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Overview

• Introduction and Closing
  – Michael Thompson, Council of State Governments

• Opportunity to Reduce Crime and Prison Costs
  – Dr. Tony Fabelo, *The JFA Institute*, Austin, Texas
What is the Council of State Governments (CSG)?

• Non-profit, non-partisan membership association of state government officials

• Funded largely through state dues

• Represents all three branches of state government: legislature, judiciary, and executive branch
Prisoner Re-Entry a National Issue

President George W. Bush
State of Union Address, January 20, 2004

“America is the land of the second chance, and when the gates of the prison open, the path ahead should lead to a better life.”

Bipartisan support for the Second Chance Act of 2004

*Senate version introduced September 10, 2004* by Senator Brownback (R-KS) and Rick Santorum (R-PA)
Strengthening prisoner re-entry policies to reduce recidivism, increase public safety and cut prison costs
Re-Entry Policy Council Recommendations

• Provide Training, Education, and Jobs
  – Project RIO (TX)
    employment up 50%     recidivism down 40%

• Ensure Support for Victims
Re-Entry Policy Council Recommendations

• Offer Safe Places to Live
  – St. Leonard’s Ministries, IL
    Recidivism – under 20%

• Break the Bonds of Addiction
  – KEY-Crest Program, DE
Re-Entry Policy Council Recommendations

• Treat Physical and Mental Illness
  – Project Bridge, RI
    recidivism – 3% of participants re-sentenced
    program: $8,400/18 months
    incarceration: $40,000/ year

- Foster Meaningful Relationships
Re-Entry Policy Council Recommendations

• Make Smart Release and Community Supervision Decisions

  – Results Driven Supervision, GA
  parole completions up 11%
CSG Technical Assistance to Kansas 3R Committee

• Identify opportunities to generate savings

• Analyze neighborhoods that receive high concentrations of people released from prison

• Provide options to reinvest in safer communities
Dr. Tony Fabelo
Opportunity to Reduce Crime and Prison Costs

• Kansas Justice Framework Strong
  – Tough and smart policies in place

• Framework Under Pressure
  – Prison capacity shortfall projected

• Opportunity Available to Strengthen Framework
Kansas Justice Framework
Tough and Smart

Sentencing Guidelines Structure

Mandatory Treatment (SB 123)
Framework Under Pressure of Increasing Prison Population

Actual and Projected Prison Population
Revocations Consuming a Large Chunk of Prison Capacity

8,991 prisoners, December 31, 2004

2,551
28.4%

Violators of Parole and Probation Conditions – No New Conviction

Offenders don’t stay long in prison – recycle quickly
Not enough time to do much with them in terms of rehabilitation
Short prison term not an effective punishment for conditions violators
Revocations Represent a Large Percentage of Prison Admissions

Admissions 8,598

July 1, 2003 to Dec. 30, 2004
Admissions for 18 Month Period

New Commitments 2,144 (25%)
Probation Revocations 2,763 (32%)
Parole Revocations 3,603 (42%)
Other Admissions 88 (1%)

Conditions Violations

2,538 (91.9%)

3,335 (92.6%)

68% of all admissions

Conditions Violations 5,873
Kansas is Using Prisons as Intermediate Sanction Facilities for Parolees

July 1, 2003 to Dec. 30, 2004

Parole Revocations
3,603 (42% of Admissions)

Conditions Violations
3,335 (92.6% of Parole Revocations)

- Close to 88% of the parolees with conditions violations served 6 months or less
- 26% were admitted more than once during the 18 month period studied
- 49% were on parole for a non-person felony
Same Use of Prisons as Intermediate Sanction Facilities for Conditions Violations of Probation

July 1, 2003 to Dec. 30, 2004

Probation Revocations
2,763 (32% of Admissions)

Conditions Violations
2,538 (91.9% of Probation Revocations)

- 57% served 6 months or less
- 76% were revoked on first hearing, most for one reason
- 62% were on probation for a non-person felony
Kansas Can Better Utilize Prison Space While Making Revocation Policies More Effective

In Lieu of Prison Diverted to Community Intermediate Punishment Rehabilitation Initiative (CIPRI)

Condition Violators
Low Risk/High Need Offenders

Elements
Community Level
Risk/Needs Assessments
Secure and/or Other Housing
Intense “Wrap Around” Services
Collaboration/Coordination
Accountability/Performance Measures

Average 6 months participation with goal of reducing recidivism by 25%
Reduction in Recidivism and Prison Costs Possible

100
Condition Violators
Low Risk/High Need Offenders
(43 Probationers/57 Parolees)

$561,790 in Cost Avoidance for Every 100 Offenders Diverted to CIPRI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prison</th>
<th>CIPRI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prison LOS Cost</strong></td>
<td>LOS Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,208,257</td>
<td>$1,080,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recidivism LOS Cost</strong></td>
<td>Recidivism LOS Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,734,131</td>
<td>$1,300,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,942,388</td>
<td>$2,380,598</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Eric Cadora
Looking at Wichita for Justice Reinvestment

• Two Counties Account for Almost Half of Prison Admissions
  – Wichita analyzed more closely here

• Criminal justice populations are highly concentrated in specific neighborhoods
  – Associated resources are not well targeted to these places
Prison Admissions
Prison Admissions by County
New Commitments and Revocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>New Commitment</th>
<th>Probation Revocation</th>
<th>Parole Revocation</th>
<th>ADM Per 1000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District 1</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 2</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Produced by The Justice Mapping Center with The JFA Institute and the Spatial Information Design Lab, GSAPP, Columbia University.
Average Length of Stay—in months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Sentence</th>
<th>New Commitments</th>
<th>Parole Revocations</th>
<th>Probation Revocations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of District Admissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRICT 1 (441)</th>
<th>DISTRICT 2 (157)</th>
<th>DISTRICT 3 (252)</th>
<th>DISTRICT 4 (172)</th>
<th>DISTRICT 5 (42)</th>
<th>DISTRICT 6 (248)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Produced by The Justice Mapping Center with The JFA Institute and the Spatial Information Design Lab, GSAPP, Columbia University.
Prison Expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Total Expenditure</th>
<th>New Commitment</th>
<th>Probation Revocation</th>
<th>Parole Revocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District 1</td>
<td>$11,389,702</td>
<td>$5.8 Million</td>
<td>$2.5</td>
<td>$3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 2</td>
<td>$2,026,126</td>
<td>$0.9</td>
<td>$0.7</td>
<td>$0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>$4,933,039</td>
<td>$2.3</td>
<td>$1.0</td>
<td>$1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 4</td>
<td>$4,157,792</td>
<td>$1.9</td>
<td>$0.9</td>
<td>$1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 5</td>
<td>$1,379,792</td>
<td>$0.7</td>
<td>$0.09</td>
<td>$0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 6</td>
<td>$5,038,944</td>
<td>$1.8</td>
<td>$1.2</td>
<td>$1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Crime in Wichita
Crime by Type

PROPERTY CRIME

DISTRICT 1 (86.7)
DISTRICT 2 (56.1)
DISTRICT 3 (72.4)
DISTRICT 4 (70.3)
DISTRICT 5 (40.6)
DISTRICT 6 (63.3)

VIOLENT CRIME

75.8 11.0
52.7 3.4
64.8 7.5
65.2 5.1
39.0 1.6
56.4 6.9

Produced by The Justice Mapping Center with The JFA Institute and the Spatial Information Design Lab, GSAPP, Columbia University
Parole & Probation in Wichita
Parole Supervision Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>Parolees per 1000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District 1 (345)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 2 (156)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 3 (229)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 4 (179)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 5 (36)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 6 (271)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Produced by The Justice Mapping Center with The JFA Institute and the Spatial Information Design Lab, GSAPP, Columbia University.
Average Parole Caseload Distribution

- PAROLEES ON ONE OFFICER’S CASELOAD (41 total)
  - High: 4
  - Moderate: 19
  - Low: 13
  - Other: 5

- Parolees per 1000
### Number of Caseloads per District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Districts</th>
<th>Number of Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Parolees in Wichita: 1189
Average Case Load Size: 41

- **District 1**: 9 caseloads (367 parolees)
- **District 2**: 4 caseloads (156 parolees)
- **District 3**: 5 caseloads (229 parolees)
- **District 4**: 4 caseloads (183 parolees)
- **District 5**: 1 caseload (0 parolees)
- **District 6**: 5 caseloads (218 parolees)
Number of Caseloads per District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF DISTRICTS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF OFFICERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Probationers, Wichita: 1234
Average Case Load Size: 59

- DISTRICT 1 (6 caseloads)
  - Total: 345
- DISTRICT 2 (2 caseloads)
  - Total: 119
- DISTRICT 3 (4 caseloads)
  - Total: 254
- DISTRICT 4 (4 caseloads)
  - Total: 221
- DISTRICT 5 (1 caseload)
  - Total: 92
- DISTRICT 6 (3 caseloads)
  - Total: 203
Other Government Services
Prison Admissions & Unemployment Insurance Claimants
Expressed as Standard Deviations from the Mean Value

Prison Admissions per 1000 SD

UI Claimants per 1000 SD

Produced by The Justice Mapping Center with The JFA Institute and the Spatial Information Design Lab, GSAPP, Columbia University.
Prison Admissions & Food Stamp Recipients
Expressed as Standard Deviations from the Mean Value

Prison Admissions per 1000 SD

Food Stamp Recipients per 1000 SD
Prison Admissions & TAF Recipients
Expressed as Standard Deviations from the Mean Value

Prison Admissions per 1000 SD
TAF Recipients per 1000 SD

Produced by The Justice Mapping Center with The JFA Institute and the Spatial Information Design Lab, GSAPP, Columbia University
Government Service Expenditures

| DISTRICT 1 | FOODSTAMPS HOUSEHOLDS | 4,710 |
| DISTRICT 2 | 1,209 |
| DISTRICT 3 | 2,899 |
| DISTRICT 4 | 4,041 |
| DISTRICT 5 | 2,756 |
| DISTRICT 6 | 2,209 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOODSTAMPS EXPENDITURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Produced by The Justice Mapping Center with The JFA Institute and the Spatial Information Design Lab, GSAPP, Columbia University.
Government Service Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>TAF HOUSEHOLDS</th>
<th>TAF EXPENDITURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>$428,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td>$123,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,459</td>
<td>$412,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>$305,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>$183,686</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Produced by The Justice Mapping Center with The JFA Institute and the Spatial Information Design Lab, GSAPP, Columbia University.
District 1

Populations & Resources
District 1
Populations & Resources
City Council District 1
District 1
Overlapping Population & Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVERLAPPING POPULATIONS</th>
<th>RESOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prison Admissions</td>
<td>Prison Beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parolees</td>
<td>Prison Expenditures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probationers</td>
<td>Parole Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Stamps Households</td>
<td>Probation Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Insurance Recipients</td>
<td>Food Stamps Expenditures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAF Households</td>
<td>Unemployment Insurance Expenditures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TAF Expenditures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Sources

Kansas Department of Corrections

Kansas Office of Judicial Administration
Probation Population Snapshot on 12/30/2004

Kansas Department of Labor
Unemployment Insurance Recipients in December, 2004

Kansas Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services
Temporary Assistance to Families Recipients in December, 2004,
Food Stamps Recipients in December, 2004, and
Medical Benefit Recipients in December 2004

Wichita Police Department
Part I Crimes in 2004
Review of Findings

• Dr. Fabelo
  – Kansas’ justice framework is strong, but it is under pressure
  – *Opportunity* to create interventions to cut revocations

• Eric Cadora
  – Criminal justice populations are highly concentrated in specific neighborhoods
Next Steps to Consider

• Target probation and parole conditions violators for diversion from prison
  – 1,000 probation and parole conditions violators admitted annually from Wichita
  – Focus on 300 low risk offenders whose parole / probation is revoked each year
Thank You