

BOARD OF PAROLE HEARINGS
Executive Board Meeting
Monday, April 20, 2015

Meeting Called to Order at 1:03 p.m.

Roll Call: Commissioners Anderson, Fritz, Garner, Minor, Montes, Peck, Richardson, Roberts, Singh, Turner, Zarrinam present. Commissioner Labahn absent. Commissioner ANDERSON confirmed that a majority of currently-appointed commissioners were present.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Commissioner ROBERTS moved to approve the consent calendar and was seconded by Commissioner TURNER. The motion carried unanimously.

REPORTS AND PRESENTATIONS

Report from Executive Officer, Jennifer Shaffer

SHAFFER stated that National Crime Victims' Rights Week started on April 19, 2015. She and SANDRA MACIEL attended a California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation ceremony on April 17, 2015 to mark the event.

SHAFFER provided the latest statistics in connection with the *Coleman/Plata* case. The board held 577 youth offender hearings between January 1, 2014 and March 31, 2015. There were 166 grants, 371 denials, 38 stipulations and 2 tie votes. There were 211 cases that resulted in waivers, postponements, continuances or cancellations. SHAFFER thanked board staff for their work in scheduling the 759 youth offender hearings since January, 2014.

There have been 788 elder parole hearings scheduled since February 11, 2014. They resulted in 577 hearings. SHAFFER stated there were 166 grants, 371 denials, 38 stipulations and 2 tie votes. There were 211 waivers, postponements, continuances or cancellations.

Up to April 9, 2015, there have been 27 expanded medical parole hearings. Another 7 hearings were postponed, continued or cancelled.

From January 1, 2015 to March 31, 2015, 1,109 non-violent second strike inmates were referred to the board. The board approved 84 inmates for release and 67 were denied. Decisions are pending in many cases because the 30 day period for written input has not elapsed. Other cases are awaiting review because the inmates are not within 60 days of their earliest possible release date or have not served 50% of their sentence.

SHAFFER stated that there are several bills before the legislature that will have an impact on the board. Assembly Bill 487 would require the board to give notice to prosecutors in cases where it has received a petition to advance hearing or where the board is considering advancing a hearing through the administrative review process. Assembly Bill 920 would require the board to provide

hearing packets to registered victims. Senate Bill 224 would extend the elder parole provisions to inmates who have reached the age of 50 and who have been incarcerated for at least 15 years.

SHAFFER gave an update on the board's continuing outreach efforts. The purpose of the outreach is to provide information on the many changes at the board over the past few years to correctional staff, advocacy and community organizations, and inmates. She and Chief Deputy SANDRA MACIEL have already visited several institutions and she and Chief Deputy RHONDA SKIPPER-DOTTA recently met with parole administrators. SHAFFER intends to visit all CDCR institutions by the end of the year. SHAFFER said the board's outreach has been well received.

Report from Chief Counsel, Howard Moseley

Assistant Chief Counsel, TIFFANY SHULTZ gave a presentation on the board's draft bench guide for consultations. The guide is modelled on similar guides that are used in the courts. The board intends to have a bench guide for each type of hearing. The purpose of the guides is to provide an overview of hearing procedures for commissioners, deputy commissioners and stakeholders. SHULTZ summarized the consultation process. Panels review an inmate's institutional behavior and make individualized programming recommendations. SHULTZ invited input from stakeholders. The next draft bench guide to be presented at a future board meeting will be for parole reconsideration hearings and it is anticipated that the guide will be ready in the autumn.

Report from Chief Deputy of Program Operations, Sandra Maciel

MACIEL gave an update on the Board's Information Technology System (BITS). In response to stakeholders' requests, the local case numbers have been added to letters requesting input for parole reviews for non-violence second strike inmates. The board started using the revised letters on March 28, 2015. MACEIL also stated that for the last four months, hearings have been conducted using electronic board packets via WatchDox. The board continues to receive requests for access to WatchDox. Anyone needing assistance should e-mail TARA DOETSCH and TRACI WESTMORELAND. MACIEL also reported that the board is close to securing statewide gate clearance for deputy district attorneys and privately-retained attorneys. MACIEL anticipated that the process will be completed by May 15, 2015.

Report from Chief Deputy of Field Operations, Rhonda Skipper-Dotta

SKIPPER-DOTTA stated that the board has been working with the Division of Adult Parole Operations to implement a process for reviewing requests for parole discharge electronically. Implementation is scheduled for May 1, 2015. The new process will enable deputy commissioners to conduct the reviews at any location.

SKIPPER-DOTTA also reported that the board started updating the mentally disordered offender process about a year ago. The board currently holds approximately 15 hearings per week and the process is now contained in BITS. In September 2015, the board will provide an orientation for psychologists who conduct the independent evaluations for the mentally disordered offender screening process.

Report by Chief Administrator, Offender Investigations and Screening Division, Elizabeth Allen

ALLEN stated that the board's investigation unit has started reviewing inmates' use of social media. Staff has received training on social media investigations. ALLEN also acknowledged the work of the security team at the board's monthly meetings.

Investigator SIGIFREDO RIZO described the board's investigations into inmates' use of social media. Subpoenas have been used to obtain information, such as internet provider addresses.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Administrative Directive 2015-01A, Required Documents for a Parole Suitability Hearing and Administrative Directive 2015-01B, Determining If Good Cause Exists to Grant a Postponement of a Parole Suitability Hearing Due to an Inmate's Inability to Obtain Essential Documents, presented by Staff Attorney, Tracy Young.

YOUNG stated that the draft directives were presented at the March 2015 meeting. As a result of receiving feedback, more information has been added to the legal authority section of Administrative Directive 2015-01A. There have also been some minor formatting changes to Administrative Directive 2015-01B.

Commissioner ZARRINNAM asked whether Administrative Directive 2015-01A addressed the situation of inmates' claiming at the hearing that they were unable to conduct an *Olsen* review of their central file.

MOSELEY stated that the central file should contain chronos confirming that the inmate was offered an *Olsen* review and that it took place.

Commissioner ZARRINNAM moved to adopt Administrative Directives 2015-01A and 2015-01B. Commissioner RICHARDSON seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously, with the exception of Commissioner ROBERTS, who abstained.

Commissioner ANDERSON confirmed that the motion was approved by a majority of the commissioners present.

Meeting recessed at 1:30 p.m.

Meeting reconvened at 1:39 p.m.

PRESENTATIONS

Demystifying How the Board of Parole Schedules Hearings, presented by Chief Deputy of Program Operations, Sandra Maciel and Scheduling Analysts Kevin Stripling and Steven Mehler

MACIEL stated that there are 35 staff members in the scheduling unit. She introduced members of the unit. MACIEL stated that in 2014, the unit scheduled 4,705 suitability hearings and 1,336 consultations.

MEHLER described the hearing scheduling process. The process has undergone many changes and the timescale has been reduced from 9 months to 5 months. Scheduling starts at 6.5 months before the date the inmate's hearing must be held (called the "no later than" date or NLT). Staff reviews BITS to make sure that the NLT date is correct. They check that the proposed hearing date is consistent with various eligibility factors and the previous hearing decision, if any. They then check that the inmate has not waived a hearing on three consecutive occasions. If the previous hearing was postponed or continued, staff ensures that relevant issues have been resolved. BITS is reviewed to determine whether any miscellaneous decision impacts scheduling the hearing. A case audit reviews factors such as whether the hearing is expedited and whether there are any registered victims. The commissioner assignments are then created, taking into account public holidays, leave requests, or special events near the institution.

MOSELEY asked about communicating with private attorneys during the scheduling process.

MEHLER stated that efforts are made to accommodate the commitments of private attorneys. However, sometimes the scheduling unit is only informed of the attorney's involvement at a late stage in the scheduling process. It is then difficult to alter arrangements and MEHLER emphasized that early notification of a private attorney's involvement is helpful.

Meeting recessed at 2:15 p.m.

Meeting reconvened at 2:30 p.m.

Office of Victims and Survivors Rights and Services, presented by Chief, Cynthia Florez-DeLyon, Assistant Chief, Katie James, and Manager, Mike Young.

FLOREZ-DELYON gave a presentation describing the office's work. She stated that in 2014, there were 34,000 telephone calls, e-mails, and letters received by the office. The office assisted 1,800 victims. The average number of monthly contacts is 2,400. Each month around 175 victims or members of their family take part in parole suitability proceedings.

FLOREZ-DELYON then described the principles of restorative justice and stressed that there is no single way for a victim to heal after a crime. There are three key components to restorative justice - accountability, competency development and community safety.

YOUNG gave a presentation on the victim/offender dialogue process. He stated that inmates' participation in the process is not recorded in their central file. Since January, 2011, 11 dialogues have taken place and 13 are ongoing.

Commissioner FRITZ asked whether an inmate may initiate the dialogue.

YOUNG replied that there are insufficient resources to permit inmate-initiated dialog and that the process is victim-centered.

JACK DYSON stated that he is a volunteer facilitator and that he has participated in victim/offender dialogues, which can take between a year and two years to accomplish. The facilitator determines when the parties are ready to meet and either party may terminate the dialogue.

Meeting recessed at 3:28 p.m.

Meeting reconvened at 3:35 p.m.

DYSON introduced AL RENCH and ROGER COBBLER, who described their victim/offender dialogue. RENCH stated that he had received a determinate sentence for a serious assault on COBBLER. COBBLER had initiated the dialogue and they had worked with DYSON to prepare for their meeting. COBBLER outlined his reasons for starting the dialogue and stated that the process had helped him recover from the trauma of the crime.

PUBLIC COMMENT

MARC NORTON, attorney, stated that he had e-mailed SHAFFER and MOSELEY about recording commissioners' votes in closed session. He is awaiting a reply to his e-mail. He regretted that the votes were no longer made public. NORTON referred to the case of his client, Andrew Young. He thanked MOSELEY for ensuring Young's swift release, following the appellate court's order. NORTON read excerpts from the court's opinion and highlighted its view that one incident of assault does not mean that an offender may be classed as a serial domestic abuser.

VANESSA NELSON-SLOANE, Life Support Alliance, stated that she had recently met Andrew Young at an event.

MICHELE MOLINA, University of Southern California Restorative Justice-National Crime Victims' Rights, stated that she had committed a crime and the victim's husband had initiated a victim/offender dialogue. MOLINA stated that the restorative justice model can be very beneficial.

LAURA WEIGAND, University of Southern California Restorative Justice-National Crime Victims' Rights, stated that she was released from a determinate sentence in 2012. She described her experiences after release and recommended that parolees should be allowed to return to prisons, to help deter inmates from committing further crimes.

Meeting recessed at 4:53 p.m., to reconvene on Tuesday April 21, 2015 at 10:00 a.m.

BOARD OF PAROLE HEARINGS
Executive Board Meeting
Tuesday, April 21, 2015

Meeting called to order at 10:03 a.m.

Roll Call: Commissioners Anderson, Fritz, Garner, Minor, Montes, Peck, Richardson, Roberts, Singh, Turner, Zarrinnam present. Commissioner Labahn was not present.

EN BANC REFERRALS

Referral pursuant to Penal Code section 1170(e) to determine eligibility for recommendation to sentencing court for recall of sentence.

A. MORENO, DAVID K-50835

PASTOR MARIO MORENO, inmate's brother, VELIA HERNANDEZ and ELIZABETH MORENO, inmate's sisters, MARIA MACIAS, inmate's mother, ANTONIO MORENO, inmate's father, supported a recommendation for recall of sentence. SCOTT ESTY read a letter from the inmate's sister, MARINA OSSERA, supporting a recommendation. TRACY LUM, inmate's attorney, supported a recommendation.

Referral by the Chief Counsel pursuant to California Code of Regulations, title 15, section 2042, to assure complete, accurate, consistent and uniform decisions and the furtherance of public safety

B. ARNOLD, KENNETH E-60645

No speakers.

C. EASTMAN, KELLY K-97242

No speakers.

D. FERGUSON, KENNETH K-11229

MARC NORTON, inmate's attorney, submitted that the grant of July 2014 should be reinstated.

RICHARD SACHS, San Diego County District Attorney's Office, submitted that the board should order a rescission hearing.

CHRISTINE WARD, I Can and Crime Victims Action Alliance, read a letter from the victim, ELIDA HENDRICK, opposing the inmate's grant of parole.

E. HOWARD, JAMIL T-43569

No speakers.

Referral to consider ordering a rescission hearing, pursuant to title 15, California Code of Regulations section 2450 *et seq.*

F. RENFROW, KEITH C-34360

CANDACE CHRISTENSEN, inmate's attorney, opposed ordering a rescission hearing.

Referral by the Governor pursuant to Penal Code section 3041.1 and California Code of Regulations, title 15, section 2044 to request review of a parole decision by the full Board.

G. COLE, LEONARD H-00643

KATE BROSGART, inmate's attorney, and PAULETTA COLE, inmate's sister, opposed ordering a rescission hearing.

H. JEFF, ROBERT T-63556

NICKOLAS ALANAS, inmate's nephew, supported his parole grant.

Meeting recessed at 11:02 a.m.

Meeting reconvened at 11:16 a.m.

MIKE DUNCAN and WILLY CARRILLO, inmate's friends, ELAINE JEFF, inmate's mother, BRENNON JEFF SR., inmate's father, MELISSA KATIE CHAVEZ, inmate's aunt, JENNIFER BARIOS, inmate's aunt and victim's mother, supported the parole grant.

KEITH CHANDLER, attorney, AMBER CASTILLO, tribal director of social services, and PEPPER BARRON, substance abuse counselor, supported the parole grant.

RUBEN BARRIOS, victim's father, stated that the board should uphold the inmate's 2025 release date.

I. MARTINEZ, LEONARD G-55545

TERESA MIRAMONTES, inmate's mother, supported the parole grant.

PUBLIC COMMENT

VANESSA NELSON SLOANE, Life Support Alliance, referred to the Governor's parole decisions report. She noted that, of the 902 inmates granted parole by the board, 672 were convicted of murder. The Governor reversed 133 grants. NELSON-SLOANE stated that the Governor appears not to give weight to the inmate's advanced age. He seems to give some weight to the youth offender provisions, but still reversed 15 youth offender inmates. NELSON-SLOANE expressed concern at the Governor's reliance on confidential information. She also expressed concern about his characterization of a moderate risk assessment being an unsuitability factor. She was troubled by the Governor's reversing 4 grants when there was no hearing transcript.

CANDICE CHRISTENSEN, attorney, stated that she had met four clients on April 13, 2015, at San Quentin. They told her that two attorneys had visited them and had them sign representation agreements. The inmates did not want to change attorney, but were confused and believed that they had to sign the agreements. CHRISTENSEN stated that the incident is disturbing and she has e-mailed the attorneys, but has not received a reply. She has reported the attorneys to the California State Bar and has informed Chief Counsel MOSELEY.

Meeting is recessed at 12:00 p.m., to reconvene at 1:30 p.m.

Meeting reconvened at 2:18 p.m.

SHAFFER stated that she and several commissioners would be leaving the meeting at 3:00 p.m.

Effects of Alcohol and Drugs on Human Behavior, presented by Michael Shropshire, Ph. D., Lead Program Training Coordinator and Regulatory Affairs Coordinator for Western States Node, NIDA Clinical Trials Network

SHROPSHIRE gave a presentation and provided a handout on the effects of alcohol and drugs on human behavior. He defined substance abuse disorders and explained how drugs and alcohol affect brain function. He showed the areas of the brain that are related to emotions and that are involved in rational thinking. SHROPSHIRE explored the possible genetic links that predispose an individual to develop a substance abuse disorder.

At 3:00 p.m., SHAFFER and Commissioners TURNER, SINGH, RICHARDSON, MINOR, FRITZ and MONTES left the meeting.

Drug Programming, presented by Amber Barnett, Chief Community and Reentry Services, Division of Rehabilitative Programs

BARNETT showed a brief video and gave an overview of the drug programming provided by the Division of Rehabilitative Programs. She distributed a factsheet describing the programs.

Commissioner ZARRINNAM asked if all programs are available to every inmate upon release. BARNETT stated that the programs are only available to inmates with a moderate to high risk of drug abuse.

Commissioner ZARRINNAM asked how the assessments are made and whether participation in the programs is voluntary. BARNETT replied that inmates are evaluated by the COMPASS. She stated that an order to attend a program, made by a panel or by the Division of Adult Parole Operations, takes precedence over the assessment rating. MOSELEY pointed out that panels usually order an inmate to attend a substance abuse relapse program or a residential facility.

BARNETT agreed with Commissioner ZARRINNAM's observation that it is inadvisable to mix inmates with a lengthy history of sobriety with those whose sobriety history is short.

Commissioner ZARRINNAM asked whether inmates can be assessed before release. BARNETT stated that it is difficult to do so because of the limited availability of space in the programs.

Overview of California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation's Office of the Ombudsman, presented by Jean Weiss

WEISS gave an overview of the history and work of the Office of the Ombudsman. She stated that the office does not conduct investigations, but aims to resolve issues at the lowest possible level.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

VANESSA NELSON SLOANE, Life Support Alliance, stated that her organization works often with the Division of Rehabilitative Services. She regretted that many substance abuse programs do not address the needs of lifer parolees. She stated that panels should be wary of ordering parolees to attend treatment programs. It is counter-productive to require them to repeat programs that they have attended during their incarceration. There are insufficient sober living facilities available. Life Support Alliance has found the Office of the Ombudsman to be helpful and responsive. Staff from the office attended a function that Life Support Alliance organized last week.

Meeting recessed at 4:07 p.m., to reconvene on Wednesday, April 22, 2015 at 9:00 a.m.

BOARD OF PAROLE HEARINGS
Executive Board Meeting
Wednesday, April 22, 2015

Meeting called to order at 9:11 a.m.

Commissioners Anderson, Garner, Minor, Montes, Peck, Richardson, Roberts, Singh, Turner, Zarrinnam present. Commissioners Fritz and Labahn were not present.

Vicarious Trauma, presented by Dr. Carol Rivero

RIVERO gave a presentation on vicarious trauma and provided a handout. She explained the causes and components of vicarious trauma and compared and contrasted them to the symptoms of stress and work burnout. She identified the symptoms of vicarious trauma and discussed methods of addressing its effects.

Meeting recess at 10:55 a.m.

Meeting reconvened at 11:12 a.m.

Parole Reconsideration Hearings presented by Senior Staff Attorney, Heather McCray

McCRA Y gave a presentation and provided a handout. She described the legal background for parole reconsideration hearings and listed the parolees who are subject to the hearings. She outlined the role of DAPO, the courts, and the board. She also described the hearing procedures.

Commissioner RICHARDSON asked whether an inmate has the option of waiting until the criminal case has concluded and whether any factors would stop the parole reconsideration hearing.

MOSELEY stated that the court will proceed with the criminal case and the board's parole reconsideration hearing will trail it. Previously, the criminal case would not be adjudicated until after the parole reconsideration hearing. Now, the board's one-year deadline for holding the parole reconsideration hearing does not start to run until the criminal case has concluded.

SHAFFER stated that she has provided training to DAPO management and distributed information about the parole reconsideration process. The board receives notice of all parole violation arrests and tracks each case.

In response to Commissioner ZARRINNAM's question, McCRA Y confirmed that inmates may waive their hearing.

MOSELEY stated that they may stipulate to unsuitability, but only for one year, as the period of time between suitability hearings for inmates returned to lifer status after a parole violation is set by statute at one year.

Commissioner RICHARDSON emphasized the importance of receiving complete information about the court proceedings, in order to establish that the panel has the legal authority to proceed with the parole reconsideration hearing. In some cases, she has found the information to be incomplete.

MOSELEY stated that the board can ensure that all relevant court documents are available in Watchdox. Otherwise, the information should be available in ERMS under the legal tab.

In response to Commissioner ROBERTS'S question, MCCRAY confirmed that BITS tracks parole reconsideration hearings.

McCRAY stated that a new risk assessment is not prepared for the initial parole reconsideration hearing. If an inmate is denied, a risk assessment will be prepared for the next hearing.

In response to a question from Commissioner ZARRINNAM, MOSELEY stated that, in some circumstances, there will be dual jurisdiction between the state and a county if an inmate is sentenced to a new crime punishable at the county level. McCRAY stated that parolees who are ordered to return to lifer status at their initial parole reconsideration hearing will remain in the lifer process until granted parole.

PUBLIC COMMENT

VANESSA NELSON SLOANE, Life Support Alliance, expressed her appreciation of Dr. RIVERO'S presentation. She stated that inmates often experience matters that can lead to post-traumatic stress disorder. She raised the question of the effect that a decision not to order a return to lifer status has on a parolee's parole length.

JILL KLINGE, Alameda County District Attorney's Office, stated that district attorneys' offices are not receiving comprehensive risk assessments timely. Petition to advance packets are not in Watchdox and she requested that more information be made available. She also requested that hearing packets contain more transcripts than just the most recent.

Meeting recessed at 11:50 a.m., to reconvene at 1:30 p.m.

Meeting called to order at 1:32 p.m.

Overview of Mental Health Services Delivery System, presented by Robert Canning, Senior Psychologist

CANNING gave an overview of mental health treatment provided at the institutions. There is standardized screening of all inmates at the reception centers. He described the disorders that are treated and the levels of care available. Full psychiatric teams are not available at desert institutions because much of the medication used is heat sensitive.

SHAFFER asked about the way mental health crises are handled at desert institutions. CANNING stated that there is staff that can start treatment, pending the inmate's transfer to an appropriate facility.

Commissioner MONTES asked about the referral process and whether inmates may self-refer, CANNING answered that referrals may come from anyone in the system including inmates.

Commissioner MONTES asked about the composition of treatment teams. CANNING stated that interdisciplinary treatment teams consist of a mental health professional, sometimes a medical professional, custody representatives, and sometimes the primary physician. In the enhanced outpatient program, the treatment plan is reviewed every 90 days. There are 10 hours of structured activity per week in the program.

In response to questions from Commissioners ANDERSON, RICHARDSON, ROBERTS and ZARRINNAM about the treatment of sex offenders, CANNING stated that committing a sex offense is not a mental disorder. However, sex offenders who fall within the criteria of a mental disorder can receive treatment. The mental health treatment program is only able to address mental disorders. The program is unable to address insight issues, since lack of insight is not a mental disorder.

Commissioner ZARRINNAM asked if inmates' mental health treatment programs and classes are documented in their central files. CANNING stated that the programs and classes are considered to be treatment and are recorded in the medical file.

SHAFFER stated that board's clinicians review the medical file when preparing risk assessments.

Commissioner GARNER asked whether commissioners may refer an inmate. CANNING stated that commissioners can make a referral through the C&PR at the board desk. The panel can also make a recommendation to the inmate to self-refer. The escorting correctional officer can also refer the inmate. A referral will be evaluated and processed as appropriate. The objective of the system is to ensure that inmates are able to function in the prison system.

Commissioner ZARRINNAM asked whether sex offender can receive therapy at Coalinga Hospital. CANNING stated that those beds are for inmates with severe mental disorders.

Meeting recessed at 2:50 p.m.

Meeting reconvened at 3:04 p.m.

Long Term Offender Pilot Program (LTOPP), presented by Millicent Tidwell, Director of the Division of Rehabilitative Services

TIDWELL showed a brief video and gave a presentation on the Long-Term Offender Pilot Program, which began on January 1, 2014, as a two-year pilot program. Regulatory authority is being sought to continue the program. The program is considering making changes to some classes. The victim impact class will be extended. There will be a denial management course, to be taken early in the program. Changing the eligibility criteria is also being considered.

Commissioner Anderson asked whether the program is funded by CDCR and whether the program professionals are CDCR employees. TIDWELL confirmed that the program is funded by CDCR. Recruitment is the same as for other rehabilitative programs.

Commissioner RICHARDSON asked whether it is proposed to extend the program to other institutions. She stated that it would be advisable to put the program in institutions that have a high number of lifers. TIDWELL stated that it is hoped to extend the long-term offender program.

In addition, TIDWELL stated they were hoping to expand the substance abuse programs. She added that they are working on building an 88-bed facility to treat sex offenders. Unfortunately, no organization was prepared to operate the facility. A program has been found that can be operated in the prisons.

Commissioner ZARRINNAM asked whether every lifer is eligible for the long-term offender program and whether gang dropouts are eligible. TIDWELL stated that the program has eligibility criteria. Availability depends on the institution. Gang dropouts are eligible. The Division of Rehabilitative services has received 187 applications from various organizations to run new programs. There is a list of new programs and their location. Each of the 127 institutions will receive at least one new program.

MOSELEY asked whether there is any advantage in taking LTOPP, as compared with similar programs. TIDWELL stated that the course content is similar but LTOPP has smaller groups and inmates participate in a continuous program.

Commissioner MINOR asked about the future capacity of the program. TIDWELL stated that no capacity has been fixed.

Commissioner GARNER noted that the availability of programs appears to depend on the prison yard. TIDWELL stated that she would look into the availability by yard and report back to the board.

SHAFFER stated that panels can assist an inmate's transfer to a facility with the LTOPP by making a recommendation at the hearing.

TIDWELL stated that there is a step down program at level 4 facilities. There are also more enhanced programming yards.

Survey of U.S. Parole Systems, presented by Christopher Aarons, Graduate Legal Assistant

AARONS gave a presentation and provided a handout, comparing the parole systems of various states. He described parole eligibility, the nature of parole proceedings and denial lengths. He considered elderly parole and medical parole programs.

Meeting recessed at 4:05 p.m.

Meeting reconvened at 4:17 p.m.

Interviewing Techniques, presented by Chief Counsel, Howard Moseley

MOSELEY gave a presentation and provided a handout. He listed the benefits of good interview techniques and highlighted common interviewing errors.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

VANESSA NELSON-SLOANE, Life Support Alliance, questioned whether the mental health system treats post-traumatic stress. She stated that 10 days is not long enough for a crisis bed. She has asked about the number of LTOPP graduates who have been granted parole but has not received an answer. She is concerned that many programs will not receive continued funding.

JILL KLINGE, Alameda County District Attorney's Office, agreed with MOSELEY's observation that non-leading questions are usually better.

Meeting adjourned at 5:02 p.m.

Board of Parole Hearings

Scheduled and Backlog Hearings Report

Penal Code section 3041(d)

May, 2015

