COMMUNITY JUSTICE TASK FORCE MINUTES

Monday, January 28, 2013

3 Jennifer K Putman Meeting Room

Brookens Administrative Center

1776 E. Washington St., Urbana

MEMBERS PRESENT: Carol Ammons, Scott Bennett, Astrid Berkson (Chair), Lynn

Branham, James Kilgore, Darlene Kloeppel, Julian Rappaport,

Michael Richards, Bruce Suardini

MEMBERS ABSENT: William Sullivan

OTHERS PRESENT: Pattsi Petrie, County Board Member; Deb Busey, County

Administrator; Ann Russell; Linda Lane (administrative assistant)

Call to Order

Berkson called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m.

Public Participation

Ann Russell stated she is a licensed clinical social worker who works at Frances Nelson. She noted that the largest mental hospital in the state is Cook County Jail. She expressed the need to think about mental health facilities when thinking about a new jail. Berkson commented that what really needs to be thought about is how jails handle the mentally ill.

Discussion: Goals & Scope of Work for Task Force

Berkson asked for ideas of what this task force would do. Rappaport gave a handout (see attached) outlining a plan he had thought of. He suggest that the task force provide some practical suggestions for how the Board can use some of its resources to reduce the likelihood that residents will need to spend time in jail. He said might recommend the Board allocating funds to a call for proposals as incentive for cities or local agencies to provide services to prevent jailing of people suspected of emotional disturbances but who aren't admitted to hospitals. He stated that local police don't have any local alternatives other than arrest and jail. Rappaport said the call for proposal could specify that applicants supply some amount of matching funds in order to expand available resources. He also noted that the Mental Health Board already has a way to evaluate proposals for local services. He feels this would be more efficient than putting people in jail. Berkson stated another class of people could be included; homeless people and those who commit non-criminal offenses, such as public urination. She stated a person will spend one day in jail for every \$20 in fines, which could end up being a lengthy stay for offenses that don't seem to be criminal.

Berkson asked for any other suggestions. Ammons asked for clarification if task force members were being asked to bring proposals of alternative or establishing goals. Berkson stated yes and noted there are only three (3) months to influence the needs assessment and two (2) months after that to influence the Board. Berkson stated it's not just a matter of policies, proposals and principals, but what can we do, how can we do it, and how well will it work. Kloeppel stated she was also unclear and asked if the purpose was to come up alternatives or to develop a process for how alternative can happen. Rappaport asked if new members had seen the report. They stated they had. Kloeppel said what she saw in the report were three (3) options put forth of kinds of thing that might need to happen. She wanted to know if they were to investigate those more thoroughly or can they present other options. Kilgore felt starting point should be what is in the current report and to go forward from that, noting that he would like to add other things as well. He stated that they needed develop proposals in those areas and

noted that what Rappaport had put together was the beginning of that process. He continued by stating the second thing is that the recommendations do require resources and recommended beginning to look at reallocation of the funds from the public safety sales tax in order to fund initiatives or have matching funds and all the other programs that will be preventative rather than just improving on the jail facility. He stated that some kind of understanding of how they might restructure how the public safety sales tax money is spent in order to be able to develop the proposals. Kilgore noted the proposals they present will need budgets with them. Berkson stated that more money should be available in the future as bonds are paid off.

Branham stated this was a preliminary report but felt it set the foundation for the next step. She referred to potential recommendation #4 and felt the handout Rappaport provided is a specific tool to implement the recommendation. She noted one challenge the task force will face is that the task force wants to help make sure that the needs assessment is valuable to this county. She stated they were very specific with ILPP that the task force needed data, number crunching, and particularly needed a risk assessment done. She noted the taskforce wanted to help guide ILPP's process. Kloeppel stated she has some data pertaining to youth, but not adults. Using Rappaport's handout as an example, she asked if it was know how many people a year that affected.

Rappaport stated his approach was to pick up where the previous task force left off. He said he had been to several meetings among the police forces and they have told him that what is on his handout is a huge problem. He stated that the police don't want to take these people to jail but that there isn't an alternative. Rappaport stated that the statistics will vary from police force to police force, but felt there is enough data to say that it is not a trivial problem. He noted that the police departments tell him it happens every day. Kloeppel suggested an assessment screening tool, or triage point, that would have an array of possible choices in order to hit the largest pools of the main problems. Rappaport felt they aren't in a position, in terms of mental health services, to know what the potential resources in the community are among the many mental health providers. He suggested the approach could call for proposals asking current providers what they could offer if they had the resources. He also felt that it wouldn't have to be funded completely by the County but could ask the cities to put some money into it.

Kilgore stated that the Sheriff had been asked to put numbers together regarding the inmates with mental health issues, and the results varied from 20%-40%. Kilgore also noted that ILPP had been asked for a cross-referenced list of the jail population in of regards to mental health, substance abuse, charges against people and race. Kilgore felt the system needed to deal with all of the issues and not just one. Kloeppel asked where could get those statistics. Branham said the NIC report. Berkson asked that the NIC report be sent to Kloeppel. Richards suggested also looking at the minutes from the first few meeting of the previous task force and the study session for the jail.

Suardini wanted to know what the charge from the Board was for this task force and asked if this task force is to find alternatives to jail or focus on a new facility. He also wanted to know where the specific recommendations the task force had already generated had gone. Berkson said everyone should have received the report. Suardini asked if it had gone to the Board. Berkson stated yes. Kilgore said it is a work in progress. Ammons agreed that this task force should start where the progress report left off. She said her understanding of this committee's responsibility was to find ways to re-allocate current funds and possibly obtain new funds. She noted that the data shows that crime is down but the incarceration rate remains stable. Ammons is hoping this committee will work with ILPP towards a final recommendation to the Board that will include alternatives of what could be done as it relates to what ILPP has done. She also stated that she like the idea of a call for proposals. She noted there could be existing programs that aren't currently being adequately funded. Ammons gave an example of someone who police picked up for defacing public property. The police took him to Carle because he had injured himself, but that there was no place for him to go after that for mental health services because he didn't have insurance. Rappaport stated that local hospital

emergency room representatives say most of the issues are behavioral, not mental illness. Suardini stated that for every person the police see with these issues, there are two-three more that the police don't see. He said that his detox center has over 800 people a year before it closed. He also said that police aren't picking up these people anymore. Many of the people can't be taken to the ER because the ER won't take people for detox.

Branham briefly explained the original charge of the task force. She noted the catalyst to forming the task force was the issue of the downtown jail facility and the assumption that a new facility needed to be built, which galvanized a core group of citizens to suggest looking at alternatives before any decisions regarding the jail were made. She then suggested that the committee consider dividing into groups to come up with some specific items and implementation plans for the potential recommendations. She suggested one group look at item #4, one group look #5 and #6, etc., as a possible way for the task force to move forward and who would want to take each part.

Rappaport felt the issue of limited resources should be dealt with first and then look at the programs. Kilgore felt they should run parallel and that there should be some discussion about what could be done with the money along with hearing recommendations. He felt that the mental health issue could be a proposal that could bring a lot of people on board. He also would like to look at recidivism and bring a proposal in regards to programs for people coming out of prison. He said he would like to bring a proposal to the next meeting.

Berkson stated that rural problems, racial disparity, and youth were added to what this task force should be looking at. She noted that diversion efforts weren't doing as well with blacks as with whites and needs to be addressed.

Ammons agrees with Branham's idea of splitting into groups to address the issues. She brought up a day reporting center. Berkson stated that all the women in the jail were there for non-violent crimes. Ammons suggested turning the downtown facility into a day reporting center. She noted that the lack of mental health services and public housing are a huge problem, so the jail becomes housing. She continued by saying that alternatives are needed so the courts, defense, prosecutors, jail keepers, etc. won't continue to be overwhelmed.

Branham noted that she would like to address recommendations #5 and #6 and asked Bennett if he would help on those as well. Kloeppel noted that there were two sets of recommendations and asked which they were working from. Branham explained that pages seven (7) and eight (8) were being used and that the others in the back were the reports submitted by the individual members. Bennett said he would help with #5 and #6 either separately or with Branham.

Rappaport said that shouldn't keep new members from brining in ideas. He suggested making the document that was submitted to the board less philosophical and more practical, giving concrete examples and practical suggestions. He felt they don't need all the answers, but rather show the expertise of what is already in the community. He also suggests proposing some mechanism to engage the part of the community that spoke at a previous meeting.

Richards agreed with Rappaport stating the easiest, immediate thing they can do is set a structure to push for a day reporting center and look for mental health or County or even State and Federal sources to fund a day reporting center. He stated they shouldn't self-censor and should not forget ways of looking at differently than the current system is set up. Kilgore said one of the major contributions they can make is to influence how the criminal justice system is viewed. He felt concrete proposals were needed with budgets attached. Berkson stated that a detox center should be high on the list. Kilgore noted that Board members seemed unhappy that there weren't specifics in the report and said those needed to be provided this time. Branham noted that in terms of specifics they could show examples of the same person with different scenarios. She also felt it could have more effect if they say "They are doing it here."

Kloeppel suggested that at the next meeting they put together a vision or ideal, with items that show "in my ideal world this is what it would look like" and to be able to put up on the walls to discuss. Ammons stated she would like to work on the ¼ cent public safety sales task

and asked if anyone wanted to help. Rappaport stated that what might be harder to do is find ways money is wasted in the currently structured system. He suggested that the re-allocation of funds doesn't necessarily have to come only from the ¼ cent tax. He wanted to know if probation services could possibly be changed to deal with re-integration and to look at ways the system is currently funded.

Branham stated that the norm is to impose a plan on someone who is returning to the outside and suggested the new paradigm is to have that person play a key role in developing a plan for themselves.

Kloeppel agrees that there are possibilities for redirecting funds or using things that are currently funded differently, and felt there was an opportunity for new funds. She knows of a grant called Second Chance that is for re-entering felons into the community. Berkson asked if her department could apply for that. Kloeppel answered that non-profits and governments can apply for it. Suardini says part of the problem is not being specific to what the needs are. Kloeppel felt they needed a vision first with some sort of flow chart to look at. Branham noted that they are under a time constraint and that it takes a lot of time to gather data, but she loved Kloeppel's idea. Kilgore felt a vision exercise is useful but it needs some planning and structure. He felt people needed to put in ideas before hand and someone needs to actually structure the session. Kloeppel stated she may be able to get a facilitator for the next meeting.

Branham felt confident that they couldn't resolve all the issues. Bennett asked what the deadline was for ILPP to submit its report and Berkson responded April 30. Rappaport asked if ILPP has provided a progress report yet. Busey noted they are still in the formative stages and are working on initial drafts. She stated that Dr. Kalmanoff would provide an update at the February 21, 2013 Board meeting.

Berkson noted that the mentally ill are clearly a problem but there are a lot more people in jail who are not criminals; people who drove without insurance, people urinating in the park, people smoking marijuana, etc. She stated that there were more arrests for marijuana than for violent crimes. Bennett stated he had some statistics and would bring to the next meeting. He noted that there is a misconception that people are in jail for driving without insurance when what really happens is that someone's license is suspended for that and then end up in jail due to the suspended license. Bennett felt needed to talk about pre-trial services and ways to minimize how long people are in custody for those types of crimes. He suggested looking at how to reduce the men's population to one pod so that the women could be moved from the downtown facility. Berkson asked if the nearly empty JDC facility could be used and to do something different with the juveniles. She noted that the facility will hold 40 but there are usually only 15-20 juveniles utilizing it. Kilgore agreed with the need to address the women's population issue. Bennett noted that the prisoners on suicide watch is in the downtown facility and is growing. Branham felt it might be beneficiary for the new members to tour the facilities. Discussion continued.

Kilgore felt that in terms of a vision it is important to explore restorative justice. Rappaport stated the ideas need to be illustrated very concretely. He said they don't want to inadvertently trigger something political. Berkson stated there is bi-partisan agreement that no one wants the cost of having so many people in jail who aren't criminals. Kilgore noted that the system of punishing rather than providing opportunities to develop job skills while incarcerated isn't working. He noted that they needed to talk about the big picture and which pieces they were going to talk about since they can't to everything to fix the system. He felt what they needed to do was get people thinking differently about how it works.

Berkson stated that the State funding for jails is more than education and that the amounts have flipped in the last 40 years due to the war on drugs. Rappaport felt the people on the board were in the best position to make the case for how to do this in a way that is more fiscally responsible than the current way the funds are used. He noted they weren't talking about some sort of liberal spending, but that believed this would be less costly. Kloeppel noted that the costs may end up not being less because the net would be widening. Berkson asked if

these people will have insurance when the national healthcare goes into effect. Kloeppel noted may not save money because there could be savings in one area but more expenses in another, but that it may be more effective. Rappaport felt it was possible to break even.

Branham suggested tentatively selecting areas to bring ideas for the next meeting. She asked if Kilgore was thinking re-entry. Kilgore said yes. Branham noted that Ammons said she would like to work on funding. She asked if the vision planning would be the next point. Berkson suggested the next meeting begin with one (1) hour of vision planning and thought that was a great way to decide on priorities and directions. She asked when everyone wanted to meet again. Kloeppel said she would like two (2) dates in case the facilitator can't make one. Discussion continued about possible dates.

Branham asked Richards if he would work on funding. Richards said yes. Kilgore stated he would like to help with that as well. Branham suggested giving ideas to each other before the next meeting via email. Kloeppel said she would commit to the issue of the jails.

Approval of Minutes – November 7, 2012

Motion by Bennett to approve minutes; seconded by Richards. **Motion approved unanimously.**

Adjournment

211212

213

214

215

216217

218

219220

221

222223

224

225226

227228

229

230231

232233234

235236

The meeting adjourned at 7:38 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

237 Linda Lane238 Administrative Assistant

I suggest that the TF provide some practical suggestions for how the County Board can use some of its resources to reduce the likelihood that residents will need to spend time in jail. We might recommend, for example:

The County Board should allocate funds to a CALL FOR PROPOSALS as an incentive for the cities or local agencies to provide services designed to prevent arrest and jailing of people brought by the police to the emergency rooms because they are behaving in ways that cause the police and others to suspect emotional disturbance, but who are not admitted to the hospital. In such circumstances police often have no local alternative other than arrest and jail, which is often inappropriate.

The call for proposals could specify that applicants provide some amount of matching funds, in order to expand available resources.

The County Mental Health Board already has a systematic way to evaluate proposals for local services. Creation of a call for proposals jointly funded by the County and other agencies, with the proposals evaluated and services monitored by the Mental Health Board, could be an efficient and effective way to stimulate local initiatives designed to reduce the number of people who are inappropriately in jail because of mental illness.