

Justice Reinvestment Local Government Commission



Subject: February 2019 Meeting Minutes
Date: February 14, 2019
11:00 a.m. -2:00 p.m.

Board members: Jack Kavanaugh, Randy Martin, Mary Lou McDonough, Corey Pack, Ross Passman

Absent: Robert Green (chair), Lt. Timothy Fridman, Matthew Barrett, Herbert Dennis, Ronnie Howard, Lt. Richard Wiersberg, Jordan Lyszczek, Lt. Dan Lasher, Sheriff Jim Dewees, James Proctor, Lamonte Cooke, Lt. Peter Wild, Lisa Thayer Welch, Esq

The Governor's Office of Crime Control & Prevention: Angelina Guarino, Senior Director of Justice Reinvestment & Rebeca Allyn, Victim Services Program Manager

Open Society Institute- Baltimore: Tara Huffman (Facilitator)

I. Goal Setting

Attendees expressed their goals for this meeting and future JRA meetings in 2019. Among the immediate priorities were laying out action steps for the coming year, uplifting local needs and opportunities, identifying what innovative programs are working in other jurisdictions, determining how JRA funding can be best directed, and more consistently receiving updates on JRA's performance on the county level.

Through the Annual Recommendation Survey, completed by 9 member counties, the following 2019 tasks were identified, listed in order of importance:

- ❖ Identify promising programs suitable for scaling up across the state.
- ❖ Expansion of local detention programming inventory to include capacity and target population, and more exhaustive evaluation of evidence basis.
- ❖ Create comprehensive state and local reentry plan.
- ❖ Develop targeted local JRA outcomes/indicators to measure JRA's desired local impact.
- ❖ Following recommendation from MSCCSP, identify where JRA reinvestment could target gaps in alternative corrections options and prepare county specific fact sheets to inform local practitioners of options.

II. Discussion of current local landscape

Members engaged in an analysis of the current local landscape for criminal justice to identify need areas and opportunities for growth.

Strengths- included recent changes in policy that improved case outcomes, and locally available programs

- Mobile Crisis Teams better equip and triage mental health calls for service, reducing jail acuity
- Increased use of emergency evaluations are diverting active mental health crises to the healthcare system, not jails
- Policy shift toward increasing number of criminal citations in place of arrest
- The Open Door Work Release center in Prince George's county has finally restored access to work release to the entire state
- 2017 change in guidance that increased pretrial release on own recognizance
- Intake assessments are now being used in many counties
- Better communication amongst criminal justice agencies
- Recognized need for specialized staff (e.g. peer counselors to meet gaps with specific qualifications)
- Expanded problem-solving courts, including teen court and mental health courts

Weaknesses-included long standing issues, technical problems and programmatic challenges

- Lack of community providers and capacity issues impact the ability for diversion and referral upon reentry.
- Gaps in local structure for standing up new programs.
- The lack of grant staff to apply for and manage new programs is an initial stumbling block, and the local approval process and need for executive level buy in halts new innovation.
- Poor hand off from state to local corrections upon release

Opportunities- existing trends that could be furthered to remedy issues or potential solutions

- Legal changes to pretrial release
- Potential expansion of current criminal citations
- Proposed legislation to expand MAT to all forms in all jails
- Growing understanding and adoption of evidence based practices, like ACES screening
- Easier transferring of involuntary commitment to mental health hospital beds
- More education on targeting treatment to individual needs and to high need individuals
- IT advancements in data tracking could direct future programming and enable better case and outcome management
- Growth of wraparound teams as part of local opioid response
- Bring state inmates back to local jails, to focus reentry on the local level, or in the interim examine and strengthen the state to local reentry process.

- New grant and TA opportunities through NIC or through local university system
- Set up a forum/ability to relay grant opportunities and provide technical assistance to locals to support counties applying for eligible grants
- Identify where Stepping Up programs are operating within Maryland

Threats- Factors that challenge sustainability of successes

- There is a lack of continued care in the community, often due to lack of capacity, that threatens the recidivism-reduction gains of successful programs.
- The early detection of needs is still not happening, most interventions are reactive not prevention oriented.
- Inconsistent funding- when funding is available it can end with no local continuation. This often occurs abruptly and there is no opportunity to plan for continuation through other means.
- Staff shortages due to historic budget cutbacks and high turnover due to demographics of current criminal justice professionals, who are predominantly near retirement age challenge sustainability of programs. This is compounded by difficulty recruiting and hiring new staff within the law enforcement and corrections environment.

III. General Themes

Members repeatedly shared the impact of a lack of parity between behavioral health and somatic care. This scarcity is the upstream source of many of the struggles within the criminal justice system. Individuals are being swept into scenarios involving arrest and incarceration, or in some cases being brought directly into incarceration because of lack of appropriate care on the outside. This is directly contributing to recidivism as these patients are not truly being stabilized. The need for more crisis and mental health beds as well as a need for round the clock access to intake via a 23 or 24 hour stabilization center is a direct need, but not one that was appropriate for JRA funding. One proposed remedy for this was to uplift interjurisdictional approaches, as some areas that do not have the capacity or sufficient population to sustain certain programs, could be served effectively by regional programs or providers.

Members stated that the changes in local population have been strongly directed by changes in enforcement, both resources and local practices. Changes in patrol practices towards highway interdiction, or falling staff shift enforcement to stops and citations that do not result in local incarceration. In some counties, individuals with mental health crises are more likely to be brought to jails because there are no other resources, and hospitals will release the patient in a short turnaround without connecting them to services or stabilizing the current crisis.

Validating risk assessment tools is a high priority to ensure funds are being appropriately spent. If jails have an effective pretrial program, operating without impartial, objective, local validation threatens the efficacy of the program.

Early detection of trauma would help delivery services earlier on within justice involvement either through diversion or deflection. There is a need to improve the aftercare/post release support targeted to high utilizers of public systems.

There was strong support for rollout of evidence-based training and interventions for correctional staff, as has occurred in Howard County, but with the consistent follow up of a TA provider to lead project management and guide fidelity. When evidence-based intervention training was offered, serious incident reports and use of force deployment fell precipitously. Over time, staff reported higher satisfaction, which addressed turnover and reduced trauma in correctional staff. This raises the opportunity to incorporate use of force data into needs assessments for grantees.

IV. Victim Services Programs

Rebecca Allyn, Victim Services Program Manager, presented on opportunities on the local level for offender-based programming with a strong benefit to victims, such as Abuse Intervention Programming (AIP) which meets JRA's evidence based requirement and can be initiated within a traditional or alternative corrections setting. While no programs in Maryland currently operate this program within corrections, it has been implemented in other states and associated with diminution credits. The Governor's Family Violence Council (FVC), staffed by GOCCP, evaluates AIP programs across the state in order to ensure consistency and appropriate implementation of evidence-based practices. Expanding access to and knowledge of AIP's is one element of the FVC's strategic plan that can operate in concert with JRA efforts.

She also identified other opportunities under JRA funding areas for programs that are victim-centered, such as models for standalone Domestic Violence court parts, which provide better for the needs of victims in those cases. GOCCP recently conducted a survey of local interest in DV courts and found that many jurisdictions had support for creating a separate court part. Pretrial Service Grant Program awardees in Wicomico and Prince George's County integrated victim stay-away alert technology into their pretrial release model, focusing on victim safety in pretrial release decisions. Other corrections-based programs, such as those with targeted work release programs, can increase the amount and speed at which restitution is paid.

Other programs funded by GOCCP, operate between victim centered and offender-based program models. The Violence Intervention and Prevention Program (VIP) which supports effective violence reduction strategies, specifically gun violence, through evidence-based and/or evidence-informed health programs. Though not explicitly a victim services program, many applicants have chosen to focus services on victims of nonfatal shootings and violent crime who themselves are at a high risk of engaging in violence. In outcomes and participation criteria, these programs prevent future victimization while serving a population that has been victimized.

V. New Business: Funding Priorities

Funding recommendations (includes online survey votes) reflect those programs that members identified as high priorities for reinvestment in their jurisdiction. This will enable a narrower scope within the first year Notice of Funding Availability, and likely shift some priorities to Year 2 funding. As a result of the votes tallied below, the top four funding priorities were identified as Reentry, Pretrial Screeners and Services, Evidence-based programming and specialty courts. Votes for each funding priority are tabulated at left from the meeting and through the annual report.

- (6) Category 1: Pretrial Risk Assessments and Services
- (3) Category 2: Diversion & Deflection Programming, Including Mediation and Restorative Justice Programs
- (3) Category 3: Recidivism Reduction Programming
- (7) Category 4: Evidence-based Practices and Policies
- (6) Category 5: Specialty Courts
- (7) Category 6: Reentry Programs
- Category 7: Enhancement of Victim's Rights
- Category 8: Provide for Substance Use Disorder and Community Mental Health Service Programs
- Category 9: Other JRCC recommendations

Category 9 was not a high priority, but the suggestion was made to include employee wellness and safety in detention as priority considerations within this category in the future.

Funding for victim's programs was not voted a high priority for first year funding, except by Cecil and Somerset county, though discussion was directed toward how to integrate victim rights into other category programs, and members were made aware that regardless of priority, 5% of all local awards must go to this category regardless.

VI. Action items

- Improve communication between agencies on the local levels who play a role in criminal justice reform. One follow up item suggested was to identify connections between existing board members and local criminal justice groups, such as CJCCs and other local data management groups to expand the work of JRA.
- Identify synergy points for reinvestment with known gaps or current efforts.
- Expand early detection of trauma programs to enable better resource delivery earlier in justice involvement or ideally, pre-justice involvement.
- Follow up with some funding breakdowns for the Anne Arundel County CIT program to provide a framework for other counties looking to scale up programs.

VII. Next Meeting

The exact meeting date in May 2019 has yet to be determined. The Board will reconvene to review existing performance measures and develop recommended outcome measures for

JRA grants and how outcome data can be used on the local level even after grants conclude.