



# GOOD TIME Q&A with MJA Sat 16 Jan 2021

Sat, 1/16 3:01PM 57:06

## SUMMARY KEYWORDS

people, michigan, sentence, crime, facilities, day, lawmakers, states, law, incarcerated, bill, state, introduce, sentencing, presentation, served, individuals, signatures, ballot initiative, prison

## SPEAKERS

Mariah, Jessica Siminski, Jack Wagner, Danielle, Audience question

**M** Mariah 03:05  
If you would like to get started?

**J** Jack Wagner 03:08  
Absolutely. Well I'd first like to thank everyone for joining us on a Saturday morning. We are Michigan justice advocacy. And this is our good time initiative townhall, we'd like to use this time to update everyone and share with you our, our focus and goals. I will go through a quick agenda here for us. It says here the meeting will be recorded. Unfortunately, that is not the case today. We're having some technical difficulties so you can ignore the first point. What I'd like to do is walk through a simple 15 minute or so presentation. And this is the presentation that we would be giving to lawmakers when we meet with them and introduce ourselves other key stakeholders, other national criminal justice organizations, and so on so you are now going to get the same presentation that we have been discussing with, like I said, the key stakeholders in this topic. So during the presentation. Feel free to write down questions put them in the chat box and we'll have a chance to go through those and others when we open it up for a live discussion after the presentation. And we should have plenty of time for that. We should have at least maybe 30 minutes or more depending on how we use the time today. But if you would just please keep yourselves on mute during the presentation and I will walk through this, as if I'm just

talking to myself. Thanks for joining again for those who are just coming in. So what I'd like to do is just quickly introduce ourselves. My name is Jack Wagner. I'm the president of Michigan Justice Advocacy and a short one minute description of who I am, why I am involved in this project is because I myself as a teenager growing up in the 70s found myself in a lot of trouble with the law. Finally, to the point when I was a 16 year old, I was put into a New Jersey State Prison for a very short period of time enough to learn my lesson. But now 40 years later, I am finding that a close family member has also gotten involved in the criminal justice system and a lot has changed in 40 years. So, with that said, I'd like to turn it over to Jessica Siminski introduce herself for one minute and then we'll go down the line.

J

Jessica Siminski 05:26

Hi, I'm Jessica Siminski and I have discovered this lovely fun spiel that I like to say is that I'm a nurse practitioner by day and, and by night I put on my superhero cape and work hard to try and bring better reform to our great state of Michigan for criminal justice. I had to be involved because almost six years ago my husband had an incident with the law and and so now we are fighting that and working hard to , stay close together as a family. And we have two small children. Rachel and Eli. Thanks guys for joining us today and we look forward to working with anyone who wants to bridge this gap and bring some reform to Michigan Thank you guys. Thanks, Jessica, Danielle Are you here.

D

Danielle 06:20

Yes, I am here Hey everyone. Good morning. My name is Danielle, and I joined this initiative because I have a few family members that have been in the facility over the years but specifically. My fiancé introduced this to me when Amani Sawari was involved in this initiative. And I just felt the need to join this cause because I feel like everyone deserves a second chance and rehabilitation should be the focus and it's time to bring a lot of our loved ones home so that's why I'm here. We thank you all for joining us on this morning.

J

Jack Wagner 07:03

Sarah, like, introduce yourself.

M

Mariah 07:10

I think she may have dropped off she may come back in.

**J** Jack Wagner 07:13  
Very good. All right, we'll come back to her, she pops up but Brenda. Are you, are you here I heard you early in the meeting.

**J** Jack Wagner 07:26  
Maybe Brenda is also on mute, and then Mariah if you would just quickly introduce yourself

**M** Mariah 07:34  
My name is Mariah LeRolland-Wagner I am MJA's executive director. I came into this during the 2020 ballot initiative for the MPRCA. Having worked with nonprofits previously. I'm the one who puts our structure and organization together and kind of finds the way to bring everyone together so that we can stay on the same page. And so you'll see me on a lot of different meetings and notes and sending information out as I do this organization stuff but I am here because I truly believe our criminal justice system is broken and flawed and, and then helping ways to improve that and make it a more holistic approach to how we treat individuals from mental health issues to substance abuse incarceration so making sure that we're addressing all these issues, as we try and bring our loved ones home.

**J** Jack Wagner 08:29  
Thank you, Mariah is good Sarah or Brenda were able to rejoin us. Maybe they're just too shy.

**M** Mariah 08:40  
No worries. Well, we can let them talk later.

**J** Jack Wagner 08:43  
Move on. Thank you. Okay. So real quick. We are a 501 c four. That's a nonprofit status under the IRS rules, and we are organized and incorporated here in the state of Michigan. And our focus is to advocate for legislative changes in the criminal justice reform we're gonna do that both through direct contact with our legislators direct lobbying that's called, and then the grassroots lobbying which is what everyone on the phone call, we'd look to for help with our first initiative and our main focus is to see a good time. Come

back into play. We used to have one here years ago, back in the 70s, but through a series of changes to the law. It has gone away essentially so there is no good time credit in Michigan. In order to accomplish this, and support the initiative we are working with and trying to build a coalition of as many willing stakeholders as possible. So today, we have 1000 followers on our social media outlets, and to the right, you're going to see just a short list that just keeps growing. As we contact lawmakers and other organizations. We explained who we are. They give permission to say yes put our names down. We are with you in, in support. They agree with us so I don't even know if this list is up to date. But we're happy that so many folks recognized the need for change. Okay I'm putting together an agenda here and first I want to focus on the history of how we got to where we are. So what you can see here on the left are some historical trends of the prison population prisoner populations, and then the historic trends of prison facility building here in the state of Michigan. On the left you can see a graphic starts in 1930 and goes up to roughly 2012, 2013 with a sudden large bump in the prison population starting in the 80s through the 90s, and, well, where we are today. This large shift we think of in the prison population. We believe this is a result, mainly of changes to policies. It's not as if suddenly there was more crime, but rather we believe it's due to the increase in the arrest prosecution and then adjudication in the sentencing of individuals. I mean for nearly 100 years here you can see it was sufficient in our state, to have only four or five prisons across the state and then suddenly we started building them at a rate of two to three per year. And that's obviously necessary if you're going to incarcerate more people, you're going to need more prisons, but every one of those prisons costs money to build initially, when we broke ground, and it costs money every year, year after year, to operate those facilities. And there's a there's a financial cost, and we're gonna look at the fiscal impact of that next. So on the left is a pie chart showing our, what we call general fund budget here in the state of Michigan and you can see a good 19% of that pie goes towards spending towards the corrections. It's a good piece of the I'm sorry. This is just the entire pie going toward corrections, the corrections budget is nearly 19% of the total state budget for the general fund. So what you're seeing here then is a good portion of the funds are going towards the operation of the facilities 29 facilities across the state, but also included in costs are state employees. So, of the over 44,000 state employees over one out of every four state employees works in one way or another for the Department of Corrections. 11,325 state employees are working for MDoc. And the chart on the right shows us the average cost of incarcerating an individual. It's approximately \$39,000 per year, when you take those numbers on the left and distribute them on a per inmate basis, and that number is just projected to increase. Of course with COVID, it's only going to get worse these projections are based on normal times and now that we are in COVID it is a much different situation, testing segregation, trying to handle the COVID situation inside the facility. Incidentally, if you look at the \$39,000 per inmate figure. We're spending if we



13:39

calculate that. If you look at the cost of three individuals incarcerated three individuals that's about the same cost as hiring one prosecutor in the state of Michigan. So as Michigan taxpayers, we are projected to spend almost \$216 million for the next five years, updating and maintaining these facilities. Let's look at another trend and that is this increasing length of sentence problem you've seen this over the years. This is a chart given to us from Kyle Kaminsky at mdoc, and it shows for those who are coming into mdoc custody. You can see that over the last 12 years that average minimum sentence. This is the average minimum sentence someone, is been sentenced to. It's steadily increasing. So the orange bar shows in 2007, this number was approximately 44.1 months and but by 2019 shown in pink on the far right. That number has increased by over 10 months, and it's nearly 4.6 years. Today, or 54.9 months. So this trend is concerning. Now we are going to look at some of the trends around the country. And also, what that actually means practically for those who are running mdoc. So, you know, certainly, as you see on the left here that Michigan is not unique in historically increasing sentence lengths. The dark blue states are those states which have increased time served over a two decade period. From 1990 to 2009 by over 50% and we fall at the 79% number over those two decades. We don't feel this is necessarily a positive trend and so we think there should be better ways for reaching our criminal justice reform goals. On the right you can see some statements from Kyle Kaminsky, and he recognizes that although there are fewer people coming into the prison. Those that are coming in are coming in for a longer period of time. And the rate of reduction is limited by law. So, mdoc and Kyle have no choice but to follow the law and the law, only allows. So many people to be released every year based on the time they were sentenced the crimes and so forth, they're limited by statute. And if you look at the current limit. If you want to reduce the population, it's going to take about 45 years to cut the current prison population in half. So he really has his hands tied. If mdoc wants to do anything about this and this is going to need legislative change. Let's talk about these longer sentences and whether or not they're really accomplishing the goals. So, what we're seeing is being tough on crime doesn't necessarily equate to greater public safety. So, make no mistake, as far as Michigan goes we are tough on crime if you look at this from a perspective of sentence lengths, just as it was ranked across 44 different states. If you take all offense categories together. Michigan is number two. Out of all the states in this study. Mean time served. We are number one, when it you just pull out the violent offenses. And then number three for nonviolent offenses so no one can say from a sentence length perspective that we are not tough on crime. But if you look at the results are we seeing a decrease in crime. Now on the right is a list of reported crimes and where we rank, out of all 50 states in the country. This isn't crimes that were charged by police This isn't crimes that were then convicted, and people sentenced. This is a list of reported crimes, so someone comes to the police and says, I was raped. I was assaulted

and so forth. And if you look at our rankings. We are number two for reported rapes. We're number 14 aggravated assaults 15 in the nation. You would think if putting people in prison for longer and longer periods of time resulted in greater public safety, that our rankings would be down at the bottom. 4849 to 50. And so that's not happening. And so if we're locking people up, the longer and longer.



18:25

longer prison sentences are having different crime rates, they're coming to the same conclusions. It seems that increasing prison terms will have a little if any effect on crime. These researchers also determined that many of the incarcerated citizens could have served even a shorter period of time without impacting public safety, and they use some pretty sophisticated techniques to try and look across the country. And look at unique qualities of the various people they were studying who are incarcerated, trying to, you know, compare apples to apples, what they're seeing is across different states for those who are in similar situations, committed similar crimes. The longer sentences are not having any significant effect on recidivism rates. So this really does beg the question what is the best way to reduce crime and get the greatest bang for your buck. And now let's look at what other states are doing. So this is a great graphic I like it because it shows numbers in every state, almost, you'll see most of the country has some kind of good time earned credit time system in place. Some of the states which don't have a number don't necessarily, it doesn't mean they don't have a good time credit system, it just means it was hard to calculate based on a percentage. So if someone was given 90 days credit for say getting their GED, and they were only serving a two year sentence well that's a 25% reduction. But if they were serving a five year sentence that 90 days is a different percentage. And so some states when they say na. It simply means it wouldn't fit into a nice calculation of a percentage. So, it looks pretty obvious when you look across the country here that most states have some sort of good time credit system, Michigan, unfortunately, is one of only six states with no policy whatsoever for a good time or earn time credit. And in that regard. We're really out of step with the rest of the country. So 31 states and the federal government provided a way for incarcerated citizens to earn some amount of sentence reduction, based on their behaviors. That means, over, about two thirds of the country recognize and incentivize positive steps towards rehabilitation. In 19 states you can earn at least a 20% reduction, and in nine states you can earn a 50% or greater reduction in time off again based on your demonstrated behaviors. This is a more detailed look and I'm not going to go into each state's statutes, but I think the really important graphic here shows us that if you look across these columns, any state that has just a gray blank box means they have nothing and Michigan as I said is one of six states with a full horizontal gray box with no policy whatsoever for goodtime credit. Now for those states that have implemented goodtime credit it would be interesting to look and

see what are the results, how are they doing, what's the impact of public safety. So, the state of Washington had expanded their good time policies back in 2003 which gives us a good longitudinal study now over several years to look at the results. And what they found was that there was a small but noticeable improvement in recidivism rates that is, you've reduced people's sentences, and the reaction was actually positive to some small degree, and they also realized an economic benefit. On top of that, so their money spent was well spent in 1997, New York State also implemented a good time policy, and under 10 years they saved \$387 million, with a lower recidivism rate as well. So I think states are recognizing that it is a good policy, it seems to be working. Pew Charitable Trusts evaluated a policy that Missouri had set up for parole and probation for those under supervision. And they have a population under supervision that's about 36,000 which is very similar to our current population of incarcerated citizens, here in Michigan and they found when they implemented this reduction in the amount of time super supervised time, they could they could reduce it by an average of 14 months with no negative impacts to public safety,



Jack Wagner 23:08

right back here in Michigan. Back in our very own home state. Most recently, you may have heard of the Michigan Joint Task Force on jail and pretrial incarceration. So some of the outcomes from the study that occurred, and the laws that were initiated. As a result, one recommendation was turned into, I think, Senate Bill 1050, which was a recommendation to, you know, limit or reduce the amount of time on supervision. I've highlighted some of the key points there. For someone who has served at least 50% of their term under supervision without any serious violations or issues. They should be eligible it says for a early discharge and in fact this is now law. So here we are we have a system in place in the county jails, for a good time, reduction, a good time sentence reduction. We have a policy where the sheriff's can decide. And it's at their discretion. We now have something that says, What for those who are under probation or parole. If you also complete a half of your term, with no issues, you'd be eligible for early discharge. So if we can do this, both at the county jail level, and we can do this for those who are on parole and probation. We're asking why doesn't the same logic apply to our state prisons for those who are incarcerated. COVID is bringing some interesting problems to the surface, and it bears. It's worth examining the situation a little bit closer. So every one of the prison system, every one of the prison facilities, has a case of COVID both amongst the staff and the incarcerated individuals, and the percentage of those who are infected keeps growing. I think we're up over 67% at the time here of this writing. And I know the death number keeps climbing. So, it's unfortunate but without some sort of early release for those folks who are going to get the virus and they and they most likely will because you just cannot implement the CDC guidelines in these facilities overcrowding and small

living spaces. More prisoners are going to likely contract this virus and unfortunately some of them will pass before they can be released so that sentence that they got, which had a determined amount of time has turned into a life sentence for those folks. If you look at the aging population due to these longer sentences in that the reality is older individuals are going to have more health problems they're more vulnerable to complications. If they're infected. You know, thinking about and considering an early release problem, policy. It just makes more and more sense it becomes more and more important. If you look at this concept of older inmates and the idea of public safety. Currently we have a population of over 15,000. In this in the facilities who are over 40 years old with a good number of them over 60 years old. If you look at how crime and recidivism works, people tend to age, out of crime. And so, the idea of releasing these longer term longer time served inmates. It's, it's not. It's a lower risk to society. There really isn't a good reason to not consider releasing older citizens who have served so much time. And I don't think this discussion will be complete without talking about crime survivors. So, we believe they're an important stakeholder and we really must consider their viewpoint when we talk about a solution. So a group called the Alliance for Safety and Justice has done a great job interviewing crime survivors here in Michigan and they've compiled a very insightful report on and summarized the victims collective comments. I'd like to read just three of them here you'll see in italics. So more than six out of 10 so that's 64% more than six out of 10 victims support the idea of a shorter prison sentence and spending more money on prevention and rehabilitation, rather than keeping people in prison for as long as possible. Seven out of 10 victims believe that the prison situation worsens the mental health conditions, and it just makes people with mental health issues, more of a safety risk rather than rehabilitating and helping them. And then eight out of 10 victims support the idea of reducing prison sentences for people who are demonstrating positive behaviors they're participating in their own rehabilitation they're participating in mental health programs and substance abuse programs and they're taking advantage of any and every educational or vocational program available to them so if a majority of the victims of violent crimes is the bottom. As the bottom slide says here.



Jack Wagner 28:23

Sorry about that.



Jack Wagner 28:28

So if the majority of the victims of violent crimes are saying look, we think that the criminal justice system can stand to be reformed. We think that the Michigan laws ought to take this into account as well and take seriously the voice of the victim. And so at the end of this we just think that a good time credit system makes good sense. At this point, I think I



would talk and open it up a little bit more now to discussions. First I want to give honor to anyone who has typed a question into our chat box and if someone could help facilitate the q&a part of this. Let's start collectively as a town hall meeting.

**M** Mariah 29:15

So nothing in the chat box so if someone is interested, go ahead and unmute yourself and you can ask some questions.

 29:25

Hi, I have a quick question.

**A** Audience question 29:28

So in listening to this presentation, it sounds like there are a number of different barriers to accomplishing your goal. What do you think is the largest one do you think it's elected officials not wanting to seem weak on crime or do you think it's educating the public or do you think it's the lobbying power that these for profit prison systems have what do you think is going to be the biggest obstacle.

**J** Jack Wagner 29:54

Well I think all of those obstacles he listed are probably right up there. We will be meeting with the prosecutors Association, and we believe that the prosecutors have a pretty strong position on the truth in sentencing laws that were passed back in the 90s. The idea that if we were to somehow undo a sentence that was given to , an offender, that we would be violating the contract if you will, or the trust that the victim who went through this whole trial process understood when the offender was sentenced. So I think it's a public perception issue. And it's a philosophical issue, the data doesn't support the idea of longer sentences are really making an improvement. it's just the concept, we hang on to somehow being tough on crime works.

**M** Mariah 30:58

I see a number of people have questions in regard to. When the bill will be introduced, or where we are with Senator Irwin, so to give everyone a little bit of an update. Senator Irwin here in Michigan introduced a package of bills in December, during the lame duck session and one of those was a good time bill, and we, he did that at our request to get

this conversation started so that people are aware that this topic of conversation will be moving forward, that we will be leading this discussion and charge in this area. So, those bills we understood when they were introduced in December, that they weren't going to be passed or voted on at that time they were just there to begin the discussion of good time. As we speak now here in January and February we are working with Irwin, along with some other senators and Rex, to discuss the formation of a new bill. So the bill introduced in December, was the old bill that existed back in 1978. We know things have changed and improved and we've gotten smarter, and we can learn from other states across the country about what policies work really well and what's really smart. So when we introduce a bill this year in conjunction with Irwin and other senators, we want to make sure this new bill reflects the, the voice of the people, those who are interested in this topic, who will be personally affected, those individuals who are incarcerated, to make sure this bill language is really what we want, not just a rehash of old things so we are currently in conversations about that so we want to make sure that the bill that we introduce is the best bill and really reflects what we want so we are working on that we do not have a date yet of when it will be introduced this year.

M

Mariah 32:54

I know there's quite a few people here who asked a few questions in regard. is it for those who are newly incarcerated, are those new offenders so that's where we're looking for a little bit of feedback from everyone. In regards to there may be different things that we are asking for.

M

Mariah 33:15

So, are there specific asks, does everyone want it to apply to every individual who's currently incarcerated, does it need to be retroactive, or is it going to be like the most bills that it starts the day the bill get signed and we move forward from there knowing that unfortunately the history and the past is the past.

J

Jack Wagner 33:37

Yeah, we are looking for the voice of everyone involved here, and I think we need to remember and realize our lawmakers work for us. They are there to do, what we want. I'm going to ask everyone on the call. What is it that we really want, and I'll just put a stake in the ground and say for example, we think it's not unreasonable to ask for a day for day credit, meaning. Every day served without incident. Following all the rules. You should earn a day off. This isn't unusual in that other states do this, around the country. Some of our own neighboring states have a day for day policy. So, a day for day would be like a 50%

reduction, meaning if you were given a two year sentence and served the first year of that two year sentence without any issues. Then we think you should be able for reduction of 50% the second year, should be given to you as credit and your time has served. What do people think of a day for day.

M

Mariah 34:57

looks like on the topic everyone likes this day for day. But I can see that there is a concern that people may not vote for that and so that is a discussion in our conversations with lawmakers that we understand those who are more conservative some of those on the Republican side, a day per day is a very progressive view. It's not radical in the sense that there are other states in the country that do it but it is a very progressive viewpoint. And, and there may be some place where we would have to do some compromises in order to get it but I think we would like to start with the day for day, and then you could see from there, what we can get people to agree to compromise. And I think that's the other question, day for day would be wonderful. But if we did have to compromise. Does anyone have a viewpoint of what would be their minimum if if they told us we could get 10% off. Is that good enough for us, or would we, we want to have more and push for more? Everyone says more. Okay, awesome.

J

Jack Wagner 36:11

I appreciate the sensitivity that folks recognize that, you know, although I personally might want this for my loved one and my family and everyone has been impacted. This may not result in a success. When we go to the lawmakers and try and get the votes. You're absolutely right. There may be many people who are uneasy with such an aggressive position, personally its progressive when I look at what other states around the country are doing, but these are the tough negotiations that have to happen. And we do need to understand what is the minimum viable laws.

M

Mariah 36:57

So it looks like, according to what I'm seeing you guys put in the chat, I really appreciate that you guys are putting stuff in the chat 25% would be your minimums for most people here it looks like 25% would be your minimum. And it looks like everyone does want it retroactive which is what we agree should be the case that we would ask for. And it looks like, according to what most of you are saying, You are do all feel that we should include everyone that there shouldn't be anyone not eligible for this type of credit is there. So, one conversation is obviously from the victim's perspective that if someone had a violent crime, CSC, sexual offense, that they should be a different category so instead of earning


at the same rate of everyone else that they earn at a different rate that is a very common language in other states. And there is that public perception that those categories of crimes are more heinous, and therefore need to be treated slightly different than other categories of crime, are people.

 38:10

 38:10

 38:10

 38:10

 Audience question 38:31

Excuse me. Hi, my name is Shelly. And, um, there are men and women who has done their time and have been rehabilitated, like in the facilities where there's on job training school, you know where erm the school that took over. Richard handlon Correctional Facility. And so some of the non violent criminals are with the violent criminals, and they are all segregated together. What I was wondering like how. Of course you said Michigan is not going to do any good time. But some of these men are now in their 50s. And they are not likely statistics says they're not likely to go back into the system and they have already done 20 and 15 and plus years. So does this apply to them. As far as being reevaluated and not doing life for something that shouldn't have been a life sentence.

 Jack Wagner 40:01

I think you're touching on, like, should this be applied retroactively meaning. From the time a person first entered the facility. 10 years ago 20 years ago 30 years ago. If we came up with a law today. That said, we would like to see the day for day credit, and we would like that to be applied retroactively, we wanted to go back to that day at individual first entered the facility. Let's say they were given a 20 year sentence. And they have served, eight years of that. Right. Let's call it 20 minimum, right. It was a 20 minimum horrible sentence. What a day for day credit would say is we want that to be applied

retroactively so if this person has served eight years already. 50% reduction of his time served give him credit or a day for day. So he served eight, giving credit for eight. Right. So that meant. What is his early release date. If it was 20, years. We're saying now bring that down on that day for day basis. You can now have his early release date recalculated based on the credit. And as that early release date becomes closer to now. That's when he becomes eligible for parole based on the day for day credit. He's still getting paid in the future, but it has moved closer to now, there would be some. When you recalculate their early release date, who's now early release date would be in the past, meaning they would be eligible to be seen by the parole board. That's what we want. That's what I personally want this law to do, but the idea of applying this retroactively also might be a stumbling block for the lawmakers and for mdoc because they may very well say this is going to be a very hard calculation. Right. They're gonna have to figure out over the time served did this person, catch any tickets, we need to calculate that based on what the law says, right, right. Figure it out, it could be a very complicated calculation for every individual so retroactive application. I feel strongly about. Because what I feel as though has happened is the length of sentences has gone beyond what I consider fair and reasonable. How do you fix that for everybody who's now incarcerated. It's great. You want to fix it, going forward, but I want to fix it for everything we've done wrong in the past, and other states have done things I want to say in the area of releasing. Well in fact they have in Oklahoma. When they started decriminalizing a lot of, you know, relatively minor offenses, turning them from felonies to misdemeanors. They recognize that going forward, those crimes that they now had people in prison for were crimes that today they're saying, are no longer punishable by a sentence in time in prison. So the way in Oklahoma went backwards and said, we're going to we're going to write a law to correct the wrongs. And they wrote a law to say those who are currently incarcerated under these now crimes that we don't consider so serious. We're going to let them out. I think in one day they let out 400 and some odd inmates, based on minor crimes right that they've turned from relatively small felonies to now misdemeanors. And we're moving in that direction here in the state as well.

M

Mariah 43:35

So, in conversations that are going there in the chat I see quite a bit going on in regards to another element so there is. Many states have different ways that they write this, but we understand that good time can't just be given to everyone, all the time for everything. If they are making choices that do not reflect rehabilitation and good behavior. So, as I can see here we're talking about misconduct, so our proposal right now. Is it would be a 30 days for 30 days so a one month period of time, and therefore we could link. When a misconduct occurs during that month, you're only ineligible for that month to receive your credit. This would only be for a class one misconduct was clearly defined in Mdoc policies

whay class one is. And to your point, Wendy. We do understand that some staff would use this as a tool of retaliation. And that is an unfortunate part of the culture that is currently existing in mdoc and so we are working with some people to discuss different ways for training and how to address that. We're also talking to Kyle Kaminsky from MDoc, to really look at the data, there are some very interesting data that shows that certain facilities have a statistically much higher rate of class one misconduct being handed out. Why, what is the reason that that is occurring and is there a specific issue apps or in facilities that need to be addressed. We know anecdotally That's true, but we really need to look in and research a little bit more so. The reason we are looking for a 30 day for 30 day credit is, that way we could tie the misconduct for just that month so there are some states where it may be a day for the day. And if someone gets in a fight, and was to physically harm another inmate. If we did a single straight day, one day for one day and they lose that one day, most people would say that would not be a effective consequence for most people, so we are trying to somewhere in the middle between a one day for one day or six months for six months, address that problem. And then also with that we are also looking at not. So, there would be no ability for a warden or a correction officers to remove someone's good time. Okay.

J

Jack Wagner 46:12

Can I also say it's very wise to consider those kinds of unintended consequences that I think you're alluding to, one of the fears we've had, and that people have cautioned us is, you might get this good time. and if it's too aggressive, the unintended consequences might be that they change laws on the other side and said well because we know they're going to get good time they're going to get sentence reductions. We're going to make sentencing even harsher, more, more punishment. And we have to be sensitive to the idea that unintended consequences could happen. So then we need to be balanced in this approach and really address everyone's concerns. I really am fearful of that kind of thing happening.

M

Mariah 46:59

So, in answer to a couple more questions there, this bill, and the discussions that we are having it does attract. Well, It attacks truth in sentencing, it will dismantle the full structure of truth in sentencing and so that's why this is a very difficult bill for us to make sure that when we are doing this, we are talking with all the stakeholders and understanding that they need to be addressed and worked with, to make that happen. Truth in sentencing is a was put into law in Michigan in 1998 and signed effective in 1999, and we are the only state in the country now that has 100% in truth in sentencing other states do not do that. So, it will be a very difficult process, we understand that, and that is why, for everyone

who's asking. And so how can you help us So right now, in these conversations that we are having with lawmakers and talking with other stakeholders and everyone. The biggest thing is public education so sharing our message, making sure people are aware of what we're doing. We have another townhall coming up later this month, where we'll give this presentation and more information, but the more that we can share this information and change public perception so people can understand what we are talking about when we bring this up. That will be the first step. The second step is in the future we will have that bill introduced this year with Irwin like we spoke about that is the new language with a new information. So when that occurs, we will be asking people to contact their senators contact their reps because we will also be introducing the same bill in the House, and we want to have a hearing. Absolutely. So, part of that it issue of getting a hearing will be to have a bill that we can have heard, and that's why we're discussing some of the things that we want in that bill that may have to be compromised in some way shape or form because we want that hearing to occur because that hearing will bring public awareness and have that topic brought up in the public consciousness so that those are the first two parts. And the third one is if you can help us directly currently we have eight committees that are involved, you are able to sign up on our website for the volunteer link and I think someone else may have just put it yep Jessica just listed it in the chat so you can go ahead and click that and sign up to help volunteer in some way shape or form, the more people we have actively involved with helping us, the better. And with that, if you know any students who are high school, college students or just graduated who would be interested in interning with us. We do have internship opportunities I know, Megan is on the call today had she's will be joining us for an internship and we will have some other interns joining us. If you know young people who are passionate about this topic and would like to help us we are more than, welcoming to having those people join us.

D

Danielle 49:58

Also, I would like to address this is Danielle Goran and one of the board members, I would like to address some of the comments in the chat. I've been answering a lot of the questions in the chat. So, we are not able to give a specific calculation, because it would depend on what's introduced in the bill. So once, once we get language for our proposals or if we're going for day for day. If that say in a perfect world that passes, mdoc will be responsible for the calculations and then applying that to the sentences so that's that's how it goes. So I wanted to make sure that we say that on the call.

J

Jack Wagner 50:45

And I do see some confusion regarding collecting signatures and doing a ballot initiative versus going through the legislative process. What we're trying to do now is go through

the legislative process. And that could be quicker. Or it might take a long time for those laws that legislators seem to want to do quickly. They do quickly. I mean they can introduce a bill and get it through the process in a matter of days, when they really want to stand behind something. On the other hand, because of politics. It could also say well you know this bill isn't so interesting to us, we're just going to bury it in a committee meaning the bill goes into some subcommittee within the legislature. They talk about it, and then they don't talk about it, and it dies, you know, it just goes away. So the other side of this coin is when we think about do we want to go out and do a ballot initiative that tends to essentially bypass the legislative process, where it is part of the process, meaning we the people have a right to have our voices heard, our legislators aren't doing what we're asking them to do we as a people can go to the public and say we want to do this. Here's the law we want. We want signatures to show that the people of Michigan care about this enough, and that signature threshold is 340,047 signatures to achieve that is monumental. And that's where the signature drive and the signature collection have to come in, but that process, then takes the language that we the people have said we want it puts it in front of the lawmakers, and there's a process. They can accept it as is. and pass it as law and they can say we want changes, we want to modify this and that, and then we the people have the right to say yes or no. But we want it to stand as it is. And if we can't come to a conclusion together. That's when it goes to the ballot, and it won't go to the ballot until 2022. So you can see why we're working on it now, the legislative process in the hopes that we can get our legislators to do what we're asking, and we can get the votes that we need. If we can't get the legislature to do what we want, then you're right we go out we start collecting signatures. And that's the other half, or the other side of this coin. Does that help answer some of that.

M

Mariah 53:13

And just to add on to that if we do go to a ballot initiative, and we do end up collecting all the signatures, we need to be able to be put on the ballot for November 2022, we would then have to be in the public and the public would have to vote on this. And so, if the public were to vote and vote this down. It would be a big setback for the future because it would say the people of Michigan do not want this to exist. So I want people to understand that we need to work with the legislators, we need to work with all these stakeholders, so that if we do go to a ballot initiative and put it in front of the people, they are not going to come out oppose and fight us on this issue ballot initiatives can cost between 10 to \$15 million. It's a very expensive endeavor. And if you spend all that money and it gets voted down as a No, that would be a lot of sad money spent and and the public would probably never in the future, vote again on this topic so we want to be very careful that if we do go to a ballot, that we are going to ballot that will succeed, and that comes from public education and making sure that we have senators and reps on our



side.



54:29



Jack Wagner 54:35

You folks have all been so helpful with your questions and I'm gonna try and capture it all but I appreciate the level of participation today, and your interest in this you know together we're gonna win this. I'm sure everyone understands this we're in it. And that's the only way we're going to get through this. We're navigating we're trying to do that for you. And we will try and keep everyone abreast of what we're up to. I believe in a full transparency kind of operation so as much as we can bring everyone on board, sign up join us become a volunteer, get in a committee. Start lending a hand, we need the help.



Mariah 55:19

We will have this presentation available on our YouTube channel, I believe jack has recorded it and we can have it so that people can walk through and maybe a slightly different presentation. Some words may be slightly different because we recorded this previous presentation a couple weeks ago, but we will put that up so that you can have that informational slideshow. Unfortunately, like we said there was some issues with recording today's presentation. But if you do have more questions feel free to contact us through our website, am I justice. org and invite friends and family to join us for our next q&a session that will be taking place on January. 26th, what time is that 6:30. It's on our website, and also on our website you can sign up for our newsletters, six o'clock. Awesome. We also have our newsletters that we send out every week with some update information so if you would like to be signed up for that, please let us know.



56:18



Jessica Siminski 56:24

our weekly newsletters we give updates to know what we are doing that week and what it is we need people to help do so don't forget that part so if you sign up for our weekly newsletter, you'll find out what else is going on and criminal justice world that we're trying to support along with, you know, so when we move the needle a little bit. everybody gains a little bit of same time so keep keep the momentum everyone just try to get more friends

and family involved. The more, the better the bigger the number, the better we are so thank you guys have a great day.



Audience question 56:52

Thank you.