

CABARRUS COUNTY JUVENILE CRIME PREVENTION COUNCIL Allocation and Funding Committee Meeting April 6, 2022 (via Webex) MINUTES

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Megan BaumgardnerSonja Bohannon-ThackerMark BolesSteve GrossmanConnie PhilbeckBeth Street

David Wall

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Perry Gabriel, Rodney Harris, Steve Morris

OTHER COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: LaShay Avery, Brian Heintz, Michelle Wilson

OTHERS PRESENT: Darryl Bego (YDI), Kim Castano (Aspire), Shannon Chambers (TYM), Chef Kimberly (Aspire), Douglas Greene (KRE8ivU), Rachel Grossman-Zack (Guardian ad Litem District Administrator), Reggie McNeil (TYM), Laura McRae (Pinnacle Family Services), Sarimar Miller (Court Counselor Supervisor), Claude Whitfield (TYM)

JCPC ASSOCIATES PRESENT: Daniel Sevigny, Joanie Bischer

Committee Chair Megan Baumgardner opened the meeting at 7:59 a.m. Attendance was taken silently via Webex participant log-in. Seven committee members and three council members attended.

Megan advised the Committee's goal is to develop funding recommendations for Council's consideration on April 20. She stated funding requests for Fiscal Year 2022-23 total \$499,201. This exceeds Cabarrus JCPC's available funds of \$459,927 by \$39,274. Megan expressed appreciation to the programs in attendance. She asked program managers to respond to questions when asked but to otherwise remain silent during committee discussions. Daniel Sevigny shared a funding request spreadsheet specific to Cabarrus County applicants on screen. It contained two blank columns for Recommendation Options 1 and 2.

The process began with Option 1. Megan suggested first allocating funds to programs that consistently require funding and then to discuss allocation of remaining funds. There was no opposition to this plan. It was suggested that the maximum dollars available for JCPC administrative expense be allocated. In addition, it was suggested that the full requests of Fostering Solutions Crisis Beds and Sex Offenders Specific Evaluation & Treatment (SOSET) be allocated. If JCPC doesn't fund these programs, there is no ability to provide such services. Further, providing funding for Restitution & Community Service and Teen Court is required. It was suggested these programs be allocated at their full request as they need to function at maximum capacity.

The Committee's discussion then shifted to how the balance of county funds within Option 1 can be responsibly allocated across remaining requests. To gain clarity around each program's performance thus far this fiscal year, Daniel provided number of youth admitted to date, number of youth served to date, and number of youth committed to be served. Based on that data, Mark Boles provided each program's percentage of goal attainment to date. Among other factors considered to determine Option 1 allocations were the following:

- The impact of COVID restrictions to a program's ability to meet targeted numbers,
- How a program's performance might change as COVID restrictions recede,
- The likelihood a program will meet/exceed its targeted number of youth to be served next year,
- The impact to programs from Raise the Age legislation,
- JCPC's obligation to prioritize programs that provide needed services for Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) referred youth,
- The programs most often selected by DJJ court counselors based on youth assessment tools,
- A program's average cost per child when compared to state averages.

With additional information provided by Daniel regarding program performance and DJJ referrals, the above process was repeated to determine Option 2 allocations.

Several members expressed regret in reducing the funding request of any particular program. It was mentioned that all the programs and services provided have value. Several members suggested equity in cuts across all funding requests. After further discussion, Michelle Wilson proposed adding another recommendation option, with a caveat that should a program have excess funds to revert to the state, the Council can determine whether other programs would benefit from those funds. There was no opposition to this proposal. Option 3 was then discussed and created.

Megan called for other comments or discussion. Hearing and seeing none, Michelle motioned that Option 3 be presented to the full council. Mark seconded. Megan required members to vote verbally or via chat. With no further discussion, the motion to recommend Option 3 to the full Council carried without opposition. (**Note:** The Committee's final funding worksheet is embedded in this document below and forms a part of these Minutes. It is also included in the April meeting packet.)

Megan expressed appreciation for members' time and efforts. She again expressed appreciation to programs present. She urged Council/Committee members and program managers present on April 20 to speak out when questions arise from the full Council regarding how three options for funding allocations were determined. Daniel advised that two-year funding remains available in FY 22-23. With no further comments or discussion, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 9:55 a.m.

Submitted by Joanie Bischer



(To open and view the Worksheet, double-click on the object then maximize the Worksheet on screen.)