

TERM OF COMMISSION: August Session of the July Adjourned Term

PLACE OF MEETING: Roger B. Wilson Boone County Government Center
Room 338

PRESENT WERE: Presiding Commissioner Edward H. Robb
District I Commissioner Karen M. Miller
District II Commissioner Elkin
Presiding Judge Gary Oxenhandler
Court Administrator Kathy Lloyd
Circuit Clerk Christy Blakemore
Senior Environmental Health Specialist Kala Gunier
Deputy County Clerk Cameron Clarke

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

Health Department

1. Abatement of property located at 5409 Thompson Road, parcel # 12-804-34-00-010.00 01 (first and second reading)

Senior Environmental Health Specialist Kala Gunier was present on behalf of this item. Ms. Gunier stated the Health Department has dealt with Mr. Fletcher for years. Ms. Gunier stated a few years ago there was a sewage complaint that the County Counselor had to deal with to make sure Mr. Fletcher was motivated to comply. Ms. Gunier stated she gave the Commissioners a copy of the email she received from Mr. Fletcher August 16, 2011 at 7:50 a.m. Ms. Gunier stated the email was dated August 15, 2011 at 10:51 p.m. Ms. Gunier stated the owner did not sign for her certified letter, so it had to be posted in the newspaper on June 29, 2011. Ms. Gunier stated the owner does not have a home phone, just a cell phone number. Ms. Gunier stated she did not have his cell phone number until she received the email. Ms. Gunier stated the owner wants to clean up the property himself. Ms. Gunier stated she left the owner a voicemail and told him the hearing would still be held, but that she would ask the Commissioners for a 30 day extension. Ms. Gunier stated most of the stuff sitting outside is junk.

Commissioner Miller stated the Commission usually adopts the order, and leaves the logistics up to the Health Department.

Ms. Gunier stated an order will keep the owner motivated. Ms. Gunier stated the bid to clean the property is \$140, but the contractor is unsure of the exact amount because he does not know what will be found.

Commissioner Elkin moved on this day the County Commission of the County of

Boone does hereby authorize the Presiding Commissioner to sign the attached Finding of Public Nuisance and Order for Abatement of a public nuisance located at 5409 Thompson Road (parcel # 12-804-34-00-010.00 01).

Commissioner Miller seconded the motion.

The motion carried 3 to 0. **Order # 324-2011**

Circuit Court

2. Presentation of Jail Task Force Report

Presiding Judge Gary Oxenhandler was present on behalf of this item. Judge Oxenhandler gave a report which begins on the following page.

FINAL



CIRCUIT JUDGES

Christine Carpenter
Division I

Gary Oxenhandler
Division II

Kevin M. J. Crane
Division III

Jodie Capshaw Asel
Division IV

COMMISSIONER

Sara Miller
Family Court, Division VIII

**Circuit Court of Missouri
Thirteenth Judicial Circuit Court**

ASSOCIATE CIRCUIT JUDGES

Larry Bryson
Division V

Carol A. England
Division VI

Robert R. Sterner
Division VII

Michael Bradley
Division IX

Leslie Ann Schneider
Division X

Deborah Daniels
Division XI

August 8, 2011

Boone County Commission
801 East Walnut, Rm. 333
Columbia, MO 65201

Good morning, Commissioners:

In April 1997, and again in October 2001, the Boone County Commission formed a Jail Task Force. These two task forces endeavored to evaluate overcrowding at the Boone County jail and write reports with recommendations to manage jail overcrowding. Among the suggestions in the Jail Task Force Reports, was the recommendation to create an ongoing group to monitor the jail population. That group, now called the Criminal Justice Administration Coordination Committee, was created in late 2003 and holds monthly meetings at the Boone County courthouse. The monthly meeting is an opportunity for the Judges, Boone County Commissioners, Sheriff, Chief of Police, Prosecutor, Public Defender, Court Administrator, Jail Administrator, private defense attorneys, Reality House director, Circuit Clerk, Adult Court Services Supervisor, and others to come together and discuss the jail population, the administration of criminal justice, and alternatives to incarceration. At the December 2010 Committee meeting, Commissioner Karen Miller requested that the committee members review the 1997 and 2001 Jail Task Force Reports and determine whether all of the recommendations had been pursued. The Committee assigned the recommendations to the appropriate entities to determine 1) whether the recommended changes were made, 2) how they were made or, when appropriate, 3) why the recommendation was not followed. For the past several months, committee members have reported back to the group with their responses. Attached to this letter is the final report consolidating the responses. I look forward to presenting this report to the commission on August 16, 2011.

Regards,

Gary Oxenhandler
Presiding Judge

CC: Members of the Criminal Justice Administration Coordination Committee

July 11, 2011

Topics from April 1997 and October 2001
Judicial and Law Enforcement Task Force Reports

Recommendation	Status Report
Authorization of law enforcement officers to issue summons on additional misdemeanor offenses.	<p><i>Columbia Police Dept, Sheriff</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• This was adopted many years ago (unknown year) and is still in place today. Essentially, everything outside of the DWI or domestic realm are released on summons. BCSD still gives deputies discretion depending on the circumstances involved in the incident, however this is monitored through reports and occurs on very rare occasions.
Expansion of home detention.	<p><i>13th Circuit Court</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• CEB Minutes of January 6, 2003, indicated a need to increase utilization of home detention and noted a review of 2002 statistics showed that in twenty of the fifty-two weeks the ADP for HD exceeded 27.• Minutes of the May 11, 2004, Criminal Justice Administration Committee (aka Jail Overcrowding Committee) stated that "Judge Hamilton requested that information regarding the need for additional staff resources to increase capacity in the Home Detention Program be compiled. Robert Perry noted that the issue of capacity is not related to a lack of available equipment, but is instead an issue of staff resources."• Minutes of the June 8, 2004, Criminal Justice Administration Committee meeting reflect that Kathy Lloyd reported "that a proposal for an additional court services officer had been made to the Prop L committee. The Prop L committee supported the request for an additional officer in order to increase capacity in the home detention program and to assist with the supervision of judicial parole when that program is established. Kathy reported that a Budget Revision had been submitted to the Boone County Commission and that initially the position will be funded through current Prop L allocations, but that an increase in funds will be requested in the 2005 budget."• CEB Minutes of March 15, 2005, indicated that Court Administrator Kathy Lloyd talked to judges about a new Global Positioning System device which can be used for people on home detention. This system was a passive system that downloaded a report of the individual's location information. It also allowed for locations to be

entered as exclusion or inclusion areas with the ability to send an immediate alert if the person violated the restrictions. This type of technology increased the surveillance of HD participants and was intended to reduce public safety concerns that might otherwise make an individual ineligible for the program.

- Minutes of the June 27, 2006, Criminal Justice Administration Committee provided a Predisposition Home Detention Studies Update as follows “Court Administrator Kathy Lloyd explained that there was an 18-20% participation rate in the home detention program.” This exceeded the target of 16%-18% of the Boone County Jail population in the HD Program. The minutes further indicated that Kathy said that “a notice had been placed in the Boone County Bar Association newsletter regarding the availability of pre-disposition home detention studies. Judges mentioned that it would be helpful if Adult Court Services would mark pre-disposition home detention reports as being pre-disposition reports.”
- Continuously since January, 2008, the pre-approval of the ACS supervisor has been required before a CSO can recommend denial of home detention. This ensures every available option is pursued to correct identified deficiencies rather than no attempt being made to salvage the client for home detention.
- From October 1, 2009, to March, 2 2010, the Hon. Jodie Asel chaired a committee representing the Court, Prosecutor’s Office, Public Defender’s Office, private defense counsel and Court Services to explore ways to increase home detention census. Proposals in the final report were among several causes for home detention total days increasing 8.6% to 13,973 in full year 2010.
- CEB Minutes of March 2, 2010, reflect the approval of a new policy to identify defendants who genuinely cannot pay their home detention participant fee and permit reduction, deferral or waiver of the fee. This policy allows indigent defendants to participate in the home detention program.
- On June 6, 2010, ACS supervisor and one CSO met with Columbia Housing Auth. Management and provided guidance to that agency to allow less dangerous defendants serving home detention to reside within CHA and Section 8 housing, thus increasing home detention census.
- On August 27, 2010, Court Services presented to a lunch and learn program in the Boone County Public Defender’s Office encouraging increased effort by defense counsel to seek home detention in lieu of jail days. The availability of pre-

	<p>disposition ACS home detention analysis to be used in plea negotiations was explained in depth. And on February 10, 2011, Court Services made a similar presentation to the Criminal Section of the Boone County Bar Association.</p>
<p>Creation of specific guidelines for use by the Columbia Police Department and Univ. of Missouri Police Department to use in deciding which cases are filed in municipal court and which are filed in state court.</p>	<p><i>Columbia Police Dept, MUPD, Judge Aulgur</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On May 2, 2011, a committee representing the Boone County Prosecutor’s office, City of Columbia Prosecutor’s Office, City of Columbia and University of Missouri police departments, and the Columbia Municipal Court met to develop guidelines to determine the charging procedures and determination of when a case was filed in municipal court or in state court. The committee issued a report on May 16, 2011. The report notes that after discussion about writing a specific charging policy, the committee instead wrote guidelines to aid police officers and prosecutors’ decision-making to determine which court should have jurisdiction in concurrent jurisdiction cases. The committee determined the following factors should be considered: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. “The accused person’s prior history of arrests, convictions, and failure to appear for court. 2. The circumstances of the offense itself, including things like the motive for the offense, the amount of planning, amount of harm done, strength of the evidence of guilt, etc. 3. An examination of the different elements of the considered criminal charge and the punishment range available under state statute v. city ordinance. They are not always the same. 4. Whether the court given jurisdiction has the authority to enforce warrants outside of Boone County, Missouri. Municipal warrants are not served by the Columbia Police Department outside of Boone County, Missouri. 5. The best use of police, prosecution, and judicial resources to protect the public and punish persons who commit a state statute or city ordinance violation.” • In addition, the report reflects that the committee also discussed “specific concurrent jurisdiction offenses and developed some solutions.” The committee recommended the police and prosecuting entities continue the current policies that include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. “The stealing of property or services of less than \$500.00 should normally be filed in the Municipal Division. Stealing of property or services over that mount should normally be filed in State Court. 2. Domestic Assault of any kind should always be filed in State Court.

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Bad Checks cases should always be filed in State Court. 4. Possession of Under 35 grams of Marijuana should always be filed in Municipal Court in compliance with City of Columbia Ordinances 16-253 – 16-255. Exceptions to filing these charges in Municipal Court are detailed in City of Columbia Ordinance 16-255.2. Other types of controlled substances should normally be filed in State Court. 5. Driving While Intoxicated/BAC charges involving persons without any prior intoxication related traffic offenses or alcohol-related enforcement contacts as defined by Missouri law shall normally be filed in Municipal Court. All other Driving While Intoxicated/BAC charges shall normally be filed in State Court. The only exception to this policy is when a person under arrest for Driving While Intoxicated/BAC refuses to take a chemical test for testing their blood alcohol content. Those refusal cases should always be filed in State Court. 6. When a person has committed offenses which the charging authority believes should go to State Court and has also committed a Deceiving a Police Officer municipal violation the Deceiving a Police Officer charge should be submitted to the State Prosecutor for consideration of charging an appropriate state charge and should not be sent to the Municipal Prosecutor. 7. All other cases involving concurrent jurisdiction between the State Court Divisions and the Municipal Division should be decided in accordance with the suggested policy considerations set out above.”
<p>Review (periodically) by the prosecutor, public defender, sheriff and judiciary the bond schedule issued by the court to insure scheduled bonds are set at their lowest reasonable level appropriately balancing the assurance that an arrestee will appear in court and public safety.</p>	<p><i>13th Circuit Court</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In October 2003, through Administrative Order 12-03, Judge Hamilton appointed a Pre-trial and Sentencing Resources Committee to review information regarding the jail population for bond and sentencing decision-making. In December 2003, that committee filed an interim report with Judge Hamilton noting they reviewed case files to identify groups of inmates that might be subject to release based on charges or bond amount. They developed a framework on a computer program that might assist in determining the cost-effectiveness of placements in jail, Reality House, Out-of-County, and Home Detention. The committee also determined the judges were appropriate in their consideration of the jail population when entering orders incarcerating persons in the Boone County Jail. In a follow up report submitted on February 20, 2004, the committee determined that contributing factors to longer

sentences were multiple offenses in multiple cases jointly considered at the time of sentence, felony filings reduced to misdemeanors in plea agreements, and violations of probation and new offenses.

- CEB minutes of December 8, 2003, indicate then-Prosecutor Kevin Crane sought to increase bonds for 3rd degree domestic assault from \$500 to \$1000 to prevent defendants from bonding out and committing further acts of violence against the victim. The discussion was tabled after a discussion that the increase would not make a practical difference in individuals being able to post bond. CEB minutes for January 5, 2004, indicate the court approved increasing the preset bonds in Domestic Violence, Assault 3rd degree; violation of an Order of Protection, class A misdemeanor; and stalking, class A misdemeanor, from \$500 to \$1000, to be effective February 1, 2004.
- CEB minutes from May 3, 2005, indicate a discussion regarding setting pre-set bonds (two people arrested for the same crime – one had a \$5,000 bond by the jail, the other who didn't make the pre-set bond had a \$300,000 bond as recommended by the prosecutor) and the circumstance when the prosecutor does not make a recommendation and the judge does not have adequate information to set the bond.
- CEB minutes of June 13, 2005, indicate the Court en Banc approved a change to Administrative Order 5-05 – Boone and Callaway County Uniform Bond Schedule – to reduce the bond on Class B, C and D felonies to \$4,500 so that defendants will not be disqualified from public defender representation. The new A.O. was 7-05.
- CEB minutes of March 6, 2007, indicate the Boone County Bar Subcommittee was concerned “about the high bonds being set on domestic assault cases” especially when the bond is set by the on-call judge. The judges’ responded the high bonds were set because of the concern about victim safety, but that the bond amount may be revisited the next day when court is open.
- The Criminal Justice Administration minutes from October 6, 2009, indicate “Judge Christine Carpenter indicated that bonds on criminal non-support cases are being set too high, because the prosecutor is requesting high bonds. Also, she is getting a lot of requests for cash only bonds.”
- The Criminal Justice Administration minutes from August 25, 2010, indicate Judge Gary Oxenhandler announced the state Sentencing Advisory Commission “has adopted the 13th Circuit’s approach to incarceration. The commission puts together

	<p>the matrix of sentencing guidelines and recommendations for circuit judges, directed at encouraging judges to not sentence non-violent offenders ... Judge Oxenhandler explained to the commission that the 13th Circuit knows what it costs to incarcerate an individual so sentencing judges know what it costs to place an individual in jail versus on probation.”</p> <p><i>Columbia Municipal Court</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As of December 13, 2010, the Columbia Municipal Court revised its May 2009 bond policy and procedures for the City of Columbia and University of Missouri Police Departments. Bond will be set by the peace officer if the court finds the defendant’s promise to appear in court is not sufficiently reasonable to assure appearance or if the person poses a danger to the crime victim, community or any other person. The bond amount is \$500 but may be set higher or lower upon a judge’s determination.
<p>When reviewing bond schedule, consideration should be given to requiring an arrestee (who has been charged with a number or series of less serious offenses) to post bond on only the most serious of the offenses.</p>	<p><i>13th Circuit Court</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the Criminal Justice Administration minutes from January 8, 2008, it indicates Attorney Rusty Antel raised concerns about bond amounts in multiple bond cases. It said “Attorney Rusty Antel mentioned that there has been some confusion as to the procedure to be followed when a defendant is in jail pending multiple charges, and the prosecutor’s office files a charge and a bond is set on that charge. In some cases the defendant is being required to post the pre-set bond on the cases that have not yet been filed, and many times those charges are never filed. He would like to see some notice from the prosecutor’s office to the jail when they know they will not be filing on some cases, so the defendant does not have to post the additional bond. After some discussion, it was agreed that the jail would release a defendant on bond for the charges that have been filed and no others; unless the prosecutor’s office notifies them in writing that additional charges will be filed.”
<p>Re-institution of the policy of granting reduction in time served for inmate-trustees.</p>	<p><i>13th Circuit Court</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEB minutes of May 24, 2004, indicate that “based on input from the Jail Overcrowding Committee, the Administrative Order regarding <i>Defendant Participation in Work and Education Program at County Jail (9-97)</i> had been revised to allow judges to give credit to defendants for time spent in trustee work or participation in an education program prior to the date of sentencing or before the effective date of the <i>Work and Education Program.</i>” Court Administrator Kathy Lloyd noted “that the order was presented to the court en banc at the April meeting

	<p>and the court requested that it be presented to the Jail Committee before the court officially approved the revisions. Kathy advised that the Jail Committee approved of the order..." The court en banc voted unanimously to approve the revised Administrative Order 3-04 as well as the revised Petition and Order for Participation in the Work and Education program.</p>
<p>Implementation of an associate circuit court "open docket" that would permit immediate scheduling of cases for disposition.</p>	<p><i>13th Circuit Court</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 2004 procedures were established for setting of cases for disposition. Upon request of attorney a case would be scheduled for immediate disposition in the division to which the case was assigned. Standards were established for court appearances to occur within 30 days for all in-custody cases. • CEB minutes from June 13, 2005, indicate there were two changes to Administrative Order 02-05 – Bond and Summons Returnable Schedule for Boone County – the changes were that "The return date shall be the next criminal arraignment docket" to allow individuals arrested for violation of probation to get an earlier court appearance and not wait for the arraignment docket of the judge of the original case. The new A.O. was 06-05. This order went through several rounds of amendments (again in 2005, November 2008, March 2009, and January 2011) which changed when cases were set. Currently in-custody cases are set for return within 48 hours of being taken into custody. • The Criminal Justice Administration Minutes from May 6, 2008, indicate Public Defender Kevin O'Brien asked to increase the time before litigation for defendants who are not in custody (i.e., allowing two to three continuances). He said "this would give priority to trials for defendants who are in custody, which would address the problem of jail overcrowding. Most negotiations do not result in plea agreements until five days before the trial date, even with the fourteen-day pre-trial conferences." • In March or April 2011, Assistant Prosecuting Attorney Merilee Crockett worked with court administrative staff Patty Alexander to set defendants wanting to make a plea within 3 days. Merilee then asked Patty to return to the previous schedule because 3 days was not enough time for discovery.
<p>Creation of ongoing group to monitor the population of the jail.</p>	<p><i>13th Circuit Court</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On September 25, 2003, Auditor June Pitchford sent a memorandum to Presiding Commissioner Schnarre, Sheriff Ted Boehm, Prosecuting Attorney Kevin Crane,

Court Administrator Robert Perry and Attorney Rusty Antel regarding Increasing Jail Population and Out-of-Facility Housing Costs. In the memorandum, Auditor Pitchford outlined concerns and indicated that she believed “*on-going and sustained efforts are necessary for the County to minimize expenditures in this area.* Perhaps a formal monthly review and reporting process to the County Commission would help in this regard.”

- On October 6, 2003, and in response to the above referenced memorandum, Presiding Judge Gene Hamilton appointed a Pre-trial and Sentencing Resources Committee comprised of Judge Gary Oxenhandler (chair), Judge Asel and Judge Carpenter, to examine
 - 1) whether the court has been fully appraised of all available information and demographics regarding the jail population for reference in making decisions as to bond and sentencing;
 - 2) whether current alternative sentencing resources are being effectively utilized; and
 - 3) whether additional alternative resources are available and, if so, identify same.
- CEB minutes of October 6, 2003, indicate that on the subject of Boone County Jail Population Issues Judge Hamilton “reported on a meeting scheduled with the Boone County Commission regarding the issue on October 16. Judge Hamilton reported that he had appointed a standing committee on this date to look at the reports that are being received, whether the alternatives to incarceration are being substantially used and whether new alternatives are needed.”
- Minutes of the Meeting of October 16, 2003, Regarding Jail Population indicated that Auditor June Pitchford presented the budget issue that allocation for out of county placements for 2003 had been depleted.
- On December 16, 2003 The Pre-Trial and Sentencing Resources Committee submitted an interim report to Judge Hamilton.
- Minutes of the December 23, 2003, Meeting Regarding Jail Population Issues indicate that Judge Hamilton suggested that monthly meetings be held. It appears that regular Criminal Justice Administration Coordination Meetings began in January 2004.
- Minutes of February 20, 2004 reflect that the Pre-Trial and Sentencing Committee

	<p>met and discussed JALAN reports and the importance of balancing critical and sometimes conflicting issues such as truth in sentencing, jail population, public safety, public trust and confidence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It appears that future discussions were primarily addressed in the monthly Criminal Justice Administration Coordination Meetings.
<p>Communication with Columbia public schools regarding providing an on-site adult education program for inmates in the jail.</p>	<p><i>Sheriff</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We worked closely with the continuing education program of Columbia Public Schools who had both grant and outreach funds to establish some on-going education programs in our facility. The on-going problem was the transient nature of our population and the lack of adequate space to operate a program. The first problem with transient population caused the coordinator to constantly be on the evaluation and qualifying portion of the routine, never actually getting into a set teaching process. The second problem was the constant battle with Court Services and their inconsistent timing of requests for use of the only program space we have. The program became impractical after three separate attempts over a one-year period. Good idea, just not practical space nor long-term applicants to use it.
<p>Creation of geographic limitations (based on nature of the offense) with regard to extradition, that is, the procedure by which person wanted in Boone County are returned to Boone County from other counties or states.</p>	<p><i>Prosecutor</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Boone County Sheriff's Dept. notifies staff of individual in custody out-of-state (our office is not notified about the in-state defendants). Staff pulls the file and speaks with the assistant prosecuting attorney assigned to the case about witness availability, strength of case, and restitution issues. Staff then brings the file to County Prosecutor or Assistant Prosecutor for a decision. If the individual is on bond, then the decision is almost always to extradite as the surety can be ordered to pay the costs of transportation. If the individual is not on bond, then we consider several factors. First, if the recommendation in the file is to reduce to a misdemeanor, then the general rule is not to extradite. Second, Prosecutor takes into consideration the following in deciding whether to extradite: 1) seriousness of the case, 2) strength of case, 3) witness availability, and 4) the amount of restitution. Then, prosecutor's office considers the costs associated with extradition and decides whether the associated costs are worth proceeding with a prosecution. If the decision is made to not extradite, then the office usually makes the warrant in the State of Missouri only. • If the individual to be extradited is being held on a probation warrant, then the

	Prosecutor will contact the judge who issued the warrant and ask the judge to decide whether to extradite.
Providing of adult education programs to inmates.	<p><i>Sheriff</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See “Communication with Columbia Public Schools regarding providing an on-site adult education program for inmates in the jail.”
Consideration should be given to review of successful bonding models in other counties.	<p><i>13th Circuit Court</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Criminal Justice Administration minutes from January 7, 2009, indicate Rusty Antel proposed a bond return schedule on a four-week rotation which is what other jurisdictions do. Further discussions occurred regarding the need for a quicker return in domestic violence cases and an alternative return schedule for drug offenses given the time needed to obtain testing on substances in drug related cases. • April 13, 2011 – Judge Oxenhandler received a copy of the Jackson County bond guidelines. He shared these with Judge Daniels who noted they were helpful. She also made the following comments regarding the guidelines; 1) no pre-set bonds in domestic violence cases, 2) no high child support, 3) problem of cash only statewide not addressed.
Review (periodically) the telephone system used at the jail to insure that it is readily accessible for inmate bonding purposes.	<p><i>Sheriff</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have since upgraded our phone system with Securus Technologies. The platform is more reliable than ever, we have excellent service and if a phone is out for any reason, we have service personnel within 24 hours to repair or replace equipment if necessary. All booking area phones are “free calls” to bondspersons.
Creation of network system and software program for use by the sheriff’s office, the prosecutor’s office, the public defender’s office, the circuit clerk’s office and the judiciary which permits the continuous monitoring of cases (particularly misdemeanors which regularly end in “time served”), bookings, commitments; the monitoring of persons serving long sentences; and any and all other statistical information referenced in this report.	<p><i>Sheriff</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In late 2009 a group of professionals from all the public safety disciplines in Boone County banded together to start investigating software solutions to develop a county-wide Records Management System (RMS). The group viewed software demos from several vendors and developed enough information to write a comprehensive Request for Proposal (RFP). The RFP covers software solutions for the Boone County Sheriff’s Department, Boone County Jail, Court Security, City of Columbia, Prosecutor’s Office, all fire departments and several of the municipal departments in Boone County. • Prior to the above, the Boone County P.A.’s Office purchased and installed their new offender management software, Karpel. Plans are in place to have some type of interface between our new RMS and Karpel. The specifics of functionality are

	<p>unknown at this time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The network used to connect all of these agencies together with this new software will be through the use of existing fiber optic connectivity and the internet (for “out of network” users). With appropriate user permissions in place the main premise behind this county-wide system is access to/from other disciplines via one RMS provider. • As of May 2011 the RFP is in the review process. • Note: This software solution does not have a connection to the Public Defender’s Office or Circuit Clerk’s Office. However, the Circuit Clerk’s office has software in place to send warrant information electronically to the warrant division at the Sheriff’s Department via the Missouri State Highway Patrol’s MULES system.
<p>Employment of a weekend/holiday bond investigator (or re-assignment of presently existing personnel).</p>	<p><i>13th Circuit Court</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEB minutes of January 6, 2003, indicate that “One of the goals for 2003, related to court services activities, is to increase coverage on bond investigations, at least initiating them, to six days a week. Ideally, for defendants taken into custody after hours on Friday who are still in custody over the weekend, bond investigations would be completed by Monday arraignments.” • CEB minutes of March 3, 2003, indicate that “Mr. Perry noted the implementation of Saturday bond investigations. Beginning Saturday, March 8, a court services officer will be on duty on Saturday to review jail population. The officer will prepare reports for Monday arraignments on individuals booked on Friday, who appear to be qualified for consideration of release.” • CEB minutes of September 8, 2003 indicate that, “Mr. Perry noted that bond investigation coverage was expanded to six days in April. He explained that this had not yielded the results anticipated. There was discussion and Mr. Perry informed the court of plans to discontinue Saturday coverage.” • Jail Overcrowding Meeting Minutes of October 20, 2003, indicate that “Weekend Bond Studies-Reason for halting this coverage was reported.” • Judges continue to be available on-call 24/7 and can be contacted regarding matters related to bonds or jail population as needed.
<p>Employment of an “inmate ombudsman” to assist inmates with problems associated with posting bond.</p>	<p><i>County Commission</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Commission recently contacted Professor Michael Lyman at Columbia College to discuss the possibility of developing an inmate ombudsman program. Dr. Lyman

	will be helping to locate more of an expert in the corrections field since his expertise is in policing.
Employment of a jail consultant or jail consultants to review the recommendations and observations regarding space utilization contained in this report to ascertain the feasibility and cost of carrying out the same.	<p><i>County Commission, Sheriff</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A consulting group was hired in 1998 and made numerous recommendations. A variety of areas such as female housing, work release participants (housed at The Reality House), the gym area and D-Pod, etc. were evaluated and considered. Remodeling within the jail was completed by the end of 1999.
Conversion of the 16 C Pod female maximum security spaces to 16 male minimum and low medium security spaces; and, in turn, conversion of the D Pod Dormitories into medium security female space and male work release space.	<p><i>Sheriff</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 16 beds in C Pod that had housed female offenders was reclassified as male housing with Phase I construction that occurred in 1999. In addition, the Work Release program was sub-contracted out to Reality House Incorporated in 1998-99 make available D Pod dormitory space for renovation that subsequently provided five separate housing areas one of which can be male or female creating a 44 bed housing pod primarily for female offenders.
Conversion of the gymnasium for medium to maximum security cell construction.	<p><i>Sheriff</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conversion of the gymnasium was accomplished as part of Phase I in 1999, however, it was not converted to cell construction but to a 24 bed open bay housing area.
Conversion of the C Pod Storage Area to secure inmate space.	<p><i>Sheriff</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This space was converted in 1999 as part of Phase I construction from a storage area into a secure inmate exercise area allowing for natural light and fresh air for those serious felony offenders. It also maintained an indoor exercise area for all inmates during inclement weather and the winter months.
With regard to inmates committed to jail for 3 days or less, scheduling of such commitments on 4 or so specific weekends throughout the year.	<p><i>13th Circuit Court, Sheriff</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criminal Justice Administration minutes of January 10, 2006 indicate that “Captain Warren Brewer stated that the best time for the jail for having people appear to be committed is between 2 p.m. and 4 p.m. on weekdays. For people only serving weekends, the best time is Saturday morning, instead of Friday afternoon. The judges indicated that they tried to avoid weekend commitments because they had been told by the jail that it was difficult to handle weekend commitments. Captain Brewer indicated that was correct, but some weekend commitments were being ordered, and it would work best for those individuals to report on Saturday morning.”

<p>Contracting out of the work the release program outside of the jail footprint.</p>	<p><i>Sheriff, Reality House</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This was initiated in 1988 in preparation for our Phase I construction completed in 1989. Reality House Incorporated has had control of our work release program continuously since that time.
<p>Further research into the development of jail industries (similar to prison industries).</p>	<p><i>Sheriff</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least two main hurdles exist with implementation of a jail industries program. One, we have no dedicated space, nor staff to supervise such an operation, and secondly, the legal problems associated with competing directly with private industry. Most of Prison Industries actual products are refurbishing of state disposal furniture and such. We do attempt when staffed appropriately, to volunteer at various areas in our local community with inmate labor. This has not been feasible for the last six months due to staff shortages.
<p>The immediate appointment by the county commission of a standing judicial and law enforcement committee for five distinct purposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) to insure the implementation of the recommendations of this report; and 2) to have as its mission, the system-wide assessment of policies and procedures involving all components of the Boone County Judicial and Law Enforcement system; and 3) to explore the reasonable alternatives to incarceration; and 4) to explore opportunities for funding of various mental health projects including but not limited to a Mental Health Court; and 5) maybe, most importantly, to educate the public about the operation and needs of the judicial and law enforcement system and, in turn, gain the support and favor of the public for future funding for the system. 	<p><i>County Commission</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Judicial and Law Enforcement task force was officially appointed on May 2, 2002- Commission order 206-2002; the task force is currently chaired by Rusty Antel and meets quarterly.

<p>The immediate creation by the county commission of a standing committee to explore methods of reviewing the sentences of persons serving sentences in the jail for consideration of early release and/or alternate punishment/rehabilitation.</p>	<p><i>County Commission</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Criminal Justice Administration Coordination Committee was implemented by Presiding Judge Hamilton starting January 2004 after a year long effort of a court appointed sub-committee to monitor jail population and identify possible long term system changes. Please see page 7 and 8, of this report for further information.
<p>The immediate creation by the county commission of a county records management and warehousing department.</p>	<p><i>County Commission</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The County Commission entered into a contract with the Underground Warehouse Storage for the Circuit Clerk’s records starting January 1, 2006. The Sheriff’s records were moved to the leased Election’s Warehouse on Paris Road in July 2006 from the County’s Records Warehouse. These two efforts freed up space for all other county records.
<p>The relocation of the juvenile office to the Johnson Building and utilization of the space vacated by the juvenile office for jury assembly needs, storage and/or microfilming, courtrooms and/or hearing rooms.</p>	<p><i>13th Circuit Court</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In a Thirteenth Judicial Court System Expansion Study issued by architects Butler, Rosenbury and Partners on January 15, 2004, it was recommended that “Juvenile Court Services should be relocated from the courthouse.” The report recommended the razing of the Johnson Building and suggested that “A new Court Annex building should be constructed west of the Courthouse with a secure corridor that connects to the courthouse.” • On September 16, 2004, the Boone County Space Needs Committee was appointed by the Boone County Commission. The committee studied space needs related to the Courthouse, Government Center, Johnson Building and also considered properties acquired by the county in recommending strategies to address assessed needs. • On June 30, 2005 the Boone County Space Needs Committee released its final report and recommended that “voters should be requested to implement a sales tax, which includes a sunset provision, to <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Build Phase 1 of the Courthouse expansion developed from the Master Plan; and ...” • On April 4, 2006, Boone County voters approved a 1/5 cent sales tax for capital improvements including renovation and expansion of the Courthouse. • On February 20, 2007, a report entitled New Addition and Renovation to Boone County Courthouse was published by Malone Finkle Eckhardt & Collins (engineers

	<p>on the Courthouse Expansion Project), which described the Scope of work with relevant parts as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This project shall consist of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A) A two-story addition of approximately 21,475 sf to the courthouse annex, ... B) Major interior renovations to the existing courthouse: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ground level juvenile court services (approx. 6,160 sf and public lobby (approx. 318 sf).
<p>Recognize the need to increase by seven the number of sworn Boone County Deputies to address the immediate need of deputies on patrol.</p>	<p><i>Sheriff</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This was addressed with the ballot issue (Proposition L) in 2002. Since that time we have been able to add a four person traffic unit, a two man pro-active unit (taken from patrol) and a 3 person cyber crimes unit. Any new position since Prop L has been obtained through grants or restructuring.
<p>Recognize the immediate need of hiring two Boone County Community service aides. (to respond to calls of a non-criminal nature).</p>	<p><i>Sheriff</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This was never pursued, as it would be impractical in a county agency setting.
<p>The immediate development of a “point of sentencing” computer data exchange system.</p>	<p><i>Sheriff</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was never anything done with this. The concept was for the judge to have access to the defendant’s criminal history via computer while on the bench. This is something that could be pursued with the new RMS project currently in review.
<p>Consideration should be given to the acquisition of videoconferencing equipment for Probate/Mid-Mo Cases.</p>	<p><i>13th Circuit Court</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEB minutes of October 7, 2008, reflect that “Judge Deborah Daniels explained that plans are in motion to hold 21-day hearing by video, where the defendant and his/her attorney would be at Mid-Missouri Mental Health Center, but the judge would be in the Boone County Courthouse.” • Minutes of the November 5, 2008, Criminal Justice Administration meeting indicate that “Sheriff Dwayne Carey said it will cost about \$20,000 to install the necessary equipment to video-conference mental health commitment hearings from the hospital. He wants to take the money out of Proposition L funds.” The final costs of the project totaled \$10,805.95, and Prop L funds were approved for this purpose. • Minutes of the December 9, 2008, CEB meeting indicate that the court made changes to Local Court Rule 65 to allow involuntary commitment hearings to be held by video.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At the June 24, 2009, Criminal Justice Administration meeting Sergeant Mike Krohn provided an update on the progress of the project indicating he had “talked to the Director of the Missouri Department of Mental Health and he is very supportive of the program. The room which will hold the video equipment at the hospital is nearly done - the wiring and flooring are complete. The final part is up to the University Hospital. The Sheriff’s Department is hoping to be up by the middle of July.” • CEB minutes of August 11, 2009, indicate that there had been “two mental health video hearings in Division XI and one in Division VI.” • Since inception approximately 470 cases have been heard by video. Additionally, guardianship proceedings in Probate Court have been added to the types of cases heard via video and the VA hospital has been equipped with video capability and hearings for those patients have been held video conference for the past several months.
<p>Consideration should be given to the implementation of procedures to insure that sentence and judgment papers issued by the Court are available from the Circuit Clerk to the Sheriff within 24 hours after sentencing.</p>	<p><i>13th Circuit Court</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JIS implementation in August 2000, significantly improved compliance with reporting of sentence and judgments regarding DOC commitments to the Sheriff within 24 hours. Clerk Christy Blakemore indicates that after the initial adjustment to JIS further improvement was achieved and that in the past several years the majority of all sentence and judgment orders for commitment to DOC have been forwarded to the Sheriff within 24 hours.
<p>Consideration should be given by the Sheriff to the development of minimum staffing policies for road officers of the Sheriff’s Office.</p>	<p><i>Sheriff</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This was established in 2002 and still exists today.
<p>Consideration should be given by the Court to the rescheduling of court appearances for state incarcerated inmates.</p>	<p><i>13th Circuit Court</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On January 24, 2003, Presiding Judge Gene Hamilton signed Administrative Order 1-03 establishing a new docket schedule effective February 1, 2003, on which in-custody criminal cases were set in the afternoon. • Minutes of the October 20, 2003 Meeting Regarding Jail Population indicated that Sheriff Boehm reported that “The PM docket has significantly reduced ‘jail days’ on writs...”
<p>Consideration should be given to the creation of a “desk officer” position to process non-law enforcement and minor incident calls.</p>	<p><i>Sheriff</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This has been considered each year since 2004, but has not been implemented. The position has proven to be a valuable one, as we utilize employees on light duty to fill

	<p>this role. However, it never seems to make the cut during budget work sessions (inner-office sessions), due to higher priority needs.</p>
<p>Consideration should be given to the development of off-site inmate security.</p>	<p><i>Sheriff</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The only development with off-site security has been housing inmates in other county jails and at Reality House. No other work has been done with this. At one time there were discussions about utilizing space at the fairgrounds, however it proved to be impractical.
<p>Consideration should be given to charging defendants for their jail costs.</p>	<p><i>13th Circuit Court, Sheriff</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Criminal Justice Administration Committee minutes from December 13, 2005 indicate that Court Administrator Kathy Lloyd explained St. Charles assesses jail costs to offenders. "She contacted the county and found that they collect the costs as a civil matter. They charge the costs at \$50 per day, and allow the offenders 5 years to pay. If they do not pay, they file a civil suit for collection. The court was not comfortable that it could collect the costs through the state's fines and costs collection program."

3. Agreement with Family Counseling Center of Missouri, Inc. (first reading)

Court Administrator Kathy Lloyd was present on behalf of this item. Ms. Lloyd stated the Circuit Court is a recipient of the STOP grant for the Mend program, which is a batterers' intervention program. Ms. Lloyd stated the Circuit Court has an agreement with the Family Counseling Center to conduct the batterers' intervention program. Ms. Lloyd stated the Family Counseling Center receives a stipend which is on a sliding scale to offset the costs of this program. Ms. Lloyd stated this agreement is part of the grant.

Commissioner Robb stated this is a first reading and requested the Deputy County Clerk to schedule this item for a second reading at the next available commission meeting with an appropriate order for approval.

4. 2012 Boone County Circuit Court Budget Presentation

Court Administrator Kathy Lloyd and Circuit Clerk Christy Blakemore were present on behalf of this item. Ms. Lloyd and Ms. Blakemore gave a budget presentation which begins on the following page.

13th Judicial Circuit Court
2012 Budget Presentation

“Preparing for Change”

*"The court anticipates new conditions
and emergent events and adjusts its
operations as necessary."*

Trial Court Performance Standard 4.5 Response to Change

Boone County
General Revenue

Budget Summary

Revenue: 2011-2012 Comparison

Budget	2011	2012	Comparison Increase/Decrease	Percentage Increase/Decrease
JJC	\$397,500.00	\$303,020.00	(\$94,480.00)	-23.77%
Juvenile Office	\$9,741.00	\$8,501.00	(\$1,240.00)	-12.73%
Sub Total:	\$407,241.00	\$311,521.00	(\$95,720.00)	-23.50%
Jury Services/Court Costs	\$13,650.00	\$13,800.00	\$150.00	1.10%
Circuit Court	\$172,800.00	\$161,575.00	(\$11,225.00)	-6.50%
Circuit Clerk	\$123,820.00	\$124,308.00	\$488.00	0.39%
Sub Total:	\$310,270.00	\$299,683.00	(\$10,587.00)	-3.41%
Grand Total	\$717,511.00	\$611,204.00	(\$106,307.00)	-14.82%

Expenditures:

Budget	2011	2012	Comparison Increase/Decrease	Percentage Increase/Decrease
JJC	\$346,584.00	\$332,371.00	(\$14,213.00)	-4.10%
Juvenile Office	\$402,233.00	\$390,557.00	(\$11,676.00)	-2.90%
Juvenile Assistance Incentive Block Grant Cash Match	\$2,157.33	\$2,259.56	\$102.23	4.74%
*Sub Total:	\$750,974.33	\$725,187.56	(\$25,786.77)	-3.43%
Jury Services/Court Costs	\$245,850.00	\$232,430.00	(\$13,420.00)	-5.46%
Circuit Court	\$1,448,332.00	\$1,469,122.00	\$20,790.00	1.44%
Circuit Clerk	\$513,823.00	\$514,085.00	\$262.00	0.05%
Sub Total:	\$2,208,005.00	\$2,215,637.00	\$7,632.00	0.35%
Grand Total	\$2,958,979.33	\$2,940,824.56	(\$18,154.77)	-0.61%

*Maintenance of Effort Funding level established by HB971 in 1997 - \$993,989

Budgets, as presented, include estimates of the following costs and will be adjusted when the costs are known:

Personnel: Increase to fringe benefits (health, Life, dental and workers compensation) for county funded positions and add COLA and/or merit as determined by the county.

Operations: Rate adjustment to building rent & utilities

Boone County
FIXED ASSETS
 2011 - 2012
 Comparison

	2010	2011	2012	Comparison 2011-12 Increase/Decrease	Percentage Increase/Decrease
JJC	\$480.00	\$4,896.00	\$12,943.00	\$8,047.00	164.36%
Juvenile Office	\$1,040.00	\$10,440.00	\$7,135.00	(\$3,305.00)	-31.66%
Jury Services and Court Costs	\$2,110.00	\$5,600.00	\$9,555.00	\$3,955.00	70.63%
Circuit Court	\$6,520.00	\$11,560.00	\$34,300.00	\$22,740.00	196.71%
Circuit Clerk	\$12,504.00	\$3,300.00	\$4,775.00	\$1,475.00	44.70%
Total	\$22,654.00	\$35,796.00	\$68,708.00	\$32,912.00	91.94%

Juvenile Justice Center
2012 Budget

	2011 Budget	2011 Expenditures Jan. - June	2012 Budget Requests	% Increase 2011 Budget to 2012 Budget
Personnel				
Salaries	\$124,456.00	\$48,544.00	\$124,456.00	0.00%
Benefits	\$15,092.00	\$6,249.00	\$15,092.00	0.00%
TOTAL PERSONNEL	\$139,548.00	\$54,793.00	\$139,548.00	0.00%
Operations				
Supplies	\$58,843.00	\$17,370.00	\$51,359.00	-12.72%
Dues Travel & Training	\$3,100.00	\$721.00	\$3,050.00	-1.61%
Utilities	\$60,789.00	\$26,611.00	\$57,925.00	-4.71%
Vehicle Expense	\$2,400.00	\$707.00	\$2,150.00	-10.42%
Equipment Bldg/Maint	\$23,141.50	\$12,846.00	\$13,006.00	-43.80%
Contractual Services	\$51,716.00	\$27,251.00	\$50,290.00	-2.76%
Miscellaneous	\$2,150.00	\$1,383.00	\$2,100.00	-2.33%
SUBTOTAL 2 - 8	\$202,139.50	\$86,889.00	\$179,880.00	11.01%
TOTAL PERSONNEL AND OPERATIONS	\$341,687.50	\$141,682.00	\$319,428.00	-6.51%
Fixed Assets	\$4,896.00	\$4,538.00	\$12,943.00	164.36%
TOTAL BUDGET	\$346,583.50	\$146,220.00	\$332,371.00	-4.10%
REVENUE	\$397,500.00	\$84,498.00	\$303,020.00	-23.77%
NET COST	(\$50,916.50)	\$61,722.00	\$29,351.00	

**JUVENILE OFFICE
2012 BUDGET
BUDGET SUMMARY**

	2011 Budget	2011 Expenditures Jan-May	Anticipated 2011 Expenditures	2012 Budget	% Increase Over 2011
<u>EXPENDITURES</u>					
Salaries	\$102,706.00	\$27,705.00	\$90,000.00	\$102,706.00	0.00%
Benefits	\$13,454.00	\$3,831.00	\$12,118.00	\$13,508.00	0.40%
TOTAL PERSONNEL	\$116,160.00	\$31,536.00	\$102,118.00	\$116,214.00	0.05%
<u>OPERATIONS</u>					
Supplies	\$14,240.00	\$3,103.00	\$13,900.00	\$15,420.00	8.29%
Dues, Training & Travel	\$7,751.00	\$3,281.00	\$6,651.00	\$7,751.00	0.00%
Utilities	\$11,400.00	\$4,531.00	\$11,300.00	\$11,400.00	0.00%
Vehicle Expense	\$11,100.00	\$2,243.00	\$10,800.00	\$10,900.00	-1.80%
Equipment & Bldg. Maintenance	\$4,525.00	\$2,603.00	\$4,375.00	\$3,120.00	-31.05%
Contractual Services	\$135,817.00	\$53,533.00	\$129,847.00	\$134,817.00	-0.74%
Miscellaneous	\$90,800.00	\$31,005.00	\$82,150.00	\$83,800.00	-7.71%
SUB-TOTAL 2 - 8	\$275,633.00	\$100,299.00	\$259,023.00	\$267,208.00	-3.06%
TOTAL PERSONNEL & OPERATIONS	\$391,793.00	\$131,835.00	\$361,141.00	\$383,422.00	-2.14%
Fixed Assets	\$10,440.00	\$0.00	\$7,161.00	\$7,135.00	-31.66%
TOTAL BUDGET	\$402,233.00	\$131,835.00	\$368,302.00	\$390,557.00	-2.90%
Total Revenue	\$9,741.00	\$2,447.00	\$9,041.00	\$8,501.00	-12.73%

Summary

1230 Jury Services and Court Costs 2012 Budget

	2011 Budget	2011 Expenditures Jan -June	2012 Budget Request	% Increase 2011 Budget to 2012 Budget
<u>Operations</u>				
Supplies	\$8,820.00	\$2,196.10	\$9,075.00	2.89%
Utilities	\$11,000.00	\$4,701.46	\$9,600.00	-12.73%
Equipment Bldg/Maint	\$19,630.00	\$2,934.65	\$10,900.00	-44.47%
Contractual Services	\$70,000.00	\$16,203.96	\$70,000.00	0.00%
Miscellaneous	\$130,800.00	\$35,370.06	\$123,300.00	-5.73%
SUBTOTAL 2-8	\$240,250.00	\$61,406.23	\$222,875.00	-7.23%
Fixed Assets	\$5,600.00	\$2,074.50	\$9,555.00	70.63%
TOTAL BUDGET	\$245,850.00	\$63,480.73	\$232,430.00	-5.46%
Revenue	\$13,650.00	\$3,573.28	\$13,800.00	1.10%

Summary

1210 Circuit Court 2012 Budget

	2011 Budget	2011 Expenditures Jan - June	2012 Budget Requests	% Increase 2011 Budget to 2012 Budget
<u>Personnel</u>				
Salaries	\$779,872.00	\$349,835.94	\$779,872.00	0.00%
Benefits	\$200,745.00	\$81,622.91	\$201,880.00	0.57%
TOTAL PERSONNEL	\$980,617.00	\$431,458.85	\$981,752.00	0.12%
<u>Operations</u>				
Supplies	\$26,510.00	\$7,702.85	\$31,400.00	18.45%
Dues, Travel & Training	\$9,980.00	\$4,013.78	\$9,925.00	-0.55%
Utilities	\$22,600.00	\$9,665.72	\$21,800.00	-3.54%
Vehicle Expense	\$5,425.00	\$1,897.35	\$5,825.00	7.37%
Equipment Bldg/Maint	\$6,820.00	\$3,558.60	\$6,250.00	-8.36%
Contractual Services	\$382,420.00	\$179,453.82	\$376,070.00	-1.66%
Miscellaneous	\$2,400.00	\$454.35	\$1,800.00	-25.00%
SUBTOTAL 2-8	\$456,155.00	\$206,746.47	\$453,070.00	-0.68%
TOTAL PERSONNEL AND OPERATIONS	\$1,436,772.00	\$638,205.32	\$1,434,822.00	-0.14%
Fixed Assets	\$11,560.00	\$5,491.18	\$34,300.00	196.71%
TOTAL BUDGET	\$1,448,332.00	\$643,696.50	\$1,469,122.00	1.44%
REVENUE	\$172,800.00	\$74,410.35	\$161,575.00	-6.50%

Summary

1221 Circuit Clerks Office 2012 Budget

	2011 Budget	2011 Expenditures Jan - Present	2012 Budget Requests	% Increase 2011 Budget to 2012 Budget
Personnel				
Salaries	\$125,795.00	\$64,064.00	\$125,795.00	0.00%
Benefits	\$37,973.00	\$19,913.00	\$37,973.00	0.00%
TOTAL PERSONNEL	\$163,768.00	\$66,027.00	\$163,768.00	0.00%
Operations				
Supplies	\$58,450.00	\$20,738.00	\$58,450.00	0.00%
Dues Travel & Training	\$3,600.00	\$1,719.00	\$3,600.00	0.00%
Utilities	\$16,600.00	\$6,624.00	\$16,600.00	0.00%
Vehicle Expense	\$250.00	\$0.00	\$225.00	-10.00%
Equipment Bldg/Maint.	\$14,200.00	\$6,251.00	\$13,000.00	-8.45%
Contractual Services	\$252,455.00	\$123,114.00	\$252,567.00	0.04%
Miscellaneous	\$1,200.00	\$336.00	\$1,100.00	-8.33%
SUBTOTAL 2:8	\$346,755.00	\$158,782.00	\$345,542.00	0.35%
Fixed Assets	\$3,300.00	\$392.00	\$4,775.00	44.70%
TOTAL BUDGET	\$513,823.00	\$225,201.00	\$514,085.00	0.05%
Revenue	\$123,820.00	\$42,269.00	\$124,308.00	0.39%

Boone County
Prop L Summary
 2011-2012 Comparison

Revenue:

Budget	2011	2012	Comparison Increase/Decrease	Percentage Increase/Decrease
Prop L-2904 (Alt. Sent)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	0.00%
Prop L-2907 (LE)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	0.00%
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	0.00%

Expenditures:

Budget	2011	2012	Comparison Increase/Decrease	Percentage Increase/Decrease
Prop L-2904 (Alt. Sent)	\$331,495.00	\$338,074.00	\$6,579.00	1.98%
Prop L-2907 (LE)	\$3,422.00	\$3,392.00	(\$30.00)	-0.88%
Total	\$334,917.00	\$341,466.00	\$6,549.00	1.96%

Fixed Assets

Budget	2011	2012	Comparison Increase/Decrease	Percentage Increase/Decrease
Prop L-2904 (Alt. Sent)	\$1,560.00	\$740.00	(\$820.00)	-52.56%
Prop L-2907 (LE)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	0.00%
Total	\$1,560.00	\$740.00	(\$820.00)	-52.56%

Summary

2904 Proposition L - Alternative Sentencing Program 2012 Budget

	2011 Budget	2011 Expenditures Jan - June	2012 Budget Request	% Increase 2011 Budget to 2012 Budget
Personnel				
Salaries	\$193,602.00	\$78,029.62	\$178,602.00	-7.75%
Benefits	\$50,359.00	\$22,258.46	\$49,412.00	-1.88%
TOTAL PERSONNEL	\$243,961.00	\$100,288.08	\$228,014.00	-6.54%
Expenditures				
Supplies	\$2,510.00	\$634.52	\$4,935.00	96.61%
Dues Travel & Training	\$3,360.00	\$507.80	\$3,360.00	0.00%
Utilities	\$14,100.00	\$8,348.24	\$15,400.00	9.22%
Vehicle Expense	\$475.00	\$111.29	\$475.00	0.00%
Equipment Bldg/Maint	\$1,610.00	\$537.84	\$950.00	-40.99%
Contractual Services	\$48,019.00	\$16,785.71	\$65,000.00	35.36%
Miscellaneous	\$15,900.00	\$4,511.19	\$19,200.00	20.75%
Sub Total 2 - 8	\$85,974.00	\$31,436.59	\$109,320.00	27.15%
TOTAL PERSONNEL AND OPERATIONS	\$329,935.00	\$131,724.67	\$337,334.00	-2.24%
Fixed Assets	\$1,560.00	\$839.20	\$740.00	-52.56%
TOTAL BUDGET	\$331,495.00	\$132,563.87	\$338,074.00	-1.98%

Summary

2907 Proposition L - Law Enforcement 2012 Budget

	2011 Budget	2011 Expenditures Jan - June	2012 Budget Request	% Increase 2011 to 2012 Budget
<u>Expenditures</u>				
Utilities	\$2,100.00	\$0.00	\$2,100.00	0.00%
Equipment Bldg/Maint	\$1,322.00	\$0.00	\$1,292.00	0.00%
Sub Total 2-8	\$3,422.00	\$0.00	\$3,392.00	-0.88%
TOTAL OPERATIONS	\$3,422.00	\$0.00	\$3,392.00	-0.88%
Fixed Assets	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	0.00%
TOTAL BUDGET	\$3,422.00	\$0.00	\$3,392.00	-0.88%

Boone County
FUND ACCOUNTS
 2011 - 2012
 Comparison

Family Services & Justice Fund	2010	2011	2012	Comparison Increase/Decrease	Percentage Increase/Decrease
Revenue	\$131,000.00	\$130,720.00	\$130,025.00	(\$695.00)	-0.53%
Expenditures	\$150,450.00	\$147,500.00	\$148,400.00	\$900.00	0.61%

Adult Drug Court Fund	2010	2011	2012	Comparison Increase/Decrease	Percentage Increase/Decrease
Revenue	\$115,550.00	\$130,550.00	\$114,025.00	(\$16,525.00)	-12.66%
Expenditures	\$129,470.00	\$121,040.00	\$140,300.00	\$19,260.00	15.91%

Administration of Justice Fund	2010	2011	2012	Comparison Increase/Decrease	Percentage Increase/Decrease
Revenue	\$21,735.00	\$20,285.00	\$19,660.00	(\$625.00)	-3.08%
Expenditures	\$15,300.00	\$16,100.00	\$17,100.00	\$1,000.00	6.21%

Fixed Assets

Budget	2010	2011	2012	Comparison Increase/Decrease	Percentage Increase/Decrease
Family Services & Justice Fund	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	0.00%
Adult Drug Court Fund	\$1,000.00	\$770.00	\$880.00	\$110.00	14.29%
Administration of Justice Fund	\$2,200.00	\$3,500.00	\$3,500.00	\$0.00	0.00%
Total	\$3,200.00	\$4,270.00	\$4,380.00	\$110.00	2.58%



2820
 Family Services and Justice Fund
 2012 Budget

Expenditures	2011 Budget	2011 Expenditures Jan - June	2012 Budget Request	% Increase 2011 to 2012 Budget
Supplies	\$650.00	\$0.00	\$650.00	0.00%
Training and Travel	\$300.00	\$0.00	\$300.00	0.00%
Contractual Services	\$146,550.00	\$64,366.13	\$147,450.00	0.61%
Total Expenditures	\$147,500.00	\$64,366.13	\$148,400.00	0.61%
Revenue	\$130,720.00	\$67,155.32	\$130,025.00	-0.53%

Budget Administration and accounting notations for Family Services and Justice Fund

- * The Family Services and Justice Fund for the 13th Judicial Circuit Court consists of two separate accounts maintained by the County Treasurers' offices in Boone & Callaway.
- * All expenses from the Family Services and Justice Fund are paid out of the Boone County Family Services and Justice Fund with Callaway County Family Services and Justice Fund reimbursing Boone County Family Services and Justice Fund for their share. The Callaway reimbursement is reported as a revenue source in the Boone County Family Services and Justice Fund.
- * The Callaway Family Services and Justice Fund accounts for Revenue directly received from the Callaway County Circuit Clerk, and the Callaway County Juvenile office. Expenditures from the Callaway Family Services and Justice Fund are the reimbursements to the Boone County Family Services and Justice Fund.

Summary

2830 Boone County Drug Court Fund 2012 Budget

	2011 Budget	2011 Expenditures Jan - June	2012 Budget Request	% Increase 2011 Budget to 2012 Budget
Supplies	\$4,690.00	\$1,713.15	\$16,430.00	250.32%
Travel & Training	\$9,580.00	\$2,023.05	\$12,940.00	35.07%
Vehicle Expenses	\$1,450.00	\$33.66	\$1,450.00	0.00%
Contractual Services	\$95,650.00	\$22,446.97	\$85,650.00	-10.45%
Miscellaneous	\$8,900.00	\$138.31	\$22,950.00	157.87%
Sub Total:	\$120,270.00	\$26,355.14	\$139,420.00	15.92%
Fixed Assets	\$770.00	\$0.00	\$880.00	100.00%
TOTAL BUDGET	\$121,040.00	\$476.47	\$140,300.00	15.91%
Revenue	\$130,550.00	\$55,740.10	\$114,025.00	-12.66%

Summary

2850 Boone County Administration of Justice Fund 2012 Budget

Expenditures	2011 Budget	2011 Expenditures Jan-May	2012 Budget Request	% Increase 2011 to 2012 Budget
Supplies	\$600.00	\$68.57	\$600.00	0.00%
Dues, Travel & Training	\$7,000.00	\$537.54	\$7,000.00	0.00%
Contractual Services	\$5,000.00	\$0.00	\$5,000.00	0.00%
Miscellaneous	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,000.00	New Line Item
Sub Total (3-8)	\$12,600.00	\$606.11	\$13,600.00	7.94%
Fixed Assets	\$3,500.00	\$296.03	\$3,500.00	0.00%
TOTAL BUDGET	\$16,100.00	\$902.14	\$17,100.00	6.21%
Revenue	\$20,285.00	\$7,331.39	\$19,660.00	3.08%

BOONE COUNTY LAW LIBRARY
2011 REVENUE AND EXPENDITURES

	Through 5-11	End of Year Estimate	2012 Estimates
Account Balance January 1, 2011	\$72,117.17	\$72,117.17	\$86,654.44
Revenue through May 31, 2011			
Fees	\$9,499.80	\$18,999.60	\$19,200.00
Fees - Probate	\$2,110.00	\$4,220.00	\$4,800.00
Interest	\$235.92	\$466.86	\$470.00
	<u>\$11,845.72</u>	<u>\$23,686.46</u>	<u>\$24,470.00</u>
Expenditures through May 31, 2011			
Publications	\$2,788.02	\$4,472.04	\$12,750.00 *
Misc.	\$2,340.47	\$4,677.15	\$4,800.00
Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	<u>\$5,128.49</u>	<u>\$9,149.19</u>	<u>\$17,550.00</u>
Ending Balance	\$78,834.40	\$86,654.44	\$93,574.44

*if new Statute Books

**Court Services
Grants
Boone & Callaway Counties**

GRANTS – 2012

Active Grants – Boone County

1) Division of Youth Services

Grant Year: July 2011 – June 2012
Grant Award: \$87,433.00
Local Match: -0-

Funding Provides: One part-time family therapist position, 2 FTE DJO positions
Start Date: 1995
Funding Authority: Division of Youth Services

2) Drug Courts Coordinating Commission

13TH Judicial Circuit Drug Court

Grant Year: July 2011 – June 2012
Grant Award: \$336,900.00
Local Match: -0-

Funding Provides: Drug treatment & drug testing
Funding Authority: Drug Court Coordinating Commission

13th Judicial Circuit DWI Court

Grant Year: September 2011 – October 2012
Grant Award: \$40,000.00
Local Match: -0-

Funding Provides: Drug treatment and drug testing
Funding Authority: Drug Court Coordinating Commission

**3) Domestic Relations Resolution Fund – (DRRF)
Contact for Kids: A Safe Way**

Grant Year: July 2011 – June 2012
Grant Award: \$8,700.00

Funding Provides: Supervised access and exchange program

Start Date: July 2009
Funding Authority: DRRF-OSCA

**Court Services
Grants**
Boone & Callaway Counties

4) Victim Services Grant

Grant Year: July 1, 2011 – June 30, 2013 (2 Year Grant)
Grant Award: \$89,324.37
Local Match: -0-

Funding Provides: One FTE Victim Advocate in both Boone and Callaway counties

Start Date: 1999
Funding Authority: Department of Public Safety

**Court Services
Grants
Boone & Callaway Counties**

PENDING:

1) **OnTrack Program**

Grant Year: October 2011 – September 2012
Grant Award: \$155,515.08
(This has not yet been awarded. This amount reflects the 2011 FY amount.)
Local Match: In kind
Funding Provides: Administration fee for full time OnTrack Court Administrator, community service stipends and incentive gift cards, housing assistance, percentage of 2 judges' salaries
Start Date: 2010
Funding Authority: DOC

2) **Fostering Court Improvement Grant**

Grant Year: October 2011-October 2012
Grant Award: \$3,000.00
Local Match: -0-
Funding Provides: Meals at round table luncheons with CD and JO Staff, meals at monthly meetings, subscription to PublicRecordsnow.com to assist with locating permanency for children in cases
Start Date: 2009
Funding Authority: OSCA

3) **Juvenile Accountability Block Grant**

Grant Year: October 2011- September 2012
Grant Award: \$ 20,336.05
Local Match: \$ 2,259.56
Funding Provides: Application has been made for funding of drug testing, continued funding of the music and art programs at RLP JJC, art supplies, and additional security cameras and equipment
Start Date: October 1999
Funding Authority: Department of Public Safety

4) **Title II – Juvenile Detention Alternative Initiative**

Grant Year: October 1, 2011- September 30,2012
Grant Award: \$ 36,566.40
Local Match: \$ -0-

**Court Services
Grants
Boone & Callaway Counties**

Funding Provides: Application has been made for team training and assessment of detention practices as well as funding for shelter care.

Start Date: 2010

Funding Authority: Department of Public Safety (Annie E. Casey Foundation)

5) **STOP Grant – Integrated Domestic Violence Program – MEND Program**

Grant Year: January 2012- December 2012

Grant Award: \$ 78,737.27

Local Match: \$ 26,245.75 (Match is made from contributions made to Family Counseling Center)

Funding Provides: Payment for participation in MEND program and to fund the Coordinator position

Start Date: January 2010

Funding Authority: Department of Public Safety

Purchasing

5. Surplus disposal of miscellaneous equipment (first reading)

Commissioner Elkin stated it looks like most of the equipment is from the Sheriff's Department.

Commissioner Miller stated it looks like they cleaned out the stuff they had stored at the North Facility.

Commissioner Robb stated this is a first reading and requested the Deputy County Clerk to schedule this item for a second reading at the next available commission meeting with an appropriate order for approval.

6. Bid award to Emery Sapp & Sons, Inc. for bid 33-14JUL11 – 2011 Concrete Rehabilitation (second reading, first read 7/21/2011)

Commissioner Miller moved on this day the County Commission of the County of Boone does hereby award bid 33-14JUL11 – 2011 Concrete Rehabilitation to Emery Sapp & Sons, Inc. It is further ordered the Presiding Commissioner is hereby authorized to sign said contract.

Commissioner Elkin seconded the motion.

The motion carried 3 to 0. **Order # 325-2011**

Commission

7. Budget amendment to purchase a new Sentinel Patriot system for Joint Communications (second reading, first read 8/4/2011)

Commissioner Miller stated Commission could do the budget amendment so the money is available, but hold off on approving the contract.

Commissioner Elkin moved on this day the County Commission of the County of Boone does hereby approve the following budget amendment to purchase a Sentinel Patriot system for Joint Communications:

Department	Account	Department Name	Account Name	Decrease \$	Increase \$
2020	91301	E911 Emergency Telephone	Computer Hardware		255,740. 00
2020	91302	E911 Emergency Telephone	Computer Software		178,610. 00

Commissioner Miller seconded the motion.

The motion carried 3 to 0. **Order # 326-2011**

8. Sole Source Purchase – 105-123111SS – Sentinel Patriot E911 System Upgrade (second reading, first read 8/4/2011)

Commissioner Miller stated she thought that if this was going to be authorized, the Deputy County Clerk should hold it instead of sending it out. Commissioner Miller stated this would give the Presiding Commissioner the ability to release the contract whenever he is satisfied with it.

Commissioner Miller moved on this day the County Commission of the County of Boone does hereby approve Joint Communications' request to utilize Sole Source Vendor CenturyLink for Sole Source Purchase 105-123111SS – Sentinel Patriot E911 System Upgrade. It is further ordered the Presiding Commissioner is hereby authorized to sign said contract.

Commissioner Elkin seconded the motion.

The motion carried 3 to 0. **Order # 327-2011**

9. Public Comment

10. Commissioner Reports

Commissioner Miller reported Mrs. Benton called her about Lotus Court. Commissioner Miller stated Mrs. Benton will be tickled to know that Lotus Court is one of the roads that will be improved as part of the Concrete Rehabilitation project.

Commissioner Elkin stated Commissioner Miller should check on the exact start date. Commissioner Elkin stated he did not believe they would start until the chip seal project is done near the end of the month.

The meeting adjourned at 10:53 a.m.

Attest:

Edward H. Robb
Presiding Commissioner

Wendy S. Noren
Clerk of the County Commission

Karen M. Miller
District I Commissioner

Skip Elkin
District II Commissioner