Michigan Justice Reinvestment Oct. 23, 2014

This report summarizes projections of jail and prison impacts.

Jails. CSG developed the following information on jail impacts from existing JR data, to move from statewide impacts of sanction policies to local impacts on the 10 largest counties in Michigan. Table1 shows, by large county, the number (or "volume") of technical probation violators (TPVs) currently sent to jail or to MDOC, and technical parole violators currently sent to MDOC.

Table 1. Status Quo Sentencing Volume of Technical Violators, CY2012

	A.	В.	C. Tech <i>Parole</i> Violators	
	TPVs Sentenced	TPVs Sentenced		
	to Jail	to Prison		
			Returned to	
			Prison	
Statewide	3,742	947	2,695	
Top 10	2,524	447	2,083	
Counties				
Wayne	465	4	1,197	
Oakland	599	179	285	
Macomb	163	21	177	
Kent	352	50	123	
Genesee	138	67	94	
Washtenaw	104	33	56	
Ingham	161	9	51	
Ottawa	39	0	8	
Kalamazoo	400	28	57	
Saginaw	103	56	35	

This depiction begins the process of illustrating the differential impact of the changes in sanction policies: in a county with relatively few violators currently serving time in jail the policies provide less relief; in counties with relatively more violators serving time in jail the policies provide greater relief. Overall, jails will experience lower population pressure as a result of sanction policies, but that experience will vary from place to place. One or more mechanisms should be in place to mitigate this impact so that counties can account for their particular circumstances.

Table 2 adds in the component of time served for probation violators currently sent to jail. Median sentence length is in column A, and a reduction of 25 percent in column B accounts for jail good time (which would be about 18% for one day out of six, but 25% is a more conservative approach, so as not to overstate policy impacts). Column C thus portrays the "beddays" occupied by technical probation violators for each large county. For example, Macomb County currently experiences 163 sentences of TPVs to jail in a year (column A from Table 1).

The average length of time actually served there is 137 days (column B from Table 2). 163 TPVs X 137 days each, divided by 365 days in a year, yields the 61 in column C of Table 2.

Table 2. Bed Days Occupied by County, CY 2012

Calendar A. B. C.					
Year 2012	SL - Median	25%	Bed-Days Occupied		
Teal 2012	Days	Reduction	by TPVs		
	Days	Reduction	Dy IFV3		
Statewide	183	137.0	1,404		
Top 10	183	137.0	863		
Counties	103	137.0	003		
Counties					
Wayne	91	68.5	87		
Oakland	183	137.0	225		
Macomb	183	137.0	61		
Kent	183	137.0	132		
Genesee	183	137.0	52		
Washtenaw	198	148.4	42		
Ingham	274	205.5	91		
Ottawa	183	137.0	15		
Kalamazoo	122	91.3	100		
Saginaw	274	205.5	58		

Table 3 culminates this analysis by comparing the impact of the status quo with the impact of sanction terms of 30 days for both probation and parole. Column A reflects the difference in impact with regard to TPVs as follows, using Macomb County again as an example. 163 TPVs X 30 days each (instead of 137), divided by 365 days in a year is 13.4 bed days. (13.4) - (61) = (-48) as shown in column A. The policy change creates negative jail usage of almost 50 days with respect to the TPV population only.

But, the policy proposal is also to sanction probation and parole technical violators who would currently go to prison, by sending them to jail for 30 days. These impacts on jails are shown in columns B and C of Table 3. For example, in Macomb County, 21 TPVs sent to prison currently (column B, Table 1) would go to jail for 30 days each, divided by 365 days in a year, yields about 2 bed-days of impact (column B, Table 3). 177 parole violators sent to prison currently (column C, Table 1) would go to jail for 30 days each, divided by 365 days in a year, yields about 15 bed-days of impact (column C, Table 3). Column D of Table 3 sums columns B and C to show the new population in the jail (with rounding in the case of Macomb), and column E is the difference between D and A. Every county except Wayne shows a negative impact – lower use of jails – as a result of the sanction policy proposal.

Table 3. Sanction Policy Impacts on Jails by Large County

	A.	B.	C.	D.	E.
	TPVs	TPVs	Tech Parole	New to	Final
	Sentenced	Sentenced to	Violators	Jails	Jail
	to Jail	Jail Sanction	Sentenced to Jail		Impact
	Sanction	(formerly to	Sanction		
		prison)	(formerly to		
			prison)		
Statewide	-1,097	78	222	299	-797
Top 10	-655	37	171	208	-447
Counties					
Wayne	-49	0	98	99	50
Oakland	-176	15	23	38	-137
Macomb	-48	2	15	16	-31
Kent	-103	4	10	14	-89
Genesee	-40	6	8	13	-27
Washtenaw	-34	3	5	7	-26
Ingham	-77	1	4	5	-72
Ottawa	-11	0	1	1	-11
Kalamazoo	-67	2	5	7	-60
Saginaw	-50	5	3	7	-42

Prison. Table 4 shows the combined impact on prison of the parole and sanction policies, as previously provided to the workgroup. Legislative budge staff should be able to provide future "savings" to MDOC based on these projections.

Table 4. Prison Impacts and Future Savings

Year End	CY2015	CY2016	CY2017	CY2018	CY2019	CY2020
Combination Impact Total	-108	-1,077	-2,267	-3,284	-4,268	-5,317
Savings						