

Michigan Department of Corrections

“Expecting Excellence Every Day”

FIELD OPERATIONS ADMINISTRATION Community Alternatives

BIANNUAL REPORT

September 2012

This report is prepared 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(2)].

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART 1:	MEASURING THE IMPACT OF PUBLIC ACT 511	3
PART 2:	JAIL UTILIZATION	22
PART 3:	PROGRAM UTILIZATION	29
PART 4:	FY 2012 APPROPRIATIONS	32
	- Community Corrections Comprehensive Plans and Services	34
	- Drunk Driver Jail Reductions & Community Treatment Programs	37
	- Residential Services	39
PART 5:	DATA SYSTEMS OVERVIEW AND STATUS	44

PART 1

MEASURING THE IMPACT OF PUBLIC ACT 511

Introduction

Section 12 of Public Act 511 of 1988 (Community Corrections Act) requires the Office of Community Alternatives to submit a biannual report detailing the effectiveness of the programs and plans funded under this Act, including an explanation of how the rate of commitment of prisoners to the state prison system has been affected.

Section 8.4 of Public Act 511 states that the purpose of the Act is “to encourage the participation in community corrections programs of offenders who would likely be sentenced to imprisonment in a state correctional facility or jail, would not increase the risk to public safety, have not demonstrated a pattern of violent behavior, and do not have a criminal record that indicates a pattern of violent offenses.”

The Department of Corrections Statistical Report reflects that the State’s prison commitment rate was 34.7% in 1989, decreased to 25% in the mid 1990’s and remained relatively stable through 2003.

During 2003, the Department placed a renewed emphasis on the use of community-based sanctions/services for straddle cell offenders, probation violators, and parole violators to control the State’s prison growth. The rate of prison dispositions has steadily declined from 21.8% in CY 2003 to 20.6% through FY 2005. In FY 2006 the rate climbed back to 21.7% as a result of some highly publicized crimes earlier in the year. The commitment rate declined to 20.0% through FY 2011. Based on the CY 1989 prison disposition rate of 34.7%, if this rate was applied to the total felony dispositions (50,678 dispositions) through FY 2011 the Department would have experienced 7,450 additional prison dispositions – the cost to incarcerate these additional offenders would have been approximately \$253 million.

Community Corrections Advisory Boards (CCABs) are required to focus on prison dispositions for their county/counties in the annual comprehensive community corrections plan and application, establish goals and objectives relative to the commitment rates, and concentrate on reducing or maintaining low prison admissions for the priority target populations. The target groups include straddle cell offenders, probation violators, and parole violators. These target groups were selected due to their potential impact on decreasing the prison commitment rates. Straddle cell offenders can be sentenced to prison, jail, or probation, and the sentencing disposition may be influenced by the availability of sanctions and treatment programs in the community. Probation and parole violators account for approximately two-thirds of the prison intake, and the percentage has steadily increased from the Mid 1990s thru 2002. Including these offenders in P.A. 511 programs offer community sanctions and treatment programs as alternatives to a prison or jail sentence. The number of probation violators sentenced to prison declined in 2004 and 2005 but began to increase in February 2006. In FY 2006, probation violators accounted for 2,147 (16.7%) of the total prison dispositions compared 1,938 (19.1%) in FY 2011. Parole violators with a new sentence accounted for 2,061 (16.0%) of the total prison dispositions in FY 2006 compared to 1,759 (7.4%) in FY 2011. Offenders under the Department of Corrections supervision accounted for 38.5% (3,904) of the total (10,135) prison dispositions in FY 2011 – this number represents 516 fewer prison commitments than the previous year.

Analysis of the felony prison disposition data continues to support the selection of the priority target groups for community corrections programs. Research indicates that community sanctions and treatment programs provide alternatives to prison and jail sentences while increasing public safety by decreasing the recidivism rates.

P.A. 511 funded community corrections programs are not the sole influence on prison commitment rates. The rates may be affected by other programs funded by 15% monies from probation fees, substance abuse programs funded by the Michigan Department of Community Health and federal monies, local and state vocational programs funded by intermediate school districts or Michigan Works!, and other county-funded community corrections programs. Other factors that affect the prison commitment rates are the state and local economy, crime rates, and prosecutorial discretion.

Prison Population and Dispositions

Prison Population Projections

Section 401 of P.A. 63 of 2011 required the Department of Corrections to submit three and five year prison population projections to the Legislature concurrent with the submission of the Executive Budget. For more details regarding the prison population projections, a copy of the report prepared by the MDOC Office of Research and Planning can be obtained from the Department's website under the publications and information section.

The Office of Research and Planning reports:

- The State prison population has declined to 42,904 at the end of December 2011.
 - ✓ Population declined by 8,650 from its peak March 2007.
- Felony Court Dispositions declined for the 4th consecutive year following 8 years of growth.
- Annual Felony court dispositions were down by over 10,000 (-20%) in 2011 from the peak reached in 2007.
- Parole violators with a new sentence and technical violation are continuing to decline.
 - ✓ Parole violators with a new sentence were the category of prison admissions with the largest decline in 2011 (-15%).
 - ✓ There was decline in the preliminary parole violator technical (PVT) revocation rate for 2011 (97 PVT per 1,000 parolees in the parole population) compared to 2010 (108 PVT per 1,000 parolees).
 - ✓ The overall revocation rate of 174 revocations per 1,000 parolees is the lowest revocation rate since at least before routine recordkeeping began 25 years ago.

OMNI Statewide Disposition Data

Michigan Department of Corrections data collection and analysis functions have been largely migrated to a new, multi-faceted system called OMNI. The OMNI system provides the capability of analyzing data in a relatively short-time frame. The following narrative and associated tables contain information from some of the OMNI Statewide Disposition data for FY 2006 through FY 2011. The OMNI extract data is based on the most serious offense for each sentencing date – no records are excluded.

The OMNI prison disposition data provides an overview of prison commitments, jail utilization, progress toward addressing State and local objectives, and factors which contribute to attainment of the objectives. Some data sets reference Group 1 offenses (Homicide, Robbery, CSC, Assault, Other Sex Offenses, Assaultive Other, Burglary and Weapon Possession) and Group 2 offenses (Larceny, Fraud, Forgery/Embezzlement, Motor Vehicle, Malicious Destruction, Drugs, OUIL 3rd and Other Non-Assaultive). The Group 1 offense categories are more serious crimes whereas the Group 2 offenses are less assaultive and perceived as more appropriate to target for P.A. 511 programming.

OMNI Felony Dispositions – FY 2006 through FY 2011

Table Sets 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8, and 1.9 examine the OMNI Statewide Disposition data, summarizing data by the most serious offense for each individual disposition. This provides “gross” dispositions which are useful in analyzing the decision points that drive disposition rates at the local level. The data includes overviews at the statewide level, with several progressively detailed summaries.

- The total number of dispositions statewide increased from 58,724 in FY 2006 to 59,897 in FY 2007 then has continually declined to 50,678 in FY 2011.
- The overall prison commitment rate for the State steadily decreased from 21.7% (12,766 dispositions) in FY 2006 to 18.8% (10,601) in FY 2009.
- In FY 2011 the overall prison commitment rate increased to 20.5% (11,124 dispositions) then decreased to 20.0% (10,135) in FY 2011.
- The following provides more detail regarding the total number of prison dispositions in FY 2010 compared to FY 2011:
 - 6,873 (61.8%) of the dispositions were for Group 1 offenses in FY 2010 compared to 6,470 (63.8%) in FY 2011.
 - 4,251 (38.2%) of the dispositions were for Group 2 offenses in FY 2010 compared to 3,665 (36.2%) in FY 2011.
 - In FY 2010, offenders under the supervision (i.e., probation, parole and prison) of MDOC accounted for 39.7% (4,421) of the total prison dispositions compared to 38.5% (3,905) in FY 2011.
 - Statewide jail only dispositions decreased from 11,182 in FY 2006 to 9,545 in FY 2011.
- The statewide straddle cell prison commitment rate decreased from 36.7% (3,935 dispositions) in FY 2006 to 30.7% (3,475 dispositions) in FY 2011.

OUIL 3rd OMNI Statewide Disposition Data – FY 2006 through FY 2011

Table 1.7 examines the FY 2003 through FY 2011 Statewide Dispositions for OUIL 3rd offenders.

A comparison of the data shows the following trends:

- The total number of OUIL 3rd dispositions decreased from 3,277 in CY 2003 to 2,726 in FY 2006 then significantly increased to 3,666 in FY 2008. The number decreased to 3,064 in FY 2011.
- A factor that has likely impacted the number of OUIL 3rd dispositions is the Michigan State Police efforts to crack down on drunk drivers as part of a federal grant for additional enforcement in 44 counties during the past several years.
- The prison commitment rate for OUIL 3rd offenders decreased from 22.6% (677) in CY 2003 to 17.2% (621) in FY 2009. The rate increased to 18.8% (651) in FY 2010 then decrease to 18.0% (553) in FY 2011 – there were 98 less prison dispositions in the past year.

Progress Toward Addressing Objectives and Priorities

In the past several 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 decreases in the overall prison commitment rates, prison commitments of straddle cell offenders and probation violators.

Local jurisdictions continually review sentence recommendations and update 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 and offenders sentenced to prison for two years or less). 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. As part of the FY 2012 Comprehensive Community Corrections Plans review process, OCA has required local jurisdictions to further reduce their overall prison commitment rates by targeting offenders in the Group 2 offense categories (i.e. Larceny, Fraud, Forgery/Embezzle, Motor Vehicle, Malicious Destruction, Drugs, OUIL 3rd and Other Non-Assaultive).

Multiple changes have been and continue to be made among counties to improve capabilities to reduce or maintain prison commitments, increase emphasis 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.
- 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 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 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.

Priority Target Populations

The analysis of felony disposition data supports the selection of the priority target groups from the straddle cell offenders and probation violators. Even though intermediate sanction cell offenders are not a major target population for community corrections programs, sentencing policies and practices need to be examined in more detail in counties where higher percentages of intermediate sanction offenders are sentenced to prison. Although prison disposition rates on intermediate offenders are normally low on a percentage basis, a large number of cases mean that even a fractional improvement statewide can amount to a significant change in prison dispositions. OMNI Felony Disposition data show that the percentage of intermediate prison dispositions increased from 2.5% (721) in FY 2006 to 3.2% (982) in FY 2010 though this increase is primarily the result of technical probation violations being reflected in the original SGL category rather than SGL N/A. However, the number of intermediate prison dispositions decreased to 850 (3.0%) in FY 2011. The counties with high prison commitment rates for straddle cell or intermediate sanction cell offenders are required to address these issues in their annual community corrections comprehensive plan and application for funding.


The incarceration of probation violators who do not comply with their conditions of probation has been one of the primary reasons for the increase in Michigan's prison population. Since 1999, probation violators have been one of the primary target populations for community corrections funded programs. In 2002, probation violators accounted for 38% of the total prison intake. As part of the Department's Plan to Control Prison Growth, the Department placed greater emphasis on this population and required the Office of Community Alternatives to increase the use of Public Act 511 programs to offer community sanctions and treatment programs as an alternative to prison. In 2004, the number of probation violators sentenced to prison declined by 5.7%. In FY 2011 probation violations accounted for 19.1% (1,938) of the total prison dispositions – this represent 199 fewer probation violators being sentenced to prison compared to the previous year. It is worthwhile to note that the number of prison dispositions for probation violators represents only 3.7% of the number (approximately 52,616) of probationers under the Department of Corrections supervision in 2011.

Table 1.1

**Office of Community Alternatives
Statewide Dispositions - Fiscal Year 2011
Based Upon OMNI Data - Most Serious Offense per Disposition Date - No Record Exclusions**

Overall Dispositions - October 2010 thru September 2011

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Prison	10135	20.0	20.0	20.0
	Jail	9545	18.8	18.8	38.8
	Jail/Prob	17863	35.2	35.2	74.0
	Probation	12714	25.1	25.1	99.1
	Other	421	.8	.8	100.0
	Total	50678	100.0	100.0	



Statewide Fiscal Year 2011 Dispositions by Guideline Group

Guideline Group	SGL NA	Count	DISPOSITION					Total
			Prison	Jail	Jail/Prob	Probation	Other	
		% within Guideline Group	26.2%	29.5%	16.6%	25.9%	1.9%	100.0%
	Intermediate	Count	850	5495	12184	9423	219	28171
		% within Guideline Group	3.0%	19.5%	43.3%	33.4%	.8%	100.0%
	Straddle	Count	3475	2121	4212	1467	61	11336
		% within Guideline Group	30.7%	18.7%	37.2%	12.9%	.5%	100.0%
	Presumptive	Count	4187	99	440	220	26	4972
		% within Guideline Group	84.2%	2.0%	8.8%	4.4%	.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	10135	9545	17863	12714	421	50678
		% within Guideline Group	20.0%	18.8%	35.2%	25.1%	.8%	100.0%

Statewide Fiscal Year 2011 Dispositions by Offense Group

			DISPOSITION					
			Prison	Jail	Jail/Prob	Probation	Other	Total
Offense Group	Offense Group1	Count	6470	2808	5545	4119	108	19050
		% within Offense Group	34.0%	14.7%	29.1%	21.6%	.6%	100.0%
	Offense Group2	Count	3665	6737	12318	8595	313	31628
		% within Offense Group	11.6%	21.3%	38.9%	27.2%	1.0%	100.0%
Total	Count	10135	9545	17863	12714	421	50678	
	% within Offense Group	20.0%	18.8%	35.2%	25.1%	.8%	100.0%	

Statewide Fiscal Year 2011 Dispositions by Guideline and Offense Group


			DISPOSITION					
			Prison	Jail	Jail/Prob	Probation	Other	Total
SGL NA	Offense Group1	Count	1228	524	333	616	26	2737
		% within Offense Group	45.2%	19.1%	12.2%	22.5%	9%	100.0%
	Offense Group2	Count	385	1306	694	989	89	3462
		% within Offense Group	11.1%	37.7%	20.0%	28.5%	2.6%	100.0%
	Total	Count	1623	1830	1027	1604	115	6199
		% within Offense Group	26.2%	29.5%	16.6%	25.9%	1.9%	100.0%
Intermediate	Offense Group1	Count	338	1484	3244	2731	40	7837
		% within Offense Group	4.3%	18.9%	41.4%	34.8%	.5%	100.0%
	Offense Group2	Count	512	4011	8940	6692	179	20334
		% within Offense Group	2.5%	19.7%	44.0%	32.9%	.9%	100.0%
	Total	Count	850	5495	12184	9423	219	28171
		% within Offense Group	3.0%	19.5%	43.3%	33.4%	.8%	100.0%
Straddle	Offense Group1	Count	1379	732	1637	591	17	4356
		% within Offense Group	31.7%	16.8%	37.6%	13.6%	.4%	100.0%
	Offense Group2	Count	2096	1389	2575	876	44	6980
		% within Offense Group	30.0%	19.9%	36.9%	12.6%	.6%	100.0%
	Total	Count	3475	2121	4212	1467	61	11336
		% within Offense Group	30.7%	18.7%	37.2%	12.9%	.5%	100.0%
Presumptive	Offense Group1	Count	3515	68	331	181	25	4120
		% within Offense Group	85.3%	1.7%	8.0%	4.4%	.6%	100.0%
	Offense Group2	Count	672	31	109	39	1	852
		% within Offense Group	78.9%	3.6%	12.8%	4.6%	.1%	100.0%
	Total	Count	4187	99	400	220	26	4972
		% within Offense Group	84.2%	2.0%	8.8%	4.4%	.5%	100.0%

Table 1.2

**Office of Community Alternatives
Statewide Dispositions - Fiscal Year 2010
Based Upon OMNI Data - Most Serious Offense per Disposition Date - No Record Exclusions**

Overall Dispositions - October 2009 thru September 2010

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Prison	11124	20.5	20.5	20.5
	Jail	9661	17.8	17.8	38.2
	Jail/Prob	18535	34.1	34.1	72.3
	Probation	14647	26.9	26.9	99.2
	Other	419	.8	.8	100.0
	Total	54386	100.0	100.0	



Statewide Fiscal Year 2010 Dispositions by Guideline Group

Guideline Group	SGL NA	Count	DISPOSITION					Total
			Prison	Jail	Jail/Prob	Probation	Other	
			1663	1588	923	1578	116	5868
		% within Guideline Group	28.3%	27.1%	15.7%	26.9%	2.0%	100.0%
	Intermediate	Count	982	5813	12865	11149	232	31041
		% within Guideline Group	3.2%	18.7%	41.4%	35.9%	.7%	100.0%
	Straddle	Count	4039	2189	4318	1720	41	12307
		% within Guideline Group	32.8%	17.8%	35.1%	14.0%	.3%	100.0%
	Presumptive	Count	4440	71	429	200	30	5170
		% within Guideline Group	85.9%	1.4%	8.3%	3.9%	.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	11124	9661	18535	14647	419	54386
		% within Guideline Group	20.5%	17.8%	34.1%	26.9%	.8%	100.0%

Statewide Fiscal Year 2010 Dispositions by Offense Group

			DISPOSITION					
			Prison	Jail	Jail/Prob	Probation	Other	Total
Offense Group	Offense Group1	Count	6873	2697	5703	4559	113	19945
		% within Offense Group	34.5%	13.5%	28.6%	22.9%	.6%	100.0%
	Offense Group2	Count	4251	6964	12832	10088	306	34441
		% within Offense Group	12.3%	20.2%	37.3%	29.3%	.9%	100.0%
Total	Count	11124	9661	18535	14647	419	54386	
	% within Offense Group	20.5%	17.8%	34.1%	26.9%	.8%	100.0%	

Statewide Fiscal Year 2010 Dispositions by Guideline and Offense Group


			DISPOSITION							
			Prison	Jail	Jail/Prob	Probation	Other	Total		
Guideline Group	SGL NA	Offense Group1	Count	1277	490	314	605	29	2715	
			% within Offense Group	47.0%	18.0%	11.6%	22.3%	1.1%	100.0%	
		Offense Group2	Count	386	1098	609	973	87	3153	
			% within Offense Group	12.2%	34.8%	19.3%	30.9%	2.8%	100.0%	
		Total	Count	1663	1588	923	1578	116	5868	
			% within Offense Group	28.3%	27.1%	15.7%	26.9%	2.0%	100.0%	
		Intermediate	Offense Group1	Count	352	1429	3426	3127	40	8374
				% within Offense Group	4.2%	17.1%	40.9%	37.3%	.5%	100.0%
			Offense Group2	Count	630	4384	9439	8022	192	22667
				% within Offense Group	2.8%	19.3%	41.6%	35.4%	.8%	100.0%
Total	Count		982	5813	12865	11149	232	31041		
	% within Offense Group		3.2%	18.7%	41.4%	35.9%	.7%	100.0%		
Straddle	Offense Group1	Count	1568	733	1634	687	15	4637		
		% within Offense Group	33.8%	15.8%	35.2%	14.8%	.3%	100.0%		
	Offense Group2	Count	2471	1456	2684	1033	26	7670		
		% within Offense Group	32.2%	19.0%	35.0%	13.5%	.3%	100.0%		
	Total	Count	4039	2189	4318	1720	41	12307		
		% within Offense Group	32.8%	17.8%	35.1%	14.0%	.3%	100.0%		
Presumptive	Offense Group1	Count	3676	45	329	140	29	4219		
		% within Offense Group	87.1%	1.1%	7.8%	3.3%	.7%	100.0%		
	Offense Group2	Count	764	26	100	60	1	951		
		% within Offense Group	80.3%	2.7%	10.5%	6.3%	.1%	100.0%		
	Total	Count	4440	71	429	200	30	5170		
		% within Offense Group	85.9%	1.4%	8.3%	3.9%	.6%	100.0%		

Table 1.3

**Office of Community Alternatives
Statewide Dispositions - Fiscal Year 2009
Based Upon OMNI Data - Most Serious Offense per Disposition Date - No Record Exclusions**

Overall Dispositions - October 2008 thru September 2009

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Prison	10601	18.8	18.8	18.8
	Jail	9890	17.6	17.6	36.4
	Jail/Prob	19064	33.8	33.8	70.2
	Probation	16319	29.0	29.0	99.2
	Other	453	.8	.8	100.0
	Total	56327	100.0	100.0	



Statewide Fiscal Year 2009 Dispositions by Guideline Group

Guideline Group	SGL NA	Count	DISPOSITION					Total
			Prison	Jail	Jail/Prob	Probation	Other	
SGL NA		5920	1522	1649	963	1670	116	5920
		% within Guideline Group	25.7%	27.9%	16.3%	28.2%	2.0%	100.0%
Intermediate		32999	985	5859	13390	12507	258	32999
		% within Guideline Group	3.0%	17.8%	40.6%	37.9%	.8%	100.0%
Straddle		12616	4067	2286	4302	1911	50	12616
		% within Guideline Group	32.2%	18.1%	34.1%	15.1%	.4%	100.0%
Presumptive		4792	4027	96	409	231	29	4792
		% within Guideline Group	84.0%	2.0%	8.5%	4.8%	.6%	100.0%
Total		56327	10601	9890	19064	16319	453	56327
		% within Guideline Group	18.8%	17.6%	33.8%	29.0%	.8%	100.0%

Statewide Fiscal Year 2009 Dispositions by Offense Group

			DISPOSITION					
			Prison	Jail	Jail/Prob	Probation	Other	Total
Offense Group	Offense Group1	Count	6533	2881	5793	4755	129	20091
		% within Offense Group	32.5%	14.3%	28.8%	23.7%	.6%	100.0%
	Offense Group2	Count	4068	7009	13271	11564	324	36236
		% within Offense Group	11.2%	19.3%	36.6%	31.9%	.9%	100.0%
Total	Count	10601	9890	19064	16319	453	56327	
	% within Offense Group	18.8%	17.6%	33.8%	29.0%	.8%	100.0%	

Statewide Fiscal Year 2009 Dispositions by Guideline and Offense Group


				DISPOSITION					
				Prison	Jail	Jail/Prob	Probation	Other	Total
Guideline Group									
SGL NA	Offense Group	Offense Group1	Count	1215	537	319	606	23	2700
			% within Offense Group	45.0%	19.9%	11.8%	22.4%	.9%	100.0%
	Offense Group2	Count	307	1112	644	1064	93	3220	
		% within Offense Group	9.5%	34.5%	20.0%	33.0%	2.9%	100.0%	
	Total	Count	1522	1649	963	1670	116	5920	
		% within Offense Group	25.7%	27.9%	16.3%	28.2%	2.0%	100.0%	
Intermediate	Offense Group	Offense Group1	Count	377	1483	3455	3246	57	8618
			% within Offense Group	4.4%	17.2%	40.1%	37.7%	.7%	100.0%
	Offense Group2	Count	608	4376	9935	9261	201	24381	
		% within Offense Group	2.5%	17.9%	40.7%	38.0%	.8%	100.0%	
	Total	Count	985	5859	13390	12507	258	32999	
		% within Offense Group	3.0%	17.8%	40.6%	37.9%	.8%	100.0%	
Straddle	Offense Group	Offense Group1	Count	1613	790	1708	719	21	4851
			% within Offense Group	33.3%	16.3%	35.2%	14.8%	.4%	100.0%
	Offense Group2	Count	2454	1496	2594	1192	29	7765	
		% within Offense Group	31.6%	19.3%	33.4%	15.4%	.4%	100.0%	
	Total	Count	4067	2286	4302	1911	50	12616	
		% within Offense Group	32.2%	18.1%	34.1%	15.1%	.4%	100.0%	
Presumptive	Offense Group	Offense Group1	Count	3328	71	311	184	28	3922
			% within Offense Group	84.9%	1.8%	7.9%	4.7%	.7%	100.0%
	Offense Group2	Count	699	25	98	47	1	870	
		% within Offense Group	80.3%	2.9%	11.3%	5.4%	.1%	100.0%	
	Total	Count	4027	96	409	231	29	4792	
		% within Offense Group	84.0%	2.0%	8.5%	4.8%	.6%	100.0%	

Table 1.4

Office of Community Alternatives
Statewide Dispositions - Fiscal Year 2008
 Based Upon OMNI Data - Most Serious Offense per Disposition Date - No Record Exclusions

Overall Dispositions - October 2007 thru September 2008

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Prison	11627	19.9	19.9	19.9
	Jail	10706	18.3	18.3	38.2
	Jail/Prob	18944	32.4	32.4	70.5
	Probation	16791	28.7	28.7	99.2
	Other	441	.8	.8	100.0
	Total	58509	100.0	100.0	



Statewide Fiscal Year 2008 Dispositions by Guideline Group

Guideline Group	SGL NA	Count	DISPOSITION					Total
			Prison	Jail	Jail/Prob	Probation	Other	
SGL NA		6459	1989	1826	917	1615	112	6459
		% within Group	30.8%	28.3%	14.2%	25.0%	1.7%	100.0%
Intermediate		34630	1142	6489	13478	13263	258	34630
		% within Group	3.3%	18.7%	38.9%	38.3%	.7%	100.0%
Straddle		12493	4324	2299	4131	1699	40	12493
		% within Group	34.6%	18.4%	33.1%	13.6%	.3%	100.0%
Presumptive		4927	4172	92	418	214	31	4927
		% within Group	84.7%	1.9%	8.5%	4.3%	.6%	100.0%
Total		58509	11627	10706	18944	16791	441	58509
		% within Group	19.9%	18.3%	32.4%	28.7%	.8%	100.0%

Statewide Fiscal Year 2008 Dispositions by Offense Group

			DISPOSITION					
			Prison	Jail	Jail/Prob	Probation	Other	Total
Offense Group	Offense Group1	Count	7001	3050	5763	4960	151	20925
		% within Group	33.5%	14.6%	27.5%	23.7%	.7%	100.0%
	Offense Group2	Count	4626	7656	13181	11831	290	37584
		% within Group	12.3%	20.4%	35.1%	31.5%	.8%	100.0%
Total	Count	11627	10706	18944	16791	441	58509	
	% within Group	19.9%	18.3%	32.4%	28.7%	.8%	100.0%	


Statewide Fiscal Year 2008 Dispositions by Guideline and Offense Group

			DISPOSITION						
			Prison	Jail	Jail/Prob	Probation	Other	Total	
Guideline Group	SGL NA	Offense Group1	Count	1524	539	296	590	27	2976
			% within Group	51.2%	18.1%	9.9%	19.8%	.9%	100.0%
		Offense Group2	Count	465	1287	621	1025	85	3483
			% within Group	13.4%	37.0%	17.8%	29.4%	2.4%	100.0%
	Total	Count	1989	1826	917	1615	112	6459	
		% within Group	30.8%	28.3%	14.2%	25.0%	1.7%	100.0%	
	Intermediate	Offense Group1	Count	390	1666	3568	3541	74	9239
			% within Group	4.2%	18.0%	38.6%	38.3%	.8%	100.0%
Offense Group2		Count	752	4823	9910	9722	184	25391	
		% within Group	3.0%	19.0%	39.0%	38.3%	.7%	100.0%	
Total		Count	1142	6489	13478	13263	258	34630	
		% within Group	3.3%	18.7%	38.9%	38.3%	.7%	100.0%	
Straddle	Offense Group1	Count	1652	786	1583	661	19	4701	
		% within Group	35.1%	16.7%	33.7%	14.1%	.4%	100.0%	
	Offense Group2	Count	2672	1513	2548	1038	21	7792	
		% within Group	34.3%	19.4%	32.7%	13.3%	.3%	100.0%	
	Total	Count	4324	2299	4131	1699	40	12493	
		% within Group	34.6%	18.4%	33.1%	13.6%	.3%	100.0%	
Presumptive	Offense Group1	Count	3435	59	316	168	31	4009	
		% within Group	85.7%	1.5%	7.9%	4.2%	.8%	100.0%	
	Offense Group2	Count	737	33	102	46	0	918	
		% within Group	80.3%	3.6%	11.1%	5.0%	.0%	100.0%	
	Total	Count	4172	92	418	214	31	4927	
		% within Group	84.7%	1.9%	8.5%	4.3%	.6%	100.0%	

**Table 1.5 Office of Community Alternatives
Statewide Dispositions - Fiscal Year 2007
Based Upon OMNI Data - Most Serious Offense per Disposition Date - No Record Exclusions**

Overall Dispositions - October 2006 thru September 2007

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Prison	12525	20.9	20.9	20.9
	Jail	11424	19.1	19.1	40.0
	Jail/Prob	18014	30.1	30.1	70.1
	Probation	17499	29.2	29.2	99.3
	Other	435	.7	.7	100.0
	Total	59897	100.0	100.0	



Statewide Fiscal Year 2007 Dispositions by Guideline Group

Guideline Group	SGL NA	Count	DISPOSITION					Total
			Prison	Jail	Jail/Prob	Probation	Other	
SGL NA		2875	2875	3897	999	1785	124	9680
	% within Group		29.7%	40.3%	10.3%	18.4%	1.3%	100.0%
Intermediate		1041	1041	5450	12673	13675	249	33088
	% within Group		3.1%	16.5%	38.3%	41.3%	.8%	100.0%
Straddle		4277	4277	2000	3952	1777	35	12041
	% within Group		35.5%	16.6%	32.8%	14.8%	.3%	100.0%
Presumptive		4332	4332	77	390	262	27	5088
	% within Group		85.1%	1.5%	7.7%	5.1%	.5%	100.0%
Total		12525	12525	11424	18014	17499	435	59897
	% within Group		20.9%	19.1%	30.1%	29.2%	.7%	100.0%

Statewide: Fiscal Year 2007 Dispositions by Offense Group

			DISPOSITION					
			Prison	Jail	Jail/Prob	Probation	Other	Total
Offense Group	Offense Group1	Count	7510	3163	5708	5088	132	21601
		% within Group	34.8%	14.6%	26.4%	23.6%	.6%	100.0%
	Offense Group2	Count	5015	8261	12306	12411	303	38296
		% within Group	13.1%	21.6%	32.1%	32.4%	.8%	100.0%
Total	Count	12525	11424	18014	17499	435	59897	
	% within Group	20.9%	19.1%	30.1%	29.2%	.7%	100.0%	

Statewide: Fiscal Year 2007 Dispositions by Guideline and Offense Group

			DISPOSITION						
			Prison	Jail	Jail/Prob	Probation	Other	Total	
SGL NA	Offense Group1	Count	1946	1035	280	673	31	3965	
		% within Group	49.1%	26.1%	7.1%	17.0%	.8%	100.0%	
	Offense Group2	Count	929	2862	719	1112	93	5715	
		% within Group	16.3%	50.1%	12.6%	19.5%	1.6%	100.0%	
	Total	Count	2875	3897	999	1785	124	9680	
		% within Group	29.7%	40.3%	10.3%	18.4%	1.3%	100.0%	
	Intermediate	Offense Group1	Count	361	1383	3550	3539	62	8895
			% within Group	4.1%	15.5%	39.9%	39.8%	.7%	100.0%
Offense Group2		Count	680	4067	9123	10136	187	24193	
		% within Group	2.8%	16.8%	37.7%	41.9%	.8%	100.0%	
Total		Count	1041	5450	12673	13675	249	33088	
		% within Group	3.1%	16.5%	38.3%	41.3%	.8%	100.0%	
Straddle	Offense Group1	Count	1639	694	1576	681	13	4603	
		% within Group	35.6%	15.1%	34.2%	14.8%	.3%	100.0%	
	Offense Group2	Count	2638	1306	2376	1096	22	7438	
		% within Group	35.5%	17.6%	31.9%	14.7%	.3%	100.0%	
	Total	Count	4277	2000	3952	1777	35	12041	
		% within Group	35.5%	16.6%	32.8%	14.8%	.3%	100.0%	
Presumptive	Offense Group1	Count	3564	51	302	195	26	4138	
		% within Group	86.1%	1.2%	7.3%	4.7%	.6%	100.0%	
	Offense Group2	Count	768	26	88	67	1	950	
		% within Group	80.8%	2.7%	9.3%	7.1%	.1%	100.0%	
	Total	Count	4332	77	390	262	27	5088	
		% within Group	85.1%	1.5%	7.7%	5.1%	.5%	100.0%	


Table 1.6

Office of Community Alternatives
Statewide Dispositions - Fiscal Year 2006
Based Upon OMNI Data - Most Serious Offense per Disposition Date - No Record Exclusions

Overall Dispositions - October 2005 thru September 2006

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Prison	12766	21.7	21.7	21.7
	Jail	11182	19.0	19.0	40.8
	Jail/Prob	17293	29.4	29.4	70.2
	Probation	17014	29.0	29.0	99.2
	Other	469	.8	.8	100.0
	Total	58724	100.0	100.0	

DISPOSITION



Statewide Dispositions Within Guideline Group

Guideline Group	SGL NA		DISPOSITION					Total
			Prison	Jail	Jail/Prob	Probation	Other	
		Count	3831	6800	1291	1853	147	13922
		% within Guideline	27.5%	48.8%	9.3%	13.3%	1.1%	100.0%
Intermediate		Count	721	2911	11831	13331	255	29049
		% within Guideline	2.5%	10.0%	40.7%	45.9%	.9%	100.0%
Straddle		Count	3935	1404	3733	1609	43	10724
		% within Guideline	36.7%	13.1%	34.8%	15.0%	.4%	100.0%
Presumptive		Count	4279	67	438	221	24	5029
		% within Guideline	85.1%	1.3%	8.7%	4.4%	.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	12766	11182	17293	17014	469	58724
		% within Guideline	21.7%	19.0%	29.4%	29.0%	.8%	100.0%

Statewide - Fiscal Year 2006 Dispositions by Guideline and Offense Group

Guideline Group			DISPOSITION					Total
			Prison	Jail	Jail/Prob	Probation	Other	
SGL NA	Offense Group1	Count	2188	1844	392	653	32	5109
		% within Group	42.8%	36.1%	7.7%	12.8%	.6%	100.0%
	Offense Group2	Count	1643	4956	899	1200	115	8813
		% within Group	18.6%	56.2%	10.2%	13.6%	1.3%	100.0%
	Total	Count	3831	6800	1291	1853	147	13922
		% within Group	27.5%	48.8%	9.3%	13.3%	1.1%	100.0%
Intermediate	Offense Group1	Count	209	778	3436	3515	83	8021
		% within Group	2.6%	9.7%	42.8%	43.8%	1.0%	100.0%
	Offense Group2	Count	512	2133	8395	9816	172	21028
		% within Group	2.4%	10.1%	39.9%	46.7%	.8%	100.0%
	Total	Count	721	2911	11831	13331	255	29049
		% within Group	2.5%	10.0%	40.7%	45.9%	.9%	100.0%
Straddle	Offense Group1	Count	1434	494	1534	602	13	4077
		% within Group	35.2%	12.1%	37.6%	14.8%	.3%	100.0%
	Offense Group2	Count	2501	910	2199	1007	30	6647
		% within Group	37.6%	13.7%	33.1%	15.1%	.5%	100.0%
	Total	Count	3935	1404	3733	1609	43	10724
		% within Group	36.7%	13.1%	34.8%	15.0%	.4%	100.0%
Presumptive	Offense Group1	Count	3552	41	335	151	22	4101
		% within Group	86.6%	1.0%	8.2%	3.7%	.5%	100.0%
	Offense Group2	Count	727	26	103	70	2	928
		% within Group	78.3%	2.8%	11.1%	7.5%	.2%	100.0%
	Total	Count	4279	67	438	221	24	5029
		% within Group	85.1%	1.3%	8.7%	4.4%	.5%	100.0%

Group 1 offenses: Homicide, Robbery, CSC, Assault, Other Sex Offenses, Assaultive Other, Burglary and Weapon Possession.
 Group 2 offenses: Larceny, Fraud, Forgery/Embezzle, Motor Vehicle, Mal. Destruction, Drugs, OUIL 3rd and Other Non-Asslt.

Table 1.7

**Office of Community Alternatives
Statewide OUIL 3rd Dispositions**

Based Upon OMNI Data - Most Serious Offense per Disposition Date - No Record Exclusions

Statewide: OUIL3 Disposition Rates by Guideline Group - Fiscal Year 2011

			DISPOSITION					
			Prison	Jail	Jail/Prob	Probation	Other	Total
Guideline Group	SGL NA	Count	45	24	13	5	0	87
		% within Guideline Group	51.7%	27.6%	14.9%	5.7%	.0%	100.0%
	Intermediate	Count	57	128	1509	108	1	1803
		% within Guideline Group	3.2%	7.1%	83.7%	6.0%	.1%	100.0%
	Straddle	Count	412	84	574	60	1	1131
		% within Guideline Group	36.4%	7.4%	50.8%	5.3%	.1%	100.0%
	Presumptive	Count	39	0	3	1	0	43
		% within Guideline Group	90.7%	.0%	7.0%	2.3%	.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	553	236	2099	174	2	3064
		% within Guideline Group	18.0%	7.7%	68.5%	5.7%	.1%	100.0%

Statewide: OUIL3 Disposition Rates by Guideline Group - Fiscal Year 2010

			DISPOSITION					
			Prison	Jail	Jail/Prob	Probation	Other	Total
Guideline Group	SGL NA	Count	38	16	16	2	1	73
		% within Guideline Group	52.1%	21.9%	21.9%	2.7%	1.4%	100.0%
	Intermediate	Count	96	147	1673	150	0	2066
		% within Guideline Group	4.6%	7.1%	81.0%	7.3%	.0%	100.0%
	Straddle	Count	476	83	654	63	0	1276
		% within Guideline Group	37.3%	6.5%	51.3%	4.9%	.0%	100.0%
	Presumptive	Count	41	0	5	0	0	46
		% within Guideline Group	89.1%	.0%	10.9%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	651	246	2348	215	1	3461
		% within Guideline Group	18.8%	7.1%	67.8%	6.2%	.0%	100.0%

Statewide: OUIL3 Disposition Rates by Guideline Group - Fiscal Year 2009

			DISPOSITION					
			Prison	Jail	Jail/Prob	Probation	Other	Total
Guideline Group	SGL NA	Count	27	26	12	6	1	72
		% within Guideline Group	37.5%	36.1%	16.7%	8.3%	1.4%	100.0%
	Intermediate	Count	96	153	1833	188	1	2271
		% within Guideline Group	4.2%	6.7%	80.7%	8.3%	.0%	100.0%
	Straddle	Count	463	84	591	82	0	1220
		% within Guideline Group	38.0%	6.9%	48.4%	6.7%	.0%	100.0%
	Presumptive	Count	35	2	6	1	0	44
		% within Guideline Group	79.5%	4.5%	13.6%	2.3%	.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	621	265	2442	277	2	3607
		% within Guideline Group	17.2%	7.3%	67.7%	7.7%	.1%	100.0%

Statewide: OUIL3 Dispositions by Guideline Group - Fiscal Year 2008

			DISPOSITION					
			Prison	Jail	Jail/Prob	Probation	Other	Total
Guideline Group	SGL NA	Count	38	25	10	6	1	80
		% within Group	47.5%	31.3%	12.5%	7.5%	1.3%	100.0%
	Intermediate	Count	84	175	1856	183	1	2299
		% within Group	3.7%	7.6%	80.7%	8.0%	.0%	100.0%
	Straddle	Count	486	98	586	55	0	1225
		% within Group	39.7%	8.0%	47.8%	4.5%	.0%	100.0%
	Presumptive	Count	57	3	2	0	0	62
		% within Group	91.9%	4.8%	3.2%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	665	301	2454	244	2	3666
		% within Group	18.1%	8.2%	66.9%	6.7%	.1%	100.0%

Statewide: OUIL3 Dispositions by Guideline Group – Fiscal Year 2007

			DISPOSITION					
			Prison	Jail	Jail/Prob	Probation	Other	Total
Guideline Group	SGL NA	Count	110	84	24	5	2	225
		% within Group	48.9%	37.3%	10.7%	2.2%	.9%	100.0%
	Intermediate	Count	79	133	1416	163	1	1792
		% within Group	4.4%	7.4%	79.0%	9.1%	.1%	100.0%
	Straddle	Count	412	70	436	57	0	975
		% within Group	42.3%	7.2%	44.7%	5.8%	.0%	100.0%
	Presumptive	Count	38	1	7	0	0	46
		% within Group	82.6%	2.2%	15.2%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	639	288	1883	225	3	3038
		% within Group	21.0%	9.5%	62.0%	7.4%	.1%	100.0%

Statewide: OUIL 3 Dispositions by Guideline Group – Fiscal Year 2006

			DISPOSITION					
			Prison	Jail	Jail/Prob	Probation	Other	Total
SGL NA		Count	241	213	38	5	1	498
		% in Guideline Group	48.4%	42.8%	7.6%	1.0%	.2%	100.0%
Intermediate		Count	39	45	1137	123	0	1344
		% in Guideline Group	2.9%	3.3%	84.6%	9.2%	.0%	100.0%
Straddle		Count	354	40	387	55	0	836
		% in Guideline Group	42.3%	4.8%	46.3%	6.6%	.0%	100.0%
Presumptive		Count	43	0	3	2	0	48
		% in Guideline Group	89.6%	.0%	6.3%	4.2%	.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	677	298	1565	185	1	2726
		% in Guideline Group	24.8%	10.9%	57.4%	6.8%	.0%	100.0%

PART 2

JAIL UTILIZATION

Section 8.4 of P.A. 511 explains that the purpose of the Act includes the participation of offenders who would likely be sentenced to imprisonment in a state correctional facility or jail. Section 2 (c) defines “community corrections program” as a program that is an alternative to incarceration in a state correctional facility or jail. Through the years, as prison commitment rates decreased, and as a result of legislative changes, the role of jails in the community corrections system has changed. This section examines the use of jails in Michigan as part of the continuum of sanctions available in sentencing decisions.

The State Community Corrections Board has adopted priorities for jail use for community corrections. Each CCAB is required to examine the jail management practices and policies as part of the annual community corrections comprehensive plan and application for funds. Local policies/practices directly affect the availability of jail beds which can be utilized for sentenced felons. Local jurisdictions have implemented a wide range of policies/practices to influence the number and length of stay of different offender populations. The local policies/practices include conditional release options for pretrial detainees, restrictions on population groups which can be housed in the jail in order to reserve jail beds for offenders who are a higher risk to public safety, earned release credits (i.e., reduction in jail time for participation in in-jail programming), and structured sentencing.

Due to the high number of straddle cell offenders sentenced to prison, the State Community Corrections Board has targeted this population as a priority population for community corrections. During CY 2003, 47.5% (4,224) of the straddle cell dispositions included a jail term, whereas in FY 2005 51.9% (5,146) of the dispositions included a jail term. However, data for FY 2011 shows the number of straddle cell dispositions with a jail term increased to 6,333 (49.9%) – this increase is likely attributed to the result of technical probation violations being reflected in the original SGL category rather than SGL N/A.

A jail sentence is also a key sanction used for probation violators. Local probation response guides often include jail time along with additional local sanctions imposed, including programs funded by community corrections. Jail crowding issues can impact the use of jails and availability of beds for alternative sanctions for different felony offender target groups, such as straddle cell offenders, probation violators, and even intermediate sanction offenders. The use of jail beds for serious felony offenders is an issue when jail crowding occurs.

Community corrections programs have been established to impact the amount of jail time that offenders serve. Program policies have been established so that program participation and successful completion of programs lead to decreased lengths of stay in jail.

Jail Statistics Overview

Michigan has jails in 81 of its 83 counties. County jail capacity statewide was 15,826 beds in 1998 and the current capacity is 19,518. The capacity decreased by 1,242 beds in 2009 due to Macomb (200), Oakland (274) and Wayne (768) beds being closed. Midland County’s new jail was completed in 2009, which increased the jail’s capacity by 152 beds and Ogemaw County’s new jail was completed in 2010, which increased the jail’s capacity by 98 beds. The majority of the county jails have been electronically submitting jail utilization and inmate profile data to the State since 1998. Collectively, these county data inputs comprise the Jail Population Information System (JPIS). Jail reporting from year to year has been less than uniform in jail representation due to issues such as jails changing jail management systems, but data since 1998 indicates the percent of total capacity reported has been on the increase. In 2005, over 92% of statewide county jail capacity was reported by 73 of the 81 jails; however, for CY 2010 the percentage of jail beds reported decreased to 75.2% primarily due to a large number of system and vendor changes in counties such as Eaton (374), Jackson (442), Kalamazoo (327 beds), Muskegon (370 beds) and several other smaller counties.

Jails play a vital role in the sanctioning process, and one of the stated purposes of JPIS is to provide information to support coherent policy making. Using JPIS data, the State and CCABs can track jail utilization, study utilization trends, examine characteristics of offenders being sent to jail, and evaluate specific factors affecting jail utilization. Such analysis can lead to potential alternatives to incarceration and result in formulation of other objectives to improve utilization (i.e., reduce jail crowding, change offender population profiles, reduce the average length of stay). Further, the data can be used to monitor the utilization of the jails before and after various policies, practices, procedures or programming are implemented.

Recognizing that all counties are not represented in data submissions and periodically some counties' data may not be up-to-date, statewide summary reports do not completely represent State figures or State totals; however, input from rural, urban, and metropolitan counties is included and such reports should present a reasonable and useful representation.

The following tables present statewide summary reports compiled from JPIS data for CY 2006 through CY 2010. The reports categorize the offenders housed in jails by their crime class and legal status (i.e., felons/misdemeanants and sentenced/unsentenced) and indicate the number of offenders housed, average daily populations, average lengths of stay, and the number of releases upon which lengths of stay are based.

The first section of the reports focuses on felons and misdemeanants that originated in the reporting counties, the part of the jail population comprised of offenders boarded in (for the State, Federal government, other counties, tribal or other jurisdictions) and "other" offenders (those held on writs, etc.). The following sections focus on target populations, offender distribution by objective classification and a listing of the overall top ten offense categories for the State – based on the percentage of jail capacity utilized.

In the statewide reports, both the sections on top ten offenses and targeted populations indicate that arrests for alcohol related offenses and felony probation violators used significant percentages of jail capacity. The data reflects that in the past two years the percentage of jail capacity used for these populations has declined, which indicates that community corrections programs targeted toward these populations have improved jail utilization.

The statewide reports also reflect an increased use of jail beds for parole violators within the DOC category which is consistent with the Department's initiative to contract locally for jail space in lieu of returning these offenders to prison.

CY 2006, CY 2007, CY2008, CY 2009 and CY 2010 JPIS Data

Tables 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, and 2.6 present statewide Jail Population Information System (JPIS) data for CY 2006 through CY 2010. JPIS submission cessation during introduction of new jail management systems can cause variations in reporting figures.

JPIS data shows the following trends in jail capacity utilization statewide by specific populations:

	<u>CY 2006</u>	<u>CY2007</u>	<u>CY 2008</u>	<u>CY 2009</u>	<u>CY 2010</u>
- Felons unsentenced during their time in jail:	22.4%	23.2%	24.1%	24.8%	25.0%
- Felons sentenced prior to admission:	11.6%	10.5%	12.4%	11.6%	13.7%
- Felons sentenced after admission:	18.1%	17.9%	15.2%	15.5%	13.0%
- Misdemeanants unsentenced during time in jail:	11.4%	11.0%	10.3%	10.3%	9.8%
- Misdemeanants sentenced prior to admission:	10.5%	9.9%	9.9%	8.5%	9.4%
- Misdemeanants sentenced after admission:	11.5%	11.6%	10.1%	9.0%	7.3%
- Felons with arrests related to alcohol:	1.9%	2.1%	2.6%	2.5%	2.4%
- Parole Violators:	3.0%	3.9%	4.8%	5.6%	6.9%
- Felony Circuit Probation Violators:	6.0%	6.3%	5.7%	5.4%	5.1%

JPIS data shows the following trends statewide for number of offenders incarcerated in jails by specific groups:

	<u>CY 2006</u>	<u>CY 2007</u>	<u>CY 2008</u>	<u>CY 2009</u>	<u>CY 2010</u>
- Felons with arrests related to alcohol:	2,867	3,527	3,864	3,674	3,436
- Parole Violators:	6,170	7,727	8,923	8,525	8,105
- Felony Circuit Probation Violators:	10,065	10,643	10,725	9,751	8,404

Table 2.1

**StateWide
2006**

StateWide's Latest Submission: 6/27/2008

Jan thru Dec

Months of Data: 12

	Offenders on Record	Average Daily Populations				No Status Change				Sentenced After Admission			Total Offenders		
		ADP	ADP%Of Housed	ADP%Of Housed + Bd Out	ADP%Of Reporting Jails	Releases	AvLOS Only Presentenced	Releases	AvLOS Only Sentenced	Releases	AvLOS Part Presentenced	AvLOS Part Sentenced	Releases Overall	AvLOS Overall	
Housed															
Regular Inmates															
Unsented Felons	65,603	3,532.5	23.5%	* In StateWide Totals - Boarded Out Offenders Are Already Counted as Boarded In From "Other Counties"	21.6%	60,501	20.1						60,501	20.1	
Unsented Misdemeanants	117,683	1,740.2	11.6%		10.7%	115,141	5.3							115,141	5.3
Sentenced Felon {prior to admission}	14,405	1,675.6	11.1%		10.3%				12,831	47.9				12,831	47.9
Sentenced Felon {after admission}	15,247	3,048.7	20.3%		18.7%						13,541	42.7	47.2	13,541	90.0
Sentenced Misd {prior to admission}	35,905	1,636.9	10.9%		10.0%				34,528	17.1				34,528	17.1
Sentenced Misd {after admission}	19,368	1,916.4	12.7%		11.7%						18,213	15.6	25.7	18,213	41.3
Boarded In															0.0
DOC	5,582	327.1	2.2%	2.0%	3,544	19.4	1,482	25.3	166	32.5	39.8	5,192	22.8		
Federal	4,042	429.1	2.9%	2.6%	3,502	43.8	69	32.6	36	59.3	22.4	3,607	44.0		
Other Counties	3,003	173.2	1.2%	1.1%	902	11.8	1,917	26.7	61	40.4	56.5	2,880	23.5		
Other	18,604	567.6	3.8%	3.5%	16,602	9.8	833	21.7	691	24.5	27.6	18,126	12.0		
Total Housed	299,442	15,047.3	100.0%		92.2%	200,192	11.1	51,660	2.9	32,708	27.2	34.8	284,560	19.5	
Jail Capacity		16,318.8													
			Targeted Jails' Capacity	%of Targeted's Capacity	ADP %of Reporting Jails										
Target Populations **															
Felony Alcohol Related Arrests	2,870	291.5	15,379.2	1.9%	1.8%	1,503	15.3	717	62.1	364	50.3	56.9	2,584	41.2	
Parole Violators	6,182	353.2	12,259.3	2.9%	2.2%	3,794	19.9	1,825	24.0	157	20.6	38.6	5,776	22.2	
Felony Circuit Court Probation Violators	10,065	783.3	13,288.0	5.9%	4.8%	4,552	15.0	2,117	29.0	2,630	15.3	45.7	9,299	31.2	

** ADP %of Capacity for Target Populations is based on the jail capacity of the counties reporting the target offense.

Objective Classification of Felon Population (Max=1)	Unk	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Housed Non-Boarders Per Level	34.2%	4.9%	6.6%	11.4%	9.8%	9.4%	17.4%	3.6%	2.9%

Top Ten Offense Categories by Percentage of Jail Capacity Utilized									
Rank	ADP %Of Capacity	Arrest Charge Code***	Crime Class	Description	Offenders on Record	Releases Overall	AvLOS Overall		
1	4.8%	Various	F	Probation Violators	10,065	9,299	31.2		
2	4.4%	Various	M	Alcohol Related Arrests	32,148	31,485	8.0		
3	3.9%	Various	M	Probation Violators	13,896	13,282	17.5		
4	2.6%	Various	O	Federal Offenders	4,016	3,582	44.0		
5	2.2%	ParV	F	Parole Violators	6,182	5,776	22.2		
6	1.8%	Various	F	Alcohol Related Arrests	2,870	2,584	41.2		
7	1.7%	Other	F	Undefined Arrest Code	7,334	7,073	14.1		
8	1.5%	P333.74032A5	F	CONT. SUB. - POSSESS LESS THAN 25 GRAMS	3,369	3,126	29.2		
9	1.5%	P750.812	M	DOMESTIC VIOLENCE	8,105	7,879	11.2		
10	1.4%	P333.74012A4	F	CONT. SUB-DELIVER/MFG LESS THAN 50 GR	2,553	2,336	36.5		

*** Charge Code Prefixes: P for PACC code, M for MCL Code, or U for UCR/MICR Arrest Code

State Wide Jail Capacities****		
Reporting Jails	All Jails	Percent Reported
16,318.8	19,183.2	85.1%

State Wide Jails Reporting (Two Counties w/o Jails)		
Counties Reporting	Counties with Jails	Percent Reporting
70	81	86.4%

**** Fractional jail capacities due to mid-year jail construction.

Table 2.2

**StateWide
2007**

StateWide's Latest Submission: 6/27/2008

Jan thru Dec

Months of Data: 12

Housed	Offenders on Record	Average Daily Populations				No Status Change				Sentenced After Admission			Total Offenders	
		ADP	ADP%Of Housed	ADP%Of Housed + Bd Out	ADP%Of Reporting Jails	Releases	AvLOS Only Presentenced	Releases	AvLOS Only Sentenced	Releases	AvLOS Part Presentenced	AvLOS Part Sentenced	Releases Overall	AvLOS Overall
Regular Inmates				* In StateWide Totals, Boarded Out Offenders Are Already Counted as Boarded In From "Other Counties"										
Unsented Felons	63,921	3,776.7	24.5%			59,052	21.1						59,052	21.1
Unsented Misdemeanants	111,350	1,790.0	11.6%			109,016	5.7						109,016	5.7
Sentenced Felon {prior to admission}	14,584	1,702.7	11.0%					12,677	45.7				12,677	45.7
Sentenced Felon {after admission}	14,204	2,917.6	18.9%							12,959	44.7	48.3	12,959	93.0
Sentenced Misd {prior to admission}	33,319	1,606.7	10.4%					31,748	17.4				31,748	17.4
Sentenced Misd {after admission}	18,812	1,883.1	12.2%							17,850	15.0	25.6	17,850	40.6
Boarded In														0.0
DOC	7,512	448.7	2.9%			4,182	18.5	2,602	25.9	263	29.0	30.7	7,047	22.7
Federal	5,118	531.7	3.4%			4,377	40.8	141	35.0	37	55.4	47.4	4,555	41.1
Other Counties	3,691	213.3	1.4%		1,241	10.7	2,172	25.6	71	28.6	44.5	3,484	21.2	
Other	18,168	571.1	3.7%		15,772	9.5	1,131	18.9	653	21.1	18.1	17,556	11.2	
Total Housed	290,679	15,441.6	100.0%		193,640	11.8	50,471	3.1	31,833	27.4	34.8	275,944	20.1	
Jail Capacity		16,274.6												
			Targeted Jails' Capacity	% of Targeted's Capacity	ADP % of Reporting Jails									
Target Populations **														
Felony Alcohol Related Arrests	3,527	327.0	15,315.0	2.1%	2.0%	1,936	13.3	820	54.9	435	52.1	51.1	3,191	36.2
Parole Violators	7,727	479.1	12,300.3	3.9%	2.9%	4,071	19.5	2,883	24.5	301	28.1	35.5	7,255	23.4
Felony Circuit Court Probation Violators	10,643	841.9	13,298.3	6.3%	5.2%	4,914	14.7	2,379	26.6	2,613	17.3	47.7	9,906	30.8

** ADP % of Capacity for Target Populations is based on the jail capacity of the counties reporting the target offense.

Objective Classification of Felon Population (Max =1)	Unk	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Housed Non-Boarders Per Level	33.8%	5.2%	5.6%	11.4%	9.9%	9.7%	18.0%	3.5%	2.9%

Top Ten Offense Categories by Percentage of Jail Capacity Utilized									
Rank	ADP % of Capacity	Arrest Charge Code***	Crime Class	Description	Offenders on Record	Releases Overall	AvLOS Overall		
1	5.2%	Various	F	Probation Violators	10,643	9,906	30.8		
2	4.3%	Various	M	Alcohol Related Arrests	28,431	27,850	8.8		
3	4.2%	Various	M	Probation Violators	13,578	12,958	18.6		
4	3.3%	Various	0	Federal Offenders	5,090	4,529	41.2		
5	2.9%	ParV	F	Parole Violators	7,727	7,255	23.4		
6	2.0%	Various	F	Alcohol Related Arrests	3,527	3,191	36.2		
7	1.6%	Other	F	Undefined Arrest Code	7,834	7,564	12.1		
8	1.5%	P333.74032A5	F	CONT. SUB. - POSSESS LESS THAN 25 GRAMS	3,334	3,105	28.6		
9	1.5%	P333.74012A4	F	CONT. SUB-DELIVER/MFG LESS THAN 50 GR	2,631	2,397	35.6		
10	1.3%	Various	0	Offenders from Other Counties	3,576	3,373	21.2		

*** Charge Code Prefixes: P for PACC code, M for MCL Code, or U for UCR/MICR Arrest Code

State Wide Jail Capacities****		
Reporting Jails	All Jails	Percent Reported
16,274.6	19,335.3	84.2%

State Wide Jails Reporting (Two Counties w/o Jails)		
Counties Reporting	Counties with Jails	Percent Reporting
68	81	84.0%

**** Fractional jail capacities due to mid-year jail construction.

**StateWide
2008**

StateWide's Latest Submission: 4/15/2009

Jan thru Dec

Months of Data: 12

	Offenders on Record	Average Daily Populations				No Status Change				Sentenced After Admission			Total Offenders	
		ADP	ADP %Of Housed	ADP%Of Housed + Bd Out	ADP %Of Reporting Jails	Releases	AvLOS Only Presentenced	Releases	AvLOS Only Sentenced	Releases	AvLOS Part Presentenced	AvLOS Part Sentenced	Releases Overall	AvLOS Overall
Housed														
Regular Inmates				* In StateWide Totals, Boarded Out Offenders Are Already Counted as Boarded In From Other Counties*										
Unsented Felons	62,594	3,929.0	25.9%		24.1%	57,624	22.1						57,624	22.1
Unsented Misdemeanants	110,234	1,675.8	11.0%		10.3%	108,312	5.5						108,312	5.5
Sented Felon (prior to admission)	15,682	2,019.2	13.3%		12.4%			12,845	46.2				12,845	46.2
Sented Felon (after admission)	12,119	2,473.7	16.3%		15.2%					11,537	46.2	48.8	11,537	95.0
Sented Misd (prior to admission)	32,362	1,606.2	10.6%		9.9%			30,293	17.1				30,293	17.1
Sented Misd (after admission)	17,459	1,651.4	10.9%	10.1%					16,977	14.3	25.7	16,977	39.9	
Boarded In													0.0	
DOC	7,247	399.7	2.6%	2.5%	3,979	15.7	2,522	26.7	391	25.5	30.1	6,892	22.0	
Federal	5,904	583.4	3.8%	3.6%	5,175	38.4	125	17.6	47	32.3	18.1	5,347	38.0	
Other Counties	5,700	293.6	1.9%	1.8%	2,202	10.7	3,166	23.7	80	33.2	50.5	5,448	19.3	
Other	15,448	539.7	3.6%	3.3%	13,412	10.4	879	23.8	712	21.3	27.5	15,003	13.0	
Total Housed	284,749	15,171.7	100.0%	93.2%	190,704	12.0	49,830	3.0	29,744	27.0	34.8	270,278	20.0	
Jail Capacity		16,282.0												
			Targeted Jails' Capacity	% of Targeted's Capacity	ADP % of Reporting Jails									
Target Populations **														
Felony Alcohol Related Arrests	3,864	408.8	15,542.9	2.6%	2.5%	2,043	14.4	1,052	61.0	432	52.2	58.9	3,527	40.1
Parole Violators	8,923	653.2	13,516.9	4.8%	4.0%	4,890	23.9	2,768	25.7	628	24.4	35.9	8,286	27.3
Felony Circuit Court Probation Violators	10,725	803.6	14,067.2	5.7%	4.9%	4,737	15.4	3,062	22.4	2,204	21.0	41.2	10,003	27.8

** ADP % of Capacity for Target Populations is based on the jail capacity of the counties reporting the target offense.

Objective Classification of Felon Population (Max =1)	Unk	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Housed Non-Boarders Per Level	35.2%	5.1%	5.3%	11.2%	10.3%	8.2%	17.9%	4.2%	2.7%

Top Ten Offense Categories by Percentage of Jail Capacity Utilized

Rank	ADP %Of Capacity	Arrest Charge Code***	Crime Class	Description	Offenders on Record	Releases Overall	AvLOS Overall
1	4.9%	Various	F	Probation Violators	10,725	10,003	27.8
2	4.0%	ParV	F	Parole Violators	8,923	8,286	27.3
3	4.0%	Various	M	Probation Violators	12,919	12,362	18.4
4	3.9%	Various	M	Alcohol Related Arrests	25,477	24,939	8.6
5	3.8%	Various	O	Federal Offenders	5,874	5,318	38.1
6	2.5%	Various	F	Alcohol Related Arrests	3,864	3,527	40.1
7	1.9%	Various	O	Offenders from Other Counties	5,571	5,328	19.3
8	1.6%	Other	F	Undefined Arrest Code	6,495	6,301	13.4
9	1.6%	P333.74012A4	F	CONT. SUB-DELIVER/MFG LESS THAN 50 GR	2,538	2,297	40.5
10	1.6%	P333.74032A5	F	CONT. SUB. - POSSESS LESS THAN 25 GRAMS	3,250	3,041	31.7

*** Charge Code Prefixes: P for PACC code, M for MCL Code, or U for UCR/MICR Arrest Code

State Wide Jail Capacities****		
Reporting Jails	All Jails	Percent Reported
16,282.0	19,372.9	84.0%

State Wide Jails Reporting (Two Counties w/o Jails)		
Counties Reporting	Counties with Jails	Percent Reporting
65	81	80.2%

**** Fractional jail capacities due to mid-year jail construction.

Table 2.3

**StateWide
2009**

StateWide's Latest Submission: 5/5/2010

Jan thru Dec

Months of Data: 12

	Offenders on Record	Average Daily Populations				No Status Change				Sentenced After Admission			Total Offenders		
		ADP	ADP %Of Housed	ADP%Of Housed + Bd Out	ADP %Of Reporting Jails	Releases	AvLOS Only Presentenced	Releases	AvLOS Only Sentenced	Releases	AvLOS Part Presentenced	AvLOS Part Sentenced	Releases Overall	AvLOS Overall	
Housed															
Regular Inmates															
Unsented Felons	58,322	3,856.7	27.6%	* In StateWide Totals Already Counted as Boarded In From "Other Counties"	24.8%	53,498	23.4						53,498	23.4	
Unsented Misdemeanants	99,651	1,599.9	11.5%		10.3%	97,818	5.7							97,818	5.7
Sented Felon {prior to admission}	14,482	1,799.1	12.9%		11.6%			12,113	45.9					12,113	45.9
Sented Felon {after admission}	11,596	2,410.9	17.3%		15.5%					10,650	47.5	48.7		10,650	96.2
Sented Misd {prior to admission}	28,198	1,313.7	9.4%		8.5%			26,795	16.8					26,795	16.8
Sented Misd {after admission}	14,981	1,403.2	10.0%		9.0%					14,358	13.8	25.9		14,358	39.7
Boarded In															0.0
DOC	6,309	412.7	3.0%	2.7%	3,321	21.2	2,361	29.3	202	26.0	34.4		5,884	25.8	
Federal	5,605	489.6	3.5%	3.2%	5,056	36.2	34	28.1	26	37.1	39.3		5,116	36.4	
Other Counties	5,567	268.3	1.9%	1.7%	2,135	10.3	3,087	23.0	114	27.7	42.9		5,336	18.9	
Other	12,487	408.7	2.9%	2.6%	10,436	9.4	1,025	23.4	734	16.6	25.1		12,195	12.5	
Total Housed	257,198	13,962.8	100.0%		89.9%	172,264	12.7	45,415	3.1	26,084	27.8	35.3	243,763	20.5	
Jail Capacity		15,531.9													
			Targeted Jails' Capacity	% of Targeted's Capacity	ADP % of Reporting Jails										
Target Populations **															
Felony Alcohol Related Arrests	3,674	370.3	15,086.2	2.5%	2.4%	1,969	14.5	927	57.0	397	53.1	59.6	3,293	38.3	
Parole Violators	8,525	677.5	12,186.5	5.6%	4.4%	4,408	27.0	2,820	27.4	626	28.5	36.1	7,854	30.1	
Felony Circuit Court Probation Violators	9,751	716.8	13,340.5	5.4%	4.6%	4,439	14.6	2,641	24.1	2,089	21.2	42.3	9,169	28.5	

** ADP % of Capacity for Target Populations is based on the jail capacity of the counties reporting the target offense.

Objective Classification of Felon Population (Max =1)	Unk	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Housed Non-Boarders Per Level	35.5%	5.8%	4.9%	10.4%	11.0%	7.7%	18.3%	3.9%	2.6%

Top Ten Offense Categories by Percentage of Jail Capacity Utilized									
Rank	ADP %Of Capacity	Arrest Charge Code***	Crime Class	Description	Offenders on Record	Releases Overall	AvLOS Overall		
1	4.6%	Various	F	Probation Violators	9,751	9,169	28.5		
2	4.4%	ParV	F	Parole Violators	8,525	7,854	30.1		
3	3.6%	Various	M	Probation Violators	11,653	11,263	17.6		
4	3.5%	Various	M	Alcohol Related Arrests	22,298	21,847	8.5		
5	3.4%	Various	O	Federal Offenders	5,569	5,087	36.3		
6	2.4%	Various	F	Alcohol Related Arrests	3,674	3,293	38.3		
7	1.6%	Various	O	Offenders from Other Counties	5,349	5,130	18.5		
8	1.5%	P333.74012A4	F	CONT. SUB-DELIVER/MFG LESS THAN 50 GR	2,313	2,107	42.1		
9	1.3%	P750.812	M	DOMESTIC VIOLENCE	7,142	6,931	10.3		
10	1.3%	P333.74032A5	F	CONT. SUB. - POSSESS LESS THAN 25 GRAMS	2,909	2,728	27.8		

*** Charge Code Prefixes: P for PACC code, M for MCL Code, or U for UCR/MICR Arrest Code

State Wide Jail Capacities****		
Reporting Jails	All Jails	Percent Reported
15,531.9	19,440.2	79.9%

State Wide Jails Reporting (Two Counties w/o Jails)		
Counties Reporting	Counties with Jails	Percent Reporting
57	81	70.4%

**** Fractional jail capacities due to mid-year jail construction.

Table 2.4

**StateWide
2010**

StateWide's Latest Submission: 12/16/2010

Jan thru Oct

Months of Data: 10

	Offenders on Record	Average Daily Populations				No Status Change				Sentenced After Admission			Total Offenders	
		ADP	ADP % Of Housed	ADP % Of Housed + Bd Out	ADP % Of Reporting Jails	Releases	AvLOS Only Presentenced	Releases	AvLOS Only Sentenced	Releases	AvLOS Part Presentenced	AvLOS Part Sentenced	Releases Overall	AvLOS Overall
Housed														
Regular Inmates														
Unsented Felons	51,758	3,659.5	28.3%	* In StateWide Trials Already Counted as Banded In From "Other Counties"	25.0%	46,799	22.8					46,799	22.8	
Unsented Misdemeanants	84,425	1,439.0	11.1%		9.8%	82,652	5.5					82,652	5.5	
Sented Felon (prior to admission)	13,850	2,008.2	15.5%		13.7%			10,944	45.9			10,944	45.9	
Sented Felon (after admission)	9,349	1,906.6	14.7%		13.0%					9,349	47.5	47.2	9,349	94.7
Sented Misd (prior to admission)	24,371	1,380.2	10.7%		9.4%			22,290	17.4			22,290	17.4	
Sented Misd (after admission)	11,251	1,063.4	8.2%		7.3%					11,251	12.9	25.0	11,251	37.9
Boarded In													0.0	
DOC	6,612	408.8	3.2%	2.8%	3,540	18.5	2,578	25.2	224	26.9	39.2	6,342	22.9	
Federal	6,575	480.3	3.7%	3.3%	5,943	23.5	34	30.0	38	28.6	30.5	6,015	23.7	
Other Counties	4,305	239.5	1.8%	1.6%	1,625	11.8	2,370	21.7	81	33.9	44.9	4,076	18.9	
Other	6,770	361.7	2.8%	2.5%	4,795	10.9	916	28.3	663	23.1	32.7	6,374	18.1	
Total Housed	219,266	12,947.2	100.0%	88.6%	145,354	12.4	39,132	3.0	21,606	28.4	35.1	206,092	20.4	
Jail Capacity		14,617.0												
Target Populations **														
Felony Alcohol Related Arrests	3,436	381.1	15,583.1	2.4%	2.6%	1,809	16.5	912	55.2	372	51.7	53.5	3,093	38.6
Parole Violators	8,105	642.6	9,338.5	6.9%	4.4%	4,078	24.9	2,951	23.3	564	31.5	39.7	7,593	27.7
Felony Circuit Court Probation Violators	8,404	681.5	13,394.5	5.1%	4.7%	3,987	14.4	1,959	21.8	1,794	16.2	41.2	7,740	26.3

** ADP % of Capacity for Target Populations is based on the jail capacity of the counties reporting the target offense.

Objective Classification of Felon Population (Max=1)	Unk	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Housed Non-Boarders Per Level	38.8%	5.6%	5.5%	10.7%	10.5%	7.2%	15.9%	3.4%	2.3%

Top Ten Offense Categories by Percentage of Jail Capacity Utilized									
Rank	ADP % Of Capacity	Arrest Charge Code***	Crime Class	Description	Offenders on Record	Releases Overall	AvLOS Overall		
1	4.7%	Various	F	Probation Violators	8,404	7,740	26.3		
2	4.4%	ParV	F	Parole Violators	8,105	7,593	27.7		
3	3.5%	Various	0	Federal Offenders	6,539	5,981	23.7		
4	3.4%	Various	M	Alcohol Related Arrests	19,077	18,635	8.2		
5	2.8%	Various	M	Probation Violators	5,195	4,735	23.1		
6	2.6%	Various	F	Alcohol Related Arrests	3,436	3,093	38.6		
7	1.7%	P750.812	M	DOMESTIC VIOLENCE	6,902	6,712	11.4		
8	1.6%	Various	0	Offenders from Other Counties	4,143	3,923	18.5		
9	1.3%	P333.74032A5	F	CONT. SUB. - POSSESS LESS THAN 25 GRAMS	2,193	1,993	29.8		
10	1.3%	P750.529	F	ROBBERY - ARMED	807	619	92.5		

*** Charge Code Prefixes: P for PACC code, M for MCL Code, or U for UCR/MICR Arrest Code

State Wide Jail Capacities****		
Reporting Jails	All Jails	Percent Reported
14,617.0	19,431.4	75.2%

State Wide Jails Reporting (Two Counties w/o Jails)		
Counties Reporting	Counties with Jails	Percent Reporting
54	81	66.7%

**** Fractional jail capacities due to mid-year jail construction.

Table 2.5

PART 3

PROGRAM UTILIZATION

Community corrections programs are expected to contribute to local goals and objectives concerning prison commitments and/or jail utilization of their respective counties. Appropriate program policies and practices must be implemented for programs to serve as diversions from prison or jail, or as treatment programs that reduce the risk of recidivism.

To impact prison commitment and jail utilization rates, specific target populations have been identified due to the high number of these offenders being sentenced to prison or jail. It is not possible to individually identify offenders that would have been sentenced to prison or jail if alternative sanctions or treatment programs were not available. But as a group, evidence can be presented to support their designation as a target population.

National research¹ has shown that appropriately targeted and administered cognitive restructuring and substance abuse programs reduce recidivism. Community corrections funds have been used to fund these types of programs based upon these national studies.

Further, supporting information is available concerning the impact of community corrections sanctions and programs on jail utilization. It is possible to identify local sentencing policies that specify that jail time will be decreased based upon an offender's participation or completion of community corrections programs.

Enrolled Offenders and Outcomes

The Department entered into a contractual agreement with Northpointe, Inc. to implement the COMPAS Case Manager System statewide – this new system merged CCIS data into a statewide centralized website. The data system has increased the department's efficiencies and enhanced the State's and local community corrections data reporting capabilities. The data below represents the first full fiscal year of data using the new system.

This section presents information relative to offenders enrolled into community corrections programs during FY 2011. In the following tables, an offender can be represented in more than one category, since he or she may be enrolled in multiple programs. It should be noted that "successful outcomes" and "percent successful" is based on program terminations occurring during the report period. Information that can be determined through examination of the tables includes the following:

- Table 3.1, indicates that in FY 2011 a total of 54,950 offenders accounted for 83,458 enrollments in programs funded by community corrections – 71.94% of the program outcomes have been successful. Felony offenders accounted for the majority of reported enrollments – 66.19% of felony offender program outcomes have been successful.
- Table 3.2, indicates that in FY 2011 specific program successful outcomes were: Community Service 81.4%; Substance Abuse 85.9%, Group Programming (i.e. education, employment, life skills, cognitive, domestic violence, sex offender, substance abuse and other group services) 73.7% and Supervision Services (i.e. day reporting, intensive supervision, electronic monitoring and pretrial supervision) 83.1%.
- Table 3.3, indicates that in FY 2012 through March total of 25,016 offenders accounted for 36,221 enrollments in programs funded by community corrections – 80.85% of the program outcomes have been successful. Felony offenders accounted for the majority of reported enrollments – 71.11% of felony offender program outcomes have been successful.
- Table 3.4, indicates that in FY 2012 through March specific program successful outcomes were: Community Service 78.3%; Substance Abuse 68.4%, Group Programming (i.e. education, employment, life skills, cognitive, domestic violence, sex offender, substance abuse and other group services) 70.9% and Supervision Services (i.e. day reporting, intensive supervision, electronic monitoring and pretrial supervision) 84.4%.

¹ Andrews, D. A. & Bonta, James (2003) The Psychology of Criminal Conduct Cincinnati, Ohio: Anderson Publishing Co.

Table 3.1

**State Summary of Program Participants
by Crime Class & Legal Status
With Percents of Successful Outcomes
P.A. 511 Funded
Fiscal Year 2011**

Number of Offenders in Programming			Number of Program Enrollments and Outcomes		
	Number Of Offenders	%	Program Enrollments	Successful Outcomes	% Successful
Felons					
Unsentenced:	11457	29.00%	24356	13569	92.31%
Sentenced:	28051	71.00%	38461	21937	56.33%
Total:	39508	100.00%	62817	35506	66.19%
Misdemeanants					
Unsentenced:	5739	37.16%	7277	6624	93.39%
Sentenced:	9703	62.84%	13364	11577	84.08%
Total:	15442	100.00%	20641	18201	86.63%
Total					
Unsentenced:	17196	31.29%	31633	20193	37.60%
Sentenced:	37754	68.71%	51825	33514	62.40%
Total:	54950	100.00%	83458	53707	71.94%

Table 3.2

**State Summary of Program Enrollments
by Crime Class & Legal Status
With Percents of Successful Outcomes
P.A. 511 Funded
Fiscal Year 2011**

Type of Program	New Enrollments	Number of Enrollments				Percent Successful				
		Unsentenced		Sentenced		Unsentenced		Sentenced		Overall
		Felony	Misd	Felony	Misd	Felony	Misd	Felony	Misd	
Case Management	3793	178	85	2417	1113	77.9%	71.8%	80.6%	81.8%	80.7%
Community Service	10292	138	54	5156	4944	75.2%	66.7%	84.7%	78.9%	81.4%
Substance Abuse	6429	1593	486	3203	1147	88.6%	92.0%	83.4%	88.3%	85.9%
Other	900	184	25	442	249	87.5%	100.0%	89.5%	84.0%	88.0%
DDJR	764	54	2	702	6	100.0%	100.0%	98.8%	100.0%	98.9%
Group Programming	12305	4418	145	6149	1593	73.3%	69.4%	73.2%	76.0%	73.7%
Supervision Services	14404	7559	1390	2886	2569	77.9%	80.0%	85.4%	87.9%	83.1%
Assessment Services	34860	9788	5125	17885	2062	98.2%	98.1%	26.4%	98.7%	61.3%
Gatekeeper	3504	622	50	2038	794	95.9%	87.5%	91.0%	62.9%	85.3%
Totals:	87251	24534	7362	40878	14477					
Totals w/o Case Mngt:	83458	24356	7277	38461	13364	97.78%	96.60%	62.27%	91.36%	78.34%

Table 3.3

**State Summary of Program Participants
by Crime Class & Legal Status
With Percents of Successful Outcomes
P.A. 511 Funded
Fiscal Year 2012**

Number of Offenders in Programming			Number of Program Enrollments and Outcomes		
	Number Of Offenders	%	Program Enrollments	Successful Outcomes	% Successful
Felons					
Unsented:	5500	32.45%	8059	7153	90.67%
Sented:	11447	67.55%	17703	11553	71.68%
Total:	16947	100.00%	25762	18706	77.92%
Misdemeanants					
Unsented:	3031	37.56%	3722	3542	94.25%
Sented:	5038	62.44%	6737	5541	84.66%
Total:	8069	100.00%	10459	9083	87.65%
Total					
Unsented:	8531	34.10%	11781	10695	38.49%
Sented:	16485	65.90%	24440	17094	61.51%
Total:	25016	100.00%	36221	27789	80.85%

Note: FY 2012 data through March 31, 2012.

Table 3.4

**State Summary of Program Enrollments
by Crime Class & Legal Status
With Percents of Successful Outcomes
P.A. 511 Funded
Fiscal Year 2012**

Type of Program	New Enrollments	Number of Enrollments				Percent Successful				
		Unsented		Sented		Unsented		Sented		Overall
		Felony	Misd	Felony	Misd	Felony	Misd	Felony	Misd	
Case Management	1294	66	33	708	487	75.0%	70.3%	66.5%	78.8%	71.7%
Community Service	4801	35	23	2083	2660	59.4%	83.3%	82.5%	75.1%	78.3%
Substance Abuse	1402	302	78	791	231	81.9%	82.2%	60.0%	70.6%	68.4%
Other	363	30	7	186	140	80.0%	100.0%	73.0%	85.9%	79.3%
DDJR	402	22	0	372	8	100.0%	0.0%	86.4%	12.5%	85.6%
Group Programming	6147	324	65	4885	873	69.9%	81.8%	69.4%	77.2%	70.9%
Supervision Services	6116	1749	713	2254	1400	79.6%	83.3%	82.7%	92.3%	84.4%
Assessment Services	14838	5155	2765	5812	1106	95.7%	98.3%	63.4%	99.6%	83.8%
Gatekeeper	2152	442	71	1320	319	96.9%	91.7%	95.1%	90.8%	94.9%
Totals:	37515	8125	3755	18411	7224					
Totals w/o Case Mnngt:	36221	8059	3722	17703	6737	99.42%	98.17%	85.38%	101.60%	93.23%

Note: FY 2012 data through March 31, 2012

PART 4

FY 2012 AWARD OF FUNDS

Community Corrections Comprehensive Plans and Applications

In August 2011, the State Community Corrections Board reviewed 38 proposals which cover 41 counties for Community Corrections Funds for FY 2012. Fifteen CCABs representing 33 counties are under multi-year contracts and received a continuation budget for FY 2012. The State Board recommended and Director Daniel H. Heyns approved the award of \$33.5 million to support Community Corrections programs statewide. It should be noted that on September 29, 2011, the Mason County Board of Commissioners voted unanimously to eliminate the Mason County Community Corrections Office – funds originally approved by the State Community Corrections Board have not been awarded.

- The proposals are pursuant to the county comprehensive corrections' plans which provide a policy framework for community corrections' funded programs.

Forty-two counties have elected to participate through formulation of a single county Community Corrections Advisory Board; and, thirty-two counties through the formulation of multi-county Community Corrections Advisory Boards. The multi-county boards consist of the following:

- Arenac/Ogemaw
- Benzie/Manistee
- Central U.P. – Alger, Schoolcraft
- Eastern U.P. – Chippewa, Luce, Mackinac
- Northern Michigan – Cheboygan, Crawford, Otsego, Presque Isle
- Sunrise Side – Alcona, Alpena, Montmorency
- Thirteenth Judicial Circuit – Antrim, Grand Traverse, Leelanau
- Thumb Region – Lapeer, Tuscola
- Tri-County – Baraga, Houghton, Keweenaw
- West Central U.P. – Delta, Dickinson, Gogebic, Iron, Menominee, Ontonagon
- Wexford/Missaukee

The comprehensive plans and applications submitted by local jurisdictions addressed the 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 following table entitled "FY 2012 Recommended Award Amounts Summary," identifies the plan amount requested for Comprehensive Plans and Services and Drunk Driver Jail Reduction & Community Treatment Program 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 2012 RECOMMENDED AWARD AMOUNTS SUMMARY

COMPREHENSIVE PLANS & SERVICES ANNUAL CONTRACTS						DDJR/CTP ANNUAL CONTRACTS			
CCAB	FY 2011	FY 2012 Plan Amount	FY 2012 Recommendation	FY 2012 Reserve	FY 2012 Total Recommended	FY 2011	FY 2012 Plan Amount	FY 2012 Recommendation	FY 2012 Reserve
BERRIEN	194,035	224,035	194,035	0	194,035				
MANISTEE/BENZIE	76,092	94,940	76,092	0	76,092	1,902	2,091	1,195	0
CALHOUN	227,894	229,893	227,893	0	227,893	24,893	23,033	13,252	0
CHARLEVOIX	42,600	42,600	42,600	0	42,600	9,450	0	5,935	0
EMMET	55,001	94,053	55,001	0	55,001	2,025	2,175	1,720	0
GENESEE	475,508	475,508	475,508	0	475,508	94,831	94,831	87,137	0
INGHAM/LANSING	292,036	285,437	285,437	0	285,437	31,347	31,347	21,169	0
JACKSON	216,608	216,608	216,563	0	216,563	34,387	34,328	25,384	0
KALAMAZOO	441,544	441,544	441,544	0	441,544	10,795	10,875	6,069	0
KALKASKA	46,208	91,029	46,208	0	46,208	7,425	3,713	4,663	0
KENT	872,566	924,823	872,566	0	872,566	87,600	87,600	86,145	0
LIVINGSTON	197,735	197,735	197,735	0	197,735	7,790	7,790	7,790	0
MACOMB	942,025	942,025	942,025	0	942,025	83,516	83,516	83,515	0
MONROE	208,775	208,775	208,775	0	208,775	-	0	0	0
MUSKEGON	209,305	209,305	209,305	0	209,305	36,365	36,421	33,820	0
OAKLAND	1,551,986	1,551,986	1,551,986	0	1,551,986	608,603	608,603	453,588	0
OTTAWA	241,041	241,046	241,041	0	241,041	5,247	11,525	4,974	0
ROSCOMMON	-	62,800	62,800	0	62,800	5,017	0	1,571	0
SAGINAW	330,446	355,977	330,446	0	330,446	67,200	63,138	67,197	0
ST. CLAIR	261,005	261,005	261,005	0	261,005	121,365	121,365	117,274	0
WEXFORD/MISSAUKEE	111,644	111,644	111,644	0	111,644	6,750	6,750	6,390	0
WASHTENAW	390,801	390,801	390,801	0	390,801	37,069	31,000	35,672	0
WAYNE	2,775,985	2,776,985	2,776,985	0	2,776,985	137,399	3,766,412	125,198	0
SUB - TOTALS	10,160,840	10,430,554	10,217,995	-	10,217,995	1,420,976	5,026,512	1,189,658	-

COMPREHENSIVE PLANS & SERVICES MULTI-YEAR CONTRACTS						DDJR/CTP MULTI-YEAR CONTRACTS			
CCAB	FY 2011	FY 2012 Plan Amount	FY 2012 Recommendation	FY 2012 Reserve	FY 2012 Total Recommended	FY 2011	FY 2012 Plan Amount	FY 2012 Recommendation	FY 2012 Reserve
ALLEGAN	103,845	103,044	103,845	0	103,845		0	0	0
BARRY	91,706	91,706	91,706	0	91,706	5,332	5,332	5,332	0
BRANCH	26,295	26,295	26,295	0	26,295	14,345	14,345	4,492	0
CASS	91,048	91,048	91,048	0	91,048	8,508	8,508	8,508	0
CENTRAL U.P.	84,655	84,655	84,655	0	84,655	435	435	136	0
CLINTON	77,200	77,200	77,200	0	77,200	4,413	4,413	1,382	0
HURON	47,025	47,025	47,025	0	47,025		0	0	0
IONIA	90,938	107,946	90,938	0	90,938	11,764	11,764	11,252	0
LENAWEE	49,061					1,250		1,164	
MARQUETTE	86,556	92,456	86,556	0	86,556	2,228	2,228	1,606	0
MECOSTA	71,545	71,545	71,545	0	71,545		0	0	0
MONTCALM	86,764	86,764	86,764	0	86,764	4,080	4,080	3,184	0
SHIAWASSEE	65,298	65,298	65,298	0	65,298	11,523	11,523	4,377	0
OSCEOLA	56,535	77,388	56,535	0	56,535		0	0	0
SUB - TOTALS	1,028,471	1,022,370	979,410	-	979,410	63,878	62,628	41,433	-

COMPREHENSIVE PLANS & SERVICES MULTI-YEAR CONTRACTS - CONTINUATION					DDJR/CTP MULTI-YEAR CONTRACTS - CONTINUATION			
CCAB	FY 2011			FY 12 Award	FY 2011		FY 2012 Recommendation	
ARENAC/OGEMAW	89,397			89,397	1101		346	
BAY	154,820			154,820	18,247		14,729	
EASTERN U.P.	139,147			139,147	2,085		653	
EATON	178,924			178,924	22,014		18,551	
GRATIOT	45,583			45,583	3,373		1,751	
ISABELLA	113,255			113,255	4,275		4,275	
MIDLAND	155,486			155,486	6,565		5,030	
NORTHERN	212,889			212,889	12,850		9,852	
ST. JOSEPH	114,056			114,056				
SUNRISE SIDE	130,053			130,053	2,567		2,149	
THIRTEENTH	197,993			197,993	61,988		37,257	
THUMB AREA	213,979			213,979	94,683		94,683	
TRI-COUNTY	134,853			134,853				
VAN BUREN	119,730			119,730	4,655		1,458	
WEST CENTRAL U.P.	322,908			322,908	-		-	
SUB - TOTALS	2,323,073			2,323,073	234,403	-	190,734	-

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PLANS AND SERVICES

FY 2012 Appropriation	\$13,958,000
FY 2012 Award of Funds	\$13,520,478

FY 2012 Community Corrections Plans and Services funds have been awarded to support community-based programs in 73 counties (54 county, city-county, or multi-county CCABs). It should be noted that on September 29, 2011, the Mason County Board of Commissioners voted unanimously to eliminate the Mason County Community Corrections Office – funds originally approved by the State Community Corrections Board have not been awarded. Additional awards are expected to be made during the fiscal year to continue local programming – The State Community Corrections Board recommended that funds to be set-aside for several counties until they submit revised *FY 2012 Comprehensive Community Corrections Plan and Application* program descriptions that clearly outlines objectives and strategies to address local prison commitment rates, improve jail utilization and reduce recidivism that meets the approval of OCA.

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	\$1,054,571
Group-Based Programs	\$3,665,420
Supervision Programs	\$1,987,917
Assessment Services	\$1,220,552
Gatekeeper & Jail Population Monitor	\$1,118,836
Case Management	\$1,199,407
Substance Abuse Testing	\$ 192,571
Other	\$ 236,226
CCAB Administration	\$2,844,978

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 2012 proposal development and award of funds process, 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 2012 Comprehensive Plans and Services funds, are identified on the attached table entitled, "Comprehensive Plans and Services: FY 2012 Summary of Program Budgets". The following chart entitled "Budget Summary Plans and Services Funds" provides the statewide amounts for each sanction and services funded.

COMMUNITY ALTERNATIVES
 COMPREHENSIVE PLANS AND SERVICE FUNDS
 SUMMARY OF PROGRAM BUDGETS - FY 2012

CCAB	COMMUNITY SERVICE	GROUP-BASED PROGRAMS	SUPERVISION PROGRAMS	ASSESSMENT SERVICES	GATEKEEPER	CASE MANAGEMENT	SUBSTANCE ABUSE TESTING	OTHER	ADMINISTRATION	TOTALS
ALLEGAN	41,444	60,801	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,600	103,845
BARRY	2,500	25,000	-	-	13,641	-	23,053	-	27,512	91,706
BAY	-	41,682	27,880	31,310	-	-	10,448	-	43,500	154,820
BENZIE/MANISTEE	4,000	40,248	8,500	10,000	-	-	-	-	13,344	76,092
BERRIEN	-	52,479	50,603	-	47,902	-	-	-	43,051	194,035
BRANCH	-	24,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,295	26,295
CALHOUN	-	48,126	82,574	-	43,000	-	-	-	54,193	227,893
CASS	6,000	44,903	-	-	14,500	-	-	-	25,645	91,048
CENTRAL U.P.	29,161	2,970	550	-	-	-	-	-	9,646	42,327
CENTRAL U.P. (UPCAP)	29,161	2,970	550	-	-	-	-	-	9,647	42,328
CHARLEVOIX	9,000	15,000	5,200	-	1,900	-	-	-	11,500	42,600
CLINTON	-	18,000	-	20,000	16,000	-	-	-	23,200	77,200
EASTERN U.P.	58,905	-	41,951	-	-	-	-	-	38,291	139,147
EATON	36,000	29,800	-	-	21,140	21,140	-	13,826	57,018	178,924
EMMET	3,704	25,200	6,000	1,835	7,000	-	-	-	11,262	55,001
GENESEE	15,000	67,700	60,000	56,400	59,000	62,208	25,000	-	130,200	475,508
GRATIOT	9,379	11,896	12,979	-	-	-	-	-	11,329	45,583
HURON	18,000	13,725	-	-	7,350	-	-	-	7,950	47,025
INGHAM/LANSING	-	152,587	43,350	-	12,500	-	-	15,000	62,000	285,437
IONIA	-	64,590	-	-	-	-	-	-	26,348	90,938
ISABELLA	-	72,500	15,301	-	23,454	2,000	-	-	-	113,255
JACKSON	28,100	90,000	24,575	-	13,200	-	7,850	-	52,838	216,563
KALAMAZOO	-	-	266,000	6,000	-	-	85,000	-	84,544	441,544
KALKASKA	4,000	20,000	5,000	-	3,633	-	-	-	13,575	46,208
KENT	63,896	350,333	209,729	36,150	2,500	-	-	-	209,958	872,566
LIVINGSTON	-	92,660	8,791	37,450	14,540	-	2,400	-	41,894	197,735
MACOMB	59,500	149,000	-	286,900	-	218,793	-	-	227,832	942,025
MARQUETTE	27,500	33,400	8,500	-	-	-	-	-	17,156	86,556
MECOSTA	27,525	-	15,310	-	21,020	-	-	-	7,690	71,545
MIDLAND	-	106,066	-	20,460	-	-	-	-	28,960	155,486
MONROE	-	134,620	30,200	-	-	-	-	-	43,955	208,775
MONTCALM	8,250	49,810	-	2,000	-	-	2,000	-	24,704	86,764
MUSKEGON	8,736	53,736	-	24,758	91,318	-	-	-	30,757	209,305
NEMCOG	32,000	48,819	30,000	20,000	39,100	-	-	-	42,970	212,889
OAKLAND	-	336,446	199,198	463,529	96,716	350,062	-	-	106,035	1,551,986
OGEMAW/ARENAC	27,100	38,797	1,000	2,500	3,000	-	-	-	17,000	89,397
OSCEOLA	32,701	12,302	3,519	-	-	-	-	-	8,013	56,535
OTTAWA	56,516	27,500	77,000	25,025	-	-	-	-	55,000	241,041
ROSCOMMON	12,100	31,600	-	-	2,600	-	-	-	16,500	62,800
SAGINAW	-	103,818	94,616	39,480	41,304	-	-	-	51,228	330,446
ST. CLAIR	-	199,005	32,000	-	-	-	-	-	30,000	261,005
ST. JOSEPH	-	31,940	47,900	-	-	-	-	-	34,216	114,056
SHIAWASSEE	-	26,083	22,415	-	-	-	-	-	16,800	65,298
SUNRISE SIDE	24,200	36,000	-	15,500	22,353	-	-	-	32,000	130,053
13TH CIRCUIT	-	27,283	70,206	-	-	61,204	-	-	39,300	197,993
THUMB REGIONAL	33,500	99,679	24,000	22,800	-	-	-	-	34,000	213,979
TRI CO REGIONAL	71,240	23,400	-	-	-	-	-	-	40,213	134,853
VAN BUREN	33,670	-	27,633	-	29,378	-	-	-	29,049	119,730
WASHTENAW	-	142,261	124,757	95,455	17,637	-	-	-	10,691	390,801
WAYNE	30,000	562,335	250,180	-	423,150	484,000	36,820	207,400	783,100	2,776,985
WCUP	211,783	10,850	25,950	-	-	-	-	-	74,325	322,908
WEXFORD	-	13,500	34,000	3,000	30,000	-	-	-	31,144	111,644
TOTALS	1,054,571	3,665,420	1,987,917	1,220,552	1,118,836	1,199,407	192,571	236,226	2,844,978	13,520,478

Budget Summary Plans and Services Funds FY 2012



DRUNK DRIVER JAIL REDUCTION & COMMUNITY TREATMENT PROGRAM

FY 2012 Appropriation	\$1,440,100
FY 2012 Award of Funds	\$1,421,825

The FY 2012 Drunk Driver Jail Reduction and Community Treatment Program (DDJR&CTP) funds are 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. It should be noted that on September 29, 2011, the Mason County Board of Commissioners voted unanimously to eliminate the Mason County Community Corrections Office – funds originally approved by the State Community Corrections Board have not been awarded.

The Annual Appropriations Act 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 or the lower limit of the sentencing range is 1 year or less and the upper limit of the range is more than 18 months and the prior record variable is less than 35 points, 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 3rd "intermediate" offenders identified in community corrections programs on a monthly average has increased (151.5%) from 285 in January 2004 to 715 in December 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 2010. OMNI data shows that the number of OUIL 3rd "intermediate" dispositions with a jail term decreased from 2,298 in CY 2003 to 1,637 FY 2011. 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.

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS	
OFFICE OF COMMUNITY ALTERNATIVES	
DDJR FUNDING SUMMARY - FY 2012	
CCAB	AWARD AMOUNT
ALLEGAN	0
ARENAC/OGEMAW	346
BARRY	5,332
BAY	14,729
BERRIEN	0
BRANCH	4,492
CALHOUN	13,252
CASS	8,508
CENTRAL U.P.	136
CHARLEVOIX	5,935
CLINTON	1,382
EASTERN U.P.	653
EATON	18,551
EMMET	1,720
GENESEE	87,137
GRATIOT	1,751
HURON	0
INGHAM/LANSING	21,169
IONIA	11,252
ISABELLA	4,275
JACKSON	25,384
KALAMAZOO	6,069
KALKASKA	4,663
KENT	86,145
LENAWEE	1,164
LIVINGSTON	7,790
MACOMB	83,515
MANISTEE/BENZIE	1,195
MARQUETTE	1,606
MECOSTA	-
MIDLAND	5,030
MONROE	0
MONTCALM	3,184
MUSKEGON	33,820
NORTHERN	9,852
OAKLAND	453,588
OSCEOLA	0
OTTAWA	4,974
ROSCOMMON	1,571
SAGINAW	67,197
SHIAWASSEE	4,377
ST. CLAIR	117,274
ST. JOSEPH	
SUNRISE SIDE	2,149
THIRTEENTH	37,257
THUMB AREA	94,683
TRI-COUNTY	
VAN BUREN	1,458
WASHTENAW	35,672
WAYNE	125,198
WEST CENTRAL U.P.	0
WEXFORD/MISSAUKEE	6,390
TOTALS	1,421,825

RESIDENTIAL SERVICES

FY 2012 Appropriation	\$18,075,500
FY 2012 Allocated Funds	\$17,181,803

Since 1991, the State has lapsed over \$13 million in Residential Services funds. In 2007, due to continued lapse funding, the State Community Corrections Board approved the Office of Community Alternatives to change the process for contracting Residential Services statewide. The intended goals of the changes were to reduce annual lapsed funds, increase Residential Services availability to counties, and implement a more efficient administrative process.

In FY 2008, the Department of Corrections began contracting directly with Residential Service providers in an effort to reduce lapsed funds and ensure Residential Services were available as an alternative sanction and service to local jurisdictions. The Office of Community Alternatives, Substance Abuse Services (SAS) Section administers the contracts. Centralizing these services has reduced lapsed funds and increased the efficiency of these operations – administrative costs were reduced by allowing the provider to have one contract with the State rather than individual contracts with each CCAB. Counties also experienced increased flexibility to access programs that were not traditionally part of their residential provider network.

In 2010, the State Community Corrections Board approved the Office of Community Alternatives to discontinue allocating a specific number of beds per CCAB and disseminate a statewide Residential Service Directory to local jurisdictions providing greater access to services which would likely further reduce lapsed funding. FY 2012 funds were allocated to support Residential Services pursuant to 51 local comprehensive corrections' plans. The bed allocation plan responds to program utilization patterns between local jurisdictions and creates greater capabilities for local jurisdictions to access Residential Services for eligible felony offenders from a wider range of service providers.

The OCA is cognizant that each jurisdiction developed an offender referral process that provided for effective program placement. Therefore, the current local referral process remained the same to ensure offenders are placed into programs expeditiously and not utilize jail beds awaiting placement. The State provides the CCABs with monthly program utilization reports to ensure local oversight of utilization trends is maintained.

During FY 2012, 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 residential, increasing the utilization of short-term residential services for probation violators.

The FY 2012 appropriation supports an average daily population (ADP) of 1,039 with a maximum per diem of \$47.50 – programs that have been accredited by the American Correctional Association have a maximum per diem of \$48.50.

In FY 2012, it was anticipated that an over-utilization of residential services may have been experienced and the actual ADP may be greater than 1,039 due to several factors including Macomb, Oakland and Wayne County Jail bed reduction and other administrative changes and program referral processes. However, utilization through the 2nd quarter of the fiscal year was approximately 87.6%.

The following provides information regarding the bed allocation and utilization rates for each Residential Service provider.

Residential Services Bed Allocation - FY 2012

CIRCUIT COURT PROBATION

Provider	Authorized ADP	Contract Amount
Addiction Treatment Services	12	204,000
Alternative Directions	54	944,662
CEI - House of Commons	12	208,000
Community Programs Inc.	131	2,273,987
Detroit Rescue Mission	25	434,000
Elmhurst Home Inc.	75	1,300,000
Great Lakes Recovery	7	121,400
Harbor Hall	18	304,000
Heartline	6	104,000
Home of New Vision	12	202,800
Huron House	14	239,475
KPEP	144	2,556,335
National Council on Alcoholism	4	75,000
New Paths	64	1,117,062
Operation Get Down	45	780,000
Phoenix House	3	55,000
Pine Rest	37	637,162
Salvation Army Harbor Light	45	780,312
Sequoia Recovery	18	312,500
SHAR Macomb	6	104,025
SMB TRI - CAP	55	945,975
Sobriety House	24	416,000
Solutions to Recovery	56	962,500
Sunrise Center	9	155,000
Twin County Community Corrections Program	38	658,650
West Michigan Therapy	10	179,025
Sub Total	924	16,070,870

Level III Parole Violators

Provider	Authorized ADP	Contract Amount
Alternative Directions	1	17,338
Community Programs Inc.	3	52,013
Huron House	6	104,025
KPEP	15	258,543
New Paths	21	366,938
Pine Rest	1	17,338
Salvation Army Harbor Light	5	86,688
Twin County Community Corrections Program	4	69,350
SMB TRI - CAP	6	104,025
West Michigan Therapy	2	34,675
Sub Total	64	1,110,933

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION
COMMUNITY ALTERNATIVES
RESIDENTIAL SERVICES ADP SUMMARY FY 2012 - 2nd Quarter

PROVIDER	CCAB	ORIGINAL AUTH. ADP	CURRENT AUTH ADP	REPORTED ADP	UTILIZATION RATE
Addiction Treatment Services	THIRTEENTH			3.51	
	Sub Total	10.03	10.03	3.51	34.98%
PROVIDER	CCAB	ORIGINAL AUTH. ADP	CURRENT AUTH ADP	REPORTED ADP	UTILIZATION RATE
Alternative Directions	ALLEGAN			1.20	
	KENT			51.09	
	MECOSTA			1.18	
	MONTCALM			1.17	
	OTTAWA			2.56	
	THIRTEENTH			1.23	
	Sub Total	54.36	54.36	58.42	107.47%
PROVIDER	CCAB	ORIGINAL AUTH. ADP	CURRENT AUTH ADP	REPORTED ADP	UTILIZATION RATE
CEI	EATON			0.96	
	GRATIOT			-	
	INGHAM			6.95	
	JACKSON			0.69	
	LIVINGSTON			0.44	
	NORTHERN			-	
	Sub Total	11.72	11.72	9.03	77.09%
PROVIDER	CCAB	ORIGINAL AUTH. ADP	CURRENT AUTH ADP	REPORTED ADP	UTILIZATION RATE
Christian Guidance	WAYNE			40.67	
	Sub Total	24.45	44.17	40.67	92.08%
PROVIDER	CCAB	ORIGINAL AUTH. ADP	CURRENT AUTH ADP	REPORTED ADP	UTILIZATION RATE
CPI	ALLEGAN			0.00	
	BARRY			0.00	
	CALHOUN			2.50	
	CLINTON			0.77	
	EATON			7.86	
	GENESEE			20.72	
	INGHAM			6.50	
	JACKSON			6.58	
	KALAMAZOO			-	
	LIVINGSTON			0.61	
	MACOMB			29.67	
	OAKLAND			22.32	
	ST. CLAIR			0.10	
	THUMB			1.78	
	WASHTENAW			2.62	
	WAYNE			2.91	
Sub Total	115.60	115.60	104.92	90.76%	
PROVIDER	CCAB	ORIGINAL AUTH. ADP	CURRENT AUTH ADP	REPORTED ADP	UTILIZATION RATE
Dot Caring	BAY			2.01	
	SAGINAW			1.42	
	Sub Total	5.86	5.86	3.43	58.56%
PROVIDER	CCAB	ORIGINAL AUTH. ADP	CURRENT AUTH ADP	REPORTED ADP	UTILIZATION RATE
Elmhurst	MONROE			0.07	
	WAYNE			52.08	
	Sub Total	73.24	68.17	52.15	76.50%
PROVIDER	CCAB	ORIGINAL AUTH. ADP	CURRENT AUTH ADP	REPORTED ADP	UTILIZATION RATE
Get Back Up	WAYNE			19.62	
	Sub Total	19.55	19.55	19.62	100.38%
PROVIDER	CCAB	ORIGINAL AUTH. ADP	CURRENT AUTH ADP	REPORTED ADP	UTILIZATION RATE
Great Lakes Recovery	CHARLEVOIX			0.19	
	EMMET			0.15	
	EUP			-	
	INGHAM			0.47	
	KALKASKA			0.41	
	LIVINGSTON			1.04	
	MANISTEE/BENZIE			0.08	
	MARQUETTE			2.16	
	MONTMORENCY			0.13	
	NORTHERN			0.72	
	OTTAWA			0.42	
	ROSOMMON			-	
	SUNRISE SIDE			2.31	
	THIRTEENTH			1.09	
	WCUP			2.69	
Sub Total	6.84	13.32	11.87	89.12%	

PROVIDER	CCAB	ORIGINAL AUTH. ADP	CURRENT AUTH ADP	REPORTED ADP	UTILIZATION RATE
Harbor Hall	CHARLEVOIX			-	
	EUP			0.49	
	JACKSON			3.36	
	LIVINGSTON			0.00	
	MANISTEE/BENZIE			0.20	
	NORTHERN			0.49	
	OGEMAW/ARENAC			-	
	SUNRISE SIDE			1.97	
	THIRTEENTH			0.00	
WEXFORD/MISSAUKEE			-		
Sub Total		15.15	15.15	6.51	42.98%
Heartline	WAYNE			1.43	
	Sub Total		5.86	5.86	1.43
Home of New Vision	LENAWEE			1.23	
	LIVINGSTON			2.49	
	THIRTEENTH			-	
	WASHTENAW			3.39	
	Sub Total		11.42	11.42	7.12
Huron House	ST. CLAIR			17.91	
	WCUP			-	
	Sub Total		19.76	19.76	17.54
KPEP	ALLEGAN			2.95	
	BARRY			1.00	
	BERRIEN			25.29	
	BRANCH			0.03	
	CALHOUN			11.72	
	CASS			0.54	
	EATON			0.52	
	INGHAM			8.64	
	IONIA			0.51	
	JACKSON			9.39	
	KALAMAZOO			39.72	
	KENT			3.96	
	LENAWEE			-	
	LIVINGSTON			4.86	
	MECOSTA			1.33	
	MUSKEGON			37.41	
	OTTAWA			0.38	
	SAGINAW			1.14	
	ST. CLAIR			0.25	
	ST. JOSEPH			-	
VAN BUREN			2.65		
Sub Total		159.15	169.00	152.50	90.23%
NCA	ALLEGAN			0.51	
	BARRY			0.24	
	EATON			1.08	
	INGHAM			1.70	
	IONIA			0.37	
	JACKSON			0.49	
	KENT			0.00	
Sub Total		4.23	4.23	4.39	103.98%
New Paths	BAY			0.01	
	EATON			2.80	
	GENESEE			50.78	
	OAKLAND			0.00	
	SAGINAW			0.12	
	SHIAWASSEE			0.00	
	THUMB			6.96	
	WASHTENAW			1.37	
Sub Total		82.77	67.53	62.04	91.87%
Operation Get Down	WAYNE			32.67	
	Sub Total		43.94	43.94	32.67
Phoenix House	LIVINGSTON			1.31	
	WCUP			1.90	
	Sub Total		3.10	3.10	3.21
Pine Rest	ALLEGAN			0.23	
	CLINTON			0.42	
	INGHAM			1.01	
	IONIA			2.23	
	KENT			19.28	
	LIVINGSTON			1.64	
	MONTCALM			0.55	
	OTTAWA			1.02	
	Sub Total		35.66	35.66	26.39

PROVIDER	CCAB	ORIGINAL AUTH. ADP	CURRENT AUTH ADP	REPORTED ADP	UTILIZATION RATE
Salvation Army	MACOMB			21.28	
	MONROE			18.81	
	Sub Total	48.84	48.84	40.09	82.09%
PROVIDER	CCAB	ORIGINAL AUTH. ADP	CURRENT AUTH ADP	REPORTED ADP	UTILIZATION RATE
Sequoia	EATON			0.38	
	IONIA			0.08	
	LIVINGSTON			0.67	
	MONTCALM			0.41	
	OAKLAND			11.54	
	WAYNE			-	
Sub Total	16.62	16.62	13.08	78.69%	
PROVIDER	CCAB	ORIGINAL AUTH. ADP	CURRENT AUTH ADP	REPORTED ADP	UTILIZATION RATE
SHAR	MACOMB			5.96	
	OAKLAND			5.49	
	Sub Total	5.86	14.59	11.45	78.45%
PROVIDER	CCAB	ORIGINAL AUTH. ADP	CURRENT AUTH ADP	REPORTED ADP	UTILIZATION RATE
Sobriety House	WAYNE			16.03	
	Sub Total	23.44	23.44	16.03	68.39%
PROVIDER	CCAB	ORIGINAL AUTH. ADP	CURRENT AUTH ADP	REPORTED ADP	UTILIZATION RATE
Solutions to Recovery	EATON			0.17	
	LIVINGSTON			0.59	
	OAKLAND			42.53	
	WASHTENAW			6.85	
	Sub Total	51.37	51.37	50.14	97.61%
PROVIDER	CCAB	ORIGINAL AUTH. ADP	CURRENT AUTH ADP	REPORTED ADP	UTILIZATION RATE
Sunrise Centre	BAY			-	
	EATON			1.84	
	EMMET			0.40	
	IONIA			0.49	
	ISABELLA			0.33	
	LIVINGSTON			0.39	
	MANISTEE			0.25	
	MONTCALM			-	
	NORTHERN			1.03	
	OGEA W/ARENA C			0.40	
	SUNRISE SIDE			0.64	
	THIRTEENTH			0.13	
	WAYNE			-	
	WEXFORD/MISSAUKEE			1.64	
Sub Total	8.51	8.51	7.54	88.65%	
PROVIDER	CCAB	ORIGINAL AUTH. ADP	CURRENT AUTH ADP	REPORTED ADP	UTILIZATION RATE
TCCPC	BRANCH			3.05	
	CASS			3.89	
	LENAWEE			3.35	
	ST. JOSEPH			19.15	
	VAN BUREN			1.00	
	Sub Total	41.88	35.26	30.45	86.37%
PROVIDER	CCAB	ORIGINAL AUTH. ADP	CURRENT AUTH ADP	REPORTED ADP	UTILIZATION RATE
Tri-Cap	BAY			3.61	
	GRATIOT			0.54	
	HURON			-	
	IONIA			1.51	
	ISABELLA			1.96	
	MIDLAND			10.24	
	MONTCALM			3.28	
	OGEA W			1.85	
	ROSCOMMON			0.51	
	SAGINAW			30.86	
	THUMB			3.89	
	WAYNE			0.33	
	Sub Total	58.84	58.27	58.58	100.53%
PROVIDER	CCAB	ORIGINAL AUTH. ADP	CURRENT AUTH ADP	REPORTED ADP	UTILIZATION RATE
West Mi Therapy	MUSKEGON			7.03	
	Sub Total	11.75	8.08	7.03	86.96%

TOTALS	ORIGINAL AUTH. ADP	CURRENT AUTH. ADP	YTD REPORTED ADP	UTILIZATION RATE
	969.77	983.39	851.80	
				86.6%
				MONTHLY UTILIZATION RATE
				YTD UTIL. RATE
				86.62%

Note: Includes sixty-two residential beds set-aside for level three technical parole violators in lieu of return to prison.

PART 5

DATA SYSTEMS OVERVIEW AND STATUS

The Automated Data Services Section (ADSS) within the MDOC/Office of Research and Planning is responsible for the oversight of two community corrections information systems: the Jail Population Information System (JPIS) and the Community Corrections Information System (CCIS). This report summarizes the status of each system. The Department has entered into a contractual agreement with Northpointe, Inc. to implement the COMPAS Case Manager System statewide – this new system merged both the JPIS and CCIS data into one data system which is expected to increase departmental efficiencies and enhance the State's and local community corrections data reporting capabilities.

Jail Population Information System (JPIS)

Overview

The Michigan Jail Population Information System was originally developed as a means to gather standardized information on jail utilization and demographics from county jails throughout the State. JPIS is the product of a cooperative effort among the Michigan Department of Corrections, Office of Community Alternatives, County Jail Services Section and the Michigan Sheriff's Association, with assistance from Michigan State University and the National Institute of Corrections. While it was never intended that JPIS would have all the information contained at each individual reporting site, specifications called for the capture of data on individual demographics, primary offense, known criminal history and information related to arrest, conviction, sentencing, and release.

Mission and Concept

The primary purpose of the statewide Jail Population Information System is to provide the ability to monitor and evaluate jail population characteristics for use in policy planning. As a statewide database, it is sufficiently flexible to enable the system to be compatible with existing jail management and MIS systems in each county. Originally developed as a mainframe process, the JPIS system was later rewritten to run in MDOC's client/server environment gathering monthly files and returning error summaries and analytical reports. The COMPAS Case Manager System will provide a statewide internet based data system which will increase departmental efficiencies and enhance the State's and local jails reporting capabilities.

JPIS is a means to gather a subset of the information which already resides on individual jail management systems, with each county running a monthly extract process to generate a standard file. The primary approach has always been to promote the adoption, enhancement and proper use of local data systems. In turn, the local system provides the foundation to extract the optimum of usable data for the JPIS extract, which should be viewed as a logical by-product of local data capture.

History and Impact

The locally-centered approach taken for JPIS development has had a substantial impact on the utilization of local jail management systems throughout the State. When JPIS requirements were first implemented, over half the counties in Michigan did not have functional automated jail management systems, and objective inmate risk classification was in its infancy. Now, all the counties have automated systems, with nearly every county having transmitted electronic data files to the central JPIS system. Similarly, the JPIS requirement for standardized classification of offenders has been a major factor in the adoption of objective offender classification processes and procedures throughout the State.

Use of JPIS Data

Edit error reports generated by COMPAS Case Manager are available to the counties, based upon individual incoming files, include summaries of admissions, releases and a snapshot of inmates still unreleased at month-end. In addition, counts are given for the ten most commonly occurring arrest and conviction charges. These reports enhance capabilities to review each monthly submission for accuracy.

Since 1998, detailed reports based upon accumulated JPIS master data have been transmitted to each Sheriff's department and CCAB. The reports cover cumulative data for the current calendar year, as well as full-year data for the preceding year. The associated tables include such categories as average daily population for the jail, releases and lengths of stay for offenders. In addition, there is summary data on security classification, most frequently occurring arrest charges and on target populations for community corrections programs. Local officials are given the opportunity to provide feedback on the accuracy and completeness of their data submissions, as reflected in the reports. The reports provide a primary means for review of JPIS statistics with the counties to isolate and correct data problems not readily identified by routine file editing. As additional data problems are identified and resolved, the quality and confidence in the reports increase.

The new COMPAS Case Manager System data reporting system will automate this reporting process.

Local Data Systems and JPIS

Michigan counties employ a wide variety of electronic jail management packages which vary in nature based upon jail size and local requirements for data collection. These applications include both custom-written systems and packages purchased from outside vendors. On a statewide basis, it is a very dynamic environment, with regular hardware and software upgrades at individual sites - and not infrequently - switches to entirely different jail management packages. This evolving vendor landscape presents some unique data-gathering challenges, as even the most conscientious counties periodically deal with jail management software issues that disrupt both local operations and JPIS data submissions.

JPIS Data Reporting Status

Even though several counties do not have active Community Corrections Advisory Boards and do not receive community corrections funding, the counties submitting JPIS data to OCA have accounted for over 92% of statewide jail beds during CY 2004 and CY 2005. However, due to local vendor problems, the data only accounted for 75.2% of the jail beds in 2010. At any given time, a number of counties will be working to resolve local data system issues which may also affect their capability to submit JPIS data. Technical assistance is provided by ADSS where appropriate, and every attempt is made to recover any missed monthly data once problems are resolved. ADSS will continue to provide technical support to maximize the collection and aggregation of local jail data on a statewide basis.

During the transition period of implementing the new COMPAS Case Manager System, county jails have continued to submit monthly data which has been stored on the server for future data reporting. The system has been implemented although various data reporting problems have been identified and complete data is not available for reporting purposes at this time.

Community Corrections Information System (CCIS)

Overview

The Department entered into a contractual agreement with Northpointe, Inc. to implement the COMPAS Case Manager System statewide – this new system merged CCIS data into a statewide centralized website. The data system will increase the department efficiencies and enhance the State's and local community corrections data reporting capabilities.

Local jurisdictions enter offender profile and program utilization data into the centralized website case manager program for all offenders enrolled in community corrections programs funded by P.A. 511 and other funding sources. Two types of data are required: (1) characteristics of offenders who have been determined P.A. 511 eligible for enrollment into programs; and (2) program participation details.

The CCIS data is utilized locally for program planning and case management purposes. OCA uses the data to examine the profiles of offenders in programs, monitor utilization, and evaluate the various CCAB goals and objectives specific to program utilization.

CCIS Features

Available at the CCAB level, the report identifies year-to-date information on new enrollments, average lengths of stay of successful and failed completions, and average enrollment levels for each P.A. 511 funded program. Statistics on offender characteristics (i.e., population percentages of felons, probation violators, straddle cell offenders, etc.) are also provided. Enhancements are part of OCA's ongoing commitment to assist local entities and OCA staff to actively monitor local program activity and the various elements of services to priority populations.

Impact of System Enhancements

As changes and improvements to corrections-related data systems continue to be refined, the overall ability to monitor prison commitments, jail utilization and program utilization by priority target groups of offenders continues to improve. Areas in which data system enhancements have an impact include:

1. Improvement to the timeliness and availability of felony disposition data. The use of a data export process to import felony disposition data directly generated from the MDOC's master data-gathering system, OMNI, into the centralized website is being created to provide local CCAB timely felony disposition data.

The ready accessibility and improved timeliness of felony disposition data obtained from OMNI and the enhanced data on sentencing guideline scores improves the analytical and reporting capabilities at the local level. As a result, the accuracy of CCIS data is improved as well.

2. An expanded capability to identify target groups in jails and link to other data sources.

The streamlined Jail Population Information System requirements are aimed at improving the ability to identify target populations among sentenced and unsentenced felons. The adoption of the JPIS enhancements by software vendors and local jails provides an expanding capability to link felony disposition data to jail population data.

The centralized statewide case manager system will merge JPIS data into one data system which will increase the Departments and local CCAB accessibility and timeliness of jail data, and enhance data reporting capabilities.