MEMORANDUM

Date: August 24, 2016

To: The Honorable Chair and Members   From: C.H. Huckelberry
        Pima County Board of Supervisors   County Administrator

Re: **MacArthur Foundation Grant Safety and Justice Challenge**

Attached is a summary of impact calculations associated with a number of criminal justice strategies designed to reduce the average daily population at the Pima County Adult Detention Complex. These strategies all relate to altering the historic manner in which we have dealt with specific populations in our jail.

The strategies will reduce the average daily population in the jail from a baseline in 2014 by 562; a 26 percent reduction in the number of persons held in our jail on a daily basis.

The MacArthur Foundation Grant is aptly named Safety and Justice. We need to ensure those individuals who pose a safety risk to the community are held in a detention setting while providing a broader sense of community and social justice to those who do not belong in jail.

Implementing the MacArthur Foundation grant is an action that allows an improved and comprehensive review of criminal justice activities in Pima County. I have long stated that the criminal justice system as we had known it is a series of silos that are independently operated, rather than an appropriately integrated system. Our past efforts in creating the Justice Coordinating Council and now these actions will begin to instill the efficiency the system's terminology implies which has been lacking in this system for decades.

We hope the MacArthur Foundation grant is the turning point in this discussion and will result in true systemic reform, where both the safety of the community and social justice for individuals are taken into consideration.

CHH/anc

Attachment

c: Ellen Wheeler, Assistant County Administrator

Implementation Plan: Impact Calculations

In this section sites are asked to demonstrate, through the data and calculations outlined below, the projected impact of revised implementation plan strategies. For each item, a set of instructions is provided to help guide sites through the calculation, and explain its purpose. At the end of the template, sites will find a set of additional considerations to keep in mind when estimating the impact of implementation plan strategies. At each step along the way, there is a place to provide information related to these additional considerations (or other context that will make it easier to understand the assumptions behind the numbers). Additionally, the next tab (labeled Summary Worksheet) provides a place to summarize the key numbers related to each strategy. Sites can use this as needed to organize the information provided.

PLEASE NOTE that sites that 1) already provided these calculations (or some close approximation of them) in their Phase II application and 2) are not changing the implementation plan from the original submission do not need to redo them for this updated implementation plan. Instead, those sites are asked to either transfer the original numbers into this template or attach in some other way the original impact calculations that were completed. If your site has

1. BASELINE JAIL POPULATION

1A. Estimate: 1894

1B. Additional explanation/context:

The average daily confined population for the six months preceding the April 15 start date (October-March) was 1875. We adjusted this up to 1894 to incorporate the average number of individuals serving sentences on home detention. While they were not confined to the jail, they were participating in a program begun as part of the SJC and would have otherwise been confined had implementation of that program coincided with the April 15 start date. Note that the baseline is 242 ADP (11%) lower than the 2014 calendar year ADP that was the baseline for the Phase II application.

Explanation/guiding instructions:

when Phase II (and progress tracking) officially begins. In the interest of consistency with the performance measurement baseline, sites are encouraged to use parameters for jail population baseline that are as close as possible to the following:
·   Confined population only
·   Contract beds excluded
phase (April 15)
If your site is not able to establish a baseline with these exact parameters, please use a number you feel is a close approximation to the population at this point and briefly explain the rationale.

2. PROJECTED 3-YEAR IMPACT FOR EACH STRATEGY

Strategy 1: Court System Innovation and Treatment Alternatives: Implement Universal Risk Scree
Target population: 7000 Individuals (estimated population per year anticipated to be reached thro
Projected impact: **40 ADP**
Additional explanation/context:

We estimated that 7000 additional individuals will receive risk assessment annually (based on known population that does not receive any risk screening today). Of these, 45% (3150) will be released directly by PTS. An additional 25% (1750) will be released at initial appearance consistent with pretrial services recommendations. As a result, based on estimated 3 day LOS, 14,700 jail beds will be saved

Strategy 1: Court System Innovation and Treatment Alternatives: Enhanced Pretrial Options for Individuals with Behavioral Health Risk

Target population: 4380 Individuals with BH risk (mental health, substance abuse, or co-occurrin
Projected impact: 72 ADP
Additional explanation/context:

We originally estimated that 4800 individuals with behavioral health risk would be released annually by Year 3 by judges at initial appearance consistent with release options to a specialty caseload. (This estimate was based on extant data from Pretrial Services risk assessment and interviews.) We estimated that six jail bed days would be saved for each of the 4800 individuals. However, due to funding restrictions, we have delayed implementation of this strategy by three months. This reduces the target population for year 3 to 4380. This will reduce jail bed days by approximately 26,280 annually (based on an ALOS of 6 days for this population) by Year 3 for ADP reduction of 72.

Strategy 2: Preventing and Resolving Failures to Appear (FTA)--Create Automated Court-Date Reminder System
Target population: 13696 warrants issued/yr (City Court and Justice Court)
Projected impact: 76 ADP
Additional explanation/context:

Automated court-reminders in both Justice and City Courts are anticipated to reduce FTA warrants issued by approximately 25% (based on past implementation data from Justice Court). This will result in an estimated 3400 fewer FTA warrants issued and an anticipated 1771 fewer jail bookings a year. The reduction in jail bookings on FTA warrants will save approximately 27,977 jail bed days annually or 76 ADP. (This calculation is based on a reduction of 926 bookings with an ALOS of 16.73 for City Court and a reduction of 845 bookings with an ALOS of 14.77 for Justice Court.)

Strategy 2: Preventing and Resolving Failures to Appear (FTA)--Warrant Court Days
Target population: 3000 warrants resolved
Projected impact: 88 ADP
Additional explanation/context:

Afterhours and/or weekend and remote warrant court days will be held to resolve the existing backlog of warrants and reduce the subsequent number of custodial arrests proportionally. We anticipate that 3000 warrants will be resolved, with an anticipated avoidance of 1692 bookings per year (ALOS 19 days), resulting in jail bed day savings of 32,148 or 88 ADP. ALOS for this substrategy is slighter higher than the warrant prevention substrategy because it includes multiple smaller municipal courts, which have higher ALOS than Tucson and Pima County.

Strategy 3: Post-Conviction Alternatives to Jail
Target population: 243 individuals eligible for home detention
Projected impact: 80 ADP
Additional explanation/context:

Individuals sentenced to the Pima County jail as a condition of probation for felony convictions, who are considered not to be a risk of violence to the victim or community, may be placed on electronic monitoring/home detention if ordered by the judge. It is estimated that 243 individuals could be placed on EM annually. This population averages 120 day sentences, so there would be an annual jail bed day reduction of 29,160 or 80 ADP.

Explanation/guiding instructions:

~~Here sites are asked to demonstrate how the jail population is expected to change (be reduced) as a~~ result of each strategy, through the calculations outlined below. Note that impacts can be calculated a few different ways depending on the nature of each strategy and how it is expected to impact the jail population. Specifically:

If the strategy's impact will come from reducing admissions
*Projected jail population saved for Strategy X = Projected admissions saved for Strategy X target population * Average LoS for Strategy X target population / 365*

If the strategy's impact will come from reducing LoS
*Projected jail population saved for Strategy X = Projected admissions for Strategy X target population * Projected LoS saved for Strategy X target population / 365*

If the strategy's impact will come from both
Perform both of the calculations above, estimating jail population reductions from LoS reductions and jail population reductions from admissions reductions separately. Note that the admissions savings are expected to come before LoS savings, or vice versa, this should be factored into the calculations.

During this step it is *critical that data reflect admissions and LoS among the target populations, not the overall jail population*. Where these specific data are not available, sites should use data that are available to make logical estimates for the target populations (e.g. if the only available LoS data is for the total pretrial population and a strategy is targeting low risk misdemeanants who are cycling through the jail, the estimated length of stay should be lower for this population).

It is also critical to *factor in how strategies (and projected impacts) will be phased in over time*. For example, a strategy that is rolled out at the very beginning of implementation will have the full three years' worth of impact to take into account (and should be calculated using that time frame). A strategy that takes a year to implement, however, should be estimated using numbers that reflect a two-year period (in other words, the projected three-year impact should be based on what can be accomplished

3. TOTAL PROJECTED JAIL POPULATION SAVED ACROSS ALL STRATEGIES
3A. Estimate: 320 ADP
3B. Additional explanation/context:
Strategy 1: 112 + Strategy 2: 164 + Strategy 3: 80= All Strategies 356   **Less 10% for possible strategy overlap (35.6) = 320**

Explanation/guiding instructions:
This involves adding up the impacts from Step 3.   *Total projected jail population saved = Projected jail population saved for Strategy X + Projected jail population saved for Strategy Y + ...*

4. PROJECTED THREE YEAR JAIL POPULATION FOLLOWING IMPLEMENTATION OF
4A. Estimate: 1574 ADP
4B. Additional explanation/context:
Baseline population (1894) - ADP reduction (320) = 1574 ADP.

Explanation/guiding instructions:
This involves subtracting the total jail population saved from Step 3 from the total jail population baseline established in Step 1.

Projected jail population = Baseline jail population – Total projected jail population saved

5. PROJECTED JAIL POPULATION REDUCTION AS A % OF BASELINE JAIL POPULATION

5A. Estimate: 17%

5B. Additional explanation/context:

The deferral (or elimination) of the proposed third daily Initial Appearance and delay of the BH strategy, due to reduced grant funding, lowered the proposed ADP reduction to 356, and we have reduced it by another 10% to 320 reflect possible overlap of strategies. While the original targeted ADP reduction was 427, it is important to note that the current baseline is already 242 ADP lower than the 2014 baseline, and the overall reduction from the 2014 baseline will be 562, which is a 26% reduction from the 2014 baseline. The 17% reduction from the new baseline will result in Pima County's ADP being at the lowest it has been in nearly twenty years. We remain convinced that our jurisdiction can achieve this bold goal and look forward to the challenge.

Explanation/guiding instructions:

This will demonstrate how close the projected reduction is to the site's original proposed target (e.g. how close to the proposed 21% reduction target)

*Projected percentage reduction = (Projected jail population – Baseline jail population) / Baseline jail population * 100.*

6. PLEASE USE THIS SPACE TO PROVIDE ANY ADDITIONAL EXPLANATION/CONTEXT

Additional considerations for impact calculations

other considerations, as relevant, and make explicit in their explanation of impact calculations how they were factored in.

1. <u>Overlapping target populations across strategies</u>, which may lead to double counting in impact estimates—this can be accounted for in one of two ways:
that   the target population will be smaller or length of stay shorter as a result of another strategy rolled out at the same time or earlier)
overlapping strategies add up to a 29% reduction, so take 10% off at the end as a buffer—this is a less precise way to do it)

2. <u>How clearly the target population is defined for each strategy</u>: Sites are encouraged to define target populations as specifically as possible, using, as relevant, criteria such as charge, risk level, criminal history, behavioral health status, and exclusionary criteria.

3. <u>How each strategy will account for unforeseen challenges</u> (e.g. pretrial cases that result in rearrests)