



## **Justice Reinvestment Initiative**

### **Budgetary Requirements on Location Detention Centers**

December 31, 2016

**Larry Hogan**  
Governor

**Boyd K. Rutherford**  
Lt. Governor

**V. Glenn Fueston, Jr.**  
Executive Director  
Governor's Office of Crime Control & Prevention

Submitted by: Governor's Office of Crime Control & Prevention

Contact: Jeffrey Zuback

410-697-9344

[jeffrey.zuback@maryland.gov](mailto:jeffrey.zuback@maryland.gov)

MSAR# 10915: Chapter 515 of 201, Section 17

## **INTRODUCTION**

Pursuant to Section 17 of the Justice Reinvestment Act (Chapter 515 of 2016), local correctional facilities shall, in coordination with the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene and local health departments, conduct an analysis to determine the budgetary requirements of this Act and shall report a plan for meeting the budgetary requirements to the General Assembly, in accordance with § 2-1246 of the State Government Article, on or before December 31, 2016. See Appendix A to this report for the statutory language. The Governor's Office of Crime Control & Prevention prepared this report.

The Governor's Office of Crime Control & Prevention conducted a meeting with the Maryland Correctional Administrators Association, the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, and the Maryland Association of Counties along with a local health officer to discuss the requirements of this report. The participants determined that the following policies/provisions of the Justice Reinvestment Act could have some impact on the local correctional population and budgets.

- Reduction in controlled dangerous substance possession sentences;
- Third and subsequent controlled dangerous substance felony offenders must serve 50% of sentence (not 25%) before parole eligibility;
- Elimination of jail time for driving with a suspended license for failing to pay a fine or failing to appear for trial;
- Revocation caps for technical violations of parole or probation;
- Increase in felony theft thresholds and a reduction in theft-related sentences;
- New administrative release provision after serving one-fourth of a sentence for drug and theft-related provisions;
- Mandatory withholding of 25% of inmate's earnings if there is a restitution order;
- Increase from 5 to 10 days good conduct credits for non-violent offenders at local correctional facilities;
- State reimbursement of \$45 for local jails providing pre-releases services for State Division of Correction inmates

The estimates that these policies/provisions would have on the correctional population were calculated based on decreases in sentences for crimes such as possession of controlled dangerous substances and theft that will possibly result in a shift of inmates from the Division of Correction to local correctional facilities. This would result in an increase in costs to the local correctional facilities. Concurrently, however, the decrease in maximum sentences for these crimes may also

result in a decrease in sentence lengths for inmates who currently are being sentenced to local correctional facilities. There is substantial judicial discretion regarding sentencing which makes it very difficult to determine the impact of the sentencing changes.

## **LOCAL CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES**

Each county in the State, with the exception of Baltimore City, operates a local correctional facility for inmates being held pretrial as well as inmates sentenced to imprisonment for one year or less (and inmates sentenced between one year up to 18 months if the sentencing judge orders the sentence to be served locally). In Baltimore City, the State Division of Pretrial Detention and Services houses all pretrial inmates and inmates sentenced to those shorter sentences. As of September 2016, there were a total of 9,523 inmates housed in local correctional facilities. Nearly 2/3 of these inmates (65.0%, n = 6,191) are pretrial inmates while just over 31% have been sentenced to serve local time (n = 2,985). Statewide, jails are at about 75% capacity.

## **METHODOLOGY**

The Governor's Office of Crime Control & Prevention ("Office") estimated how much each of these nine policies/provisions would impact the local detention centers. We based the impact on the potential increase or decrease to the population of local correctional facilities. The actual fiscal impact to each county depends on the county's per inmate cost, which varies from \$45 to \$153 per day. The Office (through the Maryland Correctional Administrators Association) sent a survey to each local correctional facility requesting responses to a series of questions seeking data related to each of the nine policies discussed below. See Appendix B to this report to view the survey. A total of eight facilities responded to the survey. The Office also requested data/information from agencies that could potentially be affected by each policy/provision. A detailed explanation of the methodology can be found in the Appendix C.

## **RESULTS**

### ***Reduction in controlled dangerous substance possession sentences***

#### **Impact on local jail population – SLIGHT DECREASE OR SLIGHT INCREASE**

The Justice Reinvestment Act reduced maximum sentences for possession of controlled dangerous substances. The current maximum sentence is four years, and this could be doubled (i.e., not more than eight years) for subsequent offenses if the State's Attorney elected to seek the additional time. On and after October 1, 2017, under the Justice Reinvestment Act first offenders can receive a maximum of one year, second and third offenders could receive up to 18 months, and fourth and subsequent offenders are subject to not more than two years' imprisonment.

Based on data from eight local detention centers, offenders sentenced for various controlled dangerous substance possession offenses make up 4% of the total jail population and just fewer than 12% of the sentenced population. Using the data from those eight facilities, projections were made at the statewide level (2,985 sentenced inmates x 12%). About 350 inmates at any given time are incarcerated for a controlled dangerous substance possession offense within Maryland's local correctional facilities.

Based on state corrections data, a total of 2,066 offenders in 2015 were sentenced to at least one day of jail/prison time for a controlled dangerous substance possession offense. Of the 2,066 offenders, 1,722 offenders (83%) were sentenced to a local correctional facility with an average sentence length of 136 days and a median sentence of 45 days. The unknown element to this provision is how many of the remaining 16% (338 inmates per year) <sup>1</sup> sentenced to State corrections could now be sentenced at the local level assuming there is a reduction in sentence length. While under the Justice Reinvestment Act, because the maximum sentence is one year, all first-time possession offenders can only be sentenced to serve local time. Based on this, it seems doubtful that currently many first offenders are sentenced to the Division of Correction. Under the Justice Reinvestment Act any subsequent offender could potentially receive a long enough sentence that would require service in the Division of Correction. If, however, the Justice Reinvestment Act results in judges reducing sentence lengths so that fewer individuals are sentenced to the Division of Correction this could potentially increase the local correctional facility populations. It may also be, however, that all sentences will be reduced, so these numbers could very well cancel each other out.

***Third and subsequent controlled dangerous substance felony offenders must serve 50% of sentence (not 25%) before parole eligibility***

Impact on local jail population – NO IMPACT

No data could be provided by either the Maryland State Commission on Criminal Sentencing Policy or the Department of Public Safety & Correctional Services regarding the number of sentenced offenders who have three or more prior controlled dangerous substance felonies in their criminal history. Although no data could be provided, it seems likely that the vast majority of individuals convicted of third or subsequent controlled dangerous substance felonies will be sentenced to the jurisdiction of the Division of Correction.

Under the Justice Reinvestment Act, the mandatory minimum sentences for many felony offenses involving controlled dangerous substances will be repealed. Nonetheless, a person who has been convicted of a third felony offense involving the more serious drugs (e.g., narcotics, LSD, PCP) will be subject to a maximum sentence of from 20 to 40 years depending on certain factors. While there will now be complete judicial discretion in deciding the length of a sentence, it seems likely that unless there are compelling mitigating circumstances, a person who

---

<sup>1</sup> location of sentence data was missing in 6 cases.

has at least two prior felony convictions will receive a sentence that will be served in the Division of Correction. The Justice Reinvestment Oversight Board and the Local Government Justice Reinvestment Commission should monitor the data on this matter.

***Elimination of jail time for driving with a suspended license for failing to pay a fine or failing to appear for trial***

The Office requested data from the Maryland District Court regarding all persons incarcerated for driving with a suspended license for failing to pay a fine or failing to appear for trial as well as the sentence length for each conviction.

Impact on local jail population – DECREASE

Data obtained from the Maryland District Court shows a total of 496 people sentenced to incarceration in 2015 for driving with a suspended license for failing to pay a fine or failing to appear at trial. The average sentence was 15 days with a median of 6 days. Under the Justice Reinvestment Act, none of these 496 individuals would serve any jail time for these offenses.

***Revocation caps for technical violations of parole or probation***

Impact on local jail population – DECREASE

Based on data from eight local detention centers, offenders sentenced for violation of probation offenses make up 8% of the total jail population and 25% of the sentenced population. Using the data from those eight facilities, projections were made at the statewide level (2,985 sentenced inmates x 25%). About 740-780 inmates at any given time are incarcerated for a violation of probation within Maryland's jails. It is unknown whether these offenders were sentenced to a violation of probation because of a new offense or a technical violation. The average sentence length for these violations of probation was 392 days. The technical revocation caps imposed under the Justice Reinvestment Act are 15 days for a first offense, 30 days for a second violation, and 45 days for a third violation. There is no cap for a fourth or subsequent violation or a violation not defined as a technical violation. The average sentence should be reduced for these technical violations moving forward. However, these revocation caps are based on judicial discretion and can be overridden if the judge determines the offender is a public safety risk.

***Increase in felony theft thresholds and a reduction in theft sentences***

Impact on local jail population – MINOR INDETERMINATE IMPACT

The Justice Reinvestment Act reduced penalties for theft offenses and also raised the thresholds for increased penalties.

| <b>Table 3</b>       |                       |   |   |
|----------------------|-----------------------|---|---|
| <b>Current Law</b>   |                       | <b>Justice Reinvestment Act (October 1, 2017)</b> |   |
| <i>Threshold</i>     | <i>Offense</i>        | <i>Threshold</i>                                  | <i>Offense</i>  |
| Under \$100          | Misdemeanor 90 Days   | Under \$100                                       | Misdemeanor 90 Days                                   |
| Under \$1,000        | Misdemeanor 18 Months | \$100 - \$1,000                                   | Misdemeanor 6 Months - First<br>One Year - Subsequent |
| \$1,000 - \$10,000   | Felony 10 Years       | \$1,500 - \$25,000                                | Felony 5 Years  |
| \$10,000 - \$100,000 | Felony 15 Years       | \$25,000 - \$100,000                              | Felony 10 Years                                       |
| Over \$100,000       | Felony 25 Years       | Over \$100,000                                    | Felony 20 Years                                       |

Similar changes were made to fraud and fraud-related offenses (e.g. credit card crimes, bad check crimes).

Based on data from eight local detention centers, offenders sentenced for various theft offenses make up 8% of the total jail population and 25% of the sentenced population. Using the data from those eight facilities, projections were made at the statewide level (2,985 sentenced inmates x 25%). About 750-800 inmates at any given time are incarcerated for a theft offense within Maryland's jails.

Based on state corrections data, a total of 2,862 offenders in 2015 were sentenced to at least one day of jail/prison time for a theft offense. Of the 2,862 offenders, 2,499 offenders (87%) were sentenced to a local correctional facility with an average sentence length of 134 days and a median sentence of 56 days. Similar to the reduction in controlled dangerous substance possession offenses, it is possible that a certain number of the remaining 12% (340 inmates per year)<sup>2</sup> sentenced to State corrections could now be sentenced at the local level assuming there is a reduction in sentence. It may also be, however, that due to the decrease in the maximum sentences that the actual sentences will also decrease for those who will be serving a sentence in a local correctional facility. This would result in decreased costs for local correctional facilities. How the judges will exercise their discretion and the actual impact is unknown.

***New administrative release provision after serving one-fourth of a sentence for drug and theft-related provisions***

Impact on local jail population – DECREASE

Data from the Pew Charitable Trusts showed that many drug offenders in Maryland are serving beyond 25% of their sentence before they have a parole hearing. Being able to release drug and theft offenders at 25% of their sentence would decrease the length of stay of these inmates which would also drive down the population over time. It is unknown how much this provision will decrease local jail populations. While offenders convicted of drug or theft-related provisions comprise 12% of the jail population and 37% of the sentenced population, this provision is

<sup>2</sup> location of sentence data was missing in 23 cases.

predicated on each offender's prior criminal history. Offenders who were previously convicted of violent offenses, sex offenses, or two or more felony drug convictions are not eligible for administrative release.

***Mandatory withholding of 25% of inmate's earnings if there is a restitution order***

Impact on local jail population – INDETERMINATE IMPACT

Only two of the eight jails that responded to the survey currently collect restitution. This provision will now ensure that the inmate is paying restitution back to the victim. It is unknown if additional correctional staff would be needed to collect restitution in each county. This provision would be required for the 400-450 inmates on work release throughout the state as well as those inmates working (with wages) in any capacity at a local facility. It is possible that local correctional facilities will be able to perform this duty with existing staff and resources. Based on the lack of data, however, we cannot estimate the impact of this provision.

***Increase from five to 10 days good conduct credits for non-violent offenders at local correctional facilities***

Impact on local jail population – DECREASE

Based on data from eight local detention centers, offenders sentenced for nonviolent offenses make up 27% of the total jail population and 88% of the sentenced population. Using the data from those eight facilities, projections were made at the statewide level (2,985 sentenced inmates x 88%). About 2,600 inmates at any given time are incarcerated for nonviolent offenses within Maryland's jails. Doubling the amount of good conduct credits earned each month would decrease the length of stay by 60 days on a 12 month sentence. A shortened length of stay would gradually reduce the stock jail population.

***State reimbursement of \$45 for local jails providing pre-releases services for state Department of Corrections inmates***

Impact on local jail population – NO IMPACT

Currently only four counties have an agreement in place with the Department of Public Safety & Correctional Services to provide pre-release services and only Montgomery County currently is housing inmates that were under previous state custody (five total in FY 2016, and seven current inmates). None of the eight jails surveyed expressed an interest in implementing this program even with the \$45 reimbursement. Unless more jails participate in this program, the impact on the local jail population will be minimal.

## CONCLUSION

The report represents a very preliminary estimate on how various provisions of the Justice Reinvestment Act would impact local correctional facilities based on estimated fluctuations in inmate populations. It may be that many offenders will have shorter lengths of stay in jail while some new offenders who were previously sentenced to the State Division of Correction may now be sentenced locally. It seems clear that the technical revocation caps, the increase in good conduct credits, and elimination of jail time for some driving while suspended crimes will reduce the population of local correctional facilities. Similarly, administrative release should result in a decrease in the local population. Whether and to what extent the sentencing changes to possession of controlled dangerous substances and theft-related offenses will impact local correctional facilities is as yet undetermined, especially in light of predicting judicial discretion in sentencing. Other changes to parole eligibility for third and subsequent felony drug offenders, withholding for restitution, and reimbursements for State pre-release inmates appear at this time to have no fiscal impact on local correctional facilities. While the nine policies/provisions in this report were estimated to have some impact on local jail populations, it is too early to make any accurate projections on population changes or budgets associated with population changes for each local detention center. Furthermore the actual per diem cost for housing an inmate varies from county to county ranging from \$45 a day to \$153 per day. Thus, the impact on the jail population will vary from county to county.

Moving forward, it is the responsibility of each local warden and the warden's staff to monitor stringently their facility jail population, and send population data as required to the Governor's Office of Crime Control & Prevention as well as the Justice Reinvestment Oversight Board, and document any expected or unexpected shifts in population. We would expect and recommend that the Local Government Justice Reinvestment Commission closely monitor the data from the local correctional facilities to determine the impact of the Justice Reinvestment Act on local correctional facilities and make appropriate recommendations for changes if warranted.

**Appendix A - Section 17 of the Justice Reinvestment Act (Chapter 515 of 2016)**

SECTION 17. AND BE IT FURTHER ENACTED, That local correctional facilities shall, in coordination with the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene and local health departments, conduct an analysis to determine the budgetary requirements of this Act and shall report a plan for meeting the budgetary requirements to the General Assembly, in accordance with § 2-1246 of the State Government Article, on or before December 31, 2016.

## Appendix B - Survey of Local Correctional Facilities

### 1. Provision: Reduction in CDS Possession Offenses

We would request a local extract from all jails on the number of inmates currently sentenced for all CDS possession offenses included in the chart below. \_\_\_\_\_

Average length of stay would also be helpful if it is available. \_\_\_\_\_

| Criminal Code           | Literal                                   | CJIS Code |
|-------------------------|---|-----------|
| CR 5-601                | CDS: ADMINISTER - NOT MARIJUANA           | 1-0247    |
| CR 5-601                | CDS: ADMINISTER - MARIJUANA               | 1-0567    |
| CR 5-601(a)(1)          | CDS: POSSESSION - MARIJUANA 10 GRAMS      | 1-0573    |
| CR 5-601(a)(1)          | CDS: POSSESSION - NOT MARIJUANA           | 4_3550    |
| CR 5-601(a)(2)          | CDS: OBTAIN BY FRAUD                      | 1-0248    |
| CR 5-601(a)(2)          | OBTAIN MARIJUANA BY FRAUD                 | 1-0568    |
| CR 5-601(a)(2)(ii)      | CDS OBTAIN BY ALTERING PRESCRIPTION       | 1-0249    |
| CR 5-601(a)(2)(ii)      | MARIJUANA OBTAIN BY ALTERING PRESCRIPTION | 1-0570    |
| CR 5-601(a)(2)(iii)(iv) | CDS OBTAIN BY CONCEALED FALSE ID          | 1-0250    |
| CR 5-601(a)(2)(iii)(iv) | OBTAIN MARIJUANA BY CONCEALED FALSE ID    | 1-0571    |
| CR 5-601(a)(2)(v)       | CDS: OBTAIN BY PERSONATION                | 1-0251    |
| CR 5-601(a)(2)(v)       | MARIJUANA OBTAIN BY PERSONATION           | 1-0569    |
| CR 5-601(a)(2)(vi)      | CDS OBTAIN BY MAKING FORGED PRESCRIPTION  | 1-0252    |

### 2. Provision: Increase in theft thresholds and reduction in sentences

We would request a local extract from all jails on the number of inmates currently sentenced for theft related offenses (mainly these included in the chart below). \_\_\_\_\_

Average length of stay would also be helpful if it is available. \_\_\_\_\_

| Criminal Code | Literal                                   | CJIS Code |
|---------------|---|-----------|
| CR 7-104      | THEFT: \$100,000 PLUS                     | 1-0624    |
| CR 7-104      | THEFT: \$10,000 TO UNDER \$100,000        | 1-0623    |
| CR 7-104      | THEFT: \$1,000 TO UNDER \$10,000          | 1-0622    |
| CR 7-104      | THEFT: LESS \$1,000 VALUE                 | 1-0621    |
| CR 7-104(3)   | THEFT LESS THAN \$100.00                  | 1-0521    |
| CR 7-104      | THEFT-SCHEME: LESS \$1,000                | 1-0631    |
| CR 7-104      | THEFT-SCHEME: \$1,000 TO UNDER \$10,000   | 1-0632    |
| CR 7-104      | THEFT-SCHEME: \$10,000 TO UNDER \$100,000 | 1-0633    |
| CR 7-104      | THEFT-SCHEME: \$100,000 PLUS              | 1-0634    |

**3. Provision: Revocation caps for technical violations of parole or probation**

We would request a local extract from all jails on the number of inmates currently sentenced for a violation of parole or probation). \_\_\_\_\_

Average length of stay would also be helpful if it is available. \_\_\_\_\_

**4. Provision: Mandatory withholding of 25% of an inmate's earnings if there is a restitution order.**

Does your agency currently collect and disburse restitution? Y N

How many current inmates do you have on work release? \_\_\_\_\_

Do you anticipate the collection of restitution to reduce the number of inmates in your work release program? Y N

If yes, by what percentage? \_\_\_\_\_

**5. Provision: Increase from 5 to 10 days good conduct credits for nonviolent offenders at local correctional facilities**

We would request an extract on the number of inmates currently in each jail convicted of a non-violent offense. \_\_\_\_\_

The average length of stay if available. \_\_\_\_\_

**6. Provision: State reimbursement of \$45 for local jails providing prerelease services for DOC inmates**

Are you currently using this program with the State, to hold inmates for re-entry, who have been serving the bulk of their sentence in one of our State prisons? Y N

Average number you hold per month? \_\_\_\_\_

Do you intend on implementing this program with the State? Y N

## Appendix C - Methodology

### *Reduction in controlled dangerous substance possession sentences*

The Office requested data from all local detention centers on the number of inmates sentenced in their facilities for the 13 controlled dangerous substance possession offenses as broken down in the Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS) found in Table 1 below. The average sentence length for these offenses was also tracked. Data was requested from the Department of Public Safety & Correctional Services Information Technology & Communications Division regarding the number of convictions for these 13 offenses during the 2015 calendar year including whether the offender was sentenced to a local or State facility.

| <b>Table 1. Controlled Dangerous Substance Possession Offenses</b> |   |                  |
|--|---|------------------|
| <b>Criminal Code</b>   | <b>Literal</b>                            | <b>CJIS Code</b> |
| CR 5-601   | CDS: ADMINISTER - NOT MARIJUANA           | 1-0247           |
| CR 5-601   | CDS: ADMINISTER - MARIJUANA               | 1-0567           |
| CR 5-601(a)(1)   | CDS: POSSESSION – MARIJUANA 10 GRAMS      | 1-0573           |
| CR 5-601(a)(1)   | CDS: POSSESSION - NOT MARIJUANA           | 4_3550           |
| CR 5-601(a)(2)   | CDS: OBTAIN BY FRAUD                      | 1-0248           |
| CR 5-601(a)(2)   | OBTAIN MARIJUANA BY FRAUD                 | 1-0568           |
| CR 5-601(a)(2)(ii)   | CDS OBTAIN BY ALTERING PRESCRIPTION       | 1-0249           |
| CR 5-601(a)(2)(ii)   | MARIJUANA OBTAIN BY ALTERING PRESCRIPTION | 1-0570           |
| CR 5-601(a)(2)(iii)(iv)  | CDS OBTAIN BY CONCEALED FALSE ID          | 1-0250           |
| CR 5-601(a)(2)(iii)(iv)  | OBTAIN MARIJUANA BY CONCEALED FALSE ID    | 1-0571           |
| CR 5-601(a)(2)(v)  | CDS: OBTAIN BY PERSONATION                | 1-0251           |
| CR 5-601(a)(2)(v)  | MARIJUANA OBTAIN BY PERSONATION           | 1-0569           |
| CR 5-601(a)(2)(vi)   | CDS OBTAIN BY MAKING FORGED PRESCRIPTION  | 1-0252           |

### *Third and subsequent controlled dangerous substance felony offenders must serve 50% of sentence (not 25%) before parole eligibility*

The Office contacted both the Maryland State Commission on Criminal Sentencing Policy and the Department of Public Safety & Correctional Services to obtain data on the number of sentenced offenders who have three or more prior controlled dangerous substance felonies in their criminal history.

### *Elimination of jail time for driving with a suspended license for failing to pay a fine or failure to appear for trial*

The Office requested data from the Maryland District Court regarding all persons in 2015 who were incarcerated for driving with a suspended license for failing to pay a fine or failure to

appear for trial (Transportation Article, § 16-303(h) and (i)) as well as the sentence length for each conviction.

***Revocation caps for technical violations of parole or probation***

The Office requested data from all local correctional facilities on the number of inmates sentenced in their facilities for a violation of parole or probation as well as the average sentence length for each conviction.

***Increase in felony theft thresholds and a reduction in theft sentences***

The Office requested data from all local correctional facilities on the number of inmates sentenced in their facilities for the nine theft offenses found in CJIS as shown in Table 2 below. The average sentence length for these offenses was also tracked. The Office requested data from the Department of Public Safety & Correctional Services Information Technology & Communications Division regarding the number of convictions for these nine crimes during the 2015 calendar year including whether the offender was sentenced to a local or State facility.

| <b>Table 2. Theft Offenses</b> |   |                  |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------|
| <b>Criminal Code</b>           | <b>Literal</b>                            | <b>CJIS Code</b> |
| CR 7-104                       | THEFT: \$100,000 PLUS                     | 1-0624           |
| CR 7-104                       | THEFT: \$10,000 TO UNDER \$100,000        | 1-0623           |
| CR 7-104                       | THEFT: \$1,000 TO UNDER \$10,000          | 1-0622           |
| CR 7-104                       | THEFT: LESS \$1,000 VALUE                 | 1-0621           |
| CR 7-104(3)                    | THEFT LESS THAN \$100.00                  | 1-0521           |
| CR 7-104                       | THEFT-SCHEME: LESS \$1,000                | 1-0631           |
| CR 7-104                       | THEFT-SCHEME: \$1,000 TO UNDER \$10,000   | 1-0632           |
| CR 7-104                       | THEFT-SCHEME: \$10,000 TO UNDER \$100,000 | 1-0633           |
| CR 7-104                       | THEFT-SCHEME: \$100,000 PLUS              | 1-0634           |

***New administrative release provision after serving one-fourth of a sentence for drug and theft-related provisions***

The Office requested a statement from the Maryland Correctional Administrators Association regarding the impact of the new administrative release provision on local correctional facilities. This provision will allow inmates convicted of certain controlled dangerous substance offenses or misdemeanor theft and fraud-related offenses to be released without a hearing by the Parole Commission if they complete satisfactorily the programming requirements imposed by the Parole Commission.

***Mandatory withholding of 25% of inmate's earnings if there is a restitution order***

The Office requested information from the local correctional facilities to determine whether or not they currently collect and disburse restitution. Data on the number of inmates on work release was also tracked.

***Increase from five to day days good conduct credits for non-violent offenders at local correctional facilities***

The Office requested data from all local correctional facilities on the number of inmates sentenced in their facilities for any non-violent offenses. The average sentence length for these offenses was also tracked.

***State reimbursement of \$45 for local jails providing pre-releases services for state Department of Corrections inmates***

The Office requested data from the Department of Public Safety & Correctional Services regarding the number of inmates transferred from a the Division of Correction to a local correctional facility for pre-release services. The Office also surveyed local correctional facilities on whether or not they currently participate in this program and if they have any futures plans to do so.