

**Minutes from the ARIOB Site Selection & Monitoring Committee Meeting
June 6, 2013, 1:30-3:30pm., at ICJIA, 300 W. Adams, Suite 200, Chicago, IL**

In attendance: Patricia Hayden, Emily Cole (for Cook County State's Attorney's Office), Sean O'Brien (for ICJIA), Angelique Orr

ARIOB by phone: Mike Torchia, Ken Tupy

Non-ARIOB members: Mary Ann Dyar, Lindsey LaPointe

Sean O'Brien opened the meeting at 1:40pm and determined there was quorum.

Approval of previous meeting minutes

Motion: Recommendation to approve the minutes from previous meetings of Site Selection & Monitoring Committee held on January 29, 2013; April 5, 2013; and April 26, 2013. Passed upon motion by Angelique Orr, seconded by Patricia Hayden (none opposed, all in favor).

Discussion of SFY13 funds

Mary Ann Dyar reported on SFY13 dollars:

- The ARI program will have unspent SFY13 funds, in part due to overlapping federal and state funds and slow spending at the site level. ARI staff has received different information as to the allowability of grantees using a "lapse period" to spend down SFY13 funds. Staff is waiting for a written determination before extending some ARI sites to 8/30/13. If not allowable, all SFY13 awards will end on 6/30/13 and SFY14 awards will start on 7/1/13.
- Angelique Orr asked about the possibilities of spending SFY13 funds in the next three weeks on a system wide or administrative level, such as a community group to do a community mapping exercise or software updates. Mary Ann Dyar cautioned that the procurement process for such activities generally takes months.
- Staff noted that ARI is looking into bringing in a trainer for staff, and one site is bringing in a trainer with a relatively quick planning process. Sean O'Brien noted that spending remaining SFY13 dollars at the site level is likely not possible before 6/30/13 due to the lengthy process of securing vendors and amending budgets.
- The difficulties in spending at site level highlight the barriers presented in short-term grant agreements. For example, \$400,000 was granted out in supplemental funding categories; however, sites were not able to spend all of it, in part due to short time periods for spending after the paperwork was finally completed.
- Mary Ann Dyar noted that the Site Selection & Monitoring Committee is the appropriate venue to discuss these issues as the ARIOB authorized this committee to make decisions about SFY13 undesignated funds.
- The Committee discussed slow spending at site level and vendors not billing. Angelique Orr suggested writing in the mandate of monthly billing to vendor contracts to assist with site spending, and Mike Torchia also suggested this to avoid future site-level spending bottlenecks. Sean O'Brien noted this can be added to agreements.

Sean O'Brien opened the discussion of responses to the SFY14 Implementation RFP

Seven jurisdictions responded; however, one proposed to begin 10/1/13 to allow more time to finalize its proposal. Thus, the Committee will review and make recommendations on six proposals.

The committee discussed the proposals by looking at their strengths, weaknesses and any concerns with funding. Mary Ann Dyar highlighted that the Committee examined the Executive Summaries submitted, including program models, target population, reduction goal and funds requested.

Sean O'Brien raised concern that due to a necessary start up period, sites will experience slow spending and suggested the Committee recommends to the full board "up to" a certain amount and then the actual contract may be less than the requested amount. Actual agreement negotiations would happen between now and early July.

Boone County (\$150,000)

- Proposal to create new drug court in Boone County.
- Staffing: 1 FTE drug court coordinator (coordinating team, all grant reporting, all staffings, CM/supervision/drug testing and service coordination for all participants) and one .5 FTE TASC recovery coach (assessment, intensive case management, linkage to community resources, all staffing).
- Three phases of outpatient drug treatment provided by Remedies Renewing Lives for up to 15 participants.
- County went through in-depth planning process and examined case files for all commitments to IDOC.

Discussion:

- High cost per person based on 10 diverted – for better cost-effectiveness, can either reduce costs and/or increase numbers served.
- Staffing levels may be excessive for program capacity of 15 (coordinator, recovery coach and drug treatment, estimated program capacity based on drug treatment capacity).
- Moral Reconciliation Therapy (MRT) books may be needed (not currently included).
- If DC coordinator is conducting oversight and MRT, % on ARI could be reduced.

Questions for Boone:

- Clarification/job description needed on DC coordinator's role (conducting probation supervision?) to determine percent of time on program.
- Clarification needed on program capacity and enrollment goals (15-20 would create better cost-effectiveness); Committee suggested providing site with a cost per person goal and shaping enrollment goal around that.

Recommendation: Approve Boone for up to \$150,000 with clarification of DC coordinator's role, program capacity, and subsequent cost-effectiveness. Approved upon a motion by Angelique Orr, Patricia Hayden seconded (none opposed, all in favor).

Lake County (\$215,835, 9 month grant):

- Proposal to maintain recovery coach program (two FTEs) started with an expiring SAMSHA grant (expires 9/30/13) and add Moral Reconciliation Therapy (MRT); additional residential treatment; and recovery home support – all services for the high-risk and need participants in Lake County's three specialty courts (drug, mental health [Therapeutic Intensive Monitoring, or TIM, Court], and veterans).
- Current drug court has three phases, averages 30 months, capacity of 50, serves class 2-4 offenders that are high risk and need with drug dependency.

Discussion

- High per person cost, although strong concept and program model/strategy, in line with Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) recommendations.
- Need clarification on target population calculation and reduction goal of 18. Identified "average eligible for diversion" of 381 (2010-2012). Proposal states "reduction goal based on number of new defendants entering into specialty court program identified as high risk and high need" – need to show specific calculation of reduction goal of 18.
- Need specific information on recovery coach caseload – caseload of 9 seems low.
- Do the 50 participants in drug court come into the reduction goal and is the reduction goal of 18 a percentage of the drug court?

Questions for Lake:

- Ask Lake County about target population calculation, plans to divert, and plans to serve (with ARI funds).
- Check on recovery coaching caseloads.

Recommendation: Approve Lake County up to \$215,835 with clarification on target population (specific number and definition), a clear reduction goal calculation, how many individuals the program plans on serving, and how treatment and recovery home services tie into the target population and reduction goal. Approved upon a motion by Angelique Orr, Patricia Hayden seconded (none opposed, all in favor).

Peoria (\$300,285.04):

- Proposal to create an intensive probation supervision program for high-risk Class 3, 4 and some 2 offenders.
- 2 FTE probation officers.
- Target population of 120 and reduction goal of 30 is clear and aligns with recent IDOC commitments.
- Request to fund an efficient drug testing machine, cutting down on time between test and results.

Discussion:

- Peoria went through an unfunded planning process and the State's Attorney increased buy-in and investment.
- Possible concern with employing inexperienced probation officers for an IPS program, although some other sites new staff works well in these roles.
- Peoria will maintain all of their specialty courts and current IPS for violent and sex offenders
- If a full 120 enrolled, high caseload for IPS (60) which can be monitored in the future.

Recommendation: Approve Peoria County up to \$300,286 with inquiry about possibility of mentoring new probation staff and possible need for future new staff if 120 enrollment hit. Approved upon a motion by Angelique Orr, Patricia Hayden seconded (none opposed, all in favor).

Sangamon County (\$224,724):

- Proposal to enhance drug court and increase capacity from 25 to 45 (24 month average length of stay), and fund drug court completely after 9/30/13 when BJA grant expires.
- Current drug court coordinator currently coordinates and supervises 25 participants. Mike Torchia (committee member and Director of Court Services in Sangamon) noted that if grant received they would ramp up to 45 immediately.
- DC coordinator is current funded by another source which expires 11/30/13. Proposal to fund DC coordinator as of 12/1/13 and fund additional officer immediately to expand capacity.
- Sangamon formerly used treatment dollars through BJA grant, but funds expended so treatment providers currently using Department of Alcohol and Substance Abuse (DASA) money.

Discussion:

- ARI grant would serve all 45 from 7/1/13 (due to lack of treatment services), for purposes of cost-effectiveness.
- How does capacity relate to IDOC numbers? Mike Torchia explained everyone going to drug court is prison-bound (all classes, primarily Class 3s and 4s), drug court population has multiple prior probation sentences, often been to IDOC before.
- Committee discussed service goal vs. reduction goal. Reduction goal based on 2010-2012 average eligible commitment data (3s and 4s) and suggested Sangamon take the average of 2010-2012 Class 3s and 4s (120) to determine 25% reduction goal. Reduction goal would be 30, allowing room to service 45 and divert 30.

Recommendation: Approve Sangamon County up to \$224,724 based on clarification of exact reduction goal (enrollment of 45). Approved upon a motion by Angelique Orr, Emily Cole seconded (none opposed, all in favor, Mike Torchia abstains).

4th Judicial Circuit (\$168,282)

- Proposal to implement mental health court and veteran's track in two counties in circuit (Effingham and Christian), hire one FTE coordinator (provides coordination, supervises half of caseload).
- Three court phases and graduation (stabilization, cognitive/life skills, restoring/reintegration) – 30-month program length with discretion for early graduation.
- Goal to divert 20 out of 80 in target population (based on 2008-2010 data).
- Entire circuit went through in-depth planning process and retreat to plan and identify model to implement and target population.

Discussion and questions:

- Circuit needs to check enrollment and diversion goal to ensure numbers align with current 2010-2012 data. Proposed enrollment and diversion numbers based on average ARI-eligible commitments (2008-2010) in both Christian and Effingham (41 and 40, 25% reduction goal of 20).

Recommendation: Approve the 4th Judicial Circuit up to \$168,282 with a request to check and possibly revise enrollment and diversion goals based on 2010-2012 data. Approved upon a motion by Angelique Orr, Emily Cole seconded (none opposed, all in favor).

2nd Judicial Circuit (\$280,207)

- Proposal to fund a circuit wide drug court.
- Formerly received planning and ramp-up grant.
- Goal to enroll 45 and divert 12 within the circuit wide drug court.

Discussion and questions:

- Discussed a suggested purchase of drug testing equipment vs. the proposed lease. It is reasonable that the Circuit will need two pieces of drug testing equipment to cover its vast geographic area.
- Discussed slow spending patterns in current ramp-up grant, but new grant should not need ramp-up time.
- Could reduction goal be higher? Proposal is to enroll 45 and divert 12. Circuit reported to staff that they want to be responsible for only the individuals they can enroll in drug court and not the entire drug court eligible population, and capacity is 45. This does not align with program goals and statute.
- Proposal needs to target 25% of the drug-court eligible population and Circuit can enroll at minimum that number, although it's advisable to enroll more to ensure the goal is reached.
- Drug court eligible populations are "moving targets" and are not necessarily reflected in IDOC data. Since it is not currently possible to discern drug court-eligibility from IDOC data, the eligible population is open to some negotiation. The Circuit can be conservative in defining their drug-court eligible target population, but the reduction goal must relate to the identified target population.
- Target population can be based on IDOC data and other factors (estimates of state's attorney screening out, violent histories, etc). Cost-effectiveness will be examined once specific target population and reduction goal is identified.
- Goal to go from seven to 12 counties within 12 months – an aggressive plan. Committee has concerns with rapid expansion given slow spending in SFY13.
- 1 FTE coordinator is responsible for program expansion (no supervision duties), coordinating all counties, expanding drug court to all counties in circuit, and exploring mental health track.
- Possibility of two separate grants to cover expansion work and coordination work (this would increase cost-effectiveness as coordinator's expansion duties would not be included in implementation grant).

Recommendation: Approve the 2nd Judicial Circuit up to \$280,207 contingent on revisions and negotiations of the grant proposal to include or exclude expansion components, and a revision of diversion numbers to be cost-effective. Additional funds may be provided for purchase of drug testing equipment.

Sean O'Brien suggested the ARI staff and the Committee report on actual funding at the August 2013 ARIOB meeting.

Sean O'Brien asked for a motion to adjourn at 3:40p.m. Approved upon a motion by Angelique Orr, Emily Cole seconded (none opposed, all in favor).