

Parole Board Survey 2001

The Association of Paroling Authorities, International has conducted a survey of paroling authorities for the last five years. This survey asks for current data as of 12/31/01 and for calendar year 2001. This report includes some information from past reports. Where this occurs it will be indicated. The 2001 survey has respondents from 52 paroling authorities including: 45 states (Mississippi, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Vermont and Virginia did not respond in time to be included) U. S. Parole Commission, U. S. Army, U. S. Air Force, National Parole Board of Canada, Canadian Provincial Boards from Ontario and Quebec and the Parole Board of Puerto Rico.

Does The Parole Board Have Discretion In Parole Release?

Since our first report in 1997 only a few boards have had any changes in their discretionary authority. Therefore, most of this material is a repeat of the 1997 report. The changes that have occurred since 1997 or have not been in earlier surveys have been underlined. We have indicated by yes, meaning full discretion with some statutory limits, Yes limited, meaning discretion except in dealing with certain type offenders, yes very limited, meaning they still have discretion in number of old code cases, but little if any discretion with individuals who committed a crime after a set date and no meaning the degree of discretionary authority a board still has is over other areas of parole, condition setting, revocations, etc. and a limited number of cases to consider for parole or parole have been totally abolished.

ALABAMA - YES - Comment: The Board cannot parole on life w/o parole or some other sentences that have to serve a mandatory term before they can be granted parole.

ALASKA – YES

ARIZONA - YES, VERY LIMITED - Comment: Only has discretion for those who committed an offense prior to January 1, 1994.

ARKANSAS - YES, VERY LIMITED - Comment: Only discretion for cases whose crimes were committed prior to 1994.

CALIFORNIA - NO - Comment: Only had 10 paroled in 1997, 12 in 2000 and in 2001, 13.

COLORADO - YES - Comment: Five year max. parole periods. We now have lifetime supervision for sex offenders. Mandatory parole applies to all inmates subsequent to 1993.

CONNECTICUT - YES - Comment: Inmates with sentences exceeding two years who have been convicted of non-capitol felonies.

DELAWARE -YES, VERY LIMITED - Comment: Parole has been abolished for all those convicted individuals who committed their crime after 6/30/90. There are still 400 persons in the system eligible for parole. The Board recommends modification of sentences to sentencing

courts upon DOC application. The Board has authority over parole and mandatory release violators.

FLORIDA - NO - STILL SOME AUTHORITY - Comment: Abolished parole in 1983 with the implementation of sentencing guidelines. The Board did retain paroling authority over pre 1983 inmates. The Board still does medical paroles, sets terms and conditions of supervision for statutorily mandated released inmates. There were 5961 parole eligible inmates in the system in 1997. Effective 10/1/97 the Board may order five year re-interviews for certain categories of inmates as opposed to a two-year interview previously required.

GEORGIA - YES, WITH LIMITS - Comment: Offenders convicted of certain violent offenses for the first time are not eligible for parole unless they are sentenced for life. A second conviction for any of these crimes requires a mandatory sentence of life without parole. Also, felony offenders convicted of any fourth felony are not eligible for parole.

HAWAII - YES - Comment: Court does impose mandatory minimum.

IDAHO - YES

ILLINOIS - NO, WITH SOME AUTHORITY - Comment: All individuals who committed a crime after 2/1/78 are on determinate sentences. About 480 inmates in a prison population in 1997 of 40,000 remained eligible for parole. The Board is the paroling authority for juvenile offenders in the system. For those inmates serving determinate sentences the Board sets conditions of release, determines when violators are to be returned to prison, screens and makes recommendations for clemency petitions to the Governor.

INDIANA - NO - Comment: Parole was abolished in 1977. Board may grant parole to offenders for crimes committed prior to 10/1/77.

IOWA - YES - Comment: Life means natural life.

KANSAS - YES, VERY LIMITED - Comment: Individuals whose crimes were committed after 7/1/93 receive a determinate sentence.

KENTUCKY - YES - Comment: Certain violent offenders must serve a minimum time before eligible for parole. Deleted all form of early parole consideration except for medical paroles. Final discharges from parole are no longer issued prior to reaching a maximum expiration date of a sentence. Parole consideration for defined violent offenders was increased from 50% to 85%. Life without parole for capital offenses. Sex offenders cannot be paroled until they have completed treatment. Persons who commit a certain specified offense who was armed or wore body armor cannot be paroled.

LOUISIANA - YES - Comment: All crimes against a person cannot be paroled.

MAINE - NO - Comment: They abolished parole in 1976 and only a few cases that still can be considered for parole. They paroled only one in 2001.

MASSACHUSETTS - YES - Comment: The Board has parole authority over all cases except a few sex offenders who under an old law are not eligible.

MARYLAND - YES - Comment: Certain crimes of violence and repeat offenders are not eligible for parole.

MICHIGAN - YES - Comment: Once the prisoner serves the minimum sentence less good time, the Board has jurisdiction to parole. The Board may now parole certain lifers sentenced for 650 grams or more of cocaine after 15 to 20 years depending on other prior convictions and cooperation with police.

MINNESOTA - NO - Comment: Does not have a parole board. An inmate serves two-thirds of their time and is released under supervision, There is a unit that approves release plans as well as revocations.

MISSOURI - YES, WITH LIMITS - Comment: Statutes restrict some cases from parole eligibility. The offender must be sentenced under the specific statute before restrictions apply. Drug trafficking first degree for some methamphetamine offenders is no longer eligible for parole.

MISSISSIPPI - YES, VERY LIMITED - Comment: The Board has discretion only if the crime was committed prior to 7/1/95. There were 3715 still in prison in 1997 eligible for parole.

MONTANA - YES - Comment: Lifers do have to serve a minimum time before they are eligible for parole.

NEBRASKA - YES - Comment: Individuals are eligible for consideration after serving 2 of their minimum term. No such reduction of a sentence will be applied to any term imposing a mandatory minimum. An inmate who commits or found guilty of a conduct violation relating to drugs or alcohol use will not be eligible for parole for 12 months. An inmate will not be eligible for parole if they refuse to comply with the department approved personalized plans. A parole violator who has been revoked as a result of a new felony conviction is not eligible for parole again on the original sentence. Inmates who have flat terms cannot be paroled on that term, but inmates can be paroled to their flat term after serving a minimum term of their indeterminate term.

NORTH CAROLINE - YES VERY LIMITED - Comment: They have authority over offenders who committed their crime prior to October 1, 1994.

NORTH DAKOTA - YES

NEVADA -YES - Comment: The Board has discretion until the last year of the prison term then parole is mandatory.

NEW HAMPSHIRE - YES

NEW JERSEY - YES - Comment: The state has adopted a ANo Early Release Act@ requiring 85% of maximum time on certain violent offenders. The murder of a minor where sexual assault has occurred is not eligible for parole.

NEW MEXICO - YES VERY LIMITED - Comment: Discretionary release was changed to determinate sentencing in 1979.

NEW YORK -YES - LIMITED - Comment: The majority of the inmates are serving indeterminate sentences and subject to discretionary release. However, second violent offenders get determinate sentences and are not eligible for parole. The sentencing reform acts have limited the Parole Board=s discretionary release authority. It extended determinate sentencing to first time violent felony offenders. Inmates with determinate sentences may be conditionally released when 6/7ths of the sentence has been served. The Board has the authority to impose conditions upon release and to revoke parole during the post release supervision period.

OHIO - YES, VERY LIMITED - Comment: All sentenced for crimes committed after 7/1/96 are not eligible for parole. The Board does set conditions for those released on determinate sentences. The Board is empowered to impose ABad time@ for institutional rule infractions that would be a criminal offense outside prison. ABad Time@ extends the sentence imposed by the sentencing court and may be imposed in increments of 15, 30, 60, 90, days per infraction with accumulation not to exceed half of the original determinate sentence.

OKLAHOMA - YES, VERY LIMITED - Comment: The Board only recommends to the Governor, who is the final releasing authority. Anyone committing certain violent offenses on or after March 1, 2000 will have to serve 85% of their sentence. (Generally offenders serve 1/3) before parole eligibility.

OREGON - YES, VERY LIMITED - Comment: Only for crimes committed before 1989. Only a small number remain eligible.

PENNSYLVANIA - YES - Comment: Offenders become eligible for parole at the expiration of their minimum sentence. Offenders with sentences of less than two years remain under the courts jurisdiction.

RHODE ISLAND - YES - Comment: All inmates are eligible after serving 1/3 of their sentences except life without parole. The Board now has the responsibility of sexual offender community notification. The Board determines the risk level for re-offending and carries out community notification with local police.

The Board has life time supervision for child molesters.

SOUTH CAROLINA - YES, LIMITED - Comment: Discretionary parole was abolished for certain crimes sentenced to 20 years or more committed after 1/1996.

SOUTH DAKOTA - YES, VERY LIMITED - Comment: Only inmates who committed their crime prior to 7/1/96 are eligible. The Board has discretionary authority over revocations and makes recommendations to the Governor on pardons and commutations.

TENNESSEE - YES, LIMITED - Comment: There is no parole for a person who committed a crime against persons offense on or after 7/1/95. Others must serve a minimum time before they are eligible.

TEXAS -YES

UTAH - YES - Comment: Life without parole and any death sentence that is commuted shall have life without parole.

VIRGINIA - YES, VERY LIMITED - Comment: Only those who committed a crime prior to the 1995 abolishment of parole are eligible.

VERMONT - YES

WASHINGTON - YES, VERY LIMITED - Comment: Parole was abolished in 1984. Only those who committed a crime prior to 1984 are still eligible and in 1997 about 700 were still in the system. As of 9/1/01 certain sex offenders were placed under the Board=s jurisdiction. The Court will sentence a sex offender to the maximum and set a minimum term. The Board will consider at the minimum to determine if the inmate should be paroled. Revocation of this type of parolee is also under the Board.

WEST VIRGINIA - YES - Comment: Must see everyone yearly, except lifers who can be given a three-year set-off.

WISCONSIN - YES, VERY LIMITED - The truth-in-sentencing law that took effect in December 31,1999 eliminated parole for individuals who committed a felony after that date. However anyone sentenced to less than one year is still parole eligible. The Board still has authority over old code cases.

WYOMING - YES - Comment: Inmates must serve a minimum before paroled. Cannot parole lifers

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA - NO - Comment: Congress abolished parole for certain felonies committed on or after 8/5/00. U.S. Parole Commission took over parole function 8/5/98.

U.S. PAROLE COMMISSION - YES, LIMITED - Comment: Offenses committed on or after 11/1/87 are not eligible for parole. There were still 5888 in the system who were eligible for parole in 1997. On 8/5/98 the Commission assumed paroling authority over some 7000 District of Columbia cases.

PUERTO RICO - YES

U.S. ARMY - YES - The Army now has a life without a parole sentence. Congress also increased the time served on a regular life sentence prior to clemency or parole consideration from five years for initial clemency to 10 years and from 10 years to 20 years for initial parole consideration. The Army now have a life sentence without parole. Clemency on these sentences is within the authority of the service secretary.

U.S. AIR FORCE - YES - Comment: The Board=s authority has been expanded to having direct supervision of those given a conditional release as opposed to a discretionary release by the Board

U.S. NAVY - YES

ONTARIO, CANADA - YES

QUEBEC, CANADA - YES

BRITISH COLUMBIA, CANADA - YES

CANADA NATIONAL BOARD - YES

NEW SOUTH WALES, AUSTRALIA - YES

VICTORIA, AUSTRALIA - YES

Summary

Looking at the 50 U. S. states we have 27 who have full discretion with statutory limits, three who have discretion over most offenders with limits on certain types of offenders, 15 who have discretion over a number of old code cases, but little if any over offenders who committed a crime after a set date and final six states that have discretion over a very small group of offenders but still might have authority over functions like setting condition for release, revocation, etc. Other boards outside the U.S. still seem to have full discretion over the prison population regarding parole release.

Paroling Authorities and Chairs

Most of this information is from the 2000 survey. Open meeting laws are new this year and there is a rewrite of the autonomy section. We asked a number of questions in the 2000 survey relating to the Boards autonomy, authority and training.

Autonomy

Most boards reported that they were autonomous, reporting directly to the governor and not subject to the control or supervision of another department/agency for operations or budget. The 8 that indicated they were not completely autonomous reports to the department of corrections or

some other agency as the oversight department. See examples of some board's organizational chart in the appendix of the 2000 report. [Table VII](#) has the number of staff employed or supervised by the boards in 2000 as well as their FY 2001 budget. A few of the boards with big budgets have included field services staff

Authority to Issue Warrants

All but eleven boards (Hawaii, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Montana, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, West Virginia and Wisconsin) have the authority to issue warrants for those individuals they have released on parole. When the board is not the issuing authority, the duty is given to the department of corrections or parole field services.

Chairs/Executive Director

The board chair is the chief administrator for the majority of the parole boards. There are some part-time boards where an executive director is the chief operational officer. Twenty-six boards reported having an executive director who either assists the chair or takes a major role in administering the agency.

Who Appoints the Chair?

The chair is appointed by the governor or chief elected official in all but six jurisdictions. Four (Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota and Ohio) are appointed by the director of corrections. Two (Oklahoma and Wyoming) are elected by the membership of the board.

Authority Over Interstate Compact

Only 8 (Alabama, Georgia, Mass., Missouri, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Virginia) boards have total administrative authority over the interstate compact for the supervision of parolees.

Open Meetings Law

Most reported an open meeting law, with 12 authorities stating they did not fall under the law. Nine reported having no law.

New Duties and Tasks

We asked boards if they had added any new areas of responsibility, either administratively or statutorily since the 2000 survey. The following are the responses:

CALIFORNIA - A new unit was created to ensure that the provisions of the ADA are complying within all their programs.

COLORADO - Statutory authority was given the board to contract with part-time ARelease Hearing Officers@ to conduct parole application hearings on nonviolent offenders.

MASSACHUSETTS - By statute victims, parents of victims or legal guardians of a minor victim of a violent or sex crime may testify at a parole hearing. By statute the family member (family is broadly defined in the statute) of a deceased victim may testify at a parole hearing.

Persons serving a life sentence, except those serving a sentence for 1st degree murder or confined in the hospital for the mentally ill will be eligible for parole.60 days prior the inmate completing 15 years. The board will have a hearing before the full board. Notice to authorities and victims is required. If not paroled at this hearing another will be held in five years or less.

NEVADA - The board will evaluate offenders being considered for parole for possible recommendation to participate in a court supervised re-entry program.

NEW JERSEY - The board is required to notify Prosecutors when they parole an inmate.

NORTH DAKOTA - If an inmate completes a program the board has recommended the inmate will be considered for parole.

RHODE ISLAND- Life time parole for a child molester.

UTAH - A new pilot Drug Board Program, has been created by the Parole Board as a post release alternative program for parolees. It is modeled after the drug court program.

WASHINGTON - Certain sex offenders who commit their crime after 9/1 /01.will be given a Adeterminate plus@ sentence and their release will be determined by the board.

ONTARIO & QUEBEC - Temporary absence in preparation for parole which was within the warden=s authority is now under the board.

US ARMY - Mandatory supervision is now required and the board has oversight.

Victims

The material in [table IV](#) relates to victims= issues. This year we asked six questions.

We found that most boards have a written definition as to whom they consider as the victim and who can represent the victim at hearings. Nine states have the definition as part of their statute. Responding if victims were allowed to appear at a parole hearing 17 paroling authorities answered no. Eleven of these had separate times and hearings for victims.

When asked if both the inmate and the victim are present in the hearing at the same time 26 said yes. However 3 allowed this only at the victims request and one by video conferencing only.

Whether victims are notified of all board decisions is mixed. Twenty-nine boards notify victims of all board decisions. Fourteen boards notify upon the victims request and only three do not notify The remainder notifies some of their decisions, mostly regarding release.

We asked two questions regarding victim representation either on the board itself or staff assigned to the board. There were only four boards that have a victim as a member of the board. Twenty-seven boards have some type of staff person to address victim issues.

Parole of Lifers

This information is from the 1998 survey. We did not repeat these questions for 1999, 2000 or 2001. Paroling Authorities were asked questions relating to their authority to parole lifers. Fourteen said the questions did not apply to them. Those that claimed authority were asked: How many lifers were in their population that were eligible for parole on 12/31/98? How many lifers were paroled during calendar 1998? Of those that were paroled what was the average years served? There were thirteen that answered yes to having authority over parole of lifers but did not have data available to address the questions asked. There were thirteen authorities that reported a total of 15,490 individuals serving life sentences who were eligible for parole. Six hundred and three lifers were paroled in 1998, with an average time served of 14.6 years.

Prison Population, Releases and Supervision

[Table I](#) gives the prison population as of 12/31/01. Also included in the table are the number of individuals released by a discretionary decision of the paroling authority, releases to community supervision by means other than discretionary decision making and those inmates that were released at the end of their term without supervision during calendar year 2001. Release numbers are hard to compare because the same authorities do not report each year (47 in 1998, 46 in 1999, 51 in 2000 and 51, (45 states and 7 other) in 2001). The main core of releasing authorities is included. Seventeen reported a decrease in their prison population during calendar 2000, but this year only 15 showed a decrease. The state of Texas showed the biggest decrease in 2000 of 38,000 and had an additional decrease of 6000 plus this year. Comparing discretionary releases over the last four years we see 114,793 1998, 134,128 in 1999 and 135,832 releases in 2000. This year there are 149,195 counting the 45 states that reported. If you add in the seven other boards the number comes to 160,109. Mandatory releases to supervision have shown increases each year to a current number of 238,873 from the 45 states and 5489 from the other 7 boards. Looking only at the state boards California represents 54% of these mandatory releases. If we remove the seven other authorities and add Texas, Louisiana, Indiana and Illinois with California these five states have 82% of the mandatory releases to supervision. Those released at the end of their term without supervision are soft numbers due to 8 boards not having the data available. With 52 boards reporting there were 110,489 released without supervision in 2001 compared to 111,103 last year. The 45 state boards accounted for 102,234 of those released without supervision in 2001. Combining all state boards they reported 490,302 total releases for calendar 2001. The largest number of releases (48%) went out under mandatory supervision, followed by (30%) by discretionary parole and (22%) being released without supervision at the completion of their sentence.

Violation Hearings, Revocations and Successful Discharge

[Table II](#) lists the number of violation hearings held by paroling authorities. As well as the number of discretionary parolees and those mandatorily released to supervision who were revoked for new crimes and conditions violations. Also included are those discretionary parolees and mandatory releases who were successfully discharged during calendar 2001. Violation hearings still make up a big part of a paroling authorities= workload. This year (calendar 2001) boards held 141,263 violation hearings which were slightly less then last year. When you look only at the 45 state boards California, Illinois, New York and Texas held 67% of the violation hearings.

Looking at revocation for the 45 state boards for 2001 we must eliminate seven states that have not separated their data between crime and condition violations and four states that did not have any data relating to violations. We then find 30% revoked for committing new crime while on discretionary parole and (70%) revoked for condition violations for a total of 37,712 returned to prison. Reviewing the 7 boards that are not state paroling authorities they have a 36% revocation rate for new crimes.

Data relating to those released mandatorily to supervision is still hard to gather. Nine boards do not have the data and there are 17 that do not have mandatory supervision release. When we look at the 16 states where we have data and eliminate California=s 88,906 mandatory release returns there is a 38% return rate for new crimes and 62% for condition violations. If we include California, the picture changes dramatically with 19% returned for new crimes and 81% for condition violations. The National Parole Board of Canada has very similar data to the states where discretionary revocations have a 35% return rate for new crimes and 65% for condition violations. Their mandatory releases have a like percentage with 35% for new crimes and 65% for condition violations.

There were 153,512 successfully discharged from supervision in calendar 2001 by state parole boards plus another 9320 by other paroling authorities in the survey for a total of 162,836. Not included in these figures are 8 states that did not have the data. As we look at discretionary parole successful releases there were four states that did not separate their data which represented 21,932 cases. New York had 72% of these cases. Eliminating these four along with the 8 with no data there was 57,092 discretionary parolees successfully discharged by state paroling authorities. There were 74,273 mandatory supervision cases successfully discharged with California, Illinois and Texas representing 82% of these cases.

Appointments, Terms, Structure, Salaries and Budgets

[Table III](#) was updated this year. It includes information relating to how boards are appointed, the term of the appointment, the number on the board, their salaries, if they are full or part-time and their use of analysis. Four boards showed an increase in the number of members and the five showed a decrease. Forty-seven boards reported the current salary of the chair and board members. Thirty-two show an increase from our 1999 survey. Fourteen were still the same. Most of these were part-time boards that received a per diem. One board had a cut in salary. We asked this year if board members= salaries were set by statute or were they a part of some state pay plan receiving increases like all employees. With 49 boards reporting 18 had their salary set by

statute, 17 were part of a pay plan, and 8 salaries were controlled by the appointing authority and the remaining a mix of all these.

Parole Conditions

This is from the 2000 survey and we asked two questions relating to A special conditions.@ The first asked if the board had Aa list of special conditions that just apply to cases depending on need.@ Most respondents reported that they dealt with the individual on a case by case basis and did not have a formal list. A number did list the type of case where they would use special conditions, i.e., sex offenders, mentally ill and substance abusers. Nine did have check lists or other types of documents which included special conditions.

We asked if boards had Aa special condition requiring polygraph testing.@ Thirty-six paroling authorities stated no to the question. California added that the Third District Court of Appeals recently held that a convicted sex offender could be required to submit to a polygraph as a condition of probations and parole. Therefore, they may be using the polygraph in the future. Fifteen boards do have some type of polygraph testing requirement. Florida has a statutory condition of release that requires sex offenders to submit to polygraph testing. Georgia requires sex offenders to have a polygraph disclosure test within three months of release and a maintenance test very six months during their term of supervision. Minnesota has polygraph testing as a part of a sex offender treatment program.

Open Hearings and the Media

This is from the 2000 survey and we asked if A parole hearings were open to the media?@ and if A video cameras were allowed?@ Twenty-one boards checked that the media was allowed at the hearing, but 33 did not allow video cameras. Maryland answered yes to allowing the media, but added the media had to request permission. California had the same requirement. Utah and Rhode Island agreed to media presence if the inmate did not object. Utah and Arkansas allow video cameras if the inmate did not object. Ohio left the camera issue to the victim. Massachusetts allows cameras A only for lifers.

Parole Board Training

This is from the 2000 survey. We wanted to know how many U.S. board members have attended the NIC new parole board member training. We also looked at how long it had been since members had attended and if members had attended any other NIC training at the Academy. Those reporting indicated that 149 had completed the new board member training and a larger number 157 had not. Most had attended within the last five years. No current member from California, Connecticut, Iowa, Massachusetts and South Dakota have attended the training. Only four states reported having members attending other training offered at the Academy.

Sex Offender Registration/Notification and Civil Commitment

This is from the 2000 survey. Most boards reported that when required they included sex offender registration and notification as a condition of parole and helped in the enforcement of the condition. There are three boards that have administrative responsibilities in regard to registration and/or notification. The Nevada Board participates in the tier assessment review of sex offenders. In Oregon the Board makes a finding of APredatory@ sex offender for community notification. The Rhode Island Parole Board is the one responsible for sex offender community notification.

Only three boards indicated they had any official role in the civil commitment of sex offenders. The California Board of Prison Terms conducts case reviews of inmates convicted of certain sexual offenses to determine if they meet the Sexually Violent Predator Program criteria. If the criteria is met, the Board returns the completed case to the Department of Correction, who in turn forwards the case to the Department of Mental Health for their clinical evaluation. If all criteria are met, it is then forwarded to the District Attorney with a recommendation relating to civil commitment. The Minnesota Board set discipline penalties for those civilly committed who refuse mandatory treatment while incarcerated. They also conduct revocation hearings for those under dual jurisdiction who have been released on supervised release to their civil commitment and then refuse to participate in treatment. The Washington Board is part of the end of sentence consideration for civil commitment and they are responsible for notifying the county prosecutor.

Court TV and Other TV Shows

This is from the 2000 survey. We asked boards if they had been on Court TV or other like TV shows. Nineteen boards reported they had been. Court TV, A&E and 60 Minutes were some of the shows listed.

What Community Resources Are Most Lacking in Regard to Placement of Parolees Back Into the Community?

This is from the 2000 survey. The responses to the question regarding the lack of resources in the community were not surprising. The National Parole Board of Canada made the following comment: AA review completed in May of 2000, of the legislation governing corrections and conditional release in Canada recommended that more effort and resources be expended in the community to ensure that programs offered in the institution can be continued in the community. It was found that in some areas particularly rural areas, no programs were offered and that in other areas the ability to deliver the programs falls short of the need.@ Nevada made this comment: AHousing for sex offenders is almost non-existent. It takes 6-12 months on average beyond the inmate=s parole eligibility date to locate a placement for a sex offender.@ Housing was by far the most listed lack of resources. It as followed by the availability of licensed substance abuse treatment, resources for the mentally ill offender and suitable treatment for sex offenders. Also, listed were vocational/employment resources and services for the chronically ill, elderly and women.

Inmates Considered for Parole and Face to Face Hearings

Reporting paroling authorities considered 391,992 inmates for parole in calendar 2001. Face to face type hearings represent 186,794 of those considered. New York had 32,618 considerations that are not in these numbers as they were not separated into type of hearing/review. There were five boards that stated they did not have face to face hearing. See [Table V](#) for a break out of individual board=s workload. When we combine parole consideration hearings with parole revocation hearings ([Table II](#)) we see boards held 325,217 face to face hearings in 2001.

Interstate Compact Cases

[Table VI](#) shows the number of out state parolees and mandatory releases that are being supervised in the state and the number of their cases that are being supervised in another state as of 12/31/01. We also asked how many individuals they have released to another state for supervision and how many violators have been returned from another state during calendar 2000. Forty-five of the fifty states responded to the survey. They reported a total of 27,182 of their releases were being supervised in another state and they were supervising 22,063 from other states. The number of cases being supervised in another state had increased by 2000 plus while those supervised within their state were down by more than 7000. They reported releasing 7169 to out of state supervision with nine states not have the data, and returning 2133 as violators, without 12 states not having the data, during calendar 2001. However, even with this lack of information from some states we do get a fair look at the volume of work involved in the compact.

Staffing and Budget

[Table VII](#) addresses the number of staff under the supervision of the boards and their FY 2001/2002 budget. The data that relates to staff is from the 2000 survey. Where one sees large numbers of staff assigned to some boards, it usually means they have field staff within their agencies budget. Examples are Missouri and Pennsylvania. When we compare the 2000 survey budget amounts to those reported this year, we find only 16 that show a real increase. Thirteen did show a slight increase which one would assume related to pay plans. Three showed the same amount to operate on and 13 showed a decrease in their budgets.

Juvenile Offender Parole Boards

Eleven states reported having parole boards that deal only with the juvenile offender. They are as follows: California, Colorado, Illinois, Kentucky, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Ohio and Utah.

Staffing and Perole Hearing Summaries

We asked if boards had staff that supplied them with some type of institutional recommendation for their hearings or reviews. All but eight boards reported having staff available. Seventeen boards had their own staff and the remainder were supplied information by staff of the department of corrections.

States Open Meetings Law

We asked if the board had an open meetings law statute and if it applied to them. Only seven states did not have an open meetings law and only two that had a law reported it did not apply to them.

Prison Pop, Releases & Supervision

TABLE I						
STATES	Prison Pop. 12/31/2001	Discretionary Releases '01	Other Sup. Rel. '01	Max. Time Rel. '01	Discretion Rel. Under sup. 12/31/01	Other Under sup. 12/31/01
Alabama	26,741	1,876	2,896	3,783	5,444	UK
Alaska	4,279	61	598	UK	UK	UK
Arizona	28,296	374	UK	UK	UK	UK
Arkansas	12,333	5,279	521	736	5,379	0
California	157,142	13	129,704	1		121,820 (1)
Colorado	17,150	2,213	2,198	1,726	3,263	2,162
Connecticut	14,220	1,987	48	UK	1,889	36
Delaware	UK	30	UK	UK	575	UK
Florida (2)	72,007	121	4,708	16,610	2,480	3,737
Georgia	47,563	9,975	NA	4,805	21,370	NA
Hawaii	2,274	932	NA	176	2,608	NA
Idaho	5,529	946	NA	470	1,688	NA
Illinois	44,348	16	27,034	6,639	120	28,677
Indiana	22,529	654	11,254	1,082	293	5,838
Iowa	8,000	4,249 (2)	NA	927	5,493	NA
Kansas	8,574	704	4,380	1,560	3,981	3,981
Kentucky	15,791	2,907	1,265	3,661	4,804	26
Louisiana	36,898	1,306	11,777	907	4,082	18,075
Maine	1,704	1	0	0	26	0

Maryland	23,478	2,458	0	5,233	6,523	7,368
Mass (3)	10,536	5,618	NA	2,407	3,718	NA
Michigan	48,849	10,868	NA	1,628	14,545	NA
Minnesota	6,529	403	3,144	376	263	2,696
Missouri	28,630	5,325	1,326	1,786	9,751	1,597
Montana	3,328	501	464	269	710	5,626
Nebraska	3,932	684	NA	1,225	502	3
Nevada	16,350	2,010	544	1,638	UK	UK
New Hamp.	2,500	725	NA	181	750	NA
New Jersey	27,389	10,810	NA	5,348	11,931	NA
New Mexico	UK	2	2,285	771	UK	UK
New York	67,395	16,982	8,120	2,960		57,378 (1)
N. Carolina	32,253	2,286	1,143	18,742	2,846	832
N. Dakota	1,107	191	NA	282	117	NA
Ohio	44,768	5,849	NA	310.00	32,642	UK
Oregon	10,999	296	3,829	UK	1,110	9,588
Penn.	37,955	8,938	NA	2,666	23,071	NA
Rhode Is.	2,513	496	NA	UK	375	NA
S. Dakota	2,815	239	675	UK	253	915
Tennessee	23,671	3,622	835	3,853	8,035	0
Texas	125,590	31,917	15,060	8,009	44,706	35,193
Utah	5,388	2,574	NA	146	3,471	NA
Washington	16,014	38	UK	36	93	UK
West Virg.	4,494	492	934	654	2,006	NA
Wisconsin	20,656	1,872	4,131	660		9683 (1)
Quebec	UK	1,323 (2)	NA	UK	UK	NA
Nat. Bd. CN	12,655	4,082	4,815	212	5,877	2,804
Ontario	7,588	584 (2)	NA	1,505	255	NA

(2)						
US Par. Co.	9,705	3,709	674	UK	9,703	742
US Air Force	567	60	NA	205	134	NA
US Army	UK	51	NA	831	0	NA
Puerto Rico	16,417	1105	NA	5412	2220	NA
Wyoming	1591	355	NA	218	514	NA
UK -Unknown						
(1) All releases						
(2) Fiscal year						
(3) Estimated						

Violation Hearings, Revocations & Successful Cases

TABLE II							
STATE	Revocation Hearings	Discretion Rel Revoked		Mandatory Revoked		Successfully Discharged	
		Condition Violation	New Crime	Condition Violations	New Crime	Discretion Release	Mandatory Release
Alabama	555	195	379	UK	UK	1239	UK
Alaska	904	57(1)		543(1)		UK	UK
Arizona	2464	UK	168	UK	UK	54	78
Arkansas	1152	410	25	705	12	2914	
California	40081	0	0	74,275	14631	NA	37030
Colorado	NA	2020(2)	392(2)			1819(2)	
Connecticut	617	334	283(3)	7	5	970	0
Delaware	64	16	14	17	12	207	UK
Florida(4)	118	2,582	UK	UK	UK	68	2055
Georgia	611	1,604	1,576	NA	NA	7042	NA
Hawaii	522	501	16	NA	NA	266	NA
Idaho	336	124	186	NA	NA	289	NA

Illinois	15931	8064(2)		3504(2)		23	14952
Indiana	1350	217	39	574	393	27	3373
Iowa	610(2)	536	192	0	0	UK	UK
Kansas	1038	2,546	184	108	184	73	2044
Kentucky	1582	1,545	97	UK	UK	299	3
Louisiana	1838	149	76	572	106	4957	633
Maine	2	1	2	1	0	0	0
Maryland	4017	2,315	UK	UK	UK	UK	UK
Mass (3)	362	UK	UK	NA	NA	3477	NA
Michigan	3865	3809	1191	NA	NA	4773	NA
Minnesota	1764	32	2	884	52	NA	NA
Missouri	152	2,580	646	745	110	2432	695
Montana	182	175	7	556	268	116	1320
Nebraska	234	UK	UK	0	1	434	0
Nevada	928	UK	UK	UK	UK	UK	UK
New Hamp.	325	225	75	NA	NA	UK	NA
New Jersey	4284	3,711	165	NA	NA	6053	NA
New Mexico	944	NA	NA	832	112	NA	700
New York	14707	8961(2)	2207(2)			15949(2)	
N. Carolina	58	377	20	154	4	2803	766
N. Dakota	43	32	11	NA	NA	190	NA
Ohio	3714	2150(2)	UK	UK	UK	UK	UK
Oregon	2845	143	214	156	446	48	1948
Penn	1212	3,446	1,165	NA	NA	4684	NA
Rhode Is.	161	144(1)		NA	NA	270	NA
S. Dakota	546	UK	UK	UK	UK	458(2)	
Tennessee	2243	546	482	NA	NA	1267	7
Texas	16224	942	4,029	1,507	2957	11079	8669
Utah	1797	1,123	365	NA	NA	585	NA

Washington	36	8	2	UK	UK	36	UK
West Virg.	246	186	49	NA	NA	417	NA
Wisconsin	NA	551	100	1022	184	3700(2)	
US Army	26	17	0	0	0	0	0
Nat. Bd. CN	3036	700	374	1,371	740	4131	3064
Ontario (4)	113	70	20	NA	NA	478	NA
US Par. Co.	1414	642	663	53	55	UK	UK
Quebec	464	432	32	NA	NA	859	NA
US Air Force	6	3	1	NA	NA	48	NA
Puerto Rico	481	428	53	NA	NA	740	NA
Wyoming	110	44	12	NA	NA	215	NA

(1) Both technical & new crimes

(2) Both discretionary & mandatory

(3) Estimated

(4) Fiscal year

Board Appointments, Salary, Terms, Numbers

Use of Analysis

TABLE III

State	Governor Appoint	Leg. Confirm	Chair Salary	Members Salary	Term Years	Number on the Board	F-Full or P-Part Time	Use of Parole Analysis
Alabama	X		\$71,235	\$71,235	5	5	P	NO
Alaska	X	X	\$150 diem	\$150 diem	5	5	P	NO
Arizona	X	X	\$57,499	\$54,499	5	5	F	YES(6)(7)
Arkansas	X	X	\$76,592	\$68,529		5 F, 2P	F	

California	X	X	\$103,317	\$99,693	7	6	F	YES
Colorado	X	X	\$83,439	\$77,928	6	7	F	NO
Connecticut	X	X		\$110 diem	4	15, 3 full	F/P	YES(6)
Delaware	X	X	\$55,000	\$110 diem	4	5, 1 full	F/P	NO
Florida	X	X	\$83,273	\$83	6	3	F	YES(6)(7)
Georgia	X	X	\$111,509	\$111,509	7	7	F	YES(6)
Hawaii	X	X	\$77,966	\$29.99 phr.	4	3, 1 full	F/P	NO
Idaho	X	X	NA	\$150 diem	3	5	P	YES
Illinois	X	X	\$78,831	\$70,620	6	15	F	YES(7)
Indiana	X		\$65,000	\$53,500	4	5	F	NO
Iowa	X	X	\$75,000	\$75,000	4	5, 2 full	F/P	YES(8)
Kansas	X	X	\$99,831	\$97,366	4	4	F	NO
Kentucky	X	X	\$65,000	\$45,000	4	8	F	NO
Louisiana	X	X	\$46,904	\$39,312	-11	7	F	NO
Maine			\$55 diem	\$55 diem				
Maryland	X	X	\$90,000	\$85,000	6	8	F	YES(9)
Mass.	X		\$89,632	\$72,352	5	7	F	YES(9)
Michigan	Dir. of Corr.		\$88,550	\$80,500	4	10	F	YES (7)
Minnesota	Dir. of Corr.		NA	44,119 - 66,712				
Missouri	X	X	\$77,988	\$71,988	6	7	F	YES (6)(7)(9)
Montana	X	X	\$50 per diem	Same	4	5	P	YES(6)
Nebraska	X	X	\$62,241	\$56,824	6	5	F	NO
Nevada	X		\$86,522	\$68,709	4	13, 7 full	F/P	YES(9)
New Hamp.	X		\$100 pd	\$100 pd	5	7	P	NO
New Jersey	X	X	\$117,928	\$104,000	6	15	F	YES (9)

New Mexico	X	X	\$75 diem	\$75 diem	6	9	P	NO
New York	X	X	\$120,800	\$101,600	6	19	F	
N. Carolina	X		\$83,000	\$75,000	4	3	F	YES(6)(7)
North Dak.	X	X	\$75 per diem	\$75 diem		6	P	
Ohio	Dir. of Corr.		54,432 - 75,321	49,363 - 68,275	life	9	F	YES(7)(9)
Oklahoma	1		\$30,800	\$30,800	4	5	P	YES(6)
Oregon	X	X	\$72,576	\$73,576	4	3	F	YES(6)(7)
Penn	X	X			6	9	F	YES
Rhode Is	X	X	\$85,000	\$18,500	3(12)	7, 1 full	P	
S. Dakota	2	X	\$75 per diem	\$75 per diem	4	6	P	NO
Tennessee	X		\$82,008	\$63,984	6	7	F	YES(9)
Texas	X	X	\$85,800	\$83,200	6	18	F	YES(8)
Utah	X	X	\$86,736	\$83,186	5	5	F	YES(6)
Vermont	X	X	\$13,000	\$80 pd	3	5	P	NO
Virginia	X	X	\$104,000	\$87,000	-11	3	F	YES(9)
Washington	X	X	\$79,600	\$45,420	5	3	F	YES(6)
West Virg.	X	X	\$45,000	\$45,000	6	5	F	
Wisconsin	X	X	\$68,000	49,654 = 60,234	2(10)	7	F	NO
Wyoming	X	X	\$125 per diem	\$125 per diem	6	7	P	
Nat. Bd. CN	X		203,100CN	\$112,600CN	-5	43 F46P	F/P	YES (6)
Ontario	X	X	\$112,400CN	\$67,600CN	6	8F, 42P	F/P	YES(6)
Quebec			\$122,700CN	\$95,000CN				
US Par. Co.	President	X	\$130,000	\$121,000	6	5	F	YES(9)

Puerto Rico	X	X	\$75,000	\$60,000	5	F
(1) Parolee only						(7) Hold probable cause hearings.
(1) Three appointed by the Governor, one by Supreme Court, one by Court of Appeals.						(8) Hold revocation hearings.
(2) Two by the Governor, two by the Att. Gen. & two by Supreme Court.						(9) Hold parole consideration hearings.
(3) Three years for the Chair and two for the members.						(10) The chair 2 years, others our merit.
(4) Eight years for the Chair & four to six for the members.						(11) At the pleasure of the Governor.
(5) Full time five years and part-time three years						(12) Chair is double appointment, 3 years as m member and 2 years as Chair.
(6) Case reports writing and interviews.						

Victims, Hearings & Notification

TABLE IV						
STATES	A	B	C	D	E	F
Alabama	Y	Y	N	N(1)	N	Y
Alaska	Y	N(4)	Y	Y(2)	N	N
Arizona	N(5)	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Arkansas	N	N(6)	N	N(7)(8)	N	N
California	Y(5)	Y	Y	N(7)	N	Y
Colorado	Y(5)	Y	Y(7)	N(8)	N	Y
Connecticut	Y	Y	Y(7)	N(7)	N	Y
Delaware	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
Florida	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
Georgia	Y	N(10)	N	Y	N	Y
Hawaii	Y	Y	Y(11)	N(7)	N	N
Idaho	Y(5)	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Illinois	Y	Y	N	N(7)	N	Y
Indiana	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
Iowa	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y

Kansas	N	N(6)	N	N	N	N
Kentucky	Y	N(6)	N	N(7)	N	Y
Louisiana	N	Y	Y(7)	N(7)	Y	N
Maine	N	Y	N	Y	N	N
Maryland	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Mass.	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Michigan	Y	N(6)	N	Y	N	Y
Minnesota	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
Missouri	Y(5)	Y	Y	N(1)	Y	Y
Montana	Y(5)	Y	N	N(7)	N	Y
Nebraska	Y(5)	Y	Y	N(7)	N	N
Nevada	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
New Hamp.	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
New Jersey	Y	Y(7)	N	N(7)	N	Y
New Mexico	Y	Y	Y	N(9)	N	N
New York	Y	N(6)	N	N(7)	N	Y
N. Carolina	Y	N(6)	N	Y	N	N
N. Dakota	Y(5)	N(8)	N	Y	N	Y
Ohio	Y	N(6)	N	Y	Y	N
Oregon	Y(5)	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Penn	Y	N(6)		Y	N	N(9)
Rhode Is.	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y
S. Dakota	N	Y	N	Y	N	N
Tennessee	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Texas	N	Y	N	Y	N	N
Utah	Y	Y	Y	N(7)	N	Y
Washington	N	N(6)	N	Y	N	Y
West Virg	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N(9)
Wisconsin	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Quebec	Y	N(10)	N	N	N	N

Nat. Bd. CN	Y	Y	Y	N(7)	N	Y
U. S. Army	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
Ontario	Y	N	NA	N(7)	N	N
US Par. Co.	Y(5)	Y	Y	Y	N	N
U.S. Air F	Y	N	N	Y	N	N
Puerto Rico	N	Y			N	N
Wyoming	Y	N(6)	N	N(1)	N	N

	(1) Only when released
A - Does the board have a definition as to who is the victim and who can represent the victim at a hearing?	(2) By mail (3) In person
B - Are victims allowed to appear in person at all hearings?	(4) Only at discretionary hearings
C - Are both the inmate and the victim present in the hearing at the same time?	(5) By statute (6) Separate hearing
D - Are victims notified of all parole decisions?	(7) On victims request (8) Violent crimes
E - Do you have a victim representative on your board?	(9) Handled by another agency
F - Do you have a staff person as a victim coordinator?	(10) May submit letter (11) video conference only

Inmates Considered for Parole & Face to Face Hearings by the Board

TABLE V		
State	Inmates Considered	Face to Face Hearings
Alabama	1876	0(1)
Alaska	154	154
Arizona	1,262	4,726

Arkansas	4,347	8,665
California	84	3,637
Colorado	9,871	9,871
Connecticut	2,970	1,151
Delaware	219	219
Florida	1738(2)	0(1)
Georgia	13,387	0(1)
Hawaii	1,801	1,004
Idaho	1756	773
Illinois	27358	324
Indiana	797	727
Iowa	10160(2)	1832(2)
Kansas	1,311	1,311
Kentucky	10,832	7,921
Louisiana	3,500	2,687
Maine	3	3
Maryland	9,848	9,842
Mass.	8712(4)	8712(4)
Michigan	22,791	19,952
Minnesota	35(3)	34(3)
Missouri	10,368	8,336
Montana	1,465	1,079
Nebraska	4302	859
Nevada	6577	6450(5)
New Hamp.	950	950
New Jersey	16,200	12,904
New Mexico	2,348	3,292
New York	32618(5)	
N. Carolina	10,448	7
North Dak.	1035	436

Ohio	8,788	7,825
Oregon	370	370
Penn	16,689	16,689
Rhode Is	1,478	1,315
S. Dakota	810	810
Tennessee	12,382	1,185
Texas	68,115	3,981
Utah	4,382	7,786
Washington	147	147
West Virg.	2,127	2,127
Wisconsin	11,507	10,750
Nat Bd. CN	5,711	3,308
Ontario	2089(2)	2084(2)
US Parole Bd	7,526	4,909
Quebec	4,748	4,567
US Air Force	117	0(1)
US Army	170	0(1)
Puerto Rico	22,796	250
Wyoming	917	833
(1) No face to face hearings		
(2) Fiscal year		
(3) Life sentences only		
(4) Estimate		
(5) Both hearings and reviews		

Interstate Compact Supervision

TABLE VI

State	Parolee/Mandatory that are supervised out of state	Parolee/Mandatory that are supervised in your state	Parolee/Mandatory Rel to another state Calender	Parolee/Mandatory your compact cases returned as
-------	--	---	---	--

	12/31/01	12/31/01	2001	violator Calender 2001
Alabama	567	UK	UK	UK
Alaska	350(1)	250(1)	UK	UK
Arkansas	937	338	319	27
California	1,734	1,405	274	170
Colorado	1283(2)	308	UK	UK
Connecticut	59	175	50	1
Florida (3)	391	1,422	UK	113
Georgia	1,236	561	297	43
Hawaii	185	44	31	12
Idaho	228	94	104	25
Illinois	2200	840	1888	78
Indiana	324	736	118	134
Kansas	1,029	985	1,028	257
Kentucky	979	421	UK	UK
Louisiana	77	463	33	13
Maine	7	90	UK	0
Maryland	513	467	UK	56
Mass (1)	690	362	75	UK
Michigan	305	647	118	UK
Minnesota	161	463	104	23
Missouri	1092	1063	449	54
Montana	99	81	103	11
Nebraska	54	148	39	8
New Hamp.	200	UK	75	45
New Jersey	473	277	490	355
New York	1,444	656	372	UK
N. Carolina	92	735	14	3
North Dak.	65	0	30(1)	4(1)

Ohio	1,792	2,879	199	UK
Oregon	1,055	1,001	UK	UK
Penn	2,302	2,002		42
Rhode Is	57	73	29	UK
S. Dakota	294	31	138	
Tennessee	473	531	74	42
Texas	3,463	1,896	516	552
Utah	176	103	67	51
Washington	14(4)	UK	2(4)	UK
West Virg.	168	155	72	14
Wisconsin	490	233(1)	UK	UK
Wyoming	124	83	61	UK

Not included are: Arizona, Iowa, Mississippi, Nevada, New Mexico, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Vermont, Virginia

(1) Estimate

(2) Includes deportations

(3) Fiscal year

(4) Only parolees

Board Staffing & Budget 2001

TABLE VII

State	# of Staff under Parole Bd 2000	Parole Boards Budget for FY 2001
Alabama		\$20,140,562
Alaska	5	\$500,000
Arizona	17	\$1,393,000
Arkansas	16	\$1,079,577
California	230	\$31,837,000
Colorado	5	\$1,028,749
Connecticut	35	\$9,926,000

Delaware	6	\$375,000
Florida	186	\$10,270,877
Georgia	345	\$51,543,432
Hawaii	1	\$196,355
Idaho		\$1,200,000
Illinois		\$1,623,300
Indiana	3	\$500,000
Iowa	18	\$1,100,000
Kansas	4	\$531,567
Kentucky	12	\$1,173,000
Louisiana	8	\$594,343
Maine		none
Maryland	73	\$3,900,000
Mass.	137	\$14,471,389
Michigan	28	\$2,133,000
Minnesota	NA	\$881,000
Missouri	545	\$82,493,997
Montana	8	\$453,000
Nebraska	55	\$632,483
Nevada	8	\$1,115,374
New Hamp.	4	\$130,000
New Jersey	193	\$12,001,000
New Mexico		\$359,800
New York	13	146307000
N. Carolina	33	\$1.700,000
North Dak.	0	\$417,641
Ohio	78	
Oklahoma	41	
Oregon	13	\$1,600,000
Penn	507	\$115,296,000

Rhode Is	10	\$852,501
S. Dakota	5	\$500,000
Tennessee	94	\$55,435,200
Texas	204	\$9,390,603
Utah	40	\$2,600,000
Vermont	3	
Virginia	4	
Washington	6	\$951,628
West Virg.	5	\$575,000
Wisconsin	11	
Wyoming	4	\$259,000
Nat Bd. CN	225	\$35,000,000CN
Ontario	255	\$4,160,200CN
US Parole Bd	85	\$9,876,000
US Army	7	
Quebec	22	\$2,700,000CN
US Air Force	2	
Puerto Rico		\$3,354,000