

**LOUISVILLE METRO CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMISSION
MEETING SUMMARY**

Thursday, February 19, 2009

Members Present: Judge Judith Bartholomew, Chair; Col. John Aubrey; Richard Badaracco; Evan Roach (Designee for Gary Barnes); Mark Bolton; Sherriall Cunningham; Walker "Critt" Cunningham; Judge Sean Delahanty; Rev. Charles Duncan; Elisa Freeman-Carr; Dan Goyette; Bishop Walter Jones; Carla Kreitman; Richard Lewis; Shane Smith; Dave Stengel; David Tandy; Lt. Jenny Assef (designee for Col. Robert White); and Clarence Williams.

Excused Members: Timothy D. Cox; William DeNardi; Roger Henderson; Candy Hill; David L. Nicholson; and Judge James Shake.

Guests Present: Julie L. Hardesty (Office of the Jefferson County Attorney); Julie Hayes (District Court Administrator); Richard L. O'Malley (Office of the Jefferson County Attorney); Marty Meyer (Congress Yarmuth's Office); and Maurice Risner (Jefferson County Public Schools).

Staff Present: Kim Allen; Faith Augustine; Bruce McMichael; Tracey Neathery; and Stephanie Stidham.

I. WELCOME/CALL TO ORDER

Judge Bartholomew called the meeting to order, welcomed all in attendance, and called for introductions.

II. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY OF NOVEMBER, 20, 2008 MEETING

The summary of the November 20, 2008 meeting was unanimously approved as submitted.

III. SPECIAL PRESENTATION

Criminal Justice Coordinating Councils/Policy Role

Presenter: Kim M. Allen, Mayor's Office Volunteer

Kim M. Allen began by mentioning that she presented this information at a Jail Crowding Conference sponsored by the National Institute of Corrections' in Minnesota. In light of today's planning session, Ms. Allen felt it was important to reemphasize the role and purpose of local coordinating and planning councils. She noted that the primary focus of any Criminal Justice Coordinating Council (CJCC) should be to influence policy and move issues forward.

The Criminal Justice Commission began as a "citizen" commission in 1967 and in 1973 it became a Board comprised of both citizen and governmental agency representatives. Although CJCC's were abundant in the 1970s, they were formed with assistance from federal grant dollars and when the availability of those grant funds diminished, many Councils disbanded. However, many communities realized the importance of CJCC's and since the 1980's there has been a resurgence of coordinating councils formed to address emerging issues facing the local criminal justice system.

Because of the fragmentation of the criminal justice system, it is important to have a coordinating council to provide a neutral forum for individual agencies to collaborate on critical system issues. Ms. Allen gave an example regarding jail crowding where individual agency decisions can impact the entire criminal justice system. A council can apply a systemic methodology to grant opportunities or other budgetary decision making that would allow for enhanced leveraging of limited funding resources.

Additional benefits of a CJCC as reported by Ms. Allen include enhanced collaboration, communication, and information sharing among stakeholders that result in improved programs and services throughout the criminal justice system. On critical issues facing a local community, obtaining consensus among key stakeholders can send a profound message to elected officials which will assist them in making more informed decisions.

Since councils operate from a position of neutrality and build relationships, trust, and credibility, they are able to overcome any concerns regarding loss of discretion, power or funding. A CJCC having a balanced membership and dedicated staff can take specific jurisdictional issues and needs into account when addressing systemic and policy components of the entire local criminal justice system.

IV. DISCUSSION OF CURRENT ACTIVITIES & FUTURE STRATEGIC PRIORITIES

A. Corrections/Jail Policy – Ms. Allen reported that the Jail Policy Committee has reconvened to monitor the implementation of the recommendations of the Metro Corrections: Vision 20/20 Commission. The Commission will be provided regular updates as the Committee progresses.

B. Courts/Proposed District Court Reorganization - Chief District Court Judge Sean Delahanty reported that discussion is continuing regarding changes to the structure and/or operations of District Court. Everything is on the table, and could lead to a total reorganization or just changes in some business practices. All stakeholders are participating in the discussions. It is anticipated that the earliest implementation date for any recommended changes would not occur until 2010.

C. Legislative/Penal Code and Sentencing Reform - Stephanie Stidham thanked members of the Legislative Committee for their work. She referred members to the agenda packet which contained a copy of the report presented to the Governor from the Justice and Public Safety Cabinet entitled "Criminal Justice Reform Review of Kentucky's Criminal Justice System". Specifically, she noted the final approved recommendations contained at the end of the report. The Legislative Committee reviewed these recommendations and reached consensus on 33 of the 41 recommendations and eight were identified as requiring more information/study. A copy of the Committee's review was also included in the agenda packet. Ms. Stidham referred members to the legislative tracking sheet contained in the agenda packet and noted that several bills filed addressed many of the issues contained in the Justice Cabinet's report.

V. REVIEW OF MCJC ORDINANCE/MEMBERSHIP RECOMMENDATIONS

Judge Judith Bartholomew referred to a copy of the ordinance establishing the Metro Criminal Justice Commission. The ordinance also establishes the membership of the Commission by virtue of office as well as those appointed by the Mayor. Members were asked to review the ordinance and consider whether or not the composition of the Commission Board could be enhanced to better address the needs of the local criminal justice system. Recommendations will be discussed at the next meeting.

VI. NEXT STEPS/FUTURE MEETING AGENDAS

Ms. Allen solicited member input regarding planning the agenda for future Commission meetings. She asked members to suggest changes to the meeting format including whether or not presentations should be limited to allow more time for policy discussions. Discussion points raised by members included: reviewing the priority issues identified in the 2007 CJC Survey and designating time to address them; emphasizing the Commission's role in educating the public and advocating for public support regarding the limited governmental resources affecting the criminal justice system; increase media attention to the issues being addressed by the CJC; and reviewing existing agency policies relating to criminal justice issues to determine effectiveness.

VII. ADJOURN/NEXT MEETING

With no further business before the Board, the meeting was adjourned. The next scheduled meeting is Thursday, March 19, 2009 at 2:00 p.m. in the Crown Room of the Judicial Center.