



ADULT REDEPLOY ILLINOIS

MINUTES

ADULT REDEPLOY ILLINOIS OVERSIGHT BOARD SITE SELECTION & MONITORING COMMITTEE

Wednesday, June 21, 2017, at 1:00 p.m.
ICJIA, 300 W. Adams Street, 2nd Floor Conference Room
Chicago, Illinois 60606

Welcome and Introductions

Angelique Orr called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m. and took the roll.

ARIOB Member Attendance	Present	Telephone	Absent
Walter Boyd			X
Lori Roper for Amy Campanelli			X
Kathy Starkovich	X		
Emily Cole for Kim Foxx	X		
Shai Hoffman for John Maki	X		
Angelique Orr (Committee Chair)	X		
Hon. James Radcliffe (Ret.)		X	
Michael Torchia		X	

Also in attendance were:

Lisa Castillo, ICJIA Associate General Counsel

Dawn English, ICJIA Human Resources

Lindsey LaPointe, ARI Program Manager

Hon. Thomas Sumner (Ret.), ARI Technical Assistance Provider (Telephone)

A quorum was established.

Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

The committee reviewed the April 27, 2017 Site Selection & Monitoring (SS&M) Committee meeting minutes. Michael Torchia noted that he was absent from the last meeting and needs to be indicated as such. Shai Hoffman requested clarification on the statement, "Mr. Kurtz added that ARI is approximately half of the agency's proposed budget for state funds."

Motion: Ms. Cole motioned to approve the April 27, 2017 minutes with the correction and subject to the requested clarification. Ms. Starkovich seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Update on SFY18 Budget

Ms. LaPointe stated that there is no appropriation for Adult Redeploy Illinois (ARI) as of yet. She provided a recap of the previous year in which a stopgap budget was passed on June 30, 2016 by the Illinois General Assembly. It was a sufficient appropriation that covered all site expenses for SFY16 and budgeted expenses for SFY17. Similar to this time last year, much is unknown in regards to a budget scenario. Ms. LaPointe clarified that in every proposed budget that has been put on the table in the Senate or House, ARI has been included but at slightly different appropriation levels. ARI sites have been



ADULT REDEPLOY ILLINOIS

instructed to submit budgets for SFY18 at maintenance levels, and conference calls will take place next week to ensure open communication and transparency with all ARI programs. Ms. Orr emphasized the need to be prepared for any budget developments and to communicate properly with the ARI Oversight Board (ARIOB). Ms. LaPointe agreed and added that the ARIOB would be involved if there is a sufficient appropriation to release SFY18 planning grant opportunities. Ms. Orr noted that ARI can and should focus on balancing program growth and effective program management.

Discussion and Vote on Changes to SFY18 Designations

Ms. Orr guided the committee through the changes to the SFY18 designations from the original funding recommendations, starting with Boone County. Due to an increase in fixed costs, Boone County's recommendation has increased from \$112,887 to \$113,078. DeKalb County's funding recommendation changed from \$153,395 to \$178,526 due to an annualization of SFY17 personnel costs. Lake County's funding recommendation increased from \$217,425 to \$225,440 due to delayed information received on fixed cost increases after the initial SFY18 designation request was approved. Ms. LaPointe informed the committee that the contingencies that were part of the initial votes for renewal funding apply to these recommendations as well, e.g., contingent upon sufficient state appropriation, subject to legal and fiscal review for reasonableness and allowability, as well as compliance with the Grants Accountability and Transparency Act (GATA) and the Illinois Supreme Court Problem-Solving Court standards if applicable.

Motion: Mr. Hoffman motioned to approve the funding recommendation for Boone County's request for \$113,078. Ms. Cole seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Motion: Ms. Starkovich motioned to approve the funding recommendation for DeKalb County's request for \$178,340 contingent upon cost-effectiveness and a recalculation of the target population. Ms. Cole seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Motion: Ms. Cole motioned to approve the funding recommendation for Lake County's request for \$225,440. Ms. Starkovich seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Review and Vote on Local Plans – SFY17 Planning Grants

Ms. Orr opened the discussion about the documents submitted by the SFY17 planning grantees. Ms. LaPointe reminded the committee that ARI funded five planning grants for SFY17: the 4th Judicial Circuit (Effingham, Fayette, Clay, and Jasper counties), the 20th Judicial Circuit (Perry and Washington counties), Adams County, LaSalle County, and Sangamon County. The committee was provided a summary chart outlining each planning grant (amount requested, proposed model, target population, key elements, and questions/comments). Ms. LaPointe noted the importance of the planning grant process to highlight any concerns and ability to make prompt changes. The local plans submitted by the grantees were reviewed and approved in substance by the committee, with any future funding decisions subject to official Notices of Funding Opportunity (NOFO).

Ms. LaPointe discussed that three of the planning grants are from existing ARI sites. First, the 4th Judicial Circuit has had a mental health court for about 3.5 years. Their planning grant is for examining ARI enhancements in Effingham County and expanding to Fayette, Jasper, and Clay counties. Enhancements would include mentoring, life skills, and a communities restoring wellness program. This would cause increases in staff hours and the hiring of a counselor to provide mental health and substance abuse treatment, which they hope will eliminate or reduce waitlists for such services. They are also requesting



ADULT REDEPLOY ILLINOIS

increases in transportation costs and gas cards to help individuals to access services. Ms. Starkovich noted that clarification was needed in the way they calculated their reduction goal.

Ms. LaPointe summarized the 20th Judicial Circuit's planning grant. This circuit is already involved in ARI, and is looking to implement a special probation program for individuals with substance use and/or co-occurring disorders in additional counties. They currently have two probation officers, each with a caseload of about 300. Funds would be used for one probation officer, drug testing supplies, travel for two staff to in-state training, and cognitive behavioral therapy. Ms. LaPointe noted the specificity and appropriateness of evidence-based practices and interventions to fill gaps in services. Typical of a rural area, the cost per person is relatively high, so the site should be careful with cost-effectiveness. Their reduction goal calculation was based on a case file analysis. Ms. Starkovich requested clarification on the diversion goal.

Ms. LaPointe then reviewed Adams County's planning grant. Not currently an ARI site, Adams County is looking to implement a new mental health court in conjunction to the current drug court. The local plan failed to articulate a total ARI-eligible population or the method which led to the reduction goal of 20 to 25 individuals. Ms. LaPointe questions whether they meant "serve" or "divert." Adams County proposes to use funds to improve access to health care and temporary housing, as well as funding portions of assistant state's attorney, the public defender, problem-solving court coordinator, and a full time probation officer. Proposed total budget is \$327,699. The county failed to answer the community involvement question, although Judge Radcliffe shared that they have strong community connections and support. Ms. LaPointe agreed and does not believe this report reflects all of their strengths. Ms. Cole noted the amount requested is higher than other jurisdictions. Ms. LaPointe went over Adams County's budget, which lists treatment costs at about \$200,000. This includes a contract with a local treatment provider, transitional housing, employment placement and support program, family support, case-management, screening, and transition planning. Ms. Cole commented that they may have participants whose expenses would be covered by Medicaid. Ms. LaPointe agreed that services need to match the cost per person. Overall, further clarification is needed.

Motion: Ms. Cole moved to approve Adams County in substance of their local plan contingent upon clarification of the population to be served and diverted, as well as of treatment services to be provided, level of community support and existing personnel in plan. Mr. Hoffman seconded the motion. Ms. Starkovich recused herself from voting. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Ms. LaPointe introduced LaSalle County's local plan. The county is planning on implementing a mental health court with a budget of \$204,563. The identified target population is 40 people, with a reduction goal of 10 people. This could lead to a high cost per person diverted. Funds are requested for behavioral health services with a local provider (same treatment provider as the intensive supervision probation with services [ISP-S] program funded by ARI), including a part-time psychiatrist, psychiatric nurse, case manager, and supportive housing staff. The referral, screening, and phase system of the mental health court are clearly articulated. No funds requested for assistant state's attorney or public defender. Ms. Cole asked about potential overlap in personnel costs with the county's ISP-S program (i.e. necessity of a psychiatrist and psychiatric nurse), and whether or not the county will be using Medicaid funds.

Ms. Cole also asked the broader question about programs dismissing convictions upon program completion (which is possible based on statute) and whether ARI has a policy position on it. Ms. LaPointe answered that many ARI programs have multiple tracks and/or plea programs, based on local control and design, and they may not be aware of the possibility to dismiss charges. Ms. Orr noted that the ultimate



ADULT REDEPLOY ILLINOIS

goal is for participants to be reintegrated into their communities, and charge dismissal could reduce barriers to this. Ms. LaPointe added that this could be a valuable conversation at a future ARIOB meeting.

Ms. LaPointe guided the committee's review of the Sangamon County local plan. Sangamon County is a current ARI site and is proposing to integrate a veterans court that would be open to all six counties in the circuit with a budget of \$24,246. Sangamon County would act as the "host county" and the problem-solving court coordinator would oversee all courts; a formal 7th Judicial Circuit Adult Redeploy Committee would be formed to oversee the project during implementation. Funds are requested for annual in-state problem-solving court conference participation, office supplies, incentives, drug testing supplies, as well as contractual substance abuse/mental health/cognitive behavioral therapy services.

Ms. LaPointe noted that the ARI-eligible population and target population are unclear due to a lack of data on veterans populations in county jails. An estimated number of veterans on probation in the six counties was provided. Ms. LaPointe also observed that the proposed program and budget do not address all of the gaps identified such as transportation resources for participants and staff, specific training on veterans issues, and plans for identifying veterans at the jail level. Mr. Torchia added that Sangamon County is putting all problem-solving courts under one umbrella, and the funds requested are to support the other counties; Sangamon County will be covered under the implementation grant proposal. Ms. Orr asked if it is feasible to expect more information regarding the target population, to which Mr. Torchia replied that they discovered inconsistencies in asking about veteran status in the jail; a better system to collect such information is in progress. Mr. Hoffman raised the concern that without an accurate target population and reduction goal, the budget may not be accurate. Ms. LaPointe shared that the county estimated about \$1,000 per month for 15 participants over a 12-month grant period. Overall, further clarification is needed on the target population and service goal.

Motion: Ms. Starkovich moved to approve the local plans of the 4th Judicial Circuit, the 20th Judicial Circuit, LaSalle County and Sangamon County in substance only. This includes the contingencies discussed in the committee's reviews. Mr. Hoffman seconded the motion. Mr. Torchia recused himself from voting on Sangamon's local plan. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Old Business/New Business

Ms. LaPointe provided an update on House Bill 3905, which was designed to expand the criteria for eligibility of ARI. It did not appear on the House floor. Communication is out to the bill's sponsor to discuss how to best advocate for the ARIOB's support of the bill going forward. Based on ARIOB support and site feedback, the bill may appear again.

Motion: Mr. Hoffman moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Cole seconded the motion. Meeting adjourned at 1:10 p.m.

(Approved 11/8/17)