

ANALYSIS

Telephone: (517) 373-5383

Fax: (517) 373-1986

Senate Bill 16 (as reported without amendment)

Sponsor: Senator John Proos

Committee: Michigan Competitiveness

CONTENT

The bill would enact the "Parole Sanction Certainty Act" to provide for the creation of a Parole Sanction Certainty Program, which would be a program using a set of established sanctions to supervise eligible offenders who had been placed on parole. The bill would do the following:

- -- Require the Department of Corrections (DOC) to adopt a system of sanctions for parole violations by offenders supervised under the Program.
- -- Require the sanctions to use evidence-based practices demonstrated to reduce recidivism and increase compliance with conditions of parole.
- -- Require the system to set forth a list of presumptive sanctions for the most common types of supervision violations, and to define positive reinforcements.
- -- Require the Department to implement the Program in the five counties where the most individuals convicted of criminal violations were sentenced to DOC incarceration.
- -- Require an individual to be informed of the conditions of parole sanction certainty supervision and to sign an agreement, before being placed on that supervision.
- -- Provide that a supervised individual who violated a condition of his or her parole sanction certainty supervision would be subject to 1) a confinement sanction (confinement for up to 30 days); 2) a nonconfinement sanction; or 3) parole revocation proceedings and possible incarceration.
- -- Provide that failure to comply with a sanction would constitute a violation of parole.
- -- Require the DOC to appoint an individual to review confinement sanctions recommended by agents, and to report to the House and Senate committees concerned with corrections.

Legislative Analyst: Suzanne Lowe

FISCAL IMPACT

The bill would have an indeterminate fiscal impact on State and local government. It costs the State an average of \$5,260 per year for each parolee supervised. Parole sanction certainty supervision would likely cost more, but it is unknown by how much. A pilot program was launched in November 2015 in targeted counties, but it is too soon to have data on the costs per parolee or parolee outcomes.

If fewer parolees were returned to prison as a result of the bill, there would be savings to the State from lower incarceration costs. For any decrease in prison intakes, in the short term, the marginal savings to State government would be approximately \$3,764 per prisoner per year. In the long term, if the reduced intake reduced the total prisoner population enough to allow the Department of Corrections to close a housing unit or an entire facility, the marginal savings to State government would be approximately \$34,550 per prisoner per year. The DOC would handle any additional reporting requirements within existing appropriations.

Date Completed: 1-27-17 Fiscal Analyst: Ryan Bergan

floor\sb16

Bill Analysis @ www.senate.michigan.gov/sfa

This analysis was prepared by nonpartisan Senate staff for use by the Senate in its deliberations and does not constitute an official statement of legislative intent.