



SOUTH DAKOTA
JUVENILE JUSTICE | PUBLIC SAFETY
IMPROVEMENT
ACT

2016 Annual Report

Juvenile Justice Public Safety Improvement Act 2016 Annual Report

South Dakota had the second-highest juvenile commitment rate in the country in 2011. While the number of committed youth was declining, the reduction lagged behind the national average and that of neighboring states. Despite the high cost of incarcerating youth- up to \$144,000 per juvenile annually- nearly half of youth released from state facilities returned within three years. In response to the high commitment rate and a desire to improve outcomes for youth and communities, the Governor, the Chief Justice, and legislative leaders formed the South Dakota Juvenile Justice Reinvestment Initiative Work Group. This bipartisan, inter-branch, data-driven group, convened to analyze juvenile justice data and consider whether policies could be developed to improve outcomes for our children. The work group developed a set of recommendations that resulted in the Juvenile Justice Public Safety Improvement Act (JJPSIA). The Act is designed to increase public safety by improving outcomes for youth in the juvenile justice system, effectively hold juveniles more accountable, and reduce costs by investing in proven community-based practices while reserving residential facilities for juveniles who are a public safety risk.

Pursuant to the Juvenile Justice Public Safety Improvement Act, (SB 73 2015), the 2016 annual report is submitted to the people and leaders of South Dakota.

The implementation, oversight, and monitoring of the reforms has truly been a collaborative effort. The South Dakota Juvenile Justice Reinvestment Initiative Oversight Council has had the privilege of collaborating with the Unified Judicial System (UJS), the Department of Corrections (DOC), the Department of Social Services (DSS), members of the legislature, the Attorney General's Office, and various other system stakeholders to work towards improving the lives of children, families, and communities in South Dakota.

South Dakota received assistance for implementation of the Juvenile Justice Public Safety Improvement Act (JJPSIA) through the Smart on Juvenile Justice Initiative, a program of the U.S. Department of Justice's Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP). The Oversight Council thanks the Crime and Justice Institute and OJJDP for their continuous support of juvenile justice policy reforms in South Dakota.

The following annual report is a compilation of the performance measures from key juvenile justice agencies related to changes in the JJPSIA. The reforms are still in their early stages and thus it is too early to call the JJPSIA a proven success. However, the data in this report demonstrates the progress South Dakota has made and will continue making as juvenile justice reform takes shape in our state.

The reforms seek to prevent youth involved with the system from future involvement, improve the outcomes of youth by expanding access to community-based programs that have been proven to work, target residential placement towards

youth who are a risk to public safety, and ensure the quality and sustainability of the JJPSIA reforms.

This annual report summarizes data relating to the reforms during Fiscal Year 2016. However, because of the January 1, 2016 implementation date, for many of the reforms, outcome data is only available for six months. Monitoring key indicators related to the JJPSIA and the release of progress reports on an annual basis provides the state with the opportunity to continuously examine what is happening under the JJPSIA reforms in South Dakota and take a deeper look at areas that may not be performing in the ways expected and to highlight those that are working well.

These early stages of reform indicate fewer youth are being committed to state custody, and instead are receiving treatment and services in their community. Youth being supervised in the community are also completing supervision at higher rates and violating less. The early data does not indicate any additional burden has been placed on counties by adoption of these reforms, and instead, counties have received additional funding through the diversion fiscal incentive program.

Much work remains and we will continue the hard work of making changes to better our youth, families, and communities across South Dakota.

Respectfully submitted,



Greg Sattizahn
Chairman, JJPSIA Oversight Council
State Court Administrator

Introduction to JJPSIA Annual Report

The majority of the policy changes included in JJPSIA went into effect January 1, 2016. The data included in this report reflect performance and outcome measures at the end of Fiscal Year 2016, meaning that for many of the measures, only six months of data have been collected and reported. The data compiled in the report was provided by the Unified Judicial System, the Department of Corrections and the Department of Social Services. Over the long term, the purpose of reporting these measures is two-fold: 1) to monitor the impact of the policy changes and assess whether the goals of JJPSIA are being met; and 2) to continue making sound data-driven policy decisions. Further, as the policy changes continue to take effect, subsequent annual reports will examine recidivism rates over a one, two, and three year period for youth discharged from probation and the custody of the Department of Corrections. It is important to note that the availability of historical data for trends and comparisons varies between measures. Consequently, in certain areas historical comparisons are not possible because the data was not routinely collected prior to JJPSIA.

Before the Juvenile Justice Public Safety Improvement Act

- ◆ In 2013, 7 in 10 youth placed in the custody of the Department of Corrections (DOC) were committed for probation violations, misdemeanors, or Children in Need of Supervision (CHINS) violations such as truancy, running away, or other status offenses that would not be crimes if committed by adults.
- ◆ More than a quarter of commitments resulted from probation violations and, of the top 10 commitment offenses, nine were misdemeanors or probation or CHINS violations.
- ◆ While youth were being committed to the DOC for lower level offenses the average length of stay in out-of-home placements increased by 27.5 percent, from 12 months in 2007 to 15.3 months in 2013.
- ◆ From 2004 to 2013, the proportion of admissions to probation for misdemeanor offenses increased from 52 to 60 percent. Despite the trend toward lower-level offenses, the average term of probation reached a high of 22.2 months in 2013, with wide variation across circuits and the actual time spent on probation increased statewide from 6.3 months on average in 2005 to 8.4 months in 2013.
- ◆ Evidence-based interventions for juveniles were not sufficiently available to serve youth in the community.
- ◆ Pre-court diversion was used inconsistently across the state.

Preventing Deeper Involvement in the Juvenile Justice System

Research consistently shows youth placed in out-of-home placements recidivate at much higher rates than those who are treated in the community.

- ◆ A \$3.2 million investment supported the JJPSIA changes including incentivizing the use of diversion and expanding community-based services.
- ◆ New juvenile citations are being issued to address certain violations swiftly and certainly in the community. Youth receiving a citation may be required to pay a fine or complete community service.
- ◆ In FY16, 1001 cases eligible for diversion were referred by the county State’s Attorneys offices*.

**State’s Attorneys are required to report the number of youth eligible and referred for diversion and the outcome of the diversions to the Unified Judicial System. State’s Attorneys from 43 counties reported this data; 23 counties had not reported this data at the time of publication of this report.*

Juvenile Citations by Offense Type (FY16) N=1274




Table 1

Key Takeaway

Alcohol possession and truancy combined comprise over two-thirds (69%) of all juvenile citations.

Outcomes of Juvenile Citations (FY16) N=1247




Table 2

Key Takeaway

A judgment, in the form of a fine or community service, was entered in 60% of all juvenile citations filed in FY16.

DIVERSION

- ◆ JJPSIA expands the use of diversion by providing fiscal incentives to counties and encouraging broader use of diversion for non-violent misdemeanants and CHINS with no prior adjudications.

- ◆ All counties are eligible to submit data to the Department of Corrections for reimbursement of up to \$250 per successful diversion.*

Key Takeaway

A total of 970 diversions, or 69%, were completed successfully.

A diversion is considered successful if the individual has satisfied the criteria of the diversion program.

- ◆ 26 counties applied for and received reimbursement through the diversion fiscal incentive program.
- ◆ A total of \$242,500.00 was paid to counties for diversions.

Diversion Completion Type by Referral Offense (FY16) N=1415




Table 3


28 counties did not submit an application for reimbursement; 12 counties had "0" diversions during the reporting period.

*See Appendix A for a list of court-approved diversion programs and the Fiscal Incentive Diversion Program Submission Summary

PROBATION

- ◆ Clear guidelines have been implemented requiring the initial term for youth on probation to be four months in most cases; if youth need more time to complete treatment, an extension can be requested. The shorter initial probation term prevents youth from being in the juvenile justice system too long and ensures that needed services are provided to the youth as soon as possible.

Average Probation Term Ordered and Average Probation Term Served (FY16) N=1925



*These cases involve youth with both types of petitions pending at the same time.

Table 5

"The shorter probation time has made it so that youth are not in the juvenile justice system for unnecessarily long periods of time. For youth who are in need of more time in treatment services, an extension will be granted or they can be placed on intensive probation."

- **Chuck Frieberg**, Director of Court Services
Unified Judicial System

New Probation Admissions (FY16) N=1010




Table 4

Key Takeaways

Youth adjudicated on a delinquency or a CHINS petition are being ordered to probation for four months or less and are remaining on probation for just under that length of time.

Youth adjudicated for both a delinquency and a CHINS petition are being ordered to probation on average for 5.3 months and staying on probation for less than that time, on average 3.7 months.

Probation Extension Requests (FY16)




Table 6

■ Delinquency* ■ CHINS

**The delinquency cases include two requests granted for cases with both a delinquency matter and a CHINS violation*

Probation Extension Requests Granted (FY16)




Table 7

■ 1st Request Granted ■ 2nd Request Granted

Key Takeaways

Requests were made to extend probation in 42 delinquency cases and 9 CHINS cases; a second extension request was made for three delinquency cases.

For delinquency cases, nearly all (98%) of the first extension requests were granted and 100% of the second requests were granted; all 9 (100%) requests for CHINS extensions were granted.

Graduated responses are the use of incentives and sanctions to encourage youth to alter their attitudes and behavior toward prosocial alternatives. The emphasis of graduated responses in supervision is skill-building and positive communication between the youth and supervising officer. It is important to consistently address positive and negative behaviors, but addressing the positive behaviors must outweigh the negative consequences to positively impact behavior change. It is important to continuously identify opportunities to reinforce a youth's prosocial behavior and attitudes. By doing so, the youth's positive behavior is more likely to be repeated and sustained.

- ◆ The Juvenile Supervisory Responses (JSR) Matrix, a graduated response system, has been developed and adopted statewide.
- ◆ The JSR includes sanctions to address negative behavior and incentives to encourage positive behavior and hold juvenile probationers more accountable through swift, certain and proportional responses to behavior.
- ◆ All Court Service Officers (CSOs) were trained on the JSR at the end of January 2016 and began using the matrix in February 2016; Training included best-practices and the importance of responses being timely, proportionate, and repetitive. Youth need consistency and repetition in the response to behavior in order to modify and sustain prosocial behavior change.

Note: Table 8 only reflects data over a 5-month period from February 1, 2016 through June 30, 2016. It is expected as CSOs become more familiar with using the JSR, the use of both sanctions and incentives will increase across all youth on probation.

Graduated Responses for Youth on Probation (FY16) N= 2184




Table 8 Youth Receiving a Graduated Response

Key Takeaway

Nearly one-third (29%) of youth on probation received an incentive as part of the juvenile probation graduated response system; while just over 10% received a sanction.

Youth on Probation and Violations Filed




Table 9

Studies have shown that youth receiving community-based supervision/services are more likely to go to school, have employment, and avoid future delinquency. These findings emphasize the importance of keeping youth in their community and using alternative strategies to supervise them effectively, including addressing behavior in violation of supervision rules. Effective Practices in Community Supervision (EPICS) is one such strategy.

- ◆ By the end of FY16, all Court Services Officers (CSOs) received training on EPICS which is designed to provide staff with skills to improve the delivery of rehabilitative services and supervision for youth being supervised in the community.
- ◆ These practices recognize the critical role staff play in supporting the prosocial development of youth. EPICS provides CSOs opportunities to identify and target antisocial behaviors and attitudes in youth while also providing opportunities for CSOs to work with youth to teach, model, and practice prosocial skills and behaviors.

Key Takeaways

During FY16 a total of 2,184 youth were being supervised on probation, an 11% reduction since FY14.

The number of probation violations filed has dropped by 62% from FY14 to FY16.

The majority of youth (60%) are given the opportunity to remain on probation and make improvements following a probation violation.

Sustained Probation Violation Outcomes (FY16)

N=197




Table 10

RECIDIVISM

Recidivism for the **Unified Judicial System** is defined as *“being adjudicated delinquent while on probation or adjudicated delinquent or convicted of a felony in adult court within one year, two years, or three years after discharge from juvenile probation.”* SDCL 26-8D-1(5).

- ◆ For FY16 this represents those individuals that meet the recidivism definition while on supervision since data are not yet available for outcomes one, two, and three years after discharge from probation.
- ◆ In FY16, 183 youth out of 1922, or 10%, were adjudicated delinquent while on supervision.

Reason Discharged from Probation




Table 11

Key Takeaways

In FY16, 94% of youth completed their term of probation, this is a 9% increase from FY 14.

Across the last three fiscal years, less than 15% of youth on probation had their probation revoked.

Expanding Access to Evidence-Based Treatment in the Community

- ◆ A \$6.1 million investment has been made to support and expand community-based services.
- ◆ The Department of Social Services (DSS), in collaboration with the Department of Corrections (DOC), and the Unified Judicial System (UJS) identified community-based services for juveniles with justice system involvement and established a referral process.

Referrals by Circuit and Source (FY16)
N=306




Table 13

Note: Data on community-based program completion not available at the close of FY16.

Key Takeaways (TABLE 13)

The greatest number of referrals originating in the 3rd circuit are from the DOC.

In the 2nd, 4th, 5th, and 6th circuits the greatest number of referrals are from UJS.

“Other” referral sources make the largest number of referrals in the 1st and 7th circuits.

Referrals for Services (FY16)
N=306




Table 12

Referral Source

*Other includes any referral received outside of UJS or DOC, such as schools, parents, and diversion programs, for youth at risk of justice system involvement.

Key Takeaways (TABLE 12)

The greatest amount (42%) of referrals originate from UJS.


Nearly one-third (29%) originate from a source other than UJS or DOC.

Functional Family Therapy (FFT)

was the first service implemented. FFT is an evidence-based, family-centered treatment program that targets problem behaviors, including substance abuse issues, family problems, and acting out. Beginning in calendar-year 2016, FFT is available to youth and families statewide.

- ◆ In FY16, DSS coordinated a comprehensive training of FFT resulting in 51 FFT clinicians able to serve youth in all areas of the state.
- ◆ 95% of the referrals received in FY16 were referred for FFT services.

FFT Providers* (By Circuit/County)



*See Appendix B for a list of FFT providers across the state.

Focus residential placements on youth who are a public safety risk

- ◆ In an effort to better utilize out-of-home residential placements, JPSIA defined the criteria for commitment to the Department of Corrections (DOC) for youth posing a serious risk to public safety.
- ◆ As a result of this change, Table 14 demonstrates the reduction in the number of youth newly placed in DOC custody over the last three fiscal years; recommitments are down significantly during this time period.




Key Takeaways

New commitments to DOC have been steadily declining since FY14 with a 43% reduction between FY15 and FY16.

The number of recommitments to DOC has declined by 62% from FY14 to FY16.

New Commitments and Recommitments* to the DOC



*A recommitment involves a youth who was previously under the jurisdiction of the Department of Corrections (DOC) and discharged and then has been adjudicated as a delinquent or CHINS for a new offense and is being recommitted to the DOC.

- ◆ JJPSIA gives circuits the option to establish **Community Response Teams (CRTs)** as resources to help judges identify community-based alternatives to DOC.

COMMUNITY RESPONSE TEAMS

Table 15 **1st Circuit (FY16)**

| CRT Recommendation | | Community Based Alternative | Court Disposition | Agreement* |
|--------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|------------|
| Case 1 | CD treatment | Yes | CD treatment | Yes |
| Case 2 | FFT restart | Yes | Probation | No |
| Case 3 | Parent pay for private placement | No | DOC Commitment | No |
| Case 4 | Intensive probation | Yes | Intensive probation | Yes |
| Case 5 | CD treatment | Yes | CD treatment | Yes |
| Case 6 | DOC commitment | No | DOC commitment | Yes |
| Case 7 | DOC commitment | No | DOC commitment | Yes |
| Case 8 | DOC commitment | No | DOC commitment | Yes |

Table 16 **2nd Circuit (FY16)**

| CRT Recommendation | | Community Based Alt. | Court Disposition | Agreement* |
|--------------------|--|----------------------|---|------------|
| Case 1 | Psych eval./consider intensive probation | Yes | Suspend DOC; Intensive probation; FFT | Partial |
| Case 2 | Intensive probation | Yes | Suspend DOC; Intensive probation | Partial |
| Case 3 | Intensive probation and psych consult | Yes | Intensive probation; 30 day house arrest; 90 days juvenile detention; 30 hrs. comm. service | Partial |
| Case 4 | Intensive probation and psych consult | Yes | DOC Commitment | No |

*Agreement means the Court's final disposition in the case was in agreement with the recommendation put forth by the CRT.

Key Takeaways

Three community response teams (CRTs) have been established in the 1st and 2nd circuits and have received a total of 12 referrals.

In the 1st circuit the CRT recommended a community based alternative in 50% (N=8) of the cases and 100% (N=4) of the cases in the 2nd circuit.

The Court in the 1st circuit agreed fully with one recommendation out of four.

In the 2nd circuit the Court agreed partially with three out of four recommendations of the CRT.

Average Length of Stay in Residential Placement




Table 17

*In-state residential includes Intensive Residential Treatment (IRT) and Psychiatric Residential Treatment Facilities (PRTF).

Key Takeaways

At the same time that commitments are down, the average length of stay in residential placements has also decreased.

In three-out-of-four DOC residential placement types, the average length of stay has declined from FY15 to FY16.

- ◆ In FY 16, DOC entered into performance based contracts with providers to ensure treatment goals are met within established timeframes and youth are returned home as quickly and safely as possible.

Key Takeaway

As of June 30, 2016, \$31,625 was paid to DOC contracted providers based on the new performance based contract model.

Amount Paid to Providers for DOC Performance Based Contracts (Total Amount Paid FY16 = \$31,625)




Table 18

- ◆ Overall, the number of youth in DOC custody has been steadily dropping, with fewer of those youth in paid placements and staying for shorter periods of time while meeting treatment goals.



- ◆ Due to these significant reductions, in April 2016, the state-run residential facility, STAR Academy, was closed.

“The number of children committed to DOC has been steadily declining, so the need for a large state-run correctional facility no longer exists in South Dakota. The closure of STAR Academy in Custer allows youth in state custody to receive the treatment they need in smaller facilities, closer to home. This means natural supports, such as family and other community members, can be engaged in the youth’s treatment and transition back home.”

- **Kristi Bunkers**, Director of Juvenile Services
SD Department of Corrections

Youth Under DOC Jurisdiction




Table 19

Key Takeaways

The total number of youth under commitment to DOC has decreased 38% since FY14.

During the same time period, there has been a decrease in the share of youth in DOC paid placement.

REVOCATION

Recidivism for the **Department of Corrections** is defined as “within one year, two years, or three years of discharge from the custody of the Department of Corrections, a juvenile commitment or conviction in adult court for a felony resulting in a sentence to the Department of Corrections.” SDCL 26-8D-1(5).

- ◆ Juvenile Corrections Agents (JCA) at the DOC have tools, such as graduated responses and EPICS, to address antisocial attitudes, values and beliefs associated with delinquent behavior.
- ◆ For FY16, data are not yet available for outcomes one, two, and three years after discharge from DOC custody.

Key Takeaways

(TABLE 20)


The number of youth on aftercare declined by 37%, or 308 fewer youth, from FY14 to FY16.

Aftercare revocations have declined from 13% of youth on aftercare in FY14 to 5% in FY16.


(TABLE 21)

There was a 78% reduction in the number of aftercare revocations from 107 in FY14 to 24 in FY16.

Aftercare Revocations



Actions Taken in Response to an Aftercare Revocation



The most common response to aftercare violations in FY16 was placement in a residential facility.

Average Length of Commitment* for Youth Discharged from DOC




Table 22

**Length of commitment includes the total time a youth was under the custody of the Department of Corrections, including residential placement and time spent on aftercare.*

Key Takeaway

Average length of commitment has remained steady over the past three fiscal years.

COUNTY DETENTION

In an effort to maintain public safety while preventing unnecessary burdens on county detention facilities, JJPSIA requires findings from the court prior to placing a child in county detention for more than 14 days in a 30-day period.

STAYS IN COUNTY DETENTION

| Circuit | Number of Detention Stays, FY16 (N=15) | Number of Days for each Detention Stay, FY16 (N=13) |
|---------|--|---|
| 1st | 2 | 1 to 3 |
| 2nd | 1 | 1 |
| 3rd | 1 | 50 |
| 4th | 0 | N/A |
| 5th | 9 | 1 to 4 |
| 6th | 1 | 15 |
| 7th | 1 | 44 |

Table 23

Key Takeaways

There were 13 juveniles across all seven circuits placed in detention pursuant to 26-8C-7(5) and 26-8B-6(3) for a total of 15 detention stays.

Two of the youth had two separate stays in detention during the reporting period.

The number of days for each detention stay ranged from 1 day to 50 days with 12 out of 15 detention stays ranging between 1 day and 4 days.

Members of the Juvenile Justice Oversight Council

Greg Sattizahn (Chair)

Unified Judicial System

Kristi Bunkers

Department of Corrections

Sheila Weber

Youth Care Provider

AJ Franken

Governor's Office

Patrick Weber

Governor's Office

Amy Iversen-Pollreis

Department of Social Services

Sarah Morrison

Deputy State's Attorney

Matt Kinney

Criminal Defense Attorney

Senator Billie Sutton

State Senate

Senator Alan Solano

State Senate

Kelly Marnette

Assistant Attorney General

Representative Brian Gosch

House of Representatives

Deb Hadcock

Pennington County Commissioner

Representative Julie Bartling

House of Representatives

Judge Scott Myren

Fifth Judicial Circuit

Justice Janine Kern

Supreme Court Chief Justice

Nancy Allard

Unified Judicial System

Judge Steven Jensen

First Judicial Circuit

Thomas Sannes

Criminal Defense Attorney

APPENDIX A

Court Approved Diversion Programs/Agencies

The following is a list of diversion programs or agencies approved by the Unified Judicial System and used by State’s Attorneys across the state for diverting youth from the juvenile justice system. These are non-Court Services diversions.

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---|
| <p>1st Circuit</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teen Court in Yankton County • Union County Youth Diversion Program • Clay County Diversion Program • James Lentsch McCook County | <p>5th Circuit</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teen Court in Brown and Roberts Counties |
| <p>2nd Circuit</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teen Court • RISE (Boy Scout Program) • LSS middle school diversion (available to Whittier and McGovern students) • CAB (Boy Scout Program- 2nd time offenders) | <p>6th Circuit</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teen Court in Hughes/Stanley Counties • Positive Action Program (via the MGM Coalition in Mellette County in conjunction with the White River School) • 3rd Millennium Classrooms Program (on-line drug/alcohol and shoplifting classes overseen by Court Services) |
| <p>3rd Circuit</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SA in Codington County and Grant County refer directly to service providers for services • Moody, Brookings, and Codington Counties use Teen Courts via Boys and Girls Club • Beadle County CAP Juvenile Diversion Program | <p>7th Circuit</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teen Court; SA refers directly to a variety of agencies for services such as: Lifeways Drug and Counseling • Youth & Family Services • Catholic Social Services • Lutheran Social Services • Big Brothers Big Sisters • Behavior Management Systems • Wellspring; Wyoming Cowboy Challenge Academy • Ateyapi Program – Rural America Initiatives • John Gordon/Gordon Preventative Services |
| <p>4th Circuit</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teen Court in Deadwood and Belle Fourche • Action for the Betterment of the Community In Sturgis and Belle Fourche • Youth Wise in Lawrence County | | |

SFY 2016 JJRI Fiscal Incentive Diversion Program Submission Summary

| County | # Referred* | # Successful | # Unsuccessful | Payment Amount |
|-------------------|-------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|
| Beadle | 3 | 3 | 0 | \$750.00 |
| Brookings | 34 | 19 | 15 | \$4,750.00 |
| Brown | 47 | 31 | 16 | \$7,750.00 |
| Butte | 19 | 14 | 5 | \$3,500.00 |
| Codington | 31 | 23 | 8 | \$5,750.00 |
| Fall River | 38 | 24 | 14 | \$6,000.00 |
| Gregory | 1 | 1 | 0 | \$250.00 |
| Hughes | 52 | 16 | 36 | \$4,000.00 |
| Hyde | 5 | 4 | 1 | \$1,000.00 |
| Jackson | 5 | 2 | 3 | \$500.00 |
| Lake | 2 | 1 | 1 | \$250.00 |
| Lawrence | 46 | 41 | 5 | \$10,250.00 |
| Lincoln | 39 | 23 | 16 | \$5,750.00 |
| McCook | 5 | 4 | 1 | \$1,000.00 |
| Meade | 30 | 22 | 8 | \$5,500 |
| Mellette | 2 | 2 | 0 | \$500.00 |
| Miner | 2 | 2 | 0 | \$500.00 |
| Minnehaha | 411 | 187 | 224 | \$46,750.00 |

SFY 2016 JJRI Fiscal Incentive Diversion Program Submission Summary (Continued)

| County | # Referred* | # Successful | # Unsuccessful | Payment Amount |
|--------------|-------------|--------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Moody | 4 | 3 | 1 | \$750.00 |
| Pennington | 595 | 526 | 69 | \$131,500.00 |
| Roberts | 17 | 9 | 8 | \$2,250.00 |
| Stanley | 10 | 2 | 8 | \$500.00 |
| Tripp | 3 | 1 | 2 | \$250.00 |
| Union | 5 | 5 | 0 | \$1,250.00 |
| Yankton | 6 | 5 | 1 | \$1,250.00 |
| TOTAL | 1412 | 970 | 442 | \$242,500.00 |

* # Referred only includes those youth who were referred and completed (either successfully or unsuccessfully) a court approved diversion program in SFY 2016.

Verification of "0" referrals received from the following counties:

Clay, Corson, Deuel, Edmunds, Grant, Harding, Hutchinson, Kingsbury, Potter, Sanborn, Sully, and Todd

Applications NOT received from the following counties:

Aurora, Bennett, Bon homme, Brule, Buffalo, Campbell, Charles Mix, Clark, Davison, Day, Dewey, Douglas, Faulk, Haakon, Hamlin, Hand, Hanson, Jerauld, Jones, Lyman, Marshall, McPherson, Oglala Lakota, Perkins, Spink, Turner, Walworth, and Ziebach

APPENDIX B

| FFT Providers | Contact Information | Counties Served |
|---|--|---|
| Behavioral Management System (BMS) | 350 Elk Street Rapid City, 57701 (605) 343-7262 | Pennington, Custer, Fall River, Oglala Lakota, Harding, Butte, Lawrence, Meade, Perkins, Corson, Ziebach, Dewey |
| Capital Area Counseling Services (CACs) | 803 East Dakota Avenue Pierre, SD 57501 (605) 224-5811 | Potter, Sully, Hyde, Hughes, Stanley, Haakon, Jones, Lyman, Jackson, Buffalo, Ziebach, Perkins, Dewey, Corson |
| Community Counseling Services (CCS) | 357 Kansas Avenue SE Huron, SD 57350 (605) 352-8596 | Hand, Beadle, Jerauld, Sanborn, Miner, Lake, Moody, Kingsbury |
| Dakota Counseling Institute (DCI) | 910 West Havens Mitchell, SD 57301 (605) 996-9686 | Brule, Aurora, Davison, Hanson, Sanborn, Buffalo |
| East Central Behavioral Health (ECBH) | 211 4 th Street Brookings, SD 57006 (605) 697-2850 | Brookings |
| Human Services Agency (HSA) | 123 19 th Street NE Watertown, SD 57201 (605) 886-0123 | Roberts, Grant, Clark, Codington, Deuel, Hamlin |
| Lewis & Clark Behavioral Health Services (LCBHS) | 1028 Walnut Street Yankton, SD 57078 (605) 665-4606 | McCook, Douglas, Hutchinson, Turner, Charles Mix, Bon Homme, Yankton, Clary, Union |
| Lutheran Social Services (LSS) | 705 E 41 st St, Suite 200 Sioux Falls, SD 57105 -OR- (605) 444-7500 | Butte, Lawrence, Meade, Pennington, Custer, Fall River, Oglala Lakota, Brookings, Minnehaha, Lincoln |
| Northeastern Mental Health Center (NEMCH) | 2920 Sheridan Lk Rd, Rapid City, SD 57702 (605) 791-6700 | Perkins, Corson, Ziebach, Dewey, Campbell, Walworth, McPherson, Edmunds, Potter, Faulk, Brown, Spink, Marshall, Day |
| Southeastern Behavioral Health (SEBH) | 14 South Main Street, Suite 1E Aberdeen, SD 57401 (605) 225-1010 | Minnehaha, McCook, Turner, Lincoln |
| Southern Plains Behavioral Health Services (SPBHS) | 2000 South Summit Avenue Sioux Falls, SD 57104 (605) 336-0510 | Bennett, Mellette, Todd, Tripp, Gregory |

APPENDIX C

Facilities eligible for participation in *the performance reimbursement rate* through the Department of Corrections Fiscal Year 2017

| Facility | Location |
|---|-----------------|
| Aurora Plains | Plankinton, SD |
| Abbott House (girls only) | Mitchell, SD |
| Children's Home Society-Black Hills | Rapid City, SD |
| Children's Home Society-Sioux Falls | Sioux Falls, SD |
| Canyon Hills Center | Spearfish, SD |
| Our Home ASAP (male - sex offenders) | Huron, SD |
| Our Home-Parkston | Parkston, SD |
| Summit Oaks Center | Sioux Falls, SD |
| McCrossan Boy's Ranch (boys only) | Sioux Falls, SD |
| New Beginnings Center | Aberdeen, SD |
| Wellfully | Rapid City, SD |
| Benchmark (boys only) | Woods Cross, UT |
| Coastal Harbor Treatment Center | Savannah, GA |
| Copper Hills Youth Center | West Jordan, UT |
| Clarinda Academy | Clarinda, IA |
| Forest Ridge Youth Services (girls only) | Estherville, IA |
| Lakeside Academy | Kalamazoo, MI |
| Natchez Trace Youth Academy (boys only) | Waverly, TN |
| Southwestern Youth Services (boys only) | Magnolia, MN |
| Woodward Academy (boys only) | Woodward, IA |

LIPSIA

2016 Annual Report

2016

500 copies of this publication were printed at a cost of \$4.10 per copy.
Printed by Pheasantland Industries at the South Dakota State Penitentiary.