

**REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE**  
**Pursuant to P.A. 114 of 2009**  
**Section 611**  
**Community ReEntry Programs**

*Section 611 of 2009 P.A. 114* requires that the Department of Corrections provide individual reports for the community reentry program, the electronic tether program, and the special alternative to incarceration program, including information on:

- Monthly new participants. Community reentry program participants shall be categorized by reason for placement. For technical rule violators, the report shall sort offenders by length of time since release from prison, by the most recent violation, and by number of violations occurring since release from prison.
- Monthly participant unsuccessful terminations, including cause.
- Number of successful terminations.
- End month population by facility/program.
- Average length of placement.
- Return to prison statistics.
- Description of each program location or locations, capacity, and staffing.
- Sentencing guideline scores and actual sentence statistics for participants, if applicable.
- Comparison with prior year statistics.
- Analysis of the impact on prison admissions and jail utilization and the cost effectiveness of the program.

The Community ReEntry Program brings the Residential ReEntry Program, the Intensive Detention ReEntry Program, and remainder of the Community Residential Program under the umbrella of the Michigan Prisoner ReEntry Initiative revitalizing the focus on public safety and offender success by assisting offenders in their transition back to their communities. Core reentry principles provide the foundation for how the combined program is operated. Comprehensive and structured programming includes facilitated groups that address issues of Domestic Violence, Substance Abuse, Parenting, Criminal Thinking, Recreation, Employment Preparation, Finance/Budgeting, Life Skills, Family Reunification, 12 Step programs, and other programs identified to meet their needs.

The Residential ReEntry Program (RRP) is currently operating at two sites. In 2006, the former Tuscola prison camp (closed in 2005) was reopened as the Tuscola Residential ReEntry Program (TRRP). In 2008, the last Technical Rule Violator (TRV) center, Lake County TRV, changed its focus to reentry by becoming the Lake County Residential ReEntry Program (LCRRP).

Both sites house and work with parolees who need a ReEntry refresher course when their behavior exhibits early signs of parole failure. TRRP also provides programming to new parolees placed as a condition of their parole. TRRP houses male parolees. LCRRP houses both male and female parolees when they begin to exhibit violation behaviors and need additional programming assistance and housed CRP prisoners while that program was active.

Report to the Legislature  
 Sec. 611 of 2009 P.A. 114 - Community ReEntry Programs  
 March 2010

Since the January 2008 closure of the Grand Rapids Correction Center, which was the last remaining residential CRP center; prisoners were placed in the community under CRP supervision on electronic monitoring. This report includes only CRP prisoners who were in need of RRP programming/services provided at LCRRP. CRP prisoners on electronic monitoring are not included in this report as they are the subject of a separate electronic tether / monitoring report.

As of October 2007, the Intensive Detention ReEntry Program (IDRP) falls within the Community ReEntry Programs. The IDRP began in July of 2004 as a result of the need to have an alternative for technical parole violators in counties where jail overcrowding had diminished the Department's ability to detain them. The goal was to provide parole agents the opportunity to detain parolees with compliance problems before they became more serious parole violators and, if needed, repeated incidents of noncompliance could be handled with repeated detentions.

Currently, the Department contracts with the Clinton County Jail and Ingham County Jail to house parole violators for up to 45 days, with an average stay of about 30 days. In rare circumstances, stays can be extended up to 120 days. Two field agents are assigned to the jails to supervise the IDRP population. The field agents at the jails assist field agents in the community by developing an updated release plan for the parolee, which includes updated placement information and outpatient or residential substance abuse treatment recommendations based on assessments to determine level of care needed. While in the jails, parolees receive cognitive programming and Michigan Works employability skills training, which includes enrollment in the Michigan Works Talent Bank. Parolees complete and receive copies of resumes to use while searching for employment upon release.

Table 1 shows the number of new Community ReEntry Program participants by month and program site.

**Table 1 - New Community ReEntry Program Participants Monthly By Location**

	IDRP				RRP				Total	
	Clinton		Ingham		Lake County		Tuscola			
	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009
Jan	52	49	212	177	69	77	88	85	421	388
Feb	38	37	123	143	87	109	104	54	352	343
Mar	47	38	164	189	118	108	78	58	407	393
Apr	47	51	180	178	103	84	99	69	429	382
May	43	35	168	140	97	102	87	68	395	345
Jun	38	42	164	188	101	87	58	83	361	400
Jul	56	50	200	191	80	110	87	100	423	451
Aug	50	40	203	168	121	109	60	51	434	368
Sep	41	52	212	180	114	84	84	55	451	371
Oct	56	41	184	156	102	94	97	65	439	356
Nov	39	34	140	158	97	93	37	70	313	355
Dec	43	42	170	186	78	104	62	69	353	401
<b>Total</b>	<b>550</b>	<b>511</b>	<b>2,120</b>	<b>2,054</b>	<b>1,167</b>	<b>1,161</b>	<b>941</b>	<b>827</b>	<b>4,778</b>	<b>4,553</b>
<b>Avg</b>	<b>45.8</b>	<b>42.6</b>	<b>176.7</b>	<b>171.2</b>	<b>97.3</b>	<b>96.8</b>	<b>78.4</b>	<b>68.9</b>	<b>398.2</b>	<b>379.4</b>

Table 2 looks at only the parole technical violators from the 2009 new Community ReEntry Program participants for which RRP was an appropriate intervention and breaks down time since parole from prison until admission to the RRP.

**Table 2 – Parole Technical Violator Length of Time Since Release from Prison to Admission to RRP**

Length of Time Since Release from Prison	2008		2009	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
0-6 Months	285	21.3%	243	20.7%
7-12 Months	318	23.8%	232	19.8%
13-18 Months	257	19.3%	162	13.8%
19+ Months	475	35.6%	537	45.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,335</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>1,174</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Tables 3 through 5 look at only the new RRP participants and present active sentence information for the parolees at the time of their admissions to the RRP. In 2009, the 1,988 new RRP participants had 4,016 active sentences, with similar distributions to 2008 participants.

The details presented in Tables 3 and 4 are for individual sentences only, since a composite or cumulative minimum term that accounts for consecutive sentences would obscure offense type information.

**Table 3 - Minimum Term Groups for All Active Offenses at the Time of Admission to RRP**

Minimum Term Groups*	2008		2009	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
0-12 Months	1,084	25.9%	988	24.6%
13-24 Months	1,987	47.4%	1,955	48.7%
25-36 Months	604	14.4%	556	13.8%
37-60 Months	336	8.0%	299	7.4%
61-120 Months	147	3.5%	194	4.8%
121+ Months	30	0.7%	23	0.6%
Life	1	0.0%	1	0.0%
<b>Total Offenses</b>	<b>4,189</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>4,016</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\* These Minimum Terms represent individual active sentences and disregard consecutives.

**Table 4 - Offense Types for All Active Offenses at the Time of Admission to RRP**

Offense Type	2008			2009		
	Number	Percent	Average Term*	Number	Percent	Average Term*
Nonassaultive	2,323	55.5%	23.0	2,195	54.7%	21.9
Drug	779	18.6%	20.8	654	16.3%	21.2
Assaultive	1,087	25.9%	34.8	1,167	29.1%	37.1
<b>Total Offenses</b>	<b>4,189</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>25.7</b>	<b>4,016</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>26.2</b>

\* In months, these Average Terms represent individual active sentences and disregard consecutives.

Sentencing Guidelines (SGL) information has been captured in OMNI on a statewide basis since October of 2002 thus, 2003 is the first available, full year of the 1999 Legislative Sentencing

Guidelines. Unfortunately, over 65% of the sentencing dates for the 2008 and 2009 new RRP participants are from before 2003 and additional complications, such as a mix of sentences with and without SGL data, and the change in handling of SGLs with regard to probation violations, make interpreting SGL sentencing characteristics dubious at this time. Regardless, Table 5 shows that most of the actual sentences agree with the SGL ranges, though this comparison is not that useful since it represents about one third of the sentences for new RRP participants.

**Table 5 - Comparison of Actual Sentence with SGL Range for New RRP Participants**

Actual Sentence vs. SGL Range	2008		2009	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Below Range	97	7.8%	95	6.8%
Within Range	1087	87.2%	1220	87.0%
Above Range	63	5.1%	87	6.2%
Total with SGLs	1,247	29.8%	1,402	34.9%
<b>Unknown SGLs</b>	<b>2,942</b>	<b>70.2%</b>	<b>2,614</b>	<b>65.1%</b>
<b>Total Offenses</b>	<b>4,189</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>4,016</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Table 6 reverts back to entire Community ReEntry Program data and shows that in 2009, there were 2,547 parolees that successfully completed the IDRP and 1,835 parolees (including 1 CRP prisoner) that successfully completed the RRP. The 2009 average successful stay for parolees in the IDRP was 30.9 days (up from 28.6 days in 2008), and for the RRP 79.3 days (up from 71.3 days in 2008).

**Table 6 - Monthly Successful Community ReEntry Program Terminations by Location**

	IDRP				RRP				Total	
	Clinton		Ingham		Lake County		Tuscola			
	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009
Jan	43	50	179	180	91	90	51	57	364	377
Feb	42	41	179	151	90	84	46	48	357	324
Mar	43	51	113	181	24	79	97	62	277	373
Apr	46	41	202	174	84	82	78	62	410	359
May	47	42	164	143	82	94	79	73	372	352
Jun	33	37	162	197	91	101	62	51	348	386
Jul	46	49	170	189	113	77	58	87	387	402
Aug	61	44	191	170	86	102	64	59	402	375
Sep	49	47	212	167	111	91	75	62	447	367
Oct	45	44	172	169	70	94	75	67	362	374
Nov	43	31	140	154	101	104	58	45	342	334
Dec	41	30	162	165	121	99	74	65	398	359
<b>Total</b>	<b>539</b>	<b>507</b>	<b>2,046</b>	<b>2,040</b>	<b>1,064</b>	<b>1,097</b>	<b>817</b>	<b>738</b>	<b>4,466</b>	<b>4,382</b>
<b>Avg</b>	<b>44.9</b>	<b>42.3</b>	<b>170.5</b>	<b>170.0</b>	<b>88.7</b>	<b>91.4</b>	<b>68.1</b>	<b>61.5</b>	<b>372.2</b>	<b>365.2</b>

Unsuccessful IDRP and RRP terminations occurred in about 2.8% of all terminations for 2009 (down from 3.2% in 2008). Parolees failed the RRP after an average of 48.5 days in 2009, compared to 30.5 days in 2008. Typical reasons for unsuccessful terminations from the RRP include:

- Abscond violation
- Medically / Psychologically unmanageable

Report to the Legislature  
 Sec. 611 of 2009 P.A. 114 - Community ReEntry Programs  
 March 2010

- Substance abuse violations
- Rule violation (non substance abuse)
- New felony / misdemeanor
- Threatening / assaultive behavior
- Creating a disturbance
- Failure to follow rules of ReEntry Center
- As determined by Central Office or Center Area Manager/Manager

**Table 7 - Monthly Unsuccessful Community ReEntry Program Terminations by Location**

	IDRP				RRP				Total	
	Clinton		Ingham		Lake County		Tuscola			
	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009
Jan	0	0	1	2	2	3	4	6	7	11
Feb	0	0	1	0	8	2	11	3	20	5
Mar	2	0	1	0	6	3	5	5	14	8
Apr	0	0	1	1	3	2	6	2	10	5
May	0	0	1	3	3	5	3	3	7	11
Jun	0	1	0	3	7	3	8	6	15	13
Jul	0	1	1	0	9	5	6	5	16	11
Aug	0	1	0	5	7	8	5	10	12	24
Sep	0	1	3	2	2	0	12	3	17	6
Oct	0	0	1	0	8	3	4	9	13	12
Nov	0	0	0	4	1	2	11	5	12	11
Dec	0	0	0	2	2	4	5	2	7	8
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>125</b>
<b>Avg</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>6.7</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>10.4</b>

The monthly new Community ReEntry Program participants, monthly successful and unsuccessful terminations, and average lengths of stay resulted in the end of month populations shown in Table 8.

**Table 8 - End of Month Community ReEntry Program Populations by Location**

	IDRP				RRP				Total	
	Clinton		Ingham		Lake County		Tuscola			
	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009
Jan	49	49	190	187	169	222	107	136	515	594
Feb	42	47	134	176	158	245	154	139	488	607
Mar	46	38	194	191	246	271	130	130	616	630
Apr	47	51	165	192	262	271	145	135	619	649
May	43	44	168	187	274	274	150	124	635	629
Jun	47	50	168	191	277	257	138	149	630	647
Jul	56	50	168	178	235	285	160	156	619	669
Aug	48	45	201	179	263	284	150	137	662	645
Sep	40	50	117	186	264	276	145	126	566	638
Oct	51	46	184	168	288	273	163	115	686	602
Nov	47	45	181	175	283	260	131	132	642	612
Dec	48	60	192	191	238	261	114	133	592	645
<b>Avg</b>	<b>47.0</b>	<b>47.9</b>	<b>171.8</b>	<b>183.4</b>	<b>246.4</b>	<b>264.9</b>	<b>140.6</b>	<b>134.3</b>	<b>605.8</b>	<b>630.6</b>

Return to prison statistics measure a parolee's outcome at the conclusion of a standard follow-up period. Table 9 replicates a portion of the D3 table reported in the Department's 2008 Statistical Report (the most recent available). The table shows that offenders paroled in 2005 had a Total

Failure Rate of 50.6% (Absconds 10.1%, Technical Violators 19.8%, and New Sentence Violators 20.7%) after a full three-year follow up period. New Community ReEntry Program participants, had they existed in 2005, would have had similar recidivism rates.

**Table 9 - (portion of) Three-Year Follow-Up Outcomes of Offenders Who Paroled in 1998 to 2005 by Year**

Year Paroled	Total Cases	Success Total	Failure Total	Absconds	Technical Violators	New Sentence
2001	9,591	51.7%	48.3%	6.4%	24.6%	17.3%
2002	10,254	51.7%	48.3%	9.0%	21.1%	18.2%
2003	11,207	51.6%	48.4%	9.2%	20.4%	18.7%
2004	10,818	50.6%	49.4%	8.7%	20.9%	19.9%
2005	9,800	49.4%	50.6%	10.1%	19.8%	20.7%

See 2008 Statistical Report, Table D3, at  
[http://www.michigan.gov/documents/corrections/2008\\_MDOC\\_STATISTICAL\\_REPORT\\_287713\\_7.pdf](http://www.michigan.gov/documents/corrections/2008_MDOC_STATISTICAL_REPORT_287713_7.pdf)

The Community ReEntry Program impacts prison admissions by intervening and diverting eligible parole violators and CRP violators who would otherwise be returned to prison. At the end of 2009, the average time before reparole for a parole technical violator was 18.4 months. The 2009 average successful RRP stay was 75.0 days, or 2.5 months, which saved an average of 15.9 months per parole technical violator RRP participant.

The IDRPs programs operated at the following locations during 2008 and 2009:

**IDRP – Clinton County**

1347 East Townsend Road  
 St. Johns, MI 48879

**Capacity: 60 beds**

**IDRP - Ingham County**

640 North Cedar  
 Mason, MI 48854

**Capacity: 190 beds**

The following RRP Centers operated during 2008 and 2009:

**Lake County Residential ReEntry Program**

4153 South M-37  
 Baldwin, MI 49304

**Capacity: 300 beds**

**2008 Staffing**

1.0  
 3.0  
 1.0  
 10.0  
 1.0

Parole Probation Manager 2  
 Parole Probation Officer – E  
 Correction Shift Supervisor 1  
 Corrections Officers  
 Secretary E8

**2009 Staffing**

1.0  
 2.0  
 1.0  
 10.0  
 1.0

**16.0**

**Total Lake County Residential ReEntry Staff**

**15.0**

**Tuscola Residential ReEntry Program**

**Capacity: 160 beds**

2420 Chambers Road  
 Caro, MI 48723

**2008 Staffing**

**2009 Staffing**

1.0	Parole Probation Manager 2	1.0
2.0	Parole Probation Officers	2.0
3.0	Correction Shift Supervisor 1	3.0
1.0	Correction Shift Supervisor 2	1.0
2.0	Corrections Program Coordinator	1.0
24.0	Corrections Officers	24.0
3.0	Food Service Leader Prisoner	3.0
1.0	Maintenance Mechanic – A	1.0
1.0	Secretary 8	1.0
<b>38.0</b>	<b>Total Tuscola Residential ReEntry Staff</b>	<b>37.0</b>