

Incarceration Prevention Reduction Task Force

9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m. on May 14, 2018

Whatcom County Courthouse Fifth Floor Conference Rooms 513/514, 311 Grand Ave., Bellingham WA

AGENDA

Topic	Requested Action	Presenter	Packet Page(s)
1. Call to Order <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review April 2, 2018 Meeting Summary • Recent Task Force Success: 	Review Only	Co-Chairs	1 - 3
2. Committee Updates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steering Committee • Triage Facility Committee (<i>no April meeting</i>) • Behavioral Health Committee • Legal & Justice Systems Committee 	Information	Todd Donovan Chris Phillips Anne Deacon/Dan Hammill Stephen Gockley	4 - 10
3. Update by Jurisdictions on Jail Diversion Programs	Information	Bill Elfo Nick Lewis Raylene King Darlene Peterson	11
4. Review and discuss the proposed Information Needs and Data Exchange (INDEX) Committee		Tyler Schroeder	12 - 18
5. IPRTF review of possible grant opportunity from the Urban Institute Safety + Justice Challenge (Referred from County Council)	Review + Possible Decision	Barry Buchanan Co-Chairs	19 - 32
6. Next Steps: Ideas & Further Information <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review assigned tasks • Next meeting topics 			
7. Other Business			
8. Public Comment			
9. Adjourn			

UPCOMING MEETINGS:

IPR TASK FORCE various Mondays 9-11 a.m. Courthouse Conf. Rm 513/514 311 Grand Ave., Bellingham	COMMITTEES			
	BEHAVIORAL HEALTH various Mondays 2:30-3:30 (except where noted) Health Department Creekside Conf. Room 509 Girard, B'ham	LEGAL & JUSTICE SYS. 2 nd Tuesday 11:30 am–1:30 pm Courthouse Conf. Rm 514 311 Grand Ave., Bham	TRIAGE FACILITY 3 rd Thursday 9:30-11:00 a.m. Health Dept. MOVED TO Courthouse 5 th Floor 513 or 514, 311 Grand Avenue, B'ham	STEERING As needed Courthouse County Council Conference Room Courthouse Suite 105 311 Grand Ave., Bham
May 14	May 14	May 8	May 17 in Room 513	May 31: 9:30 a.m. September 6: 9:30 a.m.
June 11	June 11	June 12	June 21 in Room 514	
July 16	July 16	July 10	July 19 in Room 514	
August 6	August 6	(no august)	August 9 * in Room 513	
September 17	September 17	September 11	September 20: location TBD	
October 15	October 15	October 9	October 18 in Room 514	
November 26	November 26	November 13	November 15 in Room 513	
December 17	December 17	December 11	December 20 in Room 514	

Incarceration Prevention and Reduction Task Force
DRAFT Meeting Summary April 2, 2018

1. Call to Order

Task Force Co-Chair Jill Bernstein called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m.

Present: Jill Bernstein, Anne Deacon, Jerry DeBruin, Todd Donovan, Bill Elfo, Deborra Garrett, Stephen Gockley, Kate Hansen, Jack Hovenier, Deborah Hawley, Betsy Kruse, Kelli Linville, Byron Manering, Dave McEachran, Lisa McShane, Moonwater, Chris Phillips

Also Present: Caryl Dunavan (proxy for Raylene King), Kathy Walker (proxy for Dave McEachran)

Absent: Angela Anderson, Daniel Hammill, Raylene King, Nick Lewis, Darlene Peterson, Tyler Schroeder, Greg Winter

Review March 5, 2018 Meeting Summary

There were no changes.

2. Presentation from Christopher Poulos, Executive Director, Washington Statewide Reentry Council

Bernstein introduced Christopher Poulos.

Christopher Poulos, Executive Director of Washington Statewide Reentry Council, described his background with addiction, incarceration, and recovery and his work through law school and at the White House on recovery and reentry issues. He described his vision for reentry, which includes both internal and external changes. Poulos referenced his handouts (on file) and described various reentry programs, including individualized comprehensive reentry planning. He answered questions from the Task Force members and audience members regarding:

- Inducements to treatment, which include peer mentoring
- The need to restore funding for supervision upon release
- The lack of community resources
- Cultural shifts in engaging with people
- The Department of Corrections' lack of treatment for short-time offenders
- Making the public and policy-makers aware that reentry is cost-effective
- Reentry work done by the Department of Corrections could be done by the County, depending on how long folks are in custody, by beginning reentry services while still incarcerated
- The status of several bills that were before the State Legislature, including a program to issue identification other than the inmate identification
- The current reentry program in the County Jail
- The closure of Rainbow Recovery
- Peer counselor training programs
- Efforts of Restorative Community Coalition to provide a Restore-A-Life Center and Wellness & Recovery Center
- Examples of other programs

Incarceration Prevention and Reduction Task Force
DRAFT Meeting Summary April 2, 2018

3. Miscellaneous Brief Agenda Items

Finalize committee assignments

The Task Force members discussed the status of the proposed Information and Data Needs Exchange (INDEX) Committee.

The Task Force members made the following changes:

- Specify Doug Chadwick for Bill Elfo on the Behavioral Health Committee
- Add Kelli Linville to the Behavioral Health Committee
- Add a to-be-determined representative of Mayor Linville to the Triage Facility Committee
- Remove Caryl Dunavan from the Behavioral Health Committee
- Add Peter Ruffatto to the Legal and Justice Systems Committee

Phillips moved to approve the list of committee members as amended. The motion was seconded and carried unanimously. *(Clerk's Note: Committee member McEachran left the meeting and Kathy Walker served as his proxy for the remainder of the meeting, including this vote.)*

Task Force members discussed how to identify the funding spent on keeping people out of jail and working on reentry issues through the Task Force's Legal and Justice Systems Subcommittee.

Report on County Council Criminal Justice and Public Safety Committee Listening Tour

Barry Buchanan reported on the upcoming Listening Tour and plans to gather information from the public on criminal justice issue, specifically focusing on the jail.

Update on collaboration of law enforcement and St. Joseph Hospital (From August meeting)

Phillips updated the Task Force on process changes resulting from collaboration among hospital staff and community law enforcement representatives:

- To reduce calls from hospital staff to law enforcement, hospital staff will follow a new procedure to consult with their supervisor first, engage hospital security staff, and receive training to identify when it's appropriate to call law enforcement.
- Law enforcement officers don't have to stay at the hospital when they bring someone in for evaluation and treatment. The hospital staff will notify law enforcement when they are releasing someone who was brought in.
- Law enforcement officers are no longer required to check their weapons when entering the psychiatric unit.
- Any case in which a law enforcement officer must wait will be fast-tracked through the process.

4. Committee Updates

Donovan reported for the Steering Committee and submitted a handout (on file) explaining the annual report timeline, the status of the INDEX Committee and data collection efforts, and the Steering Committee's approval of funding to bring Dr. Jacqueline van Wormer to the Pretrial Processes Workgroup for consultation services.

Incarceration Prevention and Reduction Task Force
DRAFT Meeting Summary April 2, 2018

Deacon spoke on the potential construction completion date of the new triage facility in mid-2019.

Phillips reported for the Triage Facility Committee and updated the Task Force on the committee's recent work on its work plan and the triage facility. The committee will work next on operating funds and the shift of behavioral health funding to private insurance companies:

- A request for proposals from insurance companies is due to the state next week
- Now is the time to make sure companies know that triage facilities will save them money over emergency hospital stays

Gockley reported for the Legal and Justice Systems Committee:

- The Committee's working on its work plan and data needs
- The work of the Pretrial Processes Workgroup

Garrett reported for the Pretrial Processes Workgroup and the upcoming presentation and consultation from Dr. Jacqueline van Wormer on April 19. Task Force members are invited as observers. Dr. van Worker will guide the group on how to move forward with selecting a pretrial risk assessment tool and creating a pretrial monitoring unit.

Deacon reported for the Behavioral Health Committee:

- The Committee's working on its work plan and data needs
- They Committee recently discussed the Ground-level Response and Coordinated Engagement (GRACE) Program. There is currently a request for qualifications for a hub agency.

The Task Force members discussed the possibility of using one pretrial risk assessment tool across all jurisdictions in the county.

5. Next Steps: Ideas and Further Information

This item was not discussed.

6. Other Business

There was no other business.

7. Public Comment

Joy Gilfilen spoke about the proliferation of bureaucracy on the Task Force and how the only real representative of inmates is Deborah Hawley. They need to listen to the inmates

7. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 11:03 a.m.

***Incarceration Prevention and Reduction Task Force
Steering Committee
Meeting Summary for April 26, 2018***

1. Call To Order

Committee Chair Todd Donovan called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. in the County Council Conference Room, 311 Grand Avenue, Bellingham.

Members Present: Jill Bernstein, Todd Donovan, Stephen Gockley, Chris Phillips

Also Present: Perry Mowery (proxy for Anne Deacon) and Barry Buchanan

Members Absent: Jack Hovenier, Tyler Schroeder, Anne Deacon,

Review March 8, 2018 Meeting Summary

There were no changes.

2. Discussion with Mark Gardner on annual report and outline for committee report

Mark Gardner, City of Bellingham, submitted a handout (on file) demonstrating the committee report writing structure and answered questions about the report deadlines.

The committee discussed the structure and content of the report, including:

- Highlighting recent activities in the progress section
- Providing background on other items and costs
- Including information from 2017 to educate newer councilmembers
- Foreshadowing upcoming budget requests
- Writing the report for two audiences: the County Council and the public
- Including good data in the form of graphs and charts, when possible
- Creating a narrative about the vision and goals of the Information Needs and Data Exchange (INDEX) Committee
- Expanding section D to include community reentry and stabilization
- The need to simplify the report while keeping detailed requests for the Council to know what is needed to move forward
- Adding information on what's in progress of reach subject
- Highlight outcomes
- The Behavioral Health and Triage Facility committee chairs will work together to write their sections of the report
- Limiting the topics to three each per committee, plus a section on the INDEX Committee
- Identifying how to measure success

3. What's next in creating the INDEX Committee?

The committee discussed:

Incarceration Prevention and Reduction Task Force
Steering Committee
Meeting Summary for April 26, 2018

- Include information in the annual report on this proposed committee
- The Council's request for data
- Identifying data, metrics, and barriers
- Figuring out the baseline and whether or not they're successful with their projects
- Identify how they assess performance
- Where is data a barrier to implementing various initiatives
- Each committee should identify one metric for each of their three initiatives in the report that would determine the success of that initiative
- To get better metrics and more accurate data, the systems have to be integrated
- An important policy goal is to establish a percentage decrease in the jail population
- Refining the processes, improving the way things work together, and then observing outcomes
- Engaging Tyler Schroeder, the Bellingham Mayor, and other interested stakeholders to come prepared for a more fully developed committee structure
- The structure and roles of a technical group versus a policy group.
 - The policy and outcomes, not the technical group, should drive the process
 - The technical people would interact with the policy group about the possible options to get those policy and outcomes
 - Drive the numbers with the policy, goals, and outcomes, and the systems will conform to what they need to get those outcomes
- The process for forming the INDEX Committee

The committee agreed by general consent to move forward with a dual structure INDEX Committee that is comprised of a policy group and a technical group, and to ask Tyler Schroeder to draft such a structure for proposal to the full Task Force at its meeting in May.

4. Discussion with Committee Chairs on progress of developing work plans

The committee discussed the status of each committee work plan and whether or not they should create a work plan for the full Task Force. The committee chairs indicated they would like to continue discussion of their committee work plans during the May committee meetings.

5. Other Business

Committee members discussed the recent presentation and discussion with Dr. Jacqueline van Wormer regarding pretrial risk assessment:

- 2018 budget supplemental request to fund a custom, locally validated pretrial risk assessment tool
- Requesting funds in the 2019-2020 biennial budget to fund a new pretrial services unit
- The procurement process

6. Next Steps: Ideas & Further Information

***Incarceration Prevention and Reduction Task Force
Steering Committee
Meeting Summary for April 26, 2018***

The annual report and the IPRTF discussion and recommendation regarding the INDEX Committee will be scheduled on the next Steering Committee agenda.

7. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

8. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

DRAFT

***Incarceration Prevention and Reduction Task Force
April Meeting Summaries***

Triage Facility Subcommittee

No April meeting

Legal & Justice Systems Subcommittee: April 10

A quorum of members did not attend this meeting.

Behavioral Health Subcommittee: April 16

1. Call To Order

A quorum of members did not attend this meeting. Those attending the meeting discussed the agenda items listed below. The audio of the discussion is available on the committee website.

Members Present: Anne Deacon, Chadwick, Dan Hammill, Doug Mike Parker

Members Absent: Byron Manering, Kelli Linville, Sandy Whitcutt, and the undesignated proxy for Kate Hansen

Also Present: Jill Bernstein, Jeff Brubaker, Mark Gardner

2. Presentation from Jeff Brubaker on City of Bellingham implementation of GRACE-like program

3. Discuss the Committee's annual report

4. ~~Committee work plan~~ *This item was not discussed.*

5. ~~Review list of data needs for Information and Data Exchange (INDEX) Committee~~ *This item was not discussed.*

6. Updates on GRACE, CPIT, and Whatcom has Hope programs

Incarceration Prevention and Reduction Task Force
Legal & Justice Systems Subcommittee
DRAFT Meeting Summary for May 8, 2018

1. Call To Order

Committee Chair Stephen Gockley called the meeting to order at 11:37 a.m. in the Whatcom County Courthouse Conference Room 514, 311 Grand Avenue, Bellingham.

Members Present: Angela Anderson, Jill Bernstein, Bill Elfo, Deborra Garrett, Stephen Gockley, Deborah Hawley, Raylene King, Moonwater, Darlene Peterson, Peter Ruffatto

Also Present: Kathy Walker (proxy for Dave McEachran), Heather Flaherty (proxy for Lisa McShane)

Members Absent: Deborah Hawley, Dave McEachran, Lisa McShane

Review March 13, 2018 Meeting Summary

There were no changes

2. Annual Report

Mark Gardner, City of Bellingham Legislative Policy Analyst, and the committee members discussed the annual report, including:

- The audiences are the County Council and public
- Make the report content and format as easy to read as possible
- Include information about book-and-release efforts of other jurisdictions besides the County
- Reframe the section on barriers and challenges to include opportunities
- Include next steps and additional context of how they plan to move forward
- How to include the Committee's work plan in the annual report
- The process for the Committee's review, making amendments, and approval of the Committee's section of the annual report
- Several changes to the section on the proposed pretrial processes risk assessment and program
- How much cost detail should be in the report for pretrial services

The Committee also discussed:

- The status of the book-and-release program
- Real-time response capabilities of GPS electronic monitoring hardware
- How monitoring tools can be used differently by different jurisdictions
- The possibility of assigning GPS monitoring to certain pretrial defendants
- Prosecutorial discretion and best practices for drug court

Incarceration Prevention and Reduction Task Force
Legal & Justice Systems Subcommittee
DRAFT Meeting Summary for May 8, 2018

The committee members can email proposed updates to Stephen Gockley by end-of-day on Friday, May 11.

5. Update on Pretrial Processes Workgroup

Garrett described and the Committee discussed two upcoming grant opportunities:

1. MacArthur Foundation Grant, which may not work for pretrial services, but could be an option for another program (*handout on file*)
2. Arnold Foundation's upcoming expansion of its risk assessment program, which could be an option for Whatcom County's pretrial services unit for Superior Court.

Garrett also updated the Committee on the status of the Pretrial Processes Workgroup:

- The workgroup, and Dave Reynolds especially, is working to provide Dr. van Wormer statistics she needs to help identify a potential consultant for the County

The Committee discussed the grant opportunities and the timeline for submitting an 2018 budget supplemental request to hire a project manager to begin building the pretrial services program.

3. Draft Priorities and Work Plan

This item was not discussed.

4. Identify the ideal data needs of the committee for the INDEX Committee

Committee members described various data on which they would like more information:

- The number of Assault 3 cases happening in the hospital emergency department
- Make sure law enforcement can use the system effectively
- Average length of stay in the jail
- How long it takes to process a case through the system
- Collect data from the courts of limited jurisdiction, including tribal court
- Track the amount of work being done currently to divert misdemeanor and gross misdemeanor offenders from arrest and booking into jail to determine whether diversion efforts are improving
- Track the success of the various diversion and release programs, such as electronic home monitoring, drug court, and others
- Provide the INDEX Committee the comments from the Sheriff and District Court regarding the Vera Institute final report
- Establish baseline data

(Due to audio recorder malfunction, the remainder of the meeting, 1:10 p.m. to adjourn, was not recorded.)

Incarceration Prevention and Reduction Task Force
Legal & Justice Systems Subcommittee
DRAFT Meeting Summary for May 8, 2018

The Committee agreed to schedule this item for discussion during the majority of the June committee meeting.

6. Next Steps: Ideas & Further Information

This item was not discussed.

7. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

8. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 1:32 p.m.

DRAFT



City of Bellingham 2018 1st Quarter Jail Alternatives Report

The City of Bellingham contracts with the Yakima County Corrections Center and Friendship Diversion Services as a part of Bellingham's Reduction Incarceration Challenge, (BRIC), and to help address the request from the Whatcom County Sheriff to reduce the City of Bellingham's inmate population in the Whatcom County Jail.

In the first quarter of 2018, there were 57 Bellingham defendants who were transported to Yakima to serve their sentences or await case resolution out of 221 Bellingham defendants who were arrested and booked into jail on strictly Bellingham charges. The defendants transferred to Yakima served a total of 906 days. Of the 57 defendants transferred, 39 were pre-trial inmates (68%). Prior to being transferred to Yakima, each of these defendants had been through a screening process to see if there was any possibility for them to be released to serve their sentences on Electric Home Monitoring. Video proceedings were held for those defendants needing court hearings with private counsel from Yakima being provided at every hearing to assist all defendants. The daily bed rate for these defendants is currently \$57.20 per day with no booking fees as compared to the current rate charged by the Whatcom County jail of \$116.00 per day with a \$100.00 booking fee.

During this same time frame, there were 79 defendants who completed serving their sentences on Electronic Home Monitoring totaling 3,318 days. The two types of Electronic Home Monitoring includes either a GPS bracelet that monitors the defendant's location 24/7 or the SCRAM bracelet that is monitored for alcohol consumption only. The cost for these ankle bracelets is \$14.50 per day.

The cost to the City for those defendants completing their sentences by this method was \$40,276.41 to supplement all indigent defendants who could not pay for the service, (or needed supplemental help to pay). Had these defendants served their time in the Whatcom County Jail, the daily bed rate would have totaled \$384,888.00. Being placed on Electronic Home Monitoring allowed those defendants to remain in their residence and attend work, school, treatment, counseling, probation, medical/dental appointments, scheduled court hearings, attorney appointments and continue to provide essential child care needs when verified by the program manager.

Information Needs and Data Exchange (INDEX) Subcommittee

VISION OR MISSION STATEMENT:

The mission of the Information Needs and Data Exchange (INDEX) Subcommittee is to develop a data collection and reporting system that accurately informs policymakers when considering programmatic changes necessary to minimize jail use and improve efficiency in the criminal justice system.

GOALS:

To achieve the mission, the INDEX Committee will:

- Figure out the baseline statistics on jail use to determine whether or not programmatic changes will be successful.
- Identify how to assess performance and establish metrics that would determine the success of each new initiative.
- Identify where data is a barrier to implementing various initiatives.
- Maximize the accuracy of a data collection system by integrating the system across all jurisdictions.
- Establish a realistic and achievable percentage decrease in the jail population.
- Allow policymakers to refine processes, improve the way things work together, and then observing outcomes.
- *More?*

BEGINNING TASKS:

Achieving these goals will include the following tasks:

- Determine what data is collected currently, by whom, and when
- Identify the current systems used by each agency and jurisdictions
- Identify data points not collected
- *More?*

STRUCTURE:

The INDEX Committee structure includes: 1. A technical workgroup, and 2. A policy workgroup. Within that structure, the policy workgroup would drive the process and guide the work of the technical workgroup in terms of objectives.

Information Needs and Data Exchange (INDEX) Subcommittee

Policy Workgroup

The policy workgroup would be the Incarceration Prevention and Reduction Task Force

- The policy group is comprised of policymakers who will determine the policy, goals, and outcomes of the INDEX Committee.

Technical Workgroup

The technical group includes the information technology, department, and agency staff who can identify the systems and data that will conform to the outcomes.

- The technical workgroup would interact with the policy workgroup about the possible options to achieve those policies and outcomes.
- The technical workgroup would identify how best to track the data to achieve the policies and outcomes.

The technical workgroup would be representatives from the following agencies. The representatives selected should have detailed knowledge about the systems used by and data collected from their agencies:

- Whatcom County Jail
- Whatcom County Prosecutor's Office
- Whatcom County Public Defender's Office
- Bellingham Municipal Court
- Small Cities municipal court(s)
- District Court
- Superior Court
- Whatcom County Health Department
- North Sound Behavioral Health Organization
- Law Enforcement: Cities, County, State
- City Attorney's Office: Bellingham, Small Cities

DATA OUTCOMES, TRENDS, AND ISSUES: Triage Facility Committee:

Outcomes to Measure:		
	1	Diversion from criminal justice and/or hospital
	2	Maximum use of the facility
	3	Stabilizing an individual in a less restrictive environment
Trends to Track:		
	1	Daily Census
	2	Number of admissions per unit
	3	Number of denials
	4	Length of Stay
	5	Discharge disposition
	6	
3 Metrics to measure from 3 Annual Report topics (1 metric per topic):		
	1	
	2	
	3	
Interoperability Issues:		
		Connect the intake data from the triage center, social services, emergency department and other medical sources, law enforcement, possibly via claims data
		Consider whether the County, in concert with the managed care organizations (MCOs), could pay the regional Behavioral Health Organization (BHO) to collect all the data as a central repository
		Can law enforcement bill for, and consequently report on, transport data

Triage Facility Data Points

GOALS of Facility (OUTCOME MEASURES):

- ❖ Diversion from criminal justice and/or hospital
- ❖ Maximum utilization of facility
- ❖ Improved health and wellness of individuals who receive services

DATA POINTS (INTEROPERABILITY ISSUES/TRENDS):

1. Daily census
2. # of Admissions per unit
 - A. Referral source
 - 1) Hospital Psych unit step-down

- 2) Emergency Department
- 3) EMS drop-off
- 4) Law Enforcement drop-off
- 5) Treatment provider
- 6) Social Service provider (i.e., housing)
- 7) Self

3. # of Denials

A. Reason for denial

- 1) No bed capacity
- 2) Inappropriate referral
 - a. level of care not required (not acute enough)
 - b. higher level of care required
 - c. inability of unit to manage behaviors that pose a significant risk of harm to others

4. Length of Stay (and specify program)

5. Discharge disposition

A. Transferred

- 1) to in-patient treatment setting (MH or SUD)
- 2) to out-patient treatment provider (MH or SUD)
- 3) back to community treatment provider
- 4) to higher level of medical care

B. Left against clinical/medical advice

OTHER:

C. Medication Assisted Treatment initiated and connected to ongoing provider

D. Housing status upon discharge

- 1) Return to homelessness
- 2) Return to home with no further treatment

DATA OUTCOMES, TRENDS, AND ISSUES: Legal and Justice Systems Committee:

Outcomes to Measure:		
	1	
	2	
	3	
Trends to Track:		
	1	
	2	
	3	
	4	
	5	
	6	
1-3 Metrics to measure from each Annual Report topic:		
Pretrial	1	Reduce the 60 percent of jail inmates that are held pretrial
	2	Minimize failures to appear (FTAs)
	3	
Interoperability Issues:		

From Committee on February 13:

Suggestions regarding specific **data points** to collect:

- Collect and distinguish between booking, court, and jail information/data
- How many people have concurrent warrants in multiple jurisdictions?
 - Does this person have active warrants from another jurisdiction?
 - If Yes, which jurisdictions?
- How many warrants are for someone who also has active warrants in another jurisdiction
 - Does this person listed in this warrant have active warrants in another jurisdiction? Booked offense(s) (*felony*)
- Final charge(s) (from the Prosecutor) (*felony*)
- Booked citation charge(s) (*gross misdemeanor*)
- Bond amount by prosecutorial charge
- Does the defendant have a history with one of the special courts?
- Recidivism: how long after jail or court release until the person was booked on a new crime?

Suggestions regarding data **collection system**:

- The ability to collect, sort, and report data by person
- The ability to collect, sort, and report data by warrant

- The ability to collect, sort, and report data by booked offense and final charge (felony) and by booked citation charge (gross misdemeanor)
- The ability to run a report on the number of people booked (probable cause) under each booked offense
- The ability to run a report on the number of people charged (prosecutorial) under each final charge

Suggestions regarding **data interpretation and processes:**

- Consider a combined multi-jurisdictional court dates for people with concurrent warrants in more than one jurisdiction.
- Enhanced data sharing: The systems of all jurisdictions must communicate. Provide access for each jurisdiction to easily access data from other jurisdictions.
- Create baseline information and benchmarks that can be monitored to track success of programs and processes.
- Distinguish between the data points/categories and the algorithms of the report to produce correct interpretations of the data
- Create accurate and consistent definitions
- People entering data need to be adequately trained to enter consistent information correctly
- Algorithms must be accurate
- Take advantage of new technology for efficiency in data entering and reporting.

DATA OUTCOMES, TRENDS, AND ISSUES: Behavioral Health Committee:

Outcomes to Measure:		
	1	
	2	
	3	
Trends to Track:		
	1	
	2	
	3	
	4	
	5	
	6	
3 Metrics from 3 Annual Report Topics:		
	1	
	2	
	3	
Interoperability Issues:		

From March 5 Behavioral Health Committee:

- Who is in jail
- What are the behavioral health disorders identified
- What programs exist to address behavioral health disorders of jail inmates
- Is there potential for an involuntary facility
- Does the inmate have serious and persistent mental illness, which is defined as very symptomatic and chronic
- What are the legal charges that allows them to divert from jail
- Whether the person has had services previously, and if so, what were those services
- Behavioral health issues that are not serious and/or persistent
- What is the social metadata: social, legal, family
- A confidential interviewer
- What kind of substance use disorder
- Information on people in jail versus out of jail
- An assessment at point of release
- Interview people who have been in jail in the last six months
- Offer an incentive to participate in an interview
- GRACE cohort to provide data



Supported by the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation



Request for Proposals for the Innovation Fund Competition

May 2018

Purpose of solicitation	The Innovation Fund is an opportunity for justice agencies and local communities to implement bold and innovative ideas in order to reduce over-incarceration in jails and build capacity for future system change.
Eligibility	This competition is open to any jurisdiction with governing authority over a local jail or jail system that has at least 50 beds. Jurisdictions that have received past Safety and Justice Challenge funding are not eligible.
Award	Selected applicants will receive technical assistance, peer learning, and a grant of up to \$50,000 to support a 15-month implementation process.
RFP Issue date	May 1, 2018
Deadline for applications	June 15, 2018
Notice of decision to applicants and public announcement	September 2018
Implementation period	October 2018 – December 2019

Overview

Since the 1980s, jail populations have more than tripled as America relies on local incarceration. In the United States, we have over 3,000 jails that hold 731,000 people on any given day, with nearly 12 million jail admissions annually. Jails form a critical part of our nation's incarceration problem with troubling individual, financial, and social consequences. Although most people booked into jail are released within a few days, being detained can place individuals on a slippery slope with serious consequences: job and housing loss, more punitive sentences, reduced social mobility, future criminal behavior, worsened health, and weakened familial and social bonds. These consequences become more severe for those entering jail already disadvantaged, whether because of mental illness, substance abuse, poverty, or other factors such as race and gender.

Fortunately, there is tremendous local-level innovation occurring across the country aimed at reducing incarceration and making the criminal justice system more fair and effective at protecting communities. To further support such innovative efforts nationwide, the [John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation](#) (MacArthur) partnered with the [Urban Institute \(Urban\)](#) to launch the Innovation Fund in 2016. The purpose of the Innovation Fund is to foster and support innovative ideas from local jurisdictions that are consistent with the goals of MacArthur's [Safety and Justice Challenge](#) to reduce over-incarceration in America while maintaining or enhancing public safety, with a particular focus on addressing disproportionate justice impact on low-income individuals and communities of color.

To build on the momentum generated by the Innovation Fund work to date, MacArthur and Urban are announcing a second Innovation Fund competition.

The Innovation Fund

We recognize that innovation and risk-taking can be difficult, especially in the criminal justice space. To this end, the Innovation Fund provides awardees with financial assistance, technical assistance, and a network of support to test bold and innovative ideas from start to finish. The first Innovation Fund competition yielded a cohort of 20 participant jurisdictions, diverse in their sizes, geography and areas of focus. Details on the work of the first round Innovation Fund sites are available at <http://www.safetyandjusticechallenge.org/innovation-fund/>.

The goals of the Innovation Fund include:

- Creating a space for jurisdictions to test new ideas and take risks;
- Developing a better understanding of the key issues related to reducing the overuse of jail and measures that can be taken to address these issues;
- Enhancing capacity for coordination among stakeholders and future system change efforts in Fund participant sites; and
- Disseminating innovative practices and lessons learned during implementation to shape future initiatives.

Types of support

The sites selected to participate in the Innovation Fund will benefit from the following:

- **Grant awards of \$50,000.** These awards are intended to fund the planning and implementation of the site's innovation for a 15-month period.
- **Access to expert technical assistance (TA) and feedback from Urban.** An Urban TA team will provide support over a 15-month period (October 2018–December 2019), which could include such activities as help troubleshooting challenges in planning and implementation, developing performance measures, and thought partnership to identify evidence-based practices to inform innovation design.

- **Virtual peer learning opportunities.** Innovation Fund participants will have access to a wide variety of webinars, trainings, and peer consultation events hosted by Urban and the broader SJC partners through SJC Exchange, the networks' online platform for peer learning.
- **Elevation of your jurisdiction's work through attendance at the Safety and Justice Challenge Network convenings.** The SJC Network meets twice yearly to bring the network together based on shared issues and focus areas, roles in the system, and jurisdiction size; strengthen site capacity through plenaries, workshops, and access to TA providers; and inspire and motivate the teams to advance their reform work.
- **Forming part of a network of jurisdictions at the forefront of a national movement to rethink the use of jail.** Throughout the innovation period, participating jurisdictions will have the opportunity to interact and learn from experts and peer-sites as part of the robust Challenge network.

Project Timeline

Applications for participation are due on June 15, 2018. Successful applicants will be notified by September 2018. Implementation and technical assistance will span a 15-month period from October 2018–December 2020. The first SJC convening after selection will occur October 17-19, 2018; two representatives from each new Innovation Fund site will be expected to attend.

Eligibility

Any jurisdiction with governing authority over a local jail or jail system that has at least 50 beds is eligible to apply for grant funding through the Innovation Fund Competition. Jurisdictions that wish to contract with local partners to carry out some or all of the proposed innovation activities may apply with that partner and have the funds awarded directly to that partner if selected. Jurisdictions may submit more than one application under this solicitation. However, we will not fund more than one innovation in the same jurisdiction.

Communities that that received funding as a 2017-18 Innovation Fund site are not eligible to apply for this second round of funding.

Urban is interested in serving a diverse group of sites through the Innovation Fund. However, MacArthur and Urban believe that certain applicant characteristics will ensure sites get the most value possible out of Innovation Fund participation.

Potential impact. Sites should be able to articulate the impact their project would have on the challenges facing the jail population(s) in their jurisdiction. Projects that can clearly identify the characteristics of their population to be positively impacted by this project will be scored more highly than those who cannot.

Prove readiness to implement innovation. Sites are expected to clearly define the goals for their proposed innovation, including the scope and any associated planning and stakeholder engagement that has or will need to occur. Applications should indicate how the Innovation Fund funding will be spent in alignment with the site's goals.

What Do We Mean by Innovation?

In the framework of the Innovation Fund, we understand innovation to include new solutions, strategies, processes, models, and/or products related to the jail population that lead to new or improved capabilities, relationships, and a better use of assets and resources. Ideas can be innovative locally, nationally, thematically, and/or in their approach to tackling challenges around

the jail population, and must be rooted in research or evidence. Innovative ideas should be aimed at reducing jail populations while increasing public safety and creating a more fair, just, and equitable justice system.

The innovation must address challenges identified at one or more of these [decision points](#) in the criminal justice process:

- arrest;
- charging;
- appointment of counsel;
- pretrial release/bail;
- case processing;
- disposition and sentencing;
- and reentry/community supervision.

Potential Innovation Fund Activities

Examples of activities the Innovation Fund might support include, but are not limited to:

- Expanding or enhancing pretrial release, diversion, or management programs/systems;
- Implementation measures, processes, or mechanisms to reduce racial and ethnic disparities;
- Making improvements to technology, such as automated court reminders; kiosk and cell phones to replace office visits; and electronic monitoring systems as alternatives to incarceration;
- Improving behavioral health resources and alternatives to jail for those dealing with mental illness and substance abuse issues;
- Putting in place new developments and/or collaborations in data systems to collect, manage, analyze, and share data;
- Establishing, expanding, or enhancing cooperative partnerships and infrastructure to support coordination between agencies involved with jail populations;
- Improving police practice for conducting arrests and reducing jail bookings;

- Implementing speedy hearing processes, or alternative mechanisms to curtail use of incarceration for technical violations; or
- Activities that strengthen community engagement and systems reform.

You may wish to review the work undertaken by the first cohort of Innovation Fund sites, described [here](#).

Expectations of Awardees

The intention of the Innovation Fund is to create an opportunity for local jurisdictions to build capacity by providing a package of tailored support including technical assistance, peer learning, and financial support for future system change efforts leading to reduced reliance on local jails.

To that end, Innovation Fund awardees will be expected to:

- Commit to participate in the Innovation Fund over the **15-month implementation period** (October 2018–December 2019).
- **Engage with the Innovation Fund and broader SJC network** on an ongoing basis, including:
 - Sending a two-person team to participate in two SJC convenings annually. Attendees will participate in workshops and peer learning sessions, in addition to having opportunities to work with the Urban TA team. The Innovation Fund will cover travel expenses for the team directly (not through the grant to the jurisdiction);
 - Reporting progress on grant-funded activities to Urban on a quarterly basis, including quarterly financial reports;
 - Sharing information with the other Innovation Fund and Challenge sites, and the field, on innovation efforts and lessons learned from them as they develop; and
 - Participating in regular conference calls with the Urban TA team.

- Commit to **ongoing monitoring and evaluation** of their innovation efforts, and to adapt and modify their efforts as indicated by evaluation and performance measurement results.
- Participate in **virtual learning opportunities** convened by Urban and the SJC network. This may include presenting, facilitating, and/ or attending.

How to Apply

Please submit your application via the Innovation Fund's online platform at <https://innovation-fund.fluidreview.com/> by **11:59 p.m. EST on June 15, 2018**. Applications received after the deadline will not be accepted. You may save your work and return to edit your application within the application window before submitting it for review; reviewers will only look at final submitted applications. Note that any revisions after submission cannot be accommodated. Applications must be submitted through the Innovation Fund online platform; emailed or mailed applications will **not** be considered.

Should you experience any technical difficulties with the online application process, please e-mail support@fluidreview.com for technical assistance. Direct assistance on web portal technical issues from Fluid Review's support desk will be available Monday-Friday, between the hours of 8 a.m. and 8 p.m. EST.

Application and Site Selection

Applications are invited from any jurisdiction that has at least 50 beds with governing authority over a local jail or jail system. Sites that have participated in the Safety and Justice Challenge Network or the first round of the Innovation Fund Competition will not be eligible to apply.

Since resources are available to work with a select number of innovations, every effort will be made to identify those applicants where the conditions for maximum impact are present, as well as a group of innovations that together represent jurisdictions large and small, urban and rural, and from various regions of the country.

We will also make efforts to select innovations that represent the continuum of decision points in the criminal justice system.

Please ensure you highlight any particular populations (e.g. women, individuals that identify as LGBTQ+, Native Americans) that may be a specific focus of your innovation.

Prerequisites

The elements of the application addressing the prerequisite criteria will not be scored, but are required from every applicant. Applications that do not adequately address the two prerequisite criteria will not be considered.

- **Cover Letter** – Each application must begin with a joint letter signed by the head of the lead applicant agency/organization and other key partnering organizations. The letter should outline the significance of the proposed innovation and what issues it will address with the support of the Innovation Fund, state the request of the partnering organizations, and affirm the willingness of the signatories to participate in the innovation.
- **Abstract** – Each application must include a 250-word abstract.

Selection Criteria

The following criteria will be used to select innovations from among the applicants that meet the prerequisites. Please ensure that your application addresses each item.

(1) Innovation Design and Implementation (60%)

1.1 Please provide a detailed description of the innovation your jurisdiction wishes to pursue.

Your answer should address the following (*up to 750 words total*):

- What is your innovation?
- Why is this idea innovative for your jurisdiction/community?

- If applicable, what specific population will your innovation benefit?

1.2 Describe how your proposed innovation will affect the use of jail in your jurisdiction. Please include details on what you hope to achieve in terms of measurable results and/or practice changes. *(up to 500 words total)*.

1.3 Describe your implementation plan, including the timeline that you will use to achieve the goals and objectives identified *(up to 500 words total)*.

(2) Leadership and Capacity (30%)

2.1 Who will be the lead agency for this initiative and why is this agency best suited to spearhead this effort around the use of jail in your jurisdiction? Your answer to this question should address the following *(up to 400 words total)*:

- What is the lead agency's organizational capacity and experience to manage projects with successful implementation and necessary collaboration?
- What will be the most formidable challenges for the proposed effort and how will the lead agency manage them?

2.2 What other key stakeholders, if any, will be integral to the success of this effort and why? *(up to 400 words)*

2.3 What makes now an opportune time to engage in this work? Your answer to this question should address the following *(up to 400 words)*:

- Has this idea been explored before, and if so, why haven't you been able to implement your innovation in the past?
- What other initiatives, if any, are you involved in that are relevant to the success or timeliness of your proposed innovation?

2.4 Describe the type of technical assistance and analytic supports you anticipate will be needed to successfully implement this innovation *(up to 250 words)*.

(3) Budget (10%)

3.1 In two to three sentences, please summarize how you will use the \$50,000 (*up to 150 words*).

Sites selected to participate in the Innovation Fund will receive \$50,000 to support a 15 -month implementation process (October 2018 – December 2019). **All applicants are required to submit a budget and a budget narrative.** Applicants should use the [sample budget template](#) when possible, but are permitted to use their own format provided it includes the required information. Please ensure you're explaining all costs associated with this project (both direct and indirect) and all costs should be itemized.

Applicants should provide an accompanying narrative to correspond to the line-item budget cost components. This narrative should include justification for the costs and assumptions, methodologies, and/or formulas relevant to the cost components. Please consider the following in your narrative when relevant costs are included:

- **Labor/Salaries:** Include the name (if unfilled position, include title only), title, and either annual salary with % of time (or FTE) *or* the number of estimated hours with the hourly rate. Fringe benefits should be itemized separately from the salary/hourly rate and no other loadings should be included in these base rates. Note: Only include personnel currently (or expected to be) employed by your agency; staff from partnering organizations, consultants, and other contractors should be detailed in the Contractor/Consultants line-item.
- **Fringe Benefits:** Must be included for personnel costs; Include numerical rate and description of components (e.g., Health Insurance, FICA, pension, etc.); OR attach most recent Negotiated Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (NICRA) if fringe rate is incorporated therein.
- **Contractors/Consultants:** Include the name of the entity, the services that will provided by each and the breakdown of how the estimate was derived (hourly rates, etc.) as well as a description of the relevancy to your project. Any person or organization that is not employed directly by your County should be included in this category.
- **Data Enhancements:** This line-item would include things such as software purchases geared at enhancing the county's capacity to understand and collect criminal justice related data. Please be sure to include vendor name and rates as relevant and in as

much detail as possible, such as what will be purchased, individual price, how the cost was estimated, and relevancy to your project. Attach supporting materials when possible.

- **Equipment/Hardware:** Includes items such as computers that are necessary for the success of the proposed innovation. Please include vendor name and rates as relevant and in as much detail as possible. At a minimum, this should include a description of the item, individual price, how the cost was estimated, and relevancy to your project. Attach supporting materials when possible.
- **Supplies:** Includes items such as printing costs, postage and delivery, notebooks, and other general office items that are necessary to implement the proposed innovation. Please include as much detail as possible in determining how these costs are calculated.
- **Travel:** Include description of project travel, including breakdown of all costs. Note that this should NOT include travel to Safety and Justice Challenge Network Meetings, as this will be covered separately by Urban and project partners.
- **Events/Meetings/Trainings:** Include any costs related to events, meetings, or trainings under the proposed innovation, such as food, meeting space and other supplies relevant to the event. Please be sure to include detail to how the estimated costs are calculated. For instance, if you plan to spend \$500 on an event – please break down the components of this amount (how much is spent on food (\$x/person for x people), event space, and materials).
- **Other Direct Costs:** For all other costs, detail the item and how the cost was estimated.
- **Indirect Costs:** If your agency incorporates any costs into an overhead pool (which might be categorized as overhead, general and administration, indirect costs, etc.) you may likewise incorporate these costs in the same way into your budget. If your organization has a current NICRA approved by a government agency, you may attach this as documentation for the rate included in your budget. If you do not have a NICRA, but include these costs in your budget and your budget narrative should include a description of the components of your cost pool (rent, Executive Director, Accounting staff, etc.) and how the rate was derived.

Notification of Decision

Applicants will be notified of a decision on their application via e-mail from the Foundation and Urban. Applicants who are selected will have **one week** to confirm their interest in moving forward.

To Learn More

The Urban Institute and MacArthur Foundation will host two live webinars to confirm details about the competition and application process as well as to answer questions. The content of these webinars will be identical (aside from the question and answer), and they will be recorded and accessible via the Innovation Fund project page at <https://innovation-fund.fluidreview.com/>.

The webinars are scheduled as follows:

Tuesday, May 15, 2018 from 12:00pm-1:00pm Eastern Standard Time

Thursday, June 7, 2018 from 11:00am-12:00pm Eastern Standard Time

Registration is required to participate in these sessions.

Please register for the **Tuesday, May 15, 2018** webinar at:

<https://attendee.gotowebinar.com/register/6506751873640243970>.

Please register for the **Thursday, June 7, 2018** webinar at:

<https://attendee.gotowebinar.com/register/1291115113191826434>.

Webinars will be recorded and posted on our online platform at <https://innovation-fund.fluidreview.com/>. We will also post answers to questions received regarding the Innovation Fund opportunity and RFP there.

Applicants are not required to attend a webinar.

Should you have any questions about the application process, please send an e-mail to Evelyn McCoy at emccoy@urban.org. We will make an effort to answer your individual questions and

structure our webinar according to frequently asked questions and concerns. Responses to all questions received will be posted regularly at <https://innovation-fund.fluidreview.com/>.