WES MOORE
Governor

ARUNA MILLER
Lieutenant Governor

Maryland
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF CRIME PREVENTION AND POLICY

DOROTHY LENNIG
Executive Director

Justice Reinvestment Oversight Board

Monday, September 30, 2024
1:00 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.
Google Meet joining info:
Video call link: https://meet.google.com/hym-cami-uvz
Or dial: (US) +1 925-579-3276 PIN: 953 478 512#

Board Attendance:

- Judge Philip Caroom, Board Chairman
- Delegate Charlotte Crutchfield, Montgomery County
- Dorothy J. Lennig, Esq., GOCPYVS
- Secretary Carolyn Scruggs, Maryland Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services
- Commissioner Ernest Eley, Maryland Parole Commission
- ~~Major Scott Keyser, Maryland State Police~~
- Candace McLaren Lanham, Chief Deputy Attorney General
- ~~Natasha Dartigue, Maryland Office of the Public Defender~~
- Cristina-Jorge-Tunon, Maryland Department of Budget Management
- ~~Brian Mroz, Maryland Department of Health~~
- Mary Ann Thompson, Chair, Local Government Commission
- Chief Judge John Morrissey, District Court of Maryland
- Judge Brett R. Wilson, Administrative Judge of the Circuit Court for Washington County
- Erin Roth, Department of Labor, Licensing & Regulation
- ~~Sheriff Jim DeWees, Carroll County Sheriff's Office~~
- Scott Shellenberger, Baltimore County State's Attorney
- Walt J. Pesterfield, Baltimore County Department of Corrections
- Ryan Ross, Director, Charles County Detention Center
- ~~Chief Gregory Der, Howard County Police~~
- William Henry, The Law Offices of William H. Henry
- ~~Prendi Garcia, Maryland State Police~~
- Dr. Kisha Davis, Montgomery County Health Department
- Danielle Cox, Maryland Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services

Minutes:

I. Welcome and Opening Remarks - Judge Philip Caroom, Justice Reinvestment Oversight Board Chair

A. Call to Order

B. Roll Call

C. Approval of the Minutes

1. William Henry notes that he was present at the last meeting and not listed as an attendee in the minutes.
2. Minutes are approved by the board (once including the above correction).

II. GOCPP Updates

A. PIGF Update - Brandi Cahn, Assistant Director of Justice Reinvestment

1. *See slide deck for more details.*
2. Received a record number of applications (84 applications and over $29 million in requests).
3. We were able to fund just over $13 million and up to 50 applications. Most funding went toward supporting reentry efforts (58%) followed by behavioral health (23%) and victim services (14%).
4. Quarterly performance measures are collected, which are also included in the annual report.

B. Restitution Update - Bethany Young, Director of Policy and Legislation

1. This update is provided by Brandi Cahn prior to the PIGF update above.
2. Restitution collection has been trending downward since the enactment of JRA.
3. JRA Restitution Workgroup update from May suggests that at least 5% of PIGF funding be designated to victim service enhancement and go to the State Victims of Crime Fund.
    a. We are looking to the Board for recommendations or approval of this.
4. This money would be going directly to the victims.
5. The Restitution Workgroup has appointed a new Chair and Vice Chair that will be making recommendations relating to improving the system and addressing gaps in communication and notification.
6. Vice Chair MaryAnn Thompson raises concerns about changing the grant funds while still adjusting to the “new normal” post-Covid. She suggests that the grant funds are very competitive as it is and worries this change will further

reduce what is able to be provided toward other slated projects.

7. Chair Caroom adds on to this and questions if this proposal is only for the current fiscal year or if it will become an ongoing allocation that would permanently reduce funds.
8. Chair Caroom also asks if the provision "to a county" suggests that if a county did not apply for this funding, this money would not be available to its victims.
9. Cahn clarifies that the quote presented in the slide deck is the statute as it currently stands. The goal is to further target where these funds go, but other victim services will still be funded. This proposal would be for the next fiscal year, FY26.
10. Board approves this proposal, 13 votes of approval indicated.

III. Department Reports

A. Maryland Department of Health, Deputy Secretary Bryan Mroz

1. Secretary Mroz resigned from the Department of Health about a month ago, so the health secretary is currently working on a replacement for him. Prior to leaving, Mroz submitted a justice services report (mandated under JRA statute) showing the number of 8-507s placed and the number of 8-505 evaluations (substance use disorder evaluations) that were made. *See slide deck.*
2. Indicates that we are keeping up with the placements in the timeframes the statute requires.
3. Chair Caroom and Secretary Scruggs suggest that mental health placements should be added to this report.
4. Chief Judge Morrissey indicates that Jordan Fisher from the Department of Health sends out a list each week about the incompetent individuals awaiting placement for beds. Currently it is 192 individuals.
5. Scott Shellenberger adds that his local detention center notifies him weekly of the number of people waiting. A public defender in Baltimore County has filed some items that some of the judges are very seriously considering fining the department.
    a) This is a serious problem in every jurisdiction – needs long term solutions, needs more facilities.
6. Chief Judge Morrissey has examined the business process of these hearings and noted commonalities on some of the

features that need to be presented as evidence at all of those hearings. Thus, he created a template for judges to streamline the process.
    a) Suggests steps toward a longer-term solution will be through a summit that will take place in May 2025 to address these issues.
7. Secretary Scruggs notes that at Public Safety, they have submitted last session (and will be submitting again) a bill for objection over medication that will allow them to force medicate individuals that are non-compliant in their medication to stabilize them and prevent them from decompensating while they wait within MDH.
8. Chair Caroom raises concerns that the local detention centers will not have the ability to voice their concerns at budget meetings that according to Cristina Jorge-Tunon (DBM) are exclusive to only DBM and the agency (in this case, DPSCS).
9. Director Ryan Ross notes that the cost perspective is not really of the locals' concerns. To them, it is about helping people in crisis and making the list smaller, increasing diversion centers and therapeutic spaces. Their facilities are not designed to hold people with these problems, lacking spaces beyond cells.
    a) Looking to MDH to take action on this and present a plan about what this issue can look like in 5 to 10 years. Current solutions are only "band-aids".
10. Chief Judge Morrissey agrees with Director Ross.
    a) We need to move away from competency definitions, as mental health struggles are not necessarily indicative of criminological behavior. We need to utilize more CIT teams and divert on sequential intercept models prior to jail.
    b) Central issue is: where do we house these people?
11. Vice Chair Thompson: It would be very helpful for local detention centers to have a seat at the table. A main issue is that many individuals are committing extremely low-level crimes and are found incompetent but never get the opportunity to go to State hospital because their sentences are so short. So instead, they get released and reoffend.
12. Chief Judge Morrissey: The details of these cases are usually much more complicated than that and there are more serious

issues that make it difficult to define a subset of people to pair off and get them some other type of treatment.

13. Chair Caroom: Does the board want to take a position today requesting the governor and budget folks, in their process, to consider an allocation that deals with the 192 people awaiting beds in the current fiscal year, and to come up with a venue/place where people from local detention can come to the table and have their concerns addressed?
    a) Deal with the current fiscal year first to get it on their radar and then through the summit come up with more systemic improvements to address the long-term.
    b) Could be asking DBM to fund either beds or community-based diversion resources.
14. The proposal does not have strong support. The board is putting that to the side for now, leaving it as a matter in the minutes and a matter that stakeholders in the meeting today can carry into the budget process.

B. Local Detention Centers, Director Ryan Ross

1. N/A

C. Administrative Office of the Courts, Chief Judge John Morrissey

1. They prepare quarterly report on their compliance with the 15, 30, and 45 days (regarding technical violations of probation with the statute's presumption of 15 days for a first violation, 30 for a second, and 45 for subsequent, unless there is a reason to find that a person needs more than/has qualified for more than that with a new offense or otherwise).
2. JRA is having intended effect in that they are complying on a regular basis; very consistent in terms of compliance.
3. The summit will include all the locals and will hopefully be a very large summit including all key players from a county.
4. Judge Brett Wilson: Nothing to report from the circuit court.

IV. Safer, Stronger, Together Initiative

A. Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services - Secretary Carolyn Scruggs

B. Department of Human Services

C. Department of Juvenile Services

1. The Safer, Stronger, Together initiative brings together a multi-agency approach to align communities and transform lives by understanding that justice-involved individuals and

their families touch each one of our agencies.

2. Presentation is given by Seema Gajwani (DJS), Harry Spikes (DHS), and Lisa Sandlin (DPSCS). *See slide deck.*
    a) One of the tenets of the Moore-Miller leadership that is close to this initiative is being innovative, as three departments are coming together to serve families.
    b) Geo Mapping was done by all 3 agencies' data sections. They took a snapshot of 6 months in 2023 and identified where individuals (13-25) were touching 2 or more of these agencies. They looked at where these people lived and ranked the communities with the highest concentration of these families.
    c) They found a correlation between communities that were ranked and rates of violent crime, juvenile arrests, locations where individuals were leaving incarceration and returning at high rates, poverty, and mortality.
    d) These families use exponentially more resources than other families in Maryland, but their outcomes continue to be poor.
    e) Where there are concentrations of these families, crime is elevated, emphasizing a public safety aspect.
    f) Three pilot sites were chosen on data analysis and high concentration/needs of multi-system families:
        (1) Hagerstown - Washington County, 21740
        (2) Salisbury - Wicomico County, 21801 & 21804
        (3) East Baltimore - Baltimore City, 21213
    g) Initiative broadens the focus from individual levels to family and then to community safety and wellness.
    h) Each pilot site will have a family navigator who will advocate for those multi-system families and be a liaison to the government for them. Importantly, the navigators can break through the distrust of government that these families may have, and combat the shame and isolation typically associated with accessing services.
    i) Agency staff have focuses on:
        (1) Reducing unnecessary administrative burdens.
        (2) Looking at the family as a unit, not just the individual(s) under supervision.

(3) Identifying core areas of crisis and opportunity for that family.
(4) Prevention.

j) Goals and Strategies listed in slide deck.
k) Secretary Vinny Schiraldi (DJS) notes that he was involved in a similar initiative that created NEONs (Neighborhood Opportunity Networks) and it worked incredibly well with the community.
l) Gajwani clarifies for Chair Caroom that there are not currently formal partnerships with the schools and law enforcement at this stage, but they recognize the clear overlap between the work. The main focus at this point is serving the families that are identified as the multi-system families in the pilot sites. Then as needs are learned, they can reach out to local government and other state agencies as necessary to serve their needs. Local management boards and non-profits advise, but they want to keep boards community-based.
m) In addition to work mentioned there are also implementation teams with representatives from all three agencies that meet regularly to collaborate and eventually serve as many as possible. It is not about new money but about a fundamental shift in the way these agencies spend their dollars.
n) Collective efficacy, internal social controls.

V. Local Reentry Presentation

A. Anne Arundel County Reentry Hub - Marsha Briley, Reentry Coordinator

1. *See slide deck for more details.*
2. Anne Arundel County is doing something unique with the detention facilities by establishing a comprehensive reentry hub and repurposing spaces.
3. Anne Arundel County has 2 detention centers – one system with two facilities: Ordnance Rd. and Jennifer Rd.
    a) Ordnance Road
        (1) Minimum/medium security facility (men and women); dormitory style housing
        (2) Sentenced to terms up to 18 months

(3) Capacity: 654, average daily population: 165
(4) Plethora of programs and systems: alternative sentencing (house arrest, community service), weekender program, work release, etc.
(5) Extensive programming
(a) Also partnerships with local community-based organizations
(6) Have a small number of pretrial detainees here
(7) Sits in North County - area has highest number of people returning from incarceration in the county

b) Jennifer Road
(1) Traditional multi-level correctional facility setup

4. Centralized Model Concept
a) Due to a decrease in the population post-pandemic, underutilized space, and a lack of access, it was recommended to consolidate the facilities.
b) Study revealed that a solution-based alternative to consolidating is to repurpose the available and underutilized space to create the Reentry Hub.

5. Anne Arundel County
a) The beauty of AACO is the consensus and collaboration around how to address reentry.
b) Pittman is the only County Executive in Maryland that designated construction of a reentry hub in the capital budget and established a county position of Reentry Coordinator.

6. Comprehensive Reentry Hub – Dynamic model
a) Evidence-based programming during confinement
(1) We want to prepare these people to *not* stay
b) Centralized essential services
(1) Going case by case to address needs
c) Intimate connections to the community
d) Targeted interventions reduce unnecessary interactions with the criminal justice system
(1) Triage individuals based on what level of intensity the intervention should be
e) Accurate recidivism data
f) Alignment and compliance with legislation and

COMAR

(1) Ensure hub is not only centralized but also an advocate of the process

g) Everyone invited to the table is to continue to do what they are tasked to do. They never have to do anything outside of their scope.

7. They will be breaking ground on the repurposing of underutilized space in March 2025, but are already offering the Reentry Hub services now.
8. Chair Caroom: Is there an MOU with DPSCS so that same services could be available to folks leaving DOC and local detention centers?
    a) Anne Arundel was one of the first counties to have an MOU with DPSCS in 2016. They have yet to get folks from DPSCS to the local detention center; but are working on it.

VI. Open Discussion

A. Reentry Recommendations - Emerging Adults Program

1. Chair Caroom suggests deferring this conversation to the next meeting. Maybe DPSCS can provide a report of considerations about possibly implementing these programs and/or obstacles faced.
2. Secretary Scruggs recommends inviting State's Attorney Braveboy. She works closely with these types of programs.
3. Chair Caroom recommends also inviting someone from Vera Institute to describe best practices and what other jurisdictions are doing.

B. Legislative Priorities - Geriatric Medical Parole Bill

1. Chair Caroom deferred topic to next meeting.

VII. Next Steps - Judge Caroom and Brandi Cahn

A. Next meeting on November 18th at 1:00 pm.

VIII. Good of the Order and Adjournment - Judge Caroom