

Approved: 4-23-97
Date

MINUTES OF THE HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON CORRECTIONS AND JUVENILE JUSTICE.

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Joe Kejr at 7:30 a.m. on April 9, 1997 in Room 522-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except: Representative Phill Kline, Excused
Representative Henry Helgerson, Excused

Committee staff present: Stuart Little, Legislative Research Department
Jerry Donaldson, Legislative Research Department
Jill Wolters, Revisor of Statutes
Lynn Workman, Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee:

Others attending: See attached list

Chairman Kejr announced that we would be hearing about community corrections today. Kenneth Hales, Director of Sedgwick County Department of Corrections presented the background on the Community Corrections Act which was enacted in the mid-1970's. He feels it has been successful because it has allowed the local communities to implement the programs in a way that works for that particular judicial district.

He feels the next steps in community corrections is to examine our planning process and to target & implement new or enhanced interventions to defer more from prison and to be more successful with those supervised. (Attachment # 1)

Secretary of Corrections, Charles E. Simmons, passed out information requested by the committee. (Attachment # 2) was in answer to the question regarding operating correctional industry shops for more than one shift per day.

(Attachment # 3) related to inmate assignments and lay-ins. (Attachment # 4) relates to inmate population projections requested, and (Attachment # 5) is a prophet model data requirements.

Roger Werholtz, Deputy Secretary of Corrections provided information to the committee which was requested at an earlier meeting. See (Attachment # 6 & 7)

Thomas J. Vohs, Deputy Secretary of Community and Field Services presented information on the Community Corrections Placement Processes (Attachment # 8, 9 & 10)

Secretary of Corrections, Charles Simmons supplied the committee with the information requested on the Probation Violator Tent Camp Plan. (Attachment # 11)

The next meeting is scheduled for April 10, 1997.

**HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE
ON CORRECTIONS & JUVENILE JUSTICE
9 APR 97 - 7:30a**

—————
**Representative Joseph Kejr (Chair)
Representative Shari H Weber (Vice-Chair)**

**Representatives David Adkins, Andrew Howell, Phill Kline, Jim Garner,
Henry Helgerson, Ed McKechnie & Janice Pauls (Members)**

—————
**Community Corrections Programming
J Kenneth Hales, Sedgwick County Department of Corrections**

Good Morning Representatives,

I am Kenneth Hales, Director of Sedgwick County Department of Corrections. The Sedgwick County Department of Corrections consists of the youth services facilities and programs operated by Sedgwick County, as well as the Sedgwick County Community Corrections Act funded programs. I've been with Sedgwick County for 6 years and prior to that I operated juvenile and community corrections programs in Shawnee County since the late 70s. Allow me to comment on what I believe are the key attributes of community corrections and the current challenges related to community corrections and prison overcrowding.

CCP - 1

Select Committee on Corrections &
Juvenile Justice
4-9-97
Attachment #1

#1

BACKGROUND:

In the mid-1970s the legislature was seeking ways to diminish the demand for additional prison beds. Following considerable study the Community Corrections Act, fashioned from a Minnesota act, was enacted. This is a gross over-simplification, but through the act the state asked local communities to assume a greater role with the supervision of felony offenders. The state said to the local counties, "Assume responsibility for running programs to supervise in your communities non-violent D & E felony offenders. We, the State, will take care of the chronic and violent offenders in prison. We will fund your programs, not your jails and the other things you do, but the new programs for felony offenders and will continue funding these programs, within limits, as long as you operate them according to our regulations." There have been many, many changes since 1978. However, this state and local partnership has continued and has been, in my opinion, a great success. It has been successful because the Kansas Department of Corrections has ensured that programs provide quality services consistent with its regulatory oversight and that the money has been used towards targeted offenders. It has also been successful because it has allowed the local communities to implement the programs in a way that works for that particular judicial district. The result has been both a blend of uniformity, with regard to compliance with regulatory standards, and local creativity, as it pertains to how different programs organize for efficiency.

Since the mid-80s, the community corrections act and local programs have an impressive record of success. We have supervised thousands of offenders and have done so in a way that has garnered the confidence of the courts, and legislators I believe, and have earned the respect of those in our business. However, there is one area in which we have not been successful. We have not successfully planned strategically for what you are facing right now. For the past several years, planning for the future simply hasn't been adequate. We have not effectively examined what new things we can do to successfully deal with felony offenders locally. I attribute that to 2 key factors, static funding and a lack of strategic vision. Local programs did implement new juvenile interventions when the legislature re-

emphasized services for juveniles in 1994. Local programs did implement new initiatives in the early 1990s such as day reporting, but this was specific to federal funding. For the most part, funding has been either static or diminishing for community corrections. Consequently, instead of embracing new ways of dealing with offenders locally, we've been losing tools to deal with offenders locally. Sedgwick County is a perfect example with the closure of the adult day reporting center last year due to funding cuts and the likelihood of reducing services for the felony work release center due to budget difficulties expected in FY98. The message from KDOC has consistently been to plan and budget for existing services only, do not look at new initiatives but tell us how you can keep doing what you're doing now for the same amount of money or less. Consequently, we have not examined nor planned for future needs. This we need to do in a more sophisticated way.

I think community corrections is uniquely postured to make a significant contribution to meeting the correctional needs of the State of Kansas and the local communities. Community corrections has multiple missions. One mission has always involved impacting the demand for state prison space. But another part of the mission has always involved how to supervise safely those offenders that remain in the community. Both missions must be met by the local community corrections programs and the local directors, and advisory board members were very sensitive to this. I think all will agree that we supervise offenders on community corrections that are more chronic and more violent than anyone would have anticipated, even 5 years ago. Therefore, we provide high levels of surveillance for these offenders and return them to court if they become a risk to community safety. Consequently, we experience a high rate of probation violations. This is the kind of problem that community corrections should be and can be more effective. Our practical experience and the recent literature, particularly through the National Institute of Corrections and the American Probation & Parole Association are detailing new interventions that we could attempt to address that kind of problem. In Sedgwick County Community Corrections we have integrated client management classification for adults and strategies for juvenile supervision for the purpose of supervising more effectively these clients and reducing probation violations. But that is just one tool.

Having the right type of program interventions with regard to a residential option or a drug treatment option is necessary. Those parts, too, need to be in our continuum of local services. We have many offenders in Sedgwick County that come straight out of the jail with long and severe histories of substance abuse. I can say with little doubt that when these offenders come out of the jail and back out onto the street, without benefit of a residential program or without the benefit of immediate participation in drug and alcohol treatment, the likelihood of them remaining crime-free is nominal and the likelihood of them to complying with the conditions of their probation is near zero. Additionally, the residential option is of particular value for probation violators as an alternative to prison incarceration. Not only does it provide the structure for an unsuccessful probationer, it allows the court a sanction that is less expensive and of shorter duration than prison. Although drug and alcohol treatment and residential services are the most critical need Sedgwick County currently faces, these are only two tools. Many tools are needed and needed in different ways in different districts.

NEXT STEPS:

I advocate the Kansas Department of Corrections examine our planning process to target and implement new or enhanced interventions to defer more from prison and to be more successful with those supervised. This may include ways to help the courts make better decisions at sentencing, developing options to sanction violators locally or making more efficient the relationship between court services and community corrections. Additionally, we must balance spending and planning. We can't cut resources on local corrections and invest only on new prisons and we need to project needs and plan for local corrections just as carefully as we do the prisons.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND FOR LISTENING TO MY COMMENTS



KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

A Safer Kansas through Effective Correctional Services

BILL GRAVES, GOVERNOR

CHARLES E. SIMMONS, SECRETARY

LONDON STATE OFFICE BUILDING — 900 SW JACKSON
TOPEKA, KANSAS — 66612-1284
913-296-3317

April 8, 1997

Representative Joe Kejr, Chairperson
Select Committee on Corrections and Juvenile Justice
Room 112-S
State Capitol
Topeka, Kansas 66612

Dear Representative Kejr:

During the Correctional Industry presentation to the Select Committee on Corrections and Juvenile Justice on March 26, 1997, a question was asked regarding what it would take to operate correctional industry shops for more than one shift per day. My response to that question is as follows:

As with any business, the first and primary factor to be considered in adding a second or third shift to a correctional industry operation is whether sufficient sales exist to support the additional costs. With the statutory restricted market for the traditional correctional industry program, attaining large enough sales volumes to run multiple shifts in any shop is difficult at best. If the eligible customer base were expanded, the possibility of multiple shifts would increase. The sales from the industry would have to be sufficient to cover the salaries of the supervisors hired to oversee production, as well as the inmate pay for the workers assigned to the program. In the past we have operated two shifts per day at the Hutchinson Correctional Facility on a temporary basis when backlogs of orders existed. We are currently back to one shift per day in all traditional industry shops.

The additional costs to correctional facilities to accommodate multiple shifts for industry shops varies widely depending on the location and nature of the shops. For example, the industrial yard at the Lansing Correctional Facility is located in an area in which security posts are only occupied during daytime hours when the shops are in operation. To provide sufficient security for those shops to operate at night would require several more correctional officers. On the other hand, we are currently allowing a private industry to operate twenty-four hours per day in the medium security area of that facility because security staff are already assigned there on all three shifts.

In summary, it would take an expansion of the correctional industry authorized market and additional security staff to operate multiple shifts in correctional industry shops. We have not prepared a specific determination of the number of additional security staff who would be necessary.

Sincerely,

Leonard L. Ewell
Director of Administration, KCI

LLE:gs

cc: Charles Simmons, Secretary



Equal Opportunity Employer

Select Committee on Corrections
& Juvenile Justice
4-9-97
Attachment # 2

#2

Inmate Assignments and Lay-ins

Summary

A current review of inmate assignments reflect that a total of 523 jobs need to be created to eliminate inmate idleness. An additional 272 jobs for males and 95 jobs for females are needed to ensure that there is sufficient work available to keep inmates busy for a full work day.

On July 1, 1997 the capacity at Winfield Correctional Facility will increase by an additional 127 inmates. Approximately 27 of these inmates will be needed to provide additional facility support and maintenance work. Jobs will be needed for the other 100. On April 2, 1997 the female capacity will increase by 25. There is currently no work identified for these females.

The data presented in the attached tables was collected March 27-28, 1997. The data was collected at different points in times during the two day period and therefore may not equal the population reflected at the end of the business day for every facility.

Full time activity/work assignments are from 6.5 to 8 hours in duration depending upon the location of the assignment. Inmates assigned to KCI Industries work an average of 7 hours per day. Inmates in Private Industries work an average of 8 hours per day.

Segregation inmates may or may not be assigned to a work or program assignment contingent upon the length and reason for the segregation placement.

Inmates undergoing assessment and evaluation at Topeka Correctional Facility-Reception and Diagnostic Unit may be assigned to temporary part time work assignments. Their primary assignment is evaluation.

There are 120 inmates at Larned Correctional Mental Health Facility participating in inpatient mental health programming and treatment. Most of these inmates are also assigned to work assignments.

There are a number of inmate work assignments which are "seasonal". More inmates are generally assigned to facility grounds details and community parks and lakes details from April through October than in the colder months of the year.

Under utilized positions are reflected in FTE. For example an underutilization of 40 positions may reflect that there are 80 inmates working only half time. It could also reflect that there 120 inmates working 5-6 hours per day. In most cases the inmate is assigned to work a full shift, but there are a greater number of inmates assigned than needed to perform the task(s).

There are a number of inmates with medical restrictions that could work full time if there were job assignments available to accommodate their specific medical condition.

Select Committee on Corrections x
Juvenile Justice
4-9-97
Attachment #3 2-1
#3

Inmate Work Assignments
Reported by Facility/Unit Location, Job Type, Lay-In Status and Utilization

MALES
(March 28, 1997)

Assigned Status	Lansing			Hutchinson			El Dorado			Norton		Topeka		ECF	Winfield		LCMHF	LSH	Contract	Totals
	CU	EU	SU	CU & SU	EU	WR	CU	EU	NU	CU	EU	WU	RDU		WCF	WWRF			Jail	
Work/Activity																				
Facility Support	802	194	15	498	179		438	38	55	282	53	64		343	171	16	97			
Industries	304	131	6		157					30	4			36						
Community Programs	21	117	59	80				32	47	39		17		27	87		33	38	5	
Segregation & PC	285	30		256	48	19	94			100	42			48	96	172				
	46			86			240							6			18			
Total Assignments	1458	472	80	920	384	19	772	70	102	451	99	81	0	460	354	188	148	38	5	6101
Lay-in Status																				
Evaluation - RDU													205							205
Medical/MH	30			26	12		27			3	7			4			21	5		135
Cause(restriction, disciplinary, etc.)	25			105	2		46			35				78			1			292
No Work Available	150			93	2		133			11	5			90	39					523
Total Lay-ins	205	0	0	224	16	0	206	0	0	49	12	0	205	172	39	0	22	5	0	1155
TOTAL	1663	472	80	1144	400	19	978	70	102	500	111	81	205	632	393	188	170	43	5	7256
Underutilized inmate positions (FTE)				45						150	22			30	25					272

3-1

Inmate Work Assignments
Reported by Facility/Unit Location, Job Type, Lay-In Status and Utilization

FEMALES
(March 28, 1997)

Assigned Status	Topeka	Winfield	LSH	Totals
	CU	(WWRF)		
<u>Work/Activity</u>				
Facility Support	232			232
Industries	19			19
Community Programs	51			51
Segregation & PC	122	10		132
				0
Total Assignments	424	10	0	434
<u>Lay-in Status</u>				
Evaluation	15			15
Medical/MH	5		1	6
Cause(restriction, disciplinary, etc.)	32			32
No Work Available	0			0
Total Lay-ins	52	0	1	53
Total	<u>476</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>487</u>
Underutilized inmate positions (FTE)	95	0	0	95

Notes: Inmate Population Projections

The Department of Corrections initiated use of the Prophet model for inmate population projections in 1990, when it contracted with the National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD) for this purpose. The first set of Prophet model projections was issued in 1991. The Kansas Sentencing Commission used the Prophet model to as a tool to project the impact of sentencing guidelines both immediately before and after approval of the Sentencing Guidelines Act. The commission resumed use of the Prophet model in 1995, when it began releasing official annual projections.

The department has cooperated with the Sentencing Commission in its projection efforts over the past several years and has accepted the commission's projections for departmental planning purposes during those years that the commission has produced them. Since the original 1991 Prophet model projections, the department has prepared its own multiyear projections only in 1994 and 1995, and these were five-year rather than ten-year projections. The multiyear projections were prepared because of capacity planning and budgeting requirements, and only because commission projections were not available during the timeframe involved. When the commission released its 1995 projections, the department began using these for planning purposes. During the other intervening years, the department has developed population estimates only for budget preparation purposes, which has a short, two-year planning horizon.

1. In 1990, the Department of Corrections received a technical assistance grant from the National Institute of Corrections to prepare inmate population projections. The department selected NCCD to prepare the projections using the NCCD Prophet model. The initial projections were prepared in early 1991; the final report was issued in July 1991. The projections used FY 1989 data as the base year. Revised scenarios were prepared in October 1991 based on actual population experience in FY 1991.
2. In the fall of 1991, the Kansas Sentencing Commission contracted with NCCD to prepare a fully updated baseline projection based on FY 1991 data. The commission then used the baseline model to prepare projections for implementation of sentencing guidelines proposed for consideration by the 1992 Legislature.
3. In 1992, following approval of SB 479, the sentencing guidelines act, the KSC revised both its baseline and guidelines projections.
4. During the FY 1993-FY 1994 period, no multiyear projections were produced.
5. The department produced five-year projections in October 1994, which were revised in February 1995. Projections were also developed by the department in July 1995. (Worksheets related to these projections are attached.) The department began using the KSC projections when they were released in November 1995.

Select Committee on Corrections &
Juvenile Justice 2-4
4-9-97
Attachments #4

Inmate Population Projections

Projection Series	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Actual Population as of June 30	6193	6240	6091	6926	7455										
Original NCCD Prophet Model -Jan 1991	5910	6388	6606	6949	7171	7484	7743	7937	8160						
<i>Difference from actual</i>	-283	148	515	23	-284										
NCCD Prophet - Oct 1991 Revisions	5693	5759	6051	6269	6606	6837	7153	7486	7700	8036					
<i>Difference from actual</i>	-500	-481	-40	-657	-849										
NCCD/KSC projection re SB 479 (sentencing guidelines) - Oct 1991															
Baseline		5931	6130	6434	6777	7041	7319	7608	7828	8121					
Guidelines (as originally proposed)		5517	5542	5570	5617	5585	5616	5672	5712	5725					
<i>Difference from actual</i>			-549	-1356	-1838										
NCCD Prophet Model/KSC															
Baseline - May 1992		6632	6733	7005	7172	7515	7808	8133	8408	8714					
Guidelines - Aug 1992		6544	6352	6220	6032	5864	5798	5701	5623	5670					
<i>Difference from actual</i>			261	-706	-1423										
KDOC (Oct 1994)															
				6461	6574	6473	6262	6007							
<i>Difference from actual</i>				-465	-881										
KDOC (Feb 1995)															
				6671	7045	6997	6839	6637							
<i>Difference from actual</i>				-255	-410										
KDOC (Jul 1995)															
					7362	7661	7883	7953	7841						
<i>Difference from actual</i>					-93										
KSC/NCCD Prophet (Nov 1995)															
					7331	7707	7812	7967	7985	8017	8135	8195	8336	8421	
<i>Difference from actual</i>					-124										
KSC/NCCD Prophet (Sept 1996)															
						7841	8033	8093	8134	8360	8607	8694	8798	8954	9246
<i>Difference from actual</i>															

6-18

Kansas Department of Corrections

Projected End-of-Year Inmate Population and
Estimated ADP for FY 1996 - 2000¹

Projected Year-end Inmate Population

<u>Date</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Change From Previous Year</u>	<u>Average Change Per Month</u>
June 30, 1995	6926	-----	-----
June 30, 1996	7362	+ 436	+ 36.3
June 30, 1997	7661	+ 299	+ 24.9
June 30, 1998	7883	+ 222	+ 18.5
June 30, 1999	7953	+ 70	+ 5.8
June 30, 2000	7841	-112	-9.3

Estimated ADP (Mid-point between year end projections)

FY 1996 - 7144

FY 1997 - 7512

FY 1998 - 7772

FY 1999 - 7918

FY 2000 - 7897

Major Assumptions Upon Which This Projection Is Based

1. The number of admissions via court action will increase by 5 % during FY '96 & '97, 4% during FY '98 & '99, and 3% during FY '00.
2. The determinate/indeterminate split among the FY '96 court admissions will be 75/25; for FY '97 & FY '98 it will be 90/10. Beginning in FY '99, all court admissions will be pursuant to determinate sentencing.
3. The number of condition violators in the population will remain constant; that is, the number admitted each month will be off-set by an equal number being released. The reduction anticipated as the result of the graduated sanctions program (scheduled for implementation in October, 1995) was not considered, except that an increase in the number of condition violators might otherwise have been shown.
4. The impact of SB 360 (passed by the 1995 Legislature) as it pertains to the rate of good-time and the amount of time condition violators may serve upon return to prison was in accordance with the fiscal notes prepared at the time the legislation was considered.
4. The parole rate will be 19% throughout the projection period.

¹ Prepared 7-12-95; Policy, Planning, and Data Analysis Unit

Kansas Department of Corrections
 Projected Year-end Inmate Population for FY 1996 - 2000
 Work Sheet

6/30/95 Population (Stock Population)	6926
FY 96 Court Admissions (5% increase from FY 95)	+ 2888
STOCKPOP GL Releases	-1004
STOCKPOP Parole Releases	-343
FY 96 Court Admissions Released GL	-1046
FY 96 Court Admissions Released Parole	-59
6/30/96 Population	7,362
FY 97 Court Admissions (5% increase from FY 96)	+ 3032
Impact of the SB 360 change in the rate at which good time may be earned (i.e., 20% to 15%)	+ 82
STOCKPOP GL Releases	-469
STOCKPOP Parole Releases	-383
FY 96 Court Admissions Released GL	-520
FY 96 Court Admissions Released Parole	-97
FY 97 Court Admissions Released GL	-1318
FY 97 Court Admissions Released Parole	-28
6/30/97 Population	7,661
FY 98 Court Admissions (4% increase from FY 97)	+ 3153
Impact of the SB 360 change in the rate at which good time may be earned (i.e., 20% to 15%)	+ 112
STOCKPOP GL Releases	-243
STOCKPOP Parole Releases	-367
FY 96 Court Admissions Released GL	-245
FY 96 Court Admissions Released Parole	-90
FY 97 Court Admissions Released GL	-655
FY 97 Court Admissions Released Parole	-43
FY 98 Court Admissions Released GL	-1371
FY 98 Court Admissions Released Parole	-29
6/30/98 Population	7,883
FY 99 Court Admissions (4% increase from FY 98)	+ 3279

4
4-8

Kansas Department of Corrections
 Projected Year-end Inmate Population for FY 1996 - 2000
 Work Sheet - Page 2

Impact of the SB 360 change in the rate at which good time may be earned (i.e., 20% to 15%)	+ 86
Impact of the SB 360 change in length of time condition violators may serve (begins in January, 1997)	+ 12
STOCKPOP GL Releases	-117
STOCKPOP Parole Releases	-317
FY 96 Court Admissions Released GL	-139
FY 96 Court Admissions Released Parole	-76
FY 97 Court Admissions Released GL	-308
FY 97 Court Admissions Released Parole	-41
FY 98 Court Admissions Released GL	-681
FY 98 Court Admissions Released Parole	-44
FY 99 Court Admissions Released GL	-1584
FY 99 Court Admissions Released Parole	0
6/30/99 Population	7,953
FY 00 Court Admissions (3% increase from FY 99)	+ 3377
Impact of the SB 360 change in length of time condition violators may serve	+ 18
STOCKPOP GL Releases	-65
STOCKPOP Parole Releases	-271
FY 96 Court Admissions Released GL	-73
FY 96 Court Admissions Released Parole	-63
FY 97 Court Admissions Released GL	-175
FY 97 Court Admissions Released Parole	-33
FY 98 Court Admissions Released GL	-321
FY 98 Court Admissions Released Parole	-42
FY 99 Court Admissions Released GL	-787
FY 99 Court Admissions Released Parole	-46
FY 00 Court Admissions Released GL	-1631
FY 00 Court Admissions Released Parole	0
Projected 6/30/00 Population	7,841

4-5
~~4-4~~



KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

BILL GRAVES, GOVERNOR

CHARLES E. SIMMONS, SECRETARY

LANDON STATE OFFICE BUILDING — 900 SW JACKSON
TOPEKA, KANSAS — 66612-1284
913-296-3317
MEMORANDUM

Date: October 24, 1995

To: Charles E. Simmons
Secretary of Corrections

From: Ken Shirley, Research Analyst 

Subject: Description of the current inmate population projection methodology

Briefly, the methodology used to produce the current inmate population projection has three basic components:

- **Stock Population** (beginning inmate population, i.e., June 30, 1995 inmate population)

The only thing that happens to this group is to release those offenders whose "estimated release date" falls within the projection period. The remaining inmates remain in the population throughout the projection period.

The estimated release date for those subject to the provisions of the Kansas Sentencing Guidelines Act (including those whose sentences were converted) is the "Projected Guidelines Release Date" as recorded in the KDOC computerized management information system. For the remaining offenders, the "Parole Eligibility Date" is used. The latter group is "released" at a 19% yearly parole rate (the actual rate of parole observed during the first 11 months of FY 1995).

- **Admissions Population**

The admissions population on which the projection was based consists of all court commitments for the one-year which ended May 31, 1995. The distribution of this group in terms of type and length of sentences is then applied to each yearly admissions group of the projection period.

Offenders in each yearly admission cohort are then released just as with the stock population—either by using the length of time to the anticipated Projected Guidelines Release Date or to the Parole Eligibility Date, depending upon whether the offenders are subject to Guidelines or subject to release by the Kansas Parole Board.

- **Condition Violators**

Based on observed trends, a component of the projection methodology is that the number of incoming condition violators each year will roughly equal the number of releases of offenders who had been most recently admitted as condition violators.



4-6
4-8

Major Assumptions Upon Which The Projection Is Based

1. The yearly number of court commitments will increase by 5% during each of the first two years of the projection period (FY 96-97), 4% in FY 98-99, and 3% in FY 2000.
2. Court commitments admitted over the course of the projection period will be distributed (in terms of sentence length, etc.) like those in observed period (the one-year period ending May 31, 1995).
3. The determinate/indeterminate split among FY 96 court commitments will be 75%/25%; 90%/10% in FY 97-98; and 100% determinate beginning in FY 99.
4. The number of condition violators in the inmate population will remain constant (number incoming will equal number outgoing).
5. The yearly parole rate will be 19% (the observed rate) throughout the projection period.
6. The impact of SB 360 (passed by the 1995 legislature) as it pertains to the rate of good-time and the amount of time condition violators will serve upon return to prison will be in accordance with the fiscal notes prepared at the time the legislation was considered.
7. There will be no major changes in policy or practice by the agencies/entities that have an impact on prison population (law enforcement, courts, legislature, etc.).

KWS:kws
cc Jan Johnson

Projected End-of-year Inmate Population and
Estimated ADP for FY 1995 - FY 1999

Projected Year-end Inmate Population

<u>Date</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Change from Previous Year</u>	<u>Average Change Per Month</u>
June 30, 1994	6,091 (Actual)	----	----
June 30, 1995	6,461	+ 370	+ 30.8
June 30, 1996	6,574	+ 113	+ 9.4
June 30, 1997	6,473	- 101	- 8.4
June 30, 1998	6,262	- 211	- 17.6
June 30, 1999	6,007	- 255	- 21.3

Estimated ADP (Mid-point between year-end projections)

FY 1995 - 6,281

FY 1996 - 6,518

FY 1997 - 6,524

FY 1998 - 6,368

FY 1999 - 6,135

Kansas Department of Corrections

Inmate Population Projection for FY 1995 through FY 1999
(10/14/94 - Notes and Assumptions)

FY 1995

6091 Stock Population

(This was the actual prison population at the close of business 6-30-94)

+ 40 Additional PV/CR No New Sentence in FY 95 only

(The number of offenders returned to prison for violating the conditions of their release without committing a new offense increased throughout FY 1994. Since, under sentencing guidelines, the maximum amount of time a returned offender can spend in prison is 90 days, it was assumed that at some point the number of offenders being returned would be offset by an equal number of offenders being released at the expiration of their 90 day period of incarceration; a state of balance would be achieved. It was assumed that by September 30, 1994 the population of Condition Violators would increase by 40, after which it will be stable (i.e., the number of offenders admitted as condition violators would be in balance with the number of such offenders released).

-512 Releases from Stock Population: Guidelines

(This is the number of inmates in the Stock Population who have Guidelines Release dates during FY 1995. Their release is not discretionary.)

-507 Releases from Stock Population: KPB

(This is the estimated number of inmates in the Stock Population that will be released during FY 1995 by virtue of a Kansas Parole Board decision. The estimate assumes that 25% of those eligible for parole release will be released. The 25% is based upon the FY 1994 experience of 28%, which, at the time of the projection, was on the decline. The same 25% rate was applied, regardless of whether the inmate was being considered for the first time or a subsequent time.)

5112 Residual Stock Population

(This is the number of Stock Population inmates remaining at the end of FY 1995.)

Admissions

+ 1935 Court Commitments: Guidelines

+ 645 Court Commitments: Old Law

(These numbers are the estimated number of offenders that will be sent to the KDOC by the Courts during FY 1995 (i.e., New Court Commitments, Probation Violators With New Sentence, Probation Violators Without New Sentence, Parole/CR Violators with New Sentence). It was assumed that there would be a 2.5% increase over the FY 1994 level. [Although a decrease in the number of court commitments might otherwise be anticipated due to Sentencing Guidelines, this 2.5% increase takes into account the increase anticipated due to 1994 legislative changes with regard to juvenile offenders (i.e., 16 & 17 year olds now adjudicated as adults upon second felony conviction.) It was also assumed that 75% of these commitments would be pursuant to sentencing guidelines (2580 x .75) and 25% pursuant to "old law" (2580 x .25).

(Over)

4-8
4-2

+ 120 Other Admissions (Return from Court, Transfer, etc.)

(This represents various admissions that are typically received in relatively small numbers. During FY 1994 there was an average of 10 such admissions per month. It was assumed that this trend would continue in FY 1995.)

7812 Balance

(This is the number of inmates at the end of FY 1995, if all of those admitted during FY 1995 stayed the entire year or longer.)

Releases

- 475 To Probation/Court

(This is the number of inmates expected to be released to Court and/or placed on probation. It was assumed that there would be slightly fewer of these than the 528 in FY 1994. It was assumed that, under Sentencing Guidelines, the type of case granted probation within 120 days under the "old law" is more apt to receive presumptive probation (i.e., not come to prison in the first place). The number was set at 10% under the FY 1994 number.)

- 390 Other Releases (CR, Sentence Expiration etc.)

(This is the number of inmates released due to Conditional Release and Expiration of Sentence. For the 7-19-94 projection, it was assumed that there would be a slight reduction in this type of releases during FY 1995; therefore, the number was set at 10% less (i.e., 351). However, since the actual experience during the first three months of FY 1995 did not bear this out, the number was set at the FY 1994 level.)

- 448 Via Guidelines

(This is the estimated number of inmates admitted during FY 1995 pursuant to guidelines (i.e., 1935 above) who will also be released during FY 1995. The expected time to serve was based upon the number of months between admission and the projected guidelines admission date of those admitted during the last 6 months of FY 1994.)

- 38 Via KPB Decision

(This is the estimated number of inmates admitted during FY 1995 pursuant to "old law" (i.e., 645 above) who will also be released during FY 1995 pursuant to a Parole Board decision. Parole eligibility was based upon the parole eligibility of those admitted during the last 6 months of FY 1994, specifically 12-16-93 through 6-16-94. [Although Sentencing Guidelines were in effect throughout FY 1994, the last six months were regarded as more indicative of what to expect in the future due to the "lag time" between the date of offense and admission to the KDOC. Even here, however, it is not known with much certainty the extent to which future admissions will mirror the last six months with regard to offense and sentence. In short, data for the last six months were the best available. A parole rate of 25% was assumed, regardless of whether the inmate is considered for the first or a subsequent/additional time.]

6461 FY 1995 Ending Population

4-9
~~2-13~~

FY 1996

6461 Starting Population

(This is the population as projected for the end of FY 1995)

- 155 Releases from Stock Population: Guidelines

(This is the number of inmates who were in the original stock population (i.e., 6091 above) who have Guidelines Release dates during FY 1996. Their release is not discretionary.)

- 530 Releases from Stock Population: KPB

(This is the estimated number of inmates in the original stock population (i.e., 6091 above) that will be released by virtue of a Kansas Parole Board decision during FY 1996. As in FY 1995, a 25% parole rate is assumed.)

5776 Residual Population

Admissions

+ 2376 Court Commitments: Guidelines

+ 264 Court Commitments: Old Law

(These numbers are the estimated number of offenders that will be sent to the KDOC by the Courts during FY 1996 (i.e., New Court Commitments, Probation Violators With New Sentence, Probation Violators Without New Sentence, Parole/CR Violators with New Sentence). It was assumed that 1) there would be a 2.5% increase over the FY 1995 level and 2) 90% of these commitments would be pursuant to sentencing guidelines (2640 x .90) and 25% pursuant to "old law" (2640 x .10).

+ 120 Other Admissions (Return from Court, Transfer, etc.)

(This represents various admissions that are typically received in relatively small numbers. During FY 1994 there was an average of 10 such admissions per month. It was assumed that this trend would continue in FY 1996)

8536 Balance

(This is the number of inmates at the end of FY 1996, if all of those admitted during FY 1996 stayed the entire year or longer.)

Releases

- 264 To Probation/Court

(This is the number of inmates expected to be released to Court and/or placed on probation. It was assumed that by FY 1996 releases of this type would be significantly reduced from the 528 in FY 1994; under Sentencing Guidelines, the type of case granted probation within 120 days under the "old law" is more apt to receive

(Over)

4-10
~~4-8~~

presumptive probation (i.e., not come to prison in the first place). For the 7-19-94 projection, the number was set at 25% of the FY 1994 total of 528. However, based upon the first three months of FY 1995 experience, a 50% figure was used.)

- 293 Other Releases (CR, Sentence Expiration etc.)

(This is the number of inmates released due to Conditional Release and Expiration of Sentence. It was assumed that there would be reduced from the 390 releases of this type in FY 1994 due to the depletion in the number of inmates eligible for such release. For the 7-19-94 projection the number was set at 25% of the FY 1994 number. However, based upon the first three months experience of FY 1995 the number was set at 75% of the FY 1994 number.)

- 740 FY 1995 Court Commits Released : Via Guidelines

(This is the estimated number of inmates admitted during FY 1995 pursuant to guidelines (i.e., 1935 above) who will be released during FY 1996. The expected time to serve was based upon the number of months between admission and the projected guidelines admission date of those admitted during the last 6 months of FY 1994.

- 102 FY 1995 Court Commits Released: Via KPB Decision

(This is the estimated number of inmates admitted during FY 1995 pursuant to "old law" (i.e., 645 above) who will be released during FY 1996 pursuant to a Parole Board decision. Parole eligibility was based upon the parole eligibility of those admitted during the last 6 months of FY 1994 and a parole rate of 25% was assumed, regardless of whether the inmate is considered for the first or a subsequent/additional time.)

- 547 FY 1996 Court Commits Released : Via Guidelines

(This is the estimated number of inmates admitted during FY 1996 pursuant to guidelines (i.e., 2376 above) who will also be released during FY 1996. The expected time to serve was based upon the number of months between admission and the projected guidelines admission date of those admitted during the last 6 months of FY 1994.

- 16 FY 1996 Court Commits Released: Via KPB Decision

(This is the estimated number of inmates admitted during FY 1996 pursuant to "old law" (i.e., 264 above) who will also be released during FY 1996 pursuant to a Parole Board decision. Parole eligibility was based upon the parole eligibility of those admitted during the last 6 months of FY 1994 and a parole rate of 25% was assumed, regardless of whether the inmate is considered for the first time or a subsequent/additional time.)

6574 FY 1996 Ending Population

4-11
JTB

FY 1997

6574 Starting Population

(This is the population as projected for the end of FY 1996)

- 80 Releases from Stock Population: Guidelines

(This is the number of inmates who were in the original stock population (i.e., 6091 above) who have Guidelines Release dates during FY 1996. Their release is not discretionary.)

- 473 Releases from Stock Population: KPB

(This is the estimated number of inmates in the original stock population (i.e., 6091 above) that will be released by virtue of a Kansas Parole Board decision during FY 1996. A 25% parole rate is assumed.)

6021 Residual Population

Admissions

+ 2640 Court Commitments: Guidelines

(This is the estimated number of offenders that will be sent to the KDOC by the Courts during FY 1997 (i.e., New Court Commitments, Probation Violators With New Sentence, Probation Violators Without New Sentence, Parole/CR Violators with New Sentence). It was assumed that there would be no increase in court commitments from the FY 1996 number. Also, although it is recognized that there will continue to be some offenders admitted pursuant the old law for some time to come, the number by FY 1997 will be very small. Therefore, it was assumed that 100% of the court commitments in FY 1997 and thereafter will be pursuant to Guidelines.

+ 120 Other Admissions (Return from Court, Transfer, etc.)

(This represents various admissions that are typically received in relatively small numbers. During FY 1994 there was an average of 10 such admissions per month. It was assumed that this trend would continue in FY 1996

8781 Balance

(This is the number of inmates at the end of FY 1997, if all of those admitted during FY 1997 stayed the entire year or longer.)

Releases

- 132 To Probation/Court

(This is the number of inmates expected to be released to Court and/or placed on probation. It was assumed that by FY 1997 releases of this type would be significantly reduced from the 528 in FY 1994; under Sentencing Guidelines, the type of case granted probation within 120 days under the "old law" is more apt to receive presumptive probation (i.e., not come to prison in the first place). The number was set at 25% of the FY 1994

level.)

- 195 Other Releases (CR, Sentence Expiration etc.)

(This is the number of inmates released due to Conditional Release and Expiration of Sentence. It was assumed that there would be reduced from the 390 releases of this type in FY 1994 due to the depletion in the number of inmates eligible for such release. The number was set at 50% of the FY 1994 level.)

- 321 FY 1995 Court Commits Released : Via Guidelines

(This is the estimated number of inmates admitted during FY 1995 pursuant to guidelines (i.e., 1935 above) who will be released during FY 1997. The expected time to serve was based upon the number of months between admission and the projected guidelines admission date of those admitted during the last 6 months of FY 1994.

- 105 FY 1995 Court Commits Released: Via KPB Decision

(This is the estimated number of inmates admitted during FY 1995 pursuant to "old law" (i.e., 645 above) who will be released during FY 1997 pursuant to a Parole Board decision. Parole eligibility was based upon the parole eligibility of those admitted during the last 6 months of FY 1994 and a parole rate of 25% was assumed, regardless of whether the inmate is considered for the first or a subsequent/additional time.)

- 906 FY 1996 Court Commits Released : Via Guidelines

(This is the estimated number of inmates admitted during FY 1996 pursuant to guidelines (i.e., 2376 above) who will be released during FY 1997. The expected time to serve was based upon the number of months between admission and the projected guidelines admission date of those admitted during the last 6 months of FY 1994.

- 42 FY 1996 Court Commits Released: Via KPB Decision

(This is the estimated number of inmates admitted during FY 1996 pursuant to "old law" (i.e., 264 above) who will be released during FY 1997 pursuant to a Parole Board decision. Parole eligibility was based upon the parole eligibility of those admitted during the last 6 months of FY 1994 and a parole rate of 25% was assumed, regardless of whether the inmate is considered for the first time or a subsequent/additional time.)

- 607 FY 1997 Court Commits Released Via Guidelines

(This is the estimated number of inmates admitted during FY 1997 pursuant to guidelines (i.e., 2640 above) who will also be released during FY 1997. The expected time to serve was based upon the number of months between admission and the projected guidelines admission date of those admitted during the last 6 months of FY 1994.

6473 FY 1997 Ending Population

4-13
2-17

FY 1998

6473 Starting Population

(This is the population as projected for the end of FY 1997)

- 32 Releases from Stock Population: Guidelines

(This is the number of inmates who were in the original stock population (i.e., 6091 above) who have Guidelines Release dates during FY 1998. Their release is not discretionary.)

- 395 Releases from Stock Population: KPB

(This is the estimated number of inmates in the original stock population (i.e., 6091 above) that will be released by virtue of a Kansas Parole Board decision during FY 1998. A 25% parole rate is assumed.)

6046 Residual Population

Admissions

+ 2640 Court Commitments: Guidelines

(This is the estimated number of offenders that will be sent to the KDOC by the Courts during FY 1998 (i.e., New Court Commitments, Probation Violators With New Sentence, Probation Violators Without New Sentence, Parole/CR Violators with New Sentence). It was assumed that there would be no increase in court commitments from the FY 1997 level.

+ 120 Other Admissions (Return from Court, Transfer, etc.)

(This represents various admissions that are typically received in relatively small numbers. During FY 1994 there was an average of 10 such admissions per month. It was assumed that this trend would continue in FY 1996

8806 Balance

(This is the number of inmates at the end of FY 1998, if all of those admitted during FY 1998 stayed the entire year or longer.)

Releases

- 132 To Probation/Court

(This is the number of inmates expected to be released to Court and/or placed on probation. It was assumed that by FY 1998 releases of this type would be significantly reduced from the 528 in FY 1994; under Sentencing Guidelines, the type of case granted probation within 120 days under the "old law" is more apt to receive presumptive probation (i.e., not come to prison in the first place). The number was set at 25% of the FY 1994 level.)

4-14
~~4-10~~

- 98 Other Releases (CR, Sentence Expiration etc.)
(This is the number of inmates released due to Conditional Release and Expiration of Sentence. It was assumed that there would be reduced from the 390 releases of this type in FY 1994 due to the depletion in the number of inmates eligible for such release. The number was set at 25% of the FY 1994 level.)

- 170 FY 1995 Court Commits Released : Via Guidelines
(This is the estimated number of inmates admitted during FY 1995 pursuant to guidelines (i.e., 1935 above) who will be released during FY 1998. The expected time to serve was based upon the number of months between admission and the projected guidelines admission date of those admitted during the last 6 months of FY 1994.

- 89 FY 1995 Court Commits Released: Via KPB Decision
(This is the estimated number of inmates admitted during FY 1995 pursuant to "old law" (i.e., 645 above) who will be released during FY 1998 pursuant to a Parole Board decision. Parole eligibility was based upon the parole eligibility of those admitted during the last 6 months of FY 1994 and a parole rate of 25% was assumed, regardless of whether the inmate is considered for the first or a subsequent/additional time.)

- 402 FY 1996 Court Commits Released : Via Guidelines
(This is the estimated number of inmates admitted during FY 1996 pursuant to guidelines (i.e., 2376 above) who will be released during FY 1998. The expected time to serve was based upon the number of months between admission and the projected guidelines admission date of those admitted during the last 6 months of FY 1994.

- 43 FY 1996 Court Commits Released: Via KPB Decision
(This is the estimated number of inmates admitted during FY 1996 pursuant to "old law" (i.e., 264 above) who will also be released during FY 1998 pursuant to a Parole Board decision. Parole eligibility was based upon the parole eligibility of those admitted during the last 6 months of FY 1994 and a parole rate of 25% was assumed, regardless of whether the inmate is considered for the first time or a subsequent/additional time.)

- 1003 FY 1997 Court Commits Released Via Guidelines
(This is the estimated number of inmates admitted during FY 1997 pursuant to guidelines (i.e., 2640 above) who will be released during FY 1998. The expected time to serve was based upon the number of months between admission and the projected guidelines admission date of those admitted during the last 6 months of FY 1994.

- 607 FY 1998 Court Commits Released Via Guidelines
(This is the estimated number of inmates admitted during FY 1998 pursuant to guidelines (i.e., 2640 above) who will also be released during FY 1997. The expected time to serve was based upon the number of months between admission and the projected guidelines admission date of those admitted during the last 6 months of FY 1994.

- 6262 FY 1998 Ending Population

4-15
5-19

FY 1999

6262 Starting Population

(This is the population as projected for the end of FY 1998)

- 21 Releases from Stock Population: Guidelines

(This is the number of inmates who were in the original stock population (i.e., 6091 above) who have Guidelines Release dates during FY 1999. Their release is not discretionary.)

- 319 Releases from Stock Population: KPB

(This is the estimated number of inmates in the original stock population (i.e., 6091 above) that will be released by virtue of a Kansas Parole Board decision during FY 1999. A 25% parole rate is assumed.)

5922 Residual Population

Admissions

+ 2640 Court Commitments: Guidelines

(These numbers are the estimated number of offenders that will be sent to the KDOC by the Courts during FY 1999 (i.e., New Court Commitments, Probation Violators With New Sentence, Probation Violators Without New Sentence, Parole/CR Violators with New Sentence). It was assumed that there would be no increase in court commitments from the FY 1998 level.

+ 120 Other Admissions (Return from Court, Transfer, etc.)

(This represents various admissions that are typically received in relatively small numbers. During FY 1994 there was an average of 10 such admissions per month. It was assumed that this trend would continue in FY 1996

8682 Balance

(This is the number of inmates at the end of FY 1999, if all of those admitted during FY 1999 stayed the entire year or longer.)

Releases

- 132 To Probation/Court

(This is the number of inmates expected to be released to Court and/or placed on probation. It was assumed that by FY 1999 releases of this type would be significantly reduced from the 528 in FY 1994; under Sentencing Guidelines, the type of case granted probation within 120 days under the "old law" is more apt to receive presumptive probation (i.e., not come to prison in the first place). The number was set at 25% of the FY 1994 level.)

- 98 Other Releases (CR, Sentence Expiration etc.)

(This is the number of inmates released due to Conditional Release and Expiration of Sentence. It was assumed that there would be reduced from the 390 releases of this type in FY 1994 due to the depletion in the number of inmates eligible for such release. The number was set at 25% of the FY 1994 level.)

- 85 FY 1995 Court Commits Released : Via Guidelines

(This is the estimated number of inmates admitted during FY 1995 pursuant to guidelines (i.e., 1935 above) who will be released during FY 1999. The expected time to serve was based upon the number of months between admission and the projected guidelines admission date of those admitted during the last 6 months of FY 1994.

- 69 FY 1995 Court Commits Released: Via KPB Decision

(This is the estimated number of inmates admitted during FY 1995 pursuant to "old law" (i.e., 645 above) who will be released during FY 1999 pursuant to a Parole Board decision. Parole eligibility was based upon the parole eligibility of those admitted during the last 6 months of FY 1994 and a parole rate of 25% was assumed, regardless of whether the inmate is considered for the first or a subsequent/additional time.)

- 196 FY 1996 Court Commits Released : Via Guidelines

(This is the estimated number of inmates admitted during FY 1996 pursuant to guidelines (i.e., 2376 above) who will be released during FY 1999. The expected time to serve was based upon the number of months between admission and the projected guidelines admission date of those admitted during the last 6 months of FY 1994.

- 36 FY 1996 Court Commits Released: Via KPB Decision

(This is the estimated number of inmates admitted during FY 1996 pursuant to "old law" (i.e., 264 above) who will be released during FY 1999 pursuant to a Parole Board decision. Parole eligibility was based upon the parole eligibility of those admitted during the last 6 months of FY 1994 and a parole rate of 25% was assumed, regardless of whether the inmate is considered for the first time or a subsequent/additional time.)

- 449 FY 1997 Court Commits Released Via Guidelines

(This is the estimated number of inmates admitted during FY 1997 pursuant to guidelines (i.e., 2640 above) who will be released during FY 1999. The expected time to serve was based upon the number of months between admission and the projected guidelines admission date of those admitted during the last 6 months of FY 1994.

-1003 FY 1998 Court Commits Released Via Guidelines

(This is the estimated number of inmates admitted during FY 1998 pursuant to guidelines (i.e., 2640 above) who will be released during FY 1999. The expected time to serve was based upon the number of months between admission and the projected guidelines admission date of those admitted during the last 6 months of FY 1994.

- 607 FY 1999 Court Commits Released Via Guidelines

(This is the estimated number of inmates admitted during FY 1999 pursuant to guidelines (i.e., 2640 above) who will also be released during FY 1999. The expected time to serve was based upon the number of months between admission and the projected guidelines admission date of those admitted during the last 6 months of FY 1994.

6007 FY 1999 Ending Population

4-17
J.J.



KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

BILL GRAVES, GOVERNOR

CHARLES E. SIMMONS, ACTING SECRETARY

LONDON STATE OFFICE BUILDING — 900 SW JACKSON

TOPEKA, KANSAS — 66612-1284

913-296-3317

Date: February 15, 1995

TO: Executive Committee
Executive Committee Staff

FROM: *Dick Koerner*
Dick Koerner, Correctional Manager - Policy, Planning, and Data Analysis

SUBJECT: Revised Population Projection

A revised population projection for the period FY 95 through FY 99 that was prepared for Acting Secretary Simmons is attached for your information. This projection reflects a change from 25% to 19% in the assumed parole rate for FYs 95 and 96; the rate remains at 25% for FYs 97, 98, and 99.

Attachment

cc: Acting Secretary Simmons
File

4-18
4-18

Kansas Department of Corrections

Projected End-of-year Inmate Population and
Estimated ADP for FY 1995 - FY 1999

Scenario: Parole Rate Reduced from 25% to 19% for FY 1995 and FY 1996

Projected Year-end Inmate Population

<u>Date</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Change From Previous Year</u>	<u>Average Change Per Month</u>
June 30, 1994	6,091 (Actual)	----	----
June 30, 1995	6,671	+580	+48.3
June 30, 1996	7,045	+374	+31.2
June 30, 1997	6,997	- 48	- 4.0
June 30, 1998	6,839	-158	-13.2
June 30 1999	6,637	-202	-16.8

Estimated ADP (Mid-point between year-end projections)

FY 1995 - 6,381
FY 1996 - 6,858
FY 1997 - 7,021
FY 1998 - 6,918
FY 1999 - 6,738

Prepared 11-14-94; Policy, Planning and Data Analysis. Revised 2-14-95 per parole rate reduction scenario (from 25% to 19% for FY 1995 and FY 1996).

4-19
4-13

Prophet Model Data Requirements

After June 30th of each year, KDOC gives the Kansas Sentencing Commission seven data files for use in the Prophet model projection of prison populations. These files contain a varying number of data items and cases. The following table outlines the characteristics of these seven files:

Type of Data File	Number of Data Elements or Variables	Number of Cases or Records (for FY 1996)
Fiscal Year Prison Admissions	114 variables	4827 cases
Prison Stock Population	120 variables	7455 cases
Parole Stock Population	123 variables	7303 cases
Fiscal Year Prison Releases	126 variables	4233 cases
Fiscal Year Discharges from Post-release Supervision	128 variables	4629 cases
Parole Hearings	14 variables	8226 cases
Probation Data that KDOC has on file	42 variables	678 cases
TOTAL across all 7 files:	667 variables	37,351 cases

The information in these files includes:

- Demographic-type information about the offenders
for example, KDOC number, gender, date of birth, ethnicity, race, last grade completed
- Case, Sentence, and Sentencing- related information
for example, county of conviction, case number, sentencing judge, offense date, conviction date, departure (from sentencing grid) most serious offense, the computed severity-level of the most serious offense, time to serve, criminal history class
- Release-related information by sentence type
for example, earliest release date, current release date, projected release date, controlling minimum release date, controlling maximum release date, date of parole board decision(s), result of parole board decision(s), discharge date
- Sentence Computation Information
for example, date of sentencing, date sentence begins, type of sentence (determinate, indeterminate, one of three types of "mixed" sentence structures), good time earned/forfeited/awarded/remaining (*NOTE: The good time data elements are of limited value at the current time due to incomplete data collection.*)

The data item requirements are determined by the Prophet model configuration which, in turn, is determined by NCCD.

Data Collection

Initial data collection within the KDOC system begins with recording information from the Journal Entry that accompanies the offender to the Reception and Diagnostic Unit. Both this initial set of data and subsequent information is electronically logged throughout the offender's term of incarceration with the Department. Data is stored in the KDOC's AS/400 mainframe computer in the Offender Information Management System (OMIS).

Data Transfer

On June 30th, KDOC Information Technology staff copy the existing offender records from the OMIS system into a file that is retrieved by KDOC Research staff. The Research staff takes that data from the AS/400 format and converts it into a form that can be read by a software package known as SPSS ("Statistical Package for the Social Sciences"). Data tables are created where each data element is named, defined within the software (for example, is the data field numeric or character), and an "English" translation is given each item. These files are then compressed and handed off to the Sentencing Commission.

Select Committee on Corrections
& Juvenile Justice

pb 04/04/97 3:09 PM

c:\my documents\prophet\data requirement description.doc

4-9-97

Attachment #5

2-24

45



KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

A Safer Kansas through Effective Correctional Services

BILL GRAVES, GOVERNOR

CHARLES E. SIMMONS, SECRETARY

LONDON STATE OFFICE BUILDING — 900 SW JACKSON
TOPEKA, KANSAS — 66612-1284
913-296-3317

interoffice MEMORANDUM

to: Select Committee on Corrections
from: Roger Werholtz, Deputy Secretary of Corrections 
subject: Community Based Substance Abuse Treatment Services
date: March 31, 1997

You requested additional information regarding levels of service required to eliminate delays in placing offenders in community based substance abuse treatment programs. After reviewing current demand with our Regional Parole Directors we have developed the following estimates of enhancements required:

Intermediate Inpatient Treatment	24 beds	\$350,400
Reintegration	2 beds	20,695
Outpatient Counseling	14,256 hours	240,000
Female Intermediate Inpatient Tx	16 beds	233,600
Female Reintegration	9 beds	93,130
Total		\$937,825

Reasons for difference in current estimate and enhancement package of \$118,170 submitted to Division of Budget in August 1996:

1. Increased referral and utilization rates by parole staff in last six months. The department also continued to increase emphasis on utilization of the intermediate sanctions grid. In that process, it was learned that officers were too often sanctioning offenders for dropping out of substance abuse programs and then not referring them back after the sanction was imposed. Staff were advised that even though a sanction had been imposed, the offender still needed to satisfy their need for treatment and could not simply choose to accept the sanction **instead of** completing treatment. Re-emphasizing this policy had the effect of increasing demand for treatment, but the effect was not noticed until after budget submissions had been made.



Equal Opportunity Employer

*Select Committee on Corrections +
Juvenile Justice
4-9-97
Attachment # 6*

#6

Select Committee on Corrections

Page 2

March 31, 1997

2. Increased emphasis by Kansas Parole Board on following substance abuse treatment recommendations and relapse prevention plans. Beginning in October 1996, The KPB began to actively demand relapse prevention plans from offenders at parole hearings and place more emphasis on participation in post release treatment and aftercare. This influenced offender participation rates, and, we believe, had an influence on staff awareness of this issue as well. Again, the impact of this practice was not evident until after the original budget submission and completion of the appeal process.
3. Increased referrals of female offenders by Topeka Correctional Facility for reintegration and inpatient treatment.

Results that can be expected:

1. A dip in revocations after services are implemented. Unfortunately, we cannot estimate with any certainty anticipated reduction in revocations or the duration of the effect because we do not yet have a reliable data base on which to develop projections.
2. Because our evaluation system is not yet in place for community based services, we cannot state with confidence that lower levels of revocation can be sustained over time. Additional services may simply delay the revocation process rather than prevent it.

The additional investment indicated in this estimate is one that is made more on faith than on hard data, because we cannot yet tell you with certainty that the services will produce the long term results you seek. We know that some offenders are so resistant to treatment that they will abscond rather than participate in community based treatment which is why we continue to emphasize facility based treatment as well.

Department of Corrections Program Funding Priorities

1. Sex Offender Treatment Programs (facility and community)
2. Therapeutic Community Substance Abuse Treatment
3. Other Substance Abuse Treatment Programs (facility and community)
4. Basic Literacy and Special Education Programs
5. Secondary Level Education Programs (GED)
6. Vocational Education Programs
7. Structured Residential Placements (halfway houses)
8. Cognitive Skills Intervention Strategies and Training
9. Mental Health Transition Programs for Parolees
10. Battered Women Treatment Program
11. Visitors' Centers

The criteria used to establish priorities for programs are (in no particular order):

1. Greatest immediate impact on public safety.
2. Impact on recidivism.
3. Total number of offenders impacted.
4. National/International body of research supporting program effectiveness.
5. KDOC research supporting effectiveness.
6. Potential for impact on KDOC and other agencies or organizations.
7. Ability to retain participant to program completion.

Comments on each program:

Sex Offender Treatment - The connection to criminal behavior and the victimization of others through criminal sexual behavior is obvious. The direct goal of sex offender treatment is to prevent further sexual victimization and, hence, further criminal activity. There is extensive research literature verifying the effectiveness of sex offender treatment with the majority of sex offenders. The results of KDOC's own program evaluation study of facility based sex offender treatment show similar outcomes. Both facility based and community based sex offender treatment programs show a good ability to retain their participants.

Therapeutic Community - While this is a relatively new program to KDOC, there is a considerable body of research nationally that identifies this as one of the most effective substance abuse treatment programs for offender populations. It is, however, relatively expensive when compared to other substance abuse treatment interventions. There is evidence from the national research that this program does reduce recidivism. While no causal relationship has been established between substance abuse and criminal behavior, research shows that there is a clear correlation.

Other Substance Abuse Treatment Programs - As mentioned above, there is a clear correlation between substance abuse and criminal behavior. The department has used a variety of treatment approaches over the years including traditional twelve step programs, AA/NA, psycho-educational approaches, cognitively based relapse prevention programs and Alpha-Theta

Select Committee on Corrections
& Juvenile Justice
4-9-97
Attachment #7 #7

Brainwave Training. Most research indicates that twelve step programs, psycho-educational programs and AA/NA are not very effective with criminal populations. Cognitively based relapse prevention programs and the brainwave training appear to have the most promise of the short term substance abuse treatment programs. In Kansas, the indications are inconclusive at this point. The historical data for facility based cognitive programs and brainwave programs is fairly limited in duration and community based program data is non-existent at this time. Decisions are based on research done elsewhere.

Basic Literacy and Special Education Programs - Evaluation data from Kansas does not identify any direct impact that these programs have on public safety or recidivism rates. However, without the ability to read, calculate and perform other basic tasks, offenders cannot complete sex offender treatment, substance abuse treatment, vocational training or many work release programs for which there is clear evidence of positive impact on criminal behavior. Prioritization of this program is based on viewing it as an intermediate step to other programs and opportunities that can produce outcomes of reduced recidivism. Also, failure to continue the special education program could adversely effect federal participation in other non-correctional education programs under PL 91-142.

Secondary Level Education Programs - This program has the least compelling evidence nationally and based on Kansas results. Offering it has been a long standing tradition, and a high school diploma or GED is something that is assumed to have intrinsic value. Based on data that has become available since the FY 1998 budget request was submitted, it may be advisable to review this priority.

Vocational Education - There is research data nationally and locally to indicate that vocational education does have a positive impact on recidivism and offender economic performance after release. The vocational programs also provide more skilled inmate workers for correctional industries and the facilities in general as well as enhancing some facility support services.

Structured Residential Placements (halfway houses) - Research regarding this subject is limited by the small numbers of studies of which we are aware as well as the tremendous variation among programs. Kansas data is also unavailable to this point. Parole officers report that the absence of an acceptable residence and suitable structure frequently contributes to an offender's revocation.

Cognitive Skills Intervention Strategies and Training - while still a relatively new treatment strategy, there exists considerable research to support the effectiveness of this intervention on recidivism. One barrier to implementing this on anything larger than an experimental/pilot basis is the limited availability of staff time to deliver the cognitive skills training.

Mental Health Transitional Programs for parolees - One of the unintended by-products of Mental Health Reform is that an increasing number of mentally ill individuals are becoming caught up in the criminal justice system. While comprising a relatively small proportion of the offender population, these individuals consume a great deal of staff time and services. These services are intended to safely maintain mentally ill offenders in the community for longer periods of time and

slow their patterns of recidivism. This program is also geared toward providing crisis intervention services to other offenders who may be experiencing some difficult situation which might result in a decay into criminal activity or condition violation without intervention. There is no research data to determine performance of this relatively small program at this time.

Battered Women Treatment Program - This program serves a maximum of five women at any one time and is assigned a lower priority because of the very small portion of the population it serves. There is no research base on which to evaluate performance at this time, but anecdotal information indicates that very few participants return to prison. It is important to remember that only a small percentage of the KDOC population are eligible for the program.

Visitors' Centers - In the late '70's or early '80's the state of Massachusetts conducted a recidivism study of its prison population and determined that, after controlling for all other factors in the population, the one variable having the single greatest impact on recidivism was the frequency of visits an inmate received while incarcerated. We are unaware of other research on this subject, but surface logic would support such a finding. Inmates receiving visits are more likely to have a socially appropriate support system intact upon their release. Visits are also a powerful management tool in that they are a significant incentive for inmates to cooperate with the facility. Visitors' Centers are intended to encourage inmate visiting and minimize the problems for facilities associated with visiting that center around the presence of small children, the issue of appropriate clothing and the enforcement of facility rules. However, Visitors' Centers have the least direct or immediate impact on public safety issues of all the programs provided by KDOC, and consequently are assigned the lowest priority among this group of services.



DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
Landon State Office Building
900 S.W. Jackson — Suite 400-N
Topeka, Kansas 66612-1284
(913) 296-3317

Bill Graves
Governor

Charles E. Simmons
Secretary

DATE: April 9, 1997
TO: Select Committee on Corrections and Juvenile Justice
FROM: Thomas J. Vohs *TJV*
Deputy Secretary of Community and Field Services
SUBJECT: Community Corrections Placement Processes

The Select Committee has been asked to "examine the differences in programs between the Community Corrections districts regarding how judges make placements." Staff of the Department of Corrections' Community Corrections Section surveyed local Community Corrections programs concerning this issue and the responses are attached.

A review of the responses indicates that the majority of District Courts consider Community Corrections placement for felony offenders who fall into the presumptive probation portion of the sentencing grid and for probation condition violators. Some District Courts appear to target Community Corrections placement for offenders who have extensive criminal histories, are at high risk to re-offend or violate, require intensive supervision services such as field visits or frequent drug screens, or have a need to be linked to community resources.

The amount of input Community Corrections programs have at both initial sentencing and revocation hearings varies among Judicial Districts. Some Community Corrections programs report ongoing collaboration with Court Services for the purpose of presenting coordinated dispositional recommendations to the Courts.

TJV:jg

Enclosure

cc: File

Select Committee on Corrections
& Juvenile Justice

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PLACEMENT CONSIDERATIONS

Atchison County Community Corrections - 1st Judicial District

Clients are commonly referred to Community Corrections at the sentencing stage and revocation stage of judicial proceedings. Most times the Court assigns offenders in accordance with the recommendations from Court Services. Court Services' recommendations are made by the Court Services Officers alone without any input from our staff. The Court seldom assigns cases differently than the recommendation. Almost all revocations from Court Services are assigned to Community Corrections as a last attempt prior to incarceration.

Bourbon/Linn/Miami Community Corrections - 6th Judicial District

Community Corrections and Court Services jointly screen and make recommendations to the Court regarding every adult felon. If there is a disagreement (which rarely occurs) concerning what the recommendation should be, Court Services' recommendation prevails because they write the presentence investigation.

Central Kansas Community Corrections - 20th Judicial District

For first time offenders, the majority of the placements are directly to Court Services if the offender falls within the presumptive probation grid box. There have been occasions, however, in which first time offenders are placed directly on Community Corrections. These usually pertain to high publicity cases and/or serious person crimes, however, on the majority of cases, they still fall within the presumptive probation range. Very rarely does the Court go outside the sentencing guideline range. When an offender has been in the system before and has already been on Court Services supervision but was discharged successfully or unsuccessfully and is back in front of the Court on new charges, these types of offenders are usually placed on Community Corrections.

Presently, the Court is utilizing Intermediate Sanctions. If an offender under the direct supervision of Court Services violates conditions of probation, the Court Services Officer is encouraged to utilize a sanction in lieu of going back to Court unless the offender is a risk to the community, himself, and/or an absconder risk. Therefore, direct referrals may come from Court Services Officers to Community Corrections in lieu of revocation proceedings. If the Court Services Officer is seeking revocation of probation, the Court has the discretion of reinstating probation, placing on Community Corrections, unsuccessful discharge or revocation. There is no matrix system utilized in this process. It is entirely up to the discretion of the Court.

Cimarron Basin Community Corrections - 16th and 26th Judicial Districts

Any offender who falls into the presumptive probation portion of the sentencing guidelines grid is assigned to Community Corrections.

Cowley County Community Corrections - 19th Judicial District

All felons not sent to prison go into Community Corrections.

Douglas County Community Corrections - 7th Judicial District

For adults, the Court determines whether an individual goes to Community Corrections or Court Services. Cases that are being dually supervised are assigned to Community Corrections, as are many of the probation violators. However, not all probation violators come our way. Judges do tend to follow the recommendations of the Court Services Officer or Intensive Supervision Officer when determining disposition for revocations.

Johnson County Community Corrections - 10th Judicial District

We staff cases with Court Services both in pre-sentence and probation violation status. From this staffing, a recommendation is created to offer the Court at the time of disposition.

Leavenworth County Community Corrections - 1st Judicial District

The Court can revoke an offender without our input if they want to and sometimes they do. Although we have limited staff resources, we are moving in the direction of having staff present at all sentencings/revocations to provide input to the Court.

Montgomery County Community Corrections - 14th Judicial District

At sentencing, the Court will rely on Court Services' recommendation in the presentence investigation or on their discretion. The judges rely on their individual philosophy in determining placement.

Northwest Kansas Community Corrections - 15th, 17th, and 23rd Judicial Districts

The Courts in our area are, for the most part, very receptive and endorse the Community Corrections Program on a regular basis. Most consider Community Corrections as a placement for felony offenders only and some give first time felony offenders to Court Services.

Reno County Community Corrections - 27th Judicial District

The Court sends Court Services' probation violators to Community Corrections first.

Riley County Community Corrections - 21st and 22nd Judicial Districts

The process has evolved from that of a battle to that of a cooperative, knowledgeable effort to make the best use of this community's combined offender supervision resources. All Court Services staff are well aware of our resources and appropriately refer the

"tougher" offender to Community Corrections. This includes sentencing, departures, and revocations. We have made a consistent effort to provide the Courts with a working knowledge of our current resources as well as with written feedback on the individual offenders they assign to us; to include both the negative and positive aspects of each offender's performance and progress. We forward a written progress report to the Court every two months. The net result is that a vast majority of the offenders assigned to us represent the type of offender who should receive more intensive supervision. In short, we have developed and maintained a very good working relationship with the Court which generates appropriate offender placements within our local criminal justice system.

Santa Fe Trail Community Corrections - 16th Judicial District

Placements are at the discretion of the Court.

Sedgwick County Community Corrections - 18th Judicial District

The Court routinely considers offenders for placement in Community Corrections. For the most part, the Court follows the recommendations of Court Services at probation violation hearings. A large majority of felony Court Services revocations result in the placement of the offender with Community Corrections. The criteria used by the Court Services Officer in making recommendations is the likelihood of offender success with closer supervision and the need for more community resources to meet offender needs. The exception would be when the offender commits a new offense in which public safety is a concern.

There is not a checklist for consideration used by the Court when making placement decisions. Factors considered by the Court include the following: The need for closer supervision; need for drug testing; extent of criminal history; and the need for field visits. If a case is "presumptive probation" and a downward departure is made, the offender will normally be placed with Community Corrections.

Presentence Investigations do not make a recommendation when the case is presumptive prison. When the case is presumptive probation, the investigator, in most instances, follows the recommendation of the plea agreement by the district attorney's office. Community Corrections no longer makes routine recommendations to the Court at sentencings of potential clients.

Shawnee County Community Corrections - 2nd and 3rd Judicial Districts

The process by which offenders are assigned to our program varies between the 2nd and 3rd Judicial Districts. Second District judges have been making more direct assignments at sentencing without benefit of a referral from Court Services to Community Corrections and a subsequent report to the Court. Our officers in that District believe this is a result of the Courts familiarity with our program.

8-4
8-3

While there are sporadic direct assignments in the 3rd District, most cases are screened after referral by Court Services. Most felony Court Services revocations are referred to us. All presumptive prison cases are screened in a staffing with Court Services. However formal, all this speaks to the existence of a system of offender classification. Our policy requires the coordinator to locate and track potential referrals and maintain contacts with judges, attorneys, probation/parole officers, and the Department of Corrections. The Coordinator is also authorized to represent the program in court and meetings involving potential clients.

A team composed of Community Corrections staff and Court Services staff screens all offenders who fall into the presumptive probation grid to determine those clearly inappropriate for placement. Offenders may also be screened upon request. The screening officer or designee is present at the sentencing hearing of any referred offender on which they have completed a full screening.

South Central Kansas Community Corrections - 30th Judicial District

The Court views Community Corrections just as they view Court Services. We are there to perform and provide services as they feel necessary. I have attempted, over the years, to work with the Court so that only high risk felons are placed in our program. To date, the Court places offenders who, in their mind, require intensive supervision. I would like to add that in our service area, the judges usually know quite a bit about the offenders, and the ones they place with us are usually in need of our program and the services we offer.

I believe that it is the collective perception of Court Services, local defense attorneys, County Prosecutors, the Court, and our staff that our program provides unique and much needed services for the communities that make up our service area. All concerned parties believe that intensive supervision works on the majority of offenders assigned no matter the crime classification. Our high success rate speaks for itself. We are meeting and exceeding the mandate as set out in statute. We are an effective intermediate sanction.

Southeast Kansas Community Corrections - 11th and 31st Judicial Districts

The Court in the 11th and 31st Judicial Districts assigns offenders to Community Corrections at original sentencing and as a result of probation revocation. Our agency is not involved or consulted regarding assignment to Community Corrections, therefore, I am not sure what considerations are looked at in determining placement. Court Services carries varying degrees of influence upon the Court in determining placements. I have no knowledge of the Court's use, or lack of use, of any matrix or checklist in determining which non-prison based placement is utilized.

8-5
~~8-4~~

Sumner County Community Corrections - 30th Judicial District

Eligibility for Community Corrections placement includes felony offenders that fall into one of the categories below. They are staffed with Court Services and generally an assessment with a recommendation for supervision is submitted to the Court prior to sentencing:

Categories

- a. Presumptive probation
- b. Borderline cases that the court may depart on.
- c. Those felony offenders that may have had previous supervision on other cases (may be felony, misdemeanor, or juvenile).
- d. Those cases where Community Corrections may offer some type of needed 'special services.'
- e. Felony cases that are being revoked from Court Services.

All assignments are ordered directly by the sentencing Court.

Wyandotte County Community Corrections - 29th Judicial District

Although Court Services and Community Corrections make recommendations to the Court on offenders identified by Court Services as probable for Community Corrections, each individual judge makes their own placement decision using their own criteria.

4th Judicial District Community Corrections

The Court determines assignment to Community Corrections by: 1) as per the presentence investigation; 2) sentencing guidelines - motion to depart; 3) Court Services revocation.

5th Judicial District Community Corrections

One Court Services Officer prepares all presentence investigations. She uses the standard Sentencing Commission's presentence investigation format including the checklist. She collaborates with Community Corrections on cases that she feels are serious enough to warrant intensive supervision. The Court for the most part follows the recommendations of the presentence investigation in deciding to sentence to standard probation or to community corrections. Standard probation violations, especially when they are of a technical nature, are usually sent to Community Corrections before prison is used.

8th Judicial District Community Corrections

The Court makes placement decisions a number of ways:

8-6
8-5

1. Presentence investigation recommends Community Corrections (Court Services staffs case with Community Corrections).
2. Recommendations of Court Services Officer upon revocation. (Court Services staffs case with Community Corrections.)
3. Recommendations from the County Attorney (no staffing).
4. The Court decides that the case warrants Community Corrections placement. The Court does use a checklist that lists options available to the Court during sentencing.

9th Judicial District Community Corrections

Court Services and Community Corrections jointly staff cases and make recommendations. In deciding whether an offender should be assigned to Community Corrections or Court Services, the team considers the offender's prior record, the severity of the offense, and the needs of the offender. Offenders with the greatest need for supervision or treatment programs will be recommended for Community Corrections. Ninety-five percent of the time the Court follows the team's recommendation. If there is disagreement as to what the recommendation should be, the Directors of the two agencies, along with the Chief Court Services Officer, get together and make a decision.

12th/28th Judicial District Community Corrections

The criteria the Court uses to place people into Community Corrections are: 1) Sentencing guidelines; 2) Probation violators. Community Corrections does not have an opportunity to give any recommendations except in probation violation hearings from our caseloads. Since we do not participate in presentence investigation writing or have an option for recommendations in the presentence investigation, all new sentencing is up to the Court. The Court has a matrix that outlines appropriate cases for Community Corrections and Court Services and I do believe they refer to it. I believe on a majority of probation violations from Court Services, the Judges and the Court Services Officers routinely consider offenders for assignment to Community Corrections.

13th Judicial District Community Corrections

A target group of offenders has been established in the 13th Judicial District for Community Corrections supervision. When a presentence investigation is ordered for these offenders, Community Corrections is notified by Court Services. Community Corrections then has input as to what appropriate probation conditions will be ordered at the time of sentencing.

At Court Services revocations, the Court and Court Services routinely consider Community Corrections placement as a graduated sanction for felony offenders. At Community Corrections revocations, the judges do consider a short term jail sanction, electronic monitoring, LCCC, etc. Community Corrections' input at these proceedings is considered to be very important, and we are often looked to, to provide a recommendation.

24th Judicial District Community Corrections

Our policies provide for joint staffing by Court Services and Community Corrections when developing presentence investigations and, when deemed necessary, by supervisors. They also provide that when a Court Services Officer or Intensive Supervision Officer determines a change of status is needed, the supervising officer may present the case to a joint panel and must in felony probation cases. The joint panel will then make a recommendation and the Intensive Supervision Officer is responsible for implementing the recommendation according to departmental policy.

25th Judicial District Community Corrections

Court Services controls presentence investigation recommendations which are generally followed. If the Legislature is going to look at implementation of a grid system to slow the flow of probation revocations to prison, I would propose the development of a placement matrix as well. This should help ensure community safety and afford offenders adequate structure, opportunity, and resources to support rehabilitative efforts.

&Dec actual

Kansas Sentencing Commission FY 1997 Adult Inmate Population Projections

Assumes 6 Month Border Box Impact Lag

Grid Level	June 30, 1996	Dec 31 1996 <i>Actual</i>	June 30, 1997	June 30, 1998	June 30, 1999	June 30, 2000	June 30, 2001	June 30, 2002	June 30, 2003	June 30, 2004	June 30, 2005	June 30, 2006
Level 1	448	474	468	506	537	570	603	629	652	682	700	728
Level 2	560	595	583	616	659	680	719	753	767	785	791	805
Level 3	1,246	1,307	1,258	1,295	1,325	1,343	1,361	1,355	1,377	1,382	1,370	1,427
Level 4	289	291	306	325	340	362	381	388	396	390	396	408
Level 5	867	886	974	1,021	1,030	1,068	1,118	1,142	1,117	1,182	1,182	1,230
Level 6	158	142	161	160	151	142	158	178	159	156	154	171
Level 7	650	628	710	736	740	777	799	829	829	839	896	894
Level 8	211	200	300	330	307	226	234	248	235	223	234	250
Level 9	302	258	311	329	340	334	321	346	352	348	352	360
Level 10	33	36	38	41	42	36	40	49	56	46	54	52
Drug-Level	19	30	26	34	39	49	59	60	64	65	69	70
Drug-Level	164	170	184	196	206	202	220	214	224	227	234	237
Drug-Level	746	680	801	760	716	744	733	759	754	765	765	788
Drug-Level	326	323	349	370	381	384	413	431	419	407	410	417
Off Grid	442	516	480	527	576	621	672	718	762	829	880	940
Condition												
Violators	1,002	1,215	892	787	704	596	532	508	530	470	467	469
Unavailable		24										
TOTAL	7,463	7,755	7,841	8,033	8,093	8,134	8,363	8,607	8,693	8,796	8,954	9,246

Select Committee on Corrections
 & Juvenile Justice 8-8
 4-9-97
 Attachment # 9

Preliminary Cost Estimate
90 Bed Tent Camp

Housing: Tent

tent (10 man)	3,278
concrete slab	1,800
electric lighting	1,500
heating (2 units)	4,000
smoke detection	500
beds (KCI)	<u>2,500</u>
cost per tent	13,578

Subtotal for 9 tents 122,202

Bedding

mattress @ 60	
blankets (2) @ 10.76	
sleeping bag @ 50	
cost per bed	121

Subtotal for 90 10,890

Portable Food Service Preparation

Kitchen Trailer:

(National Guard price for 150 meal mobile unit)	15,000
---	--------

400 gal Potable Water Trailer	7,000
--------------------------------------	-------

Dining: (20 x 32 frame tent seats 40)	15,000
--	--------

concrete slab	<u>2,000</u>
---------------	--------------

Subtotal 39,000

Refrigeration: National Guard uses ice chests

?

Shower: National Guard uses 1,000 gal tanks

Water & sanitary holding (2 trailers)

?

Toilets: National Guard uses portable toilets

quote for portable toilets from a local vendor:

10 toilets @ \$95/ month includes one servicing per week	7,600
--	-------

service charge for second servicing per week within a 100 mile radius	4,000
---	-------

Portable 90 man tent camp (without showers)	Subtotal	183,692
---	----------	---------

Permanent Site:

Bring Utilities to Site:

water @ 1,000/lf	15,000
------------------	--------

sewer @ 1,000/lf	15,000
------------------	--------

electric	<u>25,000</u>
----------	---------------

55,000

*Select Committee on Corrections
& Juvenile Justice
4-9-97
Attachment 10*

Compound Utilities:

water	3,000	
sewer	6,000	
electric	10,000	
site lighting	<u>25,000</u>	
		43,000

Site Preparation: 10,000

Block Building: showers & toilets

720 sq ft @ 135/sq ft 97,200

Office Trailer 10 x 50 20,000

Food Service Tent

tent	15,000	
concrete slab	2,000	
electrical	15,000	
heating(2)	12,000	
smoke detection	1,500	
utilities	10,000	
Equipment: includes serving line, tables, Dishwasher	<u>12,130</u>	
		67,630

Storage Building: 40 x 100 175,000

Subtotal 467,830

Inmate Work Crew Equipment:

Vehicles (8 vans & 1 sedan)	195,070	
Tool trailers (8)	8,000	
Miscellaneous tools	<u>15,000</u>	
		218,070

Miscellaneous: one time costs @ 700/ inmate 63,000

April 8, 1997

**Kansas Department of Corrections
Probation Violator Tent Camp Plan**

Introduction

Probation Condition Violators (i.e., offenders on probation who have violated the conditions of probation but who have not been convicted of a new offense) comprise a significant portion of the Kansas Department of Corrections inmate population. On average, 108 such offenders have been admitted to KDOC custody monthly over the first eight months of FY 1997. To relieve the strain these offenders place on the state's prison bed space, which is near capacity, an alternative housing program has been proposed. It has been suggested that Probation Condition Violators be housed in tent camps during the eight months of the year the Kansas climate would permit. The following represents the proposal of the KDOC for the direct operation of the camp(s).

Program Statement

Define a program to manage probation condition violators in conjunction with court services and community corrections in a short term work camp setting in lieu of traditional incarceration.

General Considerations

The impact of probation violators on the department's inmate population can be addressed through shortening the length of time those offenders stay in the custody of the department or by reducing the number of violators received by the department or both.

If the intended impact of the tent camp program operated by the Department of Corrections is to reduce the number of secure beds needed for management of the growing inmate population, a major issue exists. The camp is operational only eight months of the year. It is imperative that the offenders continue to be supervised in the community pending admission to the tent camp program. Those violators approved for admission to the tent camp will be admitted from the community on a space available basis. This will reduce admissions to the Department as well as shorten the length of time the offender remains in the department's custody. The exact amount of sentence reduction that occurs will depend on the length of the offender's sentence remaining at the time of his or her placement into the tent camp.

Basic Assumptions

There are several basic assumptions upon which this plan is predicated:

1. The camps would be located at or near existing departmental facilities and would be under the administrative purview of the host facility.

Select Committee on Corrections
& Juvenile Justice
4-9-97
Attachment # 11

#11

April 8, 1997

2. A goal is to maintain ACA accreditation. Preliminary review indicates it will be possible to achieve all mandatory ACA standards. The camps would not be required to meet non-mandatory physical plant or operational standards of the American Correctional Association (ACA).
3. The camps would not be mobile. (This does not preclude the short-term deployment of participants to other locations in response to work opportunities.)
4. The camp program would be operated between March 1 and October 31. Some violators would be assigned in February to set up the camp. Some would continue into November to take down the camp. The program would be not less than 90 nor more than 120 days in duration, allowing greatest benefit of the beds.
5. Probation violators received with less than 90 days remaining to serve would be eligible to serve in this setting.
6. Upon successful completion of the camp program offenders would return to the local community to complete the remaining portion of the originally imposed probation.

In addition to these basic assumptions, there are a number of other operational assumptions enumerated in the following sub-sections of this plan.

Camp Size

The plan calls for a total of 300 beds. Of the total, 30 beds will be designated as female. The male component may be either a single 270 bed camp, two 135 bed camps, or three 90 bed camps.

Location

It is assumed that the female camp would be located in Topeka.

If the single 270 bed or two 135 bed options are chosen for the male component of the plan, the following locations are feasible:

El Dorado
Winfield
Topeka
Lansing*
Hutchinson*
Ellsworth**

April 8, 1997

* Location in association with LCF or HCF may impact those facilities court mandated accreditation.

** Suitable for one 90 bed camp.

Target Population

Probation Condition Violators are the targeted offender population. Based upon the first 8 months experience in FY '97, an estimated 1296 eligible offenders can be expected for the year. This number is comparable to the 1245 admitted during FY 1996.

During FY 1996 a total of 1035 probation condition violators were released from KDOC custody. The average length of stay for this group was 5.8 months, with no appreciable difference between genders. For that portion of the group who had determinate sentences only (540 [52%]) the average length of stay was approximately one month shorter. These data suggest that the average length of stay for this type of offender in the past has been just slightly longer than the 90-120 days proposed for the tent camp program participants and supports the notion that a 90 day program results in greater benefit from the beds. The average length of stay for probation condition violators will affect the size of the pool of probation violators eligible for a tent camp operated for only eight months of the year.

Probation condition violators whose offense severity and criminal history place them in the presumptive probation sentencing grid sector are the target population. Based upon the sentencing grid distribution of the target population during FY 1996, an estimated 84% of the probation condition violators admitted will fall within the presumptive probation portion of the sentencing grids.

Screening and Selection

Probation condition violators will be referred to a designated KDOC central screening authority. The central screening authority will determine the offenders suitability for camp placement. If the offender is not found suitable for tent camp placement, s/he would not enter the KDOC system and would remain under supervision in the community. This option would necessitate the expansion and funding of additional alternative sanctions at the community corrections level (e.g., electronic monitoring, house arrest, short term residential programs). This option is well suited to addressing the issue of whether the violator should remain under community corrections supervision pending placement into a tent camp. It also would accommodate any limitation placed on the admission of probation violators to the custody of the department.

"Off Season" Referrals

The selection and screening process will be the same throughout the year. However, since the tent camp program is in operation only eight months of the year, offenders referred and

April 8, 1997

selected during "off season" months or near the end of the "operational season" must be retained in the community until such time as placement in the camp is feasible.

Program Process

The following is a summary of how offenders would progress through the program:

The referring court submits the offender case material for review by the designated KDOC central screening authority; health screening [physical exam] will be provided by the referring county/court.)

if yes for camp, the offender is transferred to the camp by the local sheriff (transportation to the camp may be completed in cooperation with KDOC transportation system).

if no for camp, the offender remains under the supervision of the referring court services or community corrections program.

Upon successful completion of the camp program:

Notice of completion would be provided to the court. The offender would be provided a bus ticket back to the home community (i.e., court). Gratuity (i.e., "gate money" will not be provided'

The offender is reinstated on probation by the court, and the offender serves the remaining portion of the originally imposed probation under the supervision of a court services or community corrections officer.

If the offender does not successfully complete the camp program:

The Camp Administrator will provide notice to the sentencing court. The offender will be returned to the court for further proceedings to determine subsequent disposition. The county sheriff of the court of jurisdiction or court services staff will be responsible for transporting the offender.

11-4
11-3

Staffing

Position Classification	<----- Camp Size Options ----->					
	270 Beds (1 Site)	135 Beds (2 Sites)		90 Beds (3 Sites)		30 Beds (Female)
		Each Site	Total	Each Site	Total	
On-Site						
Corrections Officer T/I	10	10	20	8	24	8
Corrections Specialist I	5	3	6	2	6	0
Project Supervisor	30	12	24	8	24	4
Unit Team Manager	1	1	2	1	3	1
Correctional Counselor II	1	0	0	0	0	0
Correctional Counselor I	3	2	4	1	3	0
Driver	1	1	2	1	3	1
On-Site Sub-Total	51	29	58	21	63	14
Host Facility Support						
Warehouse	1	0	0	0	0	0
Records	1	0	0	0	0	0
Corr. Officer Escort	1	0	0	0	0	0
Host Support Sub-Total	3	0	0	0	0	0
Central Support						
Corrections Manager I	1		1		1	
Total Staff Positions	55	29	59	20	64	14

Staffing the program for eight months of every year presents somewhat of a concern. It is suggested that FTE for the camp be funded for 10 months to allow start up and shut down. In addition, an adjustment should be made to the annual shrinkage rates of the host facilities to help ensure that the appropriate number of positions are filled when needed for camp operation.

11-5
 11-4

April 8, 1997

Operations and Staffing

These are estimates for one (1) 90 bed facility

FTE	22	495,386	
Overtime, Holiday Pay and Shift Differential		<u>31,350</u>	
Subtotal		526,736	
Fringe Benefits @ 26%		<u>136,951</u>	
Subtotal		663,687	
Shrinkage		<u>(23,687)</u>	
Salaries and Wages			640,000
Other Operating Expenses@ 1,200/inmate		108,000	
Programs (1,000/inmate)		0	
Health Care (1,600/inmate)		144,000	
Food Service (1,380/inmate)		<u>124,000</u>	
Other Costs			376,000
Total Salaries and Operating Costs			1,016,000

Logistics

If implemented, the tent camp presents a variety of logistical issues. The following is a listing of some of those issues and/or assumptions regarding them; the listing is not all inclusive:

Accreditation

It will have to be determined which standards are applicable and what level of compliance can be achieved due to the type of physical plant involved.

Participant Programming

It is assumed there will be no formal programs available. Cognitive skills will be taught by KDOC staff. Volunteers from community will be recruited for self-help programs (e.g., AA/NA for substance abuse).

11-6
11-5

April 8, 1997

Structured Leisure Activities

There will not be a separate recreation area; table games and television will be available in the mess tent.

Games will be limited to table top type only
Walking track around the camp compound
Equipment for calisthenics

Food

It is assumed food will be provided by the host facility kitchen and served through a field kitchen and dining tent.

Some storage capabilities and dish washing facilities will be required.

Medical

KDOC will be responsible. This will entail sick call being scheduled for the camp. Hospital or emergency care can be provided in the community, but it is probably more cost effective to treat and handle most cases in the host facility clinic. Part of the tent camp program will include a physical endurance component similar to a boot camp or have physical work requirements. This will be taken into account in the screening and selection criteria. Thus, offenders in the camp program would be screened for good health.

It is intended that camp population (campers) will be separated from institution inmates.

Transportation

Local sheriffs or court services staff will transport to the camp (this may be done in cooperation with KDOC transportation system as is current practice).

Legal Access

Participants will be referred to and provide information about Legal Services for Prisoners

Clothing

A decision will be made to use current KDOC dress or an alternative such as jumpsuits? Special seasonal needs must be considered.

At time of completion/departure the camper will wear what they wore to camp.

11-7
H-6

April 8, 1997

Laundry

Offender clothing will be laundered at the camp, linens will be laundered by the host facility.

Bedding

Consideration will be given to using sleeping bags in lieu of sheets and blankets. Weather conditions must be taken into account.

Telephones

Will be provided by the inmate telephone service provider in the structured leisure area.

Warehouse/Storage

A storage building will be provided for on-site storage for equipment, tools, and supplies.

Admission & Discharge

An area for A&D will be needed at the camp as; this function will not be provided by the host facility.

Data Management

The offender record will be part of Offender Management Information System (OMIS).

It is expected there will be a need for programming to incorporate and bring these records on line.

Personal computers with OMIS access capabilities are required (at least 3 PC systems) per 90 bed camp.

Subsistence Allowance

Will not be provided. It is anticipated there will be a weekly issue of toilet articles and some amenities, not to exceed the value of a typical inmate wage.