

From: Tom Parker - Sentinel [trparker@sentinelgp.com]

Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 5:22 PM

To: Wolf, Janet

Subject: Corizon

#3

Hi Janet,

2013 JUN 18 AM 8:56

I usually don't write members of the BoS on issues before them, but felt compelled to do so on this topic. As you may know, I have been involved in expert witness work on criminal justice issues around the country, mostly in Federal Court, including the massive investigation into the Los Angeles County Jails system in late-2011. I'm currently engaged in a similar project at Rikers Island, the New York City jail. In addition to these, I've had occasion to make official visits to, and/or to examine, over 40 jails and prisons around the world, both during my former FBI career and also in my expert witness engagements. One of the areas I always examine is the quality of medical and mental health services given to inmates. Regrettably, most of it is universally sub-par, especially when it has been contracted out to private sector for-profit providers, for whom reducing costs is the key to greater profits. Additionally, I've found that, generally, they obtain the services of mediocre medical and mental health professionals as independent contractors at minimal fees. In my experience, all too often, these sub-contractors work under capitation terms or flat fee-for-service contracts. Under both, more volume and less time-with-patient are the driving forces, and quality gets sacrificed for quantity.

As you have rightly pointed out publicly, Corizon has no experience in juvenile mental health systems in California, and will have to develop a cadre of psychologists and psychiatrists and other mental health staff in our service area. I personally believe that Santa Barbara County should not be the testing laboratory nor training ground for them to experiment in juvenile detainee mental health services and to increase their business in our state.

As you may know, earlier this year I was appointed to the Santa Barbara County Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Commission by Superior Court Judge Arthur Garcia. As a result, I have become quite familiar with the juvenile detention facilities and programs in our county. I have talked with many facility staff, as well as officials of our county Probation Department, and have learned that ADMHS was doing a good job in its provision of juvenile mental health services in this county. So, the immediate question is "Why the change?" If it is solely for cost savings, we open the door to the sub-par services I've discussed above. It certainly does not appear that poor quality of service is the reason.

At a minimum, this entire proposed contract needs much more study, in which Corizon should be required to adequately demonstrate their past experience and capabilities in the provision of juvenile detainee mental health care. Their profit models, quality controls, and past history of juvenile mental health services should be thoroughly examined. Preferably, since the need for such a change does not appear to have been sufficiently examined by our Probation Department, this should be done by such officials under the direction of the BoS.

I admire your willingness to challenge such issues through your supervisory position. This one needs special attention and much more study. It seems to be a proposal that has no basis in need nor increased professionalism.

I would have been in attendance for the consideration of the potential Corizon contract tomorrow (Tuesday), but I am currently at Pelican Bay State Prison near Crescent City interviewing inmates on two other expert witness projects for which I am currently retained.

Best Regards,

Tom Parker