

Jefferson Area Community Criminal Justice Board

750 Harris Street Suite 207 • Charlottesville, VA 22903
(434) 296-2441 • Fax (434) 979-4038 • E-mail ngoodloe@oar-jacc.org
Albemarle • Charlottesville • Fluvanna • Greene • Louisa • Madison • Nelson • Orange

Meeting Notes

4/14/21 CCJB Meeting

Present: Susan Morrow, Clarissa Berry, Ross Carew, Jim Hall, Sena Magill, Jeff Haislip, Khalil Perine, Amy Morris, Hosea Mitchell, Sherri Stader, Avnel Coates, Hon. Claude Worrell, Ted Voorhees, Marny Bentley, Neta Davis, Neal Goodloe

Guests: University of Virginia Department of Systems Engineering Capstone Team (Grace Boland, Colin Cool, Patrick Leonard Jr, Madeline McNult and Nathaniel (Nate) Donkoh-Moore, advised by Dr. Preston White, Dr. Michael Smith, and Dr. Pete Alonzi)

Capstone Presentation:

This academic year's study (2020-21) was completed entirely in a virtual working environment, which created many logistical challenges which the team was able to overcome with the help of community partners at ACRJ, Region Ten, OAR and TJACH. The work built on that of previous Capstone teams, whose findings included the following:

2018 - 2019:

- Clients who met the screening criteria for serious mental illness ***spent more time*** in jail than those who did not meet the criteria.
- Clients who met the criteria for a serious mental illness were
 - More likely to have stayed more than 30 days
 - More likely to return to custody due to a probation violation
 - Returned to custody most frequently and spent the most time in jail

2019 - 2020:

- Of the 8,332 clients booked into ACRJ, 5,499 were administered the BJMHS
- 28% of the 5,499 were screened in for referral to mental health services
- Individuals who associate their current legal trouble with drugs and alcohol had a **12% higher screening-in rate** than those who did not
- Those who identified as female had a **20% higher rate for screen-in** compared to males, which was consistent with past findings

2020-21 Research Goals:

This year, the Capstone Team used data collected from **July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2019** from the participating agencies to examine individuals released from custody who met the screening criteria for serious mental illness to determine...

- **The relationships between the location or services and the client's post-release location**
- **The type of services clients receive**
- **The amount of services (number of visits) received**
- **The "success" of the client in completing their period of probation supervision (compliance with supervision, return to custody)**
- **Defining what a "failure" means in terms of the combined criminal justice/mental health system**
 - Return to custody
 - Failure to link someone to services
 - Failure to retain to services once linked
 - Non-compliance with probation
 - Further criminal conduct

Key Findings:

- Those who return to custody and received a mental health screening ***have longer lengths of stay*** than those who do not return to custody, and that difference is statistically significant. This suggests an association between longer lengths of stay and likelihood of returning to custody at a later date.
- Inmates who meet the screening criteria for serious mental illness and later return to custody ***have a longer*** length of stay than those that screened out & returned to custody. Medians differed by a week. This suggests that mental illness is a driver of longer lengths of stay for those returning to custody.
- The "screened in" rate for inmates returning to custody is similar to that of the overall ACRJ "screened in" cohort. This suggests that there is no additional likelihood of "screening in" as a result of a return to custody, and provides support for the observation that serious mental illness does not place a former ACRJ inmate at increased risk of return to custody.
- As distance from Charlottesville increases, fewer individuals are linked to services.
- There are 8 Region Ten locations clustered in Charlottesville which is where the greatest number of people are linked to services
- Return to custody rates increase the closer the released inmate lives to Charlottesville, no matter if they were linked to Region Ten services or not.
- Neither race, age, nor gender impacted the rate in which former ACRJ inmates were linked to Region Ten services.

State Responsible Inmates:

During 2019, 110 CVRJ inmates were transferred to the Virginia Department of Corrections. While at CVRJ, these DOC-bound inmates averaged 228 days length of stay and represented 25,055 bed days expended (@%90.90/inmate day = \$2,227,500).

During 2019, 100 ACRJ inmates were transferred to the Virginia Department of Corrections. While at ACRJ, these DOC-bound inmates averaged 280 days length of stay and represented 27,967 bed days expended (@%90.90/inmate day = \$2,599,591).

More information on the state-responsible population at the two jails can be gleaned by analyzing monthly Comp Board Average Daily Population reports. From that report, during 2019 the average daily population at each jail looked like this:

2019 CVRJ ADP: 246 Local Responsible, 109 State Responsible, 75 Federal, 431 Total ADP Average

2019 ACRJ ADP: 333 Local Responsible, 122 State Responsible, 5.7 Federal, 464 Total ADP Average

2019 CVRJ ADP%: 57.0% Local Responsible, 25.4% State Responsible, 17.5% Federal

2019 ACRJ ADP%: 71.8% Local Responsible, 26.4% State Responsible, 1.2% Federal

So, the numbers above suggest that a little more than one in four inmates at both jails on any given day are State responsible.

House Bill 2038

Governor Northam signed HB 2038 into law last week. This bill, now known as Chapter 538, creates new limits on the sentencing of “technical” probation violators in Virginia’s courts, and may have significant impact on the way that technical violations (those not involving a new violation of the law) are handled in all CCJB jurisdictions.

Probation violations represent a significant percentage of bed days expended at both ACRJ and CVRJ. This legislation represents a potentially significant shift in current practice that could have ramifications for both jails’ average daily populations.

An extensive discussion by CCJB members was generated by this new law. Concerns were expressed that the legislation may serve to undermine the Administrative Response Matrix that District 9 and OAR have been using since 2014 to reduce the number of lower-risk probationers entering ACRJ and CVRJ on probation violations.