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- CSG Justice Center provides practical, nonpartisan advice informed by the best available evidence
Justice Reinvestment

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

Funding and partners

A data-driven “Idaho Solution” for increased public safety and cost-effectiveness

Idaho Legislature enacts bipartisan resolution authorizing the establishment of an Interim Committee to undertake a study of the state’s criminal justice system.

Governor Otter, Chief Justice Burdick, Senate Pres. Pro Tem Hill, and legislative leaders launch justice reinvestment

Legislative Interim Committee and Justice Reinvestment Working Group formed, both chaired by Senator Lodge and Representative Wills

“Our corrections system is consuming an increasing share of our budget. We have a simple choice to make: continue down this path, or use data to find a smarter way to protect the public and be better stewards of tax dollars.”

*Governor C.L. “Butch” Otter*
Justice Reinvestment Process – Phase I and II

**Bipartisan, bicameral, inter-branch working group**

**Phase I**
**Analyze Data & Develop Policy Options**
- Analyze data; look at crime, courts, corrections, and supervision trends
- Solicit input from stakeholders
- Assess behavioral health system and treatment capacity
- Develop policy options and estimate cost savings

**Phase 2**
**Implement New Policies**
- Identify assistance needed to implement policies effectively
- Deploy targeted reinvestment strategies to increase public safety
- Track the impact of enacted policies/programs
- Monitor recidivism rates and other key measures

**Proposed Timeline**

- **May**
  - Working Group Meeting #1
- **Jun**
  - Interim Committee Meeting #1
- **Jul**
  - Interim Committee Meeting #2
  - Working Group Meeting #2
- **Aug**
  - Working Group Meeting #3
  - Working Group Meeting #4
- **Sep**
  - Guest Speakers
- **Oct**
  - Interim Committee Meeting #3
  - Policy Rollout Press Conference and Bill Introduction
- **Nov**
  - Working Group Meeting #4
- **Dec**
  - 2014 Session

**Data Analysis**
- Initial Data Analysis
- Detailed Data Analysis
- Final Data Analysis
- Impact Analysis

**Stakeholder Involvement**
- Stakeholder Engagement
- Policy Option Development
- Bill Drafting
- Provide Info to Policymakers and Media and Keep Stakeholders Involved
Despite a low crime rate, Idaho’s prison rate is among the highest and growing faster than all but one state.
Status quo trajectory is unsustainable; additional costs to taxpayers would reach $290 million by 2019

Drivers of Idaho’s Prison Growth
• A revolving door of recidivism from supervision and diversion programs is costly and ineffective
Drivers of Idaho’s Prison Growth

- Sanctions for revocations are long and costly, and not tailored for supervision violation behavior

**2013 DOC Snapshot Population (N=6,600)**

- Riders and Rider Failures: 25%
- Revocations and Violators: 41%
- New Commitments: 34%

**Lengthy Prison Stays following Revocation**

- Idaho: 1.8 years
- Probation: 1.6 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Probation</th>
<th>Parole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Drivers of Idaho’s Prison Growth

- Lengthy prison stays for nonviolent offenses are twice the national average

**US Average Time Served and Idaho Average Time Served at First Parole**

- Property: US 2.3, Idaho 3.9
- Drug: US 2.2, Idaho 4.1

**Source:** PEW, Time Served: The High Cost, Low Return of Longer Prison Terms, 2012.
Drivers of Idaho’s Prison Growth

- A revolving door of recidivism from supervision and diversion programs is costly and ineffective
- Sanctions for revocations are long and costly, and not tailored for supervision violation behavior
- Lengthy prison stays for nonviolent offenses are twice the national average

Current 6-Year Trajectory (2013-2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16% PRISON POP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$290 MILLION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Change in Recidivism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justice Reinvestment Policy Framework

Goal: Reduce recidivism, increase public safety, and lower costs

**STRATEGY**

1. Strengthen supervision & programs to reduce recidivism
2. Tailor sanctions for parole violations, focus the Rider program, & structure parole to reserve prison space for violent sentences
3. Assess, track & ensure impact of recidivism-reduction strategies

**5-Year Projected Outcomes (2015-2019)**

- Reduce recidivism 15%
- Reduce prison pop. 1%
- Avoid $288 million in costs
- Reinvest $33 million in treatment, supervision & victim restitution

Overview

Big Picture Summary of Analysis & Policy Framework

Detail of Policy Options & Reinvestment

Impact on Recidivism, Public Safety & Corrections Costs
Justice Reinvestment Policy Framework

Goal: Reduce recidivism, increase public safety, and lower costs

STRAtegy

1. Strengthen supervision & programs to reduce recidivism
   a) Structure swift & certain responses to violations

2. Tailor sanctions for parole violations, focus Rider program, & structure parole to reserve prison space for violent sentences
   b) Increase community-based risk-reduction programming
   c) Focus probation supervision
   d) Train probation and parole officers on evidence-based strategies
   e) Improve the collection & swift payment of victim restitution

3. Assess, track & ensure impact of recidivism-reduction strategies

First Challenge

A REVOLVING DOOR OF RECIDIVISM IS COSTLY AND INEFFECTIVE

The volume of probation and parole revocations is up considerably

Revocation Rate to Prison FY2008-2012

43% of probation terminations
57% of parole terminations

Probation Revs to Rider +39%
Probation Revs to Term -2%

Probation violation response increasingly is relying on Rider and prison-based programs
First Challenge: A REVOLVING DOOR OF RECIDIVISM IS COSTLY AND INEFFECTIVE

**Department of Correction Expenditures**

$180 Million, FY2012

- Estimated Institutional Portion $148M
- Estimated Community Portion $32M

- Two-thirds of the prison population is revocation and Rider-related
  
  $32M for community supervision + $4M in SUD expenditures for treatment (FY2013) = $36M

- Idaho spends $98 million responding to recidivism and treatment needs in prison and $36 million to intervene on recidivism in the community

**First Challenge: DJT**

- DJT is used only if ordered by the court as a special condition of probation
- Judges authorize the use of DJT in a majority of cases
- It is currently not used as a sanction for parole violators
- PPOs may use DJT as an intermediate response
- 88% of sheriffs indicated use of their jail beds for DJT
- No cap for DJT length or frequency appears in policy
- Length of jail sanctions range from 1 to 30 days
- Sheriffs reported variation in the use of DJT and requested greater consistency in policy
1. Structure swift & certain responses to violations

- Delegate authority, in statute, for probation and parole officers (PPOs) to deliver administrative responses to violations with swiftness and certainty, and require that this authority is established as part of each sentence imposed.
- Revise current violation sanctions grid so that it creates a set of meaningful responses (e.g., requiring cognitive behavioral treatment, rapid assignment into substance use treatment, or discretionary jail time in two- or three-day stays) that PPOs can use without a court hearing to respond to probation condition violations. The severity of the sanction should increase in proportion to the nature of the violation and the offender’s assessed risk level.
- Establish procedures to protect the due-process rights of individuals on supervision while imposing jail sanctions, such as extending the right to a court hearing if the probationer and parolee does not agree to the sanction imposed. Also, require administrative approval before such action can be taken to ensure the authority is used appropriately.
- Enable PPOs also to use discretionary jail time as a sanction for people on parole, invoking the same procedural due-process protections.
- When the county government agrees to use jail beds for probation and parole violations, the state shall provide reimbursement for the costs incurred.
- Increase rapid drug testing capability to ensure that probationers and parolees are being held accountable to conditions of supervision.

Where and how treatment is delivered impacts the degree of recidivism reduction

Impact of Treatment Intervention on Recidivism Rates

- Drug Treatment in Prison: -17%
- Drug Treatment in the Community: -24%
- Supervision with Risk Need + Responsivity: -30%

Supervision with effective “RNR” principles yield the biggest recidivism reduction

Sources:
Areas where higher risk probationers and parolees show greatest level of need

Percentage of Moderate to High Risk Supervision Placements with Significant Needs by LSI-R Domain, FY2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Placement Percentage</th>
<th>Estimated Annual Placements with Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accomodation</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>1,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional/Personal</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>1,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital/Family</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>1,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>1,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes/Orientation</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>2,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Companions</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>2,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal History</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>2,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>2,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Employment</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>2,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure/Recreation</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>2,492</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Increase community-based risk-reduction programming and accountability

- Broaden the authorized expenditure of felony probation and parole substance use disorder services (SUDS), which will be renamed “Treatment Supervision,” to include services addressing the criminogenic needs most closely associated with recidivism (e.g. criminal thinking and attitude) as well as the main responsivity factors (e.g. mental health and co-occurring disorders) impeding service delivery.
- Increase funding for Treatment Supervision within §19-2524 both as a sentencing option courts may impose, to require that individuals serve a term of probation while being required to complete programs and treatment addressing criminogenic needs, and as response to condition violations.
- Require the Idaho Department of Rehabilitation and Correction (IDOC) to analyze the criminogenic needs of its supervision population based on subdomain scores of the GAIN Core and LSI assessments, and conduct a gap analysis to determine barriers to addressing this population's criminogenic needs and responsivity factors.
- Focus these community-based programs on probationers and parolees who are assessed as higher-risk.
- Increase rapid drug testing capability to ensure that probationers and parolees are being held accountable to conditions of supervision.
Large supervision population is managed with high caseloads and supported by collected fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Average Probation/Parole Officer Caseload Sizes, FY2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offenders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,157</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35% of probation/parole officers are funded by cost of supervision collection

Idaho had the second highest percentage of people on probation in the U.S. (2011)

First Challenge
A REVOLVING DOOR OF RECIDIVISM IS COSTLY AND INEFFECTIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Probation Term 5 Years</th>
<th>Average Revocation</th>
<th>Average Successful Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Idaho

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Straight Probation Term 3 Years</th>
<th>1 2 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

U.S.

4 out of 5 probation revocations happen within the first 3 years of supervision

2013 Idaho Snapshot Supervision Population, N = 11,500
Currently in Supervision Years 1 to 3: 67% Past Year 3: 33%
Focus probation supervision

- Cap the maximum length of a probation supervision term at 3 years except for individuals convicted of sex offenses.
- Transfer probationers and parolees to the Limited Supervision Unit (LSU) provided the following conditions are met: no reported major violations or supervision revocations, is not serving probation for an offense categorized as violent, sexual, or driving under the influence (DUI), and is not high risk according to the most recent assessment.
- Shift applicable moderate-risk probationers and parolees to an LSU caseload after 12 months.
- Shift low- and low-moderate-risk probationers and parolees to LSU after 6 months.
- Support effective PPO/offender interactions by reducing reliance on cost of supervision for personnel and operating expenses.

Train probation and parole officers on evidence-based strategies

- Require that all current and new PPOs be trained within two years on how to apply core correctional practices, including motivational interviewing, cognitive restructuring, structured skill building, problem solving, reinforcement and use of authority.
- Establish a train-the-trainer approach to ensure all PPOs are trained on evidence-based strategies and to develop long-term training capacity.
**STRATEGY 1**

**Strengthen supervision & programs to reduce recidivism**

**Improve the collection & swift payment of victim restitution**

- Require IDOC to collect a minimum of 20 percent from deposits made into the inmate trust accounts of individuals in prison who owe restitution, and use the amount collected to defray outstanding restitution orders.

- Establish a state-administered fund that victims to whom restitution is owed may opt in to and receive proactive payments from the state for amounts up to $10,000. The state, using all methods of debt collection—including tax and lottery intercepts, wage garnishments, and termination of hunting and fishing licenses—will then collect the amount of court-ordered restitution owed under the restitution order.

- Create a subcommittee under the Interagency Criminal Justice Commission (ICJC) to study the following topics related to legal financial obligations (LFOs): priority of collections; rules and guidelines concerning the monitoring, collection, and disbursement of financial obligations; and processes for collecting outstanding debts from individuals who have completed terms of supervision and incarceration yet still owe financial obligations. The task force shall submit a report for review by the 2015 legislative session.

---

**Justice Reinvestment Policy Framework**

**Goal: Reduce recidivism, increase public safety, and lower costs**

**STRATEGY 1**

**Strengthen supervision & programs to reduce recidivism**

**STRATEGY 2**

**Tailor sanctions for parole violations, focus Rider program, & structure parole to reserve prison space for violent sentences**

**STRATEGY 3**

**Assess, track & ensure impact of recidivism-reduction strategies**

- a) Tailor sanctions for parole violations
- b) Focus Rider capacity on people that would otherwise go to prison
- c) Use risk assessment to inform the parole decision-making process
- d) Calibrate time served for nonviolent sentences to 100-150% of the fixed term
Second Challenge
SANCTIONS FOR REVOCATIONS ARE LONG, COSTLY, AND NOT TAILORED FOR VIOLATION BEHAVIOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probation Revocations to Term</th>
<th>Parole Revocations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012 probation revocations to Term 675</td>
<td>2012 parole revocations 595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average length of stay in Term for probation revocations 1.8 years</td>
<td>Average length of stay on Parole Violator and Term status 1.6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDOC cost per day $53</td>
<td>IDOC cost per day $53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= Potential cost of revocations to Term $23M + Potential cost of revocations to Term $18M = Potential cost of 2012 supervision revocations $41M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations about the State Examples
- Applies to both probation and parole populations: Kansas, Hawaii, Oklahoma, Texas, and West Virginia
- Graduated responses for subsequent violations: Kansas, Pennsylvania, Washington, and West Virginia
- Affects lengths of stay in secure community correction programs: Georgia, Missouri, Oklahoma, and Pennsylvania

Eligible Population
- Parole
- Probation
- Probation and Parole
LENGTHY PRISON STAYS FOR NONVIOLENT OFFENSES ARE TWICE THE NATIONAL AVERAGE

The average indeterminate period was 262 percent of the fixed period
FY2012 Sentences to Term

Unified Sentence Percent of Fixed Term

Fixed Length Indeterminate Length
Cont. Subs. 2.6 7.6 292%
DUI 2.9 8.6 297%
Property 2.9 8.9 307%
Person 5.7 12.8 225%
Other 2.4 5.3 221%

Years

Lengthy prison stays for nonviolent offenses are twice the national average.

Third Challenge

Average release for first-time parole was 207% percent of the fixed sentence length
FY2012

207 percent of the fixed term

Full Term Date

Parole Discretionary Period

Fixed Sentence

Risk Level
Low Mod High

Offense Type
DUI 231 percent
Crimes Against Persons 225 percent
Controlled Substances 219 percent
Crimes Against Property 200 percent
Other 150 percent

Average Parole Release Point

215% 233% 178%
Tailor sanctions for supervision violations

For probation violators:

- Create the presumption that community-based sanctions and treatment options will first be exhausted before responding to probation violations with a revocation to Rider or prison term.

For parole violators:

- Respond to significant or repeat violations of the conditions of parole with a sanction of confinement. Allow confinement for up to 90 days as the initial response, up to 180 days for the second response, and an indeterminate period subject to the discretion of the Commission on Pardons and Parole (“the Commission”) for any subsequent responses.
- Require parole violators charged with absconding to serve up to 180 days in confinement.
- Require continuation of remaining parole term upon release from confinement.
- If confinement occurs in prison, also permit the IDOC director to extend confinement by up to one month as a result of institutional misconduct.

Low-risk offenders are more likely to be placed on probation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense Type</th>
<th>Cont. Subs.</th>
<th>DUI</th>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risk Level</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rider</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison Term</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IDOC admissions and release data.
Sentencing to Rider results in lower recidivism rates than prison, but higher rates than probation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY</th>
<th>Tailor sanctions for parole violations, focus Rider program, &amp; structure parole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Present in the presentencing investigation (PSI) report current recidivism outcomes for the following offender populations: individuals who first participate in the Rider program and then serve a term of supervision, those sentenced directly to supervision without first participating in the Rider program, and those sentenced to prison.
- Differentiate the reported recidivism rates based on offender risk level, including those of lower-risk offenders, for whom recidivism is higher among individuals who participated in the Rider program followed by a term of supervision than individuals who received a direct sentence to probation.
Risk assessment guides decision-making in many parts in the system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PURPOSE</th>
<th>PRETRIAL</th>
<th>SENTENCING</th>
<th>PAROLE RELEASE</th>
<th>PROBATION/ PAROLE</th>
<th>RIDER TRIO OF OPTIONS</th>
<th>PRISON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Failure to appear</td>
<td>• Failure to appear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recidivism</td>
<td>• Risk of recidivism</td>
<td>Program, Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Risk of recidivism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used in Idaho?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 5 Counties</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance in statute or policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Admission Criteria</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool(s) Used</td>
<td>IPRA</td>
<td>GAIN Core</td>
<td>TCU</td>
<td>LSI from prison intake</td>
<td>LSI</td>
<td>LSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RDU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LSI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use risk assessment to inform the parole decision-making process

- Require that the results of a standardized risk assessment instrument be central among the criteria used by the Commission for release decision-making.
Tailor sanctions for parole violations, focus Rider program, & structure parole

Calibrate time served for nonviolent sentences to 100-150% of the fixed term

- Require that, prospectively, people sentenced to term for nonviolent offenses be paroled between 100 and 150 percent of the fixed term, and then be placed under the supervision of a PPO.
- Establish, for the initial two-year period following legislative enactment, a joint goal involving IDOC and the Commission that people sentenced to a prison term for nonviolent offenses be paroled between 100 and 150 percent of the fixed term. In 2015, the goal will be set at 50 percent of people sentenced for nonviolent offenses and, in 2016, this goal will increase to 75 percent.
### Justice Reinvestment Policy Framework

**Goal:** Reduce recidivism, increase public safety, and lower costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Action Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strengthen supervision &amp; programs to reduce recidivism</td>
<td>a) Designate oversight committee to measure and assess policy impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tailor sanctions for parole violations, focus Rider program, &amp; structure parole to reserve prison space for violent sentences</td>
<td>b) Require risk &amp; need assessments to be routinely reviewed for quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Assess, track &amp; ensure impact of recidivism-reduction strategies</td>
<td>c) Streamline corrections &amp; parole processes by analyzing key indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d) Assess the quality of offender programs and use results to improve outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**STRATEGY**

3 Assess, track & ensure impact of recidivism-reduction strategies

**Designate oversight committee to measure and assess policy impacts**

- Designate a justice reinvestment inter-branch committee to monitor and evaluate the policies and budget implications of enacted justice reinvestment policies.
STRATEGY 3  
Assess, track & ensure impact of recidivism-reduction strategies

**Require risk & need assessments to be routinely reviewed for quality**

- Engage an independent entity with expertise in risk assessment evaluation to assess the predictive validity of the state’s risk and need instrument, reliability of the assessors, and standards for certification every five years.
- Present the results to key criminal justice system stakeholders, including the courts, IDOC, and the Commission.

**Delays in release following a parole approval may cost $5 million in 2013 alone**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jan-Jun 2013 Commission of Pardons and Paroles Log of Releases and Delays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>673 total parole releases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>475 with releases past Tentative Parole Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>389 with attributable days of delay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Average attributable delay as determined by Parole Commission**
  - 74 days

- **136 bed-years or $2.6M just in Jan-Jun 2013 parole release delays**

Source: Parole Commission release delay data.
Streamline corrections & parole processes by analyzing key indicators

- Increase the capacity of data and information technology staff at IDOC and the Commission on Pardons and Parole to analyze and report key indicators, including factors contributing to delays in corrections and parole processes; prison admissions, snapshots, and releases for all types of offences; gap analyses over community-based program needs; and recidivism.
- Improve communication between IDOC and the Commission by convening periodic joint meetings and trainings to problem-solve and learn cooperatively.

Assess the quality of offender programs and use results to improve outcomes

- Require routine assessments of state-funded institution- and community-based programs to assess fidelity to models of effective interventions.
- Random program quality audits should be conducted on contracted and state-run programs designed to reduce recidivism, at least every one to two years.
Overview

Big Picture Summary of Analysis & Policy Framework

Detail of Policy Options & Reinvestment

Impact on Recidivism, Public Safety & Prison Costs

A portion of the estimated impact of policy options based on slowing the revolving door of recidivism

- Better-trained supervision workforce
- Increased treatment options in community
- Swift and certain sanctions
- Closer supervision of higher risk offenders

15% reduction in revocations to prison
JR policy framework would stabilize the prison population and save Idaho $288 million in operating & construction costs

Summary of impact, savings, and reinvestment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost Savings</td>
<td>-$0.8M</td>
<td>-$10.3M</td>
<td>-$15.8M</td>
<td>-$21.6M</td>
<td>-$26.4M</td>
<td>-$74.9M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost Savings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Savings</td>
<td>-$0.8M</td>
<td>-$10.3M</td>
<td>-$15.8M</td>
<td>-$21.6M</td>
<td>-$239.6M</td>
<td>-$288.1M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Treatment Supervision (1b): $2.5M, $3.0M, $3.0M, $3.0M, $3.0M, $14.5M
- Strengthen Supervision (1c and 1d): $2.0M, $2.0M, $2.0M, $2.0M, $2.0M, $10.0M
- Proactive Restitution Collection (1e): $0.5M, $1.0M, $1.5M, $1.5M, $1.5M, $6.0M
- Quality Assurance and Data / IT Capacity (3b, 3c, 3d): $0.5M, $0.5M, $0.5M, $0.5M, $0.5M, $2.5M
- Total Reinvestment: $5.5M, $6.5M, $7.0M, $7.0M, $7.0M, $33.0M
- Net Savings: $4.7M, -$3.8M, -$8.8M, -$14.6M, -$232.6M, -$255.1M
Proposed policies will also reduce the active supervision caseload of probation/parole officers by nearly a third.

Policy framework designed to find intersection among important goals of Justice Reinvestment.
Thank You

Anne Bettesworth, Policy Analyst
abettesworth@csg.org
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