

CJCC Pretrial Services Committee

Meeting Minutes

June 15, 2005

Community Corrections Meeting Room

Ann Arbor, MI

12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.

Members Present: J Cedric Simpson (District Court Presiding Judge, Committee Chair), Sheila Blakney (Senior Assistant, Public Defender), Charlie Pope (Magistrate/14B District Court Administrator), Kirk Filsinger (Jail Commander), Scott Patton (CJCC Staff), Alan Israel (Chief of Staff, Prosecutor's Office), Joe DeGraff (Case Manager, Community Corrections), Julie Chaffee (Director, Community Corrections)

Members Absent: Michael Gatti (Magistrate)

Others Present: Gary Greenfield (Corrections Lieutenant), Rick Visel (Director, Correctional Services)

Meeting called to order at 12:11 p.m.

I. Approval of Minutes

The motion to approve the meeting minutes from May 31, 2005 was made by Sheila Blakney, supported by Charlie Pope, and approved by members.

II. Old Business

A. Assessment Tool

Joe DeGraff indicated the state is considering adopting Compass as the assessment tool at the state-wide level for the Circuit level. It would give different risk and needs assessment tools. It was used by Community Corrections from 2000 to 2002 to determine risk of violence, community compliance and other issues. He reported that it was expensive and time-consuming. Joe DeGraff believes that for pre-trial services, a quicker solution would be needed. Charlie Pope said it could be useful as a motion to bond after arraignment.

Julie Chaffee shared copies of the assessment tool with members. She would like to use this as a basis for having the magistrates and judges identify the issues that they would like verified. This would be the second set of an assessment if the individual is not eligible for a bond release. Sheila Blakney asked if the tool would be compatible with the Sheriff Department's software and other systems.

J Cedric Simpson asked if everyone in custody arraignment would be used by the assessment tool. Julie Chaffee clarified that crime classes A, B, or C would not be used. J Cedric Simpson asked if he had 100 arraignments (60 misdemeanor, 40 felons), would all be used. Julie Chaffee responded yes. She estimated that the total number of questions verified may be around 10 to 15. She proposed that at some point, a phone line be added in the Sheriff's Office to allow inmates to make non-collect calls for bond.

J Cedric Simpson noted that 10-15 questions may be sufficient for misdemeanants, but may not be sufficient for felonies. Additional questions may be necessary for this. Julie Chaffee noted that some information may be necessary for programming and tether decisions. J Cedric Simpson identified that there is a point, at which for District Courts, the Probation Department takes over. Theoretically, a misdemeanor will stay in jail for 28 days in cases in which they cannot make

CJCC Pretrial Services Committee

bond. Julie Chaffee noted that the eligibility criteria proposed changes, which include having Community Corrections offer programs for all who do not fall into crime classes A, B, or C.

J Cedric Simpson walked through an example of when an individual is referred to the Probation Department but is still unable to post bond. Julie Chaffee said in this case, Community Corrections would assist the Probation Department. Charlie Pope restated the utility of the 15 questions being verified. In many of these cases, there would be a release bond. Those who are unable to make bond would have a more detailed assessment that would be used at future steps in the criminal justice process.

Sheila Blakney expressed concerns with her past experience with Compass, as her recollection is that area of residency had been used as a risk determination criterion in the past. Joe DeGraff indicated that peer association is a great determinant in risk for re-offending. J Cedric Simpson asked for clarification of what he will get on the bench during bond recommendation. Joe DeGraff indicated that judges would get bar graphs that capture normative scales related to substance abuse assessment, risk assessment, etc. Judges would get a recommendation in terms of programming, but not in terms of sentencing. Joe DeGraff noted that it is possible that while the assessment would be based on objective criteria, it is possible for the results of the assessment to contradict probation. One of the fundamental differences between district probation and circuit probation is that circuit probation tends to do their own assessment. It may be appropriate to forward assessments to probation.

J Cedric Simpson noted that as a court, he could be relying on something about which the District Court may not have control. Sheila Blakney asked if members should map out the whole process in order to tackle the arraignment issue. Probation is not generally involved in the pre-trial stage.

For 14-A District Court, of the arraignments for April and May, 60% are misdemeanor arraignments and 40% are felony arraignments. County wide, if the other two district courts were included, the overall proportion of misdemeanor population would increase. Joe DeGraff indicated that he analyzed 550 jail admissions in a month in 2003. Joe DeGraff also indicated that the Sheriff had developed an analysis (Herb Mahony's tool) that has inmate numbers as unique identifiers that can track bond amounts and track inmate movement into and out of the system.

Discussion ensued about adding data analysis to the next committee meeting. Julie Chaffee asked that the objective of the analysis be agreed upon by the group. Joe DeGraff noted that the first objective is to determine the number of inmates in pretrial. The second objective is to estimate what the impact would be. J Cedric Simpson asked if there are misdemeanants in jail pretrial and where are they coming from.

B. Flowchart

This discussion was postponed.

C. Further Research Update

Scott Patton passed out a disk with all the research that included policies, procedures, from other pretrial services programs. He indicated that this could be used during the implementation phase.

CJCC Pretrial Services Committee

III. New Business

A. Draft Recommendations

Scott Patton distributed a copy of draft recommendations. He indicated that the intent of the document was to be descriptive of meeting and recommendations. He said that the overall content was about 40% complete. It will be reviewed at other meetings.

IV. Next Steps

- A. Jail Population Information for April/ May – Sheriff
- B. In-Custody Arraignments for April/ May – Three District Courts
- C. Identify Questions for District Court Arraignment – Charlie Pope and Michael Gatti to get to judges
- D. Community Corrections & Zope Survey – Scott Patton
- E. Bar Graph from Compass

Adjourned at 1:25 p.m.

Next Pretrial Services Committee meeting will be on 6/29/05, 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m., at LLRC Room B.