

**COMMUNITY JUSTICE TASK FORCE MINUTES****Wednesday, June 5, 2013****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 Kloepfel, Michael Richards, Bruce Suardini, William Sullivan

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Julian Rappaport

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Deb Busey (County Administrator), Linda Lane (Administrative Assistant), Sophia Lewis, Jamie Lynn Mullins

**Call to Order**

Ammons called the meeting to order at 6:04 pm.

**Approval of Agenda**

Ammons asked for any corrections to agenda and motion to approve. **Motion** by Bennett to approve agenda; **seconded** by Kilgore. **Approved unanimously.**

**Public Participation**

Sophia Lewis, who leads the women in jail workgroup of CUPCPJ, spoke on issues regarding women in jail and wanted to make it clear she is not asking the jail to force a state agency to teach a class in the jail. She said they would like the jail to tighten communications with the courts about what the social services plans are for those who have been convicted who are in jail and have children. She said they would like inmates to be able to start classes before sentencing. She mentioned a Bill of Rights of Children of Incarcerated Parents. She specifically mentioned the sixth right, which is the right for a child to see, talk to and touch their parents, and that it implies that the incarcerated be able to supply that experience for the child. Lewis wanted to emphasize the importance of that and said that even though Dr. Kalmanoff is interested in making a direct recommendation of the social services plan registration, they would like to see support from within the social justice task force's response to the report. She would like to make sure it's included so that it is implemented and further research continues regarding issues that affect the diversionary items that are in the jail.

**Approval of Agenda**

Ammons noted Berkson needed to be added as attending the last meeting. **Motion** by Bennett to approve as amended, **seconded** by Berkson. **Approved unanimously.**

**Review****Review any Other Final Recommendations**

Ammons said they will skip Item A until Kloepfel arrives but noted that she had started the process of structuring the report. She asked Branham to go over the other recommendations.

Branham started with the council recommendations. She said she made a number of changes but hasn't made them all because she had received some conflicting comments. She said she deleted a lot, all of the discussion of specific subcommittees, and some of the benefits of the coordinating council. She asked for discussion regarding what the group (coordinating council) should be called and stated that they had previously discussed putting restorative in the title. She suggested they should call it the Coordinating Council on Restorative and Criminal Justice. She stated now it is Restorative and Criminal Justice Coordinating Council. Kilgore said he's uncomfortable using restorative justice in the

57 title when they haven't talked about it and determined what it means. Branham stated that the final  
58 recommendation she has to complete regards restorative justice but hasn't had time yet to complete.  
59 Kilgore said they need to have a common understanding because it is such a big issue. Berkson thinks  
60 restorative is a loaded word and feels it will turn off many board members. She said to leave it out of  
61 the name but that it would be ok to use in the body. Bennett agreed, saying that CJCC is a recognized  
62 term in the law enforcement community and felt they would deal with less resistance if it is a term  
63 people were familiar with. After some discussion, the consensus was to call it the Criminal Justice  
64 Coordinating Council. Branham said there will be a separate recommendation for restorative justice.

65 She continued to another section of recommendation #7, and stated that she softened the  
66 language based on recommendations received. She went over the wording that had been changed  
67 regarding who might be included in the CJCC. She said it gives maneuvering room but also gives  
68 direction. She asked if it was now appropriately tempered. Berkson felt it was. Others agreed. Branham  
69 moved to a different section of the recommendation. She said that other language that had been  
70 softened is how this council comes about. She said the earlier draft referred to a need for an inter-  
71 governmental agreement, but it now puts the responsibility of initiating the council on the Board. She  
72 asked if this satisfied Suardini's concern regarding quasi-government. He stated that the changes she  
73 made addressed his concerns that it not be all government. Kilgore said they need to identify a driver  
74 for this project, but that it doesn't necessarily need to be in the document. Kilgore felt that some people  
75 on this committee should start talking to Board members about addressing the recommendations as  
76 strategies. Berkson asked if the coordinating council recommendation should precede the others.  
77 Kilgore said no. Berkson asked when they should start talking to Board members. Kilgore said the day  
78 after the report is presented to them. Ammons said that the Justice chair or Board chair could put this  
79 on the county board agenda for them to work on and develop a resolution. She noted that it will have to  
80 move through the regular process of initiating any council.

81 Branham stated the next section is where she has received conflicting comments. She noted  
82 there are currently four recommendations: establish a coordinating council; integrate data collection  
83 and evaluation in the system; make sure training takes place; and public outreach. She stated that one  
84 option is to leave it as four separate recommendations. Another is to combine the training and public  
85 outreach recommendation and leave the other two separate. A third option is to have the council as one  
86 recommendation and combine the other three. She said a fourth option is to combine all four with the  
87 council as the recommendation and the other three as responsibilities of the council. She asked for  
88 input from others. Bennett stated he preferred it be kept in the same section right after the council is  
89 mentioned because it prevents adding another section later. He felt that would streamline it more.  
90 Ammons stated she was the one that initiated the steps and noted the pros are that it keeps them  
91 together and it lays out what this body suggests the council does. She felt that leaving them separate  
92 allows for a pick and choose situation. She agreed that it should be streamlined and reduced. Berkson  
93 felt three of the items might be on their way to implementation before getting a coordinating council.  
94 She said if they are combined that it could keep anything from happening at all. She said her  
95 preference is to keep them separated. Richards said it should be kept separate because a coordinating  
96 council may never pass. If the other recommendations are part of the council then they run the risk of  
97 everything being killed. He stated that people will either want a council or not. He said they could put  
98 note that if the coordinating council is approved then these three would be part of the council. Kloepfel  
99 stated that on her table of contents the coordinating council could be under the system coordination  
100 section. Sullivan stated the debate hinges on two questions: first, it's possible some things could be  
101 implemented without a council and if they are assumed under the council, they lose the possibility of  
102 achieving all of them; and second, if these exist as a whole that may be more powerfully described in its  
103 entirety. Branham noted that each section talks about what they are doing now and wants to make sure

104 they aren't lumped together without including the reasons why and highlighting the core deficits in the  
105 system. Ammons asked if evaluation could stand alone without a council. Branham said theoretically  
106 yes. Kilgore said that what Kloepfel is suggesting is these things can be put together in a sense that  
107 they all have to do with system coordination. His concern is having too many recommendations and too  
108 much detail, but noted they don't want equal weight for data collection and the coordinating council.  
109 Berkson said she feels that Kloepfel's format is what the Board will want to see. Ammons asked if they  
110 agreed that the layout could address the issue and that they wouldn't have to look at as separate or  
111 together. Branham stated she is 100% in support of a coordinating council rather than some other  
112 possible alternative. Ammons agreed. Kloepfel stated that what she is saying is they want these  
113 activities to occur and they want something to coordinate that.

#### 114 **Review of Structure of Report**

115 Ammons moved to Kloepfel regarding the review of the report structure. Kloepfel noted that  
116 she laid out a format as a draft only. She said she tried to separate out sidebars and bullets so people  
117 aren't just reading a document. She tried to lay out the table of contents to make a reasonable  
118 connection between the parts so it reads like one document. She stated she has the executive  
119 summary, the purpose and vision that she has started to draft, and the recommendations stated briefly  
120 in table format. She stated she was unsure where to go from this point. She said there are the overview  
121 sections and asked if this is what should be the executive summary. She said it will be 20 pages and  
122 felt that was too long. Kilgore said that the text of the total report should be 20 pages. Kloepfel said she  
123 thought the executive summary should be a table that lists what the recommendations are with a few  
124 more paragraphs. Ammons suggested the executive summary narrate some of what will be seen later,  
125 then have the full reports. Kloepfel stated that she will pull basic information from each overview to  
126 create a two page executive summary. Kilgore said the recommendations should be shortened for the  
127 executive summary. Ammons noted that would put all recommendations on one page. Branham said  
128 the audience isn't just the County Board and noted that different paragraphs have details that will sell it  
129 to different audiences. She felt it's important to keep the details. She stated that she doesn't like the  
130 word appendix for the full reports. She also said that with multiple stakeholders, any one of them could  
131 kill any part of this. Ammons stated that a copy of the full report with all the text will be kept. Kilgore  
132 stated that for 98% of the audience 20 pages would be better. Discussion continued.

133 Kloepfel said she is proposing the executive summary be two to five paragraphs with  
134 shortened recommendations totaling no more than two or three pages. She said the second part could  
135 be a two-page summary report, or the argument they want to make. The third section would be the full  
136 report with no graphics, only narrative. She noted that she will be going on vacation but wanted to  
137 present a layout before she left. She said to send recommendations and comments to her and she will  
138 have her secretary make changes where applicable. Ammons noted there isn't time to keep emailing  
139 changes back and forth. Kloepfel said she will have a draft at the next meeting that they can discuss  
140 and make changes to. Kilgore asked how many pages it was. Kloepfel said she has put everything in  
141 except Mental Health recommendation and there are 60 pages. Kilgore asked how many pages the  
142 summary was. Kloepfel said 20. She said she will try to make it sound as one voice once she has  
143 everything.

144 Branham said she had a question about the number and order. She thought the mental health  
145 and substance abuse recommendations were split and thought they were going to identify the first  
146 priorities within each recommendation. She explained what she thought the recommendations were  
147 and stated there is still the question of racial diversity. Kloepfel said she is missing restorative justice  
148 and thought they were integrating it into the concepts rather than one on its own, which is why she is  
149 missing #5. She said the reason she has two for drug court and detox is because they were sent to her  
150 as separate recommendations so she left them that way, but knew they should probably be together.

151 She said mental health would be #2, but she doesn't have actual wording. She said #3 and #4 should  
152 be combined and asked how it should read. She said #4 would be community sanctions. Kloeppel said  
153 they would then take out #5 and integrate it into other pieces. Ammons mentioned the racial justice task  
154 force recommendation that Kilgore would write, stating it could be in section #3. Ammons said that at  
155 this point Kloeppel is still waiting on some recommendations.

156 Kloeppel stated at the end she put in something about juvenile justice, racial disproportionality,  
157 and could put something in about women. Ammons said she will send language to Kloeppel about the  
158 women. Kloeppel said she needed to incorporate their coordination with ILPP. Sullivan said he likes  
159 Kilgore's idea of giving a short title to each recommendation. Kloeppel asked if they were going to  
160 separate restorative justice or integrate it. Ammons felt it depended on what the content is. Ammons  
161 stated that what Branham had submitted before read as more philosophical to her than actual steps  
162 and tasks. Branham said they are starting to get into restorative justice in the juvenile system but it  
163 doesn't exist in the adult system. Ammons felt it needed to be a separate recommendation. Sullivan  
164 agreed, noting that this type of change is what they are trying for. Kilgore said that if they are going to  
165 talk about restorative justice it's not putting all of the responsibility on the victim, but also on the system  
166 to perceive the causes of crime in a different way. Branham noted that her full report on restorative  
167 justice was only two pages. Kloeppel asked if it could be included under community sanctions and re-  
168 entry services. Branham stated that elements of community sanctions have no focus on restorative  
169 justice, that it is an approach, not a program or sanction. She said it can be part of the process in all  
170 three stages of criminal justice. Kloeppel stated that if it's going to be divided it's not fitting and felt it  
171 should be in the introduction. She said the first five or six are services they want to see, but restorative  
172 justice is a philosophy. Sullivan said it could also be a strategy. Branham said it's implemented through  
173 practical tools, and it's the largest step in addressing the fact that many people in jail haven't been  
174 convicted of anything. Kloeppel said it should be at the end then, that they should list the services first.  
175 She stated that she will put it as #6 after re-entry.

176 She asked if everyone had agreed to combine 7, 8, 9 and 10. Ammons stated they had not  
177 agreed to do so. She said the people she has talked to said they should remain separate. Kilgore said  
178 the council should be one and the other three should be together for the sake of having fewer  
179 recommendations. Several felt that would be fine. Berkson noted that presenting in small pieces makes  
180 them seem more doable. If they are lumped together, it will be all or none. Kilgore thinks that data  
181 collection and evaluation could go together. Branham said if they are going to have racial disparity as a  
182 recommendation, that education could be combined with training so they end up with an even 10  
183 recommendations. She said the council would be #7, data evaluation #8, and combine #9 and #10.  
184 Kloeppel referred everyone back to the table of contents because it's different from just listing  
185 recommendations. She noted that she doesn't have a funding recommendation. Ammons noted that it  
186 isn't a recommendation and will be a separate narrative. Kloeppel said system coordination can be  
187 narrative or recommendations. Ammons felt it didn't have to be a number; it just had to be in the report.  
188 Branham asked where the council was on the list in the table of contents. Kloeppel said what they had  
189 talked about and agreed to was that it was under system coordination strategies. She said the  
190 recommendation would say they want a formal way by which the system can be coordinated. Ammons  
191 stated that she thought Branham's concern was that the language wasn't the same. Kloeppel thinks this  
192 is more palatable and has a better chance of acceptance. Branham said she thought Kloeppel was  
193 going to list the 10 recommendations, first put what they want to do, and second how they are going to  
194 do it. She said she is seeing some disconnect with matching to the table of contents. Kloeppel said  
195 there is disconnect and stated she is working on that and waiting for final reports. Kilgore says it  
196 creates a problem if it doesn't match and said they need something that indicates where people can  
197 find the recommendation, e.g. mental health. Kloeppel said it will follow in order. She said the table of

198 contents was a way of organizing it and is trying to see if it still works. She noted the first part works.

199 Kloeppel said strategies for implementation would include funding support and some formal  
200 mechanism to make that happen. She said she is using different terms and has written with what she  
201 feels is more commonly used language. Suardini said list each as individual, noting at the bottom that  
202 the council is a vehicle to take care of the strategies. Ammons said they don't want to change the  
203 language so much that they lose the concept of the committee. She felt that data collection and  
204 evaluation should be used instead of performance measures because they mean different things. She  
205 stated the language has to be consistent with the recommendation. Branham asked if the table of  
206 contents could list the recommendations but separate them with subsections so that it's all  
207 recommendations. She noted that would make it easier to track the language. Berkson felt it would be  
208 more palatable to adjust the recommendation to be consistent with the table of contents. Ammons  
209 noted that what they are trying to accomplish is systemic change, not recommending the current  
210 system. Berkson felt the table of contents says that more clearly than listing the recommendations.  
211 Sullivan noted that there are several ways to approach it, but it's most important that the ideas match  
212 and that they are in an organized thoughtful fashion. He thinks that Branham's idea for the table of  
213 contents seems sound. He thinks they should say what the problem or challenge is, these are our  
214 recommendations of what needs to change, how we can implement these changes, how can we fund  
215 these changes, and what's next. He felt they needed renamed so they are consistent and that they  
216 should be in the same order. Kilgore felt that Kloeppel had enough information for the next step.  
217 Ammons asked Branham to get her final recommendation to Kloeppel.

#### 218 **Review Statement of Core Principals and Vision**

219 Kilgore felt final comments regarding the purpose and introduction should be sent to Kloeppel  
220 within 24-48 hours. Kloeppel said she would like them the next day. Kloeppel stated she needs to figure  
221 out how to reference the previous task force report, possibly include a link. Ammons stated the core  
222 principals, which she thought it was agreed upon in principal, that #4 (which is specifically covering the  
223 human rights issue) should be part of the vision. Kloeppel stated what she said was "building on the  
224 core principals developed by the first task force." Ammons asked another sentence be added to include  
225 #4. Kilgore said that he isn't comfortable with the language "building on the core principals of the  
226 previous task force" because they haven't really talked about it.

#### 227 **Review any Other Final Recommendations**

228 Ammons stated the final recommendation for tonight is community sanctions. Branham went  
229 over her handout regarding her recommendation dealing with a full range of community sanctions. She  
230 noted that there are four; one is discussed more fully in the restorative justice section. She noted that  
231 the main change she made was regarding day fines. She stated that it's a difficult concept and if the  
232 committee is struggling with it then the Board will too. She said rather than saying day fines, she says  
233 penalties that avoid supervision and incarceration costs. She said she talks about a starting point that  
234 would be revamping the structure for implementing and collecting fines. She said what she is calling for  
235 is a look at the economic sanctioning system, but she isn't providing specifics. She said it's important to  
236 look at because it saves on incarceration and supervision costs, it's complicated to put in process, and  
237 they need an expert. She stated that everyone agrees that the current fine and fee structure doesn't  
238 work. Berkson said that unpaid fines aren't just ignored; they end up affecting someone's credit rating.  
239 Branham said when the question is asked how you are going to do it, her answer is that you need an  
240 expert consultant. Bennett said the concept is hard because they don't want the idea of two systems;  
241 those that can pay and those that can't. He noted that the term day fine is almost misleading and it's a  
242 very progressive European notion. He noted that if a person goes to jail there is an economic impact on  
243 their family and they should be able to tell someone that they can pay off their fine in other ways.  
244 Bennett said he likes the way it is written now better than saying day fines because it addresses other

245 ways to look at it. He stated that a person does not go to jail for not paying their fine in Champaign  
246 County, but that it does affect their credit rating. He noted that court costs are mandatory fees, largely  
247 from the State and some from the County, even if there are no fines charged, and they are hurting  
248 people in the same way as fines. Sullivan said Branham framed it well by saying, here are the things  
249 that need to be looked at, these are our recommendations, they don't have the details, and they need  
250 to hire a consultant. He asked if that took care of Berkson's concerns. Berkson said yes, that taking out  
251 the carefully calibrated fees and that they need to look to a consultant for economic penalties is fine.  
252 She said that this is different from Europe and our poor are so much poorer and can't afford any fees at  
253 all. Ammons said the overarching issue is the recommendation to look at the overall economic penalty  
254 structure. Bennett suggested looking at calibrated fines, fees, and costs because they are all different.  
255 Suardini asked where Branham was asking for the consultant. Branham said in the cost section on  
256 page 9. Berkson felt the idea of a consultant should be at the beginning of the recommendation.  
257 Suardini agreed.

258 Ammons said that at this point they are waiting for the final pieces to be sent to Kloepfel. She  
259 stated that they need to be sent by close of business June 10, but preferably earlier. Kloepfel stated  
260 she will use the latest versions and will bring a final draft to the next meeting. She said she will try to get  
261 a copy out before that. She said they will be able to make some final edits before presenting to the  
262 Board. She will then send copies to the committee before giving to anybody else. Bennett confirmed  
263 that they would be submitting the report to the Board on June 25, 2013. Ammons said the goal is to get  
264 it to them before that so they have time to review it. Kloepfel said she was told June 19. Busey said it  
265 depended on how they wanted to produce it. She said there is a County Board meeting on June 20.  
266 She said if they can get it posted that day in whatever version is going to be hard-copied, they can  
267 distribute it at the meeting.

268

#### 269 **Next Meeting**

270

271 Ammons stated that the next meeting will be Thursday, June 13, 2013 at 6:00pm in the Putman  
272 Room. This will be the final draft review and presentation strategy.

273

#### 274 **Adjournment**

275

276 The meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

277

278 Respectfully Submitted,

279

280 Linda Lane

281 Administrative Assistant