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The Council of State Governments Justice Center

National nonprofit, nonpartisan membership association of state government officials that engages members of all three branches of state government.

The Justice Center provides practical, nonpartisan advice informed by the best available evidence.
What is Justice Reinvestment?

A data-driven approach to reduce corrections spending and reinvest savings in strategies that can decrease recidivism and increase public safety.

The Justice Reinvestment Initiative is supported by funding from the U.S. Department of Justice’s Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) and The Pew Charitable Trusts.
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In FY2014, just **19 PERCENT** of felony sentences were to probation. In other states, this rate is higher: nationally, it is 27 percent; in Idaho, 58 percent, and in Kansas, 69 percent.

The majority of people sentenced for offenses under the lowest felony class (Class C) receive sentences to prison, where their average length of stay is 10 months, a costly sanction that provides limited options for programs that can lower recidivism. Sentencing people convicted of a Class C offense to probation, however, enables a sentence of up to 5 years that provides longer periods of accountability and monitoring. Probationers can receive treatment as needed, be sanctioned for failure to comply with conditions, and be revoked and sentenced to prison.
On any given day, **27 PERCENT** of North Dakota’s prison beds are occupied by people who were on probation and parole supervision prior to being revoked to serve a term in prison.

Probation and parole revocations impose substantial costs for county governments as well: 33 percent of people revoked from probation are required to serve terms in jail. 45 percent of revocations from probation involved no new criminal offenses; the probationer violated the conditions of his or her supervision. In surveys, probation and parole officers indicated they are seeking additional tools—sanctions, incentives, and treatment where needed—to hold probationers and parolees accountable.
THIRD CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM CHALLENGE

There is a substantial need for substance use treatment, and barriers exist to accessing adequate care.

Probation and parole officers believe that **75 PERCENT** of people on supervision have a need for substance use treatment, and POs indicate long wait periods to access behavioral health treatment.

A shortage of behavioral health treatment is a factor underpinning many of North Dakota’s criminal justice challenges. This issue has been raised by numerous criminal justice system stakeholders, including local law enforcement, prosecutors, judges, and defense attorneys. Over a three-year period, from 2011 to 2014, the number of felony sentences for drug offenses increased two-and-a-half times. In 2014, four out of five felony drug sentences were for possession.
Ten-year cost of relying on contracted capacity to accommodate projected prison growth

Current contract beds (530) *carried forward through 2025* $220M

Population growth (1,310) *carried through 2025* $265M

**Total Estimated Cost of Accommodating Prison Growth Through Contract Beds** $485M

*daily rate estimate is $114/day*

Building a **NEW STATE PRISON** would add costs above the contract beds

**OUT-OF-STATE CONTRACT BEDS** likely would be needed, possibly increasing collateral costs

Contract beds within the state of North Dakota are **NOT ADEQUATELY EQUIPPED** to handle inmates’ special needs

Source: DOCR emails (2015-17 contract facility budget information and DOCR facility cost-per-day figures); DOCR housing data; DOCR inmate projections; “Locking Up North Dakota,” DOCR 2015.
CSG Justice Center staff are pursuing regional perspectives in stakeholder engagement, reflecting the state’s size and diversity.

Statewide Surveys

District court judges and probation and parole officers participated in online CSG Justice Center staff surveys. 62 percent of district court judges responded, and 71 percent of probation and parole officers responded.
Stakeholder input informs the data analysis presented today.

**Incarceration Issues Committee**
Individual meetings/calls with working group members and their staff

**North Dakota Legislature**
Meetings with senators and House representatives

**Courts**
Meetings/calls with individual judges, state attorneys, and the Attorney General’s Office; administration of a judicial survey; and court observations

**Community and Tribal Organizations**
Turtle Mountain Tribal Council, NDACo, Indian Affairs Commission, Three Affiliated Tribes, CAWS North Dakota, North Dakota Council on Abused Women Services Coalition, and North Dakota Board of Addiction Counseling Services

**Corrections**
Meetings with DOCR staff, Centre Inc., and the Dakota Women’s Correctional Rehab Center; probation officers survey; and observation of probation reporting sessions

**Behavioral Health**
DHS, Regional Human Services Centers, Ruth Meiers Hospitality Center, ADAPT Inc., Heartview Foundation, Heart River Alcohol and Drug Abuse Services, Native American Resource Center, and Choice Recovery Counseling

**Law Enforcement**
Burleigh, Ward, and Cass County Police Department; Bismarck and Minot Police Department; Rolette, Bottineau, Pierce, Stark, and Williams County Sheriff’s Office; Southwest Multi Correction Center; and presented at the joint Chiefs and Sheriffs Associations meeting
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Justice reinvestment goals explored in today’s presentations:

- Avoid hundreds of millions in corrections spending
- Improve services and resources for victims of crime
- Reduce recidivism with stronger supervision
- Expand access to high-quality programs and treatment
The core tenets of justice reinvestment are interconnected and build upon one another to create an impact.

AVERT PRISON GROWTH

INCREASE PUBLIC SAFETY

Lower Recidivism

North Dakota Justice Reinvestment Framework

Hold People Accountable in the Community
Content of today’s presentation

• Is the **first draft** of an eventual policy package. There will be several more iterations before the bill is finalized for submissions.

• The purpose of the presentation and today’s bill draft is to spark discussion and to work toward **consensus on ideas to move forward**.

• Not all ideas discussed to date are included in today’s content. **Additional material** will be brought forward at the September meeting.

• It is likely that not all ideas included in today’s presentation or bill draft will be included in the final **bill filed in October**.

• The goal of today’s presentation is to discuss the **ideas and intent** of the proposed policies. Individual meetings will be set to review **specific language** contained in the bill draft.

• Cost aversion and **impact estimates** will be provided at the next meeting.
Content of today’s presentation

• You may notice discrepancies between the bill draft distributed today and ideas presented in these slides. Conversations with a number of stakeholders shaped these policy ideas, and some changes were made while the official bill draft was processing in the North Dakota system.

• Ideas presented in these slides are more current than language in the bill draft.

• We will be speaking with each member of the Incarceration Issues Committee to discuss these details more in depth.
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More than 30 North Dakota victim advocates have participated in the justice reinvestment process.

**ORGANIZATIONS ENGAGED:**

- Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Program Directors and Advocates from Beulah, Washburn, Dickinson, Jamestown, Bismarck, Grand Forks, Minot and Bottineau, and Grafton
- Member of the Batterers Treatment Forum
- CAWS North Dakota
- FBI Victim Advocate
- First Nations Women’s Alliance
- Crime Victim Compensation
- CJIS/SAVIN Staff
POLICY OPTION #1: Create stronger protections for survivors of domestic violence and help promote reform and recovery for batterers.
Domestic violence presents a significant threat to public safety.

Between 1992 and 2014, 136 people were murdered in North Dakota during incidents of domestic violence. The North Dakota Domestic Violence Fatality Review Commission reviewed these incidents and found several common factors:

- One or both parties had a **history of prior domestic violence incidents**; the majority of those incidents resulted in involvement with law enforcement and the criminal justice system.

- One or both parties had a **history of alcohol or substance use** sometimes in conjunction with a history of treatment for mental illness or a chronic health condition.

52% of homicide deaths in ND involved domestic violence

North Dakota Domestic Violence Fatality Report, 2014
1A. Require that all defendants with pending charges related to domestic violence undergo a pretrial risk assessment, including a **lethality assessment**, to inform decisions to detain or release before trial. *This policy plank has not yet been incorporated into legislation or court rule.*

1B. Require that sentences for offenses defined as domestic violence include a **period of probation**, even for misdemeanor offenses. *This policy plank has not yet been incorporated into legislation or court rule.*
There are 9 Batterer’s Treatment Programs across the state that work within the minimum guidelines for programming.

Not all programming submitted to the courts follows the Adult Batterers Treatment Standards of North Dakota; someone ordered to complete treatment may attend a 26-week course or they may complete a significantly shorter online course.
Courts have no reassurance that the programming received by a defendant is effective.

Both batterers treatment and anger management are currently included in sentences for domestic violence offenses.

Batterer’s intervention programs (BIP) have been shown to reduce harm at greater rates than anger management programs.

---

**Percentage of Outcomes for Defendants Who Participated in BIP versus Those Who Did Not**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>BIP Participants</th>
<th>Other DV Defendants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subsequent arraignment</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsequent arraignment for violent offenses</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsequent restraining order</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

North Dakota Domestic Violence Fatality Report, 2014*
Local jurisdictions saw a 70-percent reduction or more in criminal justice system involvement after individuals completed BIP.

Grand Forks tracked the outcomes of 294 participants in their Batterers Treatment Programming between 2004–2013.

### Law Enforcement and Court Activity for Offenders Who Completed New Choices Between 2004 and 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2 years before and year of completing program</th>
<th>2 years after completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LE Incident Reports</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convictions</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection Orders</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community Violence Intervention Center data, 2016
1C. The sentence for a domestic violence offense must include an order to complete a batterers intervention program as a condition of probation. Location in draft policy: page 7, lines 1–6.

1D. A batterers intervention standards oversight committee shall be formed to establish minimum standards for BIPs, revise the standards as is deemed necessary, and make the standards available to the public. Location in draft policy: page 7, lines 12–29 and page 8, lines 1–15.

1E. A batterers intervention program must be certified by the state in order to meet the conditions of probation. Location in draft policy: page 7, lines 7–9.
Key ways to support victims of crime

ADDITIONAL AREAS TO EXPLORE:

Opportunities to improve benefits available to victims of crime through the crime victim compensation program

Opportunities to improve consistency in enforcing orders of protection issued in Indian Country

Opportunities to implement victim notification improvements and systems changes to ensure all victims are enrolled in SAVIN
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Key ways to avert growth in jail and prison populations and avert growing corrections costs

**POLICY OPTION 2:** Hold people with lower-level offenses accountable with probation and treatment

**POLICY OPTION 3:** Tailor responses to supervision violations based on risk and seriousness

**POLICY OPTION 4:** Increase use of good time sentence reductions to limit time in incarceration
Class C felonies are a broad offense class that comprises nearly two-thirds of all admissions to prison.

North Dakota’s sentence structure lacks distinction between offenses containing and not containing violence. As a result, negligent homicide and second offense of possession of drug paraphernalia fall within the same felony class.

The state could avert significant savings by diverting some of these offenses to alternatives to incarceration.

### 2014 Prison Admissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Average Length of Stay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drug</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>7.8 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>11.6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>17.6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>13.7 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Other" offenses include DUI, traffic offenses, obstruction, escape, and other offenses. Misdemeanor A offenses made up 3% of FY2014 prison admissions.

Source: DOCR prison admission data files
Incarceration for lower-level offenses creates significant costs for the state and counties without changing the behaviors that lead to recidivism.

**Sentencing options for people with lower-level drug offenses**

- **JAIL OR PRISON**
  - 8 months of incarceration at $113.59/day
  - **$27,262 total cost**

- **PROBATION**
  - 2 years of supervision at $4.24/day
  - **$3,095 total cost**

**Probation provides options to change behavior and lower risk**

- Tailor supervision intensity based on risk of recidivism and other public safety characteristics
- Respond to violations with sanctions
- Refer to programs addressing risks and needs
- Revoke from probation and resentencing to incarceration

*Percentages shown are based on FY2014 activity.*
*Source: CSG Justice Center analysis of Administrative Office of the Courts sentencing data; correspondence with DOCR*
POLICY
OPTION #2

Avert prison growth by holding people with lower-level offenses accountable with probation and treatment.

2A. Separate the more than 350 class C felonies into two classes of offenses. Retain some offenses as class C felonies and move certain offenses to class A misdemeanors. Retain current penalties for class C felonies. Location in draft policy: page 9, lines 2–17.

2B. Statutorily establish that the court will impose a sentence of probation or a fully suspended incarceration sentence for class A misdemeanors. Location in draft policy: page 9, lines 18–24.

2C. Statutorily establish that the court will impose a sentence of community service for class B misdemeanors. Location in draft policy: page 9, line 25–Page 10, line 2.
POLICY OPTION #2

Avert prison growth by holding people with lower-level offenses accountable with **probation and treatment.**

**2D. Allow exceptions for sentences to incarceration** if the person is concurrently or consecutively sentenced to imprisonment on a more serious charge or there are substantial and compelling reasons the defendant cannot be effectively and safely supervised in the community. *Location in draft policy: page 9, lines 8–13, lines 22–24, line 29–lines 2 on page 10.*
Restructuring how violations escalate into revocations could divert over half of current revocations to alternative sanctions.

Reducing revocations for technical violations by just **10%** could avert as much as **$2.8 million** in state spending that can be reinvested in programs and treatment.
Avert growth in incarcerated populations by tailoring responses to supervision based on risk and seriousness.

**3A. Classify violations of probation and parole** into compliance violations, risk violations, and revocation violations. *Location in draft policy: page 4, lines 8–26, and page 13, lines 11–29.*

**3B.** Restrict responses to compliance violations to community sanctions or short periods of incarceration. *Location in draft policy: page 4, lines 9–16, and page 13, lines 12–19.*

**3C.** Allow community sanctions or longer periods of confinement of up to 30 days for risk violations. *Location in draft policy: page 4, lines 17–22, and page 13, lines 20–25.*

**3D.** Allow for the initiation of revocation proceedings for revocation violations. *Location in draft policy: page 4, lines 22–26, and page 13, lines 26–29.*
Earned-time sentence reductions for pretrial and jail sentences would enable reinvestment in crime-reduction strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUPPORT FOR POLICY OPTION #4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three interventions that provide substantially different benefits per dollar spent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **DETER CRIME**
  - Increase law enforcement’s ability to use hot spot strategies and deploy additional officers to increase the perceived certainty of apprehension.

- **REDUCE RECIDIVISM**
  - Use high-quality supervision (risk, need, responsivity), consistent sanctioning, and high-quality treatment programs tailored to needs.

- **PROLONG INCAPACITATION**
  - Increase length of stay to hold moderate- to high-risk offenders in prison for an additional 3 months, adding 250 to the prison population.

---

**Benefit to Cost Ratio**

- **$$$$$$$**
- **$$$$$$$**
- **$$**

POLICY OPTION #4

Incentivize good behavior and reduce incarcerated populations by creating **good time sentence reductions** for individuals with sentences to jail.

4A. Performance criteria includes participation in court-ordered or staff-recommended **treatment** and **education programs** and **good work performance**. *Location in draft policy: page 2, lines 3–6.*

4B. While incarcerated in a correctional facility, an offender may earn no more than a one-day sentence reduction per six days served. An inmate sentenced to jail may receive good time sentence reductions for any sentence for which incarceration time is longer than 60 days. *Location in draft policy: page 2, lines 7–8 and 10–11.*

4C. An offender may receive **sentence reduction for time spent in custody** prior to sentence and commitment but is not eligible for sentence reduction or sentence reduction credit for time on pretrial probation or other community supervision. *Location in draft policy: page 2, lines 8–10.*
OVERVIEW

01  Project Update

02  Goals and Process

03  Policies to Support Victims of Crime

04  Policies to Avert Growth in Prison Populations and Corrections Costs

05  Policies to Reduce Recidivism by Strengthening Community Supervision

06  Next Steps
Key ways to reduce recidivism and strengthen community supervision

**POLICY OPTION 5:** Use swift, certain, and proportionate sanctions and incentives for individuals on probation or parole.

**POLICY OPTION 6:** Frontload supervision resources during the period when risk of recidivism is the highest.

**POLICY OPTION 7:** Focus supervision resources on those most likely to reoffend.

**POLICY OPTION 8:** Ensure that people who have committed violent offences and are released from prison to the community are supervised.
Improve swift and certain responses to supervision violations to increase accountability and avert substantial costs to the state and counties.

Revocation rates are for FY2014 and include revocations for any reason.

Source: DOCR supervision data
POLICY OPTION #5

Reduce recidivism by improving use of *swift, certain, and proportionate sanctions* for probationers and parolees.

5A. Require the probation and parole systems to apply intermediate measures and incentives in accordance with a **formalized matrix of behaviors and corresponding responses**. The matrix must require officers to respond swiftly, certainly, and proportionately to the defendant based on the individual’s risk of reoffending and the severity of the violation and be used in pursuit of improved compliance. *Location in draft policy: page 5, lines 1–3, and page 14, lines 6–8.*

5B. When a petition for revocation is submitted to the court, it must include documentation of violations and responses to violations imposed by probation or parole officers. *Location in draft policy: page 14, lines 9–10.*
Most recidivism occurs in the first year of supervision, creating the need for frontloading resources.

Overall 3-year re-arrest rate is 56% (cumulative across the 36 months in graph at left).

Once “at risk” of being arrested (i.e. recidivating), 2–3% of the cohort are getting arrested each month early on, but that falls to about 1% per month by month 24.
Frontload supervision resources during the period when risk of recidivism is the highest.

**6A.** Maintain current caps on **three-year probation terms** for class AA, class A, class B and class C felony offenses and maintain the **360-day probation cap** for class B misdemeanors. *Location in draft policy: page 11, lines 8–11.*

**6B.** **Reduce the cap** for class A misdemeanors to one year. *Location in draft policy: page 9, lines 19–24.*
The average probation term exceeds two years, challenging efforts to focus resources when risk is the highest.

**FY2014 Probation Terminations—Average Length of Stay by Supervision Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervision Level</th>
<th>Months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diversion (n = 550)</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum (n = 345)</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (n = 781)</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum (n = 469)</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Court (n = 75)</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Classified (n = 979)</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Less than one percent of probation cases were missing supervision level.

Source: DOCR supervision data

Proposed termination point for compliant probationers
POLICY OPTION #7

Reduce probation caseloads to focus on those most likely to reoffend by automatically terminating supervision.

7A. A defendant is eligible for presumptive termination and discharge from probation after a period of 12 consecutive months on probation without a risk or revocation violation. Exemptions to automatic termination are made for violent offenders. Location in draft policy: page 16, lines 26–31 and page 17, lines 1–2.

7B. If a departure is made from the presumptive termination, the judge shall state on the record the reason for denying discharge from supervision. Location in draft policy: page 17, lines 7–11.

7C. A defendant with outstanding fines, fees, or restitution orders is not eligible for early termination, but may be placed on the lowest level of supervision for the remainder of the payment schedule. Location in draft policy: page 17, lines 2–4.
A much larger portion of people with 85-percent sentences are released without post-release supervision than all other sentences.

29% of inmates in prison for 85% offenses are released with no supervision, compared to only 4% of inmates in prison for other offenses.

Rates shown are for releases from prison during FY2014.

Source: DOCR prison release data files
Reduce recidivism and improve public safety by ensuring that violent offenders have **post-release supervision**.

**8A.** Require violent offenders as defined in subsection 1 of 12.1-32-09.1 to have one year of **post-release supervision**. *Location in draft policy: page 17, lines 29–30.*
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Next steps

• CSG Justice Center staff will **compile comments** from today’s discussion.

• Justice Center staff will meet with Incarceration Issues Committee members to **discuss bill draft language** and additional ideas.

• Bill language will be drafted around **known topics for inclusion**, such as pretrial processes, additional policies to support victims, improvements around data collection, and strengthening existing evidence-based practices.

• A new bill draft will be **submitted in September** to reflect these conversations, corrections, and new ideas.

• **Cost aversion and impact projections** will be calculated based on the updated bill draft to be presented in September.
Sample of impact projection modeling from a previous justice reinvestment state
Sample of averted costs and reinvestment from previous justice reinvestment state

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Averted Costs</th>
<th>FY2016</th>
<th>FY2017</th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
<th>FY2020</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operational Costs Averted</td>
<td>$4.0M</td>
<td>$9.1M</td>
<td>$10.4M</td>
<td>$10.6M</td>
<td>$10.6M</td>
<td>$44.8M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Construction Costs Averted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$261.6M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Averted Costs</strong></td>
<td>$4.0M</td>
<td>$9.1M</td>
<td>$10.4M</td>
<td>$10.6M</td>
<td>$10.6M</td>
<td>$306.4M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reinvestments</th>
<th>FY2016</th>
<th>FY2017</th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
<th>FY2020</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase the number of probation officers</td>
<td>$0.1M</td>
<td>$0.9M</td>
<td>$2.0M</td>
<td>$2.5M</td>
<td>$2.5M</td>
<td>$8.0M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based programs and treatment to reduce recidivism</td>
<td>$2.0M</td>
<td>$5.0M</td>
<td>$5.0M</td>
<td>$5.0M</td>
<td>$5.0M</td>
<td>$22.0M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve parole supervision</td>
<td>$0.3M</td>
<td>$0.3M</td>
<td>$0.3M</td>
<td>$0.3M</td>
<td>$0.3M</td>
<td>$1.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability policies</td>
<td>$0.5M</td>
<td>$0.2M</td>
<td>$0.2M</td>
<td>$0.2M</td>
<td>$0.2M</td>
<td>$1.3M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Reinvestment</strong></td>
<td>$2.9M</td>
<td>$6.4M</td>
<td>$7.5M</td>
<td>$8.0M</td>
<td>$8.0M</td>
<td>$32.8M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Savings</strong></td>
<td>$1.1M</td>
<td>$2.7M</td>
<td>$2.9M</td>
<td>$2.6M</td>
<td>$2.6M</td>
<td>$273.6M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
North Dakota Justice Reinvestment Timeline

- **Press Conference & Project Launch**
- **Meeting 1**
  - Initial Analysis
- **Meeting 2**
  - April 20 Interim Report
- **Meeting 3**
  - June 7 Interim Report
- **Meeting 4**
  - TBD Final Analysis
- **Meeting 7**
  - TBD Policy Options Discussed
  - Legislation Pre-Filed
- **Legislative Session**

**Data Analysis**

- Jan 2017

**Stakeholder Engagement**

- Policymaker & Stakeholder Engagement, Briefings, Policy Development
- Ongoing Engagement
Thank You

Michelle Rodriguez, Program Associate
mrodriguez@csg.org

Receive monthly updates about justice reinvestment states across the country as well as other CSG Justice Center Programs.

Sign up at:
CSGJUSTICECENTER.ORG/SUBSCRIBE
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