



Criminal Justice Advisory Council Board Members

Executive Committee Members:

* Present during this meeting

** Excused Absence

Jim Bradley*

Dave Alvord*

Kim Brock**

TBD

Kelly Colopy**

Chief Matthew Dumont*

Rep. Jim Dunnigan*

Judge Susan Eisenman*

Scott Fisher**

Sim Gill*

Aimee Griffiths**

Kele Griffone*

Andrew Johnston*

Tiffany King**

Judge Jojo Liu*

Rich Mauro*

Chief Mike Brown*

Judge Brendan McCullagh**

Wayne Niederhauser*

Jim Peters*

Stephanie Pitcher**

Chair, Sheriff Rosie Rivera**

Judge Laura Scott*

Mayor Jeff Silvestrini*

Pamela Vickrey*

Tim Whalen*

Vice Chair, Mayor Jenny Wilson*

Salt Lake County Council

Salt Lake County Council

Third District Court Executive

South Salt Lake City Police Department

Director, Salt Lake County Human Services

Salt Lake County Sheriff's Office

Utah House of Representatives

Third District Juvenile Court

Division Administrator, Salt Lake City Prosecutor's Office

District Attorney, Salt Lake County

AP&P Region Chief -Sent Representative: Chief Dan Hays

Director, Criminal Justice Services

Salt Lake City Homeless Policy and Outreach

Crime and Victim Advocate

Salt Lake City Justice Court

Executive Director, Salt Lake Legal Defenders Association

Unified Police Department, LEADS Chair

Judge, West Valley City Justice Court

Office of Homeless Services

State Justice Court Administrator

Utah State Senate

Salt Lake County Sheriff

Presiding Judge, Third District Court

Mayor, Millcreek City

Executive Director, Utah Juvenile Defender Attorneys

Director, Salt Lake County Behavioral Health Services

Mayor, Salt Lake County

CJAC Staff Members:

Katherine Fife*

Alexandra Allen*

Interim Director for OHCJR, Mayor's Administration

Associate Director, Mayor's Office of Homelessness and Criminal Justice Reform

Allison Heffernan*

Amber Lietz*

Amy Stocks*

Brooke Lockyer*

John Krantz*

Sebastian Green*

Data Analyst

MTSS Safety and Success Coordinator

Reentry and Reintegration Policy Coordinator

Grant and Office Coordinator

Data Analyst, Information Services

Policy and Project Coordinator

County Staff and Members of the Public Attendance: Adam Cohen, Judge Adam Mow, Andi Faulkner, Andrea Jacobsen, Lt Andrew Cluff, Beth Graham, Brandi Hopkins, Corinne Johnson, Erin Litvack, Isaac Higham, Jeannie Edens, Jessica Thayer, Justin Stewart, Kara Trevino, Kathryn Calderon, Leslie Howitt, Lourdes Cook, Madisen Dury, Marian Howe-Taylor, Marni Epstein, Mary Jo McMillen, Natalie Thompson, Neil Webster, Robert Sampson, Saskia DeVries, Shawn Newell, Sherry Anderson, Suzanne Harrison, Tarra McFadden, Will Carlson

Meeting Minutes

MEETING CONVENED AT NOON

Time
Stamp
on Video

Item

June 12th, CJAC Committee Meeting ([Link to video for internal](#))

The audio can be found on our website <https://www.slco.org/cji/advisory-council/>

00:00

Welcome from Sim Gill

Mayor Silvestrini made a motion to approve the CJAC minutes from the April 2024 meeting. Chief Dumont seconded the motion, all were in favor.

01:07

Member Roundtable

Sim Gill opened the room to members who would like to share information about work going on in their office. Rich Mauro discussed the progression and updates of Home Court. Discussion between members on Home Court continued looking at the nuances and model of Home Court to meet the needs of the population. As well as the importance of addressing the day to day needs and connection to resources for those experiencing homelessness.

30:30

CCJJ Upcoming Plans

Alex Allen reviewed with the group the upcoming request from CCJJ. CJAC's/CJCC's are being asked to feed information of the work and needs happening in their own counties up to CCJJ. We have been asked to look at the pretrial and probation systems in our county and create a wish list of what we need to do execute to the best of our ability. A work group is formed to begin working on this but opened to the room for input. The annual CCJJ Strategic Plan for SLCo CJAC is **due this November**. Requested that the group starts brainstorming thoughts and input for the plan.

32:47

Civil Commitment Panel (Brian Currie, Julie George, and Kenny Martinez)

Three individuals with extensive knowledge in the criminal justice and homeless systems with specific expertise in Civil Commitment. The panel included: Kenny Martinez, Julie George, and Brian Currie. The Panel introduced themselves and their professional experience. Sim started off the discussion with the first question, but the room was encouraged to ask questions as well.

First question was: How does the civil commitment process and implementation realistically work? Review of the different sheets/slips that can be issued, the meaning of each, and who can administer them. Pink, blue and white sheets. Review of internal processes and criteria once a patient reaches a white sheet level and what the courts look at.

45:52 Second question: Do you feel it was a good addition to add criteria when reviewing civil commitment cases (looking at the patients ability to sustain themselves, access needs, interaction with the community)etc.)? Does it help identify systemic deficits? Yes and no, when looking at a case it is important to view it from both a parental perspective and the perspective of a lawyer. Are their basic needs met but also are they a threat to the safety of the community.

50:24 Third Question: What is the qualitative difference between pink and blue sheets? The difference is who administers/signs the sheets. Pink are from officers/law enforcement while blue sheets are from medical staff. Discussion of some of the important processes occurred

53:23 Fourth Question: The panel was asked to elaborate on the Crisis Campus of Hope and the 23 hr. chair offered by the crisis center. It was noted that this has been a huge relief and support system to many patients. They are seen by specialist and connected with treatment providers, community resources, and enabling a system of care.

54:36 Fifth Question: How often is follow up occurring for those that have been pink sheeted? Unfortunately, not a lot of follow-up procedures on in place. The follow-up that does occur may be a phone call with them but getting back in contact can be difficult. There are barriers within the system that make it so follow does not or cannot occur. It was identified that having a continuity of care for reach person would make a huge positive impact.

59:45 Sixth Question/comment: If we had the vision to fund the continuity of care service described we would save on the backend (ie: police, EMTs, and other direct service roles). The panel was in agreement.

1:00:10 Seventh Question: It was brought up that there may be a possibility for some of the needs to continue care for these folks could happen through Home Court. Julie was asked to elaborate about the gaps in the system and some of the issues highlighted when they are outside of SLCo. They receive petitions from all over the state since there is a bigger capacity in the hospitals here. It was mentioned that since the majority of resources are housed within SLCo we need to be mindful about oversaturation of referrals.

1:03:50 Eighth Question: What does the process look like for someone who voluntarily commits themselves? It is an agreement between the patient and the doctor that they will stay as long as the doctor determines is best. However, they still maintain the right to leave when they choose.

1:05:12 Ninth Question: Should there be an ability to expunge a civil commitment? Historically it has never been implemented. It is federal and state legislation that determines this. In order to make civil commitment something that can be expunged it would take buy in from the federal government. The panel believes alternatives, community support and programs, and the ability to expunge could benefit many people who go through this process. There needs to be some sort of middle ground, discussion occurred of possible options or what the needs are to support this.

1:09:44 Tenth Question/comment: Civil commitment is a legal status not a physical location. There is a community expectation from the community that if someone is civilly committed there is a support process. Currently there is a lack of resources for supportive success. Once someone is civilly committed they return to the environment they were in prior. The receiving centers also help mitigate many of the problems faced by starting the sheeting process.

1:17:44 What is the percentage of people that have pending or possible charges in the criminal/legal system that fall into the civil commitment system? There is not an exact number further review of data would be needed to answer this question. The goal of SLCo is to get at least an additional 300 beds into the receiving center to help support this population.

1:25:19 If we added a program to improve the continuity of care for those released following a pink or blue sheet evaluation with follow-up and support what is the recommendation and ideal staffing model for this program? It would take the work of case managers, peer mentors, social workers, improved communication between hospitals and community organizations, and the idea was brought up that creating a mandatory exit interview upon discharge if they meet a certain condition could be beneficial to the process.

1:30:06 Does the casual court setting make an impact on understanding the seriousness of the case to the client? In a criminal court it does make sense for it to be more formal, in a civil commitment court it is more beneficial to the clients to have it be more casual.

Important note: Being civilly committed does not guarantee treatment.

Time
Stamp
on Video

Item

1:44:54 **Meeting Close out**

CJAC members closed out the meeting with final remarks on discussion and highlighting the need to look at next steps.

Meeting Adjourned

Next Regular Meeting: August 14th, 2024

**Minutes and meeting materials available via website slco.org/cji or by request to: Brooke Lockyer BLockyer@slco.org, 385-468-7092