Sheriff Paul Bailey, Berrien County

Testimony on SB 933, 934, 935, 948, and 949

Chairman Shirkey and members of the committee, thank you for allowing me a few minutes of your time to testify on behalf of the Michigan Sheriffs Association (MSA) on SB 933, 934, 935, 948, and 949. If it is appropriate, I would like to address the entire package as a whole and then discuss specifics on the bills you have before you today.

Package as a Whole:

The package as a whole represents a positive step toward improving the criminal justice system. Instead of simply shortening sentences on the back end, Senator Proos has attempted to improve contact with the system so that a criminal has a better chance at success when he or she is released. MSA believes this is the best approach for society, local governments, and the user of the system. While this package focuses on system change, MSA believes that investment in local infrastructure also must be made. We suggest the following investments as additional items for legislators to think about.

- Investment in mental health and substance use treatment before, during, and after touching the system
- Investment in diversion and specialty courts
- Continuation of the Virtual Jail Program and increased reimbursement rates for the County Jail Reimbursement Program
- Investment in community corrections

Bills Under Consideration Today:

933:

SB 933 deals with technical probation violations and ensuring a swift and certain sanction occurs. MSA supports this concept and simply wants to make sure the sheriff has the ability to work with the judge when issues of bed space occur.

934:

SB 934 allows the court to reduce/eliminate probation if ½ of the probation is successfully completed. MSA has no concerns with this proposal.

SB 935:

SB 935 Creates a new act titled the Supervising Region Incentive Act. MSA may be fine with this concept, we just need a better handle on how it will work. For example, what is the role of the probation/parole officer in relation to the jail and sheriff under this scenario? In addition, MSA has a

concern that there may be an incentive not to revoke if there is money on the line for each region, which could, inadvertently, affect public safety. It may be wise to make sure the DOC is working with regions and local stakeholders to reduce revocations where possible.

SB 948 and 949:

SB 948 and 949 make changes to the Swift and Sure statute and MSA has no concerns with those bills.

Conclusion:

Again, MSA is generally supportive of the approach the Senate is taking in this package. We believe our questions and concerns can be addressed as we move forward with the sponsors and engage in more discussion. Thank you for your time and consideration as we work in partnership to protect the people of Michigan.