



**Champaign County Community Justice Task Force
Monday, October 1, 2012 – 6:00pm
Jennifer K. Putman Meeting Room – Brookens Administrative Center
1776 E. Washington St., Urbana**

Chair: Michael Richards
Members: Scott Bennett, Lynn Branham, Mark Driscoll, Sheila Ferguson, James Kilgore, Julian Rappaport, Benita Rollins-Gay, William Sullivan

Agenda Item

- I. **Call to Order**
- II. **Roll Call**
- III. **Approval of Agenda**
- IV. **Public Participation**
- V. **Approval of Minutes – September 24, 2012**
- VI. **Discussion of Ideas for Report**
- VII. **Discussion – Next Steps**
- VIII. **Other Business**
- IX. **Next Meeting Date – October 22, 2012 – 6:00pm**
- X. **Adjourn**

1 COMMUNITY JUSTICE TASK FORCE MINUTES
2 Monday, September 24, 2012
3 Shields Meeting Room
4 Brookens Administrative Center
5 1776 E. Washington St., Urbana

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Call to Order

Richards called the meeting to order at 6:08 p.m.

Roll Call

Lane called the roll. Bennett, Branham, Ferguson, Kilgore, Rappaport, Rollins-Gay, and Richards were present establishing a quorum.

Approval of Agenda

Motion by Rolling-Gay to approve the agenda; seconded by Kilgore. **Motion approved.**

Public Participation

Pattsi Petrie, as a board member, continued to thank the members for the time and effort put into the task force. She also stated that the resolution to hire the firm from Berkley passed at the County Board meeting on September 20. She stated she was unaware of the time frame of when negotiations would begin with them. She noted that the reason she mentioned this is because it seems to run parallel and interlock with what this task force is addressing.

Approval of Minutes – September 10, 2012

Motion by Rappaport to approve minutes, seconded by Bennett. Motion approved.

Discussion of Ideas for Report

43 Driscoll and entered the meeting at 6:12

Richards asked for each member to give a summary of their report.

Kilgore stated that he felt it important to hit the urgent issues that may not be covered in some of the other reports; 1st make recommendation regarding downtown jail; 2nd put together recommendation based on the dialog with community members related to race in the criminal justice system; 3rd in regards to re-entry getting someone to monitor people on parole; 4th is the issue of funding, particularly the public safety sales tax; last is a response to Branham's idea of a permanent body to oversee this body, thinks it is a good idea but may be premature.

52 Branham asked if should get all ideas out before asking questions. It was agreed to get
53 the ideas out there first and then discuss.

54 Richards noted that Kilgore suggested dorms to deal with the crisis at the downtown jail.

55 Rappaport stated that was a good concrete example. He felt have enough information to say a
56 number of people in jail are there for crimes that don't need heavy duty security facility. He
57 asked if that was how everyone else understood it. He suggested there are multiple things that
58 could be done that would probably not be as cost prohibitive as building a jail. Kilgore
59 responded that there are two parts: one is the physical structure problem and the other is how
60 many people don't belong in a jail, such as the mental health or traffic subset. He suggested
61 investigation of racial discrepancies. Rappaport stated would want to pursue issue of race by
62 looking at in more complex ways than simply the over-representation of the total jail population.
63 He asked if it was known how many African American men are in jail that have significant
64 mental health issues. He asked if the African American community is being served in a way to
65 reduce this problem. He suggested not just studying the issue of racial disparity but also how it
66 impacts other various demographic and service needs of the community. Rappaport said that
67 racial disparity should include sub categories that show why person is there, what they need
68 and what services would be useful.

69 Driscoll noted that the mental health recommendation was a collaborative effort through
70 email between Ferguson, Rollins-Gay and himself. He said he has viewed the question of race,
71 from his point of view, when talking about an evidenced based model that has proven effective
72 within jail setting, that inherent in that is the fact that it has effectiveness in working with people
73 of color because of over-representation in the system. If instituted and evidence based model
74 that was appropriate for the jail that can follow someone back into the community it would
75 address the question of race. Rollins-Gay agreed.

76 Richards turned the discussion back to Kilgore's report and noted that Kilgore suggested
77 spending more than 5% of the public safety sales tax money on programming. He explained it is
78 distributed 5% on programs and 95% on facilities. Driscoll questioned reallocating the 5%
79 because that money is currently used for programs targeted to juveniles but is actually applied
80 to a restorative justice model and fits with what's recommended in Branham's report. Richards
81 suggested that Kilgore didn't mean taking that money away but shifting money. He stated it
82 doesn't necessarily have to be 5% but was originally set to be at least 5% and felt Kilgore was
83 suggesting spending more on programs and less on bricks. Rappaport noted that Kilgore's
84 suggestion of alternate housing could lead to other expenses and he wondered if that would
85 come from the 95%. Richards stated that spending of the public safety sales tax income
86 changes and could be built into the budget. He continued by saying that some money will
87 become available in 2014 when some bonds are paid off. He also noted that there are many
88 ways that public safety can be interpreted. Driscoll asked if the ¼% sales tax expired when
89 bonds are paid off. Richards stated that it did not. Kilgore said he has notion of community
90 participation being involved in suggestion of how to spend money in regards to public safety
91 issues. He thinks that will promote public acceptance.

92 Rappaport stated he was unclear on the mechanism to coordinate with ILPP. Richards
93 stated it isn't set in stone. Rappaport feels task force should be proactive with the consultant to
94 have mutual influence before ILPP starts their process of making recommendations. Richards
95 stated there was not a lot of detail about the role of the task force and felt they would be
96 creating their own role. Branham felt County could really benefit from the number crunching to
97 get the County Board on board with ideas. Rappaport said there are plenty of ideas, but no
98 staff. Richards noted the consultant is not local so the task force can bring local expertise to the
99 consultant.

100 Rappaport started his summary by stating the need to think about things in terms of
101 intentionality: who is the target; if racial what is intended to be accomplished. He noted that
102 need to think of as a system, not independent events and needed to specify specific goals, who
103 are trying to serve and what needs trying to serve to address capacity. He stated need to ask
104 what resources are required in terms of dollars and personnel, and said coordination of
105 programs is needed and wondered which programs were pertinent to the population talking
106 about. Rappaport said need to think about how to build in a structure that deals with systemic

107 approach; to have a process of ongoing evaluation to see if goals are being accomplished and
108 to make modifications in light of those evaluations. Discussion continued.

109 Rappaport said it is possible to divert people from the justice system if done
110 intentionally. He noted the obvious place to talk about prevention is with young people. He
111 stated that juveniles who are in legal jeopardy do better if before they get into justice system
112 you develop diversion alternatives in collaboration with police and judges but don't actually
113 enroll them in the justice system. He felt it is important to keep talking about intentionality,
114 capacity and evaluation. He stated that the more programs there are the better the chance of
115 being successful.

116 Rappaport feels the County can do better with the bail policy, stating that is an area
117 where the numbers need to be crunched. He also stated that judges need to be involved and
118 believe in the process. He suggested benefitting from the community of responsible African
119 American men by developing and financing programs that would hire African American men
120 who could credibly get someone in jail to use services they would otherwise turn down, who
121 could facilitate pre-trial , re-entry, etc. The term of peer navigator was mentioned. Richards
122 agreed with the need to address the bail issue and also to push to implement pre-trial services,
123 as well as push increased mental health resources. Rappaport suggested the ideal of having
124 an aggressive mental health case manager. He also noted that there is a lot of evidence
125 showing it is better to treat locally than sending away. Ferguson suggested using local
126 hospitals for mental health inmates as well as mental health court and building business
127 relationships with local mental health providers. She noted that there are many programs
128 available that people don't know about. Ferguson also stated the need for more respite detox
129 beds and more capacity in mobile crisis. Richards asked how this was working in other
130 communities. Ferguson answered that they are using Decatur as their model. Richards wanted
131 to who funded this. Ferguson stated that the State funds some through Medicaid and some
132 need to be community funded. Rappaport suggested that public health be included along with
133 mental health and substance abuse.

134 Driscoll started his report by stating that behavioral health has existing systems working
135 within the justice system but that it needs to be broadened. More screening needs to be done,
136 but the person would have to be willing for it to be successful. Rappaport stated that if a person
137 doesn't want it, too easy to turn away so that is more reason to have case managers. Driscoll
138 noted they are assigned a case manager. He went on to say that behavioral health services
139 need to be integrated more in the jail. He also stated that there are gaps that have been
140 created due to reduction in State funding. Ferguson stated it is essential that applications for
141 social security, public aid and disability be done in a timely fashion, noting that some people
142 don't have the ability to complete the application for one reason or another. Driscoll noted that
143 the process can take years. Driscoll also mentioned that there should be a screening program
144 in place for the intellectually disabled as well because he doesn't think those people are being
145 identified. Branham suggested the screening not be confined to the jail but be used in probation
146 as well. Driscoll noted the need to have strong services in the community to deflect a person,
147 but once they are in the system they need to have those services available and be able to follow
148 them after release. Crisis Intervention Team Training of police officers was mentioned. Rollins-
149 Gay said there is already a team formed in the community, but because so few officers are
150 trained, the first responders may not be crisis trained officers. She noted they have come up
151 with other forms of training that they are trying to implement. Ferguson thought all officers
152 should be trained for crisis intervention. Discussion continued.

153 Richards moved the conversation to drug court, mental health court and other diversion
154 programs and asked how the community feels they are working. Driscoll noted that drug court
155 referrals are typically repeat offenders and that the Mental Health Board sees the program as a
156 success. However, the aftercare continues after graduation but ends once off of probation.
157 Rappaport asked how many people are served. Driscoll stated about 120 at any given time.
158 Rappaport then asked how long a person was typically in drug court. Driscoll answered

159 anywhere from 12 month to 2 years. Rappaport asked if it could serve more people. Driscoll
160 stated there is only one judge that takes care of drug court and mental health court. Ferguson
161 stated that to keep the capacity more resources will be needed as funding goes away. Bennett
162 stated it isn't a matter of funding yet. People going to drug court have to meet certain criteria.
163 He noted that mental health court is disappointing due the fact that many public defenders don't
164 know what it is and stated the need to get the word out. Rollins-Gay stated that she hears in
165 the community about graduates of drug court who become sponsors to others in drug court.
166 She noted that drug court keeps people from going back and forth to jail. Bennett stated it's a
167 support network they wouldn't otherwise have.

168 Bennett noted that pre-trial services has the same kind of element of support that drug
169 court has. He stated that the issues that Mclean County has and why they need pre-trial
170 services is not the same reason Champaign County would want it. Champaign County has
171 people in front of a judge the next day while in McLean County it takes about two weeks. He
172 feels a pre-trial service in Champaign County could be done with 2-3 people. He also said there
173 are too many programs that people don't know about or don't know how to get into. Branham
174 stated that Champaign County may have most of the programs but don't have most of the
175 community sanctioning options. Bennett asked when risk assessments are done. Driscoll said
176 it is part of the intake process. Ferguson stated that if something is identified during the
177 screening that is when mental health needs to get involved.

178 Branham's report mentions a Restorative and Criminal Justice Coordinating Council, but
179 that it will only work if it is broad based. She noted that when the people in power, plus the
180 public, plus the service providers start working together, the process works extremely well. She
181 also recommends sub-committees. Branham went on to say that the task force should continue
182 to advocate for these changes. She noted the need to implement pre-trial services and have an
183 expansive list of community services. She suggested a restorative justice center for day
184 reporting, victim offender mediation, etc. She feels there is some potential in electronic
185 sentencing and day fines should be a priority for people who don't need a lot of supervision or
186 services because it's done quickly. Branham suggested identifying priorities for community
187 sanctions at the onset with goal of having an expansive list. She said should have the criminal
188 offender give back to the community because the criminal behavior hurts the community.
189 Driscoll asked if these sanctions would be part of pre-trial services. Branham stated that pre-
190 trial services were for people not yet convicted. These sanctions would pertain to those
191 convicted. She continued by stating there should be expanded sentencing options that are
192 specially tailored to those with mental health and substance abuse problems. She also
193 mentioned restorative sentences, which can be working with non-profits such as Habitat for
194 Humanity building a house for six weeks. She said it would not be just community service but
195 would be combined with some other things. She felt that public education was important
196 because the community needs to understand restorative justice for it to work. She stated that a
197 sub-committee within the council would be the public education sub-committee. Rappaport
198 stated the need to talk about alternative sentencing that judges can believe in. He feels this
199 group, the consultant, or the County Board needs to involve judges in this process and thinks it
200 could have a tremendous effect. Branham stated should have a preliminary report and
201 suggested adding an appendix that includes national data on cost. She also said should ask
202 the consultant how much money can be saved and/or used more effectively.

203
204 **Discussion – Next Step**

205
206 Richards stated that they have 42 ideas to think about. He also noted that there is only
207 one more scheduled meeting and that the County Board has yet to address extending the
208 mandate, adding new members, etc.

209 He asked if there was anyone else the committee would like to bring in before making its
210 recommendation. Rappaport stated that he would like to have the judges come in. Richards

211 stated that Judge Ford has been invited in the past. Bennett feels that judges Claus and Ford
212 are the ones who should be involved. Branham noted the committee could spend nine months
213 to one year gathering information. She feels the committee can put together the information
214 they have and give it to the consultant. Rappaport said should be thinking of this as a process
215 and feels that they are getting close to the point of thinking about how to be effective in the
216 process of moving this to reality rather than only a report. Discussion continued.

217 Richards suggested flushing out ideas next week and narrowing it down. He doesn't
218 feel they have a buy-in with the justice system. He stated they can invite the judges to come in
219 and give their views. Bennett stated that he felt the public defender was reluctant to criticize the
220 system because of working for the chief judge. He said that the problem with bringing in
221 independent counsel is that they don't deal with the same problems that 80% of the offenders in
222 the jail have. Richards said he would talk to Deb Busey about having the judges come in.
223 Bennett said should use the next meeting to flush out ideas and ask the judges to come at a
224 future October meeting.

225 Richards noted that any idea that doesn't have a majority can be added in the appendix.
226 Ferguson asked what date they are shooting for to give list of ideas to the County Board and
227 when would the Board address them. Richards said it would be on the Justice agenda for the
228 November meeting and suggested something be turned in the beginning of November.
229 Discussion continued.

230 Petri suggested adding some diagrams showing how all this would work, stating that
231 sometime visuals help.

232 Richards stated he will take pictures of the ideas and get them typed up. It was asked if
233 administration could do that. Richards said he could ask. Driscoll said all the ideas are already
234 typed in the submitted reports and suggested they be integrated into one document, then look
235 at the list of ideas and incorporate them.

236

Other Business

237 Ferguson asked to revisit the meeting agenda wanting to know when the next meetings
238 were. Richards stated that the October 1 meeting would be a continuation of flushing out ideas.
239 He said would try to get stakeholders in on either October 15 or October 22. It was agreed that
240 most would prefer October 22.

241 Ferguson stated that her board would have to approve her continuation on this task
242 force and that Rollins-Gays was in the same situation. She mentioned some large upcoming
243 projects that could influence that decision. She wanted to make everyone aware that they may
244 need to seek out other people if the task force was extended.

245

Next Meeting Date

246 Richards reminded all that the next meeting would be Monday, October 1, 2012 at
247 6:00pm in the Jennifer K. Putman Meeting Room.

248

Adjournment

249

250 The meeting adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

Respectfully Submitted,

Linda Lane

Administrative Assistant

**IDEAS, POINTS, AND POTENTIAL RECOMMENDATIONS TENDERED AT
COMMUNITY JUSTICE TASK FORCE MEETING
ON SEPTEMBER 24, 2012**

1. Minimum-security dorm option (mention “crisis” at downtown jail; physical-plant problems)
2. Data collection (e.g., profile of inmates in jail, including their risk levels) = one potential priority task for consultant
3. Study on racial disparity throughout the criminal-justice system, including “service categories” by race
4. Increase the percentage of the public-safety sales tax reserved for alternatives to incarceration, rehabilitative programming, reentry, etc.
5. Secure public input on public-safety issues (e.g., through public hearings organized by the consultant)
6. Identify priority tasks for consultant
7. Full-time person to facilitate prisoners’ reentry back to Champaign County
 - a. Preferably a former inmate
8. Specify the goals of each program¹ (who to serve, the needs to be met, etc.)
 - a. Identify the resources needed in light of those goals (e.g., personnel, space, financing)
9. Mechanism to ensure coordination of programming & that a systemic approach is undertaken
10. Specify performance measures to be applied when assessing the efficacy of current and new programs
11. Conduct ongoing evaluations of current and new programs
12. Make modifications to programs in light of evaluation findings

¹ NOTE: For purposes of internal discussion at this point, the task force agreed that references to programs in this document include or usually include sentencing and diversion options.

13. Careful targeting of programs/sentences
14. Augmented diversion from the criminal-justice system
15. Education/training about the criminal-justice system is part of the collaborative endeavor to protect public safety, etc.
16. Proper implementation of alternatives & allocating adequate resources for them = imperative
17. Make as many alternatives to incarceration available as the community can provide [QUESTION FOR TASK FORCE: In light of point #16, do you want to also refer to as many alternatives to criminal *processing* as the community can provide?]
18. Explore changes in bail to reduce pretrial incarceration
19. Implement a pretrial-services program
20. Recruit and train a cadre of African-American men and women to facilitate pretrial release, reentry, etc. (“peer navigators”)
21. Increase resources for behavioral care (e.g., mental-health treatment and substance-abuse treatment) throughout the criminal-justice system
22. Include a section containing particularly important recommendations for state action in the final report
23. Closer and broader coordination between criminal-justice officials & community service providers
 - a. Wraparound services
 - b. Provide incentives for such coordination
24. Respite detox beds & mobile crisis intervention
25. Include public-health officials & other experts on public health in collaborative endeavor
26. Substance-abuse screening and treatment in jail
27. Aftercare when a person leaves the criminal-justice system (e.g., graduates from the drug court or mental-health court)

28. Timely processing by state of benefit applications (one of the state-level recommendations to be profiled)
29. Screening at the jail for intellectual disability/developmental disability
30. One of the potential priorities for the consultant = determine whether criminal-justice officials, including probation and jail officials, are using the optimal screening/risk-assessment tools
31. Establishment of a “system of care” – before involvement in the criminal-justice system, while in the system, etc.
32. Crisis-intervention team training for police officers, including first responders
33. One of the potential priorities for the consultant = numbers and level of unmet need for mental-health care in the jail, elsewhere in the criminal-justice system, and in aftercare [QUESTION FOR TASK FORCE: Would a related priority be to conduct such an assessment focusing on the need for substance-abuse treatment?]
34. State-level recommendations stemming from the cuts in social services & behavioral healthcare
35. Adequate space in jail for delivery of care/programming/services
36. Funding needed to continue drug court/mental-health court
37. Training of criminal-justice officials & private defense attorneys about drug court, other alternatives to incarceration, services, systemic improvements, etc.
38. Public education regarding drug court, other alternatives to incarceration, services, systemic improvements, etc.
39. Evidence-based practices combined with the training, supervision, & evaluation (both internal & external) needed to ensure conformance with those practices
40. Restorative and Criminal Justice Coordinating Council (composition, diversity, linkages with local higher-education institutions, subcommittees)
41. Priorities for community sanctions
 - a. Restorative Justice Center(s) (day reporting center that also has restorative-justice programming)
 - b. Electronic-supervision sentences

- c. Day fines
 - d. Expanded sentencing options (& diversion and deferred-adjudication options) for certain defendants with serious mental-health problems, serious substance-abuse problems, or co-occurring disorders
 - e. Restorative sentences
42. Integration of restorative justice into the county's criminal-justice system
43. Appendix in the final report with specifics on the cost-effectiveness of the community sentencing alternatives and behavioral (mental-health & substance-abuse) treatment