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What is Justice Reinvestment?

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

The Justice Reinvestment Initiative is supported by funding from the U.S. Department of Justice’s Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) and The Pew Charitable Trusts.
Pennsylvania spending on corrections continues to increase at the expense of other public safety investments.

Pennsylvania has the largest incarceration rate in the region, despite the fact that crime and arrests are generally decreasing.*

General Fund Correction Expenditures (in billions)

- FY06: $1.6
- FY16: $2.5

Correctional General Fund Spending: 61%
Total General Fund Spending: 24%

2014 Incarceration Rate

- VT
- RI
- PA: 394
- NY
- NJ
- NH
- MA
- ME
- CT

Source: NASBO State Expenditure Reports, 2005-2016, Crime in Pennsylvania Annual Uniform Crime Reports.

* Notable exceptions to the downward trend include a 29% increase in theft arrests, a 9% increase in drug arrests, and a 7% increase in DUIs.
Pennsylvania fails to frontload resources to reduce recidivism for the enormous population on probation.

- People on supervision account for 73 percent of the correctional control population but only 14 percent of expenditures.
- Texas demonstrates a more robust and effective state investment in a locally-run probation system.
- Comparison states invest 8 to 10 times more annually for enhanced probation interventions.
Pennsylvania has not fully embraced strategies proven to be effective for reducing recidivism.

Existing research shows that when done well, probation holds the potential to curb recidivism.

JRI research in Pennsylvania confirms the recidivism-reduction impact of a well-designed, state-supported community intervention.

Program | Impact on Recidivism | Cost to Benefit Ratio
---|---|---
Inpatient/intensive outpatient drug treatment (community) | -5% | $1 : $3.96
Outpatient/non-intensive drug treatment (community) | -8% | $1 : $10.85
Intensive supervision (treatment) | -21% | $1 : $1.57
Supervision with Risk Need and Responsivity Principles (high and moderate risk) | -24% | $1 : $3.73
Swift & certain/graduated sanction case management for substance-abusing offenders | -26% | $1 : $4.01

WSIPP, Inventory of Evidence-Based and Research-Based Programs for Adult Corrections, http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/ReportFile/1542/Wsipp_Inventory-of-Evidence-Based-and-Research-Based-Programs-for-Adult-Corrections_Final-Report.pdf
Key Goals of the Pennsylvania Justice Reinvestment Package

1. Realize savings by addressing ineffective short minimum prison sentences.

2. Invest in more effective probation to enable recidivism reduction.

3. Pursue pretrial and sentencing policies to further reduce recidivism.

Despite added program requirements, short prison sentences show no improvement in recidivism compared to similar groups sentenced to jail, and lack the efficiency of a more predictable release at their minimum.

Increasing effective probation interventions will reduce progression to county and state prison sentences.

- Early risk assessment
- Reduce pretrial detention
- Increase diversion and services
- Improve data collection and access
- Shift sentencing toward recidivism reduction
Policy Overview

Policy

1. Support public safety for victims by serving more people, more effectively.

2. Improve pretrial decision making to increase public safety and decrease county prison costs.

3. Revise policies to guide sentencing decisions to reduce recidivism.

4. Increase the use of effective probation interventions to lower recidivism.

5. Make short prison sentences more predictable and less expensive.

6. Improve recidivism results for parolees by targeting resources and responses.
Public Safety for Victims

Serve more victims, more effectively.

a. Require police officers to provide victim services information at the scene of the crime, or explain why they did not.

b. Require prosecutors to notify the Victim Advocate on behalf of personal injury crime victims, to facilitate parole notifications.

c. Merge the current Crime Victims Compensation Fund and the Victim Witness Services Fund into a single Crime Victim Services and Compensation Fund.

d. Increase coverage of crime victim compensation:
   • Increase statute of limitations from 2 to 3 years
   • Allow for good cause to file a claim past the 3-year limitation
   • Decrease minimum loss requirement from $100 to $50
   • Add Accidents Involving Death or Personal Injury While Not Properly Licensed (Title 75, §3742.1) as an eligible crime
   • Add vehicles to crime scene cleanup expenses
   • Do not make minors submit counseling bills to insurance unless the parents choose to have it submitted

PCCD estimates the fiscal impact of these changes to total ~$250K per year.
Informed Pretrial Decisions

Improve pretrial decision making to increase public safety and decrease county prison costs.

a. Request that the Supreme Court review court rules.
b. Establish new working group to develop strategy.
c. Organize statewide forum on pretrial reform.
d. Continue to build the state’s capacity to assist counties and judges.
e. Pursue achievable goals in each county:
   i. Increase use of risk assessment.
   ii. Decrease length of stay in pretrial status.
   iii. Increase referrals to programs that can reduce recidivism.
   iv. Collect consistent data on pretrial populations.
   v. Achieve greater transparency and predictability of decisions.

Pretrial strategy starts with core group of planners and builds out to statewide forum of county teams.

**Core Group:**
- CSG
- PCCD
- AOPC
- PPSA
- CCAP

**Key Stakeholders:**
- Law Enforcement
- MDJs & Municipal Courts
- Bail Industry

**Statewide Forum:**
- County Teams
- Supreme Court Representatives
Counties could eventually move toward data-driven pretrial release and supervision guidelines.

Virginia Pretrial Risk Assessment Instrument (VPRAI) Praxis

The Praxis is a decision grid that uses the VPRAI risk level and the charge category to determine the appropriate release type and level of supervision. Evaluation showed it to reliably predict success or failure pending trial.

Supervision Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervision Levels</th>
<th>Level I</th>
<th>Level II</th>
<th>Level III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Court date reminder for every court date</td>
<td>Court date reminder for every court date</td>
<td>Court date reminder for every court date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criminal history check before court date</td>
<td>Criminal history check before court date</td>
<td>Criminal history check before court date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Face-to-face contact once a month</td>
<td>Face-to-face contact every other week</td>
<td>Face-to-face contact weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative contact once a month (telephone,</td>
<td>Alternative contact every other week</td>
<td>Special condition compliance verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e-mail, text, or others as approved locally)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Special condition compliance verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special conditions compliance verification</td>
<td></td>
<td>Special conditions compliance verification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effective Sentencing Policies

Revise policies to guide sentencing decisions to reduce recidivism.

a. Request that the Commission on Sentencing
   i. revise prior record scoring to reflect risk to reoffend;
   ii. adjust some minimum ranges incrementally to support further reinvestments in recidivism-reducing interventions;
   iii. guide the use of restrictive conditions of probation, terms of probation, use of split sentences, and maximum sentences;
   iv. create interactive guideline information to support decisions with risk, recidivism, and cost information; and
   v. continue to analyze the cost and impact of restoring mandatory minimum sentences.

b. Streamline the process for admissions into State Intermediate Punishment.

c. Reinforce through legislation that judges have the inherent authority to terminate probation when it has been successful, and provide credit for time successfully served even when probation is revoked.

d. Simplify sentencing law by merging probation and County Intermediate Punishment into one sentencing option.
Small reductions in length of incarceration in selected grid cells can create further savings for investment in community interventions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OGS</th>
<th>PRS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>RFEL</th>
<th>REVOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3-12</td>
<td>6-14</td>
<td>9-16</td>
<td>12-18</td>
<td>15-21</td>
<td>21-27</td>
<td>27-40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>RS 9</td>
<td>1-12</td>
<td>3-14</td>
<td>6-16</td>
<td>9-16</td>
<td>12-18</td>
<td>24-36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>RS 3</td>
<td>RS 9</td>
<td>RS &lt;12</td>
<td>3-14</td>
<td>6-16</td>
<td>9-16</td>
<td>12-30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example
If minimum ranges in select PRS cells within OGS 4 to 6 were reduced slightly, just enough to reduce average length of stay by 2 to 3 months, this would eventually save ~430 prison beds at a cost of nearly $16M per year.

Note that adjusting sentence length on the margin has no impact on recidivism outcomes, but can reduce population and costs significantly. This illustration only depicts volume and potential savings at the state level, but small reductions in incarceration lengths would also generate significant savings for county prisons.

### Sentencing Level 3 Cells in OGS 4,5,6
- Annual Prison Sentences ~500
- Current Average Minimum Range 8 to 16 months
- Median Minimum Sentence 12 months

### Sentencing Level 4 Cells in OGS 4,5,6
- Annual Prison Sentences ~1,400
- Current Average Minimum Range 18 to 27 months
- Median Minimum Sentence 20 months
Sentencing guideline information can be made more interactive to support decisions with risk, recidivism, and cost information.

**Missouri Sentencing Information Application**

Enter **offense** and **criminal history** information, then enter **information for a short risk assessment** (including items such as sex, age, prior jail and prison incarcerations, prior guilty findings, prior probation/parole revocations, prior escapes, substance abuse indicator, education level, and employment status)

The system then generates a report such as:

![Image of report with highlighted sections: Offense Summary, Disposition Pattern, Average Time Served, Recidivism by Sanction Type, Sanction Cost Comparison.]

https://www.courts.mo.gov/rs/
Use of SIP can be increased by streamlining the selection process.

**Current Selection Process**

**Step 1 Eligibility**
Court determines eligibility by statute and Sentencing Guidelines:
- Crime motivated by addiction
- Excludes certain convictions (weapons, violence, sex offenses)
- 10 years free of violence
- Facing a minimum sentence of 30 months or more

**Step 2 Assessment**
Committed to DOC for comprehensive assessment, further review of eligibility and determination of treatment needs/amenability

**Step 3 Sentencing**
Within 60 days of commitment, the court, District Attorney, and Sentencing Commission will receive DOC’s recommendation. If all parties agree to SIP recommendation, the sentence will commence.

---

**Proposed Selection Process**

**Step 1 Eligibility and Sentencing**
Court determines eligibility by statute and Sentencing Guidelines:
- Crime motivated by addiction
- Excludes certain convictions (weapons, violence, sex offenses)
- 10 years free of violence
- Sentenced to a minimum prison sentence of no more than 2 (or 3) years
  Judge shall have the discretion to exclude a defendant from eligibility if inappropriate for placement in the program

**Step 2 Assessment and Placement**
DOC completes comprehensive assessment, further review of eligibility and determination of treatment needs/amenability.
If the department in its discretion believes placement in the drug offender treatment program is appropriate, the department shall make the placement and notify the court.

**SIP Program Design Unchanged**

**SIP Phase 1**
Confinement/Inpatient Treatment
Minimum of 7 months in SCI with at least 4 months in an institutional therapeutic community

**SIP Phase 2**
Inpatient Treatment
Minimum of 2 months in a community-based therapeutic community

**SIP Phase 3**
Outpatient Treatment
Minimum of 6 months in an outpatient addiction treatment program while housed in a community corrections facility or an approved residence

**SIP Phase 4**
Supervised Reintegration
A period of reintegration into the community for the balance of the 24 months
If unable to complete the program within 24 months, it may be extended to 30 months. Expelled participants shall complete their sentence in the SCI.

Proposed process is modeled on motivational boot camp admission process.
Increase the use of effective probation interventions to lower recidivism.

a. Redesign state support and leadership so that local departments have the tools and resources for effective supervision.

b. Use a funding mechanism tied to the volume and needs of those supervised rather than a percentage of probation salary costs incurred by the county since 1966. Maintain discretionary grants designed to assist a department with funding an evidence-based program.

c. Allow counties to retain all supervision fees collected instead of remitting to the state temporarily.

d. Create a state adult probation governing body under a board of primarily criminal judges. Charge the body to:
   i. Implement new funding mechanism
   ii. Support data collection
   iii. Provide training and technical assistance to guide the adoption of effective sanctions for technical probation violations and other evidence-based supervision practices
Community interventions, like CIP and D&A RIP, are less costly than incarceration, and show equal or better recidivism outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property and Drug Offenses</th>
<th>Probation</th>
<th>CIP</th>
<th>D&amp;A RIP ¹</th>
<th>Jail</th>
<th>Prison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Annual Admissions</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>4,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Average Length of Stay</td>
<td>20.0 months</td>
<td>18.0 ² months</td>
<td>15.8 ² months</td>
<td>4.5 months</td>
<td>30.5 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Cost per Participant</td>
<td>$1,000 ³</td>
<td>$1,300 ⁴</td>
<td>$4,130</td>
<td>$24,500 ⁵</td>
<td>$36,500 ⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per Sentence (Length of Stay x Cost per Day)</td>
<td>$1,667</td>
<td>$1,950</td>
<td>$5,438</td>
<td>$9,188</td>
<td>$92,771</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recidivism Analysis Recap
1) Probation recidivism outcomes were similar to jail at a lower cost.
2) CIP had lower rearrest rates than probation for DUI offenses, although the results were slightly mixed for recidivism among non-DUI offenses.
3) CIP comparisons with jail and prison showed little difference in recidivism, but at lower cost.
4) D&A RIP had better outcomes compared to CIP and probation.
5) SIP recidivism was lower than CIP and was comparable or better than D&A RIP. SIP recidivism also appeared to be lower than prison, but the comparison to general prison sentences is difficult to make.

¹. State Funded D&A RIP only.
². Average LOS for all offense types.
³. Legislative Budget and Finance Committee, Funding of County Adult Probation Services, February 2015.
⁴. Cost estimate based on blend of state and county funds.
⁵. Average statewide county jail cost per day in 2014.
⁶. Fully loaded cost per year.
Probation intervention funding can be distributed with higher rates at higher sentencing levels to support intensive interventions.

State probation funds distributed by volume with differential rates based on sentencing level factoring in risk/needs:

- **Level 5** – 3x baseline rate
- **Level 4** – 2x baseline rate
- **Level 3** – 1.5x baseline rate
- **Level 2** – Baseline rate
Current state contribution combined with new reinvestment can be distributed based on demand and still maintain current baseline funding.

An extra $20M in state funds would more than double the current GIA contribution and could support hundreds of additional probation officers or thousands of slots in expanded probation services.
Reduce state funding agencies from two to one, in addition to reforming the funding mechanism.

**County Adult Probation and Parole Advisory Committee**

- Establish new oversight to advance probation practice.
- Increase state contribution to county supervision.
- Eliminate current GIA and the pointless transfer of supervision fees to the state and back to the county.
Make short prison sentences more predictable and less expensive.

a. For the population with sentences to state prison of 24 months or less, institute a presumptive release to parole at the minimum sentence.

b. Release to state parole supervision and resources.

10% of admissions are estimated to have major disciplinary infractions that exclude them from eligibility for presumptive parole.

* Excludes RRRI, SIP, and Boot Camp admissions
Effective Parole

Improve recidivism results for parolees by targeting resources and responses.

a. Provide statutory authority for officers to use brief sanctions for technical parole violations.

b. Develop criteria for parole violator referrals to residential and non-residential community correction programs based on risk of reoffending and violation severity.

c. Develop limited admission criteria for the parole board to release people to residential centers and reduce the use of these centers for low- and medium-risk people.

d. Establish performance-based contracts for non-residential community corrections service providers to improve the quality of services.

Assumptions used in impact modeling:

- Up to half of the annual volume of written warnings would instead receive one short sanction.
- The current volume of halfway back admissions would be reduced by 25% and serve the equivalent of two 5-day sanctions.
- 15% of technical violators going to PVC and CCJs would instead serve the equivalent of two or three 5-day sanctions.
- Just 5% fewer technical parole violators who return to prison would instead be likely to serve the equivalent of six 5-day sanctions.
Parole sanctions matrix will need to be revised for use of brief sanctions for technical violations.

PBPP’s Violation Sanctions Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High-range Responses</th>
<th>Medium-range Responses</th>
<th>Low-range Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inpatient Alcohol or Drug Treatment</td>
<td>Cognitive behavioral</td>
<td>Written travel restriction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC/CCF Halfway Back</td>
<td>Day reporting</td>
<td>Written warning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV Center</td>
<td>Family reunification</td>
<td>Community service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Jail</td>
<td>Housing Group</td>
<td>Curfew (increased curfew)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI</td>
<td>Domestic Violence Group</td>
<td>Refer to ASCRA groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Uses Three Factors
- Violation Severity
- Parolee Risk Score
- Prior Adjustment

To guide responses from three ranges:

Short sanctions for technical parole violations would be included as an additional medium- to high-range response.
Impact Analysis Approach and Key Assumptions

General
Five-year impact projection utilizing historical data to simulate the status quo trajectory of specific PADOC subpopulations and compare them against assumed changes if the entire policy package was implemented as described in this presentation. SCI bed savings under the impact model are compared to the current population forecast.

Effective Date – January 1, 2018, but with some exceptions.

Impact assumptions, drivers, and results vetted with DOC, Commission on Sentencing, PBPP, and Office of the Budget.

Policy 5 – Short sentence parole
- Includes prison sentences with minimums up to 2 years, excluding personal injury crimes
- Excludes RRRI, SIP, and Boot Camp participants
- Proportion estimated with a major disciplinary violation and ineligible: 10%
- Estimated annual volume of short sentence admissions: ~2,840
- Average length of stay in SCI if this group is not presumptively paroled: 20.2 months
- Average length of stay if released at minimum: 16.2 months
- Assumes a small “reaction” increase in average minimum sentences, and a delay in release for those that arrive at DOC very close to minimum date to allow for intake and assessment processes

Policy 6a – Statutory authority for up to 5-day sanctions for technical parole violations
- Assumes limited proportion of the annual volume of technical parole violators will receive a shorter sanction (25% of Halfway Back admissions, 15% of PVC and CCJ admissions, 5% of SCI admissions)
- Current length of stay for technical violators: Halfway Back 1.9 months, PVC 2.3 months, CCJ 4.3 months, SCI 6.7 months
- Sanction time expected to be served in PVC or CCJ
- Average shortened length of stay under this policy modeled to be the equivalent of multiple short stays: Halfway Back 10 days, PVC 10 days, CCJ 15 days, SCI 1 month
- Accounts for net-widening possibility that 50% of current written warnings become short sanctions, and for the extra volume of sanctions from the additional people due to short sentence parole under policy 5.

Policy 3b – Streamline the process for admissions into State Intermediate Punishment (SIP)
- Assumes a 10% increase in annual admissions to SIP (~65 additional admissions)
- Length of stay in SCI for this group if not diverted to SIP: 26 months
- Shortened length of stay in SCI under SIP: 9 months
Policy framework projected to avert forecasted prison demand and $108 million in related costs over five years.

Current Forecast
-2,232 (-4%)

Impact Projection with Policy Options
-3,264 (-7%)

Five-Year Averted Costs
$108M

Actual SCI Population

Projected SCI Beds Saved at FY-end

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-291</td>
<td>-1,040</td>
<td>-1,036</td>
<td>-1,032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Five-year total based on incremental SCI costs per day avoided below the current forecast ($95M) as well as the cost of averted community corrections beds ($13M).
## Averted Costs and Proposed Reinvestment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>FY2019</th>
<th>FY2020</th>
<th>FY2021</th>
<th>FY2022</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Averted Costs</strong></td>
<td>$0.00M</td>
<td>$3.70M</td>
<td>$21.20M</td>
<td>$42.60M</td>
<td>$41.50M</td>
<td>$108.00M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation Reinvestment</td>
<td>$0.00M</td>
<td>$3.00M</td>
<td>$10.00M</td>
<td>$20.00M</td>
<td>$20.00M</td>
<td>$53.00M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Compensation</td>
<td>$0.00M</td>
<td>$0.25M</td>
<td>$0.25M</td>
<td>$0.25M</td>
<td>$0.25M</td>
<td>$1.00M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Reinvestment</strong></td>
<td>$0.00M</td>
<td>$3.25M</td>
<td>$10.25M</td>
<td>$20.25M</td>
<td>$20.25M</td>
<td>$54.00M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projected Savings</strong></td>
<td>$0.00M</td>
<td>$0.45M</td>
<td>$10.95M</td>
<td>$21.35M</td>
<td>$21.25M</td>
<td>$54.00M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The impact assumptions are designed to be conservative and not overstate the possible bed savings and averted costs. Notably, there are several ways in which additional savings may be achieved, which are not included in the impact assumptions:

- Retroactivity or accelerated implementation for short prison sentence parole, or less than 100% disapproval of parole at the minimum for personal injury crimes
- Reduced probation recidivism and impact on county and state prisons from the improvements and reinvestment in probation
- Larger than 10% anticipated expansion of SIP admissions
- Sentencing guideline revisions that target reduced recidivism or reduce minimum sentences
If enacted, state leaders will have the opportunity to request additional technical assistance and resources to implement these policies.

Year One

Phase I

Analyze data to design policy changes

- Collect and examine data
- Engage stakeholders
- Develop policy options
- Draft legislation / bill passage
- Plan for implementation of policy goals

Year Two

Phase II

Implement Policy Changes

- Statewide outreach and discovery
- Develop metrics to track outcomes

Implementation Assistance and Establish JR Strategies

- Plan for and allocate reinvestment funds
- Develop implementation plan
- Deliver targeted technical assistance, providing expertise and support for effective implementation

Measure Impacts

- Monitor metrics
- Adjust implementation strategy as needed

Year Three
Next Steps Involve Effort in All Three Branches of Government

**Legislative Branch**
- Assembly – enact JR legislation and appropriations
- PCS – pursue SGL reforms alongside current work on parole guidelines and risk-based PSIs

**Executive Branch**
- PBPP – short sentence and community corrections reengineering; short sanction policies; assist transition to CAPPAC
- DOC – short sentence and community corrections reengineering
- PCCD – launch CAPPAC; implement victim comp; support pretrial working group
- Office of the Governor – executive order creating a pretrial working group

**Judicial Branch**
- Supreme Court – rule changes
- AOPC – support pretrial WG and connection to court rules; assist transition to CAPPAC
- Judicial education
Pennsylvania Justice Reinvestment Timeline

- Working Group Meeting 1
- Working Group Meeting 2
- Working Group Meeting 3
- Working Group Meeting 4
- Working Group Meeting 5
- Final Report and Bill Introduction
- Statewide Pretrial Event

Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec |
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
2017 Session

Data Analysis
- Impact Analysis

Policymaker and Stakeholder Engagement
- Policy Option Development
- Ongoing Engagement
Thank You

Patrick Armstrong, Policy Analyst
parmstrong@csg.org

To receive monthly updates about all states engaged with justice reinvestment initiatives as well as other CSG Justice Center programs, sign up at: csgjusticecenter.org/subscribe
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