

1. What if any of the below strategies used by other states—and some counties in Michigan currently—would you support?
 - A. Establish statutory purpose of detention as for use only when public safety is at risk or youth are a flight risk (for their court appearance), and require findings on the written record when youth are detained for reasons other than indication of such by detention screening tool.
 - B. Restrict the use of detention solely for one or more of the following need based reasons:
 - Behavioral health treatment
 - Medical care
 - Family conflict/caregiver can't be found
 - Self-protection (e.g. runaway, self-harm risk, trafficking, etc.)
 - C. Restrict the use of detention for youth who commit status or other low level offenses.
 - D. Restrict the use of detention for violations of a court order unless the violation is for behaviors that would otherwise constitute a new offense and/or detention screening tool indicates a public safety/fight risk.
 - E. Limit/restrict the use of detention as a disposition (unless a county has longer-term residential beds within their detention facility).
 - Statute currently requires such detention for youth adjudicated of a firearm offense
 - F. Limit/restrict the placement of juveniles in adult jails pre-adjudication/conviction, including youth tried as adults.
 - G. Establish length of stay parameters/required review hearings after youth are detained for a certain length of time for pre-disposition detention.
 - H. Establish maximum lengths of stay for detaining youth post-disposition, including specifically for youth awaiting placement.
2. Either for individual recommendations above, or more generally, please comment on the following:
 - i. Are the recommendations best enacted through legislation, court rule changes, administrative policy (such as licensing), and/or funding requirements?
 - ii. What if any preconditions are necessary for your support of one or more of the recommendations?
 - i. No preconditions--recommendations should be adopted immediately
 - ii. Recommendations should be adopted with delayed effective dates (e.g. 6, 12, 24 months, etc.) to allow for sufficient planning/readiness
 - iii. Recommendations should be adopted with delayed effective dates and only if additional short-term funding mechanisms are in place such as increased CCF reimbursement rates for alternatives and increased funding for RDSS
 - iv. Would support the recommendations but only after increased funding is already allocated and administered and assessment of whether it is sufficient