



STATE OF MICHIGAN  
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS  
LANSING

JENNIFER M. GRANHOLM  
GOVERNOR

PATRICIA L. CARUSO  
DIRECTOR

**DATE:** October 26, 2005

**TO:** Senate Judiciary Committee  
Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Judiciary and Corrections  
House Judiciary Committee  
House Appropriations Subcommittee on Corrections

**FROM:** Heidi Washington  
Administrative Assistant

**SUBJECT:** Office of Community Corrections Annual Report  
Award of Funds – Fiscal Year 2006

Pursuant to MCL 791.412(1), the Michigan Department of Corrections has compiled the Office of Community Corrections Annual Report – Award of Funds – Fiscal Year 2006. In prior years, we provided you with a copy of the report. This report is now posted on the Department's Web site at [www.michigan.gov/corrections](http://www.michigan.gov/corrections). At this site, click on "Publications & Information" on the left-hand side and then click on "Legislative Reports." From there, select the report entitled "Office of Community Corrections Annual Report - Award of Funds – Fiscal Year 2006."

Please let me know if you have any questions regarding the content of this report.

c Senate Fiscal Agency  
House Fiscal Agency  
Department of Management and Budget

# **MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS**

*Expecting Excellence Every Day*

## **FIELD OPERATIONS ADMINISTRATION OFFICE OF COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS**

### **ANNUAL REPORT**

#### **Award of Funds - Fiscal Year 2006**

**Issued: November 1, 2005**

**This report is prepared annually by the Michigan Department of Corrections/Office of Community Corrections pursuant to the provisions of the Michigan Community Corrections Act [Public Act No. 511 of 1988, Section 12(1)].**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION .....	1
▪ Local Government Participation	
▪ Impact on Sentencing Dispositions	
STATE COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS BOARD PRIORITIES	
▪ Prison Admissions – Felony Target Populations	
▪ Jail Utilization	
▪ Target Populations for Community Corrections Programs	
▪ Interagency Policy and Program Development	
▪ Sentencing Recommendation and Probation Violation Processing	
▪ Administration and/or Operational	
▪ Public Education	
▪ Monitoring and Evaluation	
PROGRESS TOWARD ADDRESSING PRIORITIES.....	5
COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PROGRAMS .....	6
▪ Comprehensive Plans and Services	
▪ Residential Services	
▪ Drunk Driver Jail Reduction & Community Treatment Program	
▪ County Jail Reimbursement Program	
▪ Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation	
FY 2006 AWARD OF FUNDS ... ..	7
FY 2006 COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PLANS AND SERVICES .....	9
FY 2006 RESIDENTIAL SERVICES.....	12
FY 2006 DRUNK DRIVER JAIL REDUCTION & COMMUNITY TREATMENT PROGRAM.....	14

Note: This report has been prepared pursuant to the provisions of Public Act No. 511 of 1988, Section 12(1) which states<sup>A</sup> The office shall submit an annual report not later than November 1st of each year, detailing the individual requests received by the state board for funding under this act, and the programs and plans approved for funding.<sup>@</sup>

## **INTRODUCTION**

The Office of Community Corrections, including the State Community Corrections Board, was created pursuant to provisions of Public Act 511 of 1988 as an autonomous agency within the Michigan Department of Corrections (MDOC). Executive Order 1995-16 transferred the Office of Community Corrections to the Department of Corrections to improve efficiencies in administration and effectiveness within government, and has been established as an organization within the Field Operations Administration.

### **Local Government Participation**

The Office of Community Corrections works in cooperation with offices of the Field Operations Administration (FOA) and local units of government to reduce admissions to prison, improve utilization of local jail facilities, improve rehabilitative services to offenders, and strengthen offender accountability.

Local governments elect to participate in the implementation of the Michigan Community Corrections Act through establishing a local Community Corrections Advisory Board (CCAB) and developing a local comprehensive corrections plan in accordance with Sections 7 and 8 of P.A. 511 of 1988. The plans identify local policies and practices, as well as programs and services which will help them achieve their goals and objectives.

Since 1989, 80 of Michigan's 83 counties have elected to participate through formulation of single county, multi-county, and city-county Community Corrections Advisory Boards. Fiscal Year 2006 funds were awarded to support the implementation or continued operation of community-based sanctions and services in 72 counties.

### **Impact on Sentencing Dispositions**

Michigan's prison commitment rate was 32% in 1990. After the implementation of Public Act 511 of 1988, the rate declined to 23% and remained relatively stable through the 1990s. In the past three years, the State has placed greater emphasis on the expansion of local sanctions and has partnered with local governments to revitalize and renew efforts to meet the goals of Public Act 511, to reduce admissions to prison of nonviolent offenders, especially probation violators, and improve the use of local jails. In 2004, the overall dispositions for prison have declined to a low of 20.3%.

Since 1999, nearly 80% of the felony offenders are currently being sentenced to community-based sanctions and services. The reduction in the prison commitment rates and the increased use of local sentencing options during the 1990s can be attributed in part to the efforts of local jurisdictions to expand the range of available sentencing options and to concentrate on reducing or maintaining low prison admissions for priority target groups. This focus continues for FY 2006 with priority given to offenders with sentencing guidelines in the straddle cells, probation violators and parole violators.

The March 2005 and September 2005 Biannual Reports provide statewide and county-by-county data which summarize patterns and trends in prison admissions, jail utilization and community-based programming.

## **State Community Corrections Advisory Board Priorities**

The State Community Corrections Advisory Board Objectives and Priorities are a continuation of the priorities which were originally adopted by the Board in February 1999 to strengthen the focus of state and local community corrections policy, practice and programming on treatment effect and recidivism reduction.

These priorities are a primary focus of the reviews of community corrections comprehensive plans and proposals of local jurisdictions and a key determinant of the awards of P.A. 511 funds.

### **PRISON ADMISSIONS - FELONY TARGET POPULATIONS**

- Reduce or minimize prison admissions for: (a) offenders with sentencing guidelines within the straddle cells, especially those with a PRV  $\geq$  35 excluding G&H, (b) probation violators; and (c) parole violators.
- Offenders within the presumptive prison group should not be targeted as a group; jurisdictions should examine sentencing options on a case-by-case basis to determine if local programs are appropriate alternatives to a prison commitment.
- Community-based sanctions and services, including the creative use of jail time in conjunction with other community-based supervision, for offenders within straddle cells without compromising public safety.
- Probation violators are a priority population since: 1) technical violations are not addressed in the statutory guidelines; 2) violators account for a large proportion of prison admissions; 3) long jail sentences in response to violations contribute to jail crowding.
- The state and local jurisdictions should utilize comprehensive case planning to determine the most effective sanctions and services available locally. Case planning should begin as early as possible in the process and consider initial disposition, local probation violation response guidelines and available community-based resources. The impact upon public safety, jail crowding, prison commitments and recidivism reduction should be determinant factors.
- Parole violators should be a priority population since this group contributes to jail crowding, increases utilization of prison resources and must be reintegrated into the community effectively to reduce recidivism.

### **JAIL UTILIZATION**

Public safety should be the primary factor in determining the use of jail resources. Whenever possible, jail resources should be prioritized for use by individuals convicted of crimes against persons and/or offenders who present a higher risk of recidivism.

- The local community corrections comprehensive plan should establish clear guidelines, policies and procedures to ensure appropriate use of all sentencing options for all offender populations.
- For higher risk/need cases, jail should be utilized as a condition of probation and as part of a sentence plan, which includes short term in jail with release to other forms of supervision and/or treatment.

## **TARGET POPULATIONS FOR COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PROGRAMS**

- Felony offenders with multiple prior convictions and/or multiple probation violations should receive higher priority than first time, civil and ordinance offenders. The targeting of lower level offenders must be accompanied by quantitative measures that show how targeting these populations will significantly affect state and local criminal justice objectives.
- If misdemeanants are included in the local target populations for treatment programs then priority should be given to offenders with multiple prior convictions, including felony convictions, and a current offense for domestic violence, retail fraud, or drunk driving.
- MDOC/FOA may refer state parole violators to appropriate local correctional interventions. This includes available community corrections-funded sanctions and services. A parole violator who is bound for prison or TRV center should be considered for referral to community corrections-funded sanctions and services. All referrals and placements shall comply with state and local policy and be consistent with state and local target populations.
- Jurisdictions should annually review and update, as needed, target populations and program specific eligibility criteria for community corrections programs and update the range of sentencing options for all population groups.
- Community-based supervision and treatment services are to be restricted to higher risk/need cases consistent with principles of effective intervention. Priorities are on cognitive-based programming and education/employment services.
- Eligibility for Residential Services is restricted to felons with SGL Min/Max of 9 or greater on the initial disposition or Min/Max of 6 or greater for probation violators.

## **INTERAGENCY POLICY AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT**

CCABs should actively participate with Community Mental Health, law enforcement, and other agencies in the development of local policy and programming options to reduce admissions to jail and length of stay in jail of mentally ill offenders.

Local policies should be developed and/or updated to increase access to education and employability services for offenders such as those offered through local school districts, Michigan Works, and other local service agencies.

## **SENTENCING RECOMMENDATION AND PROBATION VIOLATION PROCESSING**

Each jurisdiction should annually review sentencing recommendation procedures, probation violation guidelines, and update response guides consistent with MDOC policies to reduce prison admission, improve jail utilization, increase program utilization, increase public safety, and decrease recidivism. Probation violation response guides should identify all available resources to address local needs.

## **ADMINISTRATIVE AND/OR OPERATIONAL**

Local jurisdictions are required to update their local strategic plan and are encouraged to utilize system mapping principles and techniques to: illustrate processes, practices, and decision points within the local system. Further, system mapping should be used to identify and define system issues, examine options to resolve issues, and guide the local comprehensive corrections plan updates and revisions.

Local jurisdictions should describe instruments utilized within the local jurisdiction. Areas to assess should include risk of recidivism and needs for services. A priority should be placed upon criminogenic needs. Individual jurisdictions must describe how the instruments are used and what purpose the instruments serve to guide or support case planning/management and monitoring/evaluation functions.

## **PUBLIC EDUCATION**

Local jurisdictions are to present specific objectives and strategies to increase awareness of community sentencing options. These efforts should communicate how these options are used to benefit the community and the offender.

## **MONITORING AND EVALUATION**

Local jurisdictions must implement and maintain current formal policies and practices that support ongoing monitoring of prison commitments, jail utilization and program utilization. These practices should aid in the determination of how local community corrections comprehensive plans effect prison commitments and jail utilization. Policies must be developed that enhance state and local ability to monitor and evaluate program content, quality and effects upon target populations.

## **Progress Toward Addressing Objectives And Priorities**

In the past three years, the State has placed greater emphasis on the expansion of local sanctions in order to allow communities to determine appropriate punishment for low level offenders who would otherwise be sent to prison. The Department has partnered with local governments to revitalize and renew efforts to meet the goals of Public Act 511 to reduce admissions to prison of nonviolent offenders, especially probation violators, and improve the use of local jails.

In previous years, the growth in prison intake has been driven by the increase of technical probation violators and offenders sentenced to prison for two years or less -- the exact target population for the Community Corrections Act and the priorities adopted by the State Board. The renewed emphasis placed on the use of community-based sanctions/services for these target populations has resulted in a decrease in the overall prison commitment rates, prison commitments of straddle cell offenders and probation violators.

Local jurisdictions have continually reviewed sentence recommendations and updated probation violation response guides consistent with Department policies in order to achieve a reduction in prison intake, improve jail utilization, and maintain public safety.

Further, local jurisdictions continue to update: target populations; program eligibility criteria for community corrections programs; and the range of sentencing options for these population groups (i.e., straddle cell offenders with SGL prior record variables of 35 points or more, probation violators, offenders sentenced to prison for two years or less, and parole violators). These target populations were a primary focus during the review of local community corrections comprehensive plans and a key determinant for the recommendations of funding in the past two fiscal years, including FY 2006 awards.

Multiple changes have been and continue to be made among counties to improve capabilities to reduce or maintain prison commitments, increase emphases on utilizing jail beds for higher risk cases, and reduce recidivism. These changes include:

- Implementation of processes and instruments to quickly and more objectively identify low to high risk cases at the pretrial stage.
- Implementation of instruments and processes to objectively assess needs of the higher risk offenders.
- Utilization of the results of screening/assessments to assist in the selection of conditional release options for pretrial defendants and conditions of sentencing.
- The development and implementation of policies within local jurisdictions to emphasize proportionality in the use of sanctions/services (i.e., low levels of supervision and services for low risk offenders and utilizing more intensive programming for the higher risk offenders).
- Implementation and expansion of cognitive behavioral-based programming with eligibility criteria restricted to offenders that are at a higher risk of recidivism.
- Increased focus is being placed on continuity of treatment to ensure offenders are able to continue participation in education, substance abuse, or other programming as they move among supervision options such as the jail, residential programs, etc.

The changes which are being made among the counties are consistent with the objectives and priorities adopted by the State Board. They are also in sync with research which has demonstrated that prison and jail commitment rates can be reduced and recidivism reduction can be achieved through effective case differentiation based on risk, matching sanctions/services by objective assessments, proportional allocation of supervision and treatment according to levels of risk/needs, and utilization of intensive (preferably cognitive behavioral-based) programming for offenders at higher risk of recidivism.

## **Community Corrections Programs**

The planning process prescribed by the Office of Community Corrections requires the Community Corrections Advisory Boards to identify linkages with other agencies, e.g., Michigan Works, Substance Abuse, Community Health, local school districts, etc., to facilitate cost-effective services to offenders and minimize duplication of services and administrative costs.

The Office of Community Corrections has administrative responsibilities for the following:

**Community Corrections Comprehensive Plans and Services** funds, awarded to local units of government, support a wide range of sanctions and services (e.g. case management, cognitive behavioral programming, community service, day reporting, education, electronic monitoring, employment services, mental health treatment, pretrial services, substance abuse treatment, etc.) which vary from county to county depending on local needs and priorities. Per the priorities adopted by the State Community Corrections Board, increased emphases are placed on strengthening treatment effect of programs and services supported by community corrections funds.

**Residential Services** funds are utilized to purchase residential and support services for eligible felony offenders. The FY 2006 funds, awarded for residential services, support an average daily population of 976. Emphases are on continued development of variable lengths of stay for different population groups – especially probation and parole violators, and improving program quality and offender movement between residential services and other local sanctions and services.

**Drunk Driver Jail Reduction & Community Treatment Program** funds are utilized to increase availability of treatment options to reduce drunk driving and drunk driving-related deaths by addressing the alcohol addiction of felony drunk drivers; to divert from jail sentences or to reduce the length of jail sentences for felony drunk drivers who otherwise would have been sentenced to jail; and to provide a policy and funding framework to make additional jail space available for housing convicted felons with the aim of enabling counties to receive county jail reimbursement.

**County Jail Reimbursement Program (CJRP)** funds are used to reimburse counties that sentence certain felony offenders — such as nonviolent, habitual offenders — to jail instead of prison. CJRP reimburses for the following felony populations:

- Except for G and H class offenders, straddle cell offenders with a prior record variable score of 35 or more points.
- All presumptive prison cell offenders (the minimum/minimum exceeds 12 months).

**Implementation, Monitoring, and Evaluation** - Emphases for FY 2006 include: refinement of local policies; improving the structure, design, and cost efficiencies of local programs; and monitoring/assessment of prison admissions, jail utilization, program utilization and treatment effect. Data from the Community Corrections and Jail Population Information Systems and the OMNI/BIR extract data base are utilized to: monitor patterns and trends in prison admissions, jail utilization and program utilization; conduct comparative analyses among programs; and assess programmatic and fiscal impacts of policy options. Local jurisdictions utilized various assessment instruments to determine an offender's risk of recidivism and criminogenic needs, produce data/information to guide case planning and case management, and monitor an offender's progress.

## FY 2006 AWARD OF FUNDS

### **Community Corrections Comprehensive Plans and Applications**

In August 2005, the State Community Corrections Board reviewed 46 proposals for Community Corrections Funds for FY 2006. The State Board recommended and Director Patricia L. Caruso approved the award of \$31.2 million to support Community Corrections programs in 72 of Michigan's 83 counties.

- The proposals are pursuant to 46 county, city-county, or multi-county comprehensive corrections' plans which provide a policy framework for community corrections' funded programs in the 72 counties.

The comprehensive plans and applications submitted by local jurisdictions addressed objectives and priorities of P.A. 511 of 1988 and the Appropriations Act, as well as objectives and priorities adopted by the State Community Corrections Board and local jurisdictions.

The attached table, entitled "FY 2006 Summary of Award Amounts," identifies the requests for Comprehensive Plans and Services, Drunk Driver Jail Reduction & Community Treatment Program, and Residential Services funds from each jurisdiction and the awards of funds as recommended by the State Community Corrections Board and approved by the Director of the Department of Corrections. The total amounts do not include funds that are being held in reserve.

## FY 2006 SUMMARY OF AWARD AMOUNTS

CCAB	Comprehensive Plans & Services			Residential Services		Drunk Driver Jail Reduction & Community Treatment			Total Award Amount
	Requested Amount	Award Amount	Reserved Funds	Requested Amount	Award Amount	Requested Amount	Award Amount	Reserved Funds	
ALLEGAN	140,076	94,780	4,900	94,170	86,688	-	-		181,468
BARRY	102,515	83,901	-	31,596	34,675	13,500	5,332		123,908
BAY	152,748	147,820	-	235,425	260,063	22,950	22,950		430,833
BERRIEN	182,597	167,097	10,000	627,800	572,138	-	-		739,235
CALHOUN	284,801	208,335	-	549,325	468,113	40,500	40,500		716,948
CASS	87,575	83,100	-	192,355	156,038	27,000	9,350		248,488
CENTRAL U.P.	85,239	80,217	1,000	-	-	2,700	2,700		82,917
CLINTON	94,552	77,000	-	31,390	17,338	13,500	4,414		98,752
EASTERN U.P.	134,500	127,000	-	-	-	10,800	2,279		129,279
EATON	264,572	151,305	-	188,340	208,050	59,388	26,255		385,610
GENESEE	434,000	374,000	60,000	1,271,295	1,404,338	133,650	133,650		1,911,988
HURON	50,300	45,800	-	31,390	10,080	-	-		55,880
INGHAM/LANSING	370,181	289,300	-	596,410	537,463	43,200	43,200		869,963
IONIA	105,500	83,000	-	62,780	52,013	40,000	25,557		160,570
ISABELLA	118,519	103,369	-	31,390	34,675	12,150	12,150		150,194
JACKSON	212,023	197,700	-	282,510	260,063	34,420	34,400		492,163
KALAMAZOO	457,100	403,000	-	1,349,770	1,352,325	17,500	10,806		1,766,131
KENT	924,071	796,670	-	1,177,125	1,300,313	106,643	87,600		2,184,583
LENAWEE	93,000	43,650	15,350	125,560	104,025	8,578	1,744		149,419
LIVINGSTON	511,045	180,474	-	282,510	104,025	93,320	16,752		301,251
MACOMB	1,238,781	859,793	-	1,020,175	693,500	90,450	90,450		1,643,743
MARQUETTE	111,638	79,000	-	31,390	34,675	12,150	2,228		115,903
MASON	120,050	56,400	-	100,448	17,338	38,950	29,698		103,436
MECOSTA	73,793	65,300	-	78,475	34,675	-	-		99,975
MIDLAND	144,268	141,913	-	172,645	138,700	33,750	33,750		314,363
MONROE	190,550	190,550	-	376,680	416,100	-	-		606,650
MONTCALM	79,180	65,930	13,250	-	104,025	22,950	4,950		174,905
MUSKEGON	239,996	149,078	88,652	863,225	745,513	64,014		51,300	894,591
NORTHERN MI	222,300	194,305	-	62,780	69,350	34,400	19,640		283,295
NORTHWEST MI	392,160	392,160	-	141,642	138,700	54,000	30,010		560,870
OAKLAND	1,475,853	1,361,408	63,000	1,569,500	1,560,375	759,556	702,139		3,623,922
OSCEOLA	56,397	48,000	3,600	78,475	17,338	-	-		65,338
OTTAWA	220,000	220,000	-	94,170	104,025	26,395	20,300		344,325
SAGINAW	377,805	301,600	-	1,020,175	866,875	81,000	81,000		1,249,475
ST. CLAIR	189,985	187,500	-	706,275	693,500	121,500	121,500		1,002,500
ST. JOSEPH	109,100	104,100	-	360,985	346,750	-	-		450,850
SHIAWASSEE	100,015	59,598	-	15,695	17,338	48,543	18,158		95,094
SUNRISE SIDE	153,050	118,700	-	47,085	52,013	19,000	4,138		174,851
THIRTEENTH CIR.	201,710	180,710	-	141,255	138,700	62,100	62,100		381,510
THIRTY FOURTH CIR	152,000	152,000	-	35,040	34,675	40,595	11,546		198,221
THUMB REGIONAL	594,919	179,800	-	188,340	86,688	153,375	97,330		363,818
TRI COUNTY REG	136,750	123,081	-	-	-	-	-		123,081
VAN BUREN	176,151	93,720	26,010	235,425	190,713	13,500	13,500		297,933
WASHTENAW	612,684	356,597	-	549,325	312,075	59,400	59,400		728,072
WAYNE	3,885,866	2,533,660	-	4,816,125	3,114,761	275,400	148,124		5,796,545
WCUP	304,370	292,620	2,100	67,160	34,675	-	-		327,295
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>16,364,284</b>	<b>12,245,041</b>	<b>287,862</b>	<b>19,433,631</b>	<b>16,925,500</b>	<b>2,690,827</b>	<b>2,029,600</b>	<b>51,300</b>	<b>31,200,141</b>

## **Community Corrections Plans and Services**

<b>FY 2006 Appropriation</b>	<b>\$12,533,000</b>
<b>FY 2006 Award of Funds</b>	<b>\$12,245,041</b>

FY 2006 Community Corrections Plans and Services funds have been awarded to support community-based programs in 72 counties (46 county, city-county, or multi-county CCABs). Nearly \$391,000 is being held in reserve for several counties until specific contractual conditions are complied with – additional awards are expected to be made during the year to continue local programming.

The Plans and Services funds are utilized within local jurisdictions to support a wide range of programming options for eligible defendants and sentenced offenders. The distribution of funds among program categories is presented below.

### **Resource Commitment by Program Category:**

Community Service	\$1,040,516
Education	\$1,426,605
Employment/Training	\$ 116,740
Intensive Supervision	\$1,162,844
Mental Health	\$ 426,112
Pretrial	\$1,467,473
Substance Abuse	\$1,617,832
Case Management	\$2,218,097
Other	\$ 13,000
CCAB Administration	\$2,755,822

The commitment of funds among program categories has been changing, and it is expected that this pattern will continue over time as increased efforts are made throughout the state to address recidivism reduction through improving treatment effectiveness. More specifically, it is expected there will be a continued shifting of resources to cognitive behavioral-based and other programming for high risk of recidivism offenders.

This shifting or reallocation of resources, which began during FY 1999 and continued through the FY 2006 proposal development and award of funds processes, reflects the effort and commitment of local jurisdictions to improve treatment effectiveness and reduce recidivism through the development and implementation of new approaches to substance abuse treatment, education and employment programming, improved case planning, sanction and service matching, case management functions, and strengthened monitoring and evaluation capabilities.

### **Resource Commitment by Local Jurisdiction**

The sanctions and services for each jurisdiction, which are supported by FY 2006 Comprehensive Plans and Services funds, are identified on the attached table entitled, "Comprehensive Plans and Services: Summary of Program Budgets - FY 2006."

**MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS**  
**FIELD OPERATIONS ADMINISTRATION**  
**Office of Community Corrections**

**Comprehensive Plans And Services: Summary Of Program Budgets - FY 2006**

CCAB	COMMUNITY SERVICE	EDUCATION	EMPLOYMENT & TRAINING	INTENSIVE SUPERVISION	MENTAL HEALTH	PRETRIAL	SUBSTANCE ABUSE	CASE MANAGEMENT	OTHER	ADMIN.	TOTAL
ALLEGAN	16,640	46,240	0	0	0	0	0	19,000	0	12,900	94,780
BARRY	2,500	33,978	0	23,253	0	0	0	0	0	24,170	83,901
BAY	12,000	18,000	0	0	0	20,000	38,260	16,060	0	43,500	147,820
BERRIEN	0	0	0	70,000	0	0	20,000	43,897	0	33,200	167,097
CALHOUN	0	24,640	0	33,507	0	80,600	0	23,000	0	46,588	208,335
CASS	5,400	0	0	9,600	0	0	19,500	23,400	0	25,200	83,100
CENTRAL U.P.	55,472	0	0	1,000	0	0	0	0	0	23,745	80,217
CLINTON	0	22,752	0	0	0	0	0	33,998	0	20,250	77,000
EASTERN U.P.	52,593	0	0	36,116	0	0	0	0	0	38,291	127,000
EATON	36,000	29,875	0	3,500	0	0	0	25,030	11,000	45,900	151,305
GENESEE	15,000	0	0	0	5,000	59,000	70,000	108,000	0	117,000	374,000
HURON	18,000	4,500	0	0	0	0	9,575	0	0	13,725	45,800
INGHAM/LANSING	53,000	0	64,600	35,000	0	0	62,200	12,500	0	62,000	289,300
IONIA	18,000	25,000	0	0	0	0	15,000	0	0	25,000	83,000
ISABELLA	0	34,919	0	20,000	6,000	0	0	14,800	0	27,650	103,369
JACKSON	48,950	27,000	0	0	0	0	48,950	20,000	0	52,800	197,700
KALAMAZOO	20,800	4,400	0	81,600	0	143,000	83,500	0	0	69,700	403,000
KENT	58,086	35,280	28,240	60,000	37,800	135,664	200,950	55,150	0	185,500	796,670
LENAWEE	24,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	6,000	0	13,650	43,650
LIVINGSTON	0	36,300	0	21,800	0	68,041	0	21,375	0	32,958	180,474
MACOMB	59,500	109,000	0	102,500	218,793	106,000	24,000	102,000	2,000	136,000	859,793
MARQUETTE	26,000	15,000	0	17,000	0	0	0	0	0	21,000	79,000
MASON	0	10,000	0	0	10,000	0	0	20,500	0	15,900	56,400
MECOSTA	22,000	0	0	14,000	0	0	0	13,500	0	15,800	65,300
MIDLAND	0	0	2,600	0	15,408	0	71,485	20,460	0	31,960	141,913
MONROE	0	0	12,000	7,150	15,600	12,000	108,800	0	0	35,000	190,550
MONTCALM	7,250	18,000	3,300	3,250	0	0	13,880	2,000	0	18,250	65,930
MUSKEGON	0	21,034	0	8,221	0	7,742	20,000	40,276	0	51,805	149,078

CCAB	COMMUNITY SERVICE	EDUCATION	EMPLOYMENT & TRAINING	INTENSIVE SUPERVISION	MENTAL HEALTH	PRETRIAL	SUBSTANCE ABUSE	CASE MANAGEMENT	OTHER	ADMIN.	TOTAL
NORTHERN MI	26,605	23,000	0	23,000	18,000	5,000	3,000	50,400	0	45,300	194,305
NORTHWEST MI	0	88,200	0	0	12,285	0	41,500	204,301	0	45,874	392,160
OAKLAND	0	155,000	0	0	0	598,105	61,932	443,826	0	102,545	1,361,408
OSCEOLA	33,298	0	0	3,165	0	0	0	0	0	11,537	48,000
OTTAWA	54,000	25,000	0	70,000	0	0	0	22,755	0	48,245	220,000
SAGINAW	0	17,196	6,000	10,000	0	120,632	55,000	30,000	0	62,772	301,600
ST. CLAIR	0	11,200	0	20,000	0	38,800	8,200	78,200	0	31,100	187,500
ST. JOSEPH	0	25,000	0	32,900	20,200	0	0	0	0	26,000	104,100
SHIAWASSEE	0	25,083	0	16,715	0	0	0	0	0	17,800	59,598
SUNRISE SIDE	0	88,200	0	0	12,285	0	41,500	204,301	0	45,874	118,700
THIRTEENTH CIR	0	12,000	0	57,860	8,000	0	0	77,150	0	25,700	180,710
THIRTY FOURTH CIRCUIT	17,922	27,608	0	11,187	12,026	0	24,200	19,557	0	39,500	152,000
THUMB REG	43,000	0	0	24,000	0	0	46,000	22,800	0	44,000	179,800
TRI COUNTY REG	76,000	8,400	0	0	0	0	0	2,000	0	36,681	123,081
VAN BUREN	25,000	0	0	7,820	0	0	0	39,765	0	21,135	93,720
WASHTENAW	0	30,000	0	50,000	0	72,889	60,000	31,237	0	112,471	356,597
WAYNE	20,000	450,000	0	260,000	0	0	502,000	553,160	0	748,500	2,533,660
WCUP	190,500	0	0	23,700	0	0	9,900	0	0	68,520	292,620
<b>TOTALS</b>	1,040,516	1,426,605	116,740	1,162,844	426,112	1,467,473	1,617,832	2,218,097	13,000	2,755,822	12,245,041

## Residential Services

<b>FY 2006 Appropriation</b>	<b>\$16,925,500</b>
<b>FY 2006 Award of Funds</b>	<b>\$16,925,500</b>

FY 2006 funds were awarded to support residential services pursuant to 43 local comprehensive corrections' plans. The FY 2006 awards respond to program utilization patterns between local jurisdictions and create greater capabilities for local jurisdictions to purchase residential services for eligible felony offenders from a wider range of providers.

During FY 2006, emphases continues to be on: utilizing residential services as part of a continuum of sanctions and services (e.g., short-term residential substance abuse treatment services followed by outpatient treatment as appropriate, residential services followed by day reporting), reducing the length of stay in residence, increasing the utilization of short-term residential services for probation violators, and increasing utilization for parole violators.

The FY 2006 appropriation supports an average daily population (ADP) of 976 which is 32 less residential beds than FY 2005. The Legislature increased the maximum per diem from \$43.00 to \$47.50.

It is expected that with the decrease in residential services that an over-utilization of residential services may be experienced in FY 2006 and that the actual ADP will be greater than 976.

The increased utilization for FY 2006 is expected due to several factors:

- A decrease in the average daily population for residential services.
- It is expected that greater emphasis on parole violators will have an impact on the utilization rates of residential services – sixty (60) residential beds have been dedicated specifically for this population. The closing of the Southwestern Michigan Community Corrections Center in Berrien County, Kalamazoo Residential Programming Center, Buena Vista Correction Center in Saginaw and the Woodward Corrections Center in Wayne County will likely have an impact on utilization rates of residential services.
- Utilization patterns among other jurisdictions are expected to continue to increase through FY 2006.
- The statutory guidelines will continue to produce increased demands for residential services. Specifically, offenders with guideline scores in the straddle cells and the higher end of the intermediate sanction cells are increasingly sentenced to a jail term followed by placement in a residential program.
- Administrative changes and program referral processes in Wayne County are likely to have a greater impact on program utilization rates of residential services.
- Attention will continue to be focused on the utilization of residential services in response to probation violations and eligible parole violators in accordance with the department's policies and procedures.

The attached table provides information regarding the past four fiscal years= data of the actual average daily population, the FY 2006 awards, and the authorized average daily population of each jurisdiction.

CCAB	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005 (Thru July)	FY 2006	
	ADP	ADP	ADP	ADP	AUTH. ADP	AWARD
ALLEGAN			4.49	6.11	5	86,688
BARRY			0.92	1.00	2	34,675
ALLEGAN/BARRY	6.4	5.4	6.30	-	-	-
BAY	4.1	6.5	5.92	14.81	15	260,063
BERRIEN	18.1	30.7	33.00	35.47	33	572,138
CALHOUN	19.6	24.5	22.43	24.46	27	468,113
CASS				9.92	9	156,038
CENTRAL U.P.						-
CLINTON				0.55	1	17,338
EASTERN U.P.						-
EATON	3.2	4.5	8.61	11.09	12	208,050
GENESEE	86.2	81.05	71.63	82.40	81	1,404,338
HURON					1	10,080
INGHAM	34.2	36	24.88	27.35	31	537,463
IONIA				2.57	3	52,013
ISABELLA		0.8	1.65	1.89	2	34,675
JACKSON	13.5	11.5	8.50	12.73	15	260,063
KALAMAZOO	84.2	70.9	73.70	75.29	78	1,352,325
KENT	95.8	98	84.67	73.99	75	1,300,313
LENAWEE			7.86	6.32	6	104,025
LIVINGSTON		9.4	6.75	5.75	6	104,025
MACOMB	25.8	24.6	27.97	36.94	40	693,500
MARQUETTE	2.4	1.9	1.38	2.19	2	34,675
MASON				1.35	1	17,338
MECOSTA				1.76	2	34,675
MIDLAND	4.3	5	3.53	6.29	8	138,700
MONROE	16.4	18	20.21	20.27	24	416,100
MONTCALM				5.79	6	104,025
MUSKEGON	30.7	35.8	39.87	45.07	43	745,513
NORTHERN MICHIGAN	3.5	2.6	2.67	5.16	4	69,350
NORTHWEST MICHIGAN	8.9	9	7.12	2.26	8	138,700
OAKLAND	91	87.1	104.76	7.49	90	1,560,375
OSCEOLA				88.54	1	17,338
OTTAWA	3	4.9	3.14	1.19	6	104,025
SAGINAW	51.1	54.4	59.11	5.53	50	866,875
SHIAWASSEE			0.52	0.82	1	17,338
ST. CLAIR	42.7	44.1	30.60	37.52	40	693,500
ST JOSEPH	43.1	47.7	34.34	23.48	20	346,750
SUNRISE SIDE	4.8	5.6	3.41	1.12	3	52,013
THIRTEENTH	9.8	8.8	9.33	7.70	8	138,700
THIRTY FOURTH	1.8	2.2	2.27	1.34	2	34,675
THUMB			3.33	4.65	5	86,688
TRI COUNTY REGIONAL.						-
VAN BUREN	4.7	10.4	11.55	8.35	11	190,713
WASHTENAW	25.5	22.4	21.67	17.96	18	312,075
WAYNE	170.2	149.5	200.54	176.49	180	3,114,761
WEST CENTRAL	4.2	3.1	0.75	1.82	2	34,675
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>909.20</b>	<b>916.35</b>	<b>943.08</b>	<b>949.57</b>	<b>976.64</b>	<b>16,925,500</b>

## **Drunk Driver Jail Reduction & Community Treatment Program**

<b>FY 2006 Appropriation</b>	<b>\$2,097,000</b>
<b>FY 2006 Award of Funds</b>	<b>\$2,029,600</b>

The FY 2006 Drunk Driver Jail Reduction and Community Treatment Program (DDJR&CTP) funds were awarded to support treatment options to reduce drunk driving and drunk driving-related deaths by addressing the alcohol addiction pursuant to 36 local comprehensive corrections' plans developed under P.A. 511.

The FY 2006 Appropriation is nearly \$1 million less than the FY 2005 budget. The awards for FY 2006 were adjusted based on the FY 2005 expenditures. All counties were awarded an increase over their FY 2005 expenditures up to the maximum allowed amount for each county.

The FY 2006 Appropriations Act, No. 4831 of 2005, Section 708 stipulates that the funds are appropriated and may be expended for any of the following purposes:

(a) To increase availability of treatment options to reduce drunk driving and drunk driving-related deaths by addressing the alcohol addiction of felony drunk drivers who otherwise likely would be sentenced to jail or a combination of jail and other sanctions.

(b) To divert from jail sentences or to reduce the length of jail sentences for felony drunk drivers who otherwise would have been sentenced to jail and whose recommended minimum sentence ranges under sentencing guidelines have upper limits of 18 months or less, through funding programs that may be used in lieu of incarceration and that increase the likelihood of rehabilitation.

(c) To provide a policy and funding framework to make additional jail space available for housing convicted felons whose recommended minimum sentence ranges under sentencing guidelines have lower limits of 12 months or less and who likely otherwise would be sentenced to prison, with the aim of enabling counties to meet or exceed amounts received through the county jail reimbursement program during Fiscal Year 2002-2003 and reducing the numbers of felons sentenced to prison.

The number of OUIL 3<sup>rd</sup> "intermediate" offenders identified in community corrections programs increased (245%) from 288 in January, 2004 to 720 in June 2005. Based on the Jail Population Information System data it appears that these programs are impacting jails – offenders occupying jail beds statewide on felony alcohol related offenses decreased from 3.2% in CY 2003 to 2.6% in CY 2004. While it is very promising to see a steady increase of drunk drivers in programs and decrease in the number of drunk drivers in jail, additional data is needed to determine the actual impact these programs are having versus other factors such as the State Police efforts in reducing drunk driving in the State.

## Drunk Driver Jail Reduction & Community Treatment Program

### Summary of Award Amounts - FY 2006

CCAB	IN JAIL ASSESSMENT	TREATMENT SERVICES	PRS	TOTAL
ALLEGAN				-
BARRY				5,332
BAY				22,950
BERRIEN				-
CALHOUN				40,500
CASS				9,350
CENTRAL U.P.				2,700
CLINTON				4,414
EASTERN U.P.				2,279
EATON				26,255
GENESEE				133,650
HURON				-
INGHAM/LANSING				43,200
IONIA				25,557
ISABELLA				12,150
JACKSON				34,400
KALAMAZOO				10,806
KENT				87,600
LENAWEE				1,744
LIVINGSTON				16,752
MACOMB				90,450
MARQUETTE				2,228
MASON				29,698
MECOSTA				-
MIDLAND				33,750
MONROE				-
MONTCALM				4,950
MUSKEGON				*
NORTHERN MICHIGAN				19,640
NORTHWEST MICHIGAN				30,010
OAKLAND				702,139
OSCEOLA				-
OTTAWA				20,300
SAGINAW				81,000
ST. CLAIR				121,500
ST. JOSEPH				-
SHIAWASSEE				18,158
SUNRISE SIDE				4,138
THIRTEENTH CIRCUIT				62,100
THIRTY FOURTH CIRCUIT				11,546
THUMB REGIONAL				97,330
TRI COUNTY REGIONAL				-
VAN BUREN				13,500
WASHTENAW				59,400
WAYNE				148,124
WCUP				-
<b>TOTALS</b>				<b>2,029,600</b>

Note: \* Muskegon County funding held in reserve \$51,300.