

1 **COMMUNITY JUSTICE TASK FORCE MINUTES**

2 **Tuesday, October 30, 2012**

3 **Jennifer K Putman Meeting Room**

4 **Brookens Administrative Center**

5 **1776 E. Washington St., Urbana**

6
7 **MEMBERS PRESENT:** Lynn Branham, Mark Driscoll, James Kilgore, Julian Rappaport,
8 Michael Richards (Chair), William Sullivan
9

10
11 **MEMBERS ABSENT:** Scott Bennett, Sheila Ferguson, Benita Rollins-Gay
12

13 **OTHERS PRESENT:** None
14

15 **Call to Order**

16
17 Richards called the meeting to order at 6:07 p.m.
18

19 **Roll Call**

20
21 Branham, Driscoll, Kilgore, Rappaport, Sullivan, Richards
22

23 **Approval of Agenda**

24
25 **Motion** by Rappaport to approve the agenda; seconded by Sullivan. **Motion approved.**
26

27 **Public Participation**

28
29 No public participation
30

31 **Approval of Minutes – September 24, 2012**

32
33 **Motion** by Rappaport to approve minutes; seconded by Kilgore. Rappaport mentioned
34 section on Carol Ammons participation seems slightly incoherent. Driscoll suggested specific
35 lines be mentioned for specific changes. Rappaport said lines 34-39 seemed as if words are
36 missing. **Motion** by Rappaport to amend lines 34-39; seconded by Sullivan. **Motion approved**
37 **to amend. Motion to approve minutes as amended passes.**
38

39 **Approval of Preliminary Report**

40
41 Richards asked Kilgore if he was saying Administrative Services had included the latest
42 version of all reports. Branham stated that the background notes aren't included. Kilgore stated
43 the recommendation on race previously presented is missing. Richards asked if that should be
44 part of the intro or appendix. Kilgore answered background. Richards suggested filling in
45 Sullivan on what they have so far for the structure of the preliminary report. Branham went over
46 the sections talked about so far. She mentioned to Driscoll that there had been discussion about
47 splitting a piece of his report, which Branham called the memo, into two sections,
48 recommendations and inventory. She suggested that individual reports for the background
49 information section each have "submitted by" with the individual's name on them.

50 Rappaport made clear that his suggestion for Driscoll's report be that the
51 recommendations (bulleted items) be incorporated in the recommendations section of the
52 report. He asked Driscoll his opinion on splitting and putting the second section in the appendix.
53 Driscoll stated that he, Ferguson and Rollins-Gay felt that the recommendations have some
54 foundation tied-back to existing services and that they are an extension of those as well as

55 services that are available in the community. He felt that the mental health group would be fine
56 with pulling the recommendations out so long as the document appears as a complete
57 document elsewhere in the report. He also felt it needed to be clear that there is an investment
58 required by the courts to implement the mental health recommendations. Rappaport stated that
59 at the last meeting the discussion focused on trying to come up with a method to have a brief
60 progress report; e.g. Branham's recommendations have been separated from all the rationale
61 and detail. Rappaport thought the committee had arrived at a point where they can say here are
62 some of our possible recommendations and then have the background notes that will explain
63 those in more detail. He said the idea was to trim it down to its bare points, not to disembody it.
64 Sullivan stated the idea is to increase the probability that it will be read. Kilgore agreed and said
65 it wasn't just for the County Board but for people beyond the County Board. Discussion
66 continued.

67 Driscoll stated his focus was on the report he presented. He said he didn't have a
68 problem with adding it the way Branham suggested and he didn't have a problem with it being a
69 separate recommendation. He said the header before the actual recommendations might be
70 reworked to become a potential recommendation. Sullivan stated that he would like some
71 recommendations made about the preventatives. He had an idea, that is happening in various
72 parts of the world, that he said would be a huge change and that is to treat small amounts of
73 marijuana and cocaine as mental health issues like alcohol is treated and not as a criminal
74 justice issue. That would be a recommendation that would go into the State level piece. He
75 suggested breaking recommendations into four categories and cluster recommendations into
76 these categories and emphasize that each category needs to be addressed. He felt it might be
77 easier for the person reading.

78 Richards asked if the task force supported all ten of the recommendations, saying he
79 hadn't seen any emails shooting them down. He felt they should talk about any concerns before
80 talking about grouping or merging. Kilgore stated he has no problem with any of the
81 recommendations but doesn't like the phrasing of recommendation number four. Driscoll asked
82 for the difference between potential recommendations one and nine. Branham said nine is other
83 steps, just some of the things the council would be addressing. Rappaport felt that it could be
84 combined with number one. Rappaport felt what would now be in recommendation number five
85 is unclear as to what it is. He felt it was also at a philosophical level. Branham respectfully
86 disagreed because it ends up affecting these sanctioning alternatives and literally becomes
87 programmatic. Rappaport stated that isn't obvious. Branham said that's because it's only one
88 sentence. She noted the details are in her section of the report and she didn't want to cross
89 reference to her report because she felt it muddied it up. Discussion continued.

90 Kilgore stated that he had as a recommendation that the task force needed a
91 philosophical recommendation to restorative justice and that it actually be the first
92 recommendation. Sullivan said it's probably one of the most important long run answers to the
93 quandary we're in right now. Sullivan and Rappaport agreed that the first recommendation
94 should be philosophical and the second recommendation should be structural, with the
95 remaining recommendations being policies. Kilgore suggested using Sullivan's idea of breaking
96 it up into groupings with subheadings. Richards said one solution would be to put the report on
97 the CJTF website with links to each individual report where needed. Branham suggested
98 changes to recommendation number four that addressed Kilgore's concerns of the wording.
99 Driscoll suggested making behavioral health a separate recommendation. Rappaport agreed.
100 Branham said could make recommendation number four be the mental health and substance
101 abuse and then could make the next recommendation other treatment programs and re-entry
102 planning needed to avoid incarceration. Sullivan said would like behavioral health as
103 recommendation number three. He suggested the first recommendation be Kilgore's sentence,
104 the second is what is now number one, then behavioral health, then other programs. Rappaport
105 stated that this would allow a visual that shows a sequence of events. Branham stated
106 recommendation number five becomes one, recommendation one becomes two,

107 recommendation three someone needs to write, recommendation four is pre-trial services,
108 recommendation five is sanctioning options, six is treatment, combine nine with two. Driscoll
109 suggested wording for the mental health recommendation. Kilgore said he didn't want it limited
110 to just the criminal justice system. Branham said if it's not limited then you have to include
111 several other suggestions on how to prevent crime. Kilgore stated that one of the main issues
112 with the jail has been mental health and it has been talked about extensively, whereas they
113 haven't heard as much about vocational training or education. He felt it was appropriate to give
114 it a special status because it is such a major issue in the County. Branham asked for agreement
115 that they wouldn't get into living wage, education deficits, etc., because she felt that wasn't the
116 charge of this task force. Richards said that the task force had opened the charge pretty
117 broadly to wherever the committee wants to go. He stated those items could be referenced in
118 the appendix and they are pretty non-controversial issues. He did state that the committee
119 wanted stick to what they've been looking at with the recommendations, things that County
120 stakeholders could actually do. Discussion continued.

121 Rappaport noted a concern about someone seeing all the services in Champaign
122 County and asking why do we need more. He felt there should be some statement explaining
123 why the services aren't sufficient. Driscoll stated part of it is the level of resources and that the
124 capacity isn't there. He also said that if the courts are going to want to utilize the services, they
125 are going to have to purchase them. He said that even though the services exist, the courts are
126 going to have to make a financial commitment to make sure the capacity is there for the people
127 they are referring to it. Richards noted that was why it was important for everyone to be at the
128 Board presentation, to answer any questions that may come up.

129 Branham asked if after recommendation number three there should be the bracket that
130 says "see....for more specific recommendations." Driscoll stated he would prefer that. He would
131 like the reader to be directed to the entire behavioral health report. Rappaport clarified that they
132 aren't disagreeing with any of the recommendations, but just reorganizing them. He noted that
133 there had been previous discussions about the housing for women and people with serious
134 mental health issues being woefully terrible and thought there should be some sort of statement
135 about it in the report with some possible ideas. He felt there should be a recommendation
136 pertinent to the very acute problem for handling that issue short of building a new jail facility. He
137 noted that they had talked about various things including some sort of temporary structure
138 where people could safely be housed. Sullivan asked if there were non-profits that could do that
139 and couldn't the County help support that work. Branham stated it is mentioned and also cited in
140 two places. She doesn't feel it's their charge and she also feels uninformed to propose modules.
141 Kilgore noted that most people being held are in either high or maximum security facilities and
142 felt that is totally inappropriate and unnecessary. Richards stated it's probably stronger if they
143 just talk about what they've seen. It was agreed to bring up the facilities issue with ILPP since
144 that is what they do.

145 Driscoll asked that the people and titles referred to in the introduction be verified. He felt
146 at least one was incorrect. Kilgore said he would like to re-work what is currently number ten.
147 He said he doesn't like the idea of a disproportionate justice impact study task force and felt it
148 should be called a racial justice task force or just a task force.

149 Patti Petrie encouraged the task force to use visuals in their presentation. She
150 addressed Rappaport's concerns about someone looking at the report and asking what more is
151 needed in the community by suggesting the use of side-bars. She also said that many of the
152 items mentioned that might potentially fall under the task force are goals of the County Board
153 which would provide legitimacy.

154 Branham wondered if the part with inventory should be left out because they don't have
155 all the information needed yet except in the mental health area. She asked if that needed to be
156 publicly disseminated yet because they don't have an inventory of everything else. She said a
157 reason to include it would be to show that they have collected some information, but the reason
158 to not include it is because they don't have it all collected. Richards noted part of the reason the

159 mental health group were pushing for the inclusion of the whole thing is that Ferguson and
160 Rollins-Gay will not be coming back. Driscoll stated they he is probably not continuing either.
161 Richards said it doesn't have to be included but should definitely be made available as a
162 resource. Richards again noted that the more people at the County Board presentation to talk
163 about their area of expertise the better he thinks it will go.

164 Branham asked if anyone objected to calling the last section background notes with
165 additional potential recommendations. All agreed that was fine. She asked if they were going to
166 take Ferguson's recommendation that names be added to the reports. She stated that her
167 understandings of what will be in that section are background papers submitted by each area
168 with their names on them. Discussion resulted that would be fine as long as no names appear in
169 the other sections. Sullivan suggested an editor-in-chief and maybe a designer. Branham noted
170 the only thing left that they haven't seen is the funding, the intro and the priority tasks for the
171 consultant. Kilgore noted that he didn't see anything in the recommendation about redistributing
172 the public safety sales tax. Richards thought that was in section four. Kilgore suggested a
173 recommendation for ILPP should be a comprehensive profile of the jail population. Discussion
174 continued.

175

176 **Discussion – Next Step**

177

178 Sullivan asked what the process of the next steps is. Branham sees them still tinkering
179 with priority tasks. She didn't know if anyone had any comments on State level
180 recommendations. Sullivan said that they need to seriously think about treating possession of
181 small amounts of substance as a mental health issue. Rappaport said he didn't fully grasp why
182 they are making State level recommendations. It was mentioned that this has an impact on
183 resources. Richards said the County Board does weigh in with the State on legislation it feels
184 affects the County.

185 Richards stated the presentation to the Board will be November 13. He also noted that
186 they have a meeting with ILPP on November 7. He felt that after meeting with ILPP might be a
187 time when they give final approval to the report, they could meet on the 12th or briefly before the
188 meeting on the 13th. Branham said what is still left is the funding piece, comments on the intro
189 and phrasing for the priority tasks for the consultant. Richards said there are still some things up
190 in the air but felt on the 7th they could, if they are disciplined and get things done before, have a
191 quick vote for approval and tell Administrative Service what they want the report to look like for
192 the County Board. Branham said she would like to have what they are sharing with the
193 consultant be as closely done as possible. Kilgore asked if there should be a separate section
194 showing what they want the consultant to do. Driscoll felt that was appropriate so the County
195 Board is aware of what they have asked the consultant.

196 Kilgore felt the issue of public safety should stay in the introduction and the definition of
197 public safety should be put back in. He also said the point of view should read as a "we" rather
198 than "they." He said the 2-hour dialog with the delegation from the African American community
199 concerning racial discrepancies in the jail population and related issues should absolutely be in
200 there in some form. Branham felt it was a political issue but didn't have a problem with it being
201 in there. She suggested alternate wording. Kilgore felt language became overwhelming and
202 technical, and didn't understand why cut out the facility needs of the jail. Branham felt this was
203 the area to capsulize the recommendations but very succinctly. He noted they will have to re-do
204 the part about what's in part two. Driscoll said the drafting needs to be done and then asked
205 would Administrative Services collate it. Richards said that once they have approved a final
206 product, Administrative Services will be happy to print it. Driscoll asked if it had to be in their
207 appropriate format. Richards said yes, they have to figure out what they want in the report.
208 Kilgore felt it needed to be proof-read as well. Branham asked about the order of the
209 background notes. Rappaport felt it didn't really matter unless they are being referred to and
210 then they would be in the order in which they were referred. Sullivan suggested alphabetical by

211 author. Kilgore said there should be a table of contents at the beginning and those four reports
212 should have a place in it. Kilgore again stated that the document should be proof-read. He went
213 on to say that any comments should be on proof-reading corrections only and not on the
214 placement of recommendations, which they are done with. Kilgore asked who would have the
215 actual document in their computer and do the page numbering and the table of contents.
216 Branham said she will do it. Rappaport said the only thing unresolved is whether or not they are
217 going put the recommendations into a grouping or leave them as a list. Kilgore suggested
218 saying that they like the idea of sub-headings and leave it to Branham to see if she can find a
219 way to do that. Kilgore said that at the end of the introduction he will put everybody's name, and
220 then asked if that should be on a title page instead. Rappaport said on a title page. Branham
221 said have a title page, a page of task force members, then a table of contents. Driscoll said he
222 will talk to Ferguson about the list of services that are attached and about adding a statement
223 somewhere in the document related to capacity. Kilgore asked if there was a list of the task
224 force members with their titles. Members went around the room giving their titles and will get
225 them from absent members thru email.

226

227 **Other Business**

228

229 Rappaport asked Richards if he will be presenting this to the County Board. Richards
230 stated that they will all be presenting it to the County Board, but he will be chairing the meeting.
231 He said they will need to talk about how they want to present it. He felt everyone should be
232 there to answer questions.

233

234 **Next Meeting Date**

235

236 The next meeting will be a discussion with Dr. Alan Kalmanoff of ILPP on Wednesday,
237 November 7, 2012 at 6:00pm in the Jennifer K. Putman Meeting Room.

238

239 **Adjournment**

240

241 The meeting adjourned at 8:37 p.m.

242

243

244 Respectfully Submitted,

245

246 Linda Lane

247 Administrative Assistant