable participation in volunteer community improvement activities.

LCA prides itself on being an innovative social service agency that helps answer the many demands on our criminal justice system and in our cities, counties and state. We work in partnership with the public sector and neighborhoods to provide a safer and healthier community.

Santa Clara County has no residential beds for Santa Clara county parolees, yet there are 3,000-4,000 in the County every day.

2. What type of program will be provided by LCA?

The program will be a multi-service center for homeless men or women parolees, and is designed to assist them in a positive and successful transition back into the community after incarceration. Services will include intensive substance abuse treatment, job development and placement, case management, cognitive skills training, literacy and education, housing and assisting clients in accessing necessary social services available in the community.
Addressing recovery first and foremost in a substantive manner is a clear prerequisite for facilitating clients’ reintegration efforts, so they can return to society as productive, self sufficient members. Our program helps clients confront their addiction and change harmful behavior. The on-site programs will be comprised of recovery focused daily group meetings from 8:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. seven days a week.

We strongly believe that each client should give something back to the community. In fact, our experience has shown that clients gain tremendous satisfaction from giving back and everyone wins. MILESTONES clients cleaned graffiti, served senior meals, provided security at public events, and participated in numerous community projects. Each month clients provided over 1400 hours of community service. In Santa Clara County we expect to work with a neighborhood advisory board to establish a community service program that meets the needs of the community.

3. **What is the risk that the program’s presence in the neighborhood contributes to more crime and more criminals "hanging out" in the area?**

The clients are in a highly structured program that keeps them busy throughout the day and night. They are held strictly accountable for their participation in the program and for all activity, both inside and outside the facility. There is no loitering or wandering around the community. The “fear” of a negative impact on the neighborhood has never been borne out in President Linda Connelly's many years of experience. She knows of no time that any neighborhood problems have increased; in reality, problems have decreased. Nationwide research supports the positive impact of well managed programs in neighborhoods. In addition, if a client decides to leave the program because of an inability to handle the structure, they do not stay around the program, but rather return to their old neighborhoods, or leave all together. Letters from MILESTONES’ neighbors attest to the stability and safety we brought to the surrounding area.

4. **What type of clients will be housed in Mountain View and for how long?**

The California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation screens all potential clients for suitability for the program. Clients are returning to the community in which they live. Clients are NOT transported from other communities. No one with a criminal history involving crimes of arson, sex offense or violence, are referred to the program. Only those clients not perceived as a risk to the community are referred. Special attention is given to those clients with drug and alcohol problems, especially those who are ready for change.
The average length of stay for most clients in the program is around 4 months. Determining the length of stay is decided on a case by case basis. The State allows some parolees to remain up to 1 year.

5. **What kind of staffing will the program have?**

The program will maintain 24 hour, 7 day per week awake staffing with community program monitors. Program staff will include a Director, Assistant Director, Case Work Supervisor, Administrative Assistant, Program Assistants, Case Managers, Group Specialists, Job Developer, Interns, Maintenance Worker and volunteers.
## Crosspoint Inc of San Antonio – Myth vs. Facts and Frequently Asked Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Myth</th>
<th>Fact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crosspoint Inc is a for-profit business that makes money housing convicted criminals.</td>
<td>Crosspoint is a local, nonprofit organization. Additionally, Crosspoint residents are required to return 25% of their gross earnings to the federal government to help defray the cost of services they receive; in FY2008 they returned over $487,000. Residents are not charged by Crosspoint for any services we provide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed facility would be the largest residential reentry facility (transitional home) in Texas.</td>
<td>Proposed facility would not even be the largest in San Antonio. Cornell Companies operates two similar juvenile facilities housing over 120 residents each. In 2006, then-Councilwoman Sheila McNeil supported and voted to approve zoning for a 130-bed transitional home in District 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosspoint houses violent felons.</td>
<td>Crosspoint does not accept anyone convicted of a sexually-oriented crime or murder in any degree and is prohibited from doing so by the San Antonio Unified Development Code (35-390). The majority of Crosspoint residents are drug or immigration offenders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bringing Crosspoint to the area will increase crime.</td>
<td>Separate studies conducted by the San Antonio Police Department and UTSA both showed that “there is no indication of a spike or increase in crime rates” related to any Crosspoint facilities. In fact, research from various sources shows that crime usually decreases in the area of a transitional home due to the increased attentiveness of the facility staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosspoint residents will be free to come and go from the facility and will be roaming the streets during the day.</td>
<td>Residents are allowed to leave the facility to go to work and authorized program-related locations. As residents establish themselves an increase in privileges also allows for visits to their family homes. All resident activity in the community must be authorized in advance and it is closely monitored via phone calls, home visits and work-site visits. Strict security measures are in place such as random searches and alcohol breath tests given to all residents when they return to the facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All criminals are habitual and cannot be rehabilitated to return to society.</td>
<td>87% of Crosspoint residents are successful program graduates and return to society as productive, self-sufficient members of society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Crosspoint facility will prevent much-needed development in the area.</td>
<td>Development has not been impeded in any current Crosspoint neighborhood, and our organization has been strongly supported by existing churches, schools and businesses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fast Facts about Pioneer Human Services

Pioneer Human Services is a Seattle-based nonprofit organization that provides a Chance for Change to people overcoming the challenges of chemical dependency, mental health issues or criminal histories by integrating an array of housing, employment, training, reentry and treatment services, using earned revenue from our entrepreneurial activities.

Founded:  November 1963

Headquarters:  Seattle, WA

Employees:  978 (as of December 31, 2009)

Locations:  57 locations throughout the state of Washington

Clients served:  12,000+ annually

Operating budget:  $60.8 million in revenues (Year End 2009)

Funding sources:  99.8 percent of revenues come from earned-income resulting from the sale of products and fees for services.

Ownership:  501(c)3 Nonprofit

Business discipline

- As a national model of social enterprise, Pioneer combines the passionate pursuit of its social mission with the discipline and innovation of a for-profit business.
- Pioneer’s operating budget is generated through income earned by the organization’s enterprises and services rendered by its treatment, counseling, housing, and corrections units. Only two tenths of one percent comes from contributions or grants.

Social enterprises

Pioneer Human Services’ social enterprises provide job training/employment, treatment and counseling, housing, and re-entry services to the people Pioneer serves and fund the organization’s operating budget.

1. Distribution services:  Pioneer Distribution Services provides assembly, packaging, and warehousing for national and international corporations. Customers include Boeing Commercial Airplanes, Nintendo of America, Sasquatch Books, Northwave and Hartley and Marks.
2. **Retail cafés and catering:** Pioneer’s Mezza Café operates in two locations: in the Starbuck’s Corporate office in Seattle, and Skyline Tower in Bellevue. Each café offers a full range of weekday menu items, as well as a full range of catering services. A Taco Del Mar franchise is operated by Pioneer as part of the café in the Seattle location.

3. **Central food services:** Pioneer’s Central Food Services operates a central kitchen facility, preparing and delivering almost one million meals annually to a variety of external customers and to residents in Pioneer’s programs. Meals are provided to other nonprofits such as Senior Services of King County and other care centers.

4. **Food buying service:** Pioneer’s Food Buying Service sells dry goods to nonprofits and government organizations, including food banks, and school districts in the western states.

5. **Sheet metal fabrication:** Operating as a part of Pioneer Industries, the sheet metal fabrication division provides precision sheet metal and water jet cut products to customers in a range of industries, including electronics, construction, commercial food preparation, and telecommunications.

6. **Precision machining:** The precision machining division operates as a part of Pioneer Industries and manufacturers more than 8,000 different parts for Boeing alone, as well as a number of other aerospace and commercial customers.

7. **Construction:** Pioneer Construction Services provides capital improvement, repair and maintenance services to its various locations and offers similar maintenance services to a number of national brand retailers, such as Macy’s, Toys “R” Us, T-Mobile and many others.

8. **Bed bug detection services:** Pioneer Construction Services offers canine detection and inspection services along with a trained labor pool to assist with proper preparation for the treatment and remediation of bed bugs.

9. **Behavioral health services group:** Residential, outpatient, and intervention programs provide an array of treatment services for adults, youth and families. Units are located in King, Pierce, Skagit, Snohomish, Spokane, Whatcom, and Yakima counties. The Residential segment includes chemical dependency, long-term involuntary and mental health treatment for adults and youth. Outpatient services include mental health treatment for adults and youth, and chemical dependency treatment for adults. The intervention segment includes service for at risk youth and their families.

10. **Community corrections:** Pioneer operates one of the largest local offender reentry programs in the country, serving adults and juveniles in seventeen residential reentry programs under contract with federal and state agencies. Our state work release facilities are in Cowlitz, King, Kitsap, Spokane, Pierce, and Yakima. Four federal residential reentry centers are in Bellingham, King, Pierce, and Spokane counties. The Basic Training Camp for juvenile offenders is located in Franklin County. A program serving youth pending immigration proceedings is located in Pierce County.

11. **Housing:** Pioneer operates 656 units of low-cost, barrier free housing among 20 buildings throughout the state. Seven properties provide 220 units of permanent housing to individuals and families and the remaining thirteen locations offer 436 units of transitional housing serving those in recovery from substance abuse mental illness and homelessness. Specialized residential programs include facilities for homeless veterans and offender reentry services. Several
partnerships exist with local services providers who offer case management and supportive services.

12. **Consulting:** Pioneer Consulting Services provides consulting services to nonprofit organizations, foundations and other groups in the area of social enterprise operation, analysis and assistance. Tours and on-site meetings are provided.

**Recidivism Rate**
Pioneer has one of the lowest recidivism rates in the nation, based on research conducted by the University of Washington which was funded by The Ford Foundation and The Casey Foundation. Only 6.4 percent of its work-release clients who were included in the study returned to prison after being discharged from the program for two years.

**Awards & Recognition**
- Named one of the White House’s Thousand Points of Light, 1990
- *Fast Company* Social Justice Award, 2000
- Municipal League of King County’s Organization of the Year (2002)
- Pioneer’s “Chance for Change” approach identified as one of the exemplary programs of Washington state in the *Report of the Re-Entry Policy Council*, 2004
- *Fast Company* Social Capitalist Award, 2006, 2007 (one of country’s top 25 social capitalists)
- Washington State Housing Finance Commission – Friend of Housing Award 2009

**Executives**
- Karen Lee, CEO
- Tracey Groscoast, CFO and Senior Vice President, Finance and Administration
- Larry M. Fehr, Senior Vice President, Corrections and Behavioral Health Services
- Marla Gese, Senior Vice President, Real Estate Services
- Sandy Gibb, Senior Vice President, Enterprises
- Cynthia Parker, Senior Vice President, Human Resources
- Barry Antos, Chief of Program Development
- LorieAnn Larson, Senior Management Associate and Consulting Services

**Historical Information:**
For historical milestones and other organizational information, please visit:


###
What are Community Residential Facilities?
Community Residential facilities provide places to live with 24-hour on site services for adults and children needing assistance or supervision and are often referred to as "special needs housing".

Examples of Community Residential Facilities:
- Group homes for Adults or youth transitioning to the community from correctional facilities
- Group homes for persons recovering from alcohol or drug addiction
- Shelters for women and children who've been victims of domestic violence
- Shelters for homeless persons
- Residential treatment facilities for persons with a mental illness

Why is there a need for community-based special needs housing and social services?
- The movement away from placing people with disabilities, or those recovering from alcohol and drug addictions, into large institutions;
- Decreasing federal support for public and low income housing;
- Changes in family support structures; and
- Voter approved initiatives that have contributed to increased incarceration rates and support services for a larger population of parolees.
- These people are part of the community too.

What is the government's role in special needs housing?
There is no "one size fits all" answer to the question of governmental responsibility for housing or services licensing, siting, or operation. Government at all levels, may or may not have a role in special needs housing and social services. When the government has a role, the role varies, depending on the laws or regulations that dictate the provision of the housing or service. The county or state usually manages licensing or contracting of
services for housing and assistance programs; the City of Portland does not license special needs housing or social service facilities. Land use siting is generally the role of city or county government.

**How do Land Use laws relate to the siting of special needs housing?**
In order to comply with the Federal Fair Housing Act and State of Oregon land use planning laws, the City of Portland must provide opportunities for siting special needs housing and social services without discrimination against these facilities based on presumptions about residents' or clients' behavior or disability.

**Can the City dictate where a facility can be sited?**
The City's Bureau of Planning can often dictate where the facility may not be sited. Special needs housing and social service uses may locate in zones where they are "allowed by right" as long as they meet all the explicit, objective standards for that use and that location, as listed in the Zoning Code. In some cases, a proposed land use is subject to a conditional use review, using an expanded set of approval criteria already listed in the Zoning Code. If the proposal meets these criteria, then it must be approved. Proposals that do not meet the conditional use criteria are denied.

**How are land uses regulated?**
Land uses in the City are regulated by a series of land use zones. The main categories of zones are industrial, employment, commercial, mixed-use, and residential (single dwelling and multi-dwelling). For each zone, the Zoning Code specifies which uses are allowed by right, which uses are prohibited, and which uses may be allowed if approved through a discretionary land use review, usually known as a conditional use. Typically, for example, commercial uses are prohibited in the residential zones. "Allowed by right" means that a use is allowed if it meets objective development standards listed in the Zoning Code, such as setback, parking, and building height.

**What's the difference between Household and Group Living?**
The regulations vary by zone and use. For example, group living is allowed by right in commercial zones. In multi-dwelling zones, small group living homes (up to 15 residents) are allowed by right and large group living homes (more than 15 residents) are considered conditional uses. In the single dwelling zones, group living homes of all sizes are conditional uses.
Household living is allowed by right in residential and commercial zones. The definition of household living includes but is not limited to:

- Families of any size plus up to five unrelated people (families can include youths under court appointed guardianship),
- Up to six unrelated people, or
- Any number of people who meet the Federal Fair Housing Act's definition of "handicapped" plus up to five unrelated people.

What criteria are used to determine if a use is allowed?
Before a conditional use is allowed, it is reviewed against a set of discretionary approval criteria usually in a public hearing. Notice, when required, is provided to the neighbors before the hearing. The criteria for group living homes and many other conditional uses focus on issues such as neighborhood livability, physical compatibility, function of the area, and public services. Hearing officers make final siting decisions for the City of Portland. Both allowed-bv-right and conditional uses must meet explicit development standards established in the Zoning Code for such rules as density, height, setbacks, and site size.

Is neighborhood notification of a siting proposal required?
Sometimes, but not always. The Federal Fair Housing Act, as amended in 1988, prohibits local governments from imposing special regulations on housing for people with special needs that would not be imposed on a related family. If notification was provided for these uses, it could be considered illegal and discriminatory. Notice is required by law when a proposal for post-incarceration group living home undergoes a conditional use review. Notice of the conditional use application and public hearing is sent by the City's Bureau of Planning to property owners within 400 feet of the proposed site and to all neighborhood and business associations whose boundaries are within 100 feet of the site. Notice is also posted at the site.

Siting Best Practices
Although, notification of many types of facilities is not required, the Community Residential Siting Advisory Committee (CRSAC) has developed recommended siting best practices to ensure that facilities are sited in the most legal, fair, and neighborly fashion. Those recommendations are customized according to the type of facility being proposed instead of a "one size fits all" approach. Please note that not all of these recommended best practices are appropriate for every type of Community Residential Facility.

If a facility is proposed for my neighborhood, what questions should I ask?
1. What will this facility look like?
2. How will it fit into the neighborhood?
3. Are there traffic or parking issues that need to be considered?
4. How will the facility/home be operated and will the residents be supervised?
5. Has the facility operator had previous experience with this type of housing?
6. How should we interact with our new neighbors?

What about health and safety issues?
These are common concerns about special needs housing. Fair housing law does not allow people to hide behind their protected class. As a general rule, this means that people in protected classes must follow rules and regulations that govern the rest of the population. Also, fair housing laws do not cover people who are a direct threat to people or property. Because people tend to make assumptions about people they are unfamiliar with, the law does require objective proof of the threat.

What is the Community Residential Siting Program?
The Community Residential Siting Program (CRSP) is designed to address issues, questions and concerns of citizens, neighborhood associations, social service providers, and service recipients related to the siting and operations of Community Residential Facilities in Portland, Fairview, Troutdale, Gresham, Wood Village, and Multnomah County.

What are the CRSP Services

- Provide information and referral for siting-related questions
- Facilitate problem solving, strategy discussions, and resolution of specific issues arising before and during the siting process
- Mediate issues that arise after a facility has been sited
- Offer community relations services, including education and information

Note: Much of the information in this guidebook was provided by the 1996 publication "Going Home"; a discussion guide for community-based housing for those with special needs produced by the Bureau of Housing and Community Development.

Where can I find more information?
See our list of useful links, or contact Judith Mowry at 503-823-4424
WHAT ARE COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS?

The goals of community corrections are to contribute to public safety and reduce future criminal conduct

What do Community Corrections Do?

- Evaluate each offender’s likelihood to commit new crimes
- Monitor offenders according to behavior and risk to re-offend, concentrating their efforts on those offenders who are most likely to re-offend
- Holding offenders accountable to conditions of supervision
- Applying a continuum of effective community-based punishments according to behavior and risk to re-offend
- Offering programs designed to reduce the risk of a return to criminal activity

Principles: Effective Practices

- Financial Consideration + Improved System
- Coordinated local criminal justice response will impact crime better than a short prison stay
- Community based sanctions are effective against crime

Community based Services

- Alcohol/drug treatment
- Mental health treatment
- Sex offender treatment
- Domestic violence treatment
- Drug courts
- Cognitive restructuring
- Anger management

Community based sanctions

- Electronic home detention
- Community service and work crews
- Intensive supervision
- Work release
- Day reporting
- Jail

Graduated Sanctions

- Funding includes dollars for community sanctions
- Administrative sanction process supports use of community sanctions
- History: statewide policy to reduce technical revocations
- Present: needed to manage local CJS resources
Performance Measures

- Reduce Criminal Behaviors
  Reduce recidivism, as measured by felony convictions from initial admission to supervision, tracking for three years from admission.

- Enforce Court and Board Orders
  Increase percentage of positive case closures

- Assist Offenders to Change
  Increase employment rates for offenders on supervision.
  Increase the rate of participation in treatment programs for offenders on supervision.

- Provide Reparation to Victims
  Increase the percentage of restitution and compensatory fines collected, owed to victims.
  Increase the number of community service hours provided by offenders on supervision. Reduce recidivism
COMMUNITY ASSESSMENT ACTION STEPS

A. Generate a Map of the your targeted Neighborhood(s)

1. Show schools, transportation routes, churches, parks, rec. centers, day care centers, and police stations.

2. Determine the density of halfway housing and other social service programs already in existence. (A sample map of Portland is included in the Tool Kit CD-ROM.)

Action Steps:

- Access land use department information, also “department of neighborhoods” in most municipalities, also other social service agencies

- Visit the National Atlas of Sentencing and Corrections at http://justiceatlas.org to see a ZIP-code level view of where prison inmates, probationers, and parolees are from; the number of people in prison, the number released from prison each year, and the number on probation or parole. Includes data on income level, employment status, the number of single-parent households, and racial demographics for each jurisdiction.

- Identify, communicate with, and join any existing Reentry Council or Reentry Team at the local, regional or state levels. Some even have staffed offices out of City Hall.

Identify Potential Community Resources for your Clients

B. Identify Medical clinics, One Stops/Employment services, government offices, transportation routes, educational and training programs and facilities, social service agencies, libraries, and recreation centers
C. Check out state/local registration laws, especially those applying to sex offenders. Entering “Criminal Registration Laws” into Google Search yields most results by state.

D. Identify Community Leaders. Check out the local City or County Council members to see who has supported residential programs of any kind in the past. By talking to them, you’ll learn much about the local zoning situation.
Building Bridges by Kevin Downey, Ph.D.

Building relationships is a critical element to the community corrections program siting process. Unfortunately, it is too often addressed superficially while the technical considerations of zoning take center stage. Many community corrections program planners underestimate the importance of having constructive and collaborative relationships in place before starting the process of planning for a new reentry facility. Doble and Lindsay (2003, p.3) found that public officials far preferred “A halfway house run by local people who are known and trusted by the community.” Public officials, however, represent just one group that successful planners must be prepared to engage and gain either their support or acquiescence.

Doing the analytical “advance-work” tied to site selection is critical to a successful project, but is not sufficient. Planners must understand local ordinances, state laws and regulations related to zoning. It is not uncommon to encounter zoning regulations that classify residential reentry centers/halfway houses/transitional homes as correctional institutions (“prisons”). Even without such systemic zoning challenges, great care must be taken in learning as much as possible about the area(s) being evaluated, knowing the location of all area school, daycares, parks, etc.

The next step is to gather data needed to gain allies. Supporters of community corrections need to be ready to address common myths (e.g., public safety risks, decline in property values, unsupervised client movement) that will inevitably arise when engaging the public. Have ready a “Myths vs. Facts” Sheet tailored to your locale. Develop a list of benefits derived from having a reentry center in the area; obtain local statistics on crime and crime reduction; gather data on property values associated with residential reentry programs; and present a clear, concise, positive message. These persuasive elements can be used proactively with the media, community stakeholders or in response to issues raised early in the effort to site a new or expanded facility. Agency Board members and others fielding questions about the facility should study these materials prior to public engagements so that they can speak extemporaneously about the issues and present accurate and consistent messages.

Depending on the audience, the benefits derived from reentry facilities can be framed in terms of community or neighborhood. Know your local city council members and
zoning commissioners, and which officials are most likely to be open-minded about siting a new or expanded program. City-wide politicians and policy makers are more likely to be swayed by general information related to recidivism reduction, reduced victimization, cost efficiency of community-based services, increased pool of motivated workers, etc. Neighborhood organizers, politicians and opinion leaders may agree that such services are essential to the community, but would prefer such services to be rendered in a different neighborhood. They need to hear how the neighborhood might benefit from having a reentry program in the area. These may include employment prospects, money spent at neighborhood businesses, potential service partnership opportunities, providing a possible new venue for neighborhood organization events and activities, collaborative efforts to improve quality of life for neighborhood residents, and potential for reducing neighborhood crime.

**Any successful effort will normally require multiple allies.** Enlist community activists or other neighborhood opinion leaders, local politicians, local law enforcement, subject matter experts and researchers from local universities and colleges, potential community service partners, local ministers or other members of the faith community, prominent business leaders and local philanthropic groups. The media can play an important role, but they often prefer to focus on controversy. Consequently, it may be better to build bridges of acceptance with community opinion leaders and other stakeholders before reaching out to the media. When meeting with the news media, it is often helpful to have some supportive opinion leaders present during these meetings. Prioritizing the sequence of those to engage should be guided by identifying those groups and individuals most likely to be supportive of a siting effort. Individual meetings should take place before meeting neighborhood or community stakeholder groups.

Careful analysis will reveal not only who is most likely to be supportive, but who is likely to be steadfast in their opposition. Even those in strong opposition may be swayed by others living in close proximity whose opinions they respect. Analysis may also be aided by local “expert” advisors who are activists, business owners or members of the faith community themselves. While early engagement with potential supporters is critical, care must be taken to avoid alienating the opposition. Local experts may be of great assistance in addressing engagement and alienation issues, but they must also be made aware of the limits of this advisory role. Potential service providers are the face of the organization while local experts play only a supporting role.

**Once a foundation of individual support is developed, community meetings must be arranged.** It is beneficial for the potential provider to set up the early meetings in a supportive (or at least neutral) venue. Having your strongest supporters present and willing to publicly voice their support will be very helpful. Each neighborhood is
different, but support from local law enforcement and/or neighborhood church and business leaders can create a positive tone to the meeting.

**Community meetings can be extremely challenging even in the best of circumstances** and a potential service provider should be prepared to participate in several meetings. Opponents will organize community meetings which are likely to take place in unfriendly venues. Providers must stay on message, remain respectful and not respond in kind to negative emotional statements. Sometimes the only positive to be taken away from such a meeting is that the attendees witnessed a caring, knowledgeable service provider who did not wither in the face of unrestrained verbal attacks. This may alter the opinion of those who are neutral or only mildly opposed. There is some anecdotal evidence that well-known local non-profits may have an easier time overcoming the lack of trust often encountered in the community engagement process. Opponents usually fear what they do not understand and their resistance is based on that fear.

A successful siting project is one that engages, educates and inspires the community members who are most directly impacted.
CREATING ALLIES/DEVELOPING RELATIONSHIPS

A. Board and Staff Preparation

1. Ask Board members whom they personally know among local for names of leaders representing the general community and the specific target neighborhood(s)
2. Prepare and provide each Board member with a brief “elevator presentation” to assure accuracy and consistency in portraying the agency. The message should define who you are, not defend your activities.
3. Provide Board and staff member with “Frequently Asked Questions.: Prepare for their private consumption a list of the “Ten Worst Questions” that might be asked.
4. Remind staff that they are public representatives of the organization and to behave with professional discretion in sharing any information about clients.
5. Promulgate an Agency policy on responding to media queries and questions from the public. All inquiries should be directed to one, single official spokesperson for the agency. (The spokesperson should designate an emergency back-up contact person.)

Note: The nature and structure of your local community will dictate the order in which you approach the various audiences mentioned below. In many cities, your first contact should be with the Mayor. In other communities, you will first approach County government. In others, you may wish to begin at the grassroots with representatives of the neighborhood you are approaching. Before approaching them, review their mission and vision statements to see how they stack up against your own.

B. Law Enforcement Engagement

1. Approach the local Chief of Police to explain your intentions to open or expand a program or facility in their jurisdiction, answer any questions, and solicit his public support. Share with him a summary of the RFP to which your bid is responding, as well as your organizational history.
2. Approach the County Sheriff to seek his support.
3. Consult with Probation and Parole officials operating in the targeted jurisdiction.
4. Reach out to law enforcement officials in the surrounding communities as well, to apprise them of your plans to open or expand a facility or program.

5. Obtain written endorsements, testimonials, or letters of support that you may share with the public.

6. Formally thank each law enforcement ally for their time and support. Maintain contact with all law enforcement personnel you have approached throughout the siting process to assure their continuing interest and support.

C. Neighborhood/Community Associations

1. Outline in writing and distribute widely a list of benefits to the community offered by the program or facility, which includes increased police protection, employment opportunities, infrastructure upgrades, community service projects, etc.

2. Contact other service agencies in the neighborhood, other halfway houses, and treatment providers, to explain your intentions and solicit their engagement and support.

3. Notify University or college criminal justice programs in the community of your plans; they see community corrections programs as an asset for internships and other learning and research opportunities.

D. Government Officials

1. Consult first with the City Council representative for the targeted neighborhood to explain your plans and answer questions. Check beforehand to see where they are in their election cycle.

2. Consult with the Zoning Board.

3. Create Talking Points for your allies to use.

4. Bring some allies (business leaders, faith leaders) to meetings with local political leaders and officials. Include family members of formerly incarcerated people.

E. Churches, Synagogues, Mosques and other Religious Institutions

1. Create and distribute widely a “We Need Your Help” tool explaining how churches can provide bridges back home for incarcerated people returning to their homes and families.

2. Provide contact information to local churches for national resources on prisoner reentry, such as the Prison Fellowship.

3. Co-present at neighborhood meetings with a pastor.

4. Reach out to local churches to provide spiritual support or even mentoring.

5. Ask local churches to consider providing direct services such as counseling or treatment programs to your clients.
6. Those not interested in providing direct services may invite client participation in their other programs such as clothes closets, bus passes, money for GED testing, or for medicine.

F. Schools Within 500 Feet of the Proposed Facility

1. Create and share “Myths and Realities” Fact Sheets on reentry.
2. Visit school Principals and PTA Presidents to provide reassurances concerning the safety of the facility and the accountability standards to which clients will be held.
3. Share the agency’s security protocols with school leaders
4. Exchange contact information with school leaders

G. Business Leaders, Civic Organizations, and Local Economic and Industrial Development Organization

1. Generate and circulate Economic impact data Fact Sheets.
2. Share information on “Myths v. Realities” of reentry.
4. Share information about new job opportunities for the community, and the contributions to be made by tax-paying former clients/
5. Co-present to local business and civic groups with a supportive business/civic leader
6. Maintain ongoing relationships with these organizations over time.
JAG Funds Chemical Dependency and Mental Health Treatment Programs

The incidence of serious mental illnesses, such as schizophrenia, major depression, bipolar disorder and post-traumatic stress disorder, is two to four times higher among offenders than it is among those in the general population. Research has demonstrated that among offenders with serious mental disorders, more than 70% also have a substance abuse problem. The Alvis House Reflections Program, which JAG monies help to fund, provides comprehensive drug and alcohol and mental health services to its participants over a six-month period. Chemical dependency and mental health needs are addressed by a committed team of professionals including a psychologist, psychiatrist, case manager, social worker, program manager, and community corrections specialist. The goal of these programs is to help clients break the cycle of mental illness symptoms, substance abuse, and criminal behavior and maximize their potential for living and functioning effectively in the community.

Alvis House operates programs in Columbus, Dayton, Chillicothe and Toledo, Ohio. The agency’s mission is “To serve communities by providing research-based programs and services that promote healthier families, personal responsibility and public safety.”

Christina and Michael with their children, Christopher and Gabby (being held by Michael). Michael was a client in the Alvis House Reflections Program for individuals with cooccurring substance abuse and mental health issues, which JAG monies help to fund. Christina, Christopher and Gabby participated in the family support program. Michael says, “The staff at Alvis House was very supportive and helpful. Coming to this program is one of the best things I could have done. I have a path to a new way of living now and my family and I understand each other a little better, too.”

Michael successfully completed the Alvis House program in April 2007, went home to live with his family and is now employed and working to further his education.
CASE STUDY IN CRISIS COMMUNICATIONS

Overview of Pioneer Human Services
- Referred to by the Reentry Policy Council as “the largest local program serving individuals released from prison in the country” (Report of the RPC, p. 583).
- Created as WA State nonprofit in 1963.
- Provides residential reentry centers, jobs and training, housing, & treatment services.
- Of 58 locations, 16 are residential reentry programs for FBOP, WA DOC, etc.

Pioneer Human Services in the News
- Pioneer cultivates positive media portrayals
- Many local and national examples
- Has media policy, Public Information Officer and PR consultant

Critical Incident
- On October 17, 2005, Resident (Milam) escapes from Seattle RRC program
- Is seen at nightclub where a Seattle Seahawk player (Hamlin) is assaulted
- Milam found murdered the next morning
- Allegations by Milam’s family fuel the fire!
- News & sports coverage

Critical Incident: The Rest of the Story
- FBOP Investigation
- Seattle Police Department find no connection between Hamlin’s assault and Milam
- FBOP investigation concludes that: “rules, procedures, and staff conduct were fully reviewed and found to be in compliance…”

Critical Incident: The Fallout
- Extensive media coverage of allegations, but none noting exoneration
- Board concerns: new policy and Public Information Officer (PIO) position
• Insurance documentation
• Lawsuit (dismissed)
• Improved security
• Staff development
• (Hamlin recovery)

Comparing “Best Practices” to Incident & Reentry (Institute for Public Relations)

Phase 1: Pre-Crisis = Preparing and preventing a crisis
• Crisis Management Plan and Team
• Trained Spokesperson
• Pre-Draft Messages

At Pioneer, prevention planning and preparation for a crisis was minimal
Pioneer had a Public Relations consultant Pioneer had a media policy
Pioneer CEO was designated at spokesperson
Pioneer had fact sheets & media kits were available, but not draft messages

Phase 2: Crisis Response = What management does after crisis
• Avoid “no comment”
• Check all facts
• Within first hour
• Concern for victims
• Include employees

Complicating Pioneer response was an FBOP Memo: “All media shall be
directed to Community Corrections Office,” referred to FOIA Pioneer’s
Statement of Work precludes contractor from investigating possible
misconduct
Who is/are the victims? Milam/Hamlin/community Were employees
somehow involved in escape?

Phase 3: Post-Crisis= Look for ways to better prepare
• Reputation repair
• Keep stakeholders updated
• Evaluate crisis management for lessons learned
Pioneer’s Crisis Management Plan and Policy Revised Public Information Officer Hired and Trained Thorough review of security and staff training conducted Continued efforts to repair reputation (such as ACA accreditation) but limited public exposure

**Concluding Thoughts**

- As the IPR report notes, “no organization is immune from a crisis,” but critical incidents involving residents and staff are an inherent risk for community correctional programs.
- Reentry programs frequently have contractual and policy requirements that preclude or restrict the “normal” PR best practices. They need to plan for this in advance.
- Although we may help thousands of clients to safely reintegrate, one heinous incident can jeopardize an entire program, especially given the politics involved.
- These reasons make it all the more important that community correctional programs develop proactive crisis communication policies and plans. A dialogue on these issues with contracting agencies should take place.

**Workshop “Being Ready to Battle Bad Publicity Arising from Community Reentry Incidents” Larry Fehr, Pioneer Human Services American Correctional Association, August 9, 2008**
CRISIS COMMUNICATIONS

A crisis can happen to any organization -- large or small, public or private. When it does, you must take immediate, corrective action to remedy the problem. You must also communicate your actions immediately and sometimes repeatedly to all appropriate audiences. Failure to communicate or to communicate effectively creates the perception that the crisis is continuing out of control, or that you are hiding something or are indifferent to public concern.

There have been many instances where an organization did an excellent job of containing or correcting the emergency, but failed to communicate those positive actions. The usual result was that the crisis was prolonged or the organization failed to recover at all. Successful crisis management involves communication as well as emergency response activities.

What is a crisis?
A crisis is an event requiring rapid decisions involving the media that, if handled incorrectly, can damage an organization's credibility and reputation.

There are two types of crises:
- Instantaneous (e.g., fire, explosion, etc.)
- Smoldering (e.g., a pattern of harassment, discrimination, etc.)

Crises need not be the seemingly unpredictable and uncontrollable events that their victims too often perceive, or allow them to become.

Your two goals in any crisis situation are to establish yourself as a credible source of information and to put a caring and compassionate face on the name of your company.

Five stages of a crisis
1. Identification:
   - The critical stage in which you determine whether an event has turned into an emergency, and is likely to escalate into a crisis. Avoid denial!
   - Separate facts from speculation.
2. **Containment:**
   - The stage in which you try to contain information about your crisis (e.g., local vs. national or international story, one-day story vs. week-long story, back page vs. front page, etc.).
   - Timely, honest, forthright response to the media can help you achieve containment.
   - Refusing or delaying communication to the media implies you are hiding something and will only serve to prolong or expand the media coverage of your crisis.

3. **Communication:**
   - Communicate as quickly as possible and as frequently as is appropriate.
   - Delaying communication will send reporters may go elsewhere to get their information after which it may be difficult or impossible for you to correct reports of inaccurate information.
   - Communicate both externally (e.g., media) and internally (e.g., employees and other stakeholders).
   - Be consistent in your communications. Don't say one thing to employees and another thing to the media.

4. **Format for your Press Briefing**
   - Introduce yourself -- name and organization
   - Set the ground rules -- explain how you will conduct the briefing
   - Make your statement -- reading it is ok
   - Be sure to express empathy and caring
   - Allow time for Q&A only if you decide if you will take questions
   - End/Exit the interview

5. **Correction**
   - The media are motivated by what went wrong, who's to blame, and what has changed to prevent further incidents
   - The media will want to know, "Do you recognize this as a problem? What are you going to do to prevent it from happening again?"
   - Explain what you are doing to investigate the problem. If possible, explain what corrective measures you are taking to prevent the problem from recurring.
6. Recovery:
   - Recovery starts at the beginning of your crisis -- when you properly identify your event as a crisis.
   - Your goal is to have as short a recovery period as possible.
   - You must convince people that you care and want to do what is right.
   - If you "break even" after an incident and keep your credibility and reputation intact, you have succeeded.
   - Being accessible to the media in order to communicate your messages to the public will facilitate recovery.
   - Remember, your goal is to communicate with the public; the media are merely a conduit.

**Crisis Communications Center**

A crisis communications center serves as a central news center in times of an emergency. It provides you with a suitable location in which to brief the news media.

- Select and equip your facility well in advance of an emergency.
- Choose a room large enough to accommodate multiple reporters.
- The room can continue to serve the original purpose for which it was designed (e.g., conference room), but it should be adapted now to serve in a future emergency.
- Be sure the room contains ample electrical and telephone outlets for laptop computers.
- Provide extra phones and fax machines.
- Dedicate a corner of the room to accommodate coffee, soft drinks, snacks.
- When selecting a room, look for good entrance and exit capability. The person who communicates with the media should not walk through the media either to speak to them or to leave. Try to have a door to your back when briefing the news media.
- If there is no suitable room for the crisis communications center at your location, or if the crisis has rendered your room unusable, then select an alternate crisis management site (e.g., hotel conference room).
- Your event might occur far from your planned crisis communications center. For example, you might end up talking to the media in the middle of a field somewhere. That's ok. Tell the media that is where you will continue to communicate.
The goal is to provide a central location for all company communications during a crisis. By helping the media do their jobs better, you help your organization. Together you become a team helping the public understand what can easily be an easily misunderstood situation.

After an Emergency

Anticipate media follow-up

Expect and prepare for follow-up inquiries several days after the emergency. Also, news reports in one medium can trigger interest by other media a day or two after the emergency.

Monitor news coverage

Monitor the print and broadcast news coverage of the emergency. Depending on the severity of the emergency and length of media interest, monitoring may be required for more than a day or two. (You may want to obtain videotapes of the TV news coverage from a video monitoring service if you have not been taping the broadcasts yourself.) Are the news reports accurate? Is there a need to get inaccurate reports corrected? Do editorials or letters to the editor indicate community concern?

Obtain positive PR

One of the most important opportunities to obtain positive public relations comes after the emergency is over. As appropriate, release to the news media, as soon as possible, company decisions about special employee or community relief, plant reconstruction, etc. Express gratitude to the community, police and fire departments, emergency crews, medical personnel and employees for their help.

The Ammerman Experience Copyright 2005
MEDIA RELATIONS AND COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS
The CSOSA Experience

By Leonard A. Sipes, Jr.

The Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency (CSOSA) is the parole and probation entity for Washington, D.C. It is a federal, executive branch agency. CSOSA prides itself on state-of-the-art practices, with some of the lowest caseloads and best contact standards, drug treatment options and programmatic initiatives in the country. Our information systems are first rate.

CSOSA decided in 2004 to embark on aggressive and comprehensive public relations outreach efforts to support strategic initiatives. Community corrections (and corrections in general) face immense public relations challenges. According to national surveys of confidence in the criminal justice system, corrections pales in comparison to law enforcement and the judiciary (see Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics from the Bureau of Justice Statistics).

The emphasis on offender reentry from prison is one example as to how the public looks at our activities. Although most of the rhetoric on reentry comes from national sources, the great majority of decisions regarding supervision and services for returning offenders will be made at the state and local levels.

The public will support this and other community corrections initiatives based solely on their ability to trust the local system assigned with implementation. The average citizen and reporter have never been exposed to national reentry advocates and their positions. All fellow citizens know about corrections is what they read in the paper and view on local TV. But when the media carries endless stories of offenders committing violent crimes as the sole message, our ability to enter or affect the discussion is greatly diminished.
Critical ingredients in media and public relations

A Service Orientation

The news media is very important to us. Unless you have an advertising budget, everything will be filtered and distributed through them. Establishing favorable media relations can only be accomplished by taking their needs into serious consideration. We believe that you have to be honest and fair in order to get the same in return. We are available around the clock through agency cell phones and Blackberry’s. We have access to the CSOSA information system through home computers. We have laptops with wireless broadband capacity. We have the authorization, tools and knowledge to take care of media needs.

Proactive Marketing

We market to the media as often as we market to the public. In a hyper-competitive media market like the nation’s Capitol, we know that our proactive efforts will not get all the exposure we want. But when a reporter writes about a parolee involved in a violent crime, we are hopeful that the reporter or editor also knows of the quality and comprehensiveness of our efforts closely supervise and obtain services for our clients. At the very least, they will know what we are trying to accomplish.

We are also concerned about our national reputation. We want recognition for developing and implementing best practices. We have sometimes found it easier to market to CBS News and National Public Radio than to local media. But while national exposure is valued, our local media connections are the ones that will play the greatest role in defining our effectiveness.

We believe in proactive efforts as the foundation of good public relations. Beyond pitching story ideas to reporters, we are systematic in our outreach efforts. These include:

1. A quarterly television show that is played approximately 600 times each year by D.C and metropolitan government and community access stations. Considering the majority of reporters (and other important partners) do not live in Washington (it’s an expensive town) regional exposure allows us to reach them in communities where they live.

2. A first-rate website (www.csosa.gov) due to be unveiled this spring. We believe that upon completion, it will rank among the best criminal justice web and pod and video casting sites in the nation. A fully functioning site can become the equivalent of a full time public relations staff position.
3. Writing story-oriented articles for national criminal justice publications and using them to populate the web site. In three years, staff has created approximately 40 articles and fact sheets to explain our activities in a friendly, non-technical way.

4. The creation and promotion of podcasts (radio shows) for placement on the web site. We will use podcasts to explain what we do, to promote special initiatives, and recruit new employees. We will also strip audio from video products to use as podcasts (http://media.csosa.gov or www.csosa.gov).

5. The creation and promotion of videocasts, which is nothing more than using existing CSOSA TV shows and video products and promoting them as web-based internet products (http://media.csosa.gov or www.csosa.gov).

6. The creation of a comprehensive e-mail and fax list to carry our message to local and national media and to interested national professionals and citizens of the District. Our new web site will also contain an e-mail signup option.

7. OurCommunityJusticeProgramssectionemploys5community representatives whose job is to attend community functions in the city where crime is on the agenda.

8. Our Office of Legislative, Intergovernmental and Public Affairs is in constant contact with federal and D.C. government officials and staff and other institutions to explain and advocate our agendas. The public affairs team is part of this office.

The above is simply a sample of what we are trying to accomplish through our public relations efforts. The bottom line is that we believe that we are major players in the effort to protect the safety of the citizens we serve. We are dedicated professionals who are operating in everyone’s best interest, thus we have little to hide and much to contribute.

When the inevitable criminal act is committed by one of the 15,000 offenders we supervise daily, we hope that most members of the media will place the crime into proper perspective. We believe that this is done through an honest acknowledgement of our efforts to closely supervise offenders and help them to transform their lives.
Successful community correctional programs depend upon a working partnership with the media. Bad media relations will impede progress and undermine your ability to reach the public. In governmental public relations, the public’s trust and respect are everything. Without it, nothing good will happen. To get it, you need the media.

Len Sipes spent 14 years as the Director of Public Relations for the Maryland Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services. Independent university research documented a gain of 30 percentage points (from 20 to 50 percent) in the public’s favorable opinion of the agency during his time there.
NATIONAL MEDIA RESOURCES/WEB SITES FOR CRIMINAL JUSTICE INFORMATION-2008

For reporters, it’s essential to reach knowledgeable specialists who will save you time by providing quotable information, helpful documents via download and referrals to knowledgeable, media friendly experts.

**Key sources for criminal justice information**

The Office of Justice Programs ([http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov](http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov)) is the umbrella organization for a variety of federal criminal justice and statistical efforts. The most useful organizations are the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) and the National Institute of Justice (NIJ). Both provide lists of publications that are useful for story purposes. Their subject specialists are always helpful, and will refer you to other media friendly experts and resources.

Another good generic national site is the National Criminal Justice Reference Service ([http://www.ncjrs.org](http://www.ncjrs.org)) another OJP funded organization. Their subject specialists are there to refer you to relevant organizations and experts. They will also refer you to web sites for quick document downloads.

**Other useful organizations**

**Crime Statistics**

The FBI [http://www.fbi.gov/publications.htm](http://www.fbi.gov/publications.htm) for information on national, state and local crimes “reported” to law enforcement

The Bureau of Justice Statistics [http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs.](http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs.) (For information on national crime surveys for “total” crime figures, see their “Criminal Victimization in the United States” series.)
**Law Enforcement**

The International Association of Chiefs of Police [http://www.theiacp.org](http://www.theiacp.org)
The National Sheriff’s Association [http://www.sheriffs.org](http://www.sheriffs.org)

**Offender Reentry, Corrections, Sentencing Policy**

American Jail Association [http://www.aja.org](http://www.aja.org)
Court Services & Offender Supervision Agency (CSOA) [http://media.csosa.gov](http://media.csosa.gov)
Radio and television programs, blog and transcripts.
International Community Corrections Association [http://www.iccaweb.org](http://www.iccaweb.org)
Pew Public Safety Performance Project [www.pewpublicsafety.org](http://www.pewpublicsafety.org)

**Courts**


**Victim Issues**


**Everything Else**

Criminal Justice Journalists [http://www.reporters.net/cjj](http://www.reporters.net/cjj) (Good tools for crime reporters. Sign up for daily news summary.)

Florida State University, School of Criminology and Criminal Justice [http://www.criminology.fsu.edu/cj.html](http://www.criminology.fsu.edu/cj.html) (Probably the best generic criminological web site in the country)

ONE AGENCY’S MODEL MEDIA ACTIVITIES Fall Quarter, 2006

Reactive Media

- We participated in a variety of offender case reviews with potential media interest. Most (unless noted here) were not the subject of media inquiries.
- Referred a Washington Post editorial writer to D.C contacts regarding pending legislation and reentry efforts. The editorial appeared on December 20.
- National Public Radio called about proposed legislation for reentry in D.C. I referred her to transition and D.C. government authorities.
- We worked with the USA’s office regarding a media release on a fraud committed by one of our employees. There were no media inquiries.
- Provided information to WRC TV regarding possible transfer of sex offenders to other jurisdictions.
- The Washington Post called about the Georgetown homicide. The Post did not mention CSOSA or supervision issues.

Proactive Media

- CBS News offered a nationwide report on the Reentry and Sanctions Center
- National Public Radio called about our article in National Sheriff Magazine about Project Safe Neighborhoods. We provided research regarding crime reductions and Project Safe Neighborhoods in other cities. The reporter states that it’s her intention to do a report on our activities.
- Pacifica radio offered a nationwide report on the supervision of sex offenders by CSOSA and other organizations.
- We continue extensive assistance to the Washington Post and their series on the status of black men. This article will focus on offenders and the criminal justice system. The Post interviewed McKinley Rush, Curtis Atkinson and others regarding CSOSA services and the supervision of offenders. It will be published on December 31.
- The Washington Post ran an article regarding CSOSA’s and the Metropolitan AME Church’s efforts to assist the training and employment of offenders returning from prison.
- The Informer ran an article on the same subject.
- WRC TV offered a report on a
Halloween Mass orientation for Sex Offenders.
• WHUR Radio offered a report on Halloween Mass orientation for Sex Offenders.
• We are arranging podcasts to support Reentry Month.
• We offered a media release for our Domestic Violence Conference in October. The Washington Post, Capitol Community Newspapers and several electronic media announced the conference. We had overflow attendance.
• The Associated Press provided a series of announcements regarding the water damage at 633 Indiana Ave. D.C. media re-broadcasted these announcements.
• We represented CSOSA at a Unity Health Care conference regarding World AIDS Day.
• WTOP Radio interviewed the Director regarding Accountability Tours during the Crime Emergency.
• We explored a series of article options with the Informer Newspaper.
• Provided support to the Job’s Coalition newsletter regarding the opening of the Reentry and Sanctions center.
• Criminal Justice Drug Newsletter provided an article regarding drug assessment and treatment at the Reentry and Sanctions Center.
• The Afro ran an article about pending D.C. reentry legislation. We provided a comment.
• Federal Computer Week ran an article favorably quoting Paul Nguyen of our IT staff about working for CSOSA.

**Fugitive Safe Surrender**

• In preparation for the launch of Fugitive Safe Surrender, we completed:
  1. A revised media strategy
  2. Two focus groups with offenders
  3. A summary of focus group recommendations.

**Television Production—D.C Public Safety**

• We completed a survey on the use of D.C. Public Safety. All stations offer the shows approximately 150 times a quarter or 600 times a year. UMBC reports approximately 100 views a month from their web site.
• We met with DCTV to increase the number of times our TV show is aired. We will get increased airings.
• We created our third television show. The subject was the supervision of sex offenders. The show was sent to all local cable television stations. Stations running the program:
  1. COMCAST in DC
  2. COMCAST in Prince Georges County
  3. DC Public Access
  4. Arlington Public Access
  5. Fairfax Public Access
  7. Prince Georges Government Access
  8. Baltimore County Government Access
  10. UMBC web site.

• We provided the Supervising Sex Offenders show to four additional counties in Maryland and Virginia.
• We are creating a schedule for TV shows in 2007.

**Public Affairs Training**

• We agreed to a format to train SCSO’s with the National Institute of Corrections in the fall of 2005. Training and IT are handling details. We will meet with NIC officials in January.

**Special Projects**

• We continue to offer recommendations to the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council regarding an upcoming crime prevention campaign. CJJC is working with DCTV and tagging existing PSA’s from the NAACP. We are working on a comprehensive approach to the campaign.
• We assisted Human Resources and a contractor to handle our new employee application process. They will mount articles created by OLIPA and video (our TV shows) and audio (podcasts) to describe CSOSA.
• Continue to send significant articles to staff
• Continued the process of updating, deleting and adding to the e-mail and fax list.
**CSOSA Web Steering Committee Update**

- IT continues to work with a contractor regarding the redesign of the web site. The redesign will be completed in January.
- Document creation and review continues in OLIPA.
- We are in the process of creating the following products to coincide with the announcement of the redesigned web site:
  1. An e-mail sign-up system on the main page for use throughout CSOSA
  2. Establishing base-line data to compare results
  3. Establishing a podcast and videocast option on the main page
  4. Create a “hit” tracking system
- Thanks to Tim Barnes of IT, we purchased podcast equipment to allow us to create professional studio quality audio recordings. We did approximately 15 podcasts for future broadcast.
- Tim also arranged for a third party server to accommodate our pod and videocasts.
- OLIPA staff continues podcast training and will assume responsibility for future podcasts from IT. We are also offering our TV shows as videocasts, and we are splicing the audio portions of TV shows and other existing CSOSA products for podcasts.
- OLIPA staff continues training on marketing the new web site and podcasts/videocasts. Only the FBI and the New York City Police Department do podcasting.
- It’s our intention to place CSOSA as “the” national leader in web, podcast and videocast efforts for the criminal justice system.

**Press Releases/E-Mail Advisory’s Issued on:**

1. Domestic Violence Conference
2. Faith Based Call to Action Postponed
3. IT’s Rising Star award
4. Washington Post article on faith based efforts
5. Video Conferencing in federal prisons (AIDS Action article)
6. Halloween Mass Orientations
7. Media coverage on the Reentry and Sanctions Center
8. Journal of Community Corrections article on CSOSA treatment services
9. TV show on managing sex offenders (D.C. Public Safety)
10. The National Sheriff Magazine’s article on Project Safe Neighborhoods
11. In Sites Magazine article on partnerships with MPD
Publications

- The International Community Corrections Association printed our article on Treatment Services
- National Sheriff Magazine will run the article on the domestic violence unit in their fall issue.
- National Sheriff Magazine offered our article on Project Safe Neighborhoods.
- AIDS Action offered a section of a book on CSOSA’s video conferencing.
- In Sites Magazine (DOJ) ran an article on our partnership with MPD.
- The Journal of Offender Monitoring printed an article CSOSA’s model of community engagement.
- Bryan Young completed the fact sheet on CSOSA’s mission statement and critical measurement criteria for the new web site.
- We created an article on what works from Tom Williams’ China presentation.
- Worked with Community Corrections Report on our community partnerships article.

Court Services & Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia
http://www.csosa.gov
SAMPLE COMMUNICATIONS PLAN

This is a snapshot of what a communications plan looks like. A full plan would include all of the goals, objectives and strategies for your organization. In addition, a goal can contain several objectives, each of which can have more than one strategy and more than one audience.

**Goal:** To better serve the needs of domestic violence victims from traditionally under-served communities

**Objective 1:** To increase by 5 percent the number of victims from under-served communities who use our services

**Strategy:** To launch a new initiative aimed at serving victims living in rural areas

**Primary Audience:** Victims living in rural areas (List towns you plan to serve)

**Tactics to reach victims living in rural areas:**
- Hold a focus group of current or past survivors to get ideas on outreach
- Hold a focus group of key stakeholders in the area (police, community organizations, key leaders, etc.) to get ideas on outreach
- Design and develop a new brochure that explains the program
- Send out a brochure via direct mail to every household in rural areas
- Put up informational displays at key areas in the community (library, police department, bank, hair salons, movie theaters, churches, etc.)
- Hold individual meetings with key leaders and stakeholders in the town to develop relationships with them
- Hold meetings with key clergy member sin the area to secure their support and involvement.
- Hold a press conference to launch the new initiative.
- Initiate four PSAs to each radio stations and papers that serves the rural town
- Initiate two feature stories
- Arrange to speak on six radio or television talk shows
- Initiate 25 speaking engagements at churches, schools, and civic and business groups.
Key Messages

- You are not alone; there is help
- Contact us and we will help you
- No one deserves to be abused

Evaluation factors:

- Increase in calls by victims living in rural areas
- Increase in participation by key stakeholders in the town
SAMPLE LETTER TO THE EDITOR

The Washington Post published an op-ed on The Second Chance Act now pending in both Houses of Congress on February 11 written by a California psychologist, David Farabee. As a provider of correctional services for a number of decades, I strongly concur with his observation that “justice delayed...is justice denied.” For years, particularly in work within the juvenile justice system, we have lamented the disconnect in the offender's mind between the offense, the arrest and the much delayed justice sanction. Prompt administration of justice serves as both a deterrent and in helping errants understand the consequences of their crime.

However, on the broader subject of reentry, I assert that reentry is not about ideology, it is about practicality. There are 650,000 plus people coming out of prison this year. We need to deal with this first on a "hands on" basis. Inside the prisons, we need to encourage the teaching of vocational skills and adult basic education as a fact, not an ideal. As offenders come out of prison, we need to address the real needs of housing, clothing and food. We need to make sure that the resources are there and a plan is in place for the offender to access them, not just "hear" about them. If anyone thinks this is a "bleeding heart" approach, just consider the inevitable alternative of dealing instead with homeless, hungry felons on the street. Would this be a “smart thing?”

The writer is correct that there is a lot of program "garbage" out there. We are in an increasing era of evaluation of those programs. Some of those approaches that have been evaluated have been shown to be basically "ineffective." Some have been shown to actually increase harm and recidivism. But there are programs that have been shown to have had a positive effect. We need to encourage the proper assessment of offenders in institutions and upon their return to our communities so that they receive the proper program match to their specific issues. I am sure that the author would join us in our efforts to encourage jurisdictions to fund proven, legitimate, evidence based practices in treatment programs.
The issue before us is not the old rehabilitation vs. punishment argument. Our concern is entirely based the reality of 650,000 felons coming back to our neighborhoods and communities. Our goal is quite simple in concept but complex in execution. We increase the public's safety by the expediting the provision of those services critical in the first months of reentry to our society.

Terry Marshall
President International Community Corrections Association
608-223-0017

Mr. Marshall is President and CEO of ATTIC Correctional Services serving the state of Wisconsin and regions of Minnesota.

Washington Post 2/21/06
SAMPLE OP-ED

Guest columnist

Charting a path to a better life when the prison gates open
By Larry M. Fehr
Special to The Times

When I started working in the criminal-justice field 30 years ago, there were about 200,000 adults in state and federal prisons in this country. Today, there are more than 2.2 million. Adult incarceration rates have more than doubled in the past two decades. Not surprisingly, the costs of corrections have soared. In the past 20 years, the annual cost to taxpayers has increased from $9 billion to more than $60 billion.

Whether you believe that increased reliance upon incarceration is good or bad public policy, one thing is certain — 97 percent of those imprisoned eventually return to our communities. This year alone, an estimated 656,000 prisoners will be released to the community from prisons (not including jails or juvenile detention facilities).

Amid these figures is a troubling fact that hasn't changed in 20 years: Two-thirds of those released from prison will be rearrested within three years. While a 67 percent failure rate would not be tolerated in most areas of private or public enterprise, if we stop to think about how prisoners are typically released in our country, we should not be surprised.

The vast majority of offenders — more than 95 percent, according to some studies — are simply released from prison with a bus ticket, "gate money" (a small amount of cash), and the promise of supervision in the future.

The failure to provide strict, graduated supervision and meaningful services to former prisoners, especially during the critical six-month period after release when we know the likelihood of recidivism is highest, reflects a national system that, as Sen. Sam Brownback, R-Kan., put it, needs to be "reinvented."

There is, however, some room for optimism. First, we have much better research on what works than we did 20 years ago. Second, there is strong public support for improving ex-offender re-entry services. Finally, there is growing bipartisan political
interest in adopting more-effective policies around the escalating numbers of prisoners being released.

Research has caught up with common sense in evaluating successful methods for releasing offenders. Simply providing a bus ticket and just enough money to get high is an obvious recipe for disaster. Instead, at the end of an inmate's prison term and only if the individual meets eligibility criteria, there should be a period of graduated transition back to the community through a residential re-entry center that emphasizes strict accountability, random drug testing, effective programming and employment.

This method has empirical support in the United States, Britain and Canada. We have a much better understanding of treatment programs that do work (such as targeting resources to higher-risk offenders, focusing on the factors that we know are related to criminal behavior, and effectively implementing treatment programs that address these risk factors); and those that don't (talking cures, scaring offenders straight, building self-esteem, drug education, etc.). Given the prevalence of addiction and mental illness among offenders, offering quality programs to change and/or manage these behaviors is essential.

Finally, research confirms what returnees themselves identify as their priorities: employment and family reunification, where appropriate.

At the national level, the issue of offender re-entry is quickly reaching a tipping point. A recent Newsweek article refers to it as "the dawn of a new movement." If so, it is a movement with considerable public support.

A recent national survey by Zogby International revealed that 79 percent of those polled are "concerned or fearful" about the annual release of nearly 700,000 prisoners. However, the survey found "striking support" for treatment services both in and after prison by an 8-to-1 margin (87 percent support). When asked about legislation to make federal funds available to communities for services in support of re-entry, 78 percent were in support. More than 90 percent felt that job training, drug treatment, family support and housing were all very important services that should be available to former prisoners.

For the first time in the nation's history, a bill focusing on improving offender re-entry, "The Second Chance Act," has received broad bipartisan support in Congress. More than 100 representatives in the House are co-sponsoring the bill, and in the Senate, a diverse
coalition of Republican and Democratic leaders has voiced support. The measure, which merits passage, would improve re-entry opportunities for federal offenders, fund demonstration projects in the states, and help remove many unnecessary barriers to effective re-entry.

As President Bush noted in his 2004 State of the Union address: "America is the land of the second chance, and when the gates of the prison open, the path ahead should lead to a better life."

*Larry M. Fehr is senior vice president of Pioneer Human Services, a Seattle-based offender re-entry program, and a lecturer at the University of Washington.*

*Seattle Times, September 2007*
SAMPLE REPORTER THANK YOU LETTER

“Anne,

“I wanted to personally thank you for the excellent article on work release that recently appeared in the Tacoma News Tribune. I also wanted to share it with the WA Community Corrections Contractors Association and others interested in work release and offender reentry in our state. As a variety of ideas are proffered concerning offender reentry, generally, and work release, specifically, I think it’s imperative that we dispel misconceptions and present accurate information to the public. Thanks, again, for your efforts.

“Larry


“Larry M. Fehr
Senior Vice President
Pioneer Human Services
7440 W. Marginal Way So.
Seattle, WA 98108-4141
206/766-7023 (direct)
www.pioneerhumanservices.org”
TIPS FOR HANDLING THE MEDIA

Have a reason for being there
- Ask yourself what is your reason for being interviewed
- What reasons does the interviewer have for interviewing you?
- Don’t agree to an interview until you know why the interviewer wants to talk to you

Be prepared
- Know what your message is going to be
- Stick with your message!

You cannot win a fight with the media
- Never lose your temper with a reporter
- Always tell the truth
- If you don’t know the answer to a question, say so

Before every interview ask yourself these questions
- Who is my audience and what matters to these people?
- What is my goal in doing this interview?
- What is my message?
- How much time do I have?

Have an agenda
- Plan to use the interview wisely
- Jot down 3-5 points you want to make during the interview
- Make certain you get these points across before the interview is finished
**Media traps to avoid**

- Personal opinions: Remember that you represent your organization.
- Speculation: Limit your responses to what is known.
- Third-party discussions: Instead of discussing an organization other than your own, bridge back to the items on your agenda to re-establish control.
- Blind source: A blind source is a memo, report or comment from some individual with whom you are unfamiliar. Don’t discuss them!

**Interruptions**

Do not allow a reporter to interrupt you before you complete your answer. You have the right to finish answering the previous question before addressing another one. Simply continue talking, or ask the reporter to allow you to finish the answer.

**Listen – Think – Respond**

- Concentrate on each question
- Listen to the entire question
- Think of its implications
- Respond after consideration

**Say “No” to “No Comment”**

The phrase “no comment” implies that you are evading the issue, hiding something that would be damaging, or that you are guilty of some wrongdoing.

Never say “no comment.” Instead, give sound reasons why you will not or cannot answer a question (e.g., proprietary information, lack of authority, current or pending litigation, etc.).

**The Ammerman Experience 2005**
Summit County Omnibus Poll 2007

Report for Oriana House

Sponsored by the UUP
The Ohio Urban University Program
INTRODUCTION

The 2007 Summit County Omnibus Poll was conducted by the Institute for Health and Social Policy at The University of Akron. Six local government and non-profit organizations fielded questions on the survey.

The 2007 Summit Poll was a household survey of 1,079 adults residing in Summit County, Ohio. Respondents were selected at random and the survey was conducted via telephone by professional interviewers employed by the Institute for Health and Social Policy. The interviewing process lasted roughly a month and a half, starting in early May and ending in mid June.

Survey questions addressed a variety of topics depending on the research focus of each participating organization. The following report outlines the general results of those questions purchased by Oriana House. In addition, results regarding the general characteristics of respondents (e.g., demographics) are outlined in Appendix A of the report, while Appendix B gives a more detailed discussion of the survey methodology.

Questions regarding this report can be forwarded to Eric J. Mundy, Ph.D., Research Associate, Institute for Health and Social Policy, The University of Akron at (330) 972-5465 or emundy@uakron.edu.
The results of the 2007 Summit County Omnibus Poll continued to indicate that Oriana House is well recognized in the local community. The majority, 87.1%, of the 1,079 respondents surveyed indicated they had heard of the organization (see Table 1.1). Familiarity with Oriana House has remained steady at about the same levels sustained during the 2003 to 2006 period. Examples of groups that were more likely to be familiar with Oriana House included residents of Akron, registered voters, democrats, relatively older individuals, and respondents from households with relatively less annual income or that were worse off financially compared to a few years ago.

Nearly half, 45.4%, of agency-aware respondents in 2007 indicated they were familiar with the specific services offered by Oriana House. This amounted to 39.1% of all respondents. Those persons who indicated they were aware of specific services were asked to name those services. Although given the opportunity to name up to five services, most services-listing respondents named one or two services. Leading services named included, in order of importance, drug-specific programs or rehabilitation, DUI programs, alcohol-specific programs or rehabilitation, and drug and alcohol programs in general.

Respondents who indicated they were familiar with Oriana House were asked how they had heard of the organization. As for the 2003 to 2006 period, the most frequently cited source of information on the organization was knowing someone that had been in an Oriana House program. Nearly one-third, 32.7%, of agency-aware respondents indicated this was the case in 2007. Other leading sources of information on the organization included newspaper articles and family, friends or colleagues. Lesser sources of information on the organization included, in order of importance, radio or television news stories, radio or television advertisements, newspaper advertisements, and mailings.
Those respondents who had heard of Oriana House were asked if they received the *Directions* newsletter in the mail. Only 4.9% of agency-aware respondents, or 4.2% of all respondents, said they received the newsletter. Of those that received the newsletter, nearly three-quarters, 70.5%, stated they had read the newsletter. These individuals amounted to 2.9% of all respondents.

Respondents were also asked to give their overall opinion of Oriana House. A large proportion of respondents had no opinion of the organization. Just over one-quarter, 25.6%, of all respondents in 2007 had no opinion of Oriana House. Of those respondents with an opinion of the organization, the majority, 60.6%, had a favorable opinion, either excellent or good, of the organization. These persons amounted to 45.0% of all respondents. Those individuals with a fair opinion of Oriana House amounted to 27.6% of those with an opinion, or 20.6% of all respondents. Only 11.8% of those with an opinion, or 8.8% of all respondents, had an unfavorable opinion, either poor or very poor, of the organization. Despite some variations, public opinion of Oriana House has remained relatively unchanged throughout the 2003 to 2007 period.

As in previous years, the majority of respondents in 2007, over three-quarters or 77.7%, stated they supported community-based corrections programs for non-violent offenders, either strongly favoring or somewhat favoring these programs. The proportion of respondents supporting these programs was up from the 2005-2006 period, but still lower than reported during the 2003-2004 period. The proportion of respondents asserting they were opposed to community-based corrections programs amounted to only 3.8% of respondents in 2007. This proportion was relatively unchanged from levels sustained during the 2003-2006 period. As was the case in previous years, a significant proportion of respondents, nearly one-fifth or 18.5%, indicated they had no opinion of community-based, non-violent offender programs.

When asked to indicate the most important consideration in sentencing non-violent offenders, half or 50.0% of respondents in 2007 stated that rehabilitating the offender was the most important consideration. This consideration was also the most important one
identified during the 2004-2006 period. Community safety was the second most important aspect in sentencing non-violent offenders, with 16.7% of respondents selecting this consideration. Those persons who felt restitution to the victim was the most important consideration in sentencing amounted to 15.5% of respondents. Another 13.4% of respondents believed punishing the offender was the most important factor in sentencing, while only 4.4% of believed that saving the taxpayers money was the most important criteria. These results did not vary greatly over the 2004-2007 period.

Respondents were also asked about the importance of using community-based corrections programs to reduce costs and relieve overcrowding in the Summit County Jail. As in previous years, the majority or 90.4% of respondents in 2007 felt that these programs were either very important or somewhat important. This proportion has remained relatively unchanged throughout the 2003-2007 period. Only 6.8% of respondents believed these programs were either somewhat unimportant or not at all important. Those persons who indicated these programs were neither important nor unimportant amounted to 2.8% of all respondents.
POLICY
Contact with the News Media
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.1.1 PURPOSE

To provide uniform guidelines for contact with the News Media on behalf of Pioneer Human Services.

.1.2 SCOPE

This policy applies to all units and employees of Pioneer Human Services.

.1.3 POLICY

It is the policy of Pioneer Human Services to communicate with the news media in an open, accurate and professional manner.

.1.4 GENERAL GUIDELINES

A. The Senior Management Associate shall serve as the Public Information Officer for Pioneer Human Services. All communications with the news media will be conducted or coordinated by the Public Information Officer, unless otherwise approved in advance by the President, or the President’s designee.

B. Pioneer generally engages in two types of news media contact, (1) proactive efforts to “tell the Pioneer story,” and (2) releases/responses to incidents involving PHS facilities, current and former employees and current or former clients. In order that these contacts be conducted in a manner that appropriately represents PHS and its mission, that ensures inappropriate information is not released, and that is responsive to news media requests, it is important that communications with the news media be effectively managed.

1. Relationships with the News Media

It is the goal of Pioneer Human Services to proactively establish positive relationships with the news media. Toward this end, the Public Information Officer will reach out to media representatives on a regular basis, to familiarize them with the “Pioneer story.”

2. Reporting Information to the News Media
News releases will be prepared and transmitted to the news media when a positive newsworthy event occurs, such as a new contract, or an award or recognition for PHS or one of its employees.

News releases will also be prepared and transmitted to the news media when a significant incident occurs. Significant incidents include but are not limited to: death of a client; fire at a facility; high profile escape (abscond); a felony committed by a client; and incidents involving a high profile resident/client.

3. Protecting Certain Information

Unless specifically authorized by the President, Pioneer will not release information to the news media that would potentially compromise a criminal or administrative investigation, would violate the privacy rights of an employee or resident/client, would disclose proprietary commercial information, or is otherwise deemed inappropriate for release under the circumstances.

.1.5 RESPONSIBILITY

The President and designated Public Information Officer are responsible for the development, review and implementation of this policy. The Public Information Officer shall develop a written News Media Communication Plan and shall conduct training on the plan for affected staff.

.1.6 REFERENCES

- See Investigating and Reporting Major Incidents, PRO-.1.
- See Injury and Illness Reporting, POL/PRO-.2.

.1.7 ASSOCIATED DOCUMENTS

- Supervisor’s Injury Report AD 26B
- Employee Warning Notice
Allow Us To Reintroduce Ourselves.  
We Are Crosspoint.

During the last several months an understandably strong debate has occurred regarding the purchase of 301 Yucca Street by our local nonprofit agency, Crosspoint, Inc. In November, Crosspoint began the long process of reaching out to build trust and a broader understanding of facts surrounding what is and what is not going to happen at 301 Yucca, a property we have now renamed “The Summit.”

Most of us have grown up with certain ideas about the outdated term “halfway houses” which are now called reentry facilities. The impression of these facilities as dangerous places where criminals loiter, where there are murderers and sex-offenders, is a false one. Murderers and sex offenders, by law, are not allowed to participate in the reentry programs in the City of San Antonio.

The truth is Crosspoint at The Summit will be a comprehensive social services center. It will have a residential reentry program as a major part of its programming, with services that include family counseling, employment support, and substance abuse treatment. It will offer outpatient mental health counseling and substance abuse treatment services, and will even provide professional outpatient services one day per week free of charge to appropriately referred District 2 residents and veterans.

Crosspoint, Inc. is a 47 year-old nonprofit social service agency that reduces repeat incidences of crime by providing individuals who have been incarcerated with the tools to gain employment and self-sufficiency in society. In addition, Crosspoint has many years of experience providing residential services for veterans who have served our country so honorably, giving them another chance to be productive community members.

Crosspoint was founded in 1963 by a group of San Antonio business, civic and religious leaders as well as physicians and mental health experts in the community to aid in the rehabilitation of persons with emotional and psychological problems. These leaders included Helen Austin, the first appointed African-American Chief of Social Services at the San Antonio State Hospital. Since 1972, the organization has worked with the Federal Bureau of Prisons, offering residential reentry and related services to returning citizens at four facilities in San Antonio in well-known historic neighborhoods such as Monte Vista, Tobin Hill, Government Hill and Madison Square Park.
For the last 17 years we have been operating in District 2 in the Government Hill location where we earned the support of the Government Hill Alliance Neighborhood Association and Chas Supermarket for being a good neighbor.

“We consider Crosspoint as an outstanding corporate neighbor. The president and two directors of Government Hill Alliance toured and spoke with Crosspoint on the agency’s program and we were very impressed with the program’s emphasis on safety and accountability. The properties were well maintained and Crosspoint has a positive relationship with working with the neighborhood.”

--Florence Alcoser, President of the Government Hill Alliance

Our corporate headquarters will move into the Eastside bringing opportunities for new hires from District 2 and more money going to nearby restaurants, contractors, and businesses by our more than 70 employees.

Through efforts to properly explain what Crosspoint truly is, we have gained the endorsement of numerous Eastside leaders. We want to thank all of those who took the time to get to know more about our program. They know we want to honor the mission previously carried out by the Sisters of the Holy Spirit and demonstrate our respect for the neighborhood that was so positively impacted by that mission.

Just as we have done successfully in other neighborhoods, Crosspoint will honor our commitment to being great neighbors and our leadership looks forward to reintroducing ourselves to each of you.

--Crosspoint Board of Directors and Staff
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