



Work Session Item 3 Travis County Commissioners Court Agenda Request

Meeting Date: 27 September 2012

Prepared By/Phone Number: Tonya Mills, Planning Manager, Justice and Public Safety - 854-4755

Elected/Appointed Official/Dept. Head: Roger Jefferies, County Executive, Justice and Public Safety – 854-4415

Commissioners Court Sponsor: Samuel Biscoe, County Judge

AGENDA LANGUAGE: Review and discuss the Mental Health Public Defender Cost-Benefit Analysis.

BACKGROUND/SUMMARY OF REQUEST AND ATTACHMENTS:

The MHPDO, consisting of 2 attorneys and 4 case management staff, along with 2 support staff, work with severely mentally ill misdemeanor defendants in Travis County's criminal justice system. Their overarching objectives as set out in the beginning of the office are to:

- Minimize the number of days a person with mental illness spends in jail.
- Reduce recidivism by providing intensive case management services.
- Increase the number of dismissals among defendants with mental illness
- Enhance legal representation by providing attorneys with specialized knowledge needed to defend persons with mental illness.

In June 2011, Justice and Public Safety presented the first part of an evaluation of the MHPDO that illustrated how the office was meeting these objectives. We then committed to complete a second part of the evaluation to examine the MHPDO's return on investment. The report which follows provides a brief summary of the first part of the evaluation and goes on to

AGENDA REQUEST DEADLINE: All agenda requests and supporting materials must be submitted as a single pdf to Cheryl Aker in the County Judge's office, Cheryl.Aker@co.travis.tx.us by **Tuesdays at 5:00 p.m.** for the next week's meeting.

estimate the cost savings and avoidances for the County generated by the MHPDO, and makes recommendations for future investments in the office.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

See attached document.

ISSUES AND OPPORTUNITIES:

See attached document.

FISCAL IMPACT AND SOURCE OF FUNDING:

See attached document.

REQUIRED AUTHORIZATIONS:

N/A

AGENDA REQUEST DEADLINE: All agenda requests and supporting materials must be submitted as a single pdf to Cheryl Aker in the County Judge's office, Cheryl.Aker@co.travis.tx.us by **Tuesdays at 5:00 p.m.** for the next week's meeting.

Tonya Mills

From: Tammy Meredith <meredith@ars-corp.com>
Sent: Friday, September 07, 2012 11:23 AM
To: Roger Jefferies; Tonya Mills
Cc: Peggy Burke
Subject: stellar research reports

Hi Roger & Tonya –

Thank you for sharing a copy of the your recent publication, *Mental Health Public Defender Office Cost-Benefit Analysis, 2012*. This report truly stands out as one of the best examples of cost-benefit studies undertaken in the criminal justice field – showing empirically that real programs can have a real impact. Your methodology is top notch, and Tonya’s analysis is not only scientifically sound but programmatically thought provoking. As your Justice Department technical assistance advisor on research and data analysis I plan to brag you up and share your work as one of the finest examples of sound research we’ve seen in the local justice reinvestment arena. I’m very proud of your work, as you both should be as well!

Best wishes,
Tammy

Tammy Meredith, Ph.D.

Applied Research Services, Inc.

663 Ethel Street, NW
Atlanta, GA 30318
(404) 881-1120 x106
(404) 881-8998 fax

www.ars-corp.com



Tonya Mills

From: Lachman, Pamela <PLachman@urban.org>
Sent: Monday, September 10, 2012 3:12 PM
To: Roger Jefferies; Tonya Mills
Cc: NLaVigne@urban.org; Ho, Helen; LCramer@urban.org
Subject: MHPDO cost-benefit mention in JRLI toolkit

Hi Roger and Tonya,

As I mentioned on the phone to Tonya, we've summarized the Travis County MHPDO cost benefit analysis in the local justice reinvestment toolkit for planners (currently under review with the JRI TA providers). Below is the text, which will appear in a sidebar in the toolkit:

[SIDEBAR: COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS OF SPECIAL POPULATIONS

Few jurisdictions have the internal analytic capacity to conduct a comprehensive analysis of the costs of a specific population within the criminal justice system, and to assess the potential benefit of reducing the population's recidivism and further contact with the criminal justice system. One jurisdiction that has this capacity is Travis County, TX (one of three local jurisdictions that served as a pilot site for local justice reinvestment, and is currently engaged in Phase II of the Justice Reinvestment Initiative). Planners in the Travis County Justice and Public Safety Division conducted a cost-benefit analysis of the county's mental health public defender office, which provides legal and case management services to individuals with a diagnosed mental illness and existing charges in the local criminal justice system.¹ The cost-benefit analysis identified the marginal costs of incarcerating the program clients, since their incarceration costs are dramatically higher than the costs of housing an individual without additional supervision and medication needs, and showed that the program was able to reduce recidivism and jail bed day consumption among this population to the point where the office is expected to become cost-beneficial after six years of operating.²]

Notes:

¹Mills, T. & Calkins, E. (2012). Mental Health Public Defender Cost-Benefit Analysis, 2012. Austin, TX: Travis County Justice and Public Safety Division.

²The reason the program took six years to become cost-beneficial is that the program needed to serve enough people (304 clients) to garner a large enough reduction in jail bed day consumption that it resulted in an overall reduction in the average daily population in the jail. As discussed earlier in this section, marginal cost savings only have tangible budgetary implications when they are associated with a population reduction.

Here is the forthcoming citation: Lachman, P., Neusteter, S.R., & Davies, E. (Forthcoming). The Criminal Justice Planner's Toolkit for Justice Reinvestment at the Local Level. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

I've cc-ed Nancy, Helen Ho and Lindsey Cramer of the Urban Institute, who are going to help finish up the document as soon as we hear back from the JRI TA providers.

Let me know if you have any questions. Thanks very much!

Research Associate
Justice Policy Center
The Urban Institute
2100 M Street NW
Washington, DC 20037
Tel: 202.261.5514
Fax: 202.296.2252
Email: plachman@urban.org

Click here to sign up for the Justice Policy Center newsletter:
<http://www.urban.org/center/jpc/signup-jpc-newsletters.cfm>



Mental Health Public Defender Office Cost-Benefit Analysis 2012



Justice and Public Safety

*Roger Jefferies,
County Executive*

*PO Box 1748 Austin, Texas
78767*

(512) 854-4415

7/2/2012

Report and Analysis:

Tonya Mills, Planning Manager

Eric Calkins, Senior Planner

Data and Contributing Analysis:

Cory Cameron, Financial Analyst

Meg Seville, Travis County Sheriff's Office

Danny Smith, Travis County Sheriff's Office

Maria Wedhorn, Travis County Sheriff's Office

Travis Gatlin, Planning and Budget Office

This page is intentionally blank

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS..... 1

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY..... 2

THE MENTALLY ILL IN THE TRAVIS COUNTY CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM..... 4

AVAILABLE TOOLS TO ADDRESS THE MENTALLY ILL IN TRAVIS COUNTY..... 4

MHPDO - PART I HIGHLIGHTS..... 6

PART II ANALYSIS: Additional Legal Analysis and Comparison to the Wheel..... 8

MHPDO Case Management..... 9

Days Since Last Released..... 11

RETURN ON INVESTMENT USING OUR TOOLS..... 13

Estimating Costs/Savings Associated with Jail Bed Day Reductions..... 13

Targeted Reductions in Bookings & Arrests..... 15

Targeted Reductions in Arrests and Lengths of Stay..... 16

Estimating Costs Savings or Cost Avoidances Generated by the MHPDO..... 16

How the MHPDO Achieves These Results and How These Results Can Be Expanded..... 18

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS..... 22

APPENDIX A..... 23

This page is intentionally blank

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Travis County is doing something right. Our jail population, which, as recently as 2008 averaged in the 2,600 range in daily population, is now hovering consistently in the 2,200 to 2,300 hundred range in daily population. This is occurring as bookings have been flat over the same period. A number of innovative initiatives established over the last several years by the District Attorney, the County Attorney, the Criminal Courts, Criminal Justice Planning, and other justice partners can be credited for this sustained reduction. Perhaps the most creative of the initiatives which have impacted our jail population is the Mental Health Public Defender Office (MHPDO) established in 2007. The MHPDO is one of the first of its kind in the country. The MHPDO, consisting of 2 attorneys and 4 case management staff, along with 2 support staff, work with severely mentally ill misdemeanor defendants in Travis County's criminal justice system. Their overarching objectives as set out in the beginning of the office are to:

- Minimize the number of days a person with mental illness spends in jail.
- Reduce recidivism by providing intensive case management services.
- Increase the number of dismissals among defendants with mental illness
- Enhance legal representation by providing attorneys with specialized knowledge needed to defend persons with mental illness.

In June 2011, Justice and Public Safety presented the first part of an evaluation of the MHPDO that illustrated how the office was meeting these objectives. We then committed to complete a second part of the evaluation to examine the MHPDO's return on investment. The report which follows provides a brief summary of the first part of the evaluation and goes on to estimate the cost savings and avoidances for the County generated by the MHPDO, and makes recommendations for future investments in the office.

In summary, the analysis revealed that over the last five and a half years, 304 clients of the MHPDO, who would have likely been rearrested and returned to jail sometime in that period, remained arrest and jail free. This has resulted in annual jail bed day savings, aggregating to 16,233 jail bed days in FY2011, which translates into 44.5 people in the jail's ADP. The jail bed day savings coupled with other quantifiable costs have created a cost avoidance of \$1,199,123. During the same period the County has invested \$1,375,000 in the operations of the office resulting in a net cost of \$175,000 to provide an increased quality of legal representation, as well as critical case management services for this vulnerable population.

Based on the estimates of continued cost avoidances in the analysis, the MHPDO should break even, meaning the cost avoidances will have become greater than the county monetary investment, in FY 2013 and should continue positive returns on investment going forward. It also should be noted, while not included in the overall cost avoidance analysis in the report, had the ADP of this mentally ill population not been reduced by the 44.5 as a result of the success of the MHPDO, it is likely the jail would have had to open an additional unit for mentally ill inmates at a cost of \$600,000 annually.

One of the keys to success for the MHPDO, in addition to the collaborative legal strategies employed by the MHPDO attorneys and Travis County's mental health court, has been the presence of two social workers and two case workers. These dedicated county staff work with this very difficult population to navigate the County's complex systems to provide housing, medication, clinic visits, and other vital services which help keep their clients out of the criminal justice system. With the ongoing growth in their caseload over the last five and a half years, the MHPDO's case management staff has built up caseloads of 60 to 70 each. This high level of caseload has become unsustainable. Within a broader staffing plan for the next three years, we are recommending in the report that follows that the County consider funding an additional case manager for FY 2013. This will allow the existing staff to reduce their caseloads to a more manageable 40 to 50 cases and allow for the recognition that case management period for this population often exceeds the original estimate of 120 days following the disposition of the client's case.

THE MENTALLY ILL IN THE TRAVIS COUNTY CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

Travis County, like many local jurisdictions throughout the nation, has grappled with mentally ill individuals in the criminal justice system for some time. It has been noted that as states began to cut funding for mental health and reduce state hospital beds, more and more individuals with mental illnesses became engaged in the criminal justice system and began filling beds in local jails.

The Treatment Advocacy Center reports that as a result of deinstitutionalization and funding cuts, **more persons with mental illness are in jails and prisons than are in hospitals. Nearly 300,000 individuals with schizophrenia or bipolar disorder are in jails and prisons nationally. This represents 16% of the total inmate population. Today, fewer than 70,000 individuals with schizophrenia or bipolar disorder are in state psychiatric hospitals receiving treatment for their disease.**¹ Additionally, the Treatment Advocacy center reports that nearly 1/3rd of the estimated 600,000 homeless are individuals with schizophrenia or bipolar disorder.¹

In Travis County, between December 31, 2008 and December 31, 2011, there have been 9,470 people booked in to the Travis County Jail with a mental health diagnosis. These individuals accounted for 14,709 bookings, or an average of 1.55 bookings per person. Of these persons evaluated over the last three years, 27%, or 2,570 people, had two or more bookings (an average of 3.04 bookings per person) and were defined as a “frequently incarcerated” population. The “frequently incarcerated” population stayed in custody for an average of 43.99 days, consuming a total of 343,554 jail bed days (JBDs), which accounts for roughly 314 people in the average daily jail population. This means that some combination of approximately 12% of the “frequently incarcerated” mentally ill sample has been in custody every day for the last three years.

AVAILABLE TOOLS TO ADDRESS THE MENTALLY ILL IN TRAVIS COUNTY

In Austin and Travis County, a number of programs and initiatives have been established to address the ongoing challenges of persons with mental illness in the criminal justice system. These programs include:

County Funded or Co-Funded Programs:

- *MCOT – Mobile Crisis Outreach Unit*
- *CIT (Crisis Intervention Team)*
- *Road to Recovery*
- *Mental Health Docket*
- *Mental Health Public Defender Office*
- *Travis County Sheriff’s Office (Psychiatric and Mental Health programming)*

Non-County Funded Programs:

- *DACC – Downtown Austin Community Court*

¹ <http://www.treatmentadvocacycenter.org/a-failed-history>

- ***Probation Programs***

Combined, these tools constitute the Travis County “toolbox” that can be used to address the needs of persons with mental illness and to address the growing concern/impact of these individuals within the criminal justice system.

MHPDO - PART I HIGHLIGHTS

This section is a brief summary of the findings from the initial Cost-Benefit Analysis presented in May 2011. The data presented in this section remains as it was in that document. Further analysis and additional data will be discussed later in the report.

Part one of the MHPDO Cost Benefit Analysis found that the Mental Health Public Defender Office was meeting the objectives that were set at the office's inception. The office has also added value through new objectives developed from lessons learned and best-practices adoption while pioneering the office.

As defined in the charter of the MHPDO in 2007, the objectives of the MHPDO are to:

- Minimize the number of days a person with mental illness spends in jail
- Reduce recidivism by providing intensive case management services
- Increase the number of dismissals among defendants with mental illness
- Enhance legal representation by providing attorneys with specialized knowledge needed to defend persons with mental illness

For the purposes of this cost-benefit analysis we examined the objectives set at the foundation of the MHPDO, the new objectives developed from lessons learned and best-practices adoption while pioneering the office, and other key performance indicators to more deeply study the execution of the MHPDO. Since inception through March 2011, the MHPDO has been appointed to **1,236 legal cases** (735 clients) and has had **1,762 case management** referrals (562 through social referrals).

The cost-benefit analysis looked at these cases and associated appointments and has concluded that the MHPDO has successfully achieved most of its original objectives including a reduction in jail bed days, an increase in dismissals, a reduction in recidivism and enhanced knowledge about persons with mental illness.

- Of the 735 MHPDO legal clients evaluated, the number of bookings post-MHPDO involvement has decreased by 38% and jail bed days consumed has decreased by 13% between 2001 and 2011
 - During the same time frame, the average number of days between bookings is 129 days, up from 122 prior to appointment to MHPDO
 - The average number of days since last released from jail for MHPDO clients is 517 days
 - Of the MHPDO clients evaluated since inception; 39% have not been rearrested in one to five years
 - A total jail bed day reduction was realized during the period evaluated, equating to a decrease of 7 inmates per day in the average daily jail population
- Through social referrals from private attorneys, case managers within MHPDO have served 562 clients; of the clients evaluated post-MHPDO involvement, bookings were reduced by 57% and jail bed days consumed decreased by 20%
 - During the same time frame, the average number of days between bookings for social referrals is 126 pre-MHPDO, and 103 post-MHPDO

- The average number of days since last released from jail for MHPDO clients for social referrals is 385 days
- Of the MHPDO social referral clients evaluated, 21% have not been rearrested in one to five years
- A total jail bed day reduction was realized during the period evaluated, equating to a decrease of 8 inmates per day in the average daily jail population
- Forty two percent (42%) of the legal cases closed were closed as dismissals
 - The average length of stay for MHPDO clients is 16.5 days for Class A misdemeanors compared to 19.4 days for non-MHPDO mentally ill inmates
 - The average length of stay for MHPDO clients is 9.8 days for Class B misdemeanors compared to 11.4 days for non-MHPDO mentally ill inmates
 - The average length of stay on misdemeanor charges for incompetent MHPDO clients was reduced by 28.6 days in FY11 over FY10

The MHPDO has also shown to have had a constructive impact on the culture and development of how the Courts and MH Wheel do business, namely in the MHPDO's execution of an unrestrained, "hands-on" forensic case management. Their distinctive case management methodology has resulted in increased quality of life and sustained connection to services for MHPDO clients, and accounts for the decrease in recidivism rates. These findings are further substantiated in Mental Health Stakeholder surveys and independent review from The Spangenburg Project (TSP), as well as a recent Texas Task Force on Indigent Defense study, both available from our office upon request. While noticeable inroads have been made in quality outcomes for the majority of MHPDO clients, 10.7% (79 of the 735 evaluated) have proven to be chronic offenders (clients with ten or more arrests post-MHPDO involvement) who are non-responsive to the Office's case management methodologies, and have historically been to be difficult to stabilize.

PART II ANALYSIS: Additional Legal Analysis and Comparison to the Wheel

Following phase one of the MHPDO cost benefit analysis, additional legal analysis was conducted to further compare the legal representation provided by the MHPDO to that provided by private attorneys through the Mental Health Wheel (Wheel).

Court data which highlights all mental health cases appointed between June 2005 through June 2011 demonstrated that the MHPDO is able to reach legal disposition in their cases approximately two times faster than Wheel attorneys. The table below outlines these findings by charge level.

Table 1: Average Days to Disposition, June 2005 through June 2011

<i>Charge Level</i>	<i>MHPDO</i>	<i>Wheel</i>
<i>Class A Misdemeanor</i>	30.25	69.75
<i>Class B Misdemeanor</i>	19.56	41.62
<i>Misdemeanor Undetermined</i>	29.58	66.09

Source: Travis County Criminal Courts

Also reviewed were the dismissal rates of both Wheel attorneys and the MHPDO. Since inception through January 31, 2012, the MHPDO has had 904 clients and been appointed to 1,546 legal cases. In part one analysis, MHPDO data revealed a 42% dismissal rate since inception. This is consistent with findings from the analysis of court data where the MHPDO dismissal rate was 39% and Wheel attorneys are 22%. A 3-5% error rate can be applied, because once there is a finding of incompetence, most cases are transferred to the MHPDO and the attorney of record is often not changed in the court system. This can skew the dismissal rates.

In Table 2 below, MHPDO data related to dismissal rates for each fiscal year are shown without the error rate adjustment:

Table 2: MHPDO Legal Case Outcomes FY10 through FY12 (To date)

	FY10		FY11		FY12TD*	
	Total	Pct.	Total	Pct.	Total	Pct.
Legal Cases Accepted	358	-	346	-	152	-
Legal Cases Closed	368	103%**	338	97%	151	99%
<i>Dismissed</i>	155	42%	143	42%	72	49%
<i>Plea Agreement</i>	174	48%	155	46%	66	44%
<i>Re-Appointed</i>	27	7%	22	7%	3	2%
<i>Convicted at Trial</i>	0	-	0	-	0	-
<i>Acquitted</i>	0	-	0	-	0	-
<i>Other</i>	11	3%	18	5%	7	5%

*As of February 29, 2012.

**Case closures can include legal cases that were initiated in a prior fiscal year.

These are measurable outcomes that speak to the increased quality of representation via the MHPDO. It is believed that there are also cost avoidances realized by the Courts which are generated by the MHPDO as a result of the decreased days to legal disposition. However, a sound methodology for doing this analysis should be developed by Justice and Public Safety, Criminal Courts Administration and the Planning and Budget Office. Historically, it has been difficult to distinguish between in jail and out of jail

cases within the court systems. Making this distinction clear would be necessary to conduct an accurate analysis, as not all of the cases are in jail at the time of legal disposition. Criminal Courts Administration is bringing a software and business intelligence package (Zone 4) online soon, which will make these kinds of analyses possible in the future.

The last piece of comparative analysis between the legal representation of the MHPDO and the private attorneys through the Mental Health Wheel was the cost of legal representation. Based on the same court data, Wheel attorney invoice amounts were reviewed to capture the average invoice submitted. The average invoice was \$186.95.

It is difficult to conduct an “apples to apples” comparison of the legal representation provided by the MHPDO and the Wheel attorneys. The MHPDO budget includes the office’s social workers and case management team who are often tasked with assisting Wheel attorneys in understanding a client’s diagnosis, developing plans and resources for clients upon release.

Additionally, case acceptance for the MHPDO attorneys can be limited when the case management team is at or near capacity, making it difficult to impossible for the office to effectively bring down the cost for legal representation through taking additional cases. Currently, it is estimated that the cost for legal representation in the MHPDO is \$635 per case, accounting for the two attorney’s salaries. Including the support staff in the office, but excluding the case management team (as they also provide some support to Wheel attorneys), the cost per case is \$941.

On the surface this cost comparison seems to present a wide variation from the cost of Wheel attorneys. It is important to note the cost savings generated by the office as a whole through both expedited legal work and ongoing community support from the case management team. Later sections in this report consider additional savings generated and offsets the overall cost of the office by these savings.

MHPDO Case Management

The data discussed in the next section suggests that intense, dedicated case management is one key to the success of the MHPDO. Since inception through January 31, 2012, the MHPDO case management team has had 2,149 referrals (603 through social referrals). The level of engagement and “hands on” support provided by the MHPDO case management staff are some of the factors that differentiate them from other resources in the community.

It is important to note that the original targets for caseloads, for both legal cases and social referrals, have shifted as the office has matured. The clients that the MHPDO serves are often severely and persistently mentally ill; often their clients are found incompetent. These cases have been found to require more intensive case management, both while clients are incarcerated and upon reentry, than originally anticipated.

When the MHPDO was designed, it estimated that the two attorneys in the office would serve 400 legal cases per year and that the team of four case management staff would work with clients for 120 days following the disposition of the legal case. The office took 346 legal cases in FY11, which was short of the 400-case target. As case management caseloads began to exceed reasonable levels, attorneys found that they had to slow the rate of new case acceptance in order to prevent overwork and degradation of service on the part of the case management team. The case load for the MHPDO case management staff has risen since the start of FY11, which ended with an average caseload per caseworker of 58. As of February 29, 2012, the average caseload per caseworker for FY12 was 68. The

high across the last two fiscal years was a staggering 73, occurring in December, 2011. The MHPDO typically serves high-needs clients at Levels of Care (LOC) III and IV. As a comparison, as of May 2011, caseloads within the Austin-Travis County Integral Care (ATCIC) program, which serves clients with similar diagnoses and characteristics, were lower, at 20.31 per caseworker for LOC III and 8.65 per caseworker for LOC IV.

The data we have suggests that caseloads in the MHPDO do not need to be as low as they are at ATCIC. Caseloads in the 40-50 per caseworker range seem reasonable and sustainable. *It is worth noting that the 73 cases per caseworker average caseload that occurred in December, 2011 was nearly double the high end of the suggested range. Furthermore, the MHPDO has not seen average monthly caseloads below 47 in the last two fiscal years on record.*

As of February 29, 2012, the MHPDO case management team had a total of 266 active cases, open for an average of 201 days. With an average of 25 days to legal disposition of cases, this means that on average, the case management team currently follows clients for 176 days, post-disposition.

Table 3 below demonstrates an effect of maintaining cases for an adequate time to stabilize clients. Even as referrals drop somewhat, the average active caseload nonetheless increases from year to year:

Table 3: MHPDO Case Management Caseloads

Caseworker Data	FY10		FY11		FY12(TD)*	
	Total	Pct.	Total	Pct.	Total	Pct.
Total Client Referrals	513	-	438	-	190	-
MHPDO Legal	358	70%	346	79%	152	80%
Social Referral	155	30%	92	21%	38	20%
Avg. # of Cases Open to CM Svcs.	216	-	232	-	273	-
MHPDO Legal	146	68%	165	71%	209	77%
Social Referral	70	32%	67	29%	64	23%
Average Active Caseload	54	-	58	-	68	-

*Through February 29, 2012

There are several points to note about the data in Table 3. First, the lengthy engagement of case management with clients is beginning to have a pronounced effect on caseloads in 2012. While incoming referrals are tracking only slightly above where they were in February of FY11 (190 in FY 12 vs. 180 in FY11) there are more substantial jumps in both the average number of cases open to case management, and, most significantly, in the average active caseload. The change from 57 (as of February 28, 2011) to 68 is a jump of over 17%.

This is happening for multiple reasons. First, the MHPDO case management team often keeps cases open longer than the 120 days imagined in the original grant application. The staff works closely with ATCIC and other entities to ensure rapid engagement in services, and then monitors to ensure the client is stable prior to closing the case. However, staff has discovered that in order to achieve success with many of their clients, they've had to adopt a more holistic approach. For example, in some instances, even clients who are connected with ATCIC and/or in transitional or semi-permanent housing still require some level of case management from the MHPDO case management team due to the complexity of their unique individual cases, symptoms, and/or needs.

Additionally, the MHPDO is the primary referral source for incompetent defendants from the Mental Health Docket. These clients typically take considerable time to situate and stabilize within the community and will often require more than 180 days of case management. It can often take close to 180 days just to get benefits started, which can often be a prerequisite for entry into many service providers within the community.

Third, as can be seen in Table 3 on page 10, anywhere from 20% to 30% of cases open to case management were classified as Social Referrals. These types of cases consist of Wheel Attorney cases, or old legal cases that are reopened as social referrals. A typical scenario for this second type of social referral could be when a client in crisis whose case has been closed for many months or years reaches out to their MHPDO caseworker. The caseworker then re-opens the client's case as a social referral in order to intervene and help the client to stabilize and/or navigate necessary systems, thereby preventing the client from decompensating and potentially becoming re-engaged in the criminal justice system.

Staff believes the unique flexibility to be able to re-open such cases is one of many contributing factors to the success of the MHPDO. The out of the box thinking and unique application of first the legal representation and the ongoing intensive case management have led to the successful stabilizing and re-entry of a number of MHPDO clients, who have remained arrest free since their last release at different intervals, up to five and a half years. These clients are discussed in the next section.

Days Since Last Released

Analysis was done to determine how long MHPDO clients are staying out of jail as well as to highlight those who have not been re-arrested in the last six months to five years. Again while it is not possible to definitively assert what would have happened absent MHPDO legal and case management involvement, it is certainly reasonable to estimate a potential avoidance of jail bed days as a result of those clients who have not been back to jail.

This following analysis looks at 472 of the 904 MHPDO Clients to date through January 31, 2012. Excluded from the 904 initially are the clients whose last arrest included a felony. In order to avoid skewing the outcomes with individuals who may have been released to Texas Department of Corrections, we included only the 735 MHPDO Legal clients whose last charge was a misdemeanor, indicating release back in to the community. Further excluded from the 735 used for this analysis are the 271 individuals who only had one arrest during the period evaluated. This was done to avoid basing savings on individuals who do not have a history of arrests and therefore might not have returned to jail regardless of the MHPDO's legal and case management support.

The remaining 472 clients were captured in their respective "days since last released" categories. In order to evaluate the impact to jail bed day consumption and to identify savings or cost avoidances associated with their success, impact to the ADP was calculated using their prior jail bed day consumption. Table 4 on the following page outlines the data as described.

Table 4: Legal Cases – Days Since Last Released

MHPDO - Legal Cases (Days)	Number	JBD 's Saved Based on Category	No. In ADP
0-30 days	11	-	-
31-60 days	29	261.84	.48
61-90 days	56	851.83	1.87
90-120 days	36	658.89	1.55
120-180 days	36	851.02	1.86
6 Mo's to 1.5 years	133	5,561.15	15.24
1.5 to 2.5 years	75	4,967.07	13.61
2.5 to 3.5 years	48	2,716.54	7.44
3.5 to 4.5 years	36	2,655.67	7.28
4.5 to 5.5 years	12	834.21	2.28
Total	472	19,358.23	53.04

Based on the prior jail bed day consumption, between FY2002 and FY2012 through January 2012, the 472 individuals represented in Table 4 spent 139,517 collective days in custody. Since the 472 individuals didn't spend every day in jail during the period evaluated, it would not be appropriate to say that those individuals represent a person for person reduction in the ADP going forward. In order to determine the impact to the ADP of the last five and a half years, it was assumed that similar frequency of arrest and jail bed day consumption would have continued in the future absent the MHPDO's support. Based on their prior consumption of jail bed days over the period evaluated, calculations were done to determine this group's impact to the average daily jail population. When aggregated across all categories, and with prior jail bed day consumption adjusted to only reflect the amount of time they have been out of jail, the 472 MHPDO clients represented in Table 4 have created an avoidance of 53.04 people in the average daily jail population.

Cost savings and cost avoidances can now be calculated based on the average number of people per day that have been reduced from the ADP. The savings related to the clients represented in Table 4 are discussed in the Return on Investment section later in this report. Only those who've been out of jail for at least six months were used to calculate savings/avoidances.

RETURN ON INVESTMENT USING OUR TOOLS

Many of these tools in the Travis County “toolbox” have been specifically designed to improve the quality of life for persons with mental illnesses in our community and to offer them much needed assistance in navigating complex legal and community support systems, as well as to reduce the number of persons with mental illness in the Travis County Jail. As a part of gauging program effectiveness and performance, cost benefit studies should be done regularly to assess cost effectiveness and jail/community impacts.

When evaluating programs designed to reduce the jail population, establishing the cost/benefit or return on investment can be daunting and sometimes misleading. Establishing overall cost is relatively straight forward, as budgets exist to drive that process. Relating the costs associated with particular populations within the jail to projected savings is more difficult and complicated. While the staffing ratio in the Travis County Jail seems simple at one corrections officer for every forty-eight inmates, an average daily jail population of 2,500 takes far more than 52 officers to manage ($2,500/48=52$). This is largely due to the diversity of inmate populations and associated security issues, since the jail is bound by a multifaceted security classification system. This classification system exists to deal with housing issues such as, but not limited to:

- male and female inmates cannot be housed together
- minimum security inmates cannot be housed with maximum security
- certain inmates require administrative segregation, and
- severely mentally ill inmates may need to be housed in specialty units

Estimating Costs/Savings Associated with Jail Bed Day Reductions

Historically, in order to establish costs associated with serving/incarcerating certain populations in the jail, a general “cost per day” was established. This cost has been demonstrated to vary from \$45 per day to secure inmates in the Travis County Jail to \$100+ estimated per day to secure inmates with mental illness. These costs include both fixed and marginal costs associated with managing the jail. The total costs were then shifted to an estimated savings, when projected jail bed day savings by a program or initiative were established. For example, take an initiative that is targeted to reduce mentally ill inmates in the average daily jail population by 25 inmates at a cost of \$100 per day. Based on those numbers, projections would seem to indicate that this reduction would create a cost savings of \$912,500 per year, as seen below:

- **25** inmates X 365 days = 9,125 jail bed days saved
- 9,125 jail bed days saved x \$100 per day = **\$912,500**

While on the surface this logic and math seems reasonable, it is an oversimplification to definitively conclude that such a savings could be realized by the jail at a dollar for dollar rate, with those savings shifted to either continue funding the current initiative or other similar initiatives. A given initiative or program may indeed create a cost savings, but unless it is such a large initiative that it creates a sustained reduction of sufficient jail bed days to close an entire unit, it is unlikely that a dollar for dollar cost versus savings can actually be realized. This is especially true when the total cost includes the custody cost to secure these individuals.

To help illustrate this, let's examine the previously estimated 9,125 jail bed days saved by the hypothetical sample initiative. These jail bed days would likely be spread among inmates with differing classification statuses and levels of care from various units within the jail. A reduction of even 10-15 inmates from one unit would not make it possible for a unit to be closed and the associated security resources eliminated or shifted, since there would be other inmates remaining in that unit who would need to be secured. Therefore, including the cost to incarcerate these individuals as an overall cost associated with serving this population, and translating that cost as a potential savings is both unrealistic and inaccurate.

Additionally, while looking at specialty populations such as the mentally ill, costing jail bed days as described above also assumes that absent their mental illness, these populations would not have been charged with a crime. While it is true that many of the persons in local jails who have a mental illness would likely not come into contact with the criminal justice system if they were stable and receiving services in the community, it does not follow that this would always be true for all such individuals. Some of the individuals with mental illnesses who have committed crimes would likely be incarcerated for the crimes that they have been charged with regardless of their mental illnesses. Stated another way: absent mental illnesses and the costs associated with treating mental illnesses in the jail, some of these individuals still might commit infractions, become incarcerated, and require a jail bed.

For these reasons, when estimating a return on investment in programs designed to reduce the average daily jail population, the focus should be on marginal costs associated with different specific jail populations. This ensures that when assumptions about *reductions* in the average daily population are applied, actual savings can be realized. When looking at the mentally ill population, realized and sustained reductions of inmates in the average daily population will have a cost savings impact on marginal costs such as pharmaceuticals, psychiatric services, treatment staff/counseling and medical costs, etc.

A small group of staff from Justice and Public Safety, the Travis County Sheriff's Office and the Planning and Budget Office worked to develop the average daily jail costs to apply to both costs savings and cost avoidances related to specialty populations. The total daily costs are outlined in Table 5; however the entire cost breakdown can be found in Appendix A.

Table 5: Costs and Cost Avoidances

Cost Type	General Pop (Excludes MH, MHSN & MSN)	Mental Health (MH)	Mental Health Special Needs (MHSN)	Medical Special Needs (MSN)	Total Population (Includes all)
Total Correctional Costs (Cost Avoidances or actual daily custody costs)	\$87.90	\$91.97	\$142.00	\$225.53	\$96.71
Total Operating Costs (Cost Savings)	\$9.27	\$11.56	\$35.38	\$74.19	\$13.54

**NOTE - Central booking costs are not included in any of the average daily costs.*

In FY2011, it is estimated that 25% (604) of the 2,416 people in the average daily jail population were treated for a mental illness. With an average of 211 people daily at \$35.38 per day and 393 people daily at \$11.56 per day, it is estimated that the marginal daily cost within the Travis County Jail related to

treating all inmates with mental illness was \$12,008.26 per day in FY2011. This annualizes to a total of \$4.51 million dollars to treat mental illness in the jail, excluding custody costs.

The “Total Operating Costs” are the values that have been identified as acceptable to use to identify savings that can be realized associated with specific population reductions. The “Total Correctional Costs” were identified as appropriate to use when identifying future cost avoidances and/or as savings when substantial sustained reductions in the Average Daily Jail Population are realized.

However, the related jail costs estimated in the next section refer to avoidances, rather than savings even though they are calculated as marginal costs. This was done because, although the overall jail population has decreased and stabilized since 2007 when the MHPDO began, the jail has realized an increase in the number of inmates with a mental illness. So while the MHPDO has successfully supported 304 people from returning to jail between six months and five and a half years, the jail has seen those people replaced with others as the community continues to struggle with adequate resources to treat behavioral health and mental illness in the community. As a result, any savings generated by the MHPDO efforts were back filled, and the jail would not have realized actual budgetary savings; rather they avoided an increase of inmates with a mental illness and the associated costs.

Over the last decade, the jail has experienced between 20-25% of their overall inmate population having a mental illness. Had the MHPDO clients evaluated for their savings actually continued their prior frequency of arrest and jail bed day consumption, the jail would have seen an average of 51 more inmates with a mental illness in the ADP. This would have pushed the percentage of mentally ill inmates to 27%, 2% over the high. The MHPDO clients are generally housed in the designated psychiatric housing in the jail, rather than in the general population with other inmates. The jail reports being at 85% of their 159 bed capacity in the psychiatric housing areas in FY2011. Depending on the stability of the clients in those housing areas and their jail classification, an additional unit may have been necessary in order to support an increased ADP of 51. The Planning and Budget Office reports a cost of \$600,000 to open a single post.

Targeted Reductions in Bookings & Arrests

Estimating costs and potential savings with regard to bookings/arrests is a somewhat more straight forward process. Regardless of inmate classification, special needs, or staffing ratios, a reduction in bookings can be directly tied to cost avoidances or cost savings. However, in order to reduce staffing resources within the Central Booking Facility, the reduction in people arrested/booked would need to be significant. Breaking points or specified levels should be established where, as bookings were reduced to a specified number, the savings achieved could be shifted to help fund other resources or enhance those resources which have contributed to the reduction.

The total direct (both City and County) Central Booking expense in FY11 was \$9,490,011 for 58,454 bookings, making the average cost per booking \$162.35. While a reduction in 200 bookings may not mean that resources could be shifted, a sustained reduction at 3,000-5,000 bookings may lead to that result. Currently, Travis County and the City of Austin are negotiating a new Central Booking Inter-local. The City of Austin shares in much of the cost of the operation of Central Booking.

Targeted Reductions in Arrests and Lengths of Stay

Singular programs that achieve reductions in jail bed days which equate to smaller numbers of inmates in the ADP may not achieve sustained reductions large enough to close units or shift jail security resources; however, a multi-pronged effort from multiple initiatives targeting arrests and lengths of stay might begin to make a significant impact.

Additionally, a number of initiatives have been instituted since FY2004 which were designed to reduce lengths of stay, thereby reducing the average daily jail population, at little or no cost to the County. Criminal Courts Administration (CCA), the District Attorney's Office (DA) and the County Attorney's Office (CA) have been instrumental in helping to achieve the remarkably stable jail population in Travis County over the last three years through the creation of specialized dockets, including the magistrates docket, the misdemeanor jail call dockets, and the mental health docket. Also, through refining processes in setting cases, the multi-agency strategy has reduced the number of days to first setting, impacting the average lengths of stay for high jail bed day consumers, thereby reducing the daily jail population. Currently, the average daily jail population is consistently tracking at around 300-350 inmates fewer than it was just four years ago when the annual ADP was 2,646. This has been achieved during a time when system inputs (bookings) have remained relatively constant at approximately 60,000 per year, until a roughly 1,600 booking reduction in FY2011.

System improvements like those established by various county departments can have a broad impact and substantial effects on jail population reduction at little cost to the County. These kinds of changes can pave the way for some resources to shift to other valuable programs and initiatives; initiatives that might not have as large or as easily quantifiable of an influence or return on investment, but do have real, considerable effects on quality of life for the people served, as well as meaningful impacts for the community at large.

Programs and initiatives that are designed to reduce the jail population or average length of stay should be evaluated regularly to determine their effectiveness. Often, initiatives designed to reduce or impact the jail population are effective at achieving those results to the levels at which they are funded, but at the point these programs reach their capacity to serve their impact shifts to a population management tool.

Estimating Costs Savings or Cost Avoidances Generated by the MHPDO

In evaluating the differences in the days to legal case disposition between the MHPDO and Wheel Attorneys, it was determined that a cost savings or cost avoidance would be difficult to estimate as we are currently unable to ascertain the number of in jail versus out of jail cases at the time of legal disposition. However, the expedited case processing should uncover other quantifiable savings. It was assumed that if cases are disposed of more quickly that they must result in fewer case settings, with each case setting having a cost. With that assumption, analysis was done on the total number of settings between 2005 and 2011 for both Wheel and MHPDO cases. The outcomes were that the MHPDO had an average of 4.38 settings per case while the Wheel attorneys had an average of 5.62. The -1.24 settings per case difference indicated an avoidance of 1,132 settings since inception of the MHPDO. At the time of this report, it is not possible to quantify the costs related to a single setting.

As of February 2012, the MHPDO has represented a total of 1,546 cases. Had these cases been represented by Wheel attorneys, it is estimated that the cost of representation would have been \$289,025.

Demonstrated reductions in the number of bookings generated by MHPDO clients, post MHPDO involvement were -1,912 or -324 per year across the five years of MHPDO existence. While it is not possible to say that this reduction is directly reflected in a savings realized by the Central Booking Facility, it can be assumed that had these bookings occurred at the same rate, additional costs may have been incurred. Therefore the booking reduction is being estimated as a cost avoidance realized for Travis County, and at \$162.35 per booking, the MHPDO created a cost avoidance of \$240,200 since inception. This is further illustrated in the break even analysis summarizing all savings and avoidances later in this section.

As discussed earlier, post MHPDO involvement and support, 472 clients have been out of custody between 30 days and five and a half years. The clients who have been out of custody for six months or longer were used to calculate the annual cost avoidances realized. Table 6 demonstrates these savings for each category. Cost avoidances were generated based on the daily marginal cost to treat persons with a serious mental illness in the jail. The daily rate was applied to an adjusted “ADP equivalent”. Jail bed days were adjusted to account for the specific recidivism rate of this population. The recidivism rate of the Mental Health Special Needs inmates in a 2006 cohort was 80%, and in a 2008 cohort was 76%. It could be assumed that between 20 and 24% of the MHPDO clients who’ve not been rearrested since their last release, would have not been rearrested regardless of MHPDOs services and support. Given that, and to fairly apply savings, the prior jail bed days consumed figures were adjusted at the blended rate of consumption of the 20 and 24% representing those not rearrested in the recidivism evaluation.

Table 6: MHPDO Clients – Released without Re-Arrest – ADP Equivalent and One Year Avoidances

Time Since Release	Total Clients	Adjusted JBD 's Saved	Equivalent No. In ADP	Cost Per day	FY2012 Cost Avoidance
6 Mo's to 1.5 years	133	5,394.31	14.78	\$35.38	\$190,851
1.5 to 2.5 years	75	4,818.06	13.20	\$35.38	\$170,463
2.5 to 3.5 years	48	2,635.05	7.21	\$35.38	\$93,228
3.5 to 4.5 years	36	2,576	7.06	\$35.38	\$91,139
4.5 to 5.5 years	12	809.18	2.21	\$35.38	\$28,629
Total	304	16,232.6	44.47		\$574,309

Break even analysis was conducted to evaluate each of the currently quantifiable results related to the MHPDO and to determine at what point Travis County has received a fiscal return on investment. Table 7 on the following page demonstrates annual cost avoidances related to eliminated and reduced jail bed day consumption of the 304 clients that have successfully been released from the Travis County Jail, without re-arrest between 6 months and five and a half years. Also included are the quantifiable savings/avoidances related to bookings and Criminal Indigent Defense (Wheel attorney costs). The cost to Travis County each year of the MHPDO’s existence is demonstrated to show both annual cost savings, aggregated cost to the County and the projected breakeven point.

Table 7: MHPDO Break Even Analysis

MHPDO -COST SAVINGS/AVOIDANCES	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Avoidances Related to Jail/Custody Costs	\$ -	\$28,629	\$119,768	\$212,996	\$383,459	\$574,309	\$703,3877	\$829,318
Related to Reduced Bookings	\$ -	\$25,024	\$55,754	\$53,228	\$53,489	\$52,705	\$53,794	\$53,794
Avoided Wheel Costs	\$17,386	\$59,824	\$58,142	\$67,302	\$64,124	\$62,348	\$62,348	\$62,348
Total Savings/Avoidances	\$17,386	\$113,447	\$233,663	\$333,525	\$501,071	\$689,362	\$819,529	\$945,460
Travis County Investment /MHPDO COST	\$125,000	\$125,000	\$250,000	\$375,000	\$500,000	\$625,000	\$657,110	\$680,109
Travis County Aggregated Breakeven	-\$107,614	-\$119,137	-\$135,473	-\$176,948	-\$175,877	-\$111,515	\$50,904	\$316,256
ANNUAL SAVINGS	-\$107,614	-\$11,523	-\$16,337	-\$41,475	\$1,071	\$64,362	\$162,419	\$265,351

In all, the total cost avoidance since inception of the MHPDO through FY2011 has been \$1,199,123. During that time, Travis County has invested \$1,375,000 in the first stand-alone mental health public defender office in the nation. In a sense, it has cost Travis County \$175,877 in the first five years of operation, just over \$35,000 annually, to improve both the quality of legal representation and to provide a much needed bridge between jail and access to community resources and services. This unquantifiable continuity has improved the quality of life for the clients served through the MHPDO. And while to date Travis County has not seen a total fiscal return on its investment, the MHPDO has begun covering the annual cost of operation through generated cost avoidances, beginning in FY2011. In FY2013, it is expected that the office will break even, where Travis County will realize a fiscal return of \$50,904 on its total investment in the office.

Beyond the purely fiscal results, the MHPDO has clearly had an impact on quality of life of the persons they serve, and the office adds value to the community through stability and consistency of service, and through follow-up and connection to much-needed services.

How the MHPDO Achieves These Results and How These Results Can Be Expanded

The MHPDO has been able to achieve significant results for the relatively small number of clients that they have served since inception. They have been successful through a symbiotic relationship between the legal and social work staff, consistency in deploying their support, and through a unique model of “meeting the clients where they are”, both physically as well as emotionally. The MHPDO Staff understands that mentally ill clients may not always keep every appointment or always have the

resources to make appointments in office. Where many agencies may then close a case, MHPDO staff continues to try and work with clients. Both legal and case management staff meets with clients in the jail, in half-way or transitional housing, in homeless camps, at ATCIC, etc. This approach has created an atmosphere of trust where their clients consistently contact their MHPDO when needing assistance. Often, clients whose cases have long been closed will come to the office for help. When working with a population that often “goes off the radar” until re-arrested, this type of relationship is important for building on successes and helping these clients have long stays out of the jail and criminal justice system.

Because of the often lengthy process of getting individuals connected to services and stable in the community, it is recommended that the benchmark for case management services, post legal case disposition, be recognized at 180 days as opposed to 120. This would be consistent with the current averages that the office is experiencing as referenced on page 9.

There has been a 28% increase in case management caseloads since FY2010, from an average of 54 in FY2010 to an average of 69 FY2012 to date (through April). Research related to industry standards for forensic case management caseloads has not provided results to this point. Currently the closest comparison is the ATCIC caseloads. JPS and the MHPDO believe that the MHPDO case management team can achieve results with a higher caseload than that of the ATCIC, and MHPDO suggests a benchmark between 40 and 50 cases. JPS concurs with this as the addition of a single case manager would provide a higher level of case management at 400 cases per year providing for an average of 180 days open per case.

Considering the length of time that cases remain open in order to stabilize MHPDO clients, the size of the current case manager caseloads and the relational impact of legal caseloads on case management caseloads, JPS is recommending the addition of a case manager in FY2013. While the MHPDO case management team has been able to achieve results with caseloads in the 60-70 range, they report that working with this difficult population at that level is not sustainable from an individual workload perspective.

Additional break even analysis was done to see the impact adding a case manager would have. Adjusting both the cost of the office and the impact that additional resources would have to the associate jail cost avoidances, the addition of one case manager in FY2013 is cost neutral. Table 8 on the following page demonstrates this.

Table 8: MHPDO Break Even Analysis- Adding a Single Case Manager in FY2013

MHPDO -COST SAVINGS/AVOIDANCES	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Avoidances Related to Jail/Custody Costs	\$ -	\$28,629	\$119,768	\$212,996	\$383,459	\$574,309	\$747,137	\$912,443
Related to Reduced Bookings	\$ -	\$25,024	\$55,754	\$53,228	\$53,489	\$52,705	\$53,794	\$53,794
Avoided Wheel Costs	\$17,386	\$59,824	\$58,142	\$67,302	\$64,124	\$62,348	\$62,348	\$62,348
Total Savings/Avoidances	\$17,386	\$113,447	\$233,663	\$333,525	\$501,071	\$689,362	\$863,279	\$1,028,585
Travis County Investment /MHPDO COST	\$125,000	\$125,000	\$250,000	\$375,000	\$500,000	\$625,000	\$710,033	\$734,884
Aggregate TC Breakeven	-\$107,614	-\$119,137	-\$135,473	-\$176,948	-\$175,877	-\$111,515	\$41,731	\$335,432
Annual Savings/Avoid	-\$107,614	-\$11,523	-\$16,337	-\$41,475	\$1,071	\$64,362	\$153,246	\$293,701

To build on the successes of the MHPDO and create an opportunity to have a large enough impact to the ADP that a Justice Re-Investment approach could be used (where the ADP could be lowered enough to reinvest dollars used to incarcerate individuals), the “reach” of the MHPDO needs to be extended. If Travis County is to start taking the office to scale and increase the number of legal cases taken each year, it would be necessary to incrementally add attorneys. Lessons learned during the first five years with respect to the relationship of the attorneys and case management staff as well as the duration of cases post legal disposition, it is also necessary to add case managers to support the additional clients/legal cases. The break even analysis in Table 9 below illustrates that the addition of one attorney and two case managers in FY2014 is also cost neutral.

Table 9: MHPDO Break Even Analysis- Adding 1 Attorney & Case Management Team in FY2014

MHPDO -COST SAVINGS/AVOIDANCES	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Avoidances Related to Jail/Custody Costs	\$ -	\$28,629	\$119,768	\$212,996	\$383,459	\$574,309	\$703,387	\$916,818
Related to Reduced Bookings	\$ -	\$25,024	\$55,754	\$53,228	\$53,489	\$52,705	\$53,794	\$80,691
Avoided Wheel Costs	\$17,386	\$59,824	\$58,142	\$67,302	\$64,124	\$62,348	\$62,348	\$93,522
Total Savings/Avoidances	\$17,386	\$113,447	\$233,663	\$333,525	\$501,071	\$689,362	\$819,529	\$1,091,031
Travis County Investment /MHPDO COST	\$125,000	\$125,000	\$250,000	\$375,000	\$500,000	\$625,000	\$657,110	\$895,322
Aggregate TC Breakeven	-\$107,614	-\$119,137	-\$135,473	-\$176,948	-\$175,877	-\$111,515	\$50,904	\$246,614
Annual Savings/Avoid	-\$107,614	-\$11,523	-\$16,337	-\$41,475	\$1,071	\$64,362	\$162,419	\$195,710

The combination of the legal and case management pieces of the office is instrumental in realizing decreases in jail bed days, bookings and incremental court costs. Taking these successes to scale may begin chipping away at the 2,600 frequently incarcerated individuals that account for roughly 283 person equivalent present every day in the ADP over the last three years.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The MHPDO has proven itself to be a vital tool in the County's toolbox addressing the mentally ill who cycle through the criminal justice system. Over the history of the office, they have helped almost a thousand clients avoid unnecessary jail time, navigate and get connected to services, avoid re-arrests, as well to help clients to become stable and obtain housing. While it's important to note the impact all of this has on the ADP and for present and future cost avoidances for the County, there are broader societal cost avoidances and community impacts that need to be highlighted as well.

Consider the fact that the MHPDO consistently obtains dismissals or plea agreements on a vast majority of their cases. This means that people who already endure the hardships that come with surviving as a mentally ill individual in Travis County are frequently spared the stress, disruption, and mental anguish that can come with longer stays in jail. The data clearly shows a decrease in recidivism post-MHPDO involvement.

At the same time, we've seen that the number of incompetent clients within the MHPDO case loads has grown and that the needs of their chronic and persistently mentally ill client base have begun to strain the current staffing level of the MHPDO. The dedication and long-term forensic case management provided by the MHPDO, which is integral to their success, means that average caseloads for attorneys and caseworkers continue to creep upward and have been sitting well above "comfortable" levels for two and a half fiscal years. Despite having to carry such a heavy caseload, the office continues to make gains and have positive impacts. This speaks volumes, and leads to speculation about their potential impact if they were staffed well enough to maintain more reasonable and manageable caseloads.

If the County is to build on the success of the program and scale up to meet the needs of the community, staffing levels will need to increase to prevent burnout and to continue to allow client care and representation to operate at a high quality level.

At this time, JPS recommends a three year growth plan beginning in FY13, should funding permit:

- Add one case manager in FY2013 to level the current case manager's case load to meet the capacity of the current legal capacity.
- Add one attorney and two case managers in FY2014.
- Add one social worker/case manager in FY2015.

JPS further recommends that work with the PBO, Courts and TCSO continue in order to build a cost model that is updated regularly so that ongoing impact can be determined.

APPENDIX A

The following page is the full analysis conducted by the Planning and Budget Office, Travis County Sheriff's Office and Justice and Public Safety with respect to the cost per day for all inmates in the Travis County Jail and further details costs for special populations.

It is important to note that the costs do not always translate dollar for dollar to savings that can be generated by programs attempting to reduce the jail population. Additionally, programs using these figures should ensure that they are applying the marginal/operating costs outlined in the tables for savings unless substantial sustained reductions in the ADP can be attributed to their program or initiative. Pages 12 thru 14 provide examples of using these costs.

DRAFT Estimated Cost per Jail Bed Day Based on FY 11 Actual Expenditures, 5 Yr Avg of CAR, and Estimated Debt Service
Version as of 3/16/2012

<p>These comparisons are an attempt to assign a value to the estimated cost per day for an inmate. Caution should be used when using these estimates to show program savings or cost avoidance. Estimates are based on actual and average expenditures and assumptions that assigned particular costs to particular segments of the population based on discussions between TCSO, CJP and PBO.</p>	Rated Capacity - includes variance beds	FY 11 Avg Daily Population (ADP)	Estimated FY 11 General Avg Daily POP (Excludes MH, HMSN, & MSN)	Estimated FY 11 Mental Health Avg Daily Pop	Estimated FY 11 Mental Health Special Needs Avg Daily Pop	Estimated FY 11 Medical Special Needs Avg Daily Pop
	3,519	2,416	1,752	393	211	60

Without Central Booking

Division #	Division Name	Category	Exp	Estimated Cost Per Day				
				ADP (Total Pop)	Gen Pop (Excludes MH, HMSN & MSN)	Mental Health	Mental Health Special Needs	Medical Special Needs
3706	Support Bureau - Corr & Reh	Personnel	8,418,390	9.55	9.55	9.55	9.55	9.55
3706	Support Bureau - Corr & Reh	Operating	909,486	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.03
TNR	Centrally Budgeted Fuel and Maintenance- Transportation Vehicles	Operating	94,596	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.11
Estimated Debt Service	Replacement Vehicles for Transportation	Debt Service	64,462	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
3735	Corrections Bureau	Personnel	51,596,469	58.51	58.51	58.51	58.51	58.51
3735	Corrections Bureau	Operating	6,933,260	7.86	7.86	7.86	7.86	7.86
3735	Corrections Bureau	5 Yr Avg. CAR	1,650,910	1.29	1.29	1.29	1.29	1.29
TNR	Fuel and Maintenance- Corrections and Transportation Vehicles	Operating	185,634	0.21	0.21	0.21	0.21	0.21
Estimated Debt Service	Replacement Vehicles for Corrections	Debt Service	179,552	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.14
Estimated Debt Service	Corrections Related Buildings	Debt Service	7,077,462	5.51	5.51	5.51	5.51	5.51
3749	Medical Services	Personnel	4,004,506	4.54	1.25	2.23	16.64	73.14
3749	Medical Services	Operating	4,961,789	5.63	1.39	3.66	27.27	65.96
3790	Inmate Services	Personnel	1,974,556	2.24	0.99	1.79	13.59	1.80
3790	Inmate Services	Operating	42,819	0.05	0.02	0.04	0.25	0.37
Personnel Total		Personnel	65,993,921	74.84	70.30	72.08	98.28	143.00
Operating Total		Operating	12,847,353	14.57	10.30	12.59	36.42	75.22
Central Fuel and Maint TTL		Operating	280,230	0.32	0.32	0.32	0.32	0.32
Subtotal - Personnel and Operating			\$ 79,121,504	\$ 89.72	\$ 80.92	\$ 84.99	\$ 135.02	\$ 218.54
5 Yr Avg. CAR Total		CAR	1,650,910	1.29	1.29	1.29	1.29	1.29
Estimated Debt Service TTL		Debt Service	7,321,476	5.70	5.70	5.70	5.70	5.70
Subtotal - 5 Yr Avg. CAR & Estimated Debt Service			\$ 8,972,386	\$ 6.99	\$ 6.99	\$ 6.99	\$ 6.99	\$ 6.99
Correction Related Total			\$ 88,093,889	\$ 96.71	\$ 87.90	\$ 91.97	\$ 142.00	\$ 225.53

Estimate Based on only Operating Expenditures for Corrections Bureau, Medical Services and Inmate Services

Division #	Division Name	Category	Exp	Estimated Cost Per Day				
				ADP (Total Pop)	Gen Pop (Excludes MH, HMSN & MSN)	Mental Health	Mental Health Special Needs	Medical Special Needs
3735	Corrections Bureau	Operating	6,933,260	7.86	7.86	7.86	7.86	7.86
3749	Medical Services	Operating	4,961,789	5.63	1.39	3.66	27.27	65.96
3790	Inmate Services	Operating	42,819	0.05	0.02	0.04	0.25	0.37
Operating Total		Operating	\$ 11,937,867	\$ 13.54	\$ 9.27	\$ 11.56	\$ 35.38	\$ 74.19
Correction Related Total			\$ 11,937,867	\$ 13.54	\$ 9.27	\$ 11.56	\$ 35.38	\$ 74.19