

COMMUNITY JUSTICE TASK FORCE MINUTES**Wednesday, May 15, 2013****Putman Meeting Room****Brookens Administrative Center****1776 E. Washington St., Urbana**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Carol Ammons, Astrid Berkson (Chair), Lynn Branham, James Kilgore, Darlene Kloeppel, Julian Rappaport, Michael Richards, Bruce Suardini

MEMBERS ABSENT: Scott Bennett, William Sullivan

OTHERS PRESENT: Deb Busey (County Administrator), Pattsy Petrie (County Board Member), Jim McGuire (County Board Member), Gerri Kirchner (League of Women Voters), Linda Lane (Administrative Assistant)

Call to Order

Ammons called the meeting to order at 6:05 pm.

Approval of Agenda

Ammons stated she would like to make a correction to the agenda before approval. She moved #7 to #9B. **Motion** by Berkson to approve agenda; **seconded** by Kloeppel. **Approved unanimously.**

Public Participation

Pattsy Petri mentioned that she has two concerns regarding the ILPP report that she has talked to Dr. Kalmanoff about. The first is when the consultant leaves town after the report is done that there will be back-pedaling to the old comfort zone. The second is directions on how to keep that from happening. She stated she has asked Dr. Kalmanoff to consider including those in the final report as advice to the Board. She would like the task force to consider likewise for their report as well.

Report on Recommendations

Ammons said the committee has had several weeks to go over the recommendations for Substance Abuse, Re-Entry, and Pre-Trial Services and would like to release to Kloeppel so she can start compiling the report. Ammons asked for discussion on these items, but asked that it be kept brief since it's been discussed for many weeks now. Branham likes the addition of statistics and felt it strengthened the report. She noted that ILPP's report recommended a sobering center to put someone who's drunk, but thought detox addressed someone in an acute stage. Suardini confirmed. Branham asked if there is a potential to integrate. Suardini felt there could be with Presence Hospital looking at the Community Resource Center. As they enter the ER the assessment would place a person on the 4th floor for detox or if in acute crisis for mental health they would go to the 5th floor. If they are not in need, they could be seen at the entry level of the hospital and diverted to a program outside. Branham noted they needed to demonstrate a systemic approach and she doesn't see the impact on the jail of detox. Suardini said that a report from Alan Jones at the jail says that 75% of people in jail are in need of substance abuse services, including detox. He noted that if you look out 3-5 years, those people who are repeat offenders could be diverted from the jail to the detox center. Branham asked how many that was. Suardini said 2-3 people per week and said the hospitals and the jail are not equipped for medical detox. Kloeppel mentioned the cost. Suardini stated that a number of people being picked up aren't being assessed for substance abuse and are in jail. He said the only way you are going to get the statistic is if there is somebody doing the assessing. Rappaport stated that having a detox center won't eliminate the problem and the impact is hard to discern. Ammons doesn't see including this in the report unless the Sheriff collects the information. Suardini said it will take 2-3 people per night away

55 from the jail. Kilgore stated that what it amounts to is what percentage of people receive detox. He
56 thought Suardini should have that information from when there was a detox center. Suardini said that
57 out of 54 names given, 78% (42 people) are receiving services and are five-time repeat offenders. 12 or
58 more had one episode, two had two episodes, and six are active clients. He noted that in two years the
59 number of people who are 10+ repeat offenders is 17, 65% (11 people) of whom were in need of
60 substance abuse services. He stated that the assessment piece is missing and without that, they can't
61 get the numbers they are looking for. Ammons stated that Kloeppel can start and if she gets to a point
62 where something is unclear, she can contact the person who wrote the piece. Kloeppel said she is
63 thinking of this in terms of a flow, e.g. if the sheriff gets 100 drop-offs per night, 50 are mental health,
64 substance abuse, homeless, etc. and shouldn't be in the jail. She noted that they should say how many
65 could be referred to the detox center, how many to mental health services and connect it to a budget.
66 She said show the flow of people in, the triage point, and the flow of people out, and how does that split
67 in terms of services and money. Kilgore liked the idea of the visual and suggested using it when
68 presenting to the Board. Berkson stated that they are still leaving out crimes of poverty of people in the
69 system that don't appear in triage. Rappaport asked how they could make referrals if they don't know if
70 service exists and at what capacity. He stated that everybody wants to make referrals, but who wants to
71 provide service once the referral is made. He said that Jones report suggests that services aren't
72 adequately dealing with the issues and that there should be ongoing evaluation. He suggested a built-in
73 mechanism that requires evaluation and feedback. Ammons said that whatever entity does the RFP will
74 include an evaluation in all the processes. Kilgore said the services that aren't there at all need to be
75 identified and then they need to get them in place. Ammons said if there are no substantive
76 recommendations for A, B and C, she wants to release to Kloeppel so she can begin her phase.
77 Berkson said they have ignored the criminalization of poverty since the beginning. She noted there are
78 no social service agencies for being poor. She felt there should be provisions in place so the person
79 isn't put in jail. Ammons thought there were some recommendation in place to expand some social
80 services that would keep people out of jail. Ammons stated there are a lot of societal issues they could
81 talk about all night but it won't move the task force forward. Branham suggested considering the
82 sobering center because it would make more likely that the detox center would be considered a priority
83 for the criminal justice system. She also said talk about specific impacts if possible. She noted the
84 statistics are good for drug court, but they need to include comparative recidivism rates to underscore
85 the cost effectiveness for the support of drug court. Ammons asked if it was possible to get those.
86 Suardini said he could get recidivism. Ammons asked that the information be emailed to Kloeppel for
87 inclusion. Richards asked Berkson how she would address criminalization of poverty. Berkson said do
88 something about decriminalizing poverty. Kloeppel asked if she was looking at another
89 recommendation that has to do with alternative ways to pay off fines. Berkson said yes. Ammons said it
90 is on the agenda to talk about other recommendations that aren't on the agenda. Ammons asked
91 Suardini for a final comment. Suardini noted that Prairie Center has handled detox the best in the past.
92 He wanted to know who was going to pay for it with the State budget reductions. Berkson asked if
93 Obamacare would help. Suardini thought it would. He stated part of the plan to divert from jail is to have
94 someone in the jail at entry who can do assessment. Branham felt it would be a stronger proposal if put
95 in general language with specific features but not deciding on the entity that will serve. She noted she is
96 wary of criticism since members of the task force belong to some of the service organizations. She also
97 felt that they shouldn't mention funding because it will be covered in another part of the report. Kilgore
98 noted that they haven't had a discussion regarding funding yet. Berkson felt the funding should be a
99 discussion for the Board. Ammons felt the funding pieces regarding recommendations should be
100 included. Kloeppel agreed with Branham and said she has concerns about recommending specific
101 programs. Ammons noted that it was voted upon at a previous meeting that they would be specific.

102 Kloeppel suggested saying here is an example of a program rather than recommending an entity.
103 Ammons stated at this point that she was turning items 5A, 5B, and 5C over to Kloeppel.

104 Ammons moved to the Mental Health draft and noted that there are some recommendation of
105 cost but they don't have as much statistical information as others. She asked Kloeppel's idea about
106 that. Kloeppel said that if there is missing information they can try to get before the next few meetings.
107 She said if they can't, they can use the same format and say they don't have the statistics because they
108 are unavailable. Branham stated that structure is important. She said their vision is to have a
109 coordinating council and noted that Rappaport's vision would have a different decision making body to
110 set up a system of care. She said system of care is separate from the coordinating council that deals
111 with criminal justice. Rappaport stated he took a practical problem and started at ground level. He said
112 the State has stopped funding mental health programs so they are dependent on local funds. He noted
113 that much of what he's read says that these people should be diverted to the public health system. He
114 said that the local public health system has zero to do with mental health and it's worth alerting the
115 community. He stated that mental health and physical health are not viewed as separate issues. He
116 noted that people with mental health issues are a serious problem and should be a concern for the
117 cities and public health. Branham said one option is to recommend the Mental Health Board be
118 responsible for developing a system of care. She felt that if they didn't identify the body it wouldn't get
119 done. Kloeppel stated that there are a couple of informal ways these decisions are made in the
120 community. She said that all of the funders, the cities, United Way, Community Foundation and Mental
121 Health Board staff get together occasionally to discuss who is funding what and how can they make
122 their money work better together. She said there is also a human services council where the providers
123 of all the social service agencies, the legal agencies, etc. get together once a month to talk about what
124 are new services, how can we refer to each other better, here are some new staff that we have, etc.
125 She said there is also a continuum of care which is the homeless service providers and related
126 agencies, that get together periodically to plan a coordinated effort of services. She noted that nothing
127 is formal that addresses the adults the jail. Rappaport agreed they exist but said there is no leadership
128 to make it cohesive. He felt the County should take the leadership role because it is a jail issue.
129 Suardini agreed with Branham that there should be some sort of model in terms of how to govern this
130 issue. He read from an article about Bexar County, TX. He said that instead of saying detox and
131 diversion, they need to have an overarching model they can present to the County. He thought the
132 ILPP report should have included some models. Richards asked if there are precedents in the State to
133 bring public health into this. Rappaport said felt there were but didn't know which ones. Richards
134 suggested getting examples of other counties. Kilgore suggested looking at what Suardini put out and
135 then be prepared to talk about it at the next meeting.

136 Ammons moved to Community Sanctions. Branham stated this pertains to recommendation #7.
137 She noted they need to help people understand they have a limited system other than Second Chance
138 and Drug Court. Her vision is to show comparative cost information to show that it's cheaper to have
139 someone in day reporting rather than in jail. She noted a sentence that states a coordinating council
140 can identify additional priorities, particularly priorities in augmenting a diversion programs. Berkson said
141 that the decision on who to prosecute should be evidence-based rather than intuition. Branham said
142 one of their recommendations is to pull evaluation into the system. Kloeppel said Dr. Kalmanoff talked
143 about a tool to determine risk. She asked if there is a similar tool determine post-conviction options.
144 Branham said yes. Berkson said court supervision is an option. Branham stated day fines are cutting
145 edge in this country (common in Europe) and frees up supervision resources. She stated a day
146 reporting center is an option for people who need more supervision than probation and it provides
147 intermediate punishment. She noted that the current electronic monitoring is old technology with no
148 integration. Rappaport said it is unclear to him what the impact regarding fines and day reporting is and

149 how does it interacts with demographics. He said he is worried that if implemented incorrectly and could
150 have a disparitive impact. Branham said that another consultant would be needed. She suggested a
151 one-day salary fine and that if implemented correctly it will diminish disparity. Rappaport felt they
152 needed to be explicit. Berkson said they need to look at discretionary income when deciding fines.
153 Kloeppel noted they will hear the other side of the argument saying that it's not equal because people
154 aren't really being punished if they are paying only so much and felt that is where a consultant comes
155 in. Branham said they should start with day-fines and that they have worked in other countries. Berkson
156 stated that European countries don't have the amount of poverty issues we have here. Branham said
157 there are South American countries where it has also worked. Richards said that the current fine
158 system doesn't care how much a person makes, and thought it would be more equitable and more of a
159 sensitive instrument. Kilgore felt it better to leave out the European context. He said that the arguments
160 for why this way is better will have more of an impact. Richards suggested saying how many countries
161 use this rather than naming any countries. Branham said the challenge is to find not just one
162 jurisdiction's data and they need to show how expensive jail is to the community. Kloeppel asked if they
163 had talked about a coordinating council, who that would be, and have they agreed that's what they
164 want. Ammons said it's down on the agenda. She asked for more comments and suggestion to be
165 emailed to Branham and copied to Bennett.

166 Ammons asked for any recommendations on the response letter to ILPP to be sent to Kilgore.
167 Branham said she really liked the tone of the letter. She noted that the biggest deficit of the ILPP draft
168 report is the planning board, what they would consider the coordinating council. She felt they should
169 commend the idea of the planning board but state that the composition needs to be diverse and is
170 something for the task force to tender a recommendation. She felt they should ask ILPP to recommend
171 the County Board take no action or approve any plan until it has received that task force report. She
172 wants the task force charge to be in the letter as well. She felt the Board can't do anything with ILPP's
173 report without the information from the task force. Kilgore said the critical piece is the criminal justice
174 advisory board and that there can't be a closed body without community participation/representation.
175 Richards said there were many good things in the report but felt that ILPP was soft-pedaling the
176 programs they hoped would be talked about. Kloeppel stated that when Dr. Kalmanoff talked about that
177 part there needed to be 2-3 people intimately involved with the decision making of the system but that
178 she didn't hear there wouldn't be others involved. Other task force members all said that he did say
179 there would be no members of the public. Kilgore asked for direction on the next step of the letter.
180 Rappaport said that Kilgore has their comments and they should let him complete the letter. Kilgore
181 asked that once the letter is done that Berkson be the one to send it since she is listed as the
182 committee chair.

183 Busey stated that the task force report will be given to the Board on June 25 and the ILPP final
184 report won't be done until sometime in later in the summer so that the CJTF report can be incorporated.
185 She said she had talked to some Board members who were in agreement with it as a concept. She
186 noted that the Board typically doesn't meet in July and that July and August are difficult to get things
187 moving, that the intent would be that ILPP's report would be delivered in late August or early
188 September. Busey said they will put that as an item on next week's Board agenda. She also noted that
189 the CJTF expanded upon their charge, which is a good thing, but not anticipated. Berkson said if ILPP
190 is to incorporate their report, they might have one final meeting for feedback.

191

192 **Next Meeting**

193

194 Ammons asked that they add some meetings to the schedule. She would like to have a meeting
195 on Wednesday, May 29 at 6pm to review funding draft; review recommendations 1,2,3,8,9,10 & 11 and

196 discuss core principles. Following that would be a meeting on Wednesday, June 5 at 6pm to review
197 structure of report (Darlene Kloeppel to prepare) and review any other final recommendations. Another
198 meeting will be Thursday, June 13 at 6pm for final approval and plan for release of report. On Tuesday,
199 June 25 at 6pm they will deliver the report to the County Board in a County Board Study Session in the
200 Shields Meeting Room at Brookens.

201 Richards asked everyone to try to come up with costs, if there is nothing for the County try to
202 come up with something for the State or on the federal level. He also asked to look for ways that would
203 save money as well. He said to come up with what it would take to run a successful program, then they
204 will deal with what County, State and Federal funding is available.

205 Berkson noted that money isn't instantly going to be pulled out of current budgets. She said if
206 there is a way for these things to be done in the current departments it would be good to note.

207

208 **Adjournment**

209

210 The meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

211

212 Respectfully Submitted,

213

214 Linda Lane

215 Administrative Assistant