

# Parole Board Survey 2003

This report for 2003 has current data as of 12/31/03 and calendar 2003. We have information from 52 boards: 44 states, U.S. Parole Commission, National Board of Canada, U.S. Air Force, and the Provincial Boards of British Columbia, Ontario, and Quebec, the Parole Board of England and Wales and the Parole Board of the Virgin Islands. Information from past surveys can be found on our web site.

## **Does The Parole Board Have Discretion In Parole Release?**

This year we asked that the statement we had included in past reports regarding discretion be reviewed to determine if it accurately stated the current law in their jurisdiction. Therefore the information in this report is current for 2002. We have indicated by yes, meaning all most 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 a number of old code cases, but little if any discretion with individuals who committed a crime after a set date. No means there is little discretion or parole has been totally abolished. However the board may still have discretionary authority over other areas of parole, setting conditions on mandatory releases to supervision, well as dealing with their revocations. Seven Boards report changes in their discretionary authority. Where this had occurred the changes from last years survey will be underlined.

ALABAMA - YES - Comment: The Board cannot parole on life w/o parole.

ALASKA – YES - Comment: Special medical parole legislation opened up the requisites for eligibility; inmates need not be as critically ill as previously required. (See appendix for statute)

ARIZONA - YES, VERY LIMITED - Comment: Only have 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 - YES, VERY LIMITED - Comment: Only had 10 paroled in 1997, 12 in 2000 and in 2001.

COLORADO - YES - Comment: Mandatory parole periods (up to 5 years) accept certain sex offenders who committed their crime after 11/1/98 who have lifetime supervision. Mandatory parole applies to all inmates subsequent to 1993, except sex offenders who are discretionary. Legislation imposed limitations on the placement options and revocation time for certain non-violent offenders whose parole is revoked for technical violations.

CONNECTICUT - YES - Comment: Inmates with sentences exceeding two years who have been convicted of non-capital felonies are eligible for parole. Legislation in 2004 created a new

board of parole & pardons and gave the chairperson the authority to release persons up to 18 months prior to the release date established by the board of parole.

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 - Limited - Comment: A 1994 law mandated a minimum 10 year prison sentence on first conviction for anyone convicted of the 7 most violent crimes. There is no parole for this group. The second conviction of this type is a life sentence without parole. All others are eligible for parole. Felony offenders convicted of nay fourth felony are not eligible for parole.

HAWAII - YES - Comment: Court does impose mandatory minimum sentences at their discretion for repeat offenders and those crimes which under statute have mandatory minimum sentences attached to the conviction.

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: Discretionary parole was abolished in 1977, but still have parole supervision. Board may grant parole to offenders for crimes committed prior to 10/1/77 and re-parole those who fall within this guideline.

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 forms of early parole consideration except for medical paroles. Final discharges from parole are no longer issued prior to reaching maximum expiration date of

sentence. Parole consideration for defined violent offenders was increased from 50% to 85%. Life without parole for capital offenses. Sex offenders can not be paroled until they have completed treatment. No person who commits a certain specified offenses who was armed or wore body armor can not be paroled.

LOUISIANA - YES - Comment: All crimes against 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 parole only 1 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: There is not a parole board in the traditional model; however they do have a Commissioner's Advisory Panel for the Review of Life-Sentenced offenders (discretionary releases). The Department of Corrections also has a Hearing and Release Unit that coordinates the lifer review process; is responsible for all administrative hearings and reviews to which inmates and released offenders are entitled, including disciplinary hearings and release revocations; and approves offender release plans.

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 are no longer eligible for parole. Legislation provided authority to the Courts to grant either probation or parole for certain offenses within 120 days of confinement.

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 ½ of their minimum term. No such reduction of sentence shall be applied to any term imposing a mandatory minimum. A parolee whose parole has been revoked shall be considered by the Board for reparole at any time in the same manner as any other committed offender eligible for parole. Every commitment offender sentenced to consecutive terms, whether received at the same time

or at any time during the original sentence, shall be eligible for parole when the offender has severed one-half the minimum term.

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

NORTH CAROLINA - YES - VERY LIMITED - Comment: Only on cases prior to 4/10/94.

NORTH DAKOTA - YES

NEW HAMPSHIRE - YES

NEW MEXICO - YES - WITH LIMITS

NEW JERSEY - YES - Comment: All inmates are eligible after serving 1/3 of their sentence except life without parole for 1st degree murder, and for habitual offenders, whereby the sentencing judge can set parole eligibility.

NEW YORK -YES - NEW LIMITS - 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. A recent 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.

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 "bad time" for institutional rule infractions that would be a criminal offense outside prison. "Bad 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 1/4 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 reoffense and carries out community notification with local police.

SOUTH CAROLINA - YES, SOME LIMITS - 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.

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

TEXAS -YES - Comment: The board has authority over who is released on parole or discretionary mandatory supervision, conditions of supervision, and revocation. They also make executive clemency recommendation to the Governor.

UTAH - YES - Comment: Life without parole and death sentences that are 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.

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 and sentencing law that took effect in January of 2000 eliminated parole for individuals arrested after that date. Anyone sentenced to less than one year is eligible. The Board still has authority over old code cases.

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

The Board was authorized to restore voting rights to one-time non-violent offenders after 5 years of being discharged from their sentence.

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 that was 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 - Comment: The Army now has a life without parole sentence. Congress also increased the time served on a regular life sentence prior to clemency or parole consideration from 5 years for initial clemency to 10 years and from 10 years to 20 years for initial parole consideration.

U.S. AIR FORCE - YES

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

ENGLAND & WALES – YES, LIMITED - Comment – The new Criminal Justice Act of 2003 has abolished parole for determinate sentenced offenders. The still has authority over lifers and “dangerous offenders.

VIRGIN ISLANDS – YES

## **Summary**

Thirty seven of the boards surveyed report having release discretion for most of their prison population. Twenty five of these are U. S. state boards. Six boards have discretion but with limits. The remaining boards either had been abolished or were operating under what one might call a sun-down provision, in that they had discretion over a small or diminishing parole eligible population. Many of these boards that have little to no releasing authority over the majority of the population still have responsibility for other parole functions like: reviewing release plans, setting parole conditions, approving good time, and handling revocations for conditional released paroles.

Boards Use of Video Conferencing

We asked if and in what way boards used video conferencing? Video conferencing for parole consideration hearings was used by 22 boards (CA, CO, CT, HI, IA, ID, KS, KY, NE, ND, NH, NJ, NY, NV, MA, MD, MI, MT, OH, OR, WI, and WV). RI uses it for out state cases only and TN has a pilot project at one institution. Using video conferencing for revocation hearings by boards is less frequent with it being used by 17 boards (AR, AZ, CT, IA, ID, KS, KY, MA, MD, MI, MT, ND, NH, NJ, OH, OR AND WV). 12 Boards use video conferencing for hearings with victims (CA, CO, CT, IA, KY, MA, MT, ND, NV, OH, OR and WI). ILLINOIS uses it for good time credit hearings. IOWA and NEVADA use video conferencing for board meetings and training

## **Medical Release Policy**

We asked if the boards had a medical release policy. It was reported that 18 boards did not have a written policy regarding medical release. We looked at those boards that had an administrative policy and those where the medical release procedures were set out in statute. Twenty one Boards had a written policy. We have included some of these in the appendage of this report. There were 13 boards where the procedure was controlled by statute. We have included some of these in the appendage of this report.

## **Use of Parole Guidelines and Assessment Instruments for Parole Decision Making as Well as Assessing Risk of Sex Offenders**

We asked if the board had a formal written set of parole guidelines or assessment instrument. Some boards submitted their policy regarding release and decision making instead of a standardized instrument. These were not counted as having either a written set of parole guidelines or assessment instrument. There were 22 boards that used either a guideline or assessment instrument, some using both. The majority of the boards (30) did not use either. We included in the appendage some examples of guidelines and risk instruments in use by parole boards. We also asked boards if they were using an assessment instrument to determine risk for sex offenders. Only 16 boards were using any type of assessment instrument that related to sex offender. All but one was using only one instrument. Washington's board uses three different assessments to determine risk. We have included in the appendage examples of both guidelines and risk instruments parole board are using.

## **Part-Time Boards Per Diem**

We asked what types of functions were allowed in consideration of part-time boards per diem pay? All counted time in conducting hearings. Slightly fewer allowed travel time as counting and less than half counted the time it would take to review a case prior to the hearing. All paid for travel expenses. The pay for per diem can be seen in table IV.

## **What Community Resources are Most Needed in a Good Release Plan**

When we asked boards what resources were needed to form a good release plan, housing was overwhelmingly the number one answer. Other needed resources which were listed numerous times: were substance abuse treatment, mental health treatment, funds to support community programs, employment placement, and sex offender treatment. Listed less frequently were health care services, and the availability of driver's license and social security cards. We asked a very similar question in our 2000 survey. Like the current survey housing was the problem. In the 2000 survey the National Parole Board of Canada made this statement: "more effort and resources be expended to ensure that programs offered in the institution can be continued in the community. It was found that in some particularly rural areas, no programs were offered and that in other areas the ability to deliver the programs falls short of the need."

## **Parole Board Sensitivity to Overcrowding**

We asked if boards had a responsibility to be sensitive to overcrowding. Fifty seven percent of the Boards felt they did not need to be sensitive to overcrowding. A few boards operate under a statute that sets out their role in assisting in the overcrowding problem. Boards feel that public safety and parolee risk overshadow other considerations. We asked this same question in our first survey in 1997 and received a very similar response.

## **What does it Take to Operate at the Highest Professional Level?**

We asked what were the most important policies/standards/practices that need to be in place for a board to operate at the highest professional level. There were five named by a high majority of the boards: Assure that there is a non-partisan, independent, and professionally qualified and committed parole board that is chosen on merit and not political affiliation; boards operate under an agreed to code of ethics; boards have a policy and procedure manual; boards uses standardized guidelines and assessment instrument in their decision making; and finally that the boards have ongoing training.

## **Budgets**

We asked boards to tell us if their fiscal year budget for 02/03 increased or decreased. Twenty one boards (AL, CO, CT, DE, FL, KY, LA, MD, MI, NE, NJ, NY, OR, PA, TN, VA, WV, WI, U.S. BOARD, CANADA NATIONAL BOARD, BRITISH COLUMBIA) showed an increase for fiscal 02/03. Nineteen boards (AZ, AR, CA, GA, ID, IL, IA, KS, MA, MO, MT, NV, NM, NC, OH, OK, TX, UT, and VT) showed a decrease for fiscal 02/03. Seven (AK, HI, IN, NH, RI, DS, WA) had no change.

## **New Duties and Tasks**



We asked boards if any new duties or tasks had been added to their area of responsibility, either administratively or statutorily since the 2002 survey. For added duties in past reports visit the other parole surveys on the web site [www.apaintl.org](http://www.apaintl.org) The following are the responses from the 2003 survey:

CONNECTICUT – Board of Parole now has the responsibility for considering pardons.

MARYLAND – Two commissioner panels now conduct open parole hearings formerly conducted by hearing officers.

MISSOURI – Board is now a part of the Sentencing Advisory Committee that will include Board guidelines along with sentencing recommendations.

NEW JERSEY – The Board provides courtesy community supervision on behalf of the court for offenders who are conditionally discharged by the court from the Special Treatment Unit which houses offenders who are deemed to be sexually violent predators.

NORTH DAKOTA – The Board has established “initial review” in order to start release planning early and match resources to the reentry plan.

RHODE ISLAND – The Board has the responsibility of verification of addresses of registered sex offenders quarterly.

VIRGINIA – The Board has additional duty of including victim input as part of the parole process.

WYOMING – The Board is authorized to restore voting rights to one time non-violent offenders.

ONTARIO – The victim empowerment act allows victims to attend and make submissions at the parole hearing. Members of the public or media are allowed to attend hearings as observers.

ENGLAND & WALES – The new Criminal Justice Act will abolish parole for determinate sentenced offenders. The Board will concentrate on lifers and dangerous offenders. The Act has also changed the Boards role in regard to recalls.

AIR FORCE – The Air Force Board now has the authority to place offenders who they deny parole on Mandatory Supervised Release.

## **Prison, Population, Releases & Supervision**

[Table I](#) gives the prison population as of 12/31/03. 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 2003. There are gaps and unknowns in the reported data. This mostly is due to the parole boards not having the data available to them and the agencies that have the data seem reluctant to supply it. This makes it

impossible to give total numbers. It is impossible to do comparisons due the wide range of differences in state parole boards.

## **Violation Hearings, Revocations & Successful Discharge**

[Table II](#) lists the number of violation hearings held by paroling authorities, number of discretionary parolees revoked for new crimes and conditions violations, and those discretionary parolees who were successfully discharged during calendar 2003. Violation hearings still make up a big part of a paroling authorities workload. There are gaps and unknowns in the data due to the parole boards not having the numbers available and the agencies that have data seem reluctant to supply it. You can get some impression of the trend in revocations and successful discharges by looking at the individual states. It is impossible to do comparisons due to a wide range of differences in state statutes.

## **Inmates Considered for Parole & Face to Face Hearings**

[Table III](#) looks at inmates that were considered for parole during 2003 and how many received a face to face hearing. Six Boards responding to the survey reported not having face to face hearings. See Table III for a break out of individual board's workload. Six boards only parole on a face to face hearing. The majority of boards consider parole release either by hearing or file review. However even in these states there is a high percentage of the cases that have a face to face hearing. One needs to look at the number of parole revocation hearings (Table II) that boards hold to get a real picture of their workload.

## **Parole Board Salaries**

We survey parole board's salaries every two years. Salaries were included in our 2001 survey. [Table IV](#) shows the salaries for both the chair and board members. Where there is a part-time board you will see the per diem rate.

## **Discretionary Releases for 1997 and 2003 Compared to Prison Population**

[Table V](#) compares the number of discretionary parole releases in 1997 and 2003 to the prison population in the state as of December 31, 1997 and 2003. There were 18 states where the data was available for the comparison. Five states percentage stayed the same, six states showed a decrease and seven showed an increase. Massachusetts showed the greatest percentage of increase (33%) followed by Pennsylvania (16%), and Missouri (11%). States where we found a decrease in percentage were Montana with (12%) followed by Georgia with (7%) and Arizona (5%).

## **Face to Face Hearings for 1997 & 2003**

There was data available for 1997 & 2003 from 23 states, U. S. Parole Commission and the National Parole Board of Canada. (Table VI). We compared these two years as to number of face to face hearings held by boards for parole consideration. Percentage ranged from an increase in Kentucky (367%) to a decrease of 473% in Arizona. Kentucky's increase is due to statute change that requires a face to face hearing. Arizona's decrease is due to abolishment of parole in that state. Illinois is included in the table for workload increase only as their hearings are more of an administrative nature and not parole consideration. Four other boards had decreases of over 100%: South Dakota, 216%, Kansas, 170%, Connecticut, 151%, and Ohio, 150%. Alaska was the only board that had an increase of over 100% at 203%. Eleven boards had increases in their hearing workload while the other 13 had decreases.

## **Violation Hearings Comparison for 1997 & 2003**

There was data available for 1997 & 2003 from 29 state boards, U. S. Parole Commission and National Parole Board of Canada. (Table VII) We compared these two years as to number of violation hearings held by the board. Percentage ranged from an increase of 5158% in Missouri to a decrease of 251% in Washington. The large increase in Missouri was due to a policy change that limited the use of wavier in violation case. Others with an increase of over 100% were Iowa, 502%, Oklahoma, 424%, Illinois, 141%, Arizona, 141%, South Dakota, 132%, New York, 114%, and Alaska, 112%. The Only state with an decrease of over 100% was North Carolina at 227%. Of the 31 boards 27 showed an increase in hearings. The following are subjects that can be found in earlier surveys:

## **Boards Arthority Over Good Time, Conditions, Supervision or Other Programs**

Information regarding this topic can be found in the 2002 survey on our web site.

## **STAFFING FOR PAROLE HEARINGS**

Information regarding this topic can be found in our 2002 survey on our web site.

## **Parole of Lifers**

Information regarding this topic can be found in our 2002 survey on our web site.

## **Parole Boards in Death Penalty Cases**

Information regarding this topic can be found in our 2002 survey on our web site.

## **Governor's Role in Parole Release**

Information regarding this topic can be found in our 2002 survey on our web site.

## **State's Open Meeting Law as The Relate to Parole Boards**

Information regarding this topic can be found in our 2001 survey on our web site.

## **Paroling Authorities and Chairs**

Information regarding this topic can be found in our 2001 on the web site [www.apaintl.org](http://www.apaintl.org)

## **Victims**

There is information regarding victims in the 2001 survey found on the web site [www.apaintl.org](http://www.apaintl.org)

## **Appointments, Terms, Structure, Salaries & Budgets**

We conduct a review of this topic every three year. The last survey was in 2001 and can be found on our web site [www.apaintl.org](http://www.apaintl.org). Salaries were updated in 2003. See table IV of this report.

## **Parole Conditions**

Information on this subject is in our 2000 survey and can be found on our web site [www.apaintl.org](http://www.apaintl.org)

## **Open Hearings and the Media**

Information on this subject is in our 2000 survey and can be found on our web site [www.apaintl.org](http://www.apaintl.org)

## **Parole Board Training**

Information on this subject is in our 2000 survey and can be found on our web site [www.apaintl.org](http://www.apaintl.org)

## **Sex Offender Registration/Notification & Civil Commitment**

Information on this subject is in our 2000 survey and can be found on our web site [www.apaintl.org](http://www.apaintl.org)

## **Court TV and Other TV Shows**

Information on this subject is in our 2000 survey and can be found on our web site [www.apaintl.org](http://www.apaintl.org)

## What community Resources are Most Lacking in Regard to Placement of Paroles Back in the Community?

Information on this subject is in our 2000 survey and can be found on our web site [www.apaintl.org](http://www.apaintl.org)

## Interstate Compact Cases

Information on this subject is in our 2000 and 2001 survey and can be found on our web site [www.apaintl.org](http://www.apaintl.org)

## Juvenile Offender Parole Boards

Information on this subject is in our 2001 survey and can be found on our web site [www.apaintl.org](http://www.apaintl.org)

Prison Pop, Releases & Supervision

TABLE I						
STATES	12/31/2003	Releases 03	Rel. 03	Rel. 03	Under sup. 12/31/03	Under sup. 12/31/03
Alabama	27,344	3,264	3,251(1)	3,797	6,875	UK(1)
Alaska	4,100	60	744	UK		956(2)
Arizona	31,258	358	UK	UK	UK	UK
Arkansas	13,109	3,682	UK	UK	UK	UK
California	161,538	27	117,710	0	0	113,727
Colorado	19,454	2,316	2,752	1,616	3,265	3,004
Connecticut	14,337	2,450	380	UK	2,218	381
Delaware						
Florida	77,316	82 (3)	4,415 (3)	16,542 (3)	1,395	3,565
Georgia	50,720	11,738	NA	5,366	22,743	NA
Hawaii	5,849	857	NA	117	2,344	NA
Idaho	5,111	1,175	NA	534	1,782	NA
Illinois	44,961	5	27,025	41,509	125	35,665

Indiana

Iowa	8,500	3,836(3)	1,079(3)	989(3)	3,292(3)	UK
------	-------	----------	----------	--------	----------	----

Kansas	9,046	499	3,898	1,302		5,612(2)
--------	-------	-----	-------	-------	--	----------

Kentucky	16,632	4,573	NA	3,683	6,358	NA
----------	--------	-------	----	-------	-------	----

Louisiana

Maine

Maryland	23,613	2,790	5,522 (3)	5,710 (3)	5,915	7,827
----------	--------	-------	-----------	-----------	-------	-------

Mass.	9,223	6,350	9	1,759	3,597	19
-------	-------	-------	---	-------	-------	----

Michigan	48,887	11,733	NA	NA	17,449	NA
----------	--------	--------	----	----	--------	----

Minnesota	7,509	1	4,730	920	20	3,000
-----------	-------	---	-------	-----	----	-------

Mississippi

Missouri	29,894	9,101	1,071	1,870	12,895	1,103
----------	--------	-------	-------	-------	--------	-------

Montana	3,201	541	1,228	233	815	6,228
---------	-------	-----	-------	-----	-----	-------

Nebraska	3,999	847	NA	1,646	641	NA
----------	-------	-----	----	-------	-----	----

Nevada	10,909	2,100	680	1,776		2,528 (2)
--------	--------	-------	-----	-------	--	-----------

New Hamp.	2,438	803	75	214	UK	UK
-----------	-------	-----	----	-----	----	----

New Jersey	27,350	7,480	NA	5,101	13,474	NA
------------	--------	-------	----	-------	--------	----

New Mexico	UK	15	UK	785	UK	UK
------------	----	----	----	-----	----	----

New York	65,196	15,937	8,475	2,821	40,900	13,433
----------	--------	--------	-------	-------	--------	--------

N. Carolina	33,911	1,189	29,040	15,083	2,177	1,269
-------------	--------	-------	--------	--------	-------	-------

N. Dakota	1,261	598	NA	NA	228	NA
-----------	-------	-----	----	----	-----	----

Ohio	44,350	4,966	8,537	10,888	6,580	10,903
------	--------	-------	-------	--------	-------	--------

Oklahoma	22,809	2,395	2,893	3,287		4,343(2)
----------	--------	-------	-------	-------	--	----------

Oregon	12,264	3	4,515	8	1,193	10,343
--------	--------	---	-------	---	-------	--------

Penn.	40,817	9,850	NA	3,271	25,766	NA
-------	--------	-------	----	-------	--------	----

Rhode Island	3,483	514	NA	UK	456	NA
--------------	-------	-----	----	----	-----	----

S. Carolina

S. Dakota	3,053	433	862	377		1,943(2)
-----------	-------	-----	-----	-----	--	----------

Tennessee	19,120	3,122	9	4,534	7,958	0
Texas	132,535	23,921	7,028	6,763	78,128	25,331
Utah						
Vermont	377	400	NA	250	797	NA
Virginia	30,928	576	1,175	1,976	2,189	3,613
Washington		35	NA	UK	117	NA
West Virginia	4,758	838	NA	442	UK	NA
Wisconsin	20,333	2,037	13,251	504		17,507(2)
Wyoming	1,872	418	NA	256	578	NA
<b>Other Boards</b>						
U.S. Parole Bd.	7,554(3)	2,174	633	UK		8,697(2)(3)
CA Parole Bd.	12,395	3,749	5,107	228	5,378	2,939
Quebec	3,728	1,210	5,500	NA	UK	UK
Eng & Wales	72,322	3,240(3)	45,000(3)	NA	3,700	UK
Virgin Islands	434	56	NA	160	56	NA
Brit Columbia	2,083	404(3)	16(3)	3,572		186(2)
Ontario	6,872	361 (3)	NA	847 (3)	UK	NA
U.S. Air Force	818	101	31	UK	145	3

UK -Unknown

(1) Court Release to probation

(2) Both Discretion & Other

(3) FY 02/03

Violation Hearings, Revocations & Successful Cases

**TABLE II**

STATE	Revocation Hearings	Discretion Rel. Revoked		Mandatory Revoked		Successfully Discharged	
		Cond. Viol.	New Crime	Cond. Viol.	New Crime	Discr. Rel.	Mand. Rel.
Alabama	890	228	349	NA	NA	1,171	NA
Alaska	811	31	3	340(1)		UK	UK
Arizona	2,654	2,109	128	UK	UK	UK	UK
Arkansas	881	2,628	83			UK	UK
California	43,599			82,646(1)		UK	40,388
Colorado	3,418(1)	2,192(1)	472(1)				2,155(1)
Connecticut	711	601(1)	110(1)	NA	NA		1,752(1)
Delaware							
Florida	68(2)	41(2)	27(2)	1,066(2)	547(2)	133(2)	2,992(2)
Georgia	546	1,727	1,548	NA	NA	5,658	NA
Hawaii	473	477	7	NA	NA	452	NA
Idaho	474	133	298	NA	NA	533	NA
Illinois	1,4462	1	0	6,306	4,105	3	19,066
Indiana							
Iowa	1,404	835	238	NA	NA	UK	NA
Kansas	980	2,448(1)	175(1)			99	1,302
Kentucky	2,018	1,973	UK	NA	NA	UK	UK
Louisiana							
Maine							
Maryland	3,707	345	199	632	558	1,321	2,764
Mass.	UK	UK	UK	UK	UK	4,432	0
Michigan	2,630	2,065	1643	NA	NA	UK	NA
Minnesota	2,076	NA	NA	1,657	197	0	UK
Mississippi							
Missouri	2,892	1,601	1,062	261	179	2,477	951
Montana	217	202	17	853	264	161	1375



Nebraska	242(2)	208(1)(2)		NA	NA	535	NA
Nevada	1,030	479	60	75	11		1,623 (1)
New Hamp.	385	254	81	NA	NA	UK	UK
New Jersey	2,379	2,885	190	13	2	5,051	NA
New Mexico	1,037	NA	NA	693	344	NA	653
New York	14,496	8,658(1)	2,129(1)				14,756(1)
N. Carolina	40	414(1)		312	102	1,658	974
N. Dakota	103	87	16	NA	NA	410	NA
Ohio	4,463	930	695	1,634	125	2,664	4,762
Oklahoma	688	138	250			369	
Oregon	798	63	132	96	507	282	2,293
Penn	6,637	3,556	1,463	NA	NA	4,864	NA
Rhode Is.	205	113	41	NA	NA	294	NA
S. Carolina							
S. Dakota	479	494(1)					483(1)
Tennessee	1,874	597	454	NA	NA	1,224	NA
Texas	30,598	993	5,850	1,048	2,665	14,563	7,627
Utah							
Vermont	170	39	80	NA	NA	1,224	NA
Virginia	817	UK	UK	UK	UK	UK	UK
Washington	37	15	0	NA	NA	25	NA
West Virg.	292	230	25	NA	NA	347	
Wisconsin	NA	423	66	742	140	3,258	15,892
Wyoming	112	71	33	NA	NA	200	NA

#### Other Boards

U.S. Parole Bd.	1,846	968(1)	715(1)			UK	UK
CA Parole Bd.	4,017	669	275	1,618	644	3,593	3,080
Quebec	486	451	35	NA	NA	705	NA

Eng & Wales	6,323	380(2)	265(2)	UK	UK	2,600(2)	UK
Virgin Islands	4	1	2	NA	NA	4	NA
Brit Columbia	242 (2)	137 (2)	47 (2)	5 (2)	0	223 (2)	10 (2)
Ontario	78 (2)	54 (2)	12 (2)	NA	NA	298 (2)	NA
U.S. Air Force	8	7	0	0	0	67	0
(1) Combine all releases							
(2) FY 02/03							

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

<b>TABLE III</b>		
State Inmates	Considered Face to Face	Hearings
Alabama	8,475	0
Alaska	871	582
Arizona	836	836
Arkansas	13,967	7,089
California	4,498	4,498
Colorado	10,553 (1)	0
Connecticut	2,034	1,079
Delaware		
Florida	1,657 (1)	0
Georgia	15,892	0
Hawaii	1,886	1,769
Idaho	1,941	1,303
Illinois	2,667	20,567
Indiana		
Iowa	8,703	2,174
Kansas	934	934

Kentucky	11,159	7,043
Louisiana		
Maine		
Maryland	9,543	9,054
Mass.	10,278	10,278
Michigan	3,327	22,280
Minnesota	NA	NA
Mississippi		
Missouri	11,765	10,542
Montana	1,278	885
Nebraska	4,255	1,047
Nevada	6,404	Unknown
New Hamp.	1,083	1,075
New Jersey	16,318	12,199
New Mexico	2,573	2,221
New York	29,388 combined	
N. Carolina	7,625	381
North Dak.	794	516
Ohio	18,550	8,466
Oklahoma	8,665	1,421
Oregon	348	348
Penn	1,038	19,038
Rhode Is	1,571	1,550
S. Carolina		
S. Dakota		
Tennessee	12,366	1,117
Texas	59,685	3,721
Utah		
Vermont	1,938	951
Virginia	7,134	0

Washington	179	179
West Virg.	2,411	2,411
Wisconsin	9,080	7,379
Wyoming	654	811
<b>Other Boards</b>		
U.S. Parole Bd.	6,285	2,924
CA Parole Bd.	5,185	3,101
Quebec	4,320	4,169
Eng & Wales	6,120(1)	1,018(1)
Virgin Islands	64	64
Brit Columbia	735(1)	984(1)
Ontario	295(1)	1,506(1)
U.S. Air Force	170	0

(1) FY 02/03

#### Parole Board Salaries

<b>TABLE IV</b>		
STATES	Chairs	Members
Alabama	\$77,336	\$76,336
Alaska	\$150 per day	\$150 per day
Arizona	\$60,000	\$45,000
Arkansas	\$80,476	\$72,046
California	\$106,000	\$99,693
Colorado	\$86,772	\$81,600
Connecticut	\$100,000	\$110 per day
Delaware		
Florida	\$86,754	\$81,600
Georgia	\$120,957	\$113,309
Hawaii	\$77,886	\$29.99 per hour
Idaho	\$150 per day	\$150 per day

Illinois	\$82,000	\$72,900
Indiana	\$104,368	\$101,930
Iowa	\$80,000	\$70,000
Kansas	\$104,368	\$101,930
Kentucky	\$71,098	\$70,230
Louisiana		
Maine		
Maryland	\$92,688	\$81,100
Mass.	\$94,590	\$75,147
Michigan	\$90,055	\$81,868
Minnesota	NA	NA
Mississippi		
Missouri	\$77,988	\$74,112
Montana	\$150 per day	\$150 per day
Nebraska	\$65,700	\$59,983
Nevada	\$81,710	\$64,887
New Hamp.	\$100 per day	\$100 per day
New Jersey	\$117,928	\$104,918
New Mexico	\$95 per day	\$95 per day
New York	\$120,000	\$101,600
N. Carolina	\$84,871	\$78,356
N. Dakota	\$75 per day	\$75 per day
Ohio	\$80,000	\$70,000
Oklahoma	\$24,000	\$22,800
Oregon	\$92,436	\$72,576
Penn.	\$105,252	\$99,776
Rhode Island	\$90,000	\$18,000 part time
S. Carolina		
S. Dakota	\$75 per day	\$75 per day
Tennessee	\$84,468	\$72,492

Texas	\$85,800	\$83,199
Utah		
Vermont	\$13,008 part time	\$80 per day
Virginia	\$100,227	\$93,262
Washington	\$77,598	\$45,418
West Virginia	\$45,000	\$45,000
Wisconsin	\$68,000	\$25-\$29 per hour
Wyoming	\$125 per day	\$125 per day
<b>Other Boards</b>		
U.S. Parole Bd.	\$136,900	\$128,200
CA Parole Bd.	US \$140,382	US \$78,342*
Quebec	US \$88,128	US \$71,242**
Eng & Wales	US \$96,310	US \$90,000
Virgin Islands	\$75 per day	\$75 per day
Brit Columbia	US \$79,200	US \$231 per day
Ontario	US \$81,321	US \$40,590
U.S. Air Force	\$120,000	\$100,000 \$130,000

Percentage of Discretionary Releases for 1997 and 2003  
Compared to Prison Population

<b>TABLE V</b>			
STATES	1997	2003	
Alabama	12%	12%	
Alaska	3%	1%	
Arizona	6%	1%	
Connecticut	7%	17%	
Georgia	30%	23%	
Hawaii	17%	15%	
Kentucky	16%	27%	
Mass.	35%	68%	
Michigan	29%	24%	

Missouri	19%	30%
Montana	29%	17%
Nebraska	22%	21%
Nevada	19%	19%
Ohio	7%	11%
Penn.	8%	24%
Rhode Island	16%	16%
S. Dakota	14%	14%
Wyoming	20%	22%

This table only includes those Boards where data was available for 1997 & 2003.

#### Percentage of Face to Face Hearings 1997 Compared to 2003

<b>TABLE VI</b>			
STATES	1997	2003	% of Change
Alaska	192	582	203%
Arizona	4,795	836	-473%
California	2,265	4,498	98%
Connecticut	2,708	1,079	-151%
Hawaii	1,931	1,769	-9%
Illinois	477	20,567	412%
Iowa	2,166	2,174	0%
Kansas	2,428	934	-170%
Kentucky	1,507	7,043	367%
Michigan	14,011	22,280	60%
Missouri	8,732	10,542	20%
Montana	934	885	-5%
N. Dakota	401	381	-5%
Ohio	21,185	8,466	-150%
Oklahoma	2,585	1,421	-81%
Oregon	373	348	-7%

Penn.	16,419	19,038	16%
Rhode Island	2,297	1,550	-48%
S. Dakota	1,634	516	-216%
Vermont	526	951	80%
Washington	279	179	-55%
West Virginia	1,373	2,411	75%
Wyoming	721	811	12%

**Other Boards**

U.S. Parole Bd.	2,331	2,924	25%
CA Parole Bd.	6,414	3,101	-106%

This table only includes those Boards where data was available for 1997 & 2003.

Percentage of Face to Face Hearings 1997 Compared to 2003

**TABLE VII**

STATES	1997	2003	% of Change
Alabama	573	890	55%
Alaska	245	811	112%
Arizona	1,100	2,654	141%
Connecticut	362	711	96%
Georgia	783	546	-46%
Hawaii	482	473	-2%
Illinois	6,040	14,462	141%
Iowa	233	1,404	502%
Kansas	1,918	980	-95%
Kentucky	1,502	2,018	34%
Michigan	3,152	2,630	-20%
Missouri	55	2,892	5158%
Montana	118	217	83%
Nevada	759	1,030	35%
New York	12,647	14,496	114%



N. Carolina	131	40	-227%
N. Dakota	48	103	114%
Ohio	3,077	4,463	45%
Oklahoma	74	388	424%
Oregon	1,125	797	-41%
Penn.	4,648	6,637	43%
Rhode Island	295	202	-43%
S. Dakota	214	497	132%
Tennessee	2,598	1,874	-38%
Texas	21,342	30,598	43%
Vermont	134	170	27%
Washington	130	37	-251%
West Virginia	209	292	40%
Wyoming	69	112	62%

**Other Boards**

U.S. Parole Bd.	1,393	1,846	32%
CA Parole Bd.	2,004	4,017	100%

This table only includes those Boards where data was available for 1997 & 2003.