REPORT TO THE MINNESOTA LEGISLATURE

CORRECTIONS CROWDING IN MINNESOTA

PREPARED BY THE CORRECTIONS CROWDING TASK FORCE SEPTEMBER 1993

Pursuant to 1991 Laws, Chapter 292, Article 8, Section 21, subd 3

The Corrections Crowding Task Force was appointed by the Commissioner of Corrections, Orville Pung, in accordance with the Health and Human Services Omnibus Appropriations Bill, Chapter 292 passed by the 1991 Minnesota Legislature. The Task Force members were:

James A. Just, Task Force Chair
Executive Director
Welcome Home, Minnetrista

Ellis Bullock,
Task Force Vice-Chair
Vice President of Public Affairs
Jostens, Inc., Bloomington

Honorable Charles T. Barnes
Judge of the Sixth Judicial Court

Henry M. Buffalo, Jr. , Esq.
Attorney at Law
Jacobson, Buffalo, Schoessler,
and Magnuson, Minneapolis

Michael Cunniff
Associate County Administrator
Hennepin County
Bureau of Community
Corrections

Richard Fritzke, Director
Anoka Community Corrections

Mary M. Hauser
Commissioner
Washington County Board

Anne Kelly
Executive Budget Officer, CORE
Department of Administration

Holland Laak
Executive Director
Minnesota State Sheriffs Assn.

Katie McWatt, Coordinator
Minority Education Program
Central High School, St. Paul

Dan Storkamp, Director
Bureau of Criminal
Justice Statistics
Minnesota Planning Office

Jenny L. Walker
Chief Public Defender
Tenth Judicial District, Anoka

David A. Johnson
Department of Finance
Minnesota Department of
Corrections

Frank W. Wood
Deputy Commissioner
Minnesota Department of
Corrections

Tom Bakken-Dryden
Adult Basic Education Teacher
Crookston

The Task Force was staffed by Charles H. Jakway, Associate Warden of Administration at the Minnesota Correctional Facility - Oak Park Heights.

CORRECTIONS CROWDING IN MINNESOTA

INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to the Health and Human Services Omnibus Appropriations Bill, Chapter 292, Subdivision 3, the Task Force on Corrections Crowding has prepared this final report to the Governor and to the Legislature to report on its findings.

An interim report was prepared and submitted to the Governor and to the Legislature on January 1, 1992, as was called for by the bill. This final report is submitted in anticipation of assisting the future legislative deliberations of criminal justice system issues. The legislation that enabled this Task Force on Corrections Crowding in Minnesota made no provisions for resources to support the work of the Task Force. Accordingly, the Task Force relied upon services and contributions from its members and primarily the Department of Corrections' staff. Difficulties encountered by the Task Force included vital information received late in the process, the complexity of the eight far-reaching assignments, extensive debate and deliberations and finally, reconciling the divergent viewpoints -- all of which contributed to the delay in submitting this final report.

The Task Force wishes to thank the Governor and the Legislature along with the Commissioner of Corrections for providing the opportunity to meet and examine these correctional issues. Extensive debate and deliberations filled the meetings with a diverse and respected collection of viewpoints representing various perspectives within the criminal justice system throughout Minnesota. Task Force members would be willing to serve on any future Task Forces addressing these serious issues including the development of a ten year criminal justice plan. This was also a charge which could not be adequately addressed given the time constraints and limited staff support that was made available to the Task Force.

During the past decade, virtually every state in the nation has been experiencing a seemingly uncontrollable explosion in their correctional populations. Minnesota has experienced the same phenomenon though it has been less dramatic and, if adequate resources and creative strategies are cooperatively and strategically applied, its impact will be manageable by the state's correctional systems. Minnesota's general population grew by six percent in the 1980's, while its prison population grew by 64 percent (more than 10 times faster than the population), its jail population by 90 percent (more than 14 times faster), and its probation population by 111 percent (nearly 18 times faster). Today, Minnesota's prisons and jails operate at near capacity with jail inmate populations frequently exceeding capacity. Most probation officers have higher caseloads than they can effectively manage. Expenses for running the state and local criminal justice systems continue to rise, in the face of shrinking government budgets and resources.

Further crowding approaching dangerous levels is anticipated in our state facilities and our county jails as well as our probation and supervised release caseloads. To build new prisons and county jails to meet this population increase is ultimately not the sole answer. No state or county has been able to build its way out of the problem. Minnesota's community-based initiatives and prevention activities must be maintained and strengthened as the first and foremost objectives in our range of responses to the corrections crowding problem.

The Legislature, Sentencing Guidelines Commission and corrections professionals must continue their active roles in preserving the expensive and scarce resources of bed space for the most chronic and violent offenders. If not, we risk the historical stability of our corrections systems and the state will be subject to litigation and court intervention for crowding and unconstitutional conditions of confinement which have cost 40 other states millions of dollars that could have been better spent on prevention and community-based initiatives.

TASK FORCE FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Legislature identified eight duties for the Corrections Crowding Task Force. In many instances, these duties overlap in significant ways with the legislative charge that has been given to the Work Group on Correctional Delivery Systems, the Advisory Task Force on the Juvenile Justice System, the Probation Standards Task Force and the Probation Violators/Per Diem Fee Working Group. Accordingly, the Corrections Crowding Task Force encourages consideration of its findings and recommendations in conjunction with those of these related groups / task forces.

DUTY 1: EXAMINE THE RELATIONSHIP, INTERDEPENDENCE, FINANCING, AND FUNCTIONS OF THE STATE AND LOCAL CORRECTIONAL SYSTEMS.

FINDINGS:

Relationship/Interdependence. From an operational perspective, the Task Force found the relationship/interdependence between the state and the county correctional systems to be excellent. The result of this intergovernmental collaborative is nationally recognized and respected as a quality continuum of correctional services composed of the state and local systems. The Task Force found, however, that in the area of correctional policy deliberation and development, the state and counties operate quite independently often to the detriment of both service delivery systems.

Financing. The Task Force found that funding has not kept pace with the demand that has been placed upon correctional facilities and it is grossly inadequate for probation supervision and those related services which are innovative and proven alternatives to incarceration. That is not to say, however, that state and local funding for correctional services has not increased over the past decade or so. In fact, the increases have been significant but generally they provided only for existing system maintenance -- they have not been commensurate with the significant increases in the offender population nor with the heightened public interest in the correctional systems' capacity to control offenders and hold them accountable.

Functions: Correctional services provided at the county level are divided into three different delivery systems: County Probation Officer, Minnesota Department of Corrections, and Community Corrections Act systems. These systems, while organizationally different, are similar in terms of their basic functions and responsibilities. They provide the courts with information that is necessary for making

informed dispositional decisions, provide a range of restorative services for crime victims, provide for the custody and/or supervision of juvenile and adult offenders and provide or broker appropriate human services to clients. Together, these systems are responsible, on any given day, for the custody and supervision of approximately 90,000 juvenile and adult offenders. The Task Force found this multiple delivery system to be inefficient and that it was not effective in terms of assuring an equitable range of sanctions and services across all jurisdictions in the state.

At the state level, the primary function is to provide for the secure and humane custody of juvenile and adult offenders sentenced by the courts to the custody of the Commissioner of Corrections. The Department of Corrections operates ten correctional facilities including seven for adults, two for juveniles and one that serves both adults and juveniles. On average, the combined population of adult offenders in these facilities is approximately 4,000 inmates; juvenile offenders number 150. In addition, the Department provides, in part or whole, probation and supervised release services to 10,500 juvenile and adult offenders under correctional jurisdiction in 57 of the state's counties. The state also performs an important regulatory function and it administers a number of subsidy and categorical funding programs.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1-1. In recognition of the interdependence of the state and county correctional systems and the importance of maintaining effective working relationships between those systems, the Task Force encourages the Commissioner of the Department of Corrections to seek the active involvement of representatives from the county correctional systems in policy development activities and financial deliberations related to the delivery of adult and juvenile correctional services in Minnesota.

1-2. By January 1, 1995 a comprehensive plan for the phased implementation of a single delivery system for correctional services at the county level should be developed and presented to the Minnesota Legislature. This plan should be cooperatively developed by the Commissioner of Corrections and correctional and judicial representatives of the three existing correctional service delivery systems. Additionally, this plan shall be premised upon implementation of the Minnesota Community Corrections Act (MS 401) in all Minnesota counties and, as may be necessary to accomplish that objective, amendments to that legislation should be specifically identified.

1-3. Legislation should be enacted during the 1994 legislative session that would prohibit the implementation of any Minnesota Sentencing Guidelines modifications and/or statutory amendments that result in the need for additional prison and jail beds or would increase the number of offenders under probation supervision/supervised release unless adequate funding for these additional resources is made available.

DUTY 2: REVIEW THE ENTIRE SYSTEM INCLUDING FELONIES, GROSS MISDEMEANORS, AND MISDEMEANORS.

FINDINGS:

Minnesota's system of categorizing criminal code violations -- misdemeanor/gross misdemeanor/felony -- represents a reasoned and balanced framework for responding to incidents of criminal activity. In its simplest terms, this framework represents the legislative codification of our collective reaction to behavior that is perceived to be anti-social and threatening to our well-being. The process of determining consensus about the impact of criminal behavior and then codifying a governmental response to it is imprecise and subject to a range of variables that can have a significant influence on the moral integrity and practical viability of that response. And until recently, Minnesota has enjoyed a national reputation for its ability to achieve this symmetry, not only in terms of the codification process itself, but as well, preserving the delicate balance between the criminal code and the resources which are necessary for administering the sanctions as provided in that code.

To some extent, this recent imbalance has been occasioned by an increased level of criminal activity -- for the period of 1981 through 1991, the crime rate actually decreased by 3 percent but the total number of serious crimes known or reported to law enforcement agencies in Minnesota increased 4 percent. More importantly, during this same period of time, adult arrests increased by 54 percent, the number of felony level offenders annually committed to state prisons rose from 825 to 1,777 or an increase of 115 percent and the number incarcerated in local jails increased over 172 percent!

This sharp increase in the use of more punitive sanctions, especially incarceration, results primarily from legislative changes in criminal law -- the addition of new felonies, the enhancement of existing criminal penalties and the conversion of misdemeanor offenses to gross misdemeanors. A prime example of this movement toward more punitive sanctions that increased reliance upon the use of incarceration with little or no data to support the efficacy of that strategy, relates

to the utilization of jail beds for most DWI offenders. Both the Sentencing Guidelines Commission and the Legislative Auditor have issued reports that essentially concur with the finding that changes in the criminal code and sentencing policy during the past decade are directly responsible for this increased reliance upon more punitive sanctions.

And what has driven this increased emphasis on incarceration? To a significant degree, it has resulted from a legislative and Sentencing Guideline Commission shift in focus away from the principles of using the least restrictive sanction(s) necessary to achieve the purposes of the sentence and the need for the use of a continuum of sanctions. In addition, the original sentencing guidelines strategy was to base recommended sentences on the typical case with the more egregious cases being handled through judicial departures from the guidelines. Recent legislative actions and guideline amendments have clearly been responsive to isolated and highly publicized criminal behavior incidents.

Recent public opinion research in Minnesota and across the nation is beginning to challenge long-held assumptions that public concern for personal safety automatically equates with demands for harsher sentencing and a greater reliance upon incarceration. This research does not support those assumptions and in fact the findings clearly indicate that the public has very little confidence in a public policy that relies upon imprisonment as a means to reduce crime. To the contrary, there is widespread support for public investments in social programs and community-based efforts as the primary strategies for reducing crime.

This research clearly supports the principles as originally embodied in Minnesota's Community Corrections and Sentencing Guidelines legislation - reserving expensive prison and jail resources for the more serious offender and relying upon the utilization of community-based sanctions and resources for the majority of offenders. And while the basic framework for furthering these principles remains intact, legislation and changes in sentencing policy since 1989 appear to signal the beginning of a reversal in that proven public policy.

This recent trend toward a greater reliance upon more punitive sanctions has not only resulted in the crowding of Minnesota's correctional resources, it has also contributed to the increasing over-representation of people of color in the various correctional populations. Both the state and county correctional systems have attempted to expand their responses to the need for culturally sensitive programming and to recruit and hire more people of color as staff. The Task Force's review of these diversity issues indicates that these efforts have fallen short of their objectives and that a renewed emphasis is essential.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

2-1. The role of the Minnesota Sentencing Guidelines Commission should be expanded to include lead responsibility for:

- Conducting research regarding the efficacy of the full range of criminal sanctions utilized in Minnesota.

- Conducting public information/education programs regarding the purpose and effectiveness of criminal sanctions.

2-2. The state and county correctional systems should aggressively pursue the development of culturally sensitive programs for adult and juvenile offenders.

2-3. The state and county correctional systems should actively recruit and hire more people of color.

2-4. Correctional system personnel should annually participate in cultural diversity training sessions.

2-5. The Task Force recommends that, for the majority of DWI offenders, alternatives to incarceration such as intensive probation supervision, electronic monitoring / home arrest, minimum security work release type facilities and treatment programming appropriate to the offenders' severity of illness be used to protect the public and decrease the likelihood of repeat offenses. Counties should receive state funding for the implementation of these alternatives.

2-6. The Task Force recommends that the Legislature reinstate the Sentencing Guidelines Commission responsibility to control the use of finite correctional resources by formulating sentencing policy that is premised upon the use of the least restrictive sanction(s) necessary to achieve the purposes of the sentence; that is based on the typical rather than the atypical case; and, that clearly recognizes the need for a continuum of sanctions and recognizes that incarceration is not the only significant sanction available to the sentencing court.

DUTY 3: ADDRESS THE NEED FOR JUVENILE AND ADULT, MALE AND FEMALE CORRECTIONAL SERVICES AND FACILITIES.

FINDINGS:

The Task Force defined the scope of this issue to include the entire organizational structure of Minnesota's correctional service delivery system with an emphasis on its philosophical underpinnings. As noted elsewhere in the Report, the correctional system in this state is premised upon a philosophy that relies primarily upon community-based alternatives to incarceration. This philosophy was embodied in two legislative initiatives that resulted in the establishment of a framework for managing community-based correctional systems and the development of a rational and consistent sentencing policy for felony level adult offenders. These initiatives, the Minnesota Community Corrections Act and the Minnesota Sentencing Guidelines, propelled the state into a leadership role regarding the development and implementation of two compatible and complementary public policies that balanced sentencing with a realistic level of public financing for correctional resources that did not jeopardize public safety.

Minnesota was unique among the states in that it was successfully avoiding the crowding of its state and county correctional resources, largely because of those initiatives. That is not the case today as the state is experiencing a significant imbalance in terms of recent sentencing patterns and the availability of the requisite correctional resources. More importantly, the Task Force concluded that this imbalance has not been the result of a dramatic increase in the overall level of criminal activity. Instead, it is directly attributable to strong public pressure for more punitive sanctions in response to isolated occurrences of highly publicized incidents of criminal behavior. The primary manifestation of this public pressure has been revisions to the criminal code creating new degrees of seriousness in crime types, increasing presumptive sentences, establishing new aggravating factors and the enactment of more mandatory minimum sentences. And all of these public policy decisions have contributed to the crowding of Minnesota's correctional service delivery systems. There is little information available to suggest that these changes in policy have had or will have any demonstrable impact on reducing the level of crime or ensuring public safety.

The Task Force concluded that the State of Minnesota is at a critical juncture relative to its reaction to the public's concern about crime. If the public policy trend of the last five years is maintained, the state will by default abandon its twenty year history of proven and primary reliance upon a community-based system of correctional services. In the alternative, it will devote scarce tax dollars to finance a correctional system that increasingly relies upon the construction and operation of costly prison and jail beds.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

3-1. The Legislature and key justice system officials should reaffirm Minnesota's commitment to its community-based system of correctional services by:

- **Strengthening the recent legislative emphasis on redesigning preventative social services as the most effective and efficient public policy response to reducing criminal behavior and ultimately promoting public safety in our communities.**

- **Significantly furthering the state's reliance upon correctional alternatives to incarceration for non-violent offenders by providing the level of funding necessary to responsibly achieve full implementation of the CCA legislation throughout the state.**

DUTY 4: REVIEW THE COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS ACT AND ITS FUNDING FORMULA.

FINDINGS:

In 1973, Minnesota was the first state to pass community corrections legislation. Since then, 18 states have enacted similar legislation though none of them, except perhaps Oregon, have enabled programming as comprehensive as Minnesota's.

The Minnesota Community Corrections Act (CCA) was intended to promote efficiency and economy in the delivery of correctional services. It was premised upon local responsibility for program planning and the delivery of correctional services for less serious offenders by county level correctional systems. An unstated objective of the CCA was to reserve the use of costly state prison resources for more dangerous offenders. This objective was originally embodied in the form of a financial disincentive wherein participating counties were required to pay a per diem fee to the state for certain felony offenders sentenced to the state prison system -- the subsequent enactment of sentencing guidelines that presumptively specify which adult offenders should be sentenced to prison and which should be retained in the community, resulted in the deletion of this provision in 1982.

By 1993, 30 counties organized into 15 CCA jurisdictions elected to deliver correctional services under this legislation. These counties represent approximately 68 percent of the state's population, 90 percent of the violent Part I crimes such as murder, criminal sexual conduct, aggravated robbery and aggravated assault and 80 percent of all other Part I crimes.

The Task Force devoted considerable attention to reviewing the effectiveness of the CCA. It heard testimony from state and local corrections administrators, reviewed previous evaluations conducted by others and concluded that the current crowding of Minnesota's prisons and jails and the overloading of its community-based probation services would likely be at a crisis stage were it not for the CCA legislation. Minnesota still ranks 49th among the 50 states in terms of its reliance upon incarceration in state prisons, 31st for all correctional expenditures measured on a per capita basis and 48th in terms of per capita expenditures for prisons.

The CCA legislation firmly stands as the centerpiece of Minnesota's correctional policy. The Task Force is convinced that the CCA has contributed significantly to the stability of our correctional system but it has not reached its full potential.

The Task Force also concluded that the original goals of the CCA have been seriously jeopardized by the trend toward harsher sanctions. In fact, the recent crowding of Minnesota's state and local correctional resources is directly attributed to this trend and the failure of funding to keep pace with the resultant demand for additional resources.

In addition to the question of programmatic effectiveness, the Task Force examined the CCA subsidy distribution formula which is written into the Act. In reviewing this issue, the Task Force concurred with the findings of previous reviews of the formula by a special legislative committee in 1979 and the Legislative Auditor in 1984 and 1991:

- The formula is overly complex.
- Three of the four measures (per capita correctional expenditures, per capita income and per capita net tax capacity) contained in the formula are inadequate.
- It results in an inequitable distribution of the CCA funds.
- Smaller, rural counties with less serious crime problems tend to be favored by the current formula.

However, it is important to understand that the formula, flawed as it may be, simply distributes a fixed appropriation among the participating counties. As such, any change in that formula will only result in a redistribution of that fixed appropriation and, to the extent that some counties would benefit, others would experience a commensurate loss in subsidy funding. The Task Force concluded that the current subsidy distribution formula should be retained; however, a supplemental funding mechanism that is responsive to unique correctional needs should be developed.

As noted by the Legislative Auditor in its 1991 report, Sentencing and Correctional Policies, "The concept of community corrections remains viable. The basic structure of Minnesota's CCA is still a good model that is consistent both with the political traditions of the state and with the best advice of corrections experts

DUTY 6: RECOMMEND AN EQUITABLE AND EFFECTIVE SOLUTION FOR THE SHORT-TERM PRISON OFFENDER.

FINDINGS:

Perhaps no other issue related to the crowding of correctional resources has engendered more debate, disagreement and polarization than the issue of "short-term offenders." Short-term offenders are those individuals who are committed to the custody of the Commissioner of Corrections and, upon arrival at the state correctional facility, have less than one year of time to serve. In 1988, 890 new commitments met this definition; in 1989 there were 867; in 1990 there were 869; in 1991 there were 903; and in 1992 there were 999.

In all instances, these short-term offenders are committed to state prisons in accord with the Minnesota Sentencing Guidelines and Minnesota statutes. Approximately two-thirds of these offenders represent presumptive commitments to prison (Sentencing Guidelines, Section II.C. Presumptive Sentence) who, because of accrued jail credit (Sentencing Guidelines, Section III.C. Jail Credit) and prison good-time (M.S. 243.18 and 244.04) which are subtracted from the length of time to be served, spend less than one year in prison. The remaining one-third of the short-term offenders were sent to prison because of technical violations of conditions of probation or supervised release (Sentencing Guidelines, Section III.B. Revocation of Stayed Sentence and M.S. 609.14, Revocation of Stay, Subd. 3. Sentence) and the time remaining to be served under the stayed sentence is less than one year. It should also be noted that many of these commitments arise from the offender requesting the execution of a sentence to state prison instead of a sentence to probation because the commitment to state prison actually results in a shorter period of corrections system control over these offenders.

The Task Force found the positions on this issue to be totally polarized. The Department of Corrections strongly opposes the utilization of prison space for those short-term offenders who are committed to prison because of technical violations of the conditions of probation. The Department argues that the state prison system is designed only for holding dangerous long-term inmates (M.S. 609.105, Subd. 3). Representatives of the judiciary and county correctional systems are strongly in support of maintaining this sentencing policy and "...view commitment to the Commissioner of Corrections following revocation of a stayed sentence to be justified when: ...Despite prior use of expanded and more onerous conditions of a stayed sentence, the offender persists in violating conditions of the stay..." (Sentencing Guidelines III.B. Revocation of Stayed Sentences). Their rationale for maintaining this section of the Sentencing Guidelines is that the utilization of prison beds for these offenders represents the only remaining sanction available to the judiciary for offenders who have received a stayed sentence but have repeatedly failed to abide by the conditions of probation.

Following extensive discussion of this issue by the members of the Task Force and considering the widely divergent perceptions of representatives in support of both viewpoints on the appropriateness of this category of prison commitments, the Task Force was unable to reach a consensus on this issue and, therefore, declined to make any recommendation. The Task Force also noted that the Probation Violators/Per Diem Fee Working Group would be examining this issue and developing recommendations.

DUTY 7: EXAMINE THE STATE'S APPROACH TO PRE-TRIAL DETENTION, HOUSING OF VARIOUS CATEGORIES OF NON-VIOLENT OFFENDERS, PRE-RELEASE COUNSELING, AND POST-RELEASE SUPERVISION.

FINDINGS:

The housing of defendants held on a pretrial status in jails can have a significant impact on the extent to which crowding occurs in those facilities. If crowding is not an issue for a jail, the tendency regarding this population is to reflect adherence to conventional jail management practice which means that all individuals eligible for detention in that facility are booked into the jail and held in pretrial status according to applicable statutes and judicial rules. Under those same statutes and rules, however, considerable latitude exists for local criminal justice systems to exercise creativity and innovation in terms of managing pretrial detainees.

Most county jails in Minnesota have or are experiencing crowding and most of the criminal justice systems have, as part of their response to this problem, developed and implemented various pretrial strategies. Formal misdemeanor / gross misdemeanor diversion programs were first operationalized by Hennepin and Ramsey counties in the late 1970s, and subsequently, various forms of this management strategy have been adopted by some of the other systems throughout the state. The Task Force noted that both Ramsey and Hennepin county recently expanded their misdemeanor/gross misdemeanor programs to include certain felony level offenses.

In addition to these diversion efforts, pretrial detainees in all jails are subject to pretrial release through some screening mechanism. In its simplest form, screening occurs during judicial consideration for release from the jail either under bond, bail, or No Bail Required status (NBR) which essentially revolves around a determination of eligibility for such release under applicable Minnesota statutes and Rules of Court. The only comprehensive pretrial screening programs are found

in the Second and Fourth Judicial Districts. In the instances of the Second District, Ramsey County contracts with Project Remand for this program, and in Hennepin County, the County's Bureau of Community Corrections operates the Pretrial Services Program.

Both of these programs operate each day of the year, 24 hours a day in accord with the specific authorization of their respective Judicial Districts and standard operating policies and procedures which regulate the day-to-day operations of these programs. In various ways, these programs provide pretrial release screening, release authorizations, recommendations for judicial review and release, and supervision of conditionally released defendants. These programs have demonstrated that they have contributed to easing the problem of jail crowding while at the same time public safety in their communities has not been compromised. In fact, preliminary data from the Hennepin County program indicates that rates of pretrial crime and failure to appear are approximately the same as observed in samples of persons assessed prior to the implementation of the new pretrial services program.

The motivation for developing and implementing diversion programs and "full-service" pretrial screening and release programs should not be limited to their potential for easing jail crowding as it relates to the pretrial detention function. National studies have shown that the additional investment made in implementing such programs results in actual costs savings, and case processing efficiencies are achieved throughout the justice system.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

7-1. The Minnesota Supreme Court should mandate that, by 1995, each judicial district shall develop a plan for implementing pretrial diversion, screening and conditional release/supervision programs.

7-2. Commencing in 1996, the Minnesota Legislature should appropriate annual funding sufficient for the operation of pretrial diversion, screening and conditional release/supervision programs in all judicial districts.

DUTY 8: CONDUCT INFORMATIONAL FORUMS ACROSS THE STATE TO SOLICIT IDEAS AND CONCERNS REGARDING CORRECTIONS CROWDING.

The Task Force heard from various judicial, executive, and legislative branch officials as well as various corrections system professionals and organizations. Formal meetings were held 18 times at state and local correctional facilities. At

the second meeting in November, 1991, Senator Randy Kelly and Senator Patrick McGowan were present to discuss the legislative intent for creating this Task Force.

The Task Force heard presentations from fifty-nine different officials, including Senators Kelly and McGowan, as were referenced earlier, Attorney General Hubert Humphrey, Senator JoAnn Benson, University of Minnesota Law Professor Steven Simon, and numerous public and private community and institution corrections practitioners.

The Task Force toured the Minnesota Correctional Facilities at Stillwater, Oak Park Heights, Shakopee, Lino Lakes and Red Wing. As well, the members toured local sentencing facilities in Ramsey, Hennepin, Anoka and Washington counties.

The list of presenters to the Task Force, the list of facilities toured by the Task Force, and the list of materials and documents reviewed by the Task Force are available upon request. Questions about this information or meetings of the Task Force can be directed to the Task Force staff Charles Jakway.