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I. Motivations for Being “At the Table”

A. Deteriorating & Outdated *Physical Infrastructure* for Secure Juvenile Detention & 365 Day Programs
Much of Juvenile Detention Infrastructure in Wisconsin is Out-Dated and Adult Corrections-Based

The current reform effort is an opportunity for change
I. Motivation for Being “At the Table”

A. Deteriorating & Outdated *Physical Infrastructure* for Secure Juvenile Detention

B. Strong Pre-Existing *Regional Partnerships* Make La Crosse a Natural Provider in a New Regionally-Based Wisconsin Juvenile Corrections Model
Counties Regularly Served by La Crosse County 365-Day Program (C.O.R.E. Academy)

- Counties regularly served by La Crosse
- Counties regularly served by Eau Claire
I. Motivation for Being “At the Table”

A. Deteriorating & Outdated *Physical Infrastructure* for Secure Juvenile Detention

B. Strong Pre-Existing *Regional Partnerships* Make La Crosse a Natural Provider in a New Regionally-Based Wisconsin Juvenile Corrections Model

C. A Long and Rich History of *State Collaboration* in Improving the Youth Justice System
Strong Partnership with the State of Wisconsin

- Early adopter of *Youth Assessment and Screening Instrument* (YASI)
- Initiatives addressing *Disproportionate Minority Contact* (DMC)
- Pilot site for *Detention Risk Assessment Instrument* (DRAI)
- Annie E. Casey *Juvenile Detention Alternative Initiative* (JDAI) site
- Working under Youth Innovation Grant to implement *Family Functional Probation* and enhanced truancy response practices

*These and other practices are designed to increase effectiveness at preventing youth from needing deep-end youth justice services, or from entering the system all together.*
I. Motivation for Being “At the Table”

A. Deteriorating & Outdated *Physical Infrastructure* for Secure Juvenile Detention

B. Strong Pre-Existing *Regional Partnerships* Make La Crosse a Natural Provider in a New Regionally-Based Wisconsin Juvenile Corrections Model

C. A Long and Rich History of *State Collaboration* in Improving the Youth Justice System
II. What Intrigued Us About a New Model for Wisconsin Juvenile Corrections

A. Wisconsin Juvenile Corrections Reform Concepts Discussed At Early Phases

1. Close Lincoln Hills & Copper Lake

   Shifting to a more regional and community-based model makes sense based on our own experience
Current Status: Operating a Successful Corrections Alternative

• La Crosse County has not placed a youth at Lincoln Hills or Copper Lake in approximately five years, largely as a result of the 2012 launch of C.O.R.E. academy (365-day program)

• Concerns about Juvenile Corrections provided a strong incentive to do something different:
  > Too far away (making reintegration and preserving family connections difficult)
  > Too expensive
  > Unsatisfactory youth outcomes

• We’ve seen the benefits of keeping youth closer to their home communities
II. What Intrigued Us About a New Model for Wisconsin Juvenile Corrections

A. Wisconsin Juvenile Corrections Reform Concepts Discussed At Early Phases

1. Close Lincoln Hills & Copper Lake

2. Replace the lost bed capacity partly by building on the success of regional 365-day programs
   - Ask counties to take non-SJO correctional-level placements
   - Financial support to upgrades facilities

It seems advantageous to build on the current “de-facto” community-based model

Shows counties with current 180/365 day programs
II. What Intrigued Us About a New Model for Wisconsin Juvenile Corrections

A. Wisconsin Juvenile Corrections Reform
   Concepts Discussed At Early Phases

1. Close Lincoln Hills & Copper Lake
2. Replace the lost bed capacity partly by building on the success of regional 365-day programs
   • Ask counties to take Type 2 correctional-level placements
   • Financial support to upgrades facilities
3. Operating Risks formerly held by the State (financial and other) would be shared
   • Counties would spread risk through joint facility ownership/operation

It didn’t seem the intent in juvenile corrections reform was to place significant additional financial obligations and risks on counties.
III. Why La Crosse County May be Passing on Submitting an Application to Operate a SRCCCY

A. Wisconsin Juvenile Corrections Reform Concepts Discussed At Early Phases

1. Close Lincoln Hills & Copper Lake

2. Meet needed bed capacity partly by building on the success of regional 365-day programs
   - Ask counties to take Type 2 correctional-level placements
   - Financial support to upgrades facilities

3. Arrange to share the risks formerly held by the State (financial and other)
   - Counties would spread risk through joint facility ownership/operation

B. Wisconsin Juvenile Corrections Reform Current Dynamics

1. Close Lincoln Hills & Copper Lake

2a. Require counties choosing to become a juvenile correction provider (SRCCCY) to replace their 365-day programs and operate under a new intensive regulatory regime

2b. Freeze & in the long-term potentially curtail 365-day programs in counties who do not become an SRCCCY

Leaves incongruous mix of 365-Day Programs and SRCCCYs competing against each other

3. Shift the lion's share of risks formerly held by the State (financial and other)
   to counties operating SRCCCYs
# La Crosse County Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current 365 Day Program</th>
<th>New WI Correctional Model</th>
<th>Deciding Whether to Assume former State-Level Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.O.R.E Academy</strong></td>
<td><strong>SRCCCY (estimate)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Local Considerations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Rate = $250</td>
<td>Daily Rate = $400-$500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staffing</strong></td>
<td><strong>Staffing</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Superintendent, Adolescent Workers, Therapists, Social Workers, Supervisors)</td>
<td>(Superintendent, Adolescent Workers, Therapists, Social Workers, Supervisors)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>Annual Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Short-Term &amp; CORE)</td>
<td>(Short-Term &amp; CORE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= $1.6 Mil</td>
<td>= $3.8 Mil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inherent Risks:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Keeping fully staffed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Liability for Challenging Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Maintaining compliance with increased regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location Challenges</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Full responsibility to cover operating losses ($180,000 per OHC Annual Average Daily Census below 12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Risks:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Full responsibility to cover operating losses ($180,000 per OHC Annual Average Daily Census below 12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**“Break Even” Census = 12 (Out-of-County)**
Dynamics Increasing Financial Risks

Policy Dynamic
With local need being fulfilled by its current C.O.R.E. program, La Crosse County does not have an urgent need to operate a SRCCCY
For Most Geographic Areas of Wisconsin
Will the Current Path lead to a More Regional & Community-Based Model?

SRCCCYs may only be viable for large counties who have a current high level of corrections placements and more economies of scale

- Dane appears likely, while Eau Claire, Fond du Lac & Rock seem to be passing
- La Crosse may be passing
- Brown appears undecided

*We are concerned how a large part of the state will not benefit and even may be harmed (with 365-day programs being frozen)*
Questions

A. If a more regional and community based youth corrections system for all counties is what is still desired:

Could SRCCCYs in Milwaukee, Racine and Dane go forward while idea of building on current 365-day programs for areas outside those regions be reconsidered? This might include:

- Allowing non-SJO youth to be served in current 365-day programs (would reduce expense)
- Providing incentives for facility upgrades to all existing 365-day programs (even if less than 95% reimbursement)
- Incentives for program enhancements and innovative community-based programming (through enhanced youth aids)

B. If the current path is unchangeable:

1. Could counties be held harmless for operating losses due to the original vision for shared risk (jointly operated facilities) not materializing? Or
2. Could current 365-day programs at least not be frozen and curtailed (so access to regional alternatives is protected)?
Thank you!