

# STATE COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS BOARD MEETING

April 21, 2005

Michigan State Library and Conference Center  
Lansing, Michigan

## Approved Minutes

**PRESENT:** Charles Brown, Alfred Butzbaugh, Patricia Caruso, Louis Dean, Stuart Dunnings, Larry Inman, Michael Nye, Brigette Officer, Bernard Parker, John Phillips, Carl Solden, George Zulakis.

Chair Larry Inman acknowledged and welcomed the newly appointed Board Members: Alfred Butzbaugh of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Circuit Court, Berrien County, representing circuit court judges and replacing Judge Nanci Grant; Brigette Officer of 30<sup>th</sup> District Court, Wayne County, representing district court judges and replacing Judge Louise Alderson; Stuart Dunnings of Ingham County Prosecutor's Office, representing county prosecuting attorneys and replacing Norman Donker. Also, Board Member Inez Brown, City Clerk of Flint, representing city government, was congratulated on her recent reappointment. Brief roundtable introductions of the Board Members were exchanged.

**I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:** Motion by Mr. Parker, supported by Mr. Dean, to approve the agenda with the following additions under New Business: the discussion of multi-year contracts, funding formulas, status report on ReEntry, and establishment of two work groups.

VOTE: Motion passed unanimously.

**II. APPROVAL OF August 19, 2004 MINUTES:** Motion by Mr. Nye, supported by Mr. Parker, to approve the August 19, 2004 Minutes as written.

VOTE: Motion passed unanimously.

**III. AMINISTRATOR REPORT:** *Prison Commitment Rates* - Administrator Brzozowski reported that the department's Felony Disposition data reports for CY 2003/2004 were sent to the CCAB Managers last month which will assist the counties through their strategic planning process for FY 2006 Application. The data showed that the overall prison commitment rate for the state decreased from 21.8% to 20.3%. The State Board's priority target population is straddle cell offenders and that population's PCR decreased from 37.4% in CY 2003 to 34.2% in CY 2004.

These rates continued to decline as expected because of the strategic planning process required by the State Board and the state's renewed emphasis on targeting straddle cell offenders to control the state's prison growth with their Five Year Plan.

*Training* – In January, OCC staff provided training relative to the Community Corrections Comprehensive Plan and Application for FY 2006. All CCABs, with the exception of two, had staff attending who have the primary responsibility for completing the document. Training evaluations were "very good" to "outstanding" in most categories.

OCC Staff also provided "New Manager Training" to new CCAB Managers providing them with a general office orientation and basic overview of specific staff functions. Nine new CCAB Managers and three CCAB Managers requesting "refresher" training included: Calhoun, Clinton, Eastern U.P., Genesee, Ionia, Livingston, Mason, Northern Michigan, Sunrise Side, Van Buren, Washtenaw and Wayne Counties. A majority of the evaluations received rated the training "very good" to "outstanding" in most categories.

OCC has sponsored over 30 “Motivational Interviewing” training sessions in the past two years at various locations throughout the state. Six additional two-day sessions have been scheduled for March through May.

*Budget Update* – For FY 2004 all contracts have been closed and final payments processed, except for Sanilac County – the CCAB Manager has not submitted their Year End Report as required by contractual agreement.

Due to the MDOC budget deficit of \$18 million for FY 2005, the OCC will not be able to reallocate underutilized funds from one county to another. The Office will approve line item budget adjustments within the appropriation as long as the award is not increased.

The FY 2006 Executive Budget includes \$4 million within the Comprehensive Plans and Services appropriation to expand local jail capacity, specifically: residential beds, mental health diversion programs, increased pretrial services and expansion, renovation, or construction of new jail beds.

**IV. CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS:** Chairman Inman called the Board’s attention to two items for the Board’s consideration; the Midyear Review for Livingston County and Sanilac County compliance issues.

*Livingston County CCAB* - Representing Livingston County was Paul Wojewuczki, CCAB Manager and Christine Curtis, OCC Programs and Services Section Manager. Ms. Curtis had been the Coordinator for Livingston County, but has recently received a promotion to her new position.

Ms. Curtis noted that Mr. Wojewuczki had been CCAB Manager in Livingston County since last summer and due to his efforts the county’s comprehensive corrections plan has significantly improved. In the application that was submitted for FY 2005, there was virtually nothing that addressed strategic planning, objectives, outcomes, etc. Once the county was advised that they were being put on probation, they made some changes in management and Mr. Wojewuczki was named CCAB Manager.

The CCAB is now using data and technical assistance that MDOC has provided, participated in trainings, clarified what the expectations are regarding prison commitment rates and understands the objectives that they need to have locally in order to both meet goals of the MDOC and locally for jail improvement. Benchmarks that were set for the county to achieve, in terms of specific prison commitment rates, have been complied with. Ms. Curtis stated that the CCAB has done a phenomenal job in addressing all the issues.

Livingston County had been given six months funding for FY 2005. Due to the State Board Meeting being cancelled in February the county was given a one month extension until the next meeting. Ms. Curtis recommended awarding the balance of the reserved funding for Livingston County for the remaining months of this fiscal year.

**MOTION:** Motion by Judge Nye, supported by Mr. Dean, to approve the balance of the funding for Livingston County pursuant to OCC staff recommendations (CPS - \$68,531; DDJR & CPT - \$42,701; PRS - \$39,237; TOTAL - \$150,469). This recommendation is to be forwarded to Director Caruso. Judge Nye noted that Livingston County had come a long way since they were last reviewed by the State Board.

**VOTE:** There was a roll call vote to approve the balance of funding for Livingston County as presented and present this recommendation to Director Caruso. Charles Brown – Yes; Alfred Butzbuagh – Yes; Patricia Caruso – Yes; Louis Dean - Yes; Stuart Dunnings – Yes; Larry Inman – Yes; Michael Nye – Yes; Brigette Officer – Yes; Bernard Parker – Yes; John Phillips – Yes; Carl Solden – Yes; George Zulakis – Yes. Motion passed unanimously.

*Sanilac County* – Administrator Brzozowski called the Board's attention to a copy of a letter (located in the Board packet) he had sent to Sanilac County, requesting that representatives appear before the State Board on this date to provide detailed information relative to program utilization, program expenditures, and discuss the County's reason(s) for not submitting the required reporting documents (FY 2004 Year End Report – due October 31<sup>st</sup>, CCIS data not being submitted since Sept. 04, FY 2005 Midyear Report – due March 15<sup>th</sup>) Because these reports have not been submitted, OCC cannot monitor the programs to ensure that the funding that has been awarded to the county is being utilized for its intended purpose. Mr. Brzozowski noted that data and the Year End Report had been sent to the office late this morning, however, there had not been enough time to review it for accuracy or completeness. Mr. Molloy also stated that he would have the FY 2005 Midyear Report submitted by next week.

There have been no expenditures submitted by the county so it is not known how much money has been spent and what type of expenditures would be forthcoming. Mr. Brzozowski requested that representatives provide the State Board with rationale why these reports have not been submitted. This has been a historical practice of the county and not an isolated incident, thus the action being requested.

Representing Sanilac County was CCAB Manager, Dennis Molloy and OCC Coordinator Abe French.

Mr. French noted that there had been a consistent lack of communication over an extended period of time, and due to the lack of communication and no information, he is unable to identify problems in the county that may exist.

Mr. Phillips questioned how the State Board would be able to make any type of a decision regarding any information that Sanilac County presented today. He appreciated their attendance and wanted the opportunity to hear from them but, with the County being seven months late in their reporting, What was the expectation of the Board if they heard something that may identify why they were late? He didn't see how they could feel comfortable making an informed decision when even staff were not receiving information.

Mr. Molloy stated there was no legitimate excuse why the reports had not been submitted; that there was a small power-struggle in the county between himself (he was made the CCAB Manager last year) and another gentleman that was the Manager prior to that and this person is still earning the Manager's salary, and their CCAB has not made any movement to correct that situation. Mr. Molloy stated that he just wanted to make a stand, which he now views as pretty stupid, pretty selfish and he doesn't have any excuse for it. He has submitted everything to date, except for the Midyear Report and offered budget information if the State Board wanted it at this time.

Chairman Inman questioned if Mr. Molloy saw this situation as continuing to be a problem, in terms of reporting, or does Mr. Molloy have something in place that he feels confident that the reports will be submitted in a timely manner? Mr. Molloy assured the Chair that the reports would be coming in timely.

Mr. Nye questioned that since there was an on-going political struggle in the county, would this be resolved to where this program will be successful or is the in-fighting going to be so devastating that basically we are spinning our wheels there for any type of community corrections achievement? Mr. Molloy stated that the situation has actually been resolved somewhat, prior to today, by the fact that it is his responsibility to get the reports in and it will be his job if he doesn't.

Mr. Nye also questioned if Mr. Molloy had the backing of the CCAB; Mr. Molloy stated that yes, he did have their backing – both the CCAB and the County Commission.

Sheriff Brown questioned if there were two Managers drawing a salary? Mr. Molloy answered that no, the other person is drawing salary through the screening of assessment fund by doing OUIL III assessments for the Circuit Court.

Mr. Parker questioned that even though the information has now come to the OCC, how is the County doing in terms of the goals that had been set? Mr. Molloy answered that their prison commitment rate is 16.25% and program utilization is up; they have a community service program in which approximately 120 people are enrolled throughout the year; their jail worksite program (recycling center and jail work crew bus – which has been disbanded due to county budget issues) is still operational; increased trustee support for meals; in-jail substance abuse program is running up to par; day reporting program is above average right now with defendants – overall program utilization is doing well.

Discussion ensued regarding previous actions that may have been taken regarding reports not being submitted to the OCC. According to Mr. Brzozowski, this has not been an issue before, but only because this instance has been a continuing practice and the lack of communication with the CCAB, had this been brought before the State Board at this time.

Mr. Parker suggested that the CCAB may be put on a probationary status for a period of time, until the review of their reports and data is complete, improved communication, reviewed by the State Board and then the remaining funding be allocated to the county.

Director Caruso restated her understanding of the problem: X number of dollars in the grant that pays for staff support and previously there was a manager who drew manager's salary and got some other amount of money for screening these OUIL III's, and Mr. Molloy also worked there and was paid for his job. This gentleman is not the manager anymore, Mr. Molloy moved into the manager's job, but Mr. Molloy does not get the screening money – the other gentleman continued to receive that funding; and as a result of that Mr. Molloy did not submit the reports for six months. Mr. Molloy stated that wasn't quite correct; the manager's salary was cut in half, with the other gentleman receiving that other half of the salary that was put for more of the OUIL III's screening by the CCAB.

There was more discussion regarding the reasoning why on-site visits had not been conducted when there seemed to be problems with the county. Coordinator French stated that since he had become the coordinator for Sanilac County about 2 ½ years ago, he had made a site visit within 60 days and had requested information on their CCAB scheduled meetings so that he might attend. Through the months he continued to request that information and never received any dates for CCAB meetings and began communicating with the FOA Area Manager to see if there was an alternate way to receive this information. In the meantime he has sent numerous e-mails reminding Mr. Molloy that the reports had not been received. Mr. French then sent a letter to the CCAB Chair and Treasurer on January 31, 2005 after the Year End Report had been delinquent for 30 days, stating that the invoice for December, 2004 we had received would not be paid until this documentation was received. Within 10 days, Mr. Molloy called the office to say the report would be here "Friday", and this is the report that was received this morning. Last year, Coordinator French also put in the proposal for the CCAB a contractual objective, to submit reports in a timely manner (which has not happened).

Mr. French also noted that all reports that come to him from the county have been late or non-existent since he was assigned the county two and a half years ago. Last year's application came in on time but there were incomplete parts, with these pages being submitted approximately 30 days late.

For clarification, Administrator Brzozowski stated that the OCC did not reimburse the county, nor have we received any expenditure requests, during that time.

Chair Inman suggested that 1) the Board could authorize Administrator Brzozowski and the Director to move forward with the funding request subject to the review of the information that has presently been submitted to the OCC, with the understanding that we are not going to have further problems in reporting items; and 2) the Board would request Mr. Brzozowski return with some procedures, that when there are situations where information is not being received on a timely basis, that there is a process that is gone through – either a set of letters to the County Board Chair, Chief Circuit Court Judge, County Administrator, CCAB Chair – that there be full contact or an onsite visit with these key stakeholders involved in this program; that we just not let it set and get to the point where we are at today.

Mr. Phillips stated that he didn't think that the Board had let it set, and went back to what he believes is the charge is of the State Board in regards to PA 511, an advisory role to the Director of the Michigan Department of Corrections, that says that the Board should do certain things. They are to advise the Director on how to distribute these funds and it is clearly written that failure to do that, they are to withhold funds.

Mr. Phillips noted that the last letter that was sent by Coordinator French stated that reports needed to be sent immediately and was dated January 31, 2005. It was a conscious decision based on this struggle, and I can respect power struggles because we have them in all counties, that you are asked to do something. He stated that since his time on the State Board, Mr. Brzozowski and his staff have bent over backwards to allow people to provide these reports in somewhat of a timely manner; and I think we ought to do what we are charged to do.

Judge Officer questioned that when there is a situation as they are addressing today, does the Board or the Director generate a letter indicating that the reports have not been sent, and they must be submitted within a certain time period and what repercussion would happen if they didn't; and if so, was that type of letter sent so that they had notice that certain actions would take place within certain amount of days?

Administrator Brzozowski stated that the letter that Coordinator French sent indicated that they were not in compliance and funding would be withheld. He noted that they were trying to work in good faith with the Manager and were told that the reports would be coming in by the next week; and it doesn't arrive. It is a conscious decision not to do it – that the office's hands become tied. He noted that it is a good idea to send copies of these letters to the CCAB Chair to ensure that information is being delivered to the CCAB.

Sheriff Brown indicated that the concern he has is that because of the in-fighting, they are penalizing the county and the program. If the county doesn't know that there is a problem because of the situation that is within the program and the State Board does something to penalize them from having the money, he didn't think that was fair. He does agree that there is a certain responsibility of this Board to first notify someone in line, so that this stops, rather than penalize the county.

Mr. Parker stated that he agreed that they should not withhold the monies because we don't want the program to suffer as a result of that, but he also thinks there should be some responsibility that the county has to fulfill their contract requirements and submitting reports is a contract requirement. There has to be a consequence and he would recommend to the Director that some probationary action take place until the review is completed and that this situation would be a consideration next year in their contract.

Mr. Dunnings questioned how often are reports required to be submitted? Administrator Brzozowski stated that the CCIS data, which is the program utilization data, is required to be submitted the 15<sup>th</sup> day every month. He noted that the office has not received data from Sanilac County since September, 2004, and there has been a lack of correspondence for the past six months. For this

current fiscal year, we have no data, other than what was submitted this morning.

Mr. Dunnings also questioned if the letter that was sent in January, 2005, also was sent to the CCAB Chair? Coordinator French stated that a copy of the letter also went to the CCAB Chair and County Treasurer; there had been no response from the CCAB Chair, however, he did receive a call from the County Treasurer who is the fiscal agent for the county. He noted that the same scenario had happened the year before; the reports were late, the County Treasurer called wanting to know why they hadn't received their money, he told her it was because no reports had been submitted and as soon as the necessary reports are submitted, there will be reimbursement for their expenses. Once the utilization reports are received, expenditures are submitted and once we ensure that we have the data, then the expenditures are approved. Sanilac County has not received the September, 2004 payment, or any money for 2005.

Mr. Brzozowski stated that this was the control through the contract to meet this obligation, if they are not meeting their obligation, then the office will withhold funds. Nor have we received any expenditures from the county, they haven't asked for any money.

MOTION: Motion by Mr. Parker, supported by Mr. Dunnings, that a recommendation be made to Director Caruso to place Sanilac County on probation until the next meeting where we will consider either taking them off probation, withdrawing funds, or continue probation; and OCC staff to continue to review and provide the funding as it is appropriate. Notification of the probation is to be sent to the Chief Circuit Court Judge, Chair of the Board of Commissioners, and the statutory members of the Sanilac County CCAB.

Director Caruso wanted to comment officially that this is a serious situation and recognizes that this is a comparatively small amount of money compared to some grants. However, this money does not fall out of the sky, and whether the state is in a difficult financial situation or not, many people are charged with making decisions about how to allocate that money. She noted that it was not too much to expect any organization that receives money from the state or any other jurisdiction, to tell us how they are spending it. And the fact that they are spending it appropriately in hindsight is not a very good excuse. She wanted it conveyed to the county that she is not very impressed.

Mr. Dean asked Mr. Molloy that since now he is responsible for the timeliness of the reports being submitted and in the event this situation should continue, what did Mr. Molloy think should be the action of this Board? Mr. Molloy answered that he understood exactly what some of the Board Members are saying – that they don't deserve the funding if they don't comply with their requirements.

Judge Nye stated that it was his understanding that there has been 2 ½ years of late reports, so it is not the in-fighting that is causing the problem. Even with the old Manager, we were not receiving reports – it seems to be the attitude of the County that they are getting their money so who cares? It bothers him that for a long period when the reports were being submitted, they were always late and now we aren't getting any reports. The State Board needs to be fiscally responsible in their recommendations to the Director.

Administrator Brzozowski stated that at the next Board Meeting, we will be reviewing the proposals and within that proposal (for Sanilac County) we will incorporate what has occurred from this date to that review period if their information has been submitted to us on time and what the office recommendation would be based on, being under a probationary period that they need to comply with the contract, submit the data timely and that will give the State Board the information within the proposal for next year, as to what they have done through this probationary period for the rest of this year.

VOTE: There was a roll call vote to approve placing Sanilac County on probationary status as stated in the above motion, and present this recommendation to Director Caruso. Charles Brown – Yes; Alfred Butzbuagh – Yes; Patricia Caruso – Yes; Louis Dean - No; Stuart Dunnings – Yes; Larry Inman – Yes; Michael Nye – Yes; Brigette Officer – Yes; Bernard Parker – Yes; John Phillips – No; Carl Solden – Yes; George Zulakis – Yes. Motion passed.

**V. PUBLIC COMMENT:** *Bob Diehl, President of the Michigan Association for Community Corrections Advancement (MACCA) and Executive Director of Huron House in Port Huron, stated that he wanted to speak regarding a recent decision of the Michigan Department of Corrections not to reallocate Probation Residential Service (PRS) funds this fiscal year. He believed that this decision was short-sighted and will ultimately be counter productive. He noted that this decision will close off PRS beds for many jurisdictions and if these resources are reduced, or closed, judges and parole and probation officers are going to be left with little alternative other than prison. Mr. Diehl's full statement is attached, (Attachment A).*

Director Caruso stated that she was an admirer of Mr. Diehl's work and his organization, and she is certain that everyone here would like to be in the situation to reallocate those dollars because they certainly get a good value in the services. However, as was noted earlier, there is an estimated \$18 million potential deficit in the department and every potential dollar has been called in. Replacement roofs on prisons are not being done at this time, a thousand positions are not being filled, there is a moratorium on spending, etc. and this decision was part of the overall effort to save money. These decisions that are difficult and not popular are not made lightly. Director Caruso also stated that she could not disagree with Mr. Diehl's position and his remarks, except to say that this is something that they have to do.

Mr. Diehl suggested that there may be a possibility that they could review what the realities are now for the counties, make some minor readjustments to assure that the needs of the department and the needs of counties are being met – it may not result in saving approximately 100 beds statewide, but it may still result in saving 65-70 beds statewide once a reallocation is made. He stated that they know what the reality is but they are trying to work diligently to make sure that they are helping the department with it's' objectives, and is hopeful that they can have a discussion in that area.

*Donna Powell, Muskegon County CCAB Manager, stated that she was here to attempt to get some direction/information as to how the Board or State sees the impact of the reallocation of funding, or non-reallocation of funding on the locals. Regarding probation residential center services, Muskegon County has had a history of high prison commitment rates and as a result of a lot of work by the OCC in trying to get Muskegon County criminal justice stakeholders to get those numbers down, they utilized their probation residential centers to the extent that last year their ADP was raised from about 39 to 42 to cover the increased utilization that was evident.*

She noted that their prison commitment rates have come down significantly and have been stable for the past few months. If utilization continued as it was, they would be the county that would be out of funds on July 31<sup>st</sup>. As of March 31<sup>st</sup>, Muskegon County was at 61% of its utilization, which should have been at 50%. Ms. Powell stated that she was looking for some direction as to what the options are at this time; continue to proceed as they have until the money runs out or stay within budget because the county is not going to be liable for any additional utilization that occurs at the end of the fiscal year – the reaction of the bench would be that those people will go to prison.

Chairman Inman stated that there is no additional information other than what Director Caruso has stated being very clear on the dilemma facing the state and with the department.

Mr. Parker stated that the Director has made a decision, but the advisory Board has not, because he would not be in support of what has taken place as he thinks it will cost the department more in the long run.

OCC Program Services Manager, Christine Curtis stated that she appreciated what all the counties will be going through being over-utilized and the inability to reallocate beds, but those beds can be used any way that they would want to use them. One of things that are being discussed with the counties, as well as with the vendors, is to address length of stay issues. One issue to consider is once 30 days is spent in a residential program to then spend 30 days on tether or day reporting, or another type of reduction of control over the offender. It takes creativity and the resources can not be used the same way that they have been in the past.

Director Caruso state that she did not have any specific suggestions but she had no objections with sitting down, looking at specific counties, and reviewing each situation. Nothing may change from where they are now, however, they are constantly re-evaluating their projections. They have an obligation to the State of Michigan that they can't spend money that they don't have. Clearly, this is a decision they don't want to have to make.

**VI. OLD BUSINESS:** None

**VII. NEW BUSINESS:** *MULTI-YEAR CONTRACTS* - Administrator Brzozowski directed the Board's attention to the list of the summary of awards for Comprehensive Plans and Services for 2004 showing the highest appropriation to the lowest award, with a cutoff point of \$100,000. (See Attachment B).

The data through OCC has become more timely, updated and more accurate than we have seen it before. Mr. Brzozowski stated that the office is in a position now to consider multi-year contracts. In the past the office would not have considered multi-year contracts because they were making decisions on data that was over two years old. Today, we are getting data usually within 60 days of the end of a quarter and staff can review the data and monitor program utilization to ensure that the goals and objectives are actually being met.

Administrator Brzozowski proposed that for FY 2006, the OCC enter into multi-year contracts with counties for no more than three years, for any county that has a CPS of less than \$100,000; which accounts for 15 CCAB's. Mr. Brzozowski noted that the CCAB Managers that put the application together are committed to a three month process. This would eliminate the time the application involves, both for the Managers and for OCC staff to review these plans which would enable them to focus more on some of those counties that need more technical assistance.

PA 511 does require an annual application, so we would still go through a process where the CCAB would make revisions to their programming if needed and present for approval from their county commissions, and submit to the OCC indicating that what they are proposing for the next fiscal year is a continuation or explicitly identify what the modifications are in funding.

Sheriff Brown stated that he would agree with one addendum, that any county that is on probation would not be eligible for the multi-year contract – a county would have to be off probation for 6 months before they could be considered for a multi-year contract.

**MOTION:** Motion by Sheriff Brown, supported by Mr. Dean that the Board accepts those counties that have \$100,000 or less funding, that are not on probation at this time but will accept those that were on probation and have been off probation for six months, for up to a three year contract. This recommendation would be forwarded to Director Caruso.

Mr. Parker questioned if this was on the request that the counties make is over \$100,000 or what was the previous year for their allocation? Mr. Brzozowski stated that it was what the recommendation would be for the award; the county may make a request for \$125,000, where they

are recommended to receive \$100,000.

Judge Officer questioned if the smaller counties that receive less money, probably need more supervision because they have less staff, less internal checks and balance system, which may account for the situation of the county that was just discussed? If there were counties with larger awards and they had not been receiving money on a regular basis because reports had not been turned in, someone would notice that – she couldn't believe that in that particular county, no one realized that they had the programs continuing and they were not being reimbursed.

Administrator Brzozowski stated that we would not change the monitoring of counties, that the office would still require the monthly data to be reported and they would not be reimbursed if the data is not received, and go through the process of notifying the county's when they are not in compliance with the contract. Then, if it becomes an on-going issue, they will be asked to appear before the State Board for non-compliance and as the statute implies, halt funding.

Sheriff Brown stated that the comment could cut both ways because the smaller staff also is the one that doesn't have the time to prepare the application document every year and the fact that they would only need to supply a letter will make them more formative than what they are now.

VOTE: There was a roll call vote to approve the option of multi-year contracts for up to three years as stated in the above motion, and present this recommendation to Director Caruso. Charles Brown – Yes; Alfred Butzbuagh – Yes; Patricia Caruso – Yes; Louis Dean - Yes; Stuart Dunnings – Yes; Larry Inman – Yes; Michael Nye – Yes; Brigette Officer – Yes; Bernard Parker – Yes; John Phillips – Yes; Carl Solden – Yes; George Zulakis – Yes. Motion passed unanimously.

*FUNDING FORMULA* – Administrator Brzozowski noted that this had been discussed during the State Board's Study Session. There is a funding formula that was put in place in the early 1990's and is used only as a guide. The formula has been established through research and is based on judicial guidelines. The actual allocation is based on a base amount and a formula amount. The base amount is \$20,000 per county (for multi-counties there is an additional \$6,000 for each additional county). The formula amount is 2/3 the county population and 1/3 felony offender totals. Felony offender totals under the judicial guidelines, when this was voted by the Board and approved as a guide for OCC staff to utilize, was the total number of offenders with sentencing guidelines less than equal to 12 months and excluding all offenders with 0-3 sentencing guidelines; and that excluding those SGLs with min/max of 12 or more.

For several years we have been under legislative guidelines and we would now like to convert the actual formula into the legislative guidelines. By doing so when you compare it to the Board's priorities, the state's priorities, the straddle cell offenders, PRV 35 or more, excluding G and H's and then provide an additional credit offender count for every presumptive that is in the county that is sentenced locally and for intermediate more as a take away an offender for intermediate lock-out going to prison. This type of a formula's impact is less than a 1/2 %, but brings the formula into using legislative instead of judicial guidelines, consistent to the Board's priorities, and also how funds have been awarded in previous years. The actual impact is insignificant.

Mr. Brzozowski stated that next year it is expected that there will be three new CCABs to join the State which are Hillsdale, Branch and Gratiot Counties. The actual formula which is used as a guide would then be what the current guidelines are in the state. A county would not lose money based on this formula.

MOTION: Motion by Mr. Parker, supported by Mr. Dunnings, to approve the funding formula using legislative sentencing guidelines as a guide for awards that are proposed by the OCC to the State Board.

VOTE: There was a roll call vote to approve the funding formula as stated in the above motion, and present this recommendation to Director Caruso. Charles Brown – Yes; Alfred Butzbaugh – Yes; Patricia Caruso – Yes; Louis Dean - Yes; Stuart Dunnings – Yes; Larry Inman – Yes; Michael Nye – Yes; Brigette Officer – Yes; Bernard Parker – Yes; John Phillips – Yes; Carl Solden – Yes; George Zulakis – Yes. Motion passed unanimously.

*ESTABLISHING WORKGROUPS* – Administrator Brzozowski stated that the Governor had created a Task Force on Jail and Prison Overcrowding, which had the final report published in March, 2005. In regards to strategies to assist counties with jail overcrowding, there were short-term, intermediate and long-term strategies identified and some of them apply to this State Board. 1) To encourage the State Board and the Department of Corrections to re-evaluate the eligibility criteria for community-based residential services; a process that should include implementation of an objective, risk/needs assessment process.

Based on those recommendations, Mr. Brzozowski would like to have the State Board create a workgroup that would contain members of the Board, representatives from MACCA, MACCAB, ALASO, FOA , and OCC Staff to look at the current eligibility that is being used based on sentencing guidelines, review evidenced-based practices, risk/needs assessments, reimbursement for programs, etc.

Volunteers to make up the *Residential Services Eligibility Criteria Workgroup* are Sheriff Charles Brown, Judge Alfred Butzbaugh, Louis Dean, and Bernard Parker. There will also be representatives from MACCA, MACCAB and Prosecutors Assoc.

Mr. Brzozowski also stated that minimum standards have never been established for day reporting, work crews, substance abuse testing, etc. in the Comprehensive Plans and Services. He is requesting that a workgroup be established to review various programs and provide minimum standards for those programs, so that when they are funded, at least there are certain minimum standards that are being met. This is occurring in the PRS. If funding is going to be awarded for certain types of services, they should meet certain type of criteria to ensure that a certain level of programming is being offered.

Volunteers to make up the *Comprehensive Plans and Services Minimum Standards Workgroup* are Judge Michael Nye, John Phillips, representatives from MACCA, MACCAB and OCC Staff.

**VIII. STATUS REPORT ON RE-ENTRY:** OCC Coordinator Sandi Hoppough will present this report at the next meeting due to time constraints, however, she provided handouts to the Board detailing the structure of the Michigan Prisoner Re-Entry Model (MPRI), which is based a model that was developed through NIC. There is also a handout on the projected activity over the next three years. This model will be in place in all counties by the end of 2007.

Director Caruso stated that things are going very well regarding MPRI, there are eight pilots on board, just started a Re-Entry facility for males, which are the units at the Cooper Street in Jackson and the programs for women will be up and running in Ypsilanti. People are really embracing this concept even though it is a major culture change in the department and other state agencies.

Mr. Phillips will ask that Director Hendrickson get in contact with Director Caruso and her staff make a presentation on MPRI at the Michigan Association of Chiefs of Police.

Meeting adjourned.

