Justice Reinvestment Initiative (JRI) State Data Tracker

*Introductory text (same for all states):* Justice reinvestment is a data-driven approach to criminal justice reform designed to examine and address correctional cost and population drivers to generate cost savings that can be reinvested in high-performing public safety strategies. The JRI state data tracker provides information on system-level indicators including prison, probation, and parole populations and overall state savings and reinvestment.  While these indicators track trends on key JRI objectives, accurate interpretation requires careful consideration of contextual factors; changes in these measures are impacted by a wide range of policies and practices that extend beyond the reforms passed during JRI engagement.

State Name: Arkansas

JRI Legislation Year: 2011

*Brief overview:* In 2011, Arkansas enacted justice reinvestment reform through Act 570 which, among other things, recalibrated penalties for some drug and property offenses, improved the parole release process, mandated electronic monitoring for certain individuals, and required the use of evidence-based practices in community supervision including intermediate jail sanctions in lieu of revocation for violations. The state subsequently tightened policies related to parole revocation in 2013 in the wake of a high profile murder that involved an individual on parole. In 2015, Arkansas was approved to begin a second Phase I engagement with JRI and is currently working toward policy reform in the 2017 legislation sessions.

*Savings & Reinvestment*

Narrative: Arkansas made an upfront investment of $2.4 million to support transitional housing, behavioral health treatment and electronic monitoring but has not documented savings or additional investment to date.

*More about state:*

* Early efforts by the Department of Corrections, Department of Community Correction, and Parole Board substantially reduced the jail backlog of individuals awaiting transfer to prison to an average of 391 in fiscal year 2013.2 The number of individuals awaiting transfer to prison increased to 2,164 in fiscal year 20143 and again increased to 2,396 in fiscal year 20154.
* In response to the growth in the number of individuals awaiting transfer to prison and increases in the average length of stay for inmates, the Arkansas Department of Correction added an additional 2,782 beds between January 2010 and January 2016.

State Name: Delaware

JRI Legislation Year: 2012

*Brief overview:* In 2012, Delaware enacted justice reinvestment legislation through SB 226 that, among other things, expanded the use of risk and needs assessments at pretrial and several other points in the system, increased potential earned time credits for individuals in prison, and strengthened community supervision through expanded use of intermediate sanctions for violations.

*Savings & Reinvestment*

Savings/Averted Costs: $ 0

State JRI Investment\*\*: $ 0

Narrative: Delaware has not documented any savings or reinvestment to date.[[1]](#footnote-1)

*More about state:*

None

State Name: Georgia

JRI Legislation Year: 2012

*Brief overview:* In 2012, Georgia enacted justice reinvestment reform through H.B.1176 which implemented a number of sentencing reforms, required the use of evidence based supervision practices, and streamlined the transfer process from jail to prison.

*Savings & Reinvestment*

Narrative:

Georgia invested more than$17.5 million upfront into accountability courts, substance abuse programs and risk assessment tool development.

*More about state:*

* Georgia has significantly reduced the backlog of individuals awaiting transfer from jail to a prison or other facility. Prior to reform, the state spent more than $20 million annually on subsidies to local jails to house these people. In the last two combined years (FY2014-2015), Georgia spent only $46,480.[[2]](#footnote-2)
* In 2016, Georgia was approved for another round of JRI and is working toward the development of legislation that will be considered in the 2017 legislative session.

State Name: Hawaii

JRI Legislation Year: 2012

*Brief overview:* In 2012, Hawaii enacted justice reinvestment reform through SB 2776 and HB 2515 that, among other things, required the use of a risk assessment tool to guide pretrial and parole release decisions, focused probation supervision on those most likely to reoffend, capped length of stay in prison for certain parole revocations , and increased victim restitution payments.

*Savings & Reinvestment*

Narrative: Between fiscal years 2013 and 2015, Hawaii reinvested $10.6 million to expand treatment programming, hire additional staff and parole officers and support reentry efforts.

*More about state:*

* As a result of reform, average monthly victim restitution collections doubled between fiscal years 2012 ($1,478/month) and 2015 ($2,954/month).[[3]](#footnote-3) A total of$1.56 million in restitution was collected between fiscal years 2012 and 2015.

State Name: Idaho

JRI Legislation Year: 2014

*Brief overview:* In 2014, Idaho enacted justice reinvestment reform through SB 1357 which, among other things, enhanced community-based substance abuse treatment for those under supervision, established swift sanctions for violations for those on parole and probation, and required the parole board to create guidelines that resulted in less time served for those convicted of property or drug offenses.

*Savings & Reinvestment*

Narrative: Idaho invested nearly $6 million upfront to strengthen community supervision, expand community based treatment, and support ongoing performance measurement, and has documented savings of more than $17 million.[[4]](#footnote-4)

*More About Idaho*

None

State Name: Kansas

JRI Legislation Year: 2013

*Brief overview:* In 2013, Kansas enacted justice reinvestment reform through HB 2710 which, among other things, authorized intermediate sanctions for violations of probation and parole including short jail stays in lieu of revocation, shortened supervision time for certain individuals on probation, and improved access to community-based programming for those under supervision.

*Savings & Reinvestment*

Narrative: Kansas has documented savings of $2.5 million and invested $8 million in areas such as behavioral health services and community-based programming for those on probation.[[5]](#footnote-5)

\*\*Includes upfront investment and subsequent investment from savings or averted costs

*More about state:*

None.

State Name: Mississippi

JRI Legislation Year: 2014

*Brief overview:* In 2014, Mississippi enacted justice reinvestment reform through HB 585 which, among other things, expanded prison release options, enhanced post-release supervision practices, promoted alternatives to prison such as specialty courts, and revised property and drug statutes to preserve prison space for those convicted of violent crimes.

*Savings & Reinvestment*

Narrative: Through budget legislation that accompanied HB 585, the state reinvested $10.85 million into accountability courts for youth and adults convicted of drug offenses.[[6]](#footnote-6)

*More About:*

* In the first year following enactment, almost 5,000 people have been discharged from supervision early due to earned credits, saving more than 1 million supervision days.[[7]](#footnote-7)
* In addition, probation revocations fell 41 percent in the first year post-enactment.[[8]](#footnote-8)

State Name: Missouri

JRI Legislation Year: 2012

*Brief overview:* In 2012, Missouri enacted justice reinvestment reform through HB 1525 which strengthened community supervision by authorizing the use of intermediate sanctions in lieu of revocations and earned discharge credits for compliant behavior as well as capping the amount of time certain individuals on probation could spend in prison to 120 days, instead of revocation. The state did not seek federal support for implementation of HB 1525 policies.

*Savings & Reinvestment*

Narrative: Missouri has documented no savings thus far and has not made any JRI related investments.

*More about state:*

* An analysis by the Pew Charitable Trusts revealed that Missouri’s earned compliance credits policy reduced supervision terms for more than 36,000 individuals by an average of 14 months in the first three years with no harm to public safety.[[9]](#footnote-9) This contributed to an 18 percent decline in the state’s community supervision caseload.[[10]](#footnote-10)
* By capping the court ordered detention sanction for certain individuals on supervision to 120 days in lieu of revocation, Missouri has diverted 3,200 individuals from revocation and reduced the average stay for this subgroup by 11 months. The Missouri DOC has found that in the last three fiscal years the average reduction in the prison population due to this reform is approximately 750.[[11]](#footnote-11)

State Name: New Hampshire

JRI Legislation Year: 2010

*Brief overview:* In 2010, New Hampshire enacted justice reinvestment reform through SB 500 which, among other things, authorized intermediate sanctions for individuals on probation and parole, capped recommitment at 90 days for individuals revoked to prison on a technical violation, and mandated or created presumptive parole for certain individuals. In 2011, New Hampshire passed SB 52 which modified or repealed policies in SB 500.

*Savings & Reinvestment*

Narrative: New Hampshire has not documented any savings, nor made any reinvestments.

*More about state:*

None.

State Name: North Carolina

JRI Legislation Year: 2011

*Brief overview:* In 2011, North Carolina enacted justice reinvestment reform through HB 642 that, among other things, implemented a new treatment program for individuals under supervision, modified sentencing options, and transformed the probation and parole system.

*Savings & Reinvestment*

Narrative: North Carolina has saved nearly $165 million and invested more than $46 million in efforts to strengthen community supervision.[[12]](#footnote-12)

*More about state:*

* Since the passage of HB 642, North Carolina has closed 11 prisons and reduced the overall operating budget.[[13]](#footnote-13)
* Between fiscal years 2011 and 2015, annual admissions to prison for probation revocations dropped 65 percent.[[14]](#footnote-14)
* Separate from the parole and probation populations, North Carolina’s post-release supervision population was 10,355 on June 30, 2015, a 357 percent increase from the 2010 population of 2,268.[[15]](#footnote-15)

State Name: Ohio

JRI Legislation Year: 2011

*Brief overview:* In 2011, Ohio enacted comprehensive justice reinvestment reform through HB 86 which, among other things, expanded eligibility for pretrial diversion, implemented a number of sentencing reforms, increased the amount of earned time people can earn off of their prison sentences, and strengthened probation supervision.

*Savings & Reinvestment*

Narrative: Ohio has yet to document any savings but they have invested more than $22 million in grants to support programs that reduce probation violations between 2012 and 2015. [[16]](#footnote-16)

*More about state:*

* Ohio expects to award an additional $21.3 million in Probation Improvement and Incentive funds in 2016 and 2017.[[17]](#footnote-17)

State Name: Oklahoma

JRI Legislation Year: 2012

*Brief overview:* In 2012, Oklahoma enacted justice reinvestment reform through HB 3052 which, among other things, required the use of a pre-sentence risk assessment to inform and expedite sentencing and access to programming, decreased penalties for some subsequent drug offenses, mandated post-release supervision for all individuals convicted of a felony offense, created alternatives to prison revocation for supervision violations, and established a grant program to support local law enforcement.

*Savings & Reinvestment*

Savings/Averted Costs: $0

State JRI Investment\*\*: $6,933,539

Narrative: Oklahoma has not documented savings to date but the state has invested nearly $7 million in a law enforcement grant program, a felony jail screen and probation improvements. [[18]](#footnote-18)

*More about state:*

* In 2015, Oklahoma was approved to begin a second Phase I engagement with JRI and is currently working toward policy reform in the 2017 legislation sessions.

State Name: Oregon

JRI Legislation Year: 2013

*Brief overview:* In 2013, Oregon enacted justice reinvestment reform through HB 3194 that, among other things, expanded presumptive probation and effectively removed mandatory minimum sentences for certain offenses, reduced presumptive prison sentence length for certain offenses, created an incentive grant program to counties, strengthened community supervision practices, and allows earned discharge from probation supervision.

*Savings & Reinvestment*

Narrative: Oregon has averted more than $18 million and invested nearly $58 million in public safety programs to support community corrections, county jails, victim services, drug courts, and state police.

\*\*Includes upfront investment and subsequent investment from savings or averted costs

*More about state:*

* As part of JRI implementation, the state created the [Oregon Knowledge Bank](http://okb.oregon.gov/), a clearinghouse for state criminal justice programs and research about Oregon-based efforts.
* Driven by its JRI implementation Oregon has also developed interactive data dashboards to provide policy makers with up-to-date information and created Regional Implementation Councils which meet quarterly to facilitate implementation and share data at the regional level.[[19]](#footnote-19)

State Name: South Carolina

JRI Legislation Year: 2010

*Brief overview:* In 2010, South Carolina enacted justice reinvestment reform through SB 1154 which, among other things, restructured penalties for certain drug and property offenses, expanded eligibility for probation and parole, increased the amount of good time individuals can earn in prison, and strengthened community supervision by mandating post-release supervision for all individuals, authorizing earned discharge, and enhancing administrative sanctions in response to supervision violations.

*Savings & Reinvestment*

Narrative: South Carolina has saved nearly $25 million between fiscal years 2010 and 2015, including $6,186,810 in fiscal year 2015 alone.

*More about state:*

* An evaluation by researchers at the Clemson Institute for Economic and Community Development found that SB 1154 reforms have contributed to the creation of 982 new jobs and a $37 million increase in the state’s gross product.[[20]](#footnote-20)
* The South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole, and Pardon Services reported a 46 percent increase in the use of administrative sanctions for violations of supervision between fiscal years 2010 and 2015.[[21]](#footnote-21) Over the same period, the state saw a 46 percent decrease in the number of people revoked to prison for a supervision violation and a 36 percent decrease in the number of individuals revoked for a new crime.[[22]](#footnote-22)

State Name: South Dakota

JRI Legislation Year: 2013

*Brief overview:* In 2013, South Dakota enacted justice reinvestment legislation that, among other things, shortened prison sentences and expanded presumptive probation for certain nonviolent crimes, authorized earned discharge from community supervision, and required the use of evidence based practices in probation and parole including the use of graduated responses to violations.

*Savings & Reinvestment*

Narrative: South Dakota has averted nearly $41 million and allocated more than $9 million to fund training, pilot supervision programs, and expand problem solving courts and treatment programming and nearly $850,000 to local counties to offset costs incurred to house individuals who violate the terms of their probation supervision.[[23]](#footnote-23)

\*\*Includes upfront investment and subsequent investment from savings or averted costs

*More about state:*

* An Urban Institute analysis published in 2016 documented that the probation placement rate for offenses eligible for presumptive probation increased in the first two years of implementation and the average sentence length for drug possession and ingestion was cut in half.[[24]](#footnote-24)

State Name: West Virginia

JRI Legislation Year: 2013

*Brief overview:* In 2013, West Virginia enacted justice reinvestment legislation through SB 371 which, among other things, required the use of a pretrial risk assessment and implemented a number of community corrections reforms including requiring supervision agencies to use risk assessments, authorizing the use of administrative sanctions for probation and parole violations, and mandating post-release supervision for people convicted of violent felony offenses.

*Savings & Reinvestment*

Narrative: West Virginia has saved an estimated $24.9 million and appropriated $11.6 million between fiscal years 2014 and 2017, almost all of which supported expanded substance abuse treatment services.

*More about state:*

None
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