

COMMUNITY JUSTICE TASK FORCE MINUTES**Monday, February 11, 2013****Lyle Shields Meeting Room****Brookens Administrative Center****1776 E. Washington St., Urbana**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Scott Bennett, Astrid Berkson (Chair), Lynn Branham, James Kilgore, Darlene Kloeppe, Julian Rappaport, Michael Richards, Bruce Suardini, William Sullivan

MEMBERS ABSENT: Carol Ammons

OTHERS PRESENT: Pattsy Petrie (County Board Member); Jim McGuire (County Board Member); Josh Hartke (County Board Member); Deb Busey (County Administrator); Ann Russell; Linda Lane (administrative assistant)

Call to Order

Berkson called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Public Participation

Pattsy Petrie shared from a book titled *The Third Lie* which is the argument often presented that government can solve everything and the more money put in the better the solutions. She felt that parts were applicable to the CJTF in relation to programs in the community. She stated the underlying point was that we don't take time to see if the programs are working but keep funding them anyway.

Ann Russell stated she is there not just for NAMI. She said she is interested in the homeless aspect as well as the problem of locking up the poor. She noted that the issue has to do with socio-economic and race issues as well as mental illness and that all these need to be taken into account.

Approval of Minutes – November 7, 2012

Motion by Kilgore to approve minutes; seconded by Sullivan. Rappaport requested that the half-page memo he gave at the last meeting be included in the minutes. **Motion to approve as amended passed unanimously.**

Visioning Exercise

Kloeppe introduced Kerri Spear as the facilitator for the visioning exercise. Spear provided two handouts; one a questionnaire and the other the results of a homeless visioning exercise she had previously participated in. She noted that she is not an expert in this topic so will just be guiding conversations. She asked everyone to take a few minutes and complete the questionnaire. She went around the room and had everyone give their name and an answer to question one; why are you participating on the task force? Answers included: County needs to think systematically about alternatives to buildings to assist people who are unnecessarily confined to jail; bring expertise into own community; bring a practical approach to the aspirational idea and to address the jail crowding; look at some programs that can be done that are shown to be better alternatives to locking people up; to have a voice for substance abuse and mental health issues that plague the jail system and to have a voice in how to divert jail inmates into community based programs; hopes to contribute expertise and also wants to be involved in solutions that offer people the best opportunity to be productive citizens; to see

55 changes made based on experience; not enough has been done to seek out and put into
56 practice alternatives to incarceration and feels it's fiscally irresponsible to burden 2-3
57 generations with the costs of building a new facility and wants to address the delinquency of
58 why these alternative haven't been addressed in the past; to find what the possibilities are to
59 influence the decisions that are going to be made. Spear stated that she noticed definite
60 themes.

61 Spear moved to question two; what would the ideal Champaign County justice system
62 include in 2023 and 2033? She noted that it's good to have both short term and long terms
63 goals. Answers included: short term goal could be less recidivism; no mentally ill individuals
64 incarcerated for activities associated with mental illness, that mental illness be treated as a non-
65 criminal activity; be fully vested and well practiced at restorative justice techniques and
66 incorporate restorative justice practices to the fullest extent possible in our criminal justice
67 system; reduce the flow to DOC by 80% to return to 1980 levels of incarceration; restorative
68 justice; no racial disparity in the jail population; add a detox center; end the war on drugs; keep
69 people out of jail who haven't committed a crime but are there because they can't pay fines due
70 to poverty; have uniform way to deal with floaters (people coming out of jail, people who have
71 been unemployed for 5 years, homeless, etc.); programs that help people get back into society;
72 integrated system of providers of care that use evidence based data to drive expenditures or
73 cuts in effective programs; an evaluation system so that it's routine that all programs and
74 services have built-in evaluation, that the service providers shouldn't have the final say but
75 should have input and be part of team along with the expected beneficiaries and people outside
76 the system, a team that includes multiple voices in the community. Spear stated the Homeless
77 Executive Committee consists of agencies where direct service providers receive direct funding,
78 but the monitoring part is done by non-funded agencies because it's hard to evaluate something
79 they have a stake in. Rappaport said the mechanics would have to be worked out but thinks it
80 important to include the principal of independent evaluation as a part of the expected way the
81 system works. Kloepffel suggested the addition of a consistent coordinated intake point (triage)
82 be added at the front end that determines if someone has a mental illness and shouldn't be in
83 the jail, or that someone should be in the jail because they are a safety risk. She didn't feel that
84 was very coordinated at this time. Bennett explained there is a requirement that a case has to
85 reach resolution (trial) within 120 days, but there are exceptions, such as the defendant moves
86 to continue because they are trying to get into a program. Kloepffel stated the assessment
87 should be done quickly so they don't have to wait in jail for a week before they are assessed.
88 Rappaport said what is needed is a full array of best practice pre-trial services. Branham stated
89 that the 11 potential recommendations should be priorities. She felt they needed to establish
90 priorities in a number of ways and concentrate resources on those who pose a risk to safety.
91 She said streamline the criminal justice system and will civil penalties suffice or can it be
92 handled thru the public health system. She also suggested limiting the convictions whenever
93 possible so people can put the past behind them. She gave an example using the Netherland's
94 model. Petrie wanted to add to the suggestion about evaluations and suggested a formative
95 evaluation be added midway thru the program to see if it is working and a summative evaluation
96 be added at the end. Rappaport stated the evaluations could be used to make changes to the
97 programs.

98 Spear moved to item 11 on the CJTF report. She noted that incarceration as the last
99 option keeps coming up. She suggested creating policies and procedures that included items
100 from the original report and items from tonight. Bennett said create new programs or expand
101 programs already in existence to address mental health issues. Kilgore noted that #1 seems too
102 philosophical for policies and procedures and felt that the philosophical runs through a lot of the
103 recommendations tonight. Kloepffel suggested calling them guiding principles instead. Spear
104 suggested having recommendations that move toward things that can be measured. Rappaport
105 said he didn't feel they can specify how programs will be carried out. Kloepffel suggested
106 dividing it into two (2) camps: guiding principles or reasons for components (e.g. less recidivism,

107 no racial disparity) and components to have (e.g. have a detox center, triage).

108 Berkson stated that they have 2½ months to influence the needs assessment and two
109 more months after that to influence the Board. She stated there will be decisions made, either
110 buildings or programs, so they need to provide specifics. Kilgore felt in the 1st process people
111 reacted negatively to a new jail and went through a thought process to look at restorative justice
112 and alternatives to incarceration, a sort of philosophical change. The 2nd process was to look at
113 ways to make philosophical change a reality by implementing programs in the community. Now
114 need to take it to another level to identify areas (mental health, how many people, cost, etc.)
115 and need to nail down proposals. Kilgore felt committee torn between discussing philosophical
116 ideas and coming up with concrete proposals, and wasn't sure if they could put together the
117 proposals without having guiding principles done. Spear stated they don't have to have all the
118 work done because they're just trying to help the Board make a decision. She asked if it was
119 possible for the core principles to be weighted later. Kloeppel stated that, as a new member,
120 the conversation tonight has helped. She stated that she can look at the ideas and say "will this
121 help?"

122 Spear asked how everyone felt about pages 28 and 29 and putting it on the list to talk
123 about prior to recommendation. She thought this list could be used at future meetings to work
124 from. She mentioned asking what currently exists, what don't have here but have elsewhere
125 (possible outsourcing), where do best practices exist elsewhere and what would recommend
126 as a best practice, what needs to be created new for Champaign County to be a model for
127 others. Rappaport said what he wants is something that is more than a list of programs to hand
128 to the Board. He noted that programs need to be developed. He stated the point is that what
129 they want is for the County Board to say to the people running the system we want you to adopt
130 a system that has these goals and intentions. Berkson said the Board can't tell the Sheriff how
131 to do his job once he has the money. She said they need to show how the programs work.
132 Kilgore said they need to force political pressure to make change. Berkson stated that you want
133 to sell the recommendations, not force them on anyone. Spear said that you have to start with a
134 plan before you can get funding. Sullivan said a way to sell it is to do a very careful assessment
135 of not only the initial cost of the building but also the lifetime cost. He noted the initial cost is 15-
136 18% of the lifetime cost to operate the building. He stated that a \$20 million investment will
137 indemnify two (2) generations of citizens within the community. He said they need to look at
138 building costs versus funding programs that provide jobs, keep people out of jail and reduce
139 crime. He suggested putting money on the table and speaking to conservative ideas. Spear said
140 that some programs (detox center, triage) might require a new building. Rappaport suggested
141 they need to try to convince people to change how they spend the money they are already
142 spending. Spear said that this committee isn't starting from scratch. She noted this is a
143 recommending council. She stated that they may recommend x, y, and z and only x gets
144 seriously considered. She said that is a huge step from where it began and they need to take
145 baby steps. Kilgore suggested build on what they have already and sell it to the Board gently.
146 Branham suggested getting data about financial implication now of spending X amount and that
147 it's not something they have to be dependent on ILPP for. She suggested they communicate by
148 email regarding principles and focus on concrete things at meetings. She again suggested
149 dividing into groups to develop more specifics. She said what they want to add is if this is
150 instituted this is how much it will cost and this is the impact on the jail. Berkson stated that only
151 two (2) people can discuss an issue outside of a meeting due to the open meetings act.
152 Discussion continued about whether or not this committee actually fell under that act.

153 Suardini said that programs like drug court have proven to save DOC \$25,000 per year
154 and felt the \$4,000 cost to treat versus the \$25,000 to incarcerate was a no-brainer. He
155 continued by saying that they already have the proven model, so if the question is do we spend
156 the money on a building or do we put it in treatment, we already have the answer. He said in
157 terms of what the Board would do, if they have the information presented on the service, they
158 need to decide where they want to put their money? Spear said to take things they are doing

159 that are going well and what the cost is and take best practices elsewhere and how much it
160 might cost here. She stated that the group has all the right ideas; they just need to put it on
161 paper so the Board has choices. She noted that the committee may not agree on everything,
162 but if they agree on the flow it gives them something to give the Board. Rappaport stated that in
163 creating change it's rarely about not having enough information, it's about people's willingness
164 to change. He said there is the need for strategies and tactics because people could read
165 something and still not change the local attitudes. Kilgore thinks they should be more optimistic.
166 He said that people and the Board are thinking about this issue now, as proven by the public
167 participation there has been and the circulation of information the task force has done. He noted
168 that it may have to be repeated several times before something happens. Sullivan stated that
169 part of the challenge is we have a State's Attorney that will look you in the eye and say we are
170 already doing these things (restorative justice) and they need to get over that hurdle. Kloepfel
171 stated that there is restorative justice for youths but not for adults and didn't know if that's what
172 the State's Attorney meant. Kilgore stated that the key players are the State's Attorney, the
173 Sheriff, and the Chief Judge. He suggested re-engaging them, then see how they respond. He
174 noted that if the players aren't on board then nothing will change. Rappaport said the police on
175 the street want an alternative and want help regarding people with mental health issues.

176 Branham suggested a concrete way to do coalition building is a national \$150,000 grant
177 for re-entry planning. The plan could yield another \$1 million in grants. She feels they could get
178 this grant. She also thought it might be helpful for a one page summary to see if we did institute
179 a cap on the incarceration rate what would the result be to the jail population? Petrie stated the
180 Board does have an avenue of help to apply for grants through RPC. She noted that annually
181 \$64 million is spent on criminal justice in Champaign County, not including Mahomet and the
182 University. She suggested creating a diagram showing where overlaps exist and plug data in
183 when it becomes available so can see where there are overlaps of cost. She noted that the \$64
184 million might not decrease, but it may be spread differently. Russell stated that NAMI has a
185 great relationship with the police and would help advocate coalition building. Rappaport asked if
186 the County had people who evaluate and monitor their own activities. Busey answered no. Most
187 of the offices the committee is talking about are office of elected officials and they are
188 encouraged by the Board to do long term planning, performance measuring, strategic plans,
189 goals and objectives. She stated there isn't extra staff to do that type of evaluation. Spear felt
190 the committee should definitely talk to the State's Attorney and Sheriff about coalition building
191 before sending their proposal to the Board. She noted that because the State's Attorney, Sheriff
192 and Chief Judge are elected official, it makes it harder to present the recommendations. She
193 said at least invite them back even if it's only to hear the ideas. She suggested having some
194 public participation that would also hear the proposal before it was submitted.

195 Spear said that moving forward they need to summarize the pages from tonight.
196 Kloepfel said that she and Spear will type everything. She said she will have by the next
197 meeting on the 22nd. Berkson said they need to discuss the grant if there is a possibility they
198 could get it. Busey stated that the presiding judge won't sign off on it due to some requirements
199 in the grant. Kloepfel stated that it is offered every year. Branham suggested working with the
200 judge if he is the only impediment, but thought it was important to have on record that he won't
201 facilitate a re-entry program that could potential yield \$1 to the County. She stated she wouldn't
202 put it in antagonistic terms but felt they would want to work with him. Busey said that if it is
203 offered every year it's the perfect opportunity to bring all the entities together and get them on
204 board. Rappaport suggested that they could recommend that as something to work towards.
205 Spear stated that there are 20 competitive grants available. She suggested coming up with
206 guiding principal, how to measure, what the cost is, provide framework, but don't have to have
207 all the answers. She said to have most of the work done then present best case.

208 Rappaport asked for another meeting date to continue the discussion. March 4 was
209 agreed upon. Branham feels they have a lot of work to do. She asked if everyone will have their
210 preliminary reports by then. Berkson said to include local statistics and costs that she thinks the

211 Sheriff has and will share. Kilgore stated that with regards to the mental health issue they could
212 form a structure to build around. He asked how to get the guideline, proposal, or suggestion into
213 the recommendation to the Board. He wondered about having someone from Community
214 Elements, NAMI and/or the police departments talk to the group. Branham said she thought,
215 because of time constraints, they had agreed to take the current recommendations and put
216 meat to the bones and wasn't sure it was the best use of the limited time to have others come
217 speak. Kloeppel said that RPC has been working with police on the juvenile side about various
218 diversion tactics for the station adjusted kids, those with minor offences or first time offenders.
219 She stated that the program took about 10 years to develop. She thought the State's Attorney
220 and police are talking about the possibility of a juvenile assessment center where they could
221 increase intake for station adjusted kids and a place to help police with status offenders. She
222 said she would be surprised if police wouldn't want something similar on the adult side. McGuire
223 suggested also talking to the fire departments because they have some of the same issues on
224 their calls.

225 Kilgore asked what reports they would be looking at at the next meeting. Sullivan said
226 the recommendations should be a three page argument, with appendices, stating the system
227 has problems, there are solutions throughout the country, the solutions have been researched
228 and came up with a proposal that looks to be conservative, cost effective and puts the
229 resources in the County in the service of the people .Keep it short, compelling and to the point.
230 Berkson stated must have budgets and costs in the appendices. Rappaport said he wasn't sure
231 could get it done in a short summary. He also pointed out the need to address housing. Kilgore
232 said it can be counted on that ILPP will give construction options. He said they need a proposal
233 that makes alternatives look feasible. Berkson suggested starting with pre-trial services. Hartke
234 said he has heard the ideas, but the Board needs concrete facts that they can vote on.

235
236 **Adjournment**

237
238 The meeting adjourned at 7:38 p.m.

239
240
241 Respectfully Submitted,

242
243 Linda Lane
244 Administrative Assistant