

**Public Safety Committee**  
Regular Meeting Minutes  
**Monday, April 5, 2010 3:30 PM**  
Scott Heyman Conference Room

**Approved**

**Call to Order**

<b>Attendee Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Excused</b>
Nathan Shinagawa	Chair	Present	
James Dennis	Member	Present	
Leslyn McBean-Clairborne	Member	Present	
Brian Robison	Member	Present	5:25 pm
Peter Stein	Member	Present	

Legislators: M. Robertson

Staff: P. Carey, D. Bodnar, DSS; J. Mareane, K. Sutherland, M. Lynch; County Administration; L. Shurtleff, Department of Emergency Response; P. Buechel, Director of the Department of Probation and Community Justice; M. Pottorff, Legislature Office

Guests: D. Dietrich, OAR; J. Rossiter, Ithaca City Treatment Court; S. Shackford, Ithaca Journal.

**Call to Order**

Mr. Shinagawa, Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:31 p.m.

**Chair's Report**

Mr. Shinagawa said at the last meeting he suggested this Committee discuss the subject of public safety concerns related to natural gas drilling of Marcellus Shale. He said he is acquainted with an individual through his employment at Guthrie Clinic in Sayre, Pennsylvania, who has lived in two communities in Wyoming and Texas that has had gas drilling activities. Mr. Shinagawa said this individual can speak to both the medical and social aspect of concerns related to gas drilling and asked if there would be any objection to extending an offer to the person to attend a meeting of this Committee and speak about this. The Committee expressed interest in hearing from this individual; Mr. Shinagawa will move forward with extending an invitation to the individual to attend a meeting.

**Sheriff's Office**

Sheriff Meskill provided the Committee with a written report and highlighted the following areas:

Jail statistics: Through the first quarter of 2010 the Sheriff's Office has expended \$17,233.35 for inmate boardouts and associated expenses of medical care labor and transportation costs. In comparison through the first quarter of 2009 the same figure amounted to \$66,356 and in the first quarter of 2008 \$117,345.38 was expended. The variances the County has received have contributed to a marked reduction of inmate boarding costs.

Traffic Safety: The Sheriff's Office has completed two Buckle Up New York (BUNY) traffic details in March. One in the hamlet of Jacksonville and one in the Village of Freeville. Several tickets were issued for various offenses including the use of cell phones, not using seat belts and speeding. The Sheriff's Office will be participating in a Statewide initiative for safe school bus operations this month and will participate in the Statewide BUNY enforcement period scheduled in late May.

Jacksonville community meeting: The Sheriff attended a meeting of the Jacksonville Community Association and discussed concerns and issues with the area residents. The main complaint was speeding and noise from heavy trucks and motorcycles. The Sheriff has planned additional traffic patrols for the area in order to mitigate the problem.

ITS (Information Technology Services): The Sheriff's Office is nearing completion of a long process of working with the Department of Criminal Justice Services, the vendor, Tompkins County ITS, and Broome County ITS to utilize the live scan equipment for fingerprint imaging equipment to process pistol permit prints. This will enhance the efficiency of Sheriff's Office staff and reduce the time to process a pistol permit application. In addition, the Office is working with the State Police and the Unified Court system to be able to issue pistol permits and amendments with a much more durable plastic card instead of the current system of using paper. This should enhance efficiency and give customers a very usable and readable card. The Sheriff expects to complete this process by the end of 2010.

Mobile Data Project: The Sheriff's Office is working with LETSS and the County ITS Department to review RFP (Request for Proposal) answers for the proposed CAD/RMS/Mobile Data Project (MDT's). The Sheriff's Office is excited about this process that will mean a faster, more efficient dispatching of deputies and law enforcement agencies that will participate in the County's Closest Car Agreement by including a new GPS system that replaces the old system that quit working eight years ago. The restoration of a GPS system will enhance officer safety.

Records Management System: The above process should also give the Sheriff's Office a Records Management System (RMS) that will provide better and complete information for managing its limited resources, as well as provide staff with easy access to information and records to assist on complaints and investigations. The system will provide the long anticipated field reporting segment and a seamless inclusion of the TRACS database so all law enforcement data will be housed in one database so all of the law enforcement data will be housed in one database.

New Uniforms: The Sheriff's Office is in the process of purchasing new uniforms for the Road Patrol Deputy Sheriffs. By unanimous choice, the deputies have chosen to switch to a new uniform that will be black in color, composed of a different fabric blend that costs more, but will wear better and be more comfortable.

NYSERDA Grant: The Sheriff's Office has applied for a grant through a firm in Albany hoping to obtain a Statewide grant from NYSERDA to convert most of the Office's vehicles to a dual fuel propane/gasoline operating system. The system should reduce greenhouse gas emissions substantially as well as reduce fuel consumption by at least 30%. An additional benefit to the system will mean cars will be able to travel a longer distance using the system.

Mr. Stein asked how many inmates would be boarded out to another facility if the variances were not in place. Mr. Meskill said the population number varies but said approximately 12 would be boarded out without the variances. Mr. Stein questioned how long the temporary variances would be in place. Mr. Meskill said his approach with the Commission of Corrections is based on two things: 1) The County has assumed a State responsibility. Last year the State Legislature signed legislation that became effective April, 2009 that states counties will no longer receive any revenues for boarding State-ready inmates or parolees; in the past Tompkins County has budgeted \$120,000 in revenues for this; and 2) When everyone is kept in-house everything is less expensive (defense, services such as OAR, Probation, DSS), and it is easier on families to visit. Mr. Meskill said the variances is up for renewal in July and he hopes the Commission will continue it.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Court System**

**Resolution (DOC ID: 1912): AUTHORIZATION TO EXECUTE A FIVE-YEAR AGREEMENT WITH THE NEW YORK STATE UNIFIED COURT SYSTEM FOR THE PROVISION OF COURT ATTENDANT SERVICES AT THE MAIN COURTHOUSE**

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>RECOMMENDED [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	James Dennis, Member
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Leslyn McBean-Clairborne, Member
<b>AYES:</b>	Shinagawa, Dennis, McBean-Clairborne, Robison, Stein

WHEREAS, all counties in New York State are obligated to provide certain services to the New York State Unified Court System related to the operation of state and county courts; and

WHEREAS, among those services is the support provided by Court Attendants employed by the host county; and

WHEREAS, Tompkins County and the Office of Court Administration (OCA) have agreed upon the number of hours of service required to be provided by Court Attendants; and

WHEREAS, OCA has agreed to reimburse Tompkins County the actual direct expense of providing those Court Attendants; and

WHEREAS, this understanding has been memorialized in a five year agreement between the County and the Unified Court System; and

WHEREAS, the specific maximum dollar amount of the reimbursement is negotiated each year of the five-year term; and

WHEREAS, the maximum dollar amount for year one of the Agreement is \$55,000, now therefore be it

RESOLVED, on recommendation of the Public Safety Committee, That the County Administrator or his designee is authorized to sign a contract with the New York State Unified Court System for the provisions of court security for the period of April 1, 2009 through March 31, 2014.

**SEQR ACTION:** TYPE II-20

\* \* \* \* \*

**OAR - Report or Discussion Item (DOC ID: 1915): OAR Client Services**

Ms. Dietrich submitted statistical information on client services for committee members to review. She said she will provide the Committee will periodic updates of this information.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Department of Emergency Response (DOC ID: 1914): Discussion of External Hazard Analysis**

Mr. Shurtleff spoke of the public officials emergency management conference held last week at Tompkins Cortland Community College. The conference was geared towards bringing along municipalities to develop individual plans that would become part of the County's Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan. He said in 2003 the County adopted a Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan. In developing the Plan there were four major areas that were focused on:

1. Issues of Preparedness and making sure responders and the community are prepared for large-scaled emergencies;
2. Response – internal and external operating procedures;
3. Efforts to develop recovery plans and to develop facilities that would potentially be threatened in the event of any type of disaster and be able to prepare the community for its return to normal;
4. Mitigation – activities that are done to reduce vulnerability of the community to an emergency, both pre-disaster and post-disaster.

Mr. Shurtleff provided an overview of the County's vulnerability/threat assessments that have been conducted in the County and how they relate to the Comprehensive Plan. He said Tompkins County, in 2004, was one of the first County's to submit a mitigation plan to the federal government that

was later approved by FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Administration). At the same time the Town of Dryden, Town of Newfield, and the City of Ithaca were working individually on local plans and chose not to be a part of the multi-jurisdictional approach. At this time they are looking to incorporate those municipalities into the County's plan.

Mr. Shurtleff spoke of the County's overall vulnerability assessment and said the following hazards of concern were identified in order of significance and also reviewed a summary of the qualitative hazard ranking for each.

1. Flood
2. Severe winter storm
3. Utility failure

He also mentioned natural gas development and said that would fit into the hazard mitigation from the standpoint of protecting the aquifers and water resources and said they will carefully watching this. Mr. Shurtleff said the Hazard Mitigation Plan was adopted by the County Legislature and is available online.

He spoke of flooding that occurred in 2006 that resulted in approximately \$3 million in damages. One of the concerns he has is the federal government wants to see formal plans; without a formal plan in place it is possible a community may not be eligible for funding.

Mr. Robison said he attended the presentation at TC3 last week where having a requirement to have mutual aid agreements among municipalities was discussed. He suggested that the Council of Governments discuss this and work to produce a large-scale blanket mutual aid agreement among municipalities. Mr. Shurtleff said this was attempted years ago but wasn't successful.

Mr. Shurtleff provided an update on the County's internal plan and said three years ago an internal review began with discussion focused on how to engage the County workforce and equipment in times of disaster. At that time three scenarios were identified that could impact County operations: loss of utilities, building loss or fire, or a pandemic-type situation. He said efforts on this will soon be resuming.

#### CAD System Update

Mr. Shurtleff provided a brief update on the CAD system, and stated six very serious responses to the request for proposals have been received and will be reviewed over the next few weeks. They will be preparing a request for proposals that will be going out for the alarm receiving equipment that receives information from the PERS equipment and telephone dialers.

Mr. Shurtleff informed the Committee of the unexpected passing this morning of Mr. Les Gifford who served on the Emergency Communications Review and Oversight Committee. Mr. Gifford was very instrumental in setting up training and protocols and procedures for the trunk radio system.

Mrs. McBean-Clairborne asked what the process would be if someone is interested in requesting a call review. Mr. Shurtleff said Lin Hurd is the Dispatch Center Manager; a request should be made to her with the time and event.

#### Department of Probation and Community Justice

Ms. Buechel, Director, announced the Department has just published the 2009 Annual Report and she will circulate copies to the Legislature.

Ms. Buechel spoke of Leander's Law that was passed in August, 2009 and goes into effect on August 13<sup>th</sup>. This Law is an expansion of the Interlock Program and has caused a great amount of furor amongst probation directors across the State. The Law states that any person convicted of a Misdemeanor or Felony DWI and who receives a conditional discharge or a sentence of Probation must have installed an ignition interlock device in their car. She said the Division of Probation and Correctional Alternatives (DPCA) was given the job of promulgating the guidelines of how to implement the law. There are questions about this, such as who will have to pay for this, who can afford to pay, what is the process.

The DPCA produced a first draft of guidelines in March that caused a lot of controversy and subsequently produced a new set a few days ago. The first draft addressed the indigent; however, the second draft remains silent on that. Ms. Buechel said each county is required to produce its own plan by July 1<sup>st</sup>. Ms. Buechel, along with the Sheriff, District Attorney, a Judge appointed by the Chief Administrative Judge, and someone from the Assigned Counsel Program, would participate in putting together this plan.

Ms. Buechel said there were 360 DWI arrests in 2009; however, some likely resulted in a plea to DWAI. The cost of the unit is \$1,200 per year. She also said there are questions about who is going to bare the responsibility to monitor the reports and compliance issues and said the Probation Department does not have the resources to take on an additional unfunded mandate.

\* \* \* \* \*

### **Alternatives-to-Incarceration Evaluation**

Judge Rossiter said she believes all of the figures contained in Ms. Bodnar's presentation are very conservative.

#### **ATI Evaluation – Cost Analysis (Part II) Introduction**

- Cost Analysis of ATI programs compares estimated savings that occur with the use of the programs with the estimated costs of the program.
- In addition, to direct costs and savings the analysis also estimates the additional financial benefits of the program in terms of increased employment, education, and reduced Public Assistance. Ms. Bodnar noted all figures presented are estimates only.

### **Presentation Outline**

Explanation of estimate for Jail cost savings  
Explanation of additional savings and revenue  
Explanation of estimate for program costs  
Explanation of additional financial benefits

### **Estimating Costs of Jail Days saved**

Calculated jail costs saved based on boardout costs as jail close or over capacity 2004-2009  
Cost per of board out between 2004-2009 ~\$82/day  
Overhead costs associated with boardout include medical, transportation, and labor equals ~15% of boardout  
Total estimated cost =\$94/day

### **Felony Drug Court Estimated Jail Days**

- The number of jail days for drug court clients based on estimate of sentence in the absence of drug court

- Felony Drug Court estimated sentences based on guidance given by Judge Rowley and Judge Sherman
- Estimate that 25% would have been sent to prison
- For the remaining 75% half would have been sentenced to a full year in jail
- The other half would receive a split sentence of six months jail and probation
- Total of 74 graduates
- Prison: 18 persons x 42 days = 756
- Full year local: 28 x 240 jail days = 6,720
- Split sentence: 28 x 120 jail days = 3,360
- Total = 10,836 jail days

#### **Felony Drug Court Estimated Jail Sanction Days**

- As a sanction for non-compliance with drug court requirements participants may be remanded to jail for a specified period of time.
- Given there would be no jail sanction in the absence of drug court the number of jail sanction days needs to be subtracted from saved jail days.
- The estimated jail sanction days for Felony Treatment Court from 2004-2009 = 1,150

#### **Felony Drug Court Estimated Inpatient Wait**

- In addition to jail sanction, participants may spend time in jail awaiting door-to-door transport to inpatient treatment
- The inpatient wait days was estimated on the expected percentage of inpatient referral that would be remanded to jail
- The number of inpatient referrals from court data base and percentage based on 2009 percentage of FDTC referrals for jail evaluation and inpatient transportation

#### **Felony Drug Court Estimated Inpatient Wait**

- The number of inpatient referrals between 2004-Sep 2009 = 114
- Estimated % with jail waits = 70%
- Estimated inpatient waits = 80
- Average days for inpatient wait (from 2009 jail evaluation data) = 26
- Estimated inpatient wait days in jail for Felony Treatment Court from 2004-2009 = 2,080

#### **Felony Drug Court Estimated Jail Days Cost Saved**

- Estimated Jail days saved = 10,836
- Estimated Jail sanction days = 1,150
- Estimated Inpatient wait days = 2,080
- Net Jail days saved = 7,606
- Cost per day = \$94
- Total Jail costs saved = \$714,964

Judge Rossiter noted that anyone sentenced to less than one year of jail would serve that time in the Tompkins County Jail. She said this program is truly an alternative-to-incarceration for anyone who is a participant in the Felony Drug Court.

#### **Additional Savings and Revenue**

- Community Service: 1,144x7.15=\$8,180
  - DWI Finds: 47 graduates charged with DWI x \$1,000 = \$47,000
- Total = \$55,180

**Felony Drug Court Estimated Program Costs**

- Probation, Assigned Counsel, Forensic Mental Health Counselor, Facilities

**Felony Drug Court Estimated Probation Costs**

- Time allocated exclusively for Drug Court = 37%
- The remaining time would need to be spent on mandated services to probationers even in the absence of Drug Court
- Salary and fringe costs 2004-2009 = \$297,208 (local cost)

**Felony Drug Court Estimated Assigned Counsel Costs**

- Assigned Counsel costs are estimated based on information from Assigned Counsel Department of actual costs for Felony Treatment Court from 2007-2009, 10% is subtracted as these would be incurred even in the absence of the FDTC. Judge Rossiter said the majority, if not all of participants, are assigned counsel.
- Costs for 2004-2005 were estimated based on average costs for 2006-2009
- Total estimated costs for Assigned Counsel 2004-2009 = \$160,474

**Felony Drug Court Estimated Mental Health Costs**

- Assigned Counsel costs are estimated based on information from Mental Health Department on costs for Felony Treatment Court from 2004-2009.
- One Forensic Mental Health Counselor provides services and consultation to all three programs. Hence, one-third of costs are assigned to each program.
- Total estimated costs for Mental Health 2004-2009 = \$149,707

**Felony Drug Court Estimated Facilities Costs**

- Felony Drug Court, Ithaca City Drug Court, Family Treatment Court and Day Reporting are all housed in the Community Justice Center.
- Costs estimated based on 2009 facilities costs with an estimated 3% increase in cost per year
- Total estimated costs for facilities 2004-2009 = \$76,779

**Felony Drug Court Estimated Total Program Costs**

- Probation = \$297,208
- Assigned Counsel = \$160,474
- Mental Health = \$149,707
- Facilities = \$76,779
- Total = \$684,168

**Felony Drug Court Savings-Costs Comparison**

- Net Jail days savings = \$714,964
- Addition savings = \$55,180
- Total program costs = \$64,168
- NET TOTAL Savings 2004-2009 = \$85,976
- Average ANNUAL Savings = \$14,952

**Felony Drug Court Additional Economic Benefits**

- During their participation in drug courts, participants are able to maintain and gain employment, improve their educational status and exit public assistance
- Each of these provides economic benefits to the County in terms of dollars spent on goods and services

**Felony Drug Court Economic Benefit of Employment**

- The average annual income of a drug court participant with full-time employment was estimated to be \$18,200
- This is equivalent to an average \$10 per hour wage for a 35-hour work week, for 52 weeks in a year
- The analysis includes both jobs gained and maintained as participants with jobs at program entry would have lost these had they been sentenced to jail

**Felony Drug Court Economic Benefit of Employment**

- Participant income for FT employment maintained =  $32 \times \$18,200 = \$582,400$
- Participant income for PT employment maintained =  $7 \times \$9,100 = \$63,700$
- Participant income for FT employment gained =  $25 \times \$18,200 = \$455,000$
- Total One-year participant income for employment = \$1,101,100

**Felony Drug Economic Benefit of Education**

Ms. Bodnar noted that according to the Census Bureau when an individual goes from having no high school diploma to getting a diploma or GED, their earning potential increases by 50%.

- The estimated increased earning for a participant receiving their GED =  $\$7.15/\text{hour} \times 0.5 = \$3.57$
- Increased FT wages =  $\$3.57 \times 35 \times 52 = \$6,506$
- Total one-year increased income =  $5 \times \$6,506 = \$32,532$

**Felony Drug Court Reduced Public Assistance Costs**

- A total of 15 graduates exited Public Assistance
- The annual costs for an individual receiving cash assistance benefits = \$5,556. For single individuals 50% of this cost is covered by the County
- TOTAL Savings =  $15 \times \$5,556 = \$83,340$
- Local Savings = \$41,670

**Felony Drug Court Total Additional Economic Benefits**

- Employment wages: \$1,101,100
- Education increased earning potential: \$32,532
- Reduced PA: \$41,670
- TOTAL One-year benefit: \$1,175,302
- Average annual; \$204,400

**Community Treatment Court Estimated Jail Days**

- Total of 90 graduates (2004-2009)
- A Misdemeanor max: one-year  $15 \times 240 + 15 \times 240 = 5,400$
- A Misdemeanor max split: 60 days jail and probation  $15 \times 40 + 15 \times 20 = 900$
- Probation only: 30 persons x 0 jail days = 0
- TOTAL = 6,300 jail days

**Effects of Changes on ICTC on Program Costs and Savings**

- In 2007, two significant changes occurred that effected the ICTC
- Change in District Attorney: change in sentencing structure that provides more incentive to engage in drug court
- Change in Presiding Judge: different philosophy with regard to using jail sanctions and jail for inpatient waits
- Present program savings and costs for entire period and separated 2004-2006 and 2007-2009

**Program Costs and Savings 2004-2006**

- Total of 42 graduates
- A Misdemeanor Max: One-year  $7 \times 240 + 7 \times 120 = 2,520$
- A Misdemeanor Max Split: 60 days Jail and Probation  $7 \times 40 + 7 \times 20 = 420$
- Probation Only: 14 persons x 0 jail days = 0
- Total = 2,940 Jail days

**Program Costs and Savings 2007-2009**

- Total of 48 graduates
- A Misdemeanor Max: One-year  $8 \times 240 + 8 \times 120 = 2,880$
- A Misdemeanor Max Split: 60 days Jail and Probation  $8 \times 40 + 8 \times 20 = 480$
- Probation Only: 16 persons x 0 jail days = 0
- Total = 3,360 Jail days

**Community Treatment Court Estimated Jail Sanction Days**

- 2004-2009 = 864
- 2004-2006 = 787
- 2007-2009 = 77

**Community Treatment Court Estimated Inpatient Wait Days**

- Total inpatient referral between 2004-September 2009 = 136
- Percentage estimated based on 2009 data for 2007- 2009 (10%). The number of days for 2004-2006 based on same relative increase for number of jail sanctions (10x)
- 2007-2009 = 58 referrals x 0.10 x 26 days = 156
- 2004-2006 = 156 x 10 x 26 days = 1,560
- 2004-2009 = 1,560 + 156 x 26 days = 1,716

**Community Treatment Court Estimated NET Jail Days Savings**

- Jail Days savings = estimated jail days saved – jail sanction days – inpatient wait days
- 2004-2009 = \$349,680
- 2004-2006 = \$55,742
- 2007-2009 = \$293,938

**Community Treatment Court Additional Savings and Revenue**

- Community Service Hours x \$7.15
- +DWI fines x (Misdemeanor DWI \$500-\$1,000)
- 2004-2009 = \$19,188
- 2004-2006 = \$11,683
- 2007-2009 = \$7,504

**Community Treatment Court Program Costs**

Probation + Assigned Counsel + Mental Health + Facilities

- 2004-2009 = \$659,261
- 2004-2006 = \$351,313
- 2007-2009 = \$308,222

**Community Treatment Comparison Savings-Costs**

- 2004-2009 = \$290,393 (Annual Average = \$50,503)
- 2004-2006 = \$283,888 (Annual Average = \$94,629)
- 2007-2009 = \$6,780 (Annual Average = \$2,465)

- Estimated cost full period at lower level \$14,174

**Community Treatment Court Total Additional Economic Benefits**

- Employment: \$500,500
- Education; \$32,532
- Increased PA = \$11,112
- Total One-Year: \$563,818
- Average Annual: \$98,055

**Day Reporting Estimated Jail Days Savings**

- For persons remanded to Day Reporting, if there was no Day Reporting they would be in jail for same period of time
- TOTAL number of participant days from June, 2006 thru September 2009 = 7,924 jail days
- Estimated Jail Days Savings = \$744,856

**Day Reporting Program Costs**

- Probation Staffing Costs = \$675,083
- Forensic Mental Health Counselor = \$71,135
- Facilities costs = \$45,009
- Total Program costs = \$794,227

**Day Reporting Savings-Cost Comparison**

- Jail Days Savings = \$744,856
- Additional Savings = \$8,744
- Program Costs = \$794,227
- TOTAL Net Cost = \$40,627
- Average Annual Net Cost = \$12,500

**Day Reporting Additional Economic Benefits**

- Employment: 200 jobs obtained  
FT (100) = \$3,640,000 PT (100) = \$1,820,000
- Education; 44 individuals obtained GED  
FT = \$286,264
- Persons with Employment Exiting PA: 38  
Total Savings = \$211,128  
Local Savings = \$105,564
- Total One-year Economic Benefit: \$3,121,828

**Summary ATI Program Savings-Cost Comparisons**

- TOTAL Jail Days Savings:  
Felony Tx Court = \$714,964 (2004-2009)  
City Tx Court = \$349,680\* (2004-2009)  
Day Reporting = \$744,856 (2006-2009)  
TOTAL = \$1,809,500
- TOTAL Additional Savings:  
Felony Tx Court = \$55,180 (2004-2009)  
City Tx Court = \$19,188 (2004-2009)  
Day Reporting - \$8,744 (2006-2009)  
TOTAL = \$83,112

**Summary ATI Program Savings-Cost Comparisons**

- TOTAL Program Costs:
  - Felony Tx Court = \$684,168 (2004-2009)
  - City Tx Court = \$659,261 (2004-2009)
  - Day Reporting - \$794,270 (2006-2009)
  - TOTAL = \$2,137,656
  - Total Program Savings = \$1,892,612
  - TOTAL NET Costs = \$245,055

**Summary ATI Program Additional Economic Benefits**

- Employment
  - Felony Tx Court = \$1,101,100 (2004-2009)
  - City Tx Court = \$542,400 (2004-2009)
  - Day Reporting - \$2,730,000 (2007-2009)
  - TOTAL =\$4,373,500
  
- Education
  - Felony Tx Court = \$32,532 (2004-2009)
  - City Tx Court = \$32,532 (2004-2009)
  - Day Reporting - \$286,264 (2007-2009)
  - TOTAL =\$351,324

**Summary ATI Program additional Economic Benefits**

- Exits from Public Assistance
  - Felony tx Court = \$41,670 (2004-2009)
  - City Tx Court = \$5,556 (2004-2009)
  - Day Reporting = \$105,564 (2007-2009)
  - TOTAL = \$141,678
  
- TOTAL One-Year Economic Benefit = \$4,866,502

**Final Summary**

- There was a net cost to the County of \$257,974 for the ATI programs from 2004-September, 2009 (drug courts) and June 2006-September, 2009 (Day Reporting).
- Additional economic benefits of \$4,866,502, if only 10% (~six weeks of employment) of economic benefit is realized (\$486,580) the ATI program would be a benefit to the community.
- In addition, there are numerous social benefits that result from reduced substance use such as improved work productivity, relationship in family and connections with community.

Judge Rossiter said one way she has tried to reduce jail days is sending people who need to be at an inpatient facility to the Day Reporting Program to make phone calls to centers to check on availability. She has found that individuals are placed in centers must faster than going to the jail and waiting for a bed to open.

Ms. Bodnar recommended, based on speaking with judges, that work be focused on the younger adult participants.

Mr. Stein said if he were making this presentation to he would say these programs don't cost the County anything and do a lot of good for many people. He voiced skepticism over some of the figures contained in the additional economic benefits.

Mr. Robison was excused at 5:25 p.m.

Minutes  
Public Safety Committee  
Monday, April 5, 2010

Judge Rossiter said there are many intangible numbers, but said whatever money the participants were spending prior to going into the ATI program was spent on drugs and in many cases by stealing from local businesses. Once they go through the program and no longer use drugs they will be more likely spending their money on more legitimate items. These programs also help prevent babies from being born into an addiction problem.

Ms. Robertson said in 1998 the County had a significant overcrowding problem in the Jail. The LaBella study did a projection of needed capacity and LaBella was confident that by 2001 additional jail beds (total of 120) would be needed; and if all of the ATI programs were instituted it may reduce that number by approximately 10%. Ms. Robertson said Tompkins County implemented a series of programs at that time and although the number fluctuates, 90 is a high population number. She said Tompkins County has changed the long-term projection for jail population by instituting these ATI programs.

The Committee extended its appreciation to Ms. Bodnar for her work on this report. Ms. Bodnar will e-mail the Power Point Presentation to Committee members.

#### **Approval of Minutes**

It was MOVED by Mr. Dennis, seconded by Mr. Stein, and unanimously adopted by voice vote by members present, to approve the minutes of March 1, 2010 as submitted. MINUTES APPROVED.

#### **Adjournment**

On motion the meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Michelle Pottorff, TC Legislature Office