

MEETING MINUTES – CRISIS RESPONSE PLANNING COMMITTEE

We are in a position to do something specific with implementation funding. Possibilities include: enhanced reentry case management for the BH population, a co-responder either with this funding or through some other source of funding, pre-trial risk-needs-responsivity assessment (RNR) – which must be built into the application to qualify for funding, and a BH coordinating council – which must also be built into the application to qualify for funding, as relayed through reviewers’ comments in response to previous, unsuccessful SCA grant applications, as well as our TA Providers’ recommendations. Some entity must provide coordination of county-wide initiatives similar to the CRPC. Perhaps the CRPC can be reconstituted with additional agencies/groups represented, such as the CIT Steering Committee, local hospitals, etc.

There was support at the last meeting surrounding a co-responder model (C-RM). However, after reviewing costs and taking into consideration the two requirements previously described, it will not be feasible to fund a C-RM with remaining funds that would come from the JMHCP implementation grant. Further, an option that has frequently been discussed in the community for more than a year has been the development of an assessment center, where law enforcement could take people with BH issues, who are being disruptive in the community, but who do not belong in jail. However, there is still not enough data re: the prevalence of BH issues of people booked into the jail to inform such an undertaking. Such a project would be costly, particularly without data to indicate the level of capacity necessary to effectively address the need.

On the list provided, the *Issues* category functions as a “parking lot” for systemic issues that must be addressed. These include data limitations – the capacity to collect, track, and share CJ/BH data, and jail facilities – the current state of jail facilities is not amenable to programming aimed at rehabilitation and support for the incarcerated population.

Jones stated that he, Lisa Benson of CC Regional Planning Commission (RPC), Driscoll, and Blodgett attended a webinar on Loom, a data sharing application for CJ data projects. Due to Champaign County’s participation in the White House’s Data Driven Justice Initiative, the use of Loom – as a repository – would be free for the County.

Use of the application would require each stakeholder to upload their data. Each stakeholder could then “lock” any part of their data they choose, depending on who they would allow to see which aspects of it. Ultimately, the platform would allow each stakeholder to view any unlocked data contributed by their counterparts, as well as access aggregate data resulting from stakeholders’ combined information. Jones stated that local hospitals are anticipated to take part in this data sharing effort. And, with the proper MOUs in place, BH agencies could take part as well. As such, this application has the potential to resolve some of the current data sharing limitations faced by this project.

A pre-trial RNR must be implemented, to inform defense counsel and judges of criminogenic/recidivism risk. The Probation Office will likely play an important role in this activity, as officers already administer the LSI-R, and an informal pre-trial unit, overseen by the Probation Office, has begun.

MEETING MINUTES – CRISIS RESPONSE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Barnard relayed recent conversations with other counties in the US where pre-trial risk assessments in jails have been implemented. The group was provided a handout with the details of these calls. As a result of the conversations with other communities, Barnard stated that we may want to consider implementing a trauma screen, as well as how RNR scores are shared.

Other jurisdictions experienced pushback from defense attorneys, through a variety of actions, including defense counsel coaching their clients on how to respond to questions on RNR assessments, so as to attain a lower score. In light of such issues, Barnard suggested that it may be prudent to release RNR scores exclusively to defense attorneys, thus allowing them to determine the best use of the information in representing their clients.

Jones said that the state of IL will be funding pre-trial RNR administration in the future. As such, implementing pre-trial RNR assessments would be a logical activity for which to apply for funding, as the sustainability of it will be required of the county sometime after the two-year window. Jones also said that support has been voiced from vital entities, such as the County and the Cities re: the formation of a BH coordinating council. Recently the City of Urbana passed a resolution to support mental health initiatives related to the justice-involved population, such as CIT officers. No match contribution has yet been offered, as Urbana would like the City of Champaign also take part in these efforts.

Jones stated that, as a County entity, RPC will be the JMHCP grant administrator and financial point of contact for the implementation grant. RPC will collect a 5% administration fee for this service.

A discussion re: the Mental Health Board's (MHB) match for the JMHCP grant was had, as RCU recently applied to the MHB for a C-RM, for FY18. Ferguson explained the thought behind this application as, should the MHB choose to support it, the funding could be considered the match for the JMHCP grant. Driscoll asked if other CJ-focused grants from the MHB could be considered match funds for this JMHCP application. This is a question for the Dept. of Justice (DOJ), and will be followed-up. However, it is not likely, as match funds cannot supplant initiatives that are currently underway.

Driscoll gave a brief overview of the funding support sought from the MHB for FY18. Of the applications received, 40 relate to MH/SA. In FY17, the MHB funded just over \$3M in programming. This year, applications received totaled approx. \$4M. It should be noted that the \$75,000 required match for the FY18 JMHCP grant is included in that figure.

Ferguson stated that the remaining funding in the implementation RFP could be used to fund a smaller piece of a C-RM or as a second C-RM that would operate evenings and weekends, which will not be covered by the funds from the MHB if they choose to fund a C-RM. Ferguson also stated personal prioritization for 1) BH, 2) RNR, and 3) C-RM. Barnard stated that from a grant writing standpoint, it would be very difficult to justify

MEETING MINUTES – CRISIS RESPONSE PLANNING COMMITTEE

expanding a program that does not currently exist. And, that additional time is needed to work on the numbers for the application, if RPC can tolerate some uncertainty.

Lennhoff reiterated the framework proposed for discussion, and the activities for which we are required to apply for funding. In addition, Lennhoff noted that there is some ambiguity surrounding possible activities for which support can be applied with remaining funds, due to the requirements of the JMHCP RFP and the timing of the applications for both to the MHB and the DOJ. Lennhoff then asked if the group could reach consensus to allow the principals to determine what to apply for with remaining funds, based on information gathered and the discussions had.

A motion was made to approve this suggestion and the motion was seconded; allowing the principals to decide how best to allocate remaining JMHCP implementation funds within the application, was unanimously approved.

Old Business

Barnard stated that the screenings that have taken place at the jail, thus far, will be used to supply required data in the grant application.

Tison stated that CIT ARMS data collection and reporting system rolled-out on Feb. 14th, and the system is expected to be fully operational by April 1st.

New Business

None

The next meeting is scheduled for April 5, 2017.

The meeting concluded at 2:11pm.