

Criminal Justice Collaborative Council

Meeting Minutes

April 22, 2005

200 North Main Lower Level Conference Room

Ann Arbor, MI

8:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Members Present: Archie Brown (Circuit Court Chief Judge), J. Cedric Simpson (District Court Presiding Judge), Glenn Cotton (Attorney, Public Representative), Lloyd Powell (Public Defender/Defense Attorney), Barbara Ryan Fuller (Public Representative), Bob Guenzel (County Administrator), Wesley Prater (Board of Commissioners Chair), Dan Dwyer (Trial Court Administrator), Barbara Levin Bergman (Community Corrections Advisory Board Chair), Brian Mackie (County Prosecutor)

Members Absent: Dan Minzey (County Sheriff), Paul Bunten (Chief of Police, City of Saline), Lawrence Kestenbaum (Clerk/Register), Kathy Reynolds (Executive Director, WCHO), Patrick Hughes (Department of Corrections Probation), William McFarlane (Township Supervisor, Superior Charter Township), John Shea (Attorney, Bar Association Representative)

Others Present: Scott Patton (CJCC Staff), Jim Robertson (Consultant), Kirk Filsinger (Jail Commander), Julie Chaffee (Director of Community Corrections), Kerry Sheldon (Management Analyst), Delphia Simpson (Public Defender Manager), Fran Alexander (Consultant), Libby Hines (Chief Judge, 15th District Court), Julie Goodrich (Judge, 15th District Court), Tim Connors (Judge, Washtenaw County Circuit Court), Dick Conlin (Judge 14A-3 Chelsea District Court), Ann Madsen (Judge, Washtenaw County Trial Court District Court Division), Mary O'Hare (Director of Organizational Development), Steve Sheldon (WCHO Administrator)

Convened: 8:00 a.m.

I. Vote on County Administrator's Public Safety and Justice Recommendation

The motion to support the County Administrator's revised recommendation that serves as an interim solution to the needs of the Public Safety & Justice system, was made by Kathy Reynolds, and supported by Lawrence Kestenbaum at the CJCC Debrief Meeting on April 18, 2005. This motion was called to a vote on April 22, 2005, and approved unanimously by members.

II. County Administrator Update

Bob Guenzel gave an update on ongoing discussions at the Board of Commissioners working sessions regarding the revised proposal for improvement of the jail and District Court. He also informed members on his funding recommendations for improvements to the public safety and justice system. Discussion ensued on the proposal.

III. CJCC Retreat

A. Pre Meeting Survey and Interviews:

Previous to the retreat, CJCC members and staff completed a survey that offered a self assessment and also identified priorities and opportunities for the CJCC in moving forward. These interview and survey results helped inform the retreat agenda and were used as a basis for

Criminal Justice Collaborative Council

starting conversations regarding the role of the CJCC, its membership and the priorities it should focus on in the coming year. Please see addendum for complete survey results.

B. CJCC Vision

Archie Brown reviewed the following elements of the vision he holds for what CJCC could bring to the community in the next five years:

1. The CJCC will continue to be used:
 - For productive discussions around difficult issues;
 - As a participative forum for discussing issues that otherwise would never be addressed even though it might be in the public's best interest for them to be addressed;
 - To support multi-disciplinary working relationships and people demonstrating an understanding and respect for one another's jobs.
2. The CJCC will ensure that the community has:
 - A fully functional jail with a well-managed jail population with effective mental health and non-violent diversion;
 - Easy access to needed information via an integrated data system.

C. Role and Responsibilities of CJCC

As defined in the charter of the CJCC:

The purpose of the CJCC is to maximize efficiency, effectiveness, fairness, and cooperative efforts of criminal justice agencies by developing plans, programs, and positions on concerns that have a multi-disciplinary Criminal Justice System application, have a positive impact on crime, are innovative or are intergovernmental in scope.

Participants agreed that the current charter of the CJCC was still relevant and addressed core elements of the role of CJCC.

Proposed modifications include:

- Stronger focus on community engagement and education
- Increase emphasis on justice
- Increase intersectional emphasis

The discussion included the following observations:

- Easily accessible, integrated data is a primary concern for the CJCC and is necessary to support effective community education and engagement.
- Representative community members help the CJCC but cannot offer broad enough communication back to constituents to be effective in a community.
- Offering citizens good information and seeking their input is necessary. Many suggested that citizens have low interest in the public safety and justice issues of a community, as the services or facilities are 'invisible' to most of the public.

D. CJCC Membership and Outreach

Expanding membership in the CJCC was suggested in surveys and in conversation with the expressed purpose of helping ensure that the CJCC has broad understanding of issues and opportunities across the system.

The group reviewed and confirmed that the benefits for broader membership go beyond the current issue of the jail needs and road patrol concerns.

Criminal Justice Collaborative Council

Future CJCC recommendations could easily have significant operational and /or financial impacts on a variety of people within the justice system and in local jurisdictions. It was suggested that CJCC subcommittees, which are targeting specific tasks, are good places to bring in other voices EARLY. The challenge will be to identify all the critical stakeholders as early as possible.

Suggested membership additions to the CJCC included:

- Representatives from the western townships, especially since the issues of townships vary significantly from one jurisdiction to another.
- Judges from 15th and 14B. *Judges suggested that increased communication and involvement on selected subcommittees seems to be the best way to keep these courts involved.*

Suggested ways to ensure improved connections and communication beyond the current CJCC membership include the following:

- Members should be active representatives of their constituents – taking information and ideas from your groups and to your groups on regular basis. Members are encouraged to establish times in their department or associations to review current CJCC activities and discussion. (Metro Alliance, Bar Association, etc.)
- Recruit the people that are most affected by the issue under discussion into the subcommittees and full discussions.
- Have a broader distribution of CJCC meeting summaries. Phone calls and informal connections should also be maintained with constituents.(i.e., judges across the county)

Members of the CJCC believe that coordination of the CJCC, via the Steering Committee and staffing, has been handled well over the past year.

- CJCC members recommended that the Public Defender be included on the Steering Committee

E. CJCC Strategic Priorities

Previous sub-committees of the CJCC include Jail Mental Health Diversion, Jail Space, and Probation Residential Center. The current sub-committees of the CJCC are Data Integration, Inmate Reintegration and Pretrial Services.

The group recommended continued efforts be made to determine a helpful scope for the group working on data integration and inmate reintegration. Julie Chaffee recommended that CJCC take the lead in conducting a cross-system analysis on gaps/opportunities to deal with limited resources. This will identify additional opportunities for alternative sanctions, better uses of existing resources and could also help focus the work of existing committees.

Participants also reviewed the following potential priorities:

- Public Education/Engagement
 - Participants agree with the needs and benefits of increased community outreach and engagement, though it is felt that data integration needs must take a priority to be able to offer the community access to better data more readily. Commissioners are continuing outreach efforts over the next month to assess community values relative to the current jail and alternative sentencing proposals.
- Justice
- Racial Profiling
 - These possible committees need review as to scope and focus by the full CJCC.
- Jail Programming

Criminal Justice Collaborative Council

- Jail programming should be incorporated into the existing Inmate Re-integration Committee.
- **Radio 800 MHZ**
This committee is active, but is not a committee of the CJCC. Maintaining close links is recommended.
 - **Court Security**
This committee is active, but is not a committee of the CJCC. Maintaining close links is recommended.
 - **Mental Health**
Recommendations have been made via last year's committee. CJCC should remain active in pursuing those recommendations.

Participants raised concerns regarding District Court sentencing relative to its effects on jail overcrowding. Archie Brown shared that he expects and hopes that the CJCC will support open, fact based conversations that cross traditional boundaries of authority. Simultaneously, each sector retains their statutory and operational authority and this authority should be respected. CJCC expects to make recommendations to sectors regarding aspects of their operations to optimize common goals.

Questions were raised as to the overlap of the roles and responsibilities of the Community Corrections Advisory Board (CCAB) and the CJCC.

- Barbara Levin Bergman will propose a team to the CJCC that will have responsibilities to address the CCAB-CJCC overlap question.

Additionally, people raised questions about the best location for Community Corrections. (Trial Court? Administration? District Court?) It was suggested that this issue be reviewed in line with decisions on the Probation Residential Center.




IV. Next Steps

1. This meeting summary will be distributed to all participants.
2. All recommendations raised in this retreat will be reviewed by the CJCC at their upcoming meeting. All decisions/actions of the CJCC will be shared with all meeting participants and other stakeholders.
3. The annual plan for CJCC, outlining current priorities, committees' scope of work and committee membership, will be shared with all participants and stakeholders.

Adjourned 12:00 p.m.

Next Criminal Justice Collaborative Committee meeting will be on 5/20/05, 7:30 a.m. to 9:00 a.m., at 200 North Main Lower Level Conference Room.

**ADDENDUM
CJCC SURVEY APRIL 2005**

Please select the role that best describes your role with the Criminal Justice Collaborative Council		Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Member		6	35%
Not a member, but active with CJCC in the past year		4	24%
Colleague and interested stakeholder		7	41%
Total		17	100%

The purpose of the CJCC is to maximize efficiency, effectiveness, fairness, and cooperative efforts of criminal justice agencies by developing plans, programs, and positions on concerns which have a multi-disciplinary Criminal Justice System application, have a positive impact on crime, are innovative or are intergovernmental in scope.




How well has the CJCC addressed its mission in the first year of its operation?		Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Poor		1	5%
Fair		2	10%
Good		6	30%
Excellent		8	40%
Don't know		3	15%
Total		20	100%

How well has the CJCC addressed its mission in the first year of its operation...explanation:

1. Proactive approach to criminal justice system
2. All plans have been "multi-disciplinary in scope" and this is an accomplishment by itself
3. Despite the millage loss, everyone knows much more and has developed a shared set of recommendations on prevention and overcrowding
4. Although unsuccessful in the vote, the CJCC investigated and put a proposal together which addressed all of the concerns of the immediate problem, and did so with a strong consensus of the group.
5. The effort focused solely around the millage, but that was a great demonstration of everything within the mission statement. One would hope that now we can tackle other issues in the same coordinated manner.
6. A unanimous recommendation went to the Board on how to improve justice in Washtenaw County
7. Though the millage failed the mission is to bring various disciplines together for cooperation and that we have done
8. Due to the short time in existence, foundations for many innovations have been made but not yet accomplished

Criminal Justice Collaborative Council

9. The intangible fact that the people are working together for the first time and there is definite give and take. The product of the proposal was a definite strength. We are starting to understand each other better
10. The CJCC proposed a thoughtful considerate fix to the overcrowding. The public didn't buy the method of correction with regards to cost.
11. Mission could change slightly Only issue is with the word "intergovernmental" – we want to include defense bar, not for profits, and public in these issues; would prefer the term "intersectoral".
12. The millage faired, no substantial change has taken place and there appears to be conflict within the group
13. We haven't accomplished anything. We have provided recommendations but until a recommendation is implemented we haven't maximized efficiency, effectiveness, fairness or developed any plans that have a positive impact on crime, or are innovative. They have been intergovernmental, but not effective.
14. Difficult to develop successful proposals without community input
15. The Council was not given enough time to take these issues to the voters. Any new ballot initiative needs town hall meetings like it was done in Novi when new court facilities were going to be placed on the ballot. Due to the range of opposition including those who felt the issues were fast tracked without sufficient time to vent concerns. More public forums are probably the only way to get any ballot issue passed.

<p>Current Membership includes Circuit Court Chief Judge, District Court Presiding Judge, County Prosecutor, Public Defender/Defense Attorney, Chair of the Community Corrections Board, County Sheriff, Trial Court Administrator, Department of Corrections Probation, City or Township Chief of Police, County Administrator, Chair of the Board of Commissioners, City Mayor or Township Supervisor, Clerk of the Court, Bar Association, Community Mental Health Representative, and two general public-at-large positions. How well does this membership structure support the work of the CJCC?</p>			
		Number of Response	Ratio
Poor		0	0%
Fair		2	10%
Good		11	55%
Excellent		7	35%
Don't Know		0	0%
		Total	20
			100%




Membership Thoughts

1. I am concerned with alignment with 15th District Court
2. While 15th and 14B District Courts have had membership on some committees, I think there should be judicial and administrative representation from those courts. The fallout from jail overcrowding impacts all courts and law enforcement agencies in the county, not just those that are funded by the county.
3. The 14A District Court Chief Judge should be a permanent member; not just a presiding District Court Judge. May want to consider membership from the 15th and 14B District Courts.
4. Unfortunately, a broader membership although unruly to some extent, may be needed.

Criminal Justice Collaborative Council

5. We might be better served by adding citizen membership from the out-county area to make them feel like they have a greater voice in the process.
6. Structure may be fine, but could have more ways to connect more with citizens
7. More community involvement is needed
8. Include additional western county citizens on the board
9. I believe the biggest variable is whether the same people participate in the discussions over time. My tenure is just a year old and I'm still feeling my way.
10. I think another general public position would add new perspectives.
Probably could use more representation from Cities and Townships

4. How well has the Steering Committee prepared for and supported the work of the full committee?	Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Poor	0	0%
Fair	0	0%
Good 	10	53%
Excellent 	6	32%
Don't Know 	3	16%
Total	19	100%

5. How well has the work of the CJCC been coordinated this year? (meeting schedules, access to information, effective agendas, engagement of needed resources etc.)	Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Poor	0	0%
Fair	0	0%
Good 	6	30%
Excellent 	12	60%
Don't Know 	2	10%
Total	20	100%

Steering Committee and Coordination Suggestions

1. Steering committee meetings should be limited to those officials appointed to the committee or their representatives, not be open meetings.
2. I think this is one of the strengths
3. Need to start asking the tough questions so that we can identify needs
4. Add Public Defender to Committee
5. Mr. Powell or defense bar rep should be on executive committee
6. Name placards for the table in front of each participant would be appreciated!
7. Organizationally, shouldn't each of the 17 members have the opportunity to become chair?
8. Agree to get whole CJCC together once a year to set the agenda for the rest of the year and maybe have the Steering Committee meet to prioritize and divide the goals

Criminal Justice Collaborative Council

into manageable chunks. Or, Steering Committee could be charged with listing the pertinent issues and work with the full membership for verification.

- Develop short term goals that can be handled in committees, but also identify the long term goals for the system in 5+ year

6. The following traits or conditions are supportive of effective collaborations. How present have they been in the CJCC over the past year?

	1 Not present at all	2 Rarely present	3 Sometimes present	4 Often present	5 Don't Know
<i>The top percentage indicates total respondent ratio; the bottom number represents actual number of respondents selecting the option</i>					
1. Capacity for effective dialogue	0% 0	10% 2	15% 3	60% 12	15% 3
2. Openness to learning best practices	0% 0	10% 2	20% 4	60% 12	10% 2
3. Access to meaningful data	5% 1	15% 3	25% 5	45% 9	10% 2
4. Understanding of the needs, goals and constraints of other parts of the system	0% 0	15% 3	30% 6	45% 9	10% 2
5. Willingness to place collective goals above individual goals	5% 1	10% 2	35% 7	35% 7	15% 3
6. Willingness to commit time and resources to the group and its goals	0% 0	5% 1	20% 4	65% 13	10% 2

Strengths of the CJCC?

- That it exists. It is a new group.
- The disciplines represented an willingness to work toward a mutual goal
- Agreement - I think that each motion made has been unanimous. There has also been an openness to learn from one another and the attendance shows that members believe it is a valuable use of their time - especially given the early morning meetings.
- Willingness of key members to work very hard on behalf of the whole; strong clear voice from Bar Association; right players at the table (though more might help);
- The group is a communications hub for all interested parties.
- Investigating and understanding the problem and arriving at group consensus.
- The use of individuals from diverse criminal justice fields and service delivery areas.
- Community involvement in process
- Commitment to improving the system to better serve the community.
- Broad membership and common understanding among everyone involved.
- Cooperation and collaborative nature in the midst of competing individual interests
- The diverse background of members

Improvement Opportunities for CJCC

- I see the need for a coordinated public relations campaign. The Ann Arbor News has done a better job covering the recent overcrowding in Livingston than our own and this

Criminal Justice Collaborative Council

is an embarrassment. I also see the need for better-coordinated advocacy with the State.





2. Quickly gathering people to develop a 'common voice' before factions can develop or individuals can speak from one angle only (i.e. post millage potential factions emerging) Good Data!
3. The CJCC will probably need to expand membership and/or meet at various locations around the county to bring the issues to the voters.
4. Greater citizen representation from out-county creating a greater feeling of participation in the process.
5. Community input and involvement, input from employees and staff performing functions associated with targeted areas of change/improvement.
6. The subcommittee members for each of the initiatives that the CJCC has taken on are usually the same people. We need to include or invite other people (citizens) from represented townships to assist in addressing the issues and not just county employees.
7. I get the sense that while the policy makers agree on goals and priorities, that this information may not always get communicated to county staff. I wonder how this could be strengthened?
8. To decide on next steps and then get moving again.
9. Redefine the goals
10. A simple list of tasks that the CJCC can complete and point to as progress.
11. Add more Twp and City Reps
12. More coffee at morning meetings.
13. Don't meet if there is nothing to talk about

Evaluation of Existing Priorities and Proposed Priorities

1. Public relations (see improvement opportunity)
2. Public outreach and communication.
 - Public Education Press releases around key issues, including overcrowding releases
 - Develop a speakers bureau to keep issues before key constituencies, like the Kiwanis Clubs
3. Data Integration Committee work is critical
4. Information systems
5. Substance-wise, data sharing should be the number one conversation. Everyone shares a frustration with the inability of members to put a hand on data and be able to answer some questions that seem pretty basic
6. Data: If someone has a question, we should within an hour be able to generate a report that gives any information we want to advocate to the public
7. Lend support to the need to secure the current preliminary exam facility.
8. Court and court staff/judges/public security
9. Provision of defense services (fees)
10. Jail programming to assist with phased inmate reentry
11. Need more focus on justice, not all on crime, i.e.
 - Consistency and appropriateness of bond decisions
 - Whether the time fits the crime
 - Representative juries
 - Perception of justice by the public
 - Percent in jail on bond for assaultive offense and which charges
 - Prison commitment rate
12. Role definition in the Justice system

Criminal Justice Collaborative Council

13. Mental health – what percent of inmates who suffer from a mental illness had their issue as a driving cause of criminal behavior versus those who are just criminals who have mental health issues
14. Driving while black is a serious issue that compromises justice
15. We have an issue of our public safety radio system upgrade, which will impact all law enforcement, fire, emergency medical services, and others. I am not sure if this is a proper venue for this. Much has already been done, but we are hopefully looking at a Nov. 05 ballot millage issue.
16. We need to stop addressing new issues until we find a way to support or fix the issues that have already been recommended. Soon we will have several recommendations with still no implementation.
17. The plate is full in terms of what needs doing.
18. None that are more pressing than those listed

The recommendations proposed by County Administration on April 7 include a 96 bed jail expansion, a new 14 A District Court, additional funds for mental health services, and a Probation Residential Center. How well does this subset of the CJCC original recommendations meet			
8. the urgent needs and opportunities you see?		Number of Responses	Response Ratio
Poor		1	5%
Fair		5	25%
Good		7	35%
Excellent		7	35%
Total		20	100%