



Milwaukee County

Holly Szablewski • Criminal Court Coordinator

Date: April 17, 2009
 To: Universal Screening Work Group
 From: Holly Szablewski
 Subject: Jail Screening Proposal-Updated, April 17, 2009

BACKGROUND

The purpose of this report is to provide updated data and statistics along with proposed budget options for implementation of a 24/7 screening program for persons booked into the Milwaukee County Criminal Justice Facility.

On February 25, 2009, the total Milwaukee County inmate population was 3,149. The following chart compares that population with the population of May 21, 2008.

Comparison of Milwaukee County Correctional Population February 25, 2009 and May 21, 2008

Inmate Category	February 25, 2009			May 21, 2008		
	Number	Percent	Rank	Number	Percent	Rank
Felony Pretrial	709	22.52	1	769	23.18	2
Misdemeanor Sentenced	682	21.66	2	802	24.18	1
Felon Sentenced	502	15.94	3	480	14.47	3
VOP w/Other Charges	462	14.67	4	278	8.38	4
Misdemeanor Pretrial	226	7.18	5	256	7.72	5
Temporary State Inmate	122	3.87	6	134	4.04	7
Misdemeanor VOP Only	88	2.79	7	63	1.90	11
Federal Safekeeper	68	2.16	8	72	2.17	9
Municipal Commitment	58	1.84	9	72	2.17	8
Awaiting Transfer to State	50	1.59	10	71	2.14	10
Sanction-Extended Supv. Viol.	47	1.49	11	37	1.12	14
OTP&R	42	1.33	12	57	1.72	12
Felony VOP Only	41	1.30	13	151	4.55	6
Revocation-Withheld Sentence	34	1.08	14	54	1.63	13
Awaiting Sentencing	18	0.57	15	20	0.60	15
State Correctional Center	0	0.00	16	1	0.03	16
TOTAL POPULATION	3149			3317		

Between 2006 and 2008, criminal case filings in Milwaukee County decreased by 3,778 cases or 15%. During this period, felony case filings declined 6%, misdemeanor 20% and criminal traffic 19%. In the first two months of 2009, criminal case filings are down 11% compared to the same time period in 2008. During January and February 2009, felony case filings have declined 8% and misdemeanor 13% over the same time period in 2008. In the first two months of 2009, criminal traffic case filings increased by 123 or 11%.

Despite the overall reduction in criminal case filings, Milwaukee County has not seen a corresponding decline in its correctional population.

Milwaukee County has a long history of providing a wide array of pretrial alternatives to incarceration. For over twenty-five years, the County has contracted with private agencies for the provision of these services. Services currently include:

- Forensic Tracking (State & County Funding)
- Release Planning
- Treatment Alternatives and Diversion (TAD) Program (State & County funding)
- AODA/Mental Health Supervision
- Milwaukee County Drug Treatment Court
- GPS Electronic Monitoring
- Failure to Appear Program
- Repeat Intoxicated Driver Intervention Program/Secure Continuous Remote Alcohol Monitoring (SCRAM) (State & County funding)
- Community Justice Resource Center (CJRC)
- Drug Testing

In addition, the City of Milwaukee also contracts with a private agency for provision of Municipal Court Intervention Services for municipal ordinance violators. Programming includes community service options, AODA and mental health interventions.

These programs provide a wide range of services from the beginning of the criminal justice process to disposition of a case.

From the mid-1980s until 2000, the County contracted with a private agency for provision of intake screening of inmates in the old County Jail. This function was performed in the Central Intake Unit of the Milwaukee County Jail, and in the evenings, in the jail in conjunction with the Special Master operation. This screening included application of a pretrial risk assessment tool that included a review of the nature and severity of the presenting offense, the defendant's criminal history, history of failure to appear and history of rearrest while out on bail. Application of the tool resulted in a numeric score that indicated the defendant's risk for pretrial misconduct, i.e., rearrest or failure to appear. A face-to-face interview was conducted with the defendant to identify other risk/need factors such as mental health and substance abuse problems, homelessness, under-employment, under-education, etc. All of this information was then verified and summarized for presentation to the Judicial Court Commissioner presiding in Intake Court at the Initial Appearance where the critical decision is made to release a defendant on their

own recognizance or require the posting of a cash bail. In addition, jail screeners also recommended conditions of release designed to reduce the potential for pretrial misconduct.

In 2000, pretrial services in Milwaukee County underwent an extensive reorganization. The Office of the Chief Judge assumed administrative oversight of the programs, the position of Pretrial Services Coordinator was created and the Pretrial Services Advisory Board was formed by County Board resolution. Because of operational issues and budgetary constraints, the Central Intake Unit screening function was eliminated. Key in the elimination of the program was the lack of systemic agreement relating to the screening and assessment content, resulting recommendations, and application/use of the information. To address those concerns, this proposal is based on national standards, evidence-based practices, and includes use of a validated pretrial risk assessment tool. The Chief Judge along with representatives of the Office of the Sheriff, District Attorney's Office, Public Defender's Office and the community have reviewed this proposal and are supportive of the proposed screening function.

During the planning for the building of the Criminal Justice Facility, it was envisioned that pretrial screening would continue, along with the availability of a wide array of pretrial alternatives to incarceration. While the array of supervision and intervention programs continues, the screening process for identifying populations best suited for release on their own recognizance, those needing pretrial intervention and those who pose a substantial risk was discontinued. Most release decisions are now made solely based on the nature of the current offense and prior criminal history that is presented by two adversarial entities, the prosecution and the defense. Viewing these two factors alone is not a good predictor of how a person will perform on pretrial release. There is no verification of information presented such as address, length of time in community, employment, education and substance abuse/mental health problems. The availability of verified, objective risk and needs information is completely lacking.

The American Bar Association, the National District Attorneys Association and the National Association of Pretrial Services Agencies have published standards for pretrial release.

American Bar Association Standard 10-1.1 “The law favors release of defendants pending adjudication of charges.”

National Association of Pretrial Services Agencies Release Standard 1.2 “In deciding pretrial release, a presumption in favor of pretrial release on a simple promise to appear (i.e., release on “personal recognizance”) should apply to all persons arrested and charged with a crime. When release on personal recognizance is deemed inappropriate, the judicial officer should assign the least restrictive condition(s) of release that will provide reasonable assurance that the defendant will appear for court proceedings and will protect the safety of the community, victims, and witnesses pending trial. The court should have a wide array of programs or options available for use in assigning such conditions, and should have the capacity to develop release options appropriate to the risks and special needs posed by defendants who are released to the community.”

National District Attorneys Association Standards on Pretrial Release 45.2.1 “Whenever possible, release before trial should be on the recognizance of the accused”... “Reliance on money bail should be discouraged and be required only in those cases in which less restrictive conditions will not reasonably ensure the defendant’s appearance”.

In addition to the above standards, **Wisconsin Statute 969.01(1)** pertaining to bail states, ... “A defendant arrested for a criminal offense is eligible for release under reasonable conditions designed to assure his or her appearance in court, protect members of the community from serious bodily harm or prevent the intimidation of witnesses. Bail may be imposed at or after the initial appearance only upon a finding by the court that there is reasonable basis to believe that bail is necessary to assure appearance in court.”

Standards also exist on the timing and involvement of the pretrial service program in provision of screening services.

National Association of Pretrial Services Agencies Release Standard 3.3(a) “In all cases in which a defendant is in custody and charged with a criminal offense, an investigation about the defendant’s background and current circumstances should be conducted by the pretrial services agency or program prior to a defendant’s first appearance in order to provide information relevant to decisions concerning pretrial release that will be made by the judicial officer presiding at the first appearance”.

American Bar Association Pretrial Release Standards 10-1.10(a) “ Every jurisdiction should establish a pretrial services agency or program to collect and present the necessary information, present risk assessments, and, consistent with court policy, make release recommendations required by the judicial officer in making release decisions, including the defendant’s eligibility for diversion, treatment, or other alternative adjudication programs, such as drug or other treatment courts. Pretrial services should also monitor, supervise, and assist defendants released prior to trial, and review the status and release eligibility of detained defendants for the court on an ongoing basis”.

PRESENTING SITUATION

In 2008, there were 42,179 bookings, an average of 116 per day, into the Milwaukee County Criminal Justice Facility compared with 46,526, or an average of 127 per day in 2007. Despite existing national standards relative to pretrial screening, Milwaukee County does not currently screen defendants prior to the initial appearance. In addition, there is no screening of persons arrested on municipal ordinance violations/commitments, Violation of Probation Holds, etc, to determine whether continued detention is necessary.

In 2008, there were approximately 18,000 cases involving 15,600 inmates who made an initial appearance on a new case or a warrant return in the In-Custody Intake Court. The judicial officer in these cases had no access to objective, verified, reliable risk and need information. In addition, this information was not available for judges at subsequent bail reviews.

In January, 2007, Milwaukee County began receiving funding from the State Office of Justice Assistance for the Treatment Alternatives and Diversion (TAD) Program. The TAD Program is designed to identify for diversion and deferred prosecution (DPA), non-violent offenders whose alleged criminal activity is related to a substance abuse and/or co-occurring mental health disorder. This funding was used to establish a small screening operation in the jail and Central Intake Unit of the jail. This unit does not function on a 24/7 basis. Offenders found to be TAD eligible whom the District Attorney and Defense Attorney agree are appropriate for diversion enter into a six-month agreement that requires the offender to meet certain conditions such as community supervision, substance abuse treatment, mental health treatment, drug testing, employment/employment training, educational programming, restitution, community service, community conferencing, etc. Upon successful completion, criminal charges are never issued in the case of a diversion, or charges are dismissed in the case of a DPA.

Since inception of the program, 602 persons were approved for a DPA and 269 were approved for diversion agreements. Approximately 59% of participants successfully complete the program. **From March 1, 2007-December 31, 2008, the TAD program saved 4,245 prison bed days (calculated as a DA recommended prison sentence of > 365 days) and 22,122 jail bed days (calculated as a DA recommended jail sentence of 365 days or less). The Department of Corrections has indicated that it costs approximately \$29,700 per year to house an inmate in the Wisconsin State Prison System. Using the above prison bed savings which is the equivalent of 11.63 years of incarceration costs, TAD saved the state \$345,411. The Milwaukee County Office of the Sheriff indicates that the out-of-pocket per diem rate for a person housed at the HOC is \$25.40. Using the above jail bed savings, the TAD program has saved Milwaukee County taxpayers approximately \$561,899. It is important to remember that these savings were accomplished with a minimal screening operation.**

As outlined above, Milwaukee County provides funding for a wide array of pretrial alternatives to incarceration. However, one of the most critical components of any sound pretrial service program is missing. Decisions as to which defendants are best suited for programming are made by judicial officers without access to risk and need information and without recommendations as to which program would best minimize the potential for pretrial misconduct and address a defendant's needs.

Milwaukee County has implemented a drug treatment court. This program is targeting higher risk/higher need offenders for whom the DA's Office is recommending a term of incarceration in the Wisconsin State Prison System. These are often offenders who would also remain in custody during the pretrial period.

Critical to the success of the above initiatives is the very early identification of the intended target populations. The earlier a person is screened, the earlier diversion from the system can occur to other appropriate alternatives, saving valuable jail bed days. Again, this is greatly hampered by the absence of a 24/7 jail screening program.

In 2006 after a two day site visit, the National Institute of Corrections issued a technical assistance report, "**Jail and Justice System Assessment for Milwaukee County**". The authors of this report made numerous recommendations designed to assist Milwaukee County in

addressing systemic issues in the criminal justice system that impact on jail/detention population. One of those recommendations that came to fruition is the creation of the Milwaukee County Community Justice Council. **This report also highly recommended that the County “Move the current pretrial release system from an afterthought to the primary ingredient in the arraignment process...” and recommended, “Development of policies, procedures and funding in support of neutral pretrial screening for all arrestees eligible for release under Wisconsin law”.**

The report went on to say that, **“Milwaukee cannot move forward to a platform of data driven public policy without knowing the characteristics of who is coming into the front door of their criminal justice system. Front end screening provides numerous benefits throughout the community if applied correctly”.**

POTENTIAL IMPACT-ONE JURISDICTION’S EXPERIENCE

In 2005, the Allegheny County criminal justice system underwent a broad assessment that included a review of the Bail Agency (Allegheny County’s pretrial services program). The evaluation showed that there were several significant departures from national standards. Program staff was responsible for investigating (performing a risk assessment and intake interview) all defendants having a preliminary arraignment (the equivalent of an initial appearance in Milwaukee County’s system). However, data showed that, “a substantial number, about 40 percent, were not being reached by the program”.¹ In addition, prior to 2006 the program did not employ the use of a validated risk assessment instrument.

Based on the results of the system assessment, the Allegheny County Court of Common Pleas requested assistance from the Pretrial Justice Institute in addressing concerns identified in the report.

“The court asked PJI for assistance in addressing the following Process Improvement Objectives:

1. Implement best practices at intake, specifically information gathering, verification and analysis.
2. Improve risk assessment procedures by validating the interim risk assessment instrument.
3. Identify pretrial release options that will be effective and meaningful.
4. Develop policies on information dissemination.
5. Establish performance measures and other techniques to evaluate the effectiveness of changes made.
6. Develop and compile written policies and procedures.
7. Establish clear and obtainable work objectives.”²

¹ “The Transformation of Pretrial Services in Allegheny County, Pennsylvania: Development of Best Practices and Validation of Risk Assessment”, Pretrial Justice Institute, October 9, 2007.

² “The Transformation of Pretrial Services in Allegheny County, Pennsylvania: Development of Best Practices and Validation of Risk Assessment”, Pretrial Justice Institute, October 9, 2007.

In September, 2007 the Allegheny County Pretrial Services Agency implemented new procedures developed in consultation with the Pretrial Justice Institute. The program implemented use of a new, validated risk assessment instrument. Under the new procedures, the program now conducts face-to-face interviews with 100 percent of all defendants having a preliminary arraignment. These interviews are conducted on laptop computers to allow entry of information and data directly into the program's information system. The result is a computer generated report to the court that provides criminal history, history of failures to appear, and the risk assessment and program recommendation.

Use of the risk assessment instrument also allowed for targeting supervision resources and different levels of supervision to defendants falling into the medium risk range.

Data from the transformation of this program show that approximately 90 percent of defendants are released during the pretrial period. In addition preliminary data show that in the first month of operation, there was a 30 percent reduction in the number of jail admissions resulting from preliminary arraignment court. In addition to the above statistics, surveys of judicial officials shows a high level of satisfaction with the information provided by the program.³

MILWAUKEE COUNTY PROPOSED SCREENING PROCESS

Screening Locations

Milwaukee County Criminal Justice Facility Booking Room and Central Intake Unit

Screening Priority

Jail screeners will prioritize screening and verification based on the reason for booking, the likelihood of release and the time frame in which a decision-maker will need the information.

Screening Protocol

Screening will consist of the application of the Milwaukee County Pretrial Risk Assessment Tool along with a face-to-face interview that will collect basic demographic information as well as screen for the presence of substance abuse and/or co-occurring mental health disorders. Copies of these tools are attached to this proposal. Ideally, these interviews should be conducted on laptops with direct entry of information into the Milwaukee County Pretrial Services Database.

Pretrial Risk Assessment Tool-this tool takes into account, by application of a numeric value, the nature of the alleged offense, whether or not the charge is a drug offense, prior convictions, prior failures to appear while on release, prior rearrest while on release, employment status, caregiver status, and residence. Application of the tool results in a numeric score ranging from 0 to 15. The higher the score, the higher the risk for pretrial misconduct. In addition to determining risk, the tool also presents information on the defendant's criminal history, probation/parole/ES status, other holds and whether there are other pending cases or outstanding warrants.

³ "The Transformation of Pretrial Services in Allegheny County, Pennsylvania: Development of Best Practices and Validation of Risk Assessment", Pretrial Justice Institute, October 9, 2007.

Information necessary for the completion of the risk assessment will be drawn from CJIS, CCAP and NCIC. Access to NCIC for this staff is essential to providing decision makers with the most reliable and valid criminal history and risk information.

Pretrial Intake Interview-this tool collects basic demographic information on the defendant such as name, address, length of time in community, telephone, race, sex, age, marital status, education level, employment status/source of income, number of dependents, and current/past criminal justice system involvement. In addition, the tool also focuses on screening for the presence of substance abuse and/or co-occurring mental health disorders and whether the person is receiving treatment services in the community. The person's history of receiving these services is also reviewed. The tool also identifies other needs/barriers such as transportation, homelessness, etc.

Ideally, jail screeners will have timely access to the Behavioral Health Division (with appropriate release or MOU) database to determine whether individuals booked into the jail are currently receiving AODA/mental health services or have received these services in the past.

All information obtained in the intake interview will be verified with collateral contacts. Whether or not the information was verified and by whom will be noted in the Risk and Needs Report.

Risk and Needs Report

Information obtained in the risk assessment and intake interview will be entered into the Milwaukee County Pretrial Services Database. This information will be formatted into a one page report that will be made available to the District Attorney, Public Defender/defense attorney, Intake Court Commissioner, Sheriff's Department and the Courts through secure electronic access to the database. A draft sample of this report is attached. The report will include the following:

- Date of the report;
- Name and telephone number for the person preparing the report;
- Defendant name, date of birth, address and telephone number;
- Verification information and source of verification;
- Presenting charges;
- List of pending cases, including warrants/bench warrants with case number, charges and next court date;
- Risk indicators, both positive and negative;
- Overall risk score;
- Identified needs such as housing, mental health and substance abuse problems;
- A recommendation as to release conditions (programming) needed to minimize risk.

Data Collection and Dissemination

All data and information collected during the screening process will be entered into the existing Milwaukee County Pretrial Services Database. This will include:

- Defendant demographics (residence information, age, sex, race, marital status, employment status, education level, etc.);
- Presenting charges;
- Criminal history information;
- Risk indicators, both positive and negative;
- Results of risk assessment (score);
- AODA/mental health history/information;
- Recommended conditions of release/bail that will minimize risk;
- Other alternatives to incarceration recommended (municipal court cases);
- DA charging decision;
- Results of Initial Appearance, including bail decision, next court date and conditions ordered.

The Judicial Review Coordinator is working collaboratively with IMSD in exploring the possibility of developing a method for extracting data collected by the Sheriff's Department and/or MPD that is also required in the screening process. Ideally, this information would auto-fill fields in the Pretrial Intake Interview. This would potentially reduce the amount of time required to complete the screening process.

A wide variety of reports containing the above data can be developed. The Community Justice Council should provide direction in development of statistical reports as well as the evaluation component of this program. The availability of reports summarizing the above data and information will provide Milwaukee County with a much better picture of its jail population. This information may be used to make policy decisions on prioritization of programming, funding for alternatives to incarceration, determination of target populations, etc. Evaluation factors for consideration might include things such as average length of stay, number of pretrial detainees and jail days saved.

STAFFING AND BUDGET PROPOSALS FOR JAIL SCREENING OPERATION

Staffing levels and budget for a screening operation will be dependant on whether screening is conducted on every person booked into the Milwaukee County Criminal Justice Facility or whether a reduced, "targeted" population is selected. In addition, the availability of certain data elements electronically from CJIS and auto-filled into the pretrial database will impact long-term staffing levels and cost.

Below are four staffing and budget proposals for a screening operation in Milwaukee County.

1. Screening of every person booked with no data sharing capabilities.
2. Screening of every person booked with data sharing capabilities.
3. Screening of a targeted population without data sharing capabilities.
4. Screening of a targeted population with data sharing capabilities.

Included in each of these proposals is funding to conduct training for judges and commissioners on the application and use of risk assessment information in the release decision making process. This is an essential element of this proposal.

Included in the budgets that call for data sharing is funding for the development of a protocol for sharing mutually needed data, and auto-populating the Pretrial Intake Interview. It should be noted that this is a one-time cost and is an estimate only. IMSD is working on a more detailed estimate.

The equipment cost line item will be significantly reduced in subsequent years. Because this is a new program, first year costs will be higher.

2010 Universal Screening Budget-Screen All, No Data Sharing

Assumptions:

1-Screen every person booked into the jail

2-24/7 operation

3-No data sharing available

4-116 bookings/day x 1.25 hrs/screen = 145 screening hours per day/3 shifts = 48.3 screening hours/shift

48.3/8 hour shift = 6.0 FTE screening positions x 1.7 shift relief factor = 10.2 (10) positions/shift

10.0 FTE positions/shift x 3 shifts = 30 FTE screening positions

1.0 Program

Director

3.0 Shift Leaders

.125 Data Specialist

5-Space for screening operation will be available in booking or close proximity

Salaries	FTE	Annual Salary	Total Salary	FICA	Health	Life	Total
Program Director	1	\$48,000	\$48,000	\$3,672	\$7,100	\$30	\$58,802
Shift Leader	3	\$35,000	\$105,000	\$8,032	\$21,300	\$90	\$134,422
Intake Specialist	30	\$32,000	\$960,000	\$73,440	\$213,000	\$900	\$1,247,340
Data Specialist	0.125	\$66,500	\$8,312	\$636	\$887	\$4	\$9,839
	34.125		\$1,121,312	\$85,780	\$242,287	\$1,024	\$1,450,403
Worker's Compensation (\$.29/\$100 of wages)							\$3,252
Office Supplies (\$50 per position/month)							\$20,475
Telephone							\$1,000
Postage							\$250
Equipment (Computers, printers, phones, desks, chairs for 12 staff/shift)*							\$27,900
Equipment Rental (Copier, toner)							\$1,500
Printing							\$1,500
Staff Training (34 Staff Attendance at NAPSA Training @ \$1,200 ea.) **							\$40,800
Professional Fees (NAPSA membership and certification expenses)							\$3,400
Subtotal							\$1,550,480
Agency Administration (12%-Assumes private vendor)							\$186,058
Training-Judicial Commissioners/Judges Application & Use of Risk and Screening Info							\$5,000
Total Expenses							\$1,741,538

*Start-up estimate. Equipment costs in subsequent years significantly lower.

**Initial year costs. Costs in subsequent years will be significantly lower.

2010 Universal Screening Budget-Screen All + Data Sharing

Assumptions:

1-Screen every person booked into the jail

2-24/7 operation

3-Data sharing available (demographic, charge info dumped into pretrial screen/database from CJIS)

4-116 bookings/day x 1.0 hrs/screen = 116 screening hours per day/3 shifts = 38.7 screening hours/shift
 38.7/8 hour shift = 4.8 (5) FTE screening positions x 1.7 shift relief factor = 8.5 positions/shift

8.5 FTE positions/shift x 3 shifts = 25.5 (26) FTE screening positions

1.0 Program Director

3.0 Shift Leaders

.125 Data Specialist

5-Space for screening operation will be available in booking or close proximity

		Annual	Total				
Salaries	FTE	Salary	Salary	FICA	Health	Life	Total
Program Director	1	\$48,000	\$48,000	\$3,672	\$7,100	\$30	\$58,802
Shift Leader	3	\$35,000	\$105,000	\$8,032	\$21,300	\$90	\$134,422
Intake Specialist	26	\$32,000	\$832,000	\$63,648	\$184,600	\$780	\$1,081,028
Data Specialist	0.125	\$66,500	\$8,312	\$636	\$887	\$4	\$9,839
	30.125		\$993,312	\$75,988	\$213,887	\$904	\$1,284,091
Worker's Compensation (\$.29/\$100 of wages)							\$2,881
Office Supplies (\$50 per position/month)							\$18,075
Telephone							\$1,000
Postage							\$250
Equipment (Computers, phone/data lines, printers, phones, desks, chairs for 11 staff/shift)*							\$25,575
Equipment Rental (Copier, toner)							\$1,500
Printing							\$1,500
Staff Training (30 Staff Attendance at NAPSA Training @ \$1,200 ea.)**							\$36,000
Professional Fees (NAPSA membership and certification expenses)							\$3,000
Subtotal							\$1,370,991
Agency Administration (12%-Assumes private vendor)							\$164,519
Training-Judicial Commissioners/Judges-Application & Use of Risk and Screening Info							\$5,000
Interface/Data Sharing Development (ESTIMATE ONLY)**							\$32,400
Total Expenses							\$1,572,910

*Start-up estimate. Equipment costs in subsequent years significantly lower.

**Initial year costs. Costs in subsequent years will be significantly lower.

2010 Universal Screening Budget-Targeted Populations/No Data Sharing

Assumptions:

- 1-Screen persons booked into the jail whose most serious charge is:
 - summary felony, misdemeanor or criminal traffic offense
 - felony, misdemeanor or criminal traffic warrant return
 - felony, misdemeanor or criminal traffic bench warrant return
 - Per 2008 MCSD data, N=27,375 or 75 bookings/day
- 2-24/7 operation
- 3-Data sharing not available
- 4-75 bookings/day x 1.25 hrs/screen = 93.75 (94) screening hours per day/3 shifts = 31.3 screening hours/shift
 - 31.3/8 hour shift=3.9 (4) FTE screening positions x 1.7 shift relief factor=6.8 (7) positions/shift
 - 7.0 FTE positions/shift x 3 shifts = 21 FTE screening positions
 - 1.0 Program Director
 - 3.0 Shift Leaders
 - .125 Data Specialist
- 5-Space for screening operation will be available in booking or close proximity

		Annual	Total				
Salaries	FTE	Salary	Salary	FICA	Health	Life	Total
Program Director	1	\$48,000	\$48,000	\$3,672	\$7,100	\$30	\$58,802
Shift Leader	3	\$35,000	\$105,000	\$8,032	\$21,300	\$90	\$134,422
Intake Specialist	21	\$32,000	\$672,000	\$51,408	\$149,100	\$630	\$873,138
Data Specialist	0.125	\$66,500	\$8,312	\$636	\$887	\$4	\$9,839
	25.125		\$833,312	\$63,748	\$178,387	\$754	\$1,076,201
Worker's Compensation (\$.29/\$100 of wages)							\$2,417
Office Supplies (\$50 per position/month)							\$15,075
Telephone							\$1,000
Postage							\$250
Equipment (Computers, phone/data lines, printers, phones, desks, chairs for 9 staff/shift)							\$20,925
Equipment Rental (Copier, toner)							\$1,500
Printing							\$1,500
Staff Training (25 Staff Attendance at NAPSA Training @ \$1,200 ea.)**							\$30,000
Professional Fees (NAPSA membership and certification expenses)							\$2,500
Subtotal							\$1,151,368
Agency Administration (12%-Assumes private vendor)							\$138,164
Training-Judicial Commissioners/Judges-Application & Use of Risk and Screening Info							\$5,000
Total Expenses							\$1,294,532

*Start-up estimate. Equipment costs in subsequent years significantly lower.

** Initial year costs. Costs in subsequent years will be significantly lower.

2010 Universal Screening Budget-Targeted Populations + Data Sharing

Assumptions:

- 1-Screen persons booked into the jail whose most serious charge is:
 - summary felony, misdemeanor or criminal traffic offense
 - felony, misdemeanor or criminal traffic warrant return
 - felony, misdemeanor or criminal traffic bench warrant return
 - Per 2008 MCSD data, N=27,375 or 75 bookings/day
- 2-24/7 operation
- 3-Data sharing available (demographic, charge info dumped into pretrial screen/database from CJIS)
- 4-75 bookings/day x 1.0 hrs/screen = 75 screening hours per day/3 shifts = 25 screening hours/shift
 - 25/8 hour shift = 3.12 FTE screening positions x 1.7 shift relief factor = 5.3 (5) positions/shift
 - 5.0 FTE positions/shift x 3 shifts = 15 FTE screening positions
 - 1.0 Program Director
 - 3.0 Shift Leaders
 - .125 Data Specialist
- 5-Space for screening operation will be available in booking or close proximity

	FTE	Annual Salary	Total Salary	FICA	Health	Life	Total
Program Director	1	\$48,000	\$48,000	\$3,672	\$7,100	\$30	\$58,802
Shift Leader	3	\$35,000	\$105,000	\$8,032	\$21,300	\$90	\$134,422
Intake Specialist	15	\$32,000	\$480,000	\$36,720	\$106,500	\$450	\$623,670
Data Specialist	0.125	\$66,500	\$8,312	\$636	\$887	\$4	\$9,839
	19.125		\$641,312	\$49,060	\$135,787	\$574	\$826,733
Worker's Compensation (\$.29/\$100 of wages)							\$1,860
Office Supplies (\$50 per position/month)							\$11,475
Telephone							\$1,000
Postage							\$250
Equipment (Computers, phone/data lines, printers, phones, desks, chairs for 7 staff/shift)*							\$16,275
Equipment Rental (Copier, toner)							\$1,500
Printing							\$1,500
Staff Training (19 Staff Attendance at NAPSA Training @ \$1,200 ea.)**							\$22,800
Professional Fees (NAPSA membership and certification expenses)							\$1,900
Subtotal							\$885,293
Agency Administration (12%-Assumes private vendor)							\$106,235
Interface/Data Sharing Development (ESTIMATE ONLY)**							\$32,400
Training-Judicial Commissioners/Judges-Application & Use of Risk and Screening Info							\$5,000
Total Expenses							\$1,028,928

*Start-up estimate. Equipment costs in subsequent years significantly lower.

** Initial year costs. Costs in subsequent years will be significantly lower.

Training

In order for universal jail screening to be successful, it is essential that all system participants understand the meaning and application of the risk assessment tool and resulting information and reports. The Pretrial Justice Institute with the National Judicial College offers training for jurisdictions on the pretrial release decision making process. This is an interactive workshop that explores the pretrial release decision making process, effective ways to make release/detention decisions, considerations for special populations all while keeping in mind state bail laws. In addition to judicial education, it is essential that the prosecution, defense and any other system participant who will utilize this information undergo similar training.

It is also strongly recommended that the Community Justice Council develop policy recommendations for the use of screening and risk assessment information.

SUMMARY

While the cost of conducting jail screening on a 24/7 basis may seem daunting, Milwaukee County continues to pay a high price for not conducting such an operation. The County currently has no available risk and need data on inmates entering its criminal justice system on which to base future policy decisions relative to detention and potential alternatives to incarceration.

Conducting 24/7 screening on those entering the system will provide the following benefits to Milwaukee County:

- Availability of neutral, objective risk and needs information to system decision-makers at the earliest decision-making points;
- Earlier identification of high cost special needs populations such as those with AODA and mental health problems so that they may be diverted from the jail/system earlier;
- More informed pretrial release/detention decisions;
- Increase in the number of persons receiving diversions and deferred prosecution agreements;
- More informed and efficient use of existing alternatives to incarceration;
- Better informed policy decisions and planning for detention capacity and future alternative initiatives;
- Reduction in average length of stay;
- Reduction in pretrial jail population.

With a 24/7 screening operation comes the need to provide adequate funding for community supervision, substance abuse treatment and other ancillary services. While Milwaukee County has a wide array of available alternatives to incarceration, the capacity of those programs may need to expand as a result of a more robust screening program.