Behavioral Health Justice Reinvestment in Oregon

Presentation to the Senate and House Committees on Judiciary

Tuesday, March 26th, 2019

Steve Allen, Senior Policy Advisored Grace Call, Program Director

Justice Center THE COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS The BHJR project is designed to address system challenges for a population that spans multiple systems in Oregon and establishes local and state partnerships to address them.



The Behavioral Health Justice Reinvestment (BHJR) project is grounded in the shared interest among local, regional, tribal, and state governments to address challenges related to people with serious behavioral health conditions cycling through Oregon's criminal justice and health systems. While BHJR and HB 3194 both use a Justice Reinvestment approach, the projects are unique.

HB 3194 (2013)

- Focused on prison population stabilization
- Leveraged changes in sentencing and county investments to successfully flatten prison growth
- Invested savings from cost avoidance in county initiatives

BHJR (2018)

- Focuses on the outcomes of adults in the criminal justice system who have serious behavioral health conditions
- Driven by collaborative engagement between behavioral health and criminal justice agencies at the county, tribal government, and state levels
- Designed to improve individual and community outcomes through a combination of new investments and more effective utilization of existing resources

32 steering committee members represented a range of perspectives.

Executive agencies

Patrick Allen, Director, Oregon Health Authority (co-chair) Heidi Steward, Assistant Director, Offender Management and Rehabilitation, Oregon Department of Corrections

Judiciary

Suzanne Chanti, Lane County Circuit Court Judge Nan Waller, Multnomah County Circuit Court Judge

Legislature

Mitch Greenlick, State Representative, District 33 Floyd Prozanski, State Senator, District 4 Duane Stark, State Representative, District 4 Elizabeth Steiner Hayward, State Senator, District 17 Jackie Winters, State Senator, District 10

Statewide nonprofits

Andi Easton, Vice President of Government Affairs, Oregon Association of Hospitals and Health Systems Bob Joondeph, Executive Director, Disability Rights Oregon Belinda "Linda" Maddy, Department of Public Safety Standards and Training Crisis Intervention Training Coordinator, Crisis Intervention Teams Center for Excellence Shannon Wight, Deputy Director, Partnership for Safety and Justice

County government

Jason Myers, Sheriff, Marion County *(co-chair)* Kevin Barton, Washington County District Attorney Jim Doherty, Morrow County Commissioner Lee Eby, Jail Captain, Clackamas County Jail Eric Guyer, Director, Jackson County Community Justice Claire Hall, Lincoln County Commissioner Silas Halloran-Steiner, Director, Yamhill County Health and Human Services Allison Knight, Lane County Public Defender Abbey Stamp, Executive Director, Multnomah County Local Public Safety Coordinating Council

Tribal government

Cheryle Kennedy, Chairwoman, The Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde

Community-based nonprofits

Eric Carson, Recovery Mentor Julia Delgado, Director of Programs, Urban League of Portland Janie Gullickson, Executive Director, Mental Health Association of Oregon Sandra Hernandez Lomeli, Youth Programs Director, Latinos Unidos Siempre (L.U.S.) Youth Organization Angel Prater, Executive Director of FolkTime Steve Sanden, Executive Director, Bay Area First Step Paul Solomon, Executive Director, Sponsors, Inc.

A small but significant group of people repeatedly cycle through Oregon's public safety and health systems with broad system and personal impacts.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE FINDINGS

- In 2017, 9 percent of people booked into the 12 counties that provided jail data accounted for 29 percent of all booking events.
- These 5,397 people with frequent criminal justice involvement (FCJI) were booked into jail 4 to 19 times a year.
- While felony drug possession and property crimes were common for the FCJI group, only 2 percent of FCJI bookings in 2017 on felony-level offenses were against persons.
- Almost 80 percent of FCJI people had some history of community corrections supervision.
- Two-thirds of FCJI people scored as high risk for recidivism on community corrections instruments.

HEALTH CARE FINDINGS

Two-thirds of FCJI people are Oregon Health Plan (OHP) members and are

- 150 percent more likely to visit emergency departments compared to other OHP members;
- 650 percent more likely to have a substance use disorder diagnosis, 75 percent more likely to have a mental health diagnosis, and 533 percent more likely to have a dual diagnosis compared to the other OHP members; and

OTHER FINDINGS

- People with FCJI are more than 3 times as likely than the general jail population to have an Oregon State Hospital stay.
- People with FCJI are much more likely to be homeless than the general jail population.

Source: CSG analysis of calendar year 2017 jail bookings data from Clackamas, Deschutes, Gilliam, Hood River, Jackson, Marion, Morrow, Multnomah, Sherman, Umatilla, Wasco, and Washington counties. Hood River, Gilliam, Sherman and Wasco counties are represented by NORCOR jail; Oregon State Hospital analysis of 2017 jail bookings data matched with OSH admission/release and OHP records matched by Integrated Client Services (ICS) of the Oregon Health Authority.

Financial impact estimates for people with complex behavioral health conditions cycling through Oregon's criminal justice and health care systems.



* Oregon State Hospital aid and assist cases are people who are transferred from the criminal justice system to the state hospital are commonly known as aid and assist cases (.370s), people who are charged with a crime and sent to the Oregon State Hospital to receive restoration competency services to help them aid and assist in their own legal defense.

Overview of the Behavioral Health Justice Reinvestment State-Run Grant Program

WHAT DOES THE PROGRAM SUPPORT? HOW IS THE PROGRAM FUNDED?

Examples could include:

- Supportive housing
- Mobile crisis services
- Employment supports
- Care coordination

- Case management
 Medications
- Workforce
- Training
- Crisis units
 Sobering/detox centers

WHO APPLIES?

- Counties
- Tribal nations
- Regional consortiums

Communities assess local program support gaps for target population and submit requests to fund plans

County or Tribal State Nation Match Investment

WHO OVERSEES THE PROGRAM?

BHJR Oversight Committee

Co-chaired by the

Criminal Justice Commission (CJC) &

the Oregon Health Authority (OHA)

HOW IS PERFORMANCE MEASURED?

Establish a statewide system of continuous quality improvement anchored in clear, simple, meaningful performance measures, such as:

- Reduce jail bookings, emergency department visits, and state hospital admissions
- 2. Improve stable housing
- 3. Improve stable employment
- 4. Improve recovery goals

OHA disperses
health care
funds

costs from lower use of jails, hospitals, and homeless services.

Cost-analysis from FUSE study

FUSE II intervention \$23,290

 including \$14,624 annual investment in wrap-around supportive service and costs

Overall, FUSE participants had less spending on:

- Jails + shelters: \$8,372 less
- Medical, mental health + addiction service costs: \$7,308 less

\$15,680 less per person in FUSE These cost avoidances virtually offset the entire cost of the wrap-around services.



SB 973 and HB 3281 BHJR Project Investments: Building from a Pilot to Statewide Approach

FY2020–2021 Funding Categories for the BHJR Grant Program

Category	Funding	Description
TOTAL BHJR Grant Program	\$23.05M	Includes costs for supports and services, statewide program supports, program evaluation, program administration, and supportive housing.
Supports and Services	\$3.8M	The supports and services for the target population not funded through Medicaid or other means. Examples could include, but are not limited to, mobile crisis services, peer- delivered services, care coordination, and detox centers. At least 72 percent of the total allocation of funding will go towards supports and services.
Statewide Program Supports	\$760K	Up to 20 percent of the total allocation to fund statewide access to specific program technical assistance supporting the BHJR program. Examples include grantee preproposal and implementation technical assistance, particularly for developing supportive housing proposals and technical assistance for troubleshooting program data collection requirements and information sharing between relevant parties.
Program Evaluation	\$190K	5 percent of the total allocation to fund ongoing costs related to the program evaluation, reporting, and delivery of data to drive local practice
Program Administration	\$700K	A percentage of the total allocation set aside for state staffing to administer the program.
Supportive Housing* One-time capital investment, on-going rental assistance, and wrap-around services	\$17.6M	Capital financing for supportive housing, which can include land/property acquisition, development, and construction. On-going costs of operating funding /rental assistance, which can include costs for building operations and maintenance, property management (operating), or private market rent (rental assistance), as well as supportive services staffing costs associated with case management and interdisciplinary teams.

*The supportive housing cost includes a one-time cost for construction and ongoing cost for rental assistance and wraparound services. For the initial pilot phase, construction costs will be \$13.5M and \$4.05M to cover rental assistance and wraparound services.

Summary of Multi-Year Funding Request

	FY 2020-2021	FY 2022-2023	FY 2024-2025
Target population	500 people	2,000 people	5,145 people
Program	\$5.5M	\$21.9M	\$56.7M
Supportive Housing Total	\$17.6M	\$58.1M	\$131.6.9M
One-time grants Rental Assistance		\$40.5M \$7.9M	\$84.9M \$20.7M
Services and Supports		\$9.7M	\$26.0M
Total investments	\$23.0M	\$80.0M	\$188.3M
TTL One-Time Housing Grants (from above)	\$13.5M	\$40.5M	\$84.9M

If policy goals are enacted, state leaders have the opportunity to request additional technical assistance to implement justice reinvestment policies.

12 months	12-18 months post-enactment
PHASE I	PHASE II
Analyze data to design policy	Oregon implements policy changes
 changes CSG and Oregon: Collect and examine data Engage stakeholders Develop policy options Draft legislation / bill 	 Oregon: Develops implementation plan Plans for and allocate reinvestment funds Oregon receives implementation assistance from CSG
 passage Plan for implementation of policy goals Draft and pass justice reinvestment legislation 	 CSG: Delivers targeted technical assistance, providing expertise and support for effective implementation Work together to measure impacts
	 CSG and Oregon: Set-up and monitor data metrics Adjust implementation strategy as needed

Oregon reports data for two years after Phase II

Thank You

Cassondra Warney Senior Policy Analyst cwarney@csg.org



Receive monthly updates about justice reinvestment states across the country as well as other CSG Justice Center Programs.

Sign up at: csgjusticecenter.org/subscribe

This material was prepared for the State of Oregon. The presentation was developed by members of The Council of State Governments Justice Center staff. Because presentations are not subject to the same rigorous review process as other printed materials, the statements made reflect the views of the authors, and should not be considered the official position of the Justice Center, the members of The Council of State Governments, or the funding agency supporting the work.

Cover image by M.O. Stevens at en.wikipedia [Public domain], via Wikimedia Commons. 12