

Criminal Justice Collaborative Council

Meeting Minutes

March 18, 2005

200 North Main Lower Level Conference Room

Ann Arbor, MI

7:30 a.m. to 9:00 a.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), Dan Minzey (County Sheriff), Barbara Ryan Fuller (Public Representative), Bob Guenzel (County Administrator), Kathy Reynolds (Executive Director, WCHO), Wesley Prater (Board of Commissioners Chair), Patrick Hughes (Department of Corrections Probation), William McFarlane (Township Supervisor, Superior Charter Township), Dan Dwyer (Trial Court Administrator), John Shea (Attorney, Bar Association Representative), Barbara Levin Bergman (Community Corrections Advisory Board Chair)

Members Absent: Brian Mackie (County Prosecutor), Paul Buntin (Chief of Police, City of Saline), Lawrence Kestenbaum (Clerk/Register)

Others Present: Scott Patton (CJCC Staff), George Siasoco (CJCC Intern), Karen Edman (Chief Deputy Clerk/Register), Jim Robertson (Consultant), Gary Greenfield (Corrections Lieutenant), Julie Chaffee (Director of Community Corrections), Kerry Sheldon (Management Analyst), Delphia Simpson (Public Defender Manager), Greg Dill (Director of Facilities Management), Steve Hiller (Deputy Chief Assistant Prosecutor), Rick Visel (Director of Correctional Services), Fran Alexander (Consultant)

Convened: 7:36 a.m.

I. Supporting Documents and Public Participation

Attendees were given the following supporting documents:

- CJCC Full Council Agenda
- Minutes from the February 2005 CJCC meeting

No Public Participation.

II. Approval of February 2005 CCJC Meeting Minutes

The motion to accept the minutes was made by Barbara Levin Bergman, supported by Lloyd Powell, and approved unanimously by CJCC members.

III. Public Engagement Briefing

Fran Alexander presented the results of a survey to CJCC members which solicited feedback on why the proposed millage failed. Members elaborated on their thoughts regarding the failure of the millage:

- Those who participate in millage votes tend to vote “No”
- Voters were not against the jail construction, but were against the alternative programs and jail operations

Criminal Justice Collaborative Council

- Emphasis on mental health diversion programs diverted from other content issues during the campaign
- Lack of assurance that the mental health diversion funds would not be used for the other parts of the millage proposal
- Lack of an easy and quick message that could be packaged in a sound bite
- The existence of a “perfect storm” that saw the coalescence of normally competitive forces against the millage
- Diversity of public safety interests along urban-rural lines in a county contribute to the difficulty of passing millage

John Shea noted that while the millage proposal was ambitious in scope, it was nonetheless the correct comprehensive solution. The audience did not agree upon first consideration. However, there is a possibility that this could begin a discussion which can educate the public more, and allow for greater engagement of groups who were against the proposal. Lloyd Powell suggested that future steps should emphasize the urgency of the public safety issue as this finds greater resonance with constituents.

Bob Guenzel noted that the proposal was driven by the challenge to find a longer-term and more comprehensive solution. Voters assess the proposal according to its different parts, with usually competitive groups coming together on similar platforms to counter the proposal. There are also groups who would protest against heavier taxes, or the performance of county government. That said, he thanked members for their participation in the effort.

Bob Guenzel indicated two successes of the CJCC effort: 1) collaboration among various stakeholders in the public safety and justice system to formulate this comprehensive solution, 2) tremendous amount of public input and engagement regarding the issues over the past two months. He noted that it was time to move forward.

III. Strategy Debrief and BOC Planning Process

Bob Guenzel reported that his staff is reviewing the extensiveness of the proposal and attached costs. Alternatives are being developed for the Board of Commissioners (BOC) that could involve a shorter term millage commitment or internal funding options. Discussions are also underway on information gathering and alternative programs that could help reduce jail overcrowding in the short term.

Bob Guenzel explained that three meetings will be scheduled with the BOC in mid-April and early May to talk about three scenarios of recommendations. Public engagement and input will be encouraged. Bob Guenzel said that he will be seeking direction from the BOC in terms of next steps in order to guide the developing budget process.

In his capacity as county administrator, Bob Guenzel will look at what solutions can be done within ten years and how these can be financed. Urgent issues presented by the jail and 14th district court in timely fashion present specific challenges. The question for the CJCC is whether their retreat should focus on these alternative strategies and reviewing recommendations.

Discussion ensued on the role of the CJCC in this process. John Shea expressed some reservation on whether the County Administrator’s proposals that will be developed over the next 30-45 days will reflect discussions by the CJCC on longer term solutions to the issue. He added that the CJCC should remain proactive on the issue. The collaborative council should engage in discussions over a longer period of time of alternative measures to alleviate jail overcrowding,

Criminal Justice Collaborative Council

such as pretrial services. Members noted that security issues within public safety and justice facilities and mental health services should continue to merit attention in the planning process.

Bob Guenzel noted that the CJCC will be able to weigh in on these developing recommendations. Certain members, in their individual capacities as part of the county system, will be deeply involved in this process. Others not regularly involved in the county process, but are interested in participating, should contact Scott Patton.

IV. CJCC Retreat

Jim Robertson reported that the retreat will fulfill three functions: revisit the goals of the council, reflect on the past year's accomplishments by the CJCC, and define next steps for the future. He added that the structure of the retreat is still being developed. Scott Patton added that the retreat is planned for three hours. Scott Patton will schedule the retreat based on feedback from members on suggested dates.

V. Community Corrections Probation Residential Center (PRC)

Archie Brown indicated that with the PRC proposal under discussion for funding, Julie Chaffee needed direction from the CJCC on the types of inmates that would be served by the facility. Discussion ensued on whether the PRC would continue serving only the 26 out-of-county clients, serve only inmates who do not qualify for state funding, or a blend of both populations. Discussion also ensued on the proposed capacity of the facility.

To give the jail some relief from overcrowding in the short term, Julie Chaffee proposed that Washtenaw County's low-security and more cost-effective-bed PRC (when it is implemented) be reserved for misdemeanants or felons in the jail that do not qualify for state funding. The 26 clients on felony charges, currently assigned to surrounding PRCs, would remain where they are, as these more serious offenders would be better served by these more intensively supervised programs.

Julie Chaffee explained the funding implications of this proposal: some inmates will not qualify for state funding, and so alternative sources need to be considered. K-PEP (Kalamazoo County PRC program run by the K-PEP organization) has offered to review the facility and implement a working PRC at the Community Corrections site, at a charge.

VI. Other Items

Discussion ensued on media coverage of discussions at the CJCC in order to increase public awareness on important public safety and justice issues, such as the releases of inmates from the jail as a result of overcrowding. Bob Guenzel noted that an *Ann Arbor News* reporter has been invited to the meetings. John Shea will contact Liz Cobbs, a reporter who used to cover the crime beat reports and courts, to invite her to the meetings.

Lloyd Powell suggested getting in touch with the *Ann Arbor News* editors to increase the possibility of reporters being delegated responsibility of covering the meetings. Dan Minzey noted that the media is given prepared reports of jail issues, such as arrests, but reporters do not respond positively.

Julie Chaffee indicated that the monthly report being developed by the data systems subcommittee could be an important component of information dissemination. Scott Patton will clarify with Undersheriff Herb Mahony when this summary developed from the JPIS reports could be presented to the CJCC for their review. Lloyd Powell advised screening of the data by

Criminal Justice Collaborative Council

Julie Chaffee and the CJCC Steering Committee to ensure purposeful interpretation before being given for public consumption and the media.

Adjourned 9:35 a.m.

Next Criminal Justice Collaborative Committee meeting will be on 4/22/05, 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m., at 200 North Main Lower Level Conference Room. This meeting is reserved for the CJCC retreat.