

# Champaign County Community Justice Task Force County of Champaign, Urbana, Illinois

		0	
7	MINUTES	- SUBJECT TO REVIEW AND APPROVAL	
8	DATE:	Wednesday, May 29, 2013	
9	TIME:	6:00 p.m.	
10	PLACE:	Jennifer Putnam Meeting Room	
11		Brookens Administrative Center	
12		1776 E Washington, Urbana, IL 61802	
12			

#### 13

## 14 Committee Members

Present	Absent
Carol Ammons (Chair)	
Scott Bennett	
Astrid Berkson	
Lynn Branham	
James Kilgore	
Darlene Kloeppel	
Julian Rappaport	
Michael Richards	
	Bruce Suardini
	William Sullivan

## 15

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27 28

29

30 31

- 16 County Staff: Deb Busey (County Administrator), Beth Brunk (Recording Secretary)
- 1718 Others Present: Pattsi Petrie (Champaign Co Board), Sophia Lewis

## 19 **MINUTES**

## I. Call to Order

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

## II. Approval of Agenda

Mr. Rappaport commented that he was unsure if the Mental Health part that had changes was included in this agenda. Ms. Ammons will add an agenda item V-C to cover the Mental Health changes.

**MOTION** by Mr. Kilgore to approve the agenda as amended; seconded by Ms. Kloeppel. Upon vote, the **MOTION CARRIED unanimously.** 

## III. Public Participation

32 Sophia Lewis explained that she leads the workgroup for women in the jail and requested 33 funding for the women. One problem that affects women who have been arrested with a 34 claim of abuse toward her children is that she must complete a service plan including a 35 specified number of courses within 9 months. This time limit begins when the mother is 36 incarcerated. The approved DCFS coursework is not currently offered in the jail so depending 37 so the length of time in jail, a woman may have a limited time to complete this requirement 38 when she has been released. Failure to complete the required studies is a negative factor 39 when her case is evaluated which could result in losing the custody of her children. Ms. Lewis would like some more time to come up with specific costs of programs needed for the women in the jail.

#### Mr. Richards entered the meeting at 6:07 p.m.

Ms. Ammons stated that this Task Force will be looking at recommendations and will see where Ms. Lewis' request could fit in. It may be something outside of the Task Force but could be included in Dr. Kalmanoff's report.

#### IV. Approval of Minutes

A. April 5, 2013 and May 15, 2013 Meetings

**MOTION** by Ms. Kloeppel to approve the April 5<sup>th</sup> and May 15<sup>th</sup>, 2013 meeting minutes for the Champaign County Community Task Force as distributed; seconded by Mr. Bennett. Upon vote, the **MOTION CARRIED unanimously.** 

#### V. Review

#### A. Funding Draft

Ms. Ammons and Mr. Richards asked for input from the Task Force on the Funding Draft that they coauthored. Ms. Berkson wondered if the County Board decided how the funds allocated to the Sheriff are used. Ms. Busey clarified that once the County Board establishes the budget for the Sheriff's office, the Sheriff controls it completely. However the County Board has to approve the budget based on what the Sheriff is asking for programmatically to be able to provide. Elected Officials align their strategic plans based on the County Board's strategic plan. Ms. Kloeppel thought outcome measures based on the County Board goals should be looked at in evaluating the Sheriff's budget. The Task Force is asking for a reprioritization of County funds to pay for alternative services.

Mr. Kilgore thought that there should be a reassessment of the jail maintenance budgets to bring them up to a standard of that would allow for adequate maintenance. Ms. Branham recommended that some costs should be listed in terms of jail construction expenses, operating costs to illustrate the small amount of money that goes to community corrections like probation, diversion, drug court, etc.

Mr. Kilgore recommended including language to indicate future plans to phase in a larger percentage than 30% from the Public Safety Sales Tax (PSST) as alternative programs expand. Mr. Richards noted that 30% was chosen because 70% of PSST money is obligated toward bond payments. Ms. Berkson thought 30% was a great deal of money – approximately \$1.1 to \$1.2 million. Ms. Busey noted that the 30% is currently being used to pay for criminal justice system technology and utility costs of the criminal justice facilities. Those costs still have to be paid for by some fund.

Ms. Kloeppel asked if any money was being considered for facility construction and/or renovation. Ms. Ammons thought that topic would be covered in Dr. Kalmanoff's report. This Task Force is concentrating on recidivism reduction by alternative plans not fully explored in the ILPP study. Mr. Kilgore thought the food statistics should be compared to a per capita number or percentage of budget to gain more meaning. Mr. Bennett thought it would be beneficial to use an average.

Ms. Branham suggested listing the Champaign Urbana Public Health District (CUPHD) as a potential source of funding for behavioral health recommendations. Mr. Richards stated that the Mental Health Board is a County entity whereas the CUPHD is not and therefore he felt uncomfortable listing it.

Mr. Richards asked for help from the Task Force members to come up with more programs than he has listed to reduce the census in the jail, get the up-front costs associated with the listed programs,

look at other counties across the country for programs that saved money and reduced the inmate population and get percentages for the reduction of recidivism. This information would give Mr. Richards an estimation of the money that could be saved by the County and reduce inmate numbers.

Mr. Richards went over the General Corporate Fund numbers as it relates to the criminal justice system. Ms. Busey noted that the PSST revenues and expenditures are equal at \$4.7 million. Ms. Branham noted that no PSST money is going toward adult community-based diversion programs. Mr. Richards suggested that the money saved by reducing traditional jail services could be used for programs to keep people out of jail. The Mental Health Board has recently committed \$576,884 for servicing people with behavioral health problems who are also involved in the criminal justice system. Short-term avenues for revenue are state and federal grants such as Access Initiative (youth only) and the Drug Court Program. Ms. Kloeppel mentioned that the Department of Corrections state grants fund re-entry programs. Ms. Petrie suggested that this document should have more visual components besides just the narrative.

B. Recommendations

1. Behavioral Health (Mental Health) Services

Mr. Rappaport indicated that he has made small changes to the 4 recommendations in this document from the previous draft. The Mental Health Board (MHB), police and the jail administrator are cooperating in making changes so the mentally ill are not put in jail. There are modest requests for support from the County for hiring a full-time person to create intergovernmental agreements and seek contracts and grants. The in-jail services with the Sheriff should include two social workers. Ms. Kloeppel will assist with estimating the cost of these additional staffing requests.

Mr. Rappaport suggested the development of a 24/7 Community-Based Mental Health Crisis Center in cooperation with a local hospital (Provena). The County should support two crisis intervention case managers at this location. The details will need to be worked out. He thought this Task Force should recommend that the County could begin a conversation with the CUPHD to discuss ways which public health and mental health could collaborate in this venture.

Ms. Ammons thought that Ms. Kloeppel should continue to work on this document. Comments should be forwarded to Ms. Kloeppel.

## 2. <u>Restorative and Criminal Justice Coordinating Council</u>

Ms. Branham explained the importance of bringing together different players including experts to look at the criminal justice system systemically. The composition of the Council must be broad-based with different options. Ms. Branham listed an example of 15 people to be included on the Council including two representatives from the public. Ms. Berkson thought a representative for juvenile justice should be included.

Mr. Kilgore commented that the idea is good to include a broader participation in the Coordinating Council than what was proposed in the ILPP study. However, the level of detail and amount of text could be interpreted as confrontational and may dilute the other recommendations' importance. Perhaps a broader recommendation of the principles would be appropriate and this detailed approach could be in the appendix as an example. Mr. Rappaport agreed that this document was too prescriptive. Ms. Berkson thought a "shovel-ready" recommendation makes it more likely to get a Coordinating Council because it gives the County Board something to work with. Mr. Bennett commented that the Court Administrator should be included in the list. Ms. Busey suggested the County Administrator should also be included as that person will have budget and finance information.

## APPROVED 6/5/2013

Mr. Bennett suggested including representatives so the key players will have the flexibility to send who they want. Ms. Branham commented that Champaign County already does this in small sections but this approach brings forth an integrated system. The Coordinating Council will help to ensure that decisions are data-based with evaluation mechanisms. Some Coordinating Councils have an Executive Committee who sets the agenda. Ms. Branham feels the current system needs tremendous improvement with a structure in place. Ms. Ammons agreed that coordination is needed and should be inclusive of many people. However, she believed that it should be more organic to garner support from the County Board.

Ms. Branham thought that the Task Force needs to reach out to people behind the scenes now to gain support. Ms. Kloeppel suggested that the Task Force could make an underlying statement that they recommend this structure and then give examples of how it could be formulated. Mr. Kilgore commented that the time to get this Council established may take a minimum of 18 months whereas projects and programs could get started soon. Once the projects and programs begin, they will be the proof that this Council is necessary.

Ms. Ammons wanted to cut this recommendation down and have an appendix which can include the detailed examples. Ms. Branham suggested that the County Board could initiate an intergovernmental agreement which would include detail. She felt that the composition should be in the full report. Mr. Rappaport reiterated that this should be a policy statement. Ms. Ammons will work with Ms. Branham individually to edit this document.

3. <u>Other Recommendations</u>

Ms. Ammons asked that the Task Forces read the other recommendations not discussed and offer suggestions to Ms. Kloeppel, Ms. Berkson and Ms. Ammons. Ms. Branham asked for direction on how to address juvenile justice. Ms. Ammons suggested a summary point stating the areas that this report is not addressing including juvenile justice. Ms. Kloeppel offered to write a 1-2 page summary on juvenile justice as she knows those resources. Ms. Kloeppel asked for the actual charge of this Task Force. Ms. Busey will send it to Ms. Kloeppel.

Ms. Ammons will e-mail Task Force members on her suggestions on edits for the recommendations. Mr. Richards will work on the Funding draft with the additions from the Task Force.

## VI. Core Principles

Ms. Ammons recommended a single core principle or goal which should encapsulate the Task Force's vision of a criminal justice system in Champaign County. She will work with Ms. Kloeppel to draft the core principle and send it to the Task Force members for their review. Ms. Kloeppel suggested using the mission statement. Mr. Kilgore felt that human dignity should be the core principle.

## VII. Next Meeting – June 5, 2013

A. <u>Review Structure of Report</u>

Ms. Kloeppel asked for the Word document of Mr. Suardini's Detox Center proposal. The Task Force members should forward their most recent versions of their recommendations to Ms. Kloeppel. She will have a rough outline ready for review at the next meeting.

## VIII. Other Business

There are two more meetings, 6/5/13 and 6/13/13 before this report will be presented to the County Board at the Study Session on June  $25^{th}$ .

## IX. Adjournment

There being no further business, Ms. Ammons adjourned the meeting at 8:06 p.m.