MEMORANDUM

Date: May 13, 2021

To: The Honorable Chair and Members
   Pima County Board of Supervisors

From: C.H. Huckelberry
       County Administrator

Re: Criminal Justice Reform

Please see the attached May 7, 2021 memorandum from Assistant County Administrator Wendy Petersen regarding additional programs we have been invited to participate in with the MacArthur Foundation regarding frequent utilizers of the Jail (Policy Research Associates) as well as probation (Urban Institute).

Clearly, the County is becoming a leader in the entire concept of justice reform. The invitation to participate in these activities indicates our efforts in justice reform over the last five years are beginning to pay off.

Our entry into the justice reform field continues to be the driving force of our program, policy and financial support of a number of justice reform proposals. These proposals are more important now, I will continue to actively support these proposals, including reallocation of resources from assisting criminal justice units to these activities and efforts.

CHH/mp

Attachment

c: The Honorable Kyle Bryson, Presiding Judge, Superior Court
   The Honorable Laura Conover, Pima County Attorney
   Jan Lesher, Chief Deputy County Administrator
   Carmine DeBonis, Jr., Deputy County Administrator for Public Works
   Francisco García, MD, MPH, Deputy County Administrator & Chief Medical Officer, Health and Community Services
   Wendy Petersen, Assistant County Administrator for Justice and Law Enforcement
   Dean Brault, Director, Public Defense Services
MEMORANDUM

Criminal Justice Reform Unit

Date: May 7, 2021

To: C. H. Huckelberry
   County Administrator

From: Wendy Petersen
   Assistant County Administrator

Re: Two Promising MacArthur Projects

The Criminal Justice Reform Unit has been asked to participate in two projects sponsored by the MacArthur Foundation but administered by other agencies or technical advisors connected with MacArthur. One project targets “Frequent Utilizers of the Jail” and the other is a study of probation trends in outcomes to jail incarceration. In my opinion, both would be valuable; however, I think the Frequent Utilizers may be particularly well suited for our purposes.

As you know, I’ve been critical of some of the projects and data tasks MacArthur has asked of us in the past. In this third grant cycle in particular, my concern has been that these requests may become onerous since our Safety + Justice Challenge (SJC) award was so low that we would not have the personnel to handle these projects. In the past, some of the projects seemed to me to be more “PR” related, not particularly helpful to our mission and a consuming waste of time.

The two projects that have come up recently seem to be a good use of our time and ultimately helpful in continuing to lower our jail population.


As part of the SJC Research Consortium, PRA is submitting an application in response to a recent Request for Proposal (RFP) to study Understanding the Frequent Utilizer Population in Jails: Examining Intersecting Needs and Strategies to Close the ‘Rustling Door.’ The twenty-page Request for Work Proposal is attached for more information (Attachment 1)

This RFP specifically states that only communities focusing on frequent utilizers are suitable sites. Pima County has been deemed a “suitable site” and we are being asked if our SJC team would be willing to be a research site for the study.

The study will last approximately 18 months and is organized into three phases. The specific request is straightforward:

   Phase 1:
   Access to individualized jail data in Pima County. PRA will work with jail staff (i.e., Jail Population Coordinator, Mike Steber) to provide approximately 6 years of electronic data including important variables to inform who the frequent utilizers are in the Pima County jail (e.g. demographic, criminal justice, and behavioral health variables);

   Phase 2:
   Interviews and/or a Sequential Intercept Mapping (SIM) workshop with key stakeholders. PRA will discuss the findings from Phase 1 and develop a strategic plan to address barriers contributing to frequent utilizers’ involvement in the criminal justice system. [As an FYI, this Spring, SAMHSA’s GAINS
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Center for Behavioral Health and Justice Transformation selected Pima County to receive one of PRA’s 2021 Sequential Intercept Mapping (SIM) workshops which will be held in August 2021.

**Phase 3:**  
Assess the outcomes of the strategies at the individual level and the site level. “Assessing ways that the jail population and racial and ethnic disparities may have been impacted through implementation of the strategies in [Pima County] will be particularly important, given the overarching goals of the SJC.” The perspectives and experiences of directly impacted individuals will be developed. The intention is to gain a preliminary sense of strategy effectiveness through outcome tracking, perspectives and insights from those directly impacted.

The expenses assumed by each research site include the staff to generate the electronic data files in Phase 1 and stakeholder time to participate in the SIM in Phase 2. All other research activities are included in PRA’s budget. In this respect, we are already providing the electronic data files to MacArthur and because Pima County was awarded one of the SAMHA’s GAINS Center for Behavioral Health SIM workshop we will already be getting this information.

We had an initial meeting to discuss this project with PRA on Friday, May 7. In the event we agree to be part of this study (should PRA be awarded the grant), PRA would need a letter of support by May 14, 2021.

I asked Jail Population Coordinator, Mike Steber to take a look at the data needs which are outlined in Appendix A of the RFWP (at p.12) and he gave me an indication of those data elements that are readily available and those that we cannot provide. We discussed this issue with PRA on our May 7 call. They explained that they will work with the data we already have and there will be no need to create any other data elements.

I think participation in this study would be useful: as of April 30, 2021, the Jail had 82 High Users (defined as 10 to 20 jail incarcerations in the previous two years) and three Super Users (those with more than 20 incarcerations in the prior 24 months). I am attaching Mr. Steber’s most recent report on the jail’s Super and High Users (Attachment 2). Although these numbers have significantly lowered since we first started tracking super and high users, this study will help us understand ways the jail population and racial and ethnic disparities may have been impacted by frequent utilizers. Our participation would be useful and ultimately my hope would be Pima County realizing a significant cost savings on housing those frequent users.

There would not be any additional cost to Pima County in participating in this study since our data is already being collected in a similar manner for our current and contracted obligations with MacArthur. Coming to grips with the underlying reasons for these frequent utilizers makes this study an attractive one.

At this point, PRA has not submitted it response to the RFP; however, if their proposal is accepted and Pima County is selected as a site for the study, I will make sure Sheriff Nanos is aware of the project.

2. **Probation (Urban Institute)**

We were recently contacted by the Urban Institute asking us to be part of Phase 2 of a study involving Pima County Probation.

For the past year, the Pima County Adult Probation Office has been working with the Urban Institute on a Reducing Revocations Challenge (RRC). Urban is now seeking funding from the MacArthur Foundation for Phase Two that would provide funding of probation services of up to $100,000. The application for
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phase two targets technical violators of probation, specifically those with substance use disorders and absconders.

As a bit of background on this project, ISLG (the Institute for State and Local Governments) requested applications to study:

1) the trends in probation outcomes to local jail incarceration; and
2) the impact of the SJC strategies being employed (as they relate to probation and the jail).

In Urban Institute’s application, they proposed a two-phased project including interviews and data collection from Probation’s management system.

The first phase would be to analyze the pathways and trends in jail incarceration among the probation population. The second phase would document and evaluate the Safety + Justice Challenge probation strategies being employed to reduce jail incarceration.

One part of this Phase 2 evaluation would be to document the work of Pima County’s Jail Population Review Committee. Urban Institute’s understanding was that people on probation could receive assistance through the Permanent Supportive Housing program (I believe they are referring to Housing First) and that they could identify who received it. To the extent that it’s possible, Urban Institute proposes to evaluate outcomes for people on probation who have received that support. This would be fairly limited and would depend on what is documented in Phase 1 (e.g., whether there are enough people on probation who received housing).

This project is also an attractive one: Probation violators constitute a large number of our jail population. Also, Chief Sanders and Adult Probation have already worked on the first phase of the project. We have a meeting tentatively scheduled with the folks from Urban Institute scheduled for May 18, 2021 at 11 a.m. I think they have some misconceptions about how our Jail Population Review Committee and our Housing First program work; however, I think we can straighten this out in our initial meeting.

I would be happy to discuss these project with you should you want any further information. At this point, nothing has been decided.
Safety and Justice Challenge Research Consortium
Request for Work Proposals (RFWP) 006:
Understanding the Frequent Utilizer Population in Jails: Examining Intersecting Needs and Strategies to Close the “Rovling Door”

The Institute for State and Local Governance (ISLG) at the City University of New York (CUNY) is pleased to invite members of the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation’s (Foundation) Safety and Justice Challenge (SJC) Research Consortium (Consortium) to submit work proposals that aim to better understand the population of “frequent utilizers” — people who cycle in and out of jail multiple times due to a confluence of intersecting needs and systemic obstacles — and examine the process of implementing strategies intended to mitigate the cycle of admission and its impact on jail populations.

I. Initiative Context

In May 2015, the Foundation launched the Safety and Justice Challenge, a nationwide effort to inspire local criminal justice reform and change the way communities think about and use jails. The initiative aims to safely reduce jail populations and racial and ethnic disparities through rigorous data tracking efforts and the implementation of a comprehensive set of jail reduction strategies across different system points. Over the last five years, the SJC has grown to include 51 cities and counties across 32 states engaged in justice system reform.

At this stage in the Challenge, many sites have achieved significant reductions in their jail populations. Stakeholders within and outside of the SJC network are interested in learning more about both the strategies that helped achieve those reductions and the context in which they were achieved. Since its inception, the SJC has relied heavily on data to develop reform strategies and assess progress toward initiative goals. This wealth of site data, covering stages from arrest to case resolution to post-disposition outcomes, also presents a unique opportunity to understand the factors, circumstances, and practices that drive jail populations and the disparities that exist across the criminal justice system.

Frequent utilizers are an understudied driver of jail populations. At a national level, there is currently no standard definition or understanding of what this population is or who comprises it, largely because of variation in local jurisdictional definitions and a lack of systematic data tracking. Notably, however, in many SJC implementation sites, frequent utilizers comprised over 20% of the jail population over a one-year period, and in some sites nearly half, suggesting that they are a significant driver of local incarceration. This population is typically brought into contact with the system through low-level offenses, misdemeanor drug-related offenses, or quality of life crimes, such as petty theft, trespassing, or fare evasion, with average lengths of stay less than 30 days, according to one study.\(^2\)

Existing literature highlights severe resource gaps around basic needs such as poverty, lack of stable housing, and access to appropriate healthcare, among others, as key determinants of contact with the criminal justice system. While there is consensus that conditions of “multisystem cycling” (e.g., emergency room services, homeless shelters) (Harding & Roman, 2017, p. 512) perpetuate criminal system involvement, there are limited evaluations of strategies intended to close the revolving door. This RFWP aims to address key gaps in the literature by seeking proposals that: (1) explore and describe the

---

\(^1\) Frequent utilizers are variably referred to as “frequent fliers,” “chronic offenders,” “high utilizers,” “chronic consumers,” and “familiar faces.”

population of frequent utilizers, focusing specifically on the intersecting needs and systemic obstacles that drive repeated criminal justice system involvement and local jail admissions, (2) document strategies enacted by local criminal justice systems to stop the revolving door, particularly in collaboration with community-based service providers, and (3) assess outcomes of these strategies, with particular attention to their impact on frequent utilizers' contact with the criminal justice system, as well as racial and ethnic disparities. This RFWP is a step toward documenting and defining what the frequent utilizer population looks like across SJC sites and offering an in-depth examination of partnerships between community-based service providers and criminal justice systems intended to close the revolving door into incarceration for this population. Findings from this research may be used to develop more targeted Consortium projects in this area in the future.

II. Task Order Term and Amount

Multiple awards may result from this RFWP, depending on the scope of submitted applications. A task order and budget will be negotiated with the selected applicant(s) after the review process is completed (described in Section VI). ISLG anticipates that the task order term will be approximately 18 months, with an anticipated start date in June, 2021. The total amount awarded may be up to $350,000, with individual award amounts dependent upon approach, design, and selection of SJC sites. Given the exploratory nature of this RFWP, applicants are expected to focus projects on multiple sites; however, given timeline constraints, applicants may consider partnership with other researchers that are either internal or external to the Consortium in order to complete all of the required components of the project as outlined in this RFWP. Additionally, applicants are required to reach out to potential sites to discuss partnership on the proposed project. SJC sites implementing strategies targeting the frequent utilizer population are listed in Appendix D—please refer to Section IV, Site Selection, for more details, definitions, and considerations.

III. Background and Literature Review

Interaction with the criminal justice system is often the result of a multitude of intersecting failures of public-serving systems to address basic needs, including substance use, mental illness, homelessness, poverty, trauma, and chronic health conditions, among others. In the absence of integrated systems responses to these needs, individuals, disproportionately poor and People of Color, are placed at an increased risk of repeated interaction with the criminal justice system. As a result, jails have come to serve as de facto providers of treatment and shelter. This not only exacerbates existing individual (e.g., substance abuse) and structural (e.g., homelessness, poverty) risk factors, but often creates new ones, as the experience of incarceration is destabilizing and can sever connections to housing, employment, medical coverage, and community support networks. In jurisdictions where there is a lack of coordinated services and/or poor reentry planning, this creates a revolving door, in which individuals with unmet needs cycle through multiple social systems, including jails, homeless shelters, and emergency medical care. System stakeholders have come to refer to this population as frequent utilizers.

---

3 Consortium members are able to sub-contract with other Consortium members or may sub-contract with research organizations or individuals that are external to the Consortium. In the latter instance, the Consortium member should be the main applicant, leading the work and providing funds to the sub-contractor directly.


The relationship between incarceration and other social systems has been well documented. Historically, policies such as the highly punitive U.S. “War on Drugs” and concurrent deinstitutionalization of psychiatric patients, in conjunction with “broken windows” policing strategies, collectively criminalized substance use disorders, mental illness, and homelessness, and contributed to a surge of incarceration in recent decades. Homelessness and incarceration, in particular, mutually perpetuate one another. Researchers estimate that 25 to 50 percent of the U.S. homeless population has been incarcerated at least once previously, and that homelessness is seven to 11 times more prevalent among the U.S. jail population than it is in the general community. Mental illness and substance use are similarly prevalent among those in the system. According to a 2014 report by the Vera Institute of Justice, serious mental illness is two to four times more prevalent in state prisons than among the general population, and over two-thirds of the jail population has a diagnosable substance use disorder, compared to just nine percent of the general population. While lack of stable housing, mental illness, and substance use on their own increase a person’s likelihood of incarceration, together they increase the risk tremendously. Homeless individuals who have a co-occurring mental illness or history of substance use face an even greater risk of criminal justice involvement: according to one study, homeless individuals with one or more mental illnesses had higher rates of arrest compared to those with mental illnesses who were not homeless. Similarly, another study found that 29 percent of homeless individuals with a local arrest record had prior contact with the state mental health system, compared to just 10 percent of homeless individuals without prior arrests. Lastly, researchers from Yale University found that substance use is a strong predictor of both homelessness among people in custody and jail incarceration for both homeless and non-homeless individuals.

For frequent utilizers, the compounding risks of multiple unmet needs can create additional complications upon release from jail. Due partly to limited coordination among public institutions, difficulty securing housing or treatment services can exacerbate existing reentry needs and increase the risk of re-arrest. In general, the majority of this population has been found to pose little threat to public safety despite frequent incarceration, as most charges are misdemeanor offenses with fewer assault charges than the general population. Further, the period of time from release to re-arrest for frequent utilizers is often quite short, with one study finding that over 50 percent of repeat arrests occur within 60 days of the initial

---

arrest, and over 25 percent within just 14 days. Research suggests that this revolving door results in high public costs, as a substantial amount of public funding across multiple institutions (e.g., public health, housing) is spent on frequent utilizers. In Miami-Dade County, for example, incarcerating 97 frequent utilizers totaled $13 million in criminal justice costs over a five-year period—a total that does not include the cost of services delivered by public health or housing providers.

Although practitioners from multiple fields (e.g., public health, criminology) acknowledge that cross institutional cycling overburdens numerous public systems and produces poor client outcomes, the systems themselves operate in silos, with limited coordination or data sharing capacity. In an effort to address systemic silos and better support this vulnerable population, law enforcement, service providers, and human services agencies have adapted strategies at three distinct points of the criminal justice system: arrest/diversion, court/sentencing, and reentry. Since the early 2000s, strategies to address frequent utilizers have ranged from specialized crisis co-response teams and interagency working groups with data sharing agreements, to coordinated service referrals systems and housing-first models that prioritize contingency-free housing. A consistent focus across nearly all frequent utilizer-focused strategies is an emphasis on multi-sector collaboration, as acknowledgement of collective responsibility and strategic coordination between law enforcement, social services, emergency, and healthcare providers across all decision-points is fundamental to supporting the long-term needs of this population.

However, while the current literature articulates the need for multi-sector collaborations as critical towards recognizing and meeting the needs of this population, there is a gap in understanding how these needs and systemic obstacles are experienced by individuals cycling through jails. Additionally, given the important role that community-based organizations play in serving the needs of these individuals and their distinct relationships with individuals and knowledge of community systems of influence, it is critical that research examine their experiences and perspectives on what is needed, and in particular the systemic barriers and challenges that exist in service delivery.

---

IV. Project Description

As noted above, this RFWP seeks to solicit proposals that (1) explore and describe the population of frequent utilizers in selected sites, focusing specifically on the intersecting needs and systemic obstacles that drive repeated criminal justice system involvement and local jail admissions, (2) document strategies enacted by local criminal justice systems in SJC sites to mitigate the cycling of frequent utilizers through jails, particularly in collaboration with community-based service providers, and (3) assess the outcomes of these strategies, with particular attention to further contacts with the criminal justice system and racial and ethnic disparities. Given the focus on individuals’ unmet needs and the systemic obstacles they face, applicants are required to submit proposals that incorporate the perspectives of community-based service providers and directly impacted individuals in addition to criminal justice and other system stakeholders. In alignment with these goals, this RFWP encourages applicants to consider sites that have pre-established relationships with community member advisory councils to aid in recruitment and provide feedback on research protocols and findings interpretation, as relevant.

Research Questions: To address these interests, work proposals should explore the following research questions in two or more SJC sites. The key research questions to be addressed require an in-depth approach to describe the prevalence and flow of frequent user populations into local jails (Phase I), document strategies that selected sites have implemented to address that flow, including ways that system stakeholders and community-based service providers have coordinated efforts (Phase II), and assess strategy-level outcomes (Phase III).

Phase I

1. How is a frequent utilizer defined in each of the selected sites and across the different stakeholder groups (e.g. agency, service provider, and directly impacted community members)?

2. In each selected site, what proportion of the jail population is comprised of frequent utilizers? Applicants should look at multiple measures to understand how frequent utilizers cycle through the jail, including, but not limited to:
   a) Percentage of jail bookings or releases that involve individuals with a recent history of prior jail incarceration (e.g. three or more bookings in any given year);
   b) Average length of stay for frequent utilizer populations as compared to non-frequent utilizer populations;
   c) Percentage of average daily jail population comprised of frequent utilizers

*Please note: all measures should be disaggregated by charge type, race, ethnicity, and gender at a minimum.

3. Who are the frequent utilizers in the selected sites? For each of the questions below, how are frequent utilizers different from the general jail population.
   a) What are the demographic and legal characteristics of this particular population in the selected sites?
   b) What are the key needs of this population?
   c) Within the broader population of frequent utilizers in each site, are there distinct subgroups with different characteristics and/or needs?

4. What are the key pathways into local incarceration for frequent utilizers?
a) Describe the drivers (e.g., unmet needs, systemic obstacles) by which this particular population continues to cycle in and out of incarceration.

Phase II

5. What strategies have sites implemented to address the revolving door of the local jail? Document and describe the strategies, including the role of community-based service providers and the nature of collaboration between them and system stakeholders. Specific questions that should be explored include the following:

a) What are the intervention points for the strategies?
b) What are the key components and/or parameters (including length of engagement)?
c) What are the eligibility criteria, and how is eligibility determined?
d) What key system stakeholders are involved in the implementation of the strategies? What are their specific roles?
e) What role do community-based service providers play in the strategies?
f) What is the level of coordination and collaboration between criminal justice system actors and community-based service providers?
g) What do stakeholders and service providers perceive to be the biggest benefits of the strategies?
h) What do stakeholders and service providers perceive more generally to be the challenges, gaps, and barriers to creating strategies that address the needs of the frequent utilizer population as well as the challenges associated with implementing the strategies?

6. Who are the strategies reaching?
   a) Of cases/persons eligible for the strategies, what percentage are enrolled/served/benefit from it?
   b) What are the criminal justice and sociodemographic characteristics, (e.g., across race, gender, socioeconomic status), of those served? How do they compare to those who are eligible, but not served by the policy, program, or practice?

Phase III

7. How do sites define success for their strategies?

8. What are the site-level outcomes of the strategies? Have they reduced the representation of frequent utilizers in the jail or changed outcomes for this population at other system points?

9. What are the individual-level outcomes of those reached by the strategies? Has implementation of the strategies reduced their contacts with the local jail or at other system points?

10. To what extent are positive outcomes equitably distributed across racial and ethnic groups? Across other groups?

Approach

Project study designs should incorporate some variation of the research questions outlined above, and employ a mixed-methods design that should include descriptive and/or multivariate statistical analyses of administrative data and analysis of qualitative data (e.g., interview or focus group data, observational data, case file review). For the qualitative analysis, applicants will be required to embed community voices (e.g., directly impacted individuals/their families and community-based organizations that deliver services to this population) in addition to those of system stakeholders. Project proposals should include
three phases of work:

- **Phase I**: The goal of Phase I is to describe the frequent utilizer population, including what it looks like when disaggregated at across sociodemographic characteristics (e.g., race/ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic status) in the selected sites. In addition to using administrative data to document the prevalence of this population in local jails (and the pathways leading to incarceration), applicants should employ qualitative methods to understand the nature and scope of the issue from the perspective of the key stakeholder groups (system-level and community-level) identified in this RFWP.

- **Phase II**: Using Phase I as a foundational stepping stone, in collaboration with the sites, applicants should describe and document the strategies that selected sites have implemented to address the needs of this population and keep them out of jail. Applicants should unpack the research questions articulated above, learning from the perspectives of system actors, individuals with lived experience, and community-based organizations that service their needs.

- **Phase III**: The goal in this phase is to assess key outcomes of the strategies, at both the individual level (i.e., among individuals served by the strategies) and the site level (i.e., trends in the jail population and at other system decision points more broadly). For this component of the research, applicants may draw on existing metrics that are being tracked in selected sites, but can also expand upon them or develop their own metrics as needed to operationalize key goals and objectives. Assessing ways that the jail population and racial and ethnic disparities may have been impacted through implementation of the strategies in the selected sites will be particularly important, given the overarching goals of the SJC. To supplement administrative data, applicants should also unpack outcomes of the strategies using qualitative methods that invite the perspectives and experiences of directly impacted individuals. It should be noted that ISLG does not expect a full outcome evaluation (though applicants are free to propose one if they think it is feasible); the intention is to gain a preliminary sense of strategy effectiveness through descriptive outcome tracking and perspectives and insights from those directly impacted.

Findings should be synthesized across sites to draw larger conclusions about the nature and scope of frequent utilizers in local jails and strategies to better serve this population, including but not limited to similarities and differences in strategies taken and their effectiveness, key elements of success, and common challenges. Where possible, applicants should identify promising areas for further analysis.

In describing the study approach, each applicant must address the potential impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on the proposed research. First, applicants should consider how COVID-19 may have affected ongoing implementation of strategies, compounded the needs already existing within the population of interest, and/or drastically changed the jail population characteristics, which could complicate the ability to draw sweeping conclusions about a particular strategy. Additionally, applicants should take into account any uncertainty regarding the ability to collect data in person and lay out a contingency plan should pandemic-related restrictions remain in place during the course of the grant.

**Site Selection**

ISLG recognizes the multiple layers that are implicated in this RFWP with respect to sites and strategy selection. Applicants are expected to include multiple sites in the research, each of which may be implementing more than one strategy to address frequent utilization. The fundamental goal of this RFWP is to understand what frequent utilizer populations look like, the types of strategies that are being implemented to keep them out of jail, critical elements of success, and common challenges and/or barriers. Applicants should communicate with potential site partners to discuss key strategies of focus and
achieve buy-in as part of the application process. Letters of support from all selected sites will be required as part of the proposal. These letters must detail their commitment to the research, including their willingness to provide any administrative data that is needed outside of the data collected by ISLG, facilitate qualitative work, and provide relevant context that will inform that work as it progresses through each phase.

ISLG is particularly interested in expanding the list of sites that are included in Consortium research to ensure a diverse range of perspectives from across the SJC Network. Therefore, we ask Consortium members to consider collaborating with sites that may not have had the opportunity to engage in this type of research work previously. Of course, the jurisdictions included in the proposed project must have strategies in place/already implemented involving policy or programmatic reforms that aim to reduce or limit frequent utilization as a driver of local incarceration. For purposes of this research engagement, ISLG is prioritizing strategies directly aimed at this objective, but may also consider strategies whose impact will indirectly work toward reducing incarceration among this group. Of particular note are strategies that may not be labeled as “frequent utilizer strategies” by the site but that have the potential to address this population (e.g. behavioral health diversion). These types of strategies can and should be considered—ISLG’s interest is in exploring as wide an array of efforts as possible.

Among sites involved in the SJC, relevant policy-based and programmatic strategies implemented to date include but are not limited to:

- a. Forensic mental and behavioral health discharge planning to facilitate reentry for people with mental illnesses, substance use disorders, and other behavioral health concerns;
- b. Specialized mobile crisis response teams with law enforcement and behavioral health clinicians to respond to people in crisis and divert to community-based services in lieu of arrest;
- c. Specialized housing programs for individuals with behavioral health contacts and multiple jail placements, that also provide referrals to services;
- d. Expedited referrals to community-based services by law enforcement and public health, and diversion programs over law enforcement interventions;
- e. Alternative-to-incarceration residential treatment facility for misdemeanor arrestees;
- f. Peer support networks to connect defendants to services and provide interpersonal support from people with lived experience;
- g. Triage centers where law enforcement can drop off people who are experiencing substance use or mental health needs as an alternative to arrest.

A summary of trends on frequent utilizer populations across sites can be found in Appendix C, and a list of sites with frequent utilizer strategies appears in Appendix D. Applicants may consider additional strategies in SJC sites that do not appear in Appendix D, as long as the strategies are part of the SJC plan to reduce jail populations and racial and ethnic disparities. (Please note that all supporting materials provided in appendices and attachments should be kept confidential and used only to inform site and strategy selection for the proposed study).

Deliverables

Following the completion of Phase I, an interim report will be required of each grantee. This deliverable should provide an in-depth, picture of the frequent utilizer population and how it flows through the local jail in each of the respective sites. Drawing from the interim report, grantees will be expected to create and release a public-facing product (e.g. infographic or “quick facts” summary brief) that presents a high-level overview of what has been learned about frequent utilizers as a driver of jail incarceration. In an effort to amplify lived experience and underscore the revolving door through the lens of those most
impacted, all deliverables should include perspectives from these individuals, and shared back with them to maximize impact. As noted above, applicants may consider creating or drawing from an existing community advisory board for their projects to inform protocol development, interpretation of results, and deliverables, among other things.

In addition to the interim report, a final public technical report and policy/research brief will be required. Applicants may also propose other deliverables that will help amplify the work to a broad range of audiences—for example, a webinar or other presentation/briefing, infographics, or interactive web pages and dashboards. The findings will be made public, and ISLG will work with each grantee on a specific communications strategy ahead of report release. Grantees should communicate regularly with all partnering sites throughout the project period, and sites will review public materials per the SJC Data Use Agreement (DUA).

Data

Work proposals will include the use of any relevant case-level administrative data that is collected by ISLG across SJC sites at the major decision-making points. For this proposal, relevant data may include elements from the jail and courts, with access to prosecution, pre-trial services, and probation data as needed. Given the explicit focus on understanding the needs and obstacles experienced by the population, as well as the systemic challenges associated with service delivery, proposals should consider ways to incorporate primary data collection efforts, including service delivery and/or other administrative data outside of ISLG’s repository, as well (as practical). Proposals are also expected to include qualitative data collection with directly impacted individuals, community-based organizations, and key system stakeholders. A comprehensive list of the data requested by ISLG appears in Appendix A, and all Consortium members may access this data under the DUA signed as part of their SJC Consortium Umbrella Agreement (Agreement). In general, available data spans the period from November 2015 through April 2020; some sites have additionally provided data as far back as May 2013 and may soon be providing data through April 2021. As a note, while Appendix A outlines the universe of data requested of each SJC site, the availability of specific data elements and time periods varies across sites, depending on data limitations and other capacity issues. Upon award, ISLG representatives will work with grantees to define the specific data universe for selected sites. Applicants may also reach out to ISLG for more information as they craft their proposals.

Work proposals including original data collection should describe data acquisition plan(s) with the partner sites, including DUAs with sites (see Section V of this RFP) for data that falls outside of ISLG’s purview.

V. Work Proposal Instructions

General: SJC Consortium members are invited to submit work proposals for consideration. Work proposal narratives should not exceed ten (10) double-spaced pages, 12-point font with 1-inch margins.

Questions and clarifications should be submitted in writing to Jennifer Ferone, ISLG Associate Research Director and Consortium Manager, Jennifer.Ferone@islg.cuny.edu, and Sukhmani Singh, Senior Research Associate, Sukhmani.singh@islg.cuny.edu, no later than May 3, 2021. Responses to questions will be posted on the SJC Exchange Research Consortium Sub-Community no later than May 7, 2021. Final submissions are due via email to Jennifer no later than 5pm (EST) on May 21, 2021. Work proposals submitted after the due date and time will not be considered for an award. The selection will be made by the Consortium Research Review Committee (RRC) in June 2021.
Work proposal narrative components (10 double-spaced pages): Applicants should begin by framing their overall approach to the work and how it aligns with the description set forth above, describing the SJC sites selected for the analysis, and providing detail about data sources, collection, and methods, and address anticipated challenges. Each section is briefly outlined below:

1) **Study framework**—Describe the project’s overall goal(s), research objectives, and approach. This section should highlight a unique framing of the work based on the applicant’s capabilities, vision, and prior literature.

2) **Site selection**—Briefly describe the sites selected for inclusion in the study and any current relationships that have been established with the sites. While prior relationships are not required, applicants must conduct outreach with sites to establish a partnership and submit affirmation that relevant site stakeholders, including community-based organizations, are willing to move forward with the proposed study.

3) **Design and methodology**—Describe in sufficient detail components of the proposed approach, including quantitative and qualitative methods drawn upon to answer the research questions outlined in this RFWP. This section should describe all research activities and work streams that will be undertaken to meet the goals of the project, including data sources and data collection efforts, measures and outcomes, and plans for analysis. In discussing the proposed approach, also include, at a high-level, necessary planning and groundwork that will be required before undertaking the full analysis (e.g., IRB approval, data acquisition, development of tools and protocols). Finally, applicants should address any anticipated challenges in carrying out their proposed design and briefly describe how they might address them or mitigate risks. Please also discuss any potential impacts of the pandemic on research activities and how the work will move forward if current circumstances and restrictions continue to persist early next year.

4) **Staffing**—Outline a staffing and management plan for the project, including a brief description of staff roles and responsibilities.

5) **Dissemination**—Describe a plan for research publications, including full technical reports, research briefs, and/or products for public dissemination of research findings.

**Work proposal attachments**: In addition to the main work proposal narrative, include the following attachments (attachments do not count towards the ten (10) double-spaced page limit of the narrative):

1) **Timeline of activities.** A general timeline of activities, as well as timing of project deliverables, should be included as a separate attachment, but also referenced in the narrative of the application. This attachment should not exceed one (1) page.

2) **Letters of support/Statement of site commitment.** Applicants will need to secure letter(s) of support from the key agencies or departments involved in the implementation of the strategies. At minimum, applicants must submit a statement describing outreach to potential sites and discuss site stakeholder commitment to the project. If possible, applicants are strongly encouraged to communicate with the designated SJC Lead Agency for the selected sites, as they are responsible for coordinating SJC activities and data facilitation to ISLG. If an applicant does not know which agency constitutes a lead agency for a particular site, you may feel free to reach out to ISLG for guidance.

3) **Budget and budget narrative.** Applicants should provide an itemized budget of up to $350,000 outlining their proposed use of funding and justification for each budget item and associated rate(s). Please include personnel costs, as well as other costs for equipment, supplies, travel, fringe benefits, indirect costs, or other direct costs necessary for carrying out
the proposed project. Applicants should specify the types of expenses included as indirect costs and describe how they determine whether to charge an expense as an indirect versus a direct cost. See Appendix B for an itemized budget template.

A budget narrative should correspond to the itemized budget and link the outlined costs to the work proposal’s components, personnel, and activities. In the narrative, carefully outline the justification and any assumptions on which the budget is based. Work proposal reviews and the final award decision will take into account the degree to which applicants have proposed advantageous budgets that balance costs alongside other factors and criteria set for in the RFWP.

VI. Proposal Scoring and Review Process

Proposals will be reviewed by ISLG and members of the SJC Consortium Research Review Committee (RRC), made up of representatives with expertise across identified priority areas and spanning academic, practitioner, and policy sectors. ISLG and the RRC will evaluate proposals based on all the factors and criteria set forth in the RFWP. The budget and budget narrative will not be assigned a technical score upon review, but will be considered with respect to alignment with proposed activities and tasks in the final award decision. A technical score will also be generated to guide discussion and decision-making for each proposal based on the following elements:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Study framework</td>
<td>10 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Site selection</td>
<td>20 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Design and methodology</td>
<td>50 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Staffing and dissemination plans</td>
<td>15 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Timeline</td>
<td>5 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100 points</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note on Eligible Applicants:* This solicitation is restricted to applicants that were pre-selected through a competitive RFP through the Safety and Justice Challenge for membership into the Research Consortium. Individuals and organizations that are not currently members of the Research Consortium are not eligible to apply for this work assignment. While all members of the Research Consortium are eligible to submit proposals, ISLG will only enter into task order negotiations with members who have a fully executed Agreement and DUA in place at that time.*
Appendix A:
Data Elements List Extracted from Consortium’s DUA

The list below contains categories of data elements that the applicant may request for the performance of its work under its Task Order(s) issued pursuant to the Contract, and for the purposes outlined in the data use agreement to which this Appendix is attached. The list is organized by criminal justice system points, providing overarching categories of data that ISLG requests from police/law enforcement, prosecutors, public defenders, court systems, probation and parole departments (if applicable to the site context), and the jail. Some sites do provide more comprehensive data depending upon capacity, resources, and data quality, while other sites may have more limited data capacity and may not be able to provide all requested elements. ISLG will work with the applicant upon submission of specific data requests to ensure that ISLG provides the most relevant information available to it to complete the requirements of a Task Order.

I. Part I: DATA REQUESTED AND RECEIVED BY ISLG ACROSS ALL PARTICIPATING SITES

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
For cases/people at each of the system points below (as applicable):

- Unique Person ID
- Unique Case ID (e.g. arrest ID, summons ID docket number, probation case number, etc.)
- Date of birth
- Gender
- Race
- Ethnicity
- Zip code (of home residence)
- Any other information necessary to identify eligible/target populations for selected strategies

LAW ENFORCEMENT
For each arrest (custodial and non-custodial):

- Date of arrest
- Zip code of arrest location
- Type of arrest—custodial or non-custodial (i.e. arrested and released with a citation)
- All charges associated with the arrest—including charge code and level (felony, misdemeanor, etc.), flag for top charge
- Offense type (for each charge) (e.g., person, property, drug, public order, sex, violation of probation/parole, other, etc.)

PROSECUTOR (OR OTHER CHARGING ENTITY):
For each case received by the prosecutor (or other charging entity):

- Date of review and/or receipt of arrest charges
- Charging outcome (e.g., case accepted, declined, deferred/diversion pre-filing, referred back to law enforcement, grand jury outcome, etc.)
- Date of charging outcome
• If not declined:
  o All charges associated with the case—including charge code and level (felony, misdemeanor, etc.)
  o Offense type (for each charge) (e.g., person, property, drug, public order, sex, violation of probation/parole, other), etc.

PUBLIC DEFENDER:
For each case screened for assigned counsel:
• If assigned counsel, type assigned (e.g., public defender, assigned counsel, private attorney)—in cases where there is a change in counsel, include all assignments
• If assigned counsel, all assignment dates

PRETRIAL SERVICES:
For each case screened/assessed:
• Outcome/recommendation of risk assessment/screening (risk level and score)

COURT:
For each court case:
• If bail/bond set:
  o Type (secure, unsecured, full cash, etc.)
  o Amount
  o Date set
  o If paid/posted: date, amount, and type paid/posted
• Release decision at bail/bond hearing/first appearance (e.g., remand, held on money bail, released on money bail, released on bond, RoR, supervised release, ATI, etc.)
• Arraignment outcome (e.g. continued, disposed, dismissed)
• Dates, types, and outcomes of selected court appearances (including bail/bond hearing/initial appearance, arraignment, disposition, sentencing)
• If diverted/deferred at any point during court processing (including problem-solving court):
  o Referral date
• Disposition (e.g. dismissal, guilty plea, conviction)
• Disposition charges (if different from filing or arraignment)
• If sentenced, sentence type and length

PROBATION AND/OR PAROLE:
For each violation issued:
• If booked into jail custody: date of booking
• Date of final violation disposition
• Final disposition (revoked, restored, etc.)

JAIL:
For jail population snapshot:
• Law enforcement agency admitting person
• Legal status (“current” status—at time of snapshot)
• If held on money bail/bond, amount
• Date/time of admission
• Date/time of booking (if different from admission)
• Risk assessment/classification/custody level (current status)
• Housing unit and cell location (including facility of confinement) (current status)
• All charges associated with jail admission (charge codes, levels, flag for top charge)
• Top/Most Serious Booking/Admission Charge Type (e.g., person, property, drug, public order, sex, violation of probation/parole, other, etc.)
• If sentenced, date, length, type (time served, jail, split) of sentence; sentencing court/jurisdiction
• If probation/parole violator, type of violation (probation/parole; technical/new arrest)
• Flag for individuals who are under the jail's jurisdiction but not confined (some elements in this list will not apply to them)

For jail admissions:
• Law enforcement agency admitting person
• Legal status at admission
• If held on money bail/bond, amount
• Date/time of admission
• Date/time of booking (if different from admission)
• Risk assessment/classification status/custody level at admission
• Assigned housing unit and cell location at admission (including facility of confinement)
• All charges associated with jail admission (charge codes, offense levels, flag for top charge)
• Offense Type for each charge associated with booking/admission (e.g., person, property, drug, public order, sex, violation of probation/parole, other, etc.)
• If released:
  • Date/time of release
  • Type of release (e.g., RoR, release on money bail, release to pretrial supervision, ATI, sentence served, transferred, etc.)
  • If sentenced: date, length, type (time served, jail, split) of sentence; and sentencing court/jurisdiction
  • Risk assessment/classification status/custody level at release
  • All charges associated with release (charge codes, levels, flag for top charge)

II. **Part II: SUPPLEMENTAL DATA REQUESTED BY ISLG IN SELECT SITES (BASED UPON SJC STRATEGY PORTFOLIO AND DATA AVAILABILITY)**

**LAW ENFORCEMENT**
For each summons:
• Date of summons
• Zip code where summons was issued
• Type of summons (e.g. civil, criminal)
• All charges associated with the summons—including charge code and level (misdemeanor, violation, etc.)

For each police diversion:
• Date of diversion
• All charges associated with the diversion
• Name and type of diversion program/service (if applicable)
• Date diversion terminated (if applicable)
• Type of termination (successful/unsuccesful) (if applicable)
• Dates and charges of any subsequent arrests that occur during diversion programming (if applicable)
For each call for service:

- Date of call
- Type/nature of incident (including information about offense, as relevant)
- Flag for incidents involving behavioral health crisis/disturbance
- Responding unit
- Outcome (e.g. arrest, transport to emergency room, referral to service)
- If referral to service, name/type of program/service

PROSECUTOR (OR OTHER CHARGING ENTITY):
For each case received by the prosecutor (or other charging entity):

- Information on any risk assessment completed by the prosecutor

For each prosecutorial diversion:

- Conditions of diversion/deferral (e.g. restitution payments)
- Date diversion terminated (if applicable)
- Type of termination (successful/unsuccessful)
- Any relevant additional detail on conditions met
- Dates and charges of any subsequent arrests that occur during diversion/deferral period (charge codes and levels)

PUBLIC DEFENDER:
For each case screened for assigned counsel:

- Date of arrest
- Date of filing (by prosecutor or other charging entity)
- Date of eligibility screening (for public defender/assigned counsel)
- Outcome of eligibility screening

PRETRIAL SERVICES:
For each case screened/assessed:

- All charges associated with the case (charge code and level—using charges at the point of assessment)
- Date of risk assessment/screening
- Pretrial release recommendation (release, release to supervision, etc.)
- Date of pretrial release recommendation
- Pretrial release decision (by the court)
- Date of pretrial release decision

For each case released to pretrial supervision:

- Enrollment and Termination dates
- Any conditions applied
- Termination type (successful/unsuccessful) and specific conditions met (e.g. restitution paid) as applicable
- Date and charges of any subsequent arrests that occur during supervision (charge codes and levels)
- Dates of any failures to appear that occur during supervision (and associated bench warrants)
COURT:
For each court case:

- Date of filing (by prosecutor or other charging entity)
- All filing charges (charge codes and levels)
- If bail/bond set:
  - If paid/posted: date of release from custody
  - If bail/bond review: date, outcome (bail/bond lowered, eliminated, etc.), and release status following review
- Any further release decisions made
- All arraignment charges (if different from filing)
- Arraignment plea
- Dates of all failures to appear and bench warrants issued
- Dates, types, and outcomes of selected court appearances
- Dates of all adjournments/continuances
- Custody status at selected court appearances (in custody, out of custody)
- Type of counsel present at selected court appearances (e.g. public defender, court-appointed counsel, private attorney)
- If screened for diversion/deferral at any point during court processing: screening date/outcome
- If diverted/deferred at any point during court processing (including problem-solving court):
  - Name and type of diversion/deferral program
  - Any conditions applied
  - Termination date and type (successful/unsuccesful) and specific conditions met (e.g. restitution paid) as applicable
  - Date and charges of any subsequent arrests that occur during diversion/deferral (charge codes and levels)

PROBATION AND/OR PAROLE:
For population snapshot:

- Original charges (code, level, flag for top charge)/sentence (date, type, length)
- Intake date
- Supervision level (if applicable)
- Risk level
- Information on any special supervision conditions (restitution, sex offender registration, etc.)
- Anticipated discharge date

For each violation issued:

- Original charges/sentence (date and type)
- Information on any special supervision conditions (restitution, sex offender registration, etc.)
- Date violation filed
- Type of violation (technical, new arrest, etc.)
- Information on conditions violated
- If booked into jail custody: release
• If diverted to program/service: date of diversion, name and type of program, termination type (successful/unsuccessful); dates and charges of any subsequent arrests that occurred during programming (charge codes and levels)

JAIL:
For jail population snapshot:
• Information on any program participation within jail (name/type of program, date of enrollment, date of termination, type of termination (successful/unsuccessful))
• Flag for mental health

For jail admissions:
• Flag for mental health
• If released:
  o Referrals/connections to services/programming upon release (name/type of service/program, date of referral)
Appendix B:  
Itemized Budget Template

Applicants should use this template to submit a budget. Please include brief statements regarding the purpose of each item, cost assumptions, and other notes related to justifying the costs. More expanded language can and should be used in the budget narrative, particularly regarding the breakdown of team roles and responsibilities and the justification of direct and indirect expenses.

**Project Lead Organization:**

**Project Term:** *(e.g., 12 months)*

**Total Budget:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name &amp; Role</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Actual cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe benefits cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal personnel</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Direct Costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Purpose and Cost Assumptions</th>
<th>Cost per item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal other direct costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal personnel and other direct costs**

**Indirect Costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Purpose and Cost Assumptions</th>
<th>Cost per item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subcontractors and consultants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role and Cost Assumptions</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subcontractor 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcontractor...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal subcontractors/consultants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Appendix C:
Frequent Utilization Population Data
CUNY Institute for State and Local Governance Safety and Justice Challenge Interim Report,
February 2021

ADP for Frequent Utilizers (3+ Bookings in One Year), Baseline Year and Year 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Baseline Year</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>-30%</td>
<td>+8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>-16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>-14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston</td>
<td>-40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mecklenburg</td>
<td>-28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pima</td>
<td>+24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>+8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennington</td>
<td>+29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>-19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>-17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of Overall ADP Attributable to Frequent Utilizers (3+ Bookings in One Year), Baseline Year and Year 3

**Frequent Utilizers (FRUs):** Individuals who have been booked three or more times in a year. Here we compare FRUs for the period of May 2015-April 2016 and May 2018-April 2019.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Baseline Year</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pennington</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multnomah</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mecklenburg</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pima</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix D:

### SJC Site Frequent Utilization Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SJC Site</th>
<th>Strategy Name/Type</th>
<th>Strategy Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Milwaukee    | Mental health strategies                 | Strategy prioritizes hiring a behavioral health liaison to conduct assessments and hiring a forensic discharge coordinator to facilitate reentry planning for people with serious mental health needs.  
(i) Crisis Mobile Teams (CMT) of behavioral health clinicians provide community-based assessment, intervention, and linkage to services in lieu of law enforcement intervention;  
(ii) Crisis Assessment Response Teams (CART) pair law enforcement officers with behavioral health clinicians in specialized units to respond to people in crisis and offer similar assessment, intervention, and service linkage in the community, via partnerships between BHD and several local criminal justice agencies;  
(iii) Crisis Resource Centers (CRC), which provide short-term assessment, stabilization, supportive and recovery services, and may serve as an alternative to arrest. |
|              | Crisis intervention services             | Prioritizes debt collection over incarceration to prevent criminalizing poverty.                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| Palm Beach   | Reduce municipal commitments for unpaid  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
|              |   fines and fees                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| San Francisco| Frequent Users Systems Engagement Project (FUSE) | Targeting homeless individuals with a behavioral health contact and three or more bookings within 12 months. This program provides housing and service referrals with the aim of reducing recidivism among this population. |
|              | Increase Healthy Connections             | Targeting individuals with serious mental illness and/or a history of substance use, including jail bookings identified as "high priority" for housing and public health interventions. Strategy includes building formal partnerships across justice, public health, and housing systems; developing new protocols for clients who touch multiple systems; launching a 24-hour, non-law enforcement behavioral crisis response system; and expediting referrals to community treatment. |
| Charleston   | Familiar Faces                           | Targeting individuals with the highest number of jail bookings over a 12-month period. Strategy prioritizes case conferencing across the Solicitor's Office, jail, and Criminal Justice Coordinating Council. |
| Pennington   | Care Campus                              | Targeting individuals with substance use issues arrested for low-level charges. Facility co-locates detox, residential treatment, crisis care, and other social services within a single complex, which acts as an alternative to jail booking. |
| Cook         | "High Utilizers"                         | Targeting individuals with behavioral health needs and frequent jail placements. Strategy connects frequent utilizations with individuals with lived experience (e.g. in recovery from addiction and with prior criminal justice involvement) to help them navigate criminal justice and treatment systems. |
### Super Users

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name Nbr</th>
<th>Inmate Name</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>975436</td>
<td>HANDY, MICHAEL DAMON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001076</td>
<td>CORTEZ, MANUEL EDGARDO JR.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1443841</td>
<td>CUELLAR, RAYMOND RICHARD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CUELLAR, RAYMOND RICHARD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Native American</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### High Users

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name Nbr</th>
<th>Inmate Name</th>
<th>Bookings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6211</td>
<td>ROMERO, MICHAEL DAVID JR.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23982</td>
<td>INIGO, ROBERT VINCENT JR.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28130</td>
<td>PORTILLO, HENRY ANTONIO SR.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42320</td>
<td>PEREZ, RICHARD SALVADOR</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52552</td>
<td>SMITH, SHELDON DOUGLAS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66321</td>
<td>FRACCARO, JAMES ANTHONY</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93862</td>
<td>SUTTON, DAVID MICHAEL</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118964</td>
<td>BULLOCK, DANIEL ALLEN</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130385</td>
<td>MARTINEZ, JOSEPH JOHN JR.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159774</td>
<td>PAYNE, CHRISTOPHER MICHAEL</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238552</td>
<td>QUIROZ, CARLOS FRANCISCO</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258887</td>
<td>LOCUST, ELIJAH DANIEL</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302208</td>
<td>HOWARD, BRYCE JENNINGS</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316400</td>
<td>LAFITTE, CARL ALLEN</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325415</td>
<td>FLORES, MANUEL CARLOS JR.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326742</td>
<td>WAHL, LIANE MACHELL</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350864</td>
<td>CLEVenger, VALOREE ROSE</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366331</td>
<td>NELSON, GREGORY JR.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371049</td>
<td>SAINZ, MARY ESTHER</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382559</td>
<td>DUNLAP, KODIE ALLEN</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421029</td>
<td>ZAJICEK, MICHELE ANN</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>454640</td>
<td>LANE, TIMOTHY JACK</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>462298</td>
<td>VALENZUELA, RICARDO JR.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477023</td>
<td>HERRERA, GEORGE JR.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500786</td>
<td>ROMero, JOSHUA RICHARD</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>517157</td>
<td>VALDEz, AMOS DELERANDRO</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>556457</td>
<td>POLIN, SILAS JORDAN ZACius</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>568948</td>
<td>SCHUNK, KIMBERLY ANN</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>591778</td>
<td>KNIGHT, JORMONN ARTREZ</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600233</td>
<td>RAMIREz, JOHN PAUL</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RAMIREZ, JOHN PAUL</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>622881</td>
<td>SICGERS, ROBERT MCCulloCH</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>702458</td>
<td>BORTLE, ANDREW SCOTT</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710879</td>
<td>MARTIN, WILLIAM TERRELL</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>720119</td>
<td>ELEM, RANDY RAMON</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>764239</td>
<td>WALKER, STEVEN JOHN</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>775034</td>
<td>BRACAMONTE, ANGEL XAVIER</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>825618</td>
<td>SOMOZa, JUAN CARLOS JR.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>829064</td>
<td>BLOUIN, RYAN JACOB</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>829950</td>
<td>DERRICK, MARY LOUISE SHIDEZHI</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>833664</td>
<td>MARTINEz, ANDREW ROBERT</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>848682</td>
<td>PALLYGA, ANNA</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
875134 ELLICK-TESCHNER, THOR ARION 14
891850 TATE, TYWON DELVON 12
900237 MILLER, NICHOLAS DION 10
900807 BELL, TAVARUS LAMONT 18
960511 IBARRA, IVAN 12
997873 COTNER, SAMANTHA JEANE 12
1042384 BELL, BRENDA LEE 11
1068650 WOODBURY, ROBERT MATTHEW 10
1132020 VILLANUEVA, FERNANDO 10
1152122 WOOD, PATRICIA CARDONA-SEGURA 12
1168012 KOWALSKI, NATHANIEL RAY 10
1178472 OMEGAR, WILLIAM JR. 11
1194976 CRAWFORD, JOHANNA MARIE 11
1206012 MABONE, MOSES ANTHONY 16
1217636 ALVAREZ, ANGEL ABRAHAM 15
1262426 BLIZZARD, BRIAN JOSEPH 10
1302918 CANO, MERCEDES ALLINE 12
1351066 ANDREAS, LEXUS MURGUIA 11
1376299 JUAREZ, HENRY 15
1452307 GONZALEZ, BRIANA ALEXIS 11
1475934 CAPERON, ALBERTO JR. 10
1534715 HERRERA, GABRIEL XAVIER 11
1550358 FISHER, STEPHEN LEROY CHARLES JR. 10
1577686 IACONIS, JOSHUA DAVID 18
1595167 SANCHEZ, CHRISTOPHER JAMES 13
1630412 LOZANO, JASMINE ASHLEY 12
1669109 BUSTAMANTE, HOLIDAY MICHELLE 11
1759451 CILLUFFO, LOUIS ANTHONY 10
1824213 WOODSON, RICHARD TERRY JR. 10
1833161 HOWARD, STEVEN LAWENCE 10
1857586 BLOMMER, SUSAN JO 10
1873914 GLYNN, SHANCE BRYCE 11
1888527 MEDINA-COLON, RAMON ALEXIS 15
1894262 JOHNSON, CHASE HARRINGTON 14
1905254 BANKS, TERRANCE LAMONT 10
1906259 LINNER, CURTIS LAMONT 13
1912785 BOLIVAR, DANIELA RHIANNON 14
1924880 STONEROCK, DAREN ROBERT 16
1928818 CONWAY, CARI ANN 11
1941952 WIESE, KELLIN DEAN 12
1958136 MARQUEZ-VELARADO, RICARDO ALANSO 14
MARQUEZ, ALANSO RICARDO 14
1977574 LOVE, GARY LELAND 13
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Native American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>