

**MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS/  
OFFICE OF COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS**

**ANNUAL REPORT**

**Requests and Awards of Funds  
for  
Fiscal Year 2002**

**Issued: November 1, 2001**

**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**

Annual Report (Citation P.A. 511) ..... 1

Introduction ..... 2

FY 2002 Objectives and Priorities ..... 5

FY 2002 Awards of Funds ..... 9

    FY 2002 Applications for and Awards of Community Corrections Funds ..... 10

    Community Corrections Plans and Services ..... 15

    Probation Residential Services ..... 18

## **REQUIREMENT FOR ANNUAL REPORT**

This report has been prepared pursuant to the provisions of Public Act No. 511 of 1988, Section 12(1) which states:

Sec. 12. (1) The office shall submit an annual report not later than November 1 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.

## **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 Department of Corrections. Executive Order 1995-16 transferred the Office of Community Corrections to the Department of Corrections, to improve efficiencies in administration and effectiveness within government.

The Office of Community Corrections operates within Field Operations Administration working in concert with Field Operations Administration Offices, Regions, and local governments to establish and utilize community corrections programs for appropriately selected offenders, mostly probationers. This partnership works together to reduce admissions to prison, improve utilization of jail facilities, improve rehabilitative services for offenders, strengthen offender accountability, and reduce recidivism.

### **Local Government Participation**

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 local comprehensive corrections plan identifies local policies and practice, and programs and services which are to be implemented to address the goals and objectives of P.A. 511, local needs, and priorities.

Since June of 1989, 80 of Michigan's 83 counties elected to participate through formulation of single county, multi-county, and city-county Community Corrections Advisory Boards. Fiscal Year 2001-2002 funds have been awarded to support implementation or continued operation of community-based sanctions and services in 71 counties.

### **Prison Admissions, Jail Utilization, and Program Utilization**

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

#### **Prison Commitments**

Michigan's prison commitment rate was 32% in 1990 and 23% in 2000; hence, nearly eighty percent (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 90's 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 2002 with priority being on offenders with sentencing guidelines in the straddle cells, probation violators and parole violators.

During 2000, 45% of the offenders in the straddle cell group were sentenced to jail, while 43% were sentenced to prison. Local jurisdictions continue to work toward further reductions in prison admissions and increased use of jail and other community based options for these offenders.

Probation and parole violators are priority populations for community corrections because offenders on probation or parole have been accounting for an increasing and now account for the largest proportion of prison admissions. These patterns/trends also indicate that while there has been an increased acceptance and use of local sentencing options, increased attention needs to be devoted to supervision and treatment options which will more effectively contribute to recidivism reduction.

### **Jail Utilization**

During the 1990s and through 2000 sentenced felons accounted for an increasing percentage of jails' average daily populations. The percentage of felony offenders sentenced to jail increased as prison commitment rates decreased; generally and increasingly the sentence to jail is a condition of probation and part of a structured sentenced plan which includes a relatively short term in jail followed by placement in residential or other community-based programs.

Local policies and practices directly affect the availability of jail beds which can be utilized for sentenced felons. In recognition of this reality, local jurisdictions have implemented a wide range of policies and practices which are designed to influence the number and length of stay of the several inmate population groups. These policies and practices include but are not limited to: conditional release options for pretrial detainees; restrictions of populations which can be housed in the jail in order to reserve jail beds for individuals who are a higher risk to public safety; earned release credits (reduction in jail time for participation in in-jail programming); and structured sentencing as referenced above.

### **Program Utilization**

Sentenced felons have accounted for an increasing percentage of community corrections program enrollees and for the vast majority of the enrollments in "treatment" type programs--substance abuse, mental health, education and employment. Misdemeanants account for the majority of enrollments in community service programs. Offenders with higher guidelines scores, probation violators, and OUIL offenders have accounted for increasing proportions of new enrollees in residential programs. This is expected to continue as increased reliance is placed on utilizing combinations of jail and other community-based programming for offenders with guidelines in the straddle cells, probation violators, and other priority population groups.

Increased emphasis is being placed throughout the state on treatment effect and cognitive behavioral based substance abuse, education, and employment programming which large scale research studies have shown reduce recidivism among higher risk of recidivism cases.

## **Programs**

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 and the specific sanctions and services supported by these funds vary from community to community depending upon local needs and priorities. Per the priorities adopted by the State Community Corrections Board and the Department in February 1999, and reaffirmed in February 2001, increased emphases are being placed on strengthening treatment effect of programs/services supported with community corrections funds.

**Probation Residential Services** funds are utilized to purchase residential and support services for eligible felony offenders. The FY 2002 funds awarded for residential services support an average daily population of 956. Emphases are on continued development of variable lengths of stay for different population groups, and improving program quality and offender movement between PRS and other local sanctions and services.

Funding for the **County Jail Reimbursement Program (CJRP)** is included within the appropriations for the Office of Community Corrections functions. The Michigan Department of Corrections County Jail Services Unit has responsibilities for administration for the program.

**Relationships with Other Programs:** The planning process prescribed by the Michigan Department of Corrections Office of Community Corrections requires each Community Corrections Advisory Board to identify means by which linkages with Michigan Works agencies, the Substance Abuse Coordinating Agency, the local Community Health Departments, the local school districts, etc., can/will facilitate the cost effective provision of services to offenders and avoid or minimize duplication of services and administrative costs.

### **Implementation, Monitoring, and Evaluation**

Emphases through FY 2002 include: refinement of local policies; improving the structure, design, and cost efficiencies of local programs; and monitoring/assessment of prison commitments, jail utilization, program utilization, and treatment effect. Data from Community Corrections and Jail Population Information Systems and the BIR 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. Various assessment instruments are utilized to assess risk of recidivism and criminogenic needs, produce data/information to guide case planning and case management, and monitor offender progress during and following participation in programs.

## **FY 2002 OBJECTIVES AND PRIORITIES**

## FY 2002 OBJECTIVES AND PRIORITIES

In order to be eligible for Community Corrections Act funding, local jurisdictions and programs work with offenders who: are bound for prison (especially with sentences of less than 24 months) or bound for jail without program intervention, and have not demonstrated a pattern of violent behavior or do not have a criminal record which indicates a pattern of violent offenses.

On February 22, 2001, the State Community Corrections Board recommended the adoption of the following priorities for the balance of Fiscal Year 2001 and for Fiscal Year 2002. This action reaffirmed priorities adopted in February 1999 to strengthen the focus of state and local community corrections policy, practice, and programming on treatment effect and recidivism reduction. The priorities were incorporated in the guidelines/instructions for the preparation of FY 2002 proposals and applications for funds by local jurisdictions, and training provided during the spring and summer of 2001.

### Prison Admissions

- Reduce or maintain low prison admissions for higher-end: a) offenders with sentencing guidelines which are within the “straddle cells”; b) probation violators; and c) parole violators.
- Offenders within the presumptive prison group are not to be targeted as a group, but jurisdictions are encouraged to examine use of local sentencing options on a case by case basis.
- Emphases are on use of community-based sanctions and services for offenders within “straddle cells” and creative use of jail time in conjunction with other community-based supervision and programming for these offenders.
- Focusing on probation violators as a priority population responds to three factors: 1) technical violations are not addressed in the statutory guidelines; 2) violators account for a large proportion of prison intake; 3) increasingly, the state and local jurisdictions will need to examine the impacts of the total sentence and supervision plan (initial disposition as well as responses to violations) on prison, jail, and other community-based resources and recidivism reduction objectives.
- A priority on parole violators has been re-emphasized considering: increased utilization of the jails and non-incarcerative options for this population can reduce prison intake

### Jail Utilization

- Priorities for jail utilization should be on use of jail beds for individuals charged with or convicted of crimes against persons and to protect public safety; to the maximum extent possible, utilization of jail beds should be restricted to higher risk of recidivism cases.

- Principles established within statutory guidelines relative to the use of incarceration for felons should be incorporated within local policies and practices relative to the use of jails and other sanctions and programming for misdemeanants, ordinance violators, and individuals on pretrial status.

Local jurisdictions through the Community Corrections Plan and/or jail management policies need to establish guidelines and parameters and limits for use of jail and other community-based options for all population groups.

For higher risk/need cases, jails should be utilized as a condition of probation and as part of a sentence plan which includes a short term in jail with release to other forms of supervision and/or treatment.

#### Target Populations for Community Corrections Programs

- Target populations are to be restricted to recidivism-prone higher risk/need cases (can include pretrial, misdemeanants, ordinance violators, and sentenced felons) provided specific criteria are employed. Examples of targeting criteria include but are not limited to: guideline scores, prior convictions, and program specific eligibility criteria.

An increased emphasis is to be placed on individuals with multiple prior convictions and/or multiple violations of probation. Moreover if misdemeanants are to be included in the local target populations for treatment programs priority is to be given to those with multiple prior convictions, including felony convictions, and a current offense for domestic violence, retail fraud, or drunk driving.

- Consistent with the public safety aims of the policies and procedures established for MDOC/FOA and participating P.A. 511 local jurisdictions, FOA may refer state parole violators to appropriate local correctional interventions, including available community corrections-funded sanctions and services. The following conditions should exist for a parole violator to be referred: bound for prison or TRV Center; the response to the violation is in accord with the review and approval by an MDOC Area Manager pursuant to MDOC Policy Directives and Operating Procedures; the referral placement is consistent with local target populations and eligibility criteria.
- Jurisdiction will need to revisit and update target population 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 and employment services.

- Probation Residential Services - Eligibility is restricted to felons with SGL min/max of 9 or greater or min/max of 6 or greater for probation violators.

## Interagency Policy and Program Development

- CCABs need to 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 strategies/practices need to be developed and/or updated to increase education levels and employability of offenders through increasing access to services available through local school districts and Michigan Works agencies.

## Sentencing Recommendation and Probation Violation Processing

- Each jurisdiction will need to continue to review sentencing recommendations and probation violation guidelines and processes, and update response guides consistent with MDOC policies to reinforce attainment of the prison commitment, jail utilization, program utilization, public safety, and recidivism reduction objectives.

## Administrative and/or Operational

- Local jurisdictions are encouraged to utilize system mapping principles and techniques to: illustrate processes, practices, and decision points within the local system; identify and define system issues; examine options to resolve issues; and guide updates and revision to the local comprehensive corrections plan.
- Local jurisdictions are to describe instruments utilized within the local jurisdiction to assess risk of recidivism and needs (particularly criminogenic needs) and how and where the instruments are used to guide or support case planning, case management, and monitoring/evaluation functions.

## Public Education

- Local jurisdictions are to develop specific objectives and strategies to increase awareness of community sanction and service options, their use, and impacts on the community and the offender.

## Monitoring and Evaluation

- Local strategies/procedures need to be developed and/or updated to: support ongoing monitoring of prison commitments, jail utilization, and program utilization; strengthen capabilities to assess the impacts of policies, practices, and programming on prison commitments and jail utilization; strengthen capabilities to monitor/assess offender progress and treatment effect; and strengthen capabilities to monitor/assess the content and quality of programs funded in whole or in part with state community corrections funds.

**FY 2002 AWARD OF FUNDS**

## **FY 2002 APPLICATIONS FOR AND AWARDS OF COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS FUNDS**

During July and August 2001, the State Community Corrections Board reviewed 43 proposals and applications for FY 2001 Community Corrections funds. The Board recommended and Director Martin approved the award of \$27.9 million to support Community Corrections programs in 71 of Michigan's 83 counties.

- The 43 proposals are pursuant to 43 county, city-county, or multi-county comprehensive corrections plans which provide a policy framework for community corrections funded programs in the 71 counties.
- During July, 23 proposals and applications for funds were reviewed; \$17.6 million was awarded pursuant to the 23 proposals to support programming in 39 counties.
- Another 20 proposals were reviewed during August and \$10.3 million was awarded for programming in 37 counties.

The proposals and applications submitted by local jurisdictions address objectives and priorities of P.A. 511 of 1988 (the Michigan Community Corrections Act) and the Appropriations Act, as well as objectives and priorities articulated by the State Community Corrections Board and the Department and by the local jurisdictions.

Observations/comments regarding FY 2000, FY 2001, and FY 2002 proposals/applications.

- Several changes are occurring among local jurisdictions. For example:  
  
Prison commitment rates have decreased in several jurisdictions. This is attributed in part to the statutory guidelines and is particularly evident among jurisdictions which historically have had rates greater than the state average.  
  
Changes in the utilization of jail beds and other community-based supervision and programming options in part reflect an increased utilization of combinations of jail and other community-based options.
- Increased attention is being devoted across the state to programming as per the priorities of the State Community Corrections Board and the Department.

During FY 2000 and FY 2001 a number of jurisdictions initiated new cognitive based programs. Several others are in the process of developing new programming or have plans to proceed with the implementation during FY 2002.

Educational programming is being enhanced within several jurisdictions with the implementation of computer-assisted instruction. These services are being made available in jails, residential centers, and at other locations within communities. This programming

has been developed through partnerships with local school districts. Additional communities will be implementing the program during FY 2002.

A number of jurisdictions have strengthened emphasis on employability, employment and retention. The basic objective is to not only address short term needs for employment but to increase potentials for job retention. Increasingly, this is being addressed through partnerships with Michigan Works agencies.

- Utilization of residential services during FY 2001 was lower than expected but an increase in utilization is expected for FY 2002.

Utilization of Probation Residential Services increased steadily through FY 2000 then decreased during FY 2001. The average daily population (ADP) was 588.9 in FY '95; 704.6 in FY '96; 771.4 in FY '97; 851.5 in FY '98, 865.8 in FY '99, 945.7 in FY 2000, and 906.2 in FY 2001.

The decrease during FY 2001 is attributed primarily to a lower than expected and a decreasing utilization of residential services during the year within Wayne County. For perspective the ADP for Wayne County was projected to be greater than 200 for the year; the actual ADP, however, was less than 170 and decreased during the year from 230 in October 2000 to 186 in December 2000 to 145 in July 2001.

Several changes are being implemented within Wayne County which are expected to produce an increase in the utilization of residential services during FY 2002. Most notably, changes in violations processing are expected to produce a decreased utilization of jail beds and increased use of residential and other services and supervision for this population.

The FY 2002 appropriations support an ADP of 956.

The attached table entitled "FY 2002 Proposals and Awards of Funds" identifies the requests for Comprehensive Plans and Services and Probation 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.

## FY 2002 PROPOSALS AND AWARDS OF FUNDS

CCAB	PLANS AND SERVICES		PROBATION RESIDENTIAL SERVICES				TOTAL
	FY 02 Requested Amount	FY02 Award	FY 02 Request		FY 02 Award		FY 02 Total Award
			Amount	ADP	Amount	ADP	
Allegan/Barry	186,378	165,640	109,865	7	78,475	5	244,115
Bay	145,820	145,820	78,475	5	78,475	5	224,295
Berrien	197,510	187,890	470,850	30	455,155	29	643,045
Branch							
Calhoun	249,588	219,288	470,850	30	376,680	24	595,968
Cass	77,028	77,028					77,028
Central UP	81,217	81,217					81,217
Clare							
Clinton	81,900	77,000					77,000
Eastern UP	127,000	127,000					127,000
Eaton	151,305	151,305	62,780	4	62,780	4	214,085
Genesee	434,000	434,000	1,208,515	77	1,208,515	77	1,642,515
Gladwin							
Gratiot							
Hillsdale							
Huron	66,742	64,712					64,712
Ingham/Lansing	289,275	289,275	627,800	40	596,410	38	885,685
Iosco							
Isabella	88,169	88,169	15,695	1	15,695	1	103,864
Jackson	197,821	197,821	282,510	18	219,730	14	417,551
Kalamazoo	402,145	402,145	1,334,075	85	1,255,600	80	1,657,745
Kent	886,819	807,000	1,710,755	109	1,491,025	95	2,298,025

CCAB	PLANS AND SERVICES		PROBATION RESIDENTIAL SERVICES				TOTAL
	FY 02 Requested Amount	FY 02 Award	FY 02 Request		FY 02 Award		FY 02 Total Award
			Amount	ADP	Amount	ADP	
Lake							0
Lenawee							
Livingston	178,142	164,474	78,475	5	31,390	2	195,864
Macomb	617,541	602,541	439,460	28	439,460	28	1,042,001
Marquette	94,500	92,900	47,085	3	47,085	3	139,985
Mason	56,250	56,250					56,250
Mecosta	68,600	65,300					65,300
Midland	143,379	135,884	78,475	5	78,475	5	214,359
Monroe	182,100	182,100	282,510	18	282,510	18	464,610
Montcalm/Ionia	152,500	152,500					152,500
Muskegon	283,928	244,000	627,800	40	596,410	38	840,410
Northern MI	168,035	168,035	62,780	4	62,780	4	230,815
NWMCOG	400,160	400,160	109,865	7	109,865	7	510,025
Newaygo							
Oakland	1,497,131	1,467,131	1,768,155	119	1,538,110	98	3,005,241
Oceana							
Osceola	58,490	51,290					51,290
Ottawa	213,070	213,070	94,428	6	78,475	5	291,545
Saginaw	425,800	299,245	941,700	60	721,970	46	1,021,215
Sanilac	61,825	61,825					61,825
Shiawassee							
St. Clair	187,500	187,500	659,190	42	659,190	42	846,690
St. Joseph	104,100	104,100	659,190	42	636,075	41	740,175
13th Circuit	187,210	180,710	156,950	10	141,255	9	321,965
34th Circuit	155,000	152,000	47,085	3	47,085	3	199,085

CCAB	PLANS AND SERVICES		PROBATION RESIDENTIAL SERVICES				TOTAL
	FY 02 Requested Amount	FY 02 Award	FY 02 Request		FY 02 Award		FY 02 Total Award
			Amount	ADP	Amount	ADP	
Thumb Area	322,311	179,800					179,800
Tri County	125,632	122,270					122,270
26th Circuit	123,550	119,950	70,445	5	62,780	4	182,730
Van Buren	134,507	116,492	219,730	14	109,865	7	226,367
Washtenaw/AA	373,855	373,855	439,460	28	408,070	26	781,925
Wayne	3,240,000	3,240,000	5,578,610	347	3,029,135	193	6,269,135
West Cent UP	298,820	289,720	78,475	5	78,475	5	368,195
<b>TOTAL</b>	13,516,653	12,938,412	18,812,038	1,197	14,997,000	956	27,935,412
APPROPRIATION		13,033,000			14,997,000	956	
Approps - awards		94,588			0		
g:\occl\everyone\legislative reports\fy 02 awards with 956 PRS.wb3							

## COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PLANS AND SERVICES FUNDS

<b>FY 2002 Appropriation</b>	<b>\$13,033,000</b>
<b>FY 2002 Award of Funds</b>	<b>\$12,938,412</b>

FY 2002 Community Corrections Plans and Services funds have been awarded to support community-based programs in 71 counties (43 county, city/county, or multi-county CCABs). Additional awards are expected to be made during the year to initiate programming in additional counties.

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	\$1,271,487
Education	731,348
Employment/Training	386,230
Intensive Supervision	2,280,283
Mental Health	262,924
Pretrial	1,466,585
Substance Abuse	1,477,966
24 Hour Structured Supervision	22,000
Case Management	2,010,261
CCAB Administration	2,877,213
Other	152,115
Total	\$12,938,412

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 effect. More specifically it is expected there will be a continued shifting of resources to cognitive/behavior based and other programming for higher risk of recidivism cases.

This shifting or reallocation of resources which began during FY '99 and FY 2000 and continued through the FY 2002 proposal development and award of funds processes, reflects the efforts and commitments of local jurisdictions to: improve treatment effect and reduce recidivism through developing and implementing new approaches to substance abuse treatment and education and employment programming; improve case planning, sanction and service matching, and case management functions; and strengthen monitoring and evaluation capabilities.

## **Resource Commitment by Local Jurisdiction**

The sanctions and services supported by FY 2002 Comprehensive Plans and Services funds within each local jurisdiction are identified on the attached Table entitled “Comprehensive Plans and Services - Summary of Budgets - FY 2002.”

**Michigan Department of Corrections - Office of Community Corrections**  
**Comprehensive Plans and Service Funds**  
**Summary of Budgets**  
**FY 2002**

CCAB	Community Service	Education	Employment & Training	Intensive Supervision	Mental Health	Pre Trial Services	Substance Abuse	24 Hour Structured	Case Management	Other	Administration	Totals
BARRY	5,500	25,550	0	43,300	0	0	7,740	0	55,350	0	28,200	165,640
BAY	27,500	17,560	0	0	0	0	57,260	0	0	0	43,500	145,820
BERRIEN	0	0	0	74,000	0	20,000	20,000	0	40,190	0	33,700	187,890
CALHOUN	0	0	0	94,700	0	0	20,000	0	0	49,000	55,588	219,288
CASS	5,000	750	0	9,000	0	0	18,535	0	20,486	400	22,857	77,028
CENTRAL U.P.	55,472	0	0	1,000	0	0	0	0	0	1,000	23,745	81,217
CLINTON	25,000	0	7,280	11,200	0	0	0	0	10,420	0	23,100	77,000
EASTERN U.P.	52,139	0	0	36,570	0	0	0	0	0	0	38,291	127,000
EATON	42,898	12,875	0	7,000	0	0	5,000	22,000	17,232	0	44,300	151,305
GENESEE	55,000	0	0	136,500	10,000	56,000	76,500	0	0	0	100,000	434,000
HURON	18,370	1,700	0	0	0	0	28,000	0	0	0	16,642	64,712
INGHAM/LANSING	53,000	0	64,582	50,000	0	0	47,193	0	12,500	0	62,000	289,275
ISABELLA	0	39,945	0	10,069	0	0	2,000	0	9,705	0	26,450	88,169
JACKSON	49,641	28,040	0	42,840	0	12,250	0	0	12,250	0	52,800	197,821
KALAMAZOO	22,500	0	10,000	66,801	0	86,688	109,500	0	40,000	0	66,656	402,145
KENT	58,086	73,200	53,200	102,060	48,060	135,664	125,370	0	22,860	2,000	186,500	807,000
LIVINGSTON	0	20,000	0	40,000	0	27,000	0	0	45,000	0	32,474	164,474
MACOMB	36,500	0	0	42,500	0	10,000	170,691	0	230,000	0	112,850	602,541
MARQUETTE	0	0	0	10,000	0	16,200	9,000	0	22,900	8,500	26,300	92,900
MASON	5,600	5,600	1,000	5,000	1,000	5,400	4,000	0	18,800	0	9,850	56,250
MECOSTA	22,000	0	0	13,000	0	0	1,000	0	13,500	0	15,800	65,300
MIDLAND	6,700	0	1,000	0	15,408	0	74,252	0	9,000	3,000	26,524	135,884
MONROE	0	76,950	12,000	7,150	0	12,000	39,000	0	0	0	35,000	182,100
MONTCALM/IONIA	47,000	16,800	0	20,500	0	0	32,450	0	8,000	0	27,750	152,500
MUSKEGON	25,400	6,770	14,400	48,200	0	37,500	0	0	47,500	0	64,230	244,000
NORTHERN MICHIGAN	24,000	10,000	0	10,000	10,000	0	5,000	0	70,000	0	39,035	168,035
NORTHWEST MICHIGAN	15,881	86,500	0	37,977	9,780	5,000	53,525	0	136,801	11,200	43,496	400,160
OAKLAND	115,000	13,000	185,568	160,000	0	470,602	0	0	244,527	0	278,434	1,467,131
OSCEOLA	31,800	0	0	2,695	0	2,695	500	0	0	0	13,600	51,290
OTTAWA	70,664	0	0	100,161	0	0	0	0	0	0	42,245	213,070
SAGINAW	0	40,000	7,000	37,000	0	88,000	0	0	0	49,250	77,995	299,245
ST. CLAIR	0	0	0	26,000	28,250	45,450	12,000	0	44,800	0	31,000	187,500
ST. JOSEPH	0	25,000	0	32,900	20,200	0	0	0	0	0	26,000	104,100
SANILAC	36,775	0	0	0	0	0	9,050	0	0	0	16,000	61,825
THIRTEENTH	0	10,000	0	59,811	10,000	0	0	0	74,040	0	26,859	180,710
THIRTY FOURTH	17,922	16,408	5,200	11,187	18,026	0	24,200	0	19,557	0	39,500	152,000
TWENTY SIXTH	0	17,500	0	0	67,200	0	0	0	9,600	0	25,650	119,950
THUMB	45,000	0	0	24,000	0	0	44,000	0	22,800	0	44,000	179,800
TRI COUNTY	74,400	11,000	0	0	0	0	200	0	1,920	0	34,750	122,270
VAN BUREN	36,239	7,200	0	8,330	0	0	0	0	12,023	27,765	24,935	116,492
WASHTENAW/ANN ARBOR	0	39,000	0	75,132	0	86,136	75,000	0	38,500	0	60,087	373,855
WAYNE	0	130,000	25,000	800,000	25,000	350,000	400,000	0	700,000	0	810,000	3,240,000
WCUP	190,500	0	0	23,700	0	0	7,000	0	0	0	68,520	289,720
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>1,271,487</b>	<b>731,348</b>	<b>386,230</b>	<b>2,280,283</b>	<b>262,924</b>	<b>1,466,585</b>	<b>1,477,966</b>	<b>22,000</b>	<b>2,010,261</b>	<b>152,115</b>	<b>2,877,213</b>	<b>12,938,412</b>

## PROBATION RESIDENTIAL SERVICES

<b>FY 2002 Appropriation</b>	<b>\$14,997,000</b>
<b>FY 2002 Award to Funds</b>	<b>\$14,997,000</b>

FY 2002 funds were awarded to support residential services pursuant to 31 local comprehensive corrections plans. This compares to 13 in FY '94, 18 in FY '95 and FY '96, 27 in FY '97, 28 in FY '98 and FY '99, and 29 in FY 2000 and FY 2001. The FY 2002 awards respond to utilization patterns among 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 2002, emphases continue 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; and increasing the utilization of short term residential services for probation violators.

The FY 2002 appropriation supports an average daily population (ADP) of 956.

It is expected that the steady increase in utilization of Probation Residential Services experienced during the mid-90s through FY 2000 will resume during FY 2002 and that the actual ADP will be greater than 956. The increased utilization for FY 2002 is expected due to several factors.

- It is expected that the decrease in utilization in Wayne County will be replaced with a steady increase in utilization during FY 2000.
- Utilization patterns and trends among other jurisdictions are expected to continue into and through FY 2002.
- The statutory guidelines will continue to produce increased demands for residential services. More specifically, sentences for offenders with guidelines in the straddle cells and the high end of the intermediate sanction cells increasingly include a term in jail (perhaps relatively short) followed by placement in a residential program and participation in a treatment program.
- Attention will continue to be focused on utilization of residential services in response to violations of probation and in accord with MDOC's Probation Violation Processing policies and procedures. Utilization of residential services for eligible parole violators is also expected to increase during FY 2002.

The attached table provides data regarding: the actual average daily population during FY '97, FY '98, FY '99, FY 2000, and FY 2001; and the FY 2002 awards and authorized average daily populations among the several jurisdictions.

**MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS - OFFICE OF COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS  
PROBATION RESIDENTIAL SERVICES  
AVERAGE DAILY POPULATION**

	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	
CCAB	ADP	ADP	ADP	ADP	ADP	AUTHORIZED ADP	AWARD AMOUNT
Allegan/Barry	1.6	2.8	4.4	3.2	6.2	5	78,475
Bay	2.6	4.3	4.2	5.2	4.1	5	78,475
Berrien	5.3	11.1	12.6	18.1	18.1	29	455,155
Calhoun	25.6	17.2	10.9	19.4	19.6	24	376,680
Eaton		3.7	2.0	4.3	3.2	4	62,780
Genesee	75.4	75.1	68.3	81.9	86.2	77	1,208,515
Ingham/City of Lansing	38.4	35.1	29.0	30.6	34.2	38	596,410
Isabella						1	15,695
Jackson	10.1	9.7	10.7	15.5	13.5	14	219,730
Kalamazoo	86.6	89.3	88.7	82.6	84.2	80	1,255,600
Kent	89.3	85.0	78.1	91.9	95.8	95	1,491,025
Livingston						2	31,390
Macomb	20.7	24.6	26.1	25.9	25.8	28	439,460
Marquette	1.1	1.8	1.2	1.6	2.4	3	47,085
Midland	3.3	4.3	3.8	4.1	4.3	5	78,475
Monroe	3.2	3.8	4.7	10.4	16.4	18	282,510
Muskegon	36.3	33.7	26.8	40.2	30.7	38	596,410
Northern Michigan	1.6	2.3	2.4	3.2	3.5	4	62,780
Northwest Michigan	3.1	5.9	5.4	8.4	8.9	7	109,865
Oakland SAI--CPI	47.2 1.9	67.7 3.0	84.9	91.2	91.0	98	1,538,110
Ottawa	7.7	5.0	5.1	3.8	3.0	5	78,475
Saginaw	46.3	46.8	47.6	45.9	51.3	46	721,970
St. Clair	38.2	40.9	40.0	37.3	42.7	42	659,190
St. Joseph	40.1	38.5	42.4	37.7	43.1	41	636,075
Thirteenth Circuit	6.0	8.1	7.5	7.5	9.8	9	141,255
Thirty Fourth Circuit	2.6	2.4	2.8	2.5	1.8	3	47,085
Twenty Sixth Circuit	4.1	4.1	3.3	4.3	4.8	4	62,780
Van Buren				8.3	4.7	7	109,865
Washtenaw/City of Ann Arbor	15.9	22.7	22.3	39.7	25.5	26	408,070
Wayne	155.0	201.4	227.0	216.9	170.2	193	3,029,135
West Central U.P.	2.1	1.5	3.4	4.3	4.2	5	78,475
<b>PRS TOTALS</b>	<b>771.4</b>	<b>851.5</b>	<b>865.8</b>	<b>945.7</b>	<b>909.2</b>	<b>956</b>	<b>14,997,000</b>