

Board of Parole & Post-Prison Supervision

2009 - 2011 Biennium

Agency Number 255

Detail of 30% Reduction to 2009-11 Essential Budget Level

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Priority (ranked with highest priority first)	Dept. Initials	Prgm. or Activity Initials	Program Unit/Activity Description	GF	LF	NL-OF	OF	FF	NL-FF	TOTAL FUNDS	Pos.	FTE	Impact of Reduction on Services and Outcomes	
Dept	Prgm/ Div	BOPPPS												
			Zero AG inflation rate (down from 23%) (cuts 4.89% of agency EBL)	\$193,446						\$ 193,446				Eliminates inflation factor of 23% from 2007-09 LAB; if inflation factor is preserved in 2009-11 LAB, will result in forced reduced usage of AG services as described below.
			Reduce AG usage for responses, appeals and General Counsel advice (cuts 4.62% of agency EBL, cumulative cuts = 9.51%)	\$182,685						\$ 182,685				* Reduction in use of AG services. Not statutorily required to respond to judicial reviews of Board actions filed in Oregon's Appellate Courts by inmates and offenders. Not likely a cost savings to the system. System forced to rule without full information. Inmates and offenders may be granted relief by the courts that would otherwise be denied. These decisions do not stand alone; body of case law may have long-range ramifications on public safety. Reduces legal advice to Board on operational and policy matters.
			Reduce number of Board-ordered psychological evaluations by 26% (cuts 0.49% of agency EBL, cumulative cuts = 10.00%)	\$19,580						\$ 19,580				Eliminates Board practice of ordering a second psychological examination for certain inmates, now used to help to verify that the underlying psychological condition is in partial or full remission. Reduces amount of information before the Board when making release decisions.
			Further reduce AG usage for responses, appeals and General Counsel advice (cuts 5.00% of agency EBL, cumulative cuts = 15%)	\$197,855						\$ 197,855				Further cuts in AG usage, see * above.

			Lay off and hold vacant 1 FTE position that provides release plan and conditions of supervision support for inmates leaving prison; cuts all reception-related functions for the Board (cuts 2.74% of agency EBL, cumulative cuts = 17.74%)	\$108,543					\$ 108,543	1	1.00	Reduces detail in release plans and orders of supervision for offenders releasing from prison. Already, DOC and the Board are focusing less attention on lower-risk offenders to enable increased emphasis on the transition of higher-risk offenders. Cuts would further reduce the time spent on release plans and conditions of supervision, requiring that most offenders receive only general conditions. Shifts workload to community corrections in that supervising officers in the community have greater responsibility to identify and enforce specific conditions needed for each individual offender on his or her caseload. The Board also would lose all reception functions, including answering telephone calls and general e-mails that come into the Board. Shifts workload to other positions, leaves general questions unanswered, and reduces agency responsiveness.
			Further reduce AG usage for responses, appeals and General Counsel advice (cuts 2.26% of agency EBL, cumulative cuts = 20%)	\$89,312					\$ 89,312			Further cuts in AG usage, see * above.
			Lay off and hold vacant half of Board's only information systems position supporting vital computer services and database (cuts 2.30% of agency EBL, cumulative cuts = 22.30%)	\$90,816					\$ 90,816	1	0.50	Reduce by 50% support for the Board's fragile PBMS computer system/database that is used to schedule parole hearings, track registered victims, generate Board Action Forms, and share information with the Department of Corrections Information System (CIS). Risk of system crashing. Also reduces computer support and training to Board staff, reducing efficiency. Shifts reporting workload to executive director.
			Further reduce AG usage for responses, appeals and General Counsel advice (cuts 1.38% of agency EBL, cumulative cuts = 23.67%)	\$54,533					\$ 54,533			Further cuts in AG usage, see * above.
			Lay off and hold vacant .5 FTE position issuing and processing Parole Board warrants (cuts 1.33% of agency EBL, cumulative cuts = 25%)	\$52,506					\$ 52,506	1	0.50	Reduce warrants issued by 68%. The Board would issue warrant for only the most-serious absconding felons that call for nationwide warrants, reducing supervising officers' ability to hold offenders on supervision accountable for their actions. The majority of absconding felons on supervision would not have warrants for their arrest. The Board would not respond to requests to verify warrants from the Social Security Administration to determine denial of SSI benefits for certain individuals with open warrants for arrest.
			Further reduce AG usage for responses, appeals and General Counsel advice (cuts 0.67% of agency EBL, cumulative cuts = 25.67%)	\$26,635					\$ 26,635			Further cuts in AG usage, see * above. At this point, the Board is waiving appearance in the Court of Appeals for all but the most-serious cases. Preserves primarily AG costs for defending Supreme Court and mandamus cases.

			Lay off and hold vacant .5 FTE position processing sanctions and revocations for offenders on supervision. (cuts 1.42% of agency EBL, cumulative cuts = 27.09%)	\$56,209					\$ 56,209	1	0.50	Reduces the scope of sanctions that the Board would review and reduce our overall work with public safety partners in this arena by half. Community Corrections agencies would have a lower range of sanctions with which to hold offenders accountable, likely reducing offenders' compliance with the expectations of the supervising officer.
			Lay off and hold vacant 1 FTE position providing victim services (cuts 2.65% of agency EBL, cumulative cuts = 29.75%)	\$105,012					\$ 105,012	1	0.50	Preserves victim registration and mail notification services. Eliminates all other services now provided to victims of crime. Victims would be referred to other resources at the Department of Justice or their District Attorney/Community Corrections crime victims' services resources. This would revert the Board to its practices of 20 years ago: victims services would no longer have a dedicated staff person to respond to questions in calls and e-mails. Victims would not be escorted to and accompanied in parole hearings, would not receive assistance in preparing or delivering statements to the Board, and would not receive safety planning assistance.
			Reduce by half the number of Predatory Sex Offender evaluations and designations made by the Board (cuts 0.25% of agency EBL, cumulative cuts = 30%)	\$10,000					\$ 10,000			Cut by 50% the number of Predatory Sex Offender (PSO)/Sexually Violent Dangerous Offender (SVDO) designation evaluations and hearings: Eliminates evaluations by contract providers; the Board would not hold hearings on approximately 25 offenders in the 2009-11 biennium. May shift costs to community corrections for making designations.
				\$1,187,132			-	-	\$ 1,187,132	5	3.00	

2009-11 EBL		\$3,957,105
	5%	\$197,855
	10%	\$395,711
	15%	\$593,566
	20%	\$791,421
	25%	\$989,276
	30%	\$1,187,132

Since 1989 the number of inmates in DOC custody has grown from approximately 4,500 to more than 13,500 today; the number of offenders on post-prison supervision has increased from 2,000 to 14,000, all under the Board's authority for setting conditions of supervision, sanctions and revocations. During the same time period, the Board's staffing levels dropped from 24 FTE to the 15 FTE of today. Any cuts to Board staffing levels must be accompanied by reductions in workload.

The Board's budget is spent primarily on three categories: 1) Attorney General Services (Appellate Division, General Counsel, and Business Services); 2) Professional Services (contracted inmate psychological and predatory sex offender examinations, interpreters and transcripts); and 3) Staffing costs for 15 FTE (three full-time Board members, one executive director and 11 support staff).

Cuts of the magnitude in this reduction plan are difficult and were not proposed without significant analysis. We understand that preserving core Board of Parole and Post-Prison Supervision functions mandated by the Constitution and statute means cuts to activities that are vital components of the public safety system. As with other agencies' proposals, these cuts may result in reduced public safety, increased recidivism, and significant cost shifts to other agencies. The Board's proposals for cuts to the 30 percent level are meant to put temporary moratoriums on non-mandated activities. The intent is to the extent possible to preserve staff positions and infrastructure in key public safety areas in anticipation of future restoration of funding for these activities.