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Fiscal Summary ($000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Expended FY 2005</th>
<th>Adjusted Appropriation FY 2006</th>
<th>Recommended FY 2007</th>
<th>Percent Change 2006-07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Budgeted</td>
<td>$1,016,592</td>
<td>$1,081,549</td>
<td>$1,064,571</td>
<td>(1.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Funds</td>
<td>$9,136</td>
<td>$10,065</td>
<td>$8,613</td>
<td>(14.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$56,879</td>
<td>$54,622</td>
<td>$55,331</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>$1,082,607</td>
<td>$1,146,236</td>
<td>$1,128,515</td>
<td>(1.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personnel Summary - Positions By Funding Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual FY 2005</th>
<th>Revised FY 2006</th>
<th>Funded FY 2007</th>
<th>Percent Change 2006-07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>9,738</td>
<td>9,859</td>
<td>9,698</td>
<td>(1.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>(2.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Positions</td>
<td>10,181</td>
<td>10,273</td>
<td>10,126</td>
<td>(1.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY 2005 (as of December) and revised FY 2006 (as of September) personnel data reflect actual payroll counts. FY 2007 data reflect the number of positions funded.

Key Points

- According to the Department of Corrections' monthly summary of residents, admissions and releases, as of January 31, 2006, there were 27,364 State sentenced inmates housed in State and county correctional facilities and halfway house placements. The department estimates that the number of admissions to the department will roughly equal the number of inmates released in FY 2007.

- According to the FY 2007 budget evaluation data, with an average projected population level of 23,158 inmates housed in State operated facilities, the State prisons are expected to operate at 138 percent of their rated capacity of 16,848 bed spaces in FY 2007. The excess population is accommodated primarily through double bunking at various institutions and the conversion of other facility operating space to inmate bed spaces. The balance of the State sentenced prison population in excess of the 23,158 are housed in county correctional facilities and halfway houses.
Key Points (Cont'd)

DIRECT STATE SERVICES

- The Department of Corrections' and the State Parole Board's combined FY 2007 Direct State Services recommendations total $931.42 million, which is $6.746 million or 0.7 percent less than the FY 2006 adjusted appropriation of $938.166 million. Funding for institutional operations is recommended at $770.3 million, totaling $1.3 million or 0.2 percent less than the FY 2006 adjusted appropriation of $771.6 million.

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

- A combined appropriation of $22.7 million is recommended for the Civilly Committed Sexual Offender Facility and the Civilly Committed Sexual Offender Facility - Annex in FY 2007, an increase of $1.7 million over the FY 2006 adjusted appropriation of $21 million. The FY 2007 recommendation would fund the increasing population of civilly committed sexual offenders. The department estimates that this population will grow at a rate of 4 residents per month. In FY 2007, the Civilly Committed Sexual Offender Facility is expected to provide 158 bed spaces and the Civilly Committed Sexual Offender Facility - Annex would provide 236 bed spaces, for a total of 394 bed spaces.

- A reduction of $1 million is included in the department's Integrated Information Systems Development account. The savings represents the end of the department's Master Lease payments for the conversion of the obsolete Legacy System 36 to the current Department of Corrections Management Information System (DOCMIS) and the Uninterrupted Power Supply (UPS) computer service system which safeguards against power failures.

- The FY 2007 budget recommends the elimination of the Inmate Work Details program, for a savings of $1.61 million. The program is responsible for providing inmate labor support to municipalities, governmental agencies and community based non-profit organizations. The program, named “Paying Communities Back” was created in FY 1998.

- The department’s FY 2007 recommendation for Materials and Supplies includes a reduction of $1.5 million which reflects the implementation of a new clothing distribution system as well as greater efficiencies in the allocation of office supplies.

- A reduction of $2 million is recommended in the department’s Services Other Than Personal accounts to reflect reduced medical services costs.

STATE PAROLE BOARD

- The State Parole Board is recommended to receive $62.2 million in Direct State Services funding in FY 2007, a decrease of $2.4 million or 3.7 percent under its FY 2006 adjusted appropriation of $64.6 million.

- A reduction of $1.78 million is recommended for the Parole Salaries and Wages account. This reduction reflects savings generated as a result of management efficiencies.
Key Points (Cont'd)

- The Intensive Supervision/Surveillance Program (ISSP) is recommended to receive $2.192 million in FY 2007, a reduction of $1.164 million or 34.7 percent under the FY 2006 adjusted appropriation of $3.356 million. The FY 2007 reduction reflects the shift of ISSP participants who fall under the jurisdiction of the Sex Offender Management Unit to that unit along with parole staff. The FY 2007 recommendation would support 450 program participants. The program is designed to allow certain offenders, who would not otherwise be appropriate for release, an opportunity to be paroled under a particularly intensive level of supervision. ISSP participants are placed in the program primarily from an institution, but may also be referred from a county jail or halfway house.

- The Parole Board's Sex Offender Management Unit is recommended to receive $5.62 million in FY 2007, an increase of $782,000 over the FY 2006 adjusted appropriation of $4.82 million. The unit is responsible for the supervision of sex offenders, including parolees, sexually violent predators released from civil commitment and offenders sentenced to Community Supervision for Life (CSL). The program is designed to enhance public safety by preventing further victimization through improved management of adult sex offenders in the community and through a uniform approach and understanding of community issues, legal issues and knowledge of specific county violation procedures surrounding CSL individuals.

- P.L.2005, c.189 authorized the Satellite-based Monitoring of Sex Offender Pilot Program and appropriated $3 million to the project. The two year program provides for the continuous, satellite-based monitoring of 250 participants. The system should provide for the capability of active and passive monitoring, or a combination of both. The FY 2007 budget recommends continuation funding of $3 million.

GRANTS IN AID
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

- The FY 2007 recommendation for the Purchase of Services for Inmates Incarcerated in County Correctional Institutions totals $33.78 million, $6.23 million less than the FY 2006 adjusted appropriation of $40.01 million. The FY 2007 reduction includes adjustments made to the FY 2006 appropriation to accommodate one-time expenditures and is based on the projected population in the county facilities. The department estimates that the number of State sentenced inmates admitted to correctional facilities in FY 2007 will roughly equal the number of inmates released.

STATE PAROLE BOARD

- The State Parole Board is recommended to receive $36.28 million in Grants-in-Aid funding in FY 2007, an increase of $1.0 million or 2.8 percent over the FY 2006 adjusted appropriation of $35.28 million. This increase constitutes an additional $1 million for the Halfway Back Program.

- The Halfway Back program is recommended to receive $17.29 million in FY 2007, an increase of $1 million or 6.1 percent. Under the Halfway Back program, the department contracts with private entities at various locations throughout the State who provide a highly supervised residential environment consisting of drug treatment and relapse prevention services for offenders on parole. The program also addresses
Key Points (Cont’d)

life skills development, anger and aggression management, unemployment and other issues confronted by offenders who are having difficulty adhering to the conditions of parole. The FY 2007 appropriation would fund 700 bed spaces, an increase of 50 beds over the FY 2006 level of 650 beds.

FEDERAL FUNDING
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
• The Department of Corrections is recommended to receive $8.58 million in federal funding in FY 2007, a decrease of $487,000 or 5.4 percent under the FY 2006 level of 9.07 million.

• The department’s federal funding reduction primarily reflects the end of a $452,000 Prison Rape Elimination grant. The grant program, which is administered by the Federal Office of Justice Programs is funded through September 2006. The program supports sexual assault awareness, prevention, and a continuum of treatment for inmates. The project includes staff training and in-prison treatment and intervention services for both inmate victims and perpetrators. In addition, the project focuses on prisoner re-entry through collaborating with faith based and community agencies for the provision of social services and treatment for victims, perpetrators, and family members of inmates.

• Project IN-SIDE (Inmate-Network-Skills in Developing Employment) is anticipated to receive $624,000 in federal funding in FY 2007, an increase of $22,000 over the FY 2006 appropriation of $602,000. Project IN-SIDE is a three year program to initiate a system of vocational training and college programs for incarcerated individuals who are below the age of 25 and within five years of parole. This program has allowed for the restoration of post-secondary certificate programs which had been eliminated due to budget constraints. Funding for Project IN-SIDE requires no State match.

STATE PAROLE BOARD
• The State Parole Board is recommended to receive $35,000 in federal funding in FY 2007, a decrease of $965,000 from its FY 2006 level of funding of $1 million. The funding reduction reflects the end of the Serious and Violent Offender Reentry program. A new appropriation of $35,000 is anticipated in FY 2007 for a National Institute of Justice grant. However, this amount is no longer anticipated.

• Not reflected in the State Parole Board’s FY 2007 recommendation is the possible receipt of $250,000 in Federal funding for a grant application submitted after the budget documents were prepared. This grant, administered by the National Institute of Corrections would allow the State Parole Board to evaluate the effectiveness of its Day Reporting Program. Day Reporting Centers provide for daily supervision of high risk parolees on the verge of parole violation due to the inability to comply with technical parole conditions (as opposed to a new offense). Participants report to the program seven days per week for a period of 8 to 10 hours daily, and return home each evening. Services provided to these individuals include: education; independent living skills; vocation/employment readiness counseling; job placement; substance abuse counseling; family counseling; team building and transportation to and from the center.
Key Points (Cont'd)

OTHER FUNDS
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

• The FY 2007 budget recommends $8.2 million for Institutional Care and Treatment, All Other Funds, an increase of $1 million or 13.5 percent over the $7.2 million appropriation. This appropriation represents funding awarded to the institutions under the State Facilities Education Act of 1979 (SFEA) (P.L.1979 c.207). Funds for this program are generated based on annual pupil count that is conducted on the last school day prior to October 16th for the following school year. Eligible student offenders are 20 years of age or younger on July 1, enrolled in education programs, and not yet possessing a high school diploma or equivalent. Funds are distributed proportionally based on each facility's pupil count after adjustments are made for central office educational support services, various special services and other contingencies.

CAPITAL PROJECTS
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

• The FY 2007 recommendation includes no funding for capital expenditures for the Department of Corrections in FY 2007, a decrease of $5 million from the FY 2006 level of funding. FY 2006 funding provided for a locking system upgrade and the replacement of modular units with permanent construction.

Background Papers

• Inmate Population Growth

• Custody Staff Overtime
Organization Chart

Commissioner

Chief of Staff

Assistant Commissioner Division of Administration

Assistant Commissioner Division of Programs & Community Services

Office of Employee Relations
Office of Financial Management
Office of Information Technology
Administration
Office of Human Resources
DEFCOR

In-But-Not-Of Agencies
New Jersey State Parole Board

Correction

Assistant Commissioner Division of Operations

Institutions
Form Operations
Field Services
Capital Planning
Maintenance/Grounds
Central Medical
Inmate Escort

Custody Operations
Classification Monitoring Unit
Health/Psychological Services
Release Notification
Parole Monitoring Unit
Central Transportation
Classification Support
### Fiscal and Personnel Summary

**AGENCY FUNDING BY SOURCE OF FUNDS ($000)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Fund</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct State Services</td>
<td>$898,264</td>
<td>$938,166</td>
<td>$931,420</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>(0.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants-In-Aid</td>
<td>116,618</td>
<td>138,383</td>
<td>133,151</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>(3.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Aid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Construction</td>
<td>1,710</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>$1,016,592</td>
<td>$1,081,549</td>
<td>$1,064,571</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>(1.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Tax Relief Fund</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct State Services</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants-In-Aid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Aid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Casino Revenue Fund</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Casino Control Fund</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Total</strong></td>
<td>$1,016,592</td>
<td>$1,081,549</td>
<td>$1,064,571</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>(1.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Funds</strong></td>
<td>$9,136</td>
<td>$10,065</td>
<td>$8,613</td>
<td>(5.7%)</td>
<td>(14.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Funds</strong></td>
<td>$56,879</td>
<td>$54,622</td>
<td>$55,331</td>
<td>(2.7%)</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>$1,082,607</td>
<td>$1,146,236</td>
<td>$1,128,515</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>(1.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PERSONNEL SUMMARY - POSITIONS BY FUNDING SOURCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>9,738</td>
<td>9,859</td>
<td>9,698</td>
<td>(0.4%)</td>
<td>(1.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>(8.3%)</td>
<td>(2.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>(2.9%)</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Positions</strong></td>
<td>10,181</td>
<td>10,273</td>
<td>10,126</td>
<td>(0.5%)</td>
<td>(1.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*FY 2005 (as of December) and revised FY 2006 (as of September) personnel data reflect actual payroll counts. FY 2007 data reflect the number of positions funded.*

**AFFIRMATIVE ACTION DATA**

- Total Minority Percent: 33.8% \(\text{to} \) 35.0% \(\text{to} \) 36.3%
### Significant Changes/New Programs ($000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Item</th>
<th>Adj. Approp. FY 2006</th>
<th>Recomm. FY 2007</th>
<th>Dollar Change</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
<th>Budget Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIRECT STATE SERVICES: MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detention and Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$76,721</td>
<td>$75,226</td>
<td>($1,495)</td>
<td>(1.9%)</td>
<td>D-74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration and Support Services</td>
<td>$628</td>
<td>$623</td>
<td>($5)</td>
<td>(.8%)</td>
<td>D-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$77,349</td>
<td>$75,849</td>
<td>($1,500)</td>
<td>(1.9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The recommended reduction is these accounts represents savings generated through the implementation of a new clothing distribution program as well as greater efficiencies in the allocation of office supplies.

| **SERVICES OTHER THAN PERSONAL:** |                      |                |               |                |             |
| Detention and Rehabilitation      | $134,785             | $133,280       | ($1,505)      | (1.1%)         | D-74        |
| System-Wide Program Support       | $7,843               | $7,364         | ($479)        | (6.1%)         | D-76        |
| **TOTAL**                          | $142,628             | $140,644       | ($1,984)      | (1.4%)         |             |

The recommended reduction in the FY 2007 department-wide Services Other Than Personal accounts represents reduced medical services costs.

| **SPECIAL PURPOSE:**             |                      |                |               |                |             |
| Civilly Committed Sexual Offender Facility | $8,586            | $8,607         | $21           | .2%            | D-74        |
| Civilly Committed Sexual Offender Facility – Annex | $12,413           | $14,127        | $1,714        | 13.8%          | D-74        |
| **TOTAL**                         | $20,099              | $22,734        | $1,735        | 8.3%           |             |

The FY 2007 recommendation would fund the increasing population of civilly committed sexual offenders. The department estimates that this population will grow at a rate of 4 residents per month. In FY 2007, the Civilly Committed Sexual Offender Facility is expected to provide 158 bed spaces and the Civilly Committed Sexual Offender Facility - Annex would provide 236 bed spaces, for a total of 394 bed spaces.
Significant Changes/New Programs ($000) (Cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Item</th>
<th>Adj. Approp. FY 2006</th>
<th>Recomm. FY 2007</th>
<th>Dollar Change</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
<th>Budget Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEDERAL FUNDS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Care and Treatment</td>
<td>$1,881</td>
<td>$1,813</td>
<td>($ 68)</td>
<td>(3.6%)</td>
<td>D-75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The decreased expectation for federal funding reflects reductions for two programs throughout the institutions, the Neglected and Delinquent program and the Adult Basic Skills program. Federal support for these programs depends on the number of students served in the prior fiscal year.

The Federal Neglected and Delinquent program provides supplementary educational training in the basic skills area to student offenders under 21 years of age and not possessing a high school diploma or equivalent. The program is recommended to receive $576,000 in FY 2007, $17,000 less than the FY 2006 adjusted appropriation of $593,000.

The Adult Basic Skills Program is anticipated to receive $979,000 in FY 2007, a decrease of $51,000 under the FY 2006 adjusted appropriation of $1.03 million. The Adult Basic Education program is designed for adults and out-of-school youth aged 16 years or older who are currently functioning below the eighth grade level or equivalent; are not enrolled in secondary school; do not have a secondary school diploma or its equivalent; and are beyond the age of compulsory school attendance under State law.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALL OTHER FUNDS:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Care and Treatment</td>
<td>$7,228</td>
<td>$8,206</td>
<td>$ 978</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>D-75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The FY 2007 recommendation for Institutional Care and Treatment, All Other Funds represents funding awarded to the institutions under the State Facilities Education Act of 1979 (SFEA) (P.L. 1979 c.207). Funds for this program are generated based on annual pupil count that is conducted on the last school day prior to October 16th for the following school year. Eligible student offenders are 20 years of age or younger on July 1, enrolled in education programs, and not yet possessing a high school diploma or equivalent. Funds are distributed proportionally based on each facility’s pupil count after adjustments are made for central office educational support services, various special services and other contingencies.

| Administrative and Support Services | $14,206 | $14,722 | $ 516 | 3.6% | D-75 |

The FY 2007 increase in this account reflects an increase in receipts from the institutional inmate canteens. Profits from each of the institution’s inmate canteens are transferred to the Inmate Welfare Fund and used to fund programs and activities which benefit the inmates.
Significant Changes/New Programs ($000) (Cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Item</th>
<th>Adj. Approp. FY 2006</th>
<th>Recomm. FY 2007</th>
<th>Dollar Change</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
<th>Budget Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIRECT STATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICES: SYSTEM WIDE PROGRAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPORT: SPECIAL PURPOSE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Information Systems Development</td>
<td>$8,472</td>
<td>$7,472</td>
<td>($1,000)</td>
<td>(11.8%)</td>
<td>D-76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The FY 2007 recommendation reflects the end of Master Lease payments for the conversion of the Legacy System 36 to the Department of Corrections Management Information System (DOCMIS) and the Uninterrupted Power Supply (UPS) computer service system which safeguards against power failures.

Inmate Work Details Program

|                                           | $1,610 | 0  | ($1,610) | (100.0%) | D-76 |

The Inmate Work Details program provides inmate labor support to municipalities, governmental agencies and community based non-profit organizations. The program, named "Paying Communities Back" was created in FY 1998. The FY 2007 budget recommendation eliminates this program.

GRANTS-IN-AID:
Purchase of Service for Inmates Incarcerated in County Penal Facilities

|                                           | $40,010 | $33,778 | ($6,232) | (15.6%) | D-77 |

Although Executive Order #106 declaring a state of emergency and authorizing the Department of Corrections to house State sentenced prison inmates in the county jails expired in March 1998, the department continues to house State inmates in county penal facilities. The State has entered into contracts with eighteen of the State's twenty-one counties to house these inmates at various reimbursement rates. The FY 2007 reduction includes adjustments made to the FY 2006 appropriation to accommodate one-time expenditures and is based on the projected population in the county facilities.

FEDERAL FUNDS:
Institutional Program Support

|                                           | $7004 | $6,574 | ($430) | (6.1%) | D-77 |

The FY2007 decrease in Federal Funding reflects the end of a $452,000 grant the Prison Rape Elimination grant offset by a $22,000 increase in the Project IN-SIDE program.
The Prison Rape Elimination grant program, which is administered by the Federal Office of Justice Programs is funded through September 2006. The program supports sexual assault awareness, prevention, and a continuum of treatment for inmates. The project includes staff training and in-prison treatment and intervention services for both inmate victims and perpetrators. In addition, the project focuses on prisoner re-entry through collaborating with faith based and community agencies for the provision of social services and treatment for victims, perpetrators, and family members of inmates.

Project IN-SIDE (Inmate-Network-Skills in Developing Employment) is anticipated to receive $624,000 in federal funding in FY 2007, an increase of $22,000 over the FY 2006 appropriation of $602,000. Project IN-SIDE is a three year program to initiate a system of vocational training and college programs for incarcerated individuals who are below the age of 25 and within five years of parole. This program has allowed for the restoration of post-secondary certificate programs which had been eliminated due to budget constraints. Funding for Project IN-SIDE requires no State match.

**PAROLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Item</th>
<th>Adj. Approp. FY 2006</th>
<th>Recomm. FY 2007</th>
<th>Dollar Change</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
<th>Budget Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>$39,701</td>
<td>$37,926</td>
<td>($1,775)</td>
<td>(4.5%)</td>
<td>D-80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The FY 2007 reduction reflects savings generated as a result of management efficiencies.

**SPECIAL PURPOSE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Item</th>
<th>Adj. Approp. FY 2006</th>
<th>Recomm. FY 2007</th>
<th>Dollar Change</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intensive Supervision/Surveillance Program</td>
<td>$3,356</td>
<td>$2,192</td>
<td>($1,164)</td>
<td>(34.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Intensive Supervision/Surveillance Program (ISSP) is designed to allow certain offenders, who would not otherwise be appropriate for release, an opportunity to be paroled under a particularly intensive level of supervision. ISSP participants are placed in the program primarily from an institution, but may also be referred from a county jail or halfway house. The FY 2007 reduction reflects the shift of ISSP participants who fall under the jurisdiction of the Sex Offender Management Unit to that unit along with parole staff. The FY 2007 recommendation would support 450 program participants.

**Sex Offender Management Unit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Item</th>
<th>Adj. Approp. FY 2006</th>
<th>Recomm. FY 2007</th>
<th>Dollar Change</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$4,842</td>
<td>$5,624</td>
<td>$ 782</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Sex Offender Management Unit is responsible for the supervision of sex offenders, including parolees, sexually violent predators released from civil commitment and offenders sentenced to Community Supervision for Life (CSL). The program is designed to enhance public safety by preventing further victimization through improved management of adult sex offenders in the community and through a uniform approach and understanding of community issues, legal issues and knowledge of specific county violation procedures surrounding CSL individuals. The recommended increase reflects the growing population of sex offenders who must be supervised by the unit. The FY 2007 budget estimates that the
Significant Changes/New Programs ($000) (Cont'd)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Item</th>
<th>Adj. Approp.</th>
<th>Recomm.</th>
<th>Dollar Change</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
<th>Budget Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2006</td>
<td>FY 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballistic Vest Replacement</td>
<td>$239</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>($239)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>D-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In response to a fatal stabbing incident at Bayside State Prison in FY 1998, DOC custody staff and parole officers were outfitted with body armor providing protection against stabbing attempts. The FY 2006 recommendation supplemented about $36,000 generated from the Body Armor Fund for the replacement of 250 protective vests that had reached their expiration date.

The Body Armor Fund, which was created by P.L.1997, c.177 (N.J.S.A. 52:17B-4.4) provides for grants to be made to local law enforcement agencies, the Division of State Police, the Division of Criminal Justice, the Administrative Office of the Courts and the Department of Corrections and State Parole Board for the purchase of body vests for the law enforcement officers, investigators, probation officers and corrections officers of those agencies. The fund is supported through $1 surcharge on all tickets issued in the State as well as a $1 surcharge on all bail forfeitures (N.J.S.A. 39:5-41).

GRANTS-IN-AID
Halfway Back Program

|                    | $16,289     | $17,289 | $1,000        | 6.1%           | D-80        |

The Halfway Back program is recommended to receive $16.29 million in FY 2007, an increase of $1 million. Under the Halfway Back program, the department contracts with private entities at various locations throughout the State who provide a highly supervised residential environment consisting of drug treatment and relapse prevention services for offenders on parole. The program also addresses life skills development, anger and aggression management, unemployment, and other issues confronted by offenders who are having difficulty adhering to the conditions of parole. The FY 2007 appropriation would fund 700 bed spaces, an increase of 50 beds over the FY 2006 level of 650 beds.

FEDERAL FUNDS

|                    | $1,000      | $35     | ($965)        | (96.5%)        | D-81        |

The FY 2006 appropriation of $1 million represented the last year of available funding for the Serious and Violent Offender Reentry Initiative program. A new appropriation of $35,000 is anticipated in FY 2007 for a National Institute of Justice grant. However, this amount is no longer anticipated.

Not reflected in this line item is the possible receipt of $250,000 in Federal funding for a grant application submitted after the budget documents were prepared. This grant, administered by the National Institute of Corrections would allow the State Parole Board to evaluate the effectiveness of its Day Reporting Program.
Day Reporting Centers provide for daily supervision of high risk parolees on the verge of parole violation due to the inability to comply with technical parole conditions (as opposed to a new offense). Participants report to the program seven days per week for a period of 8 to 10 hours daily, and return home each evening. Services provided to these individuals includes: education; independent living skills; vocation/employment readiness counseling; job placement; substance abuse counseling; family counseling; team building and transportation to and from the center.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Item</th>
<th>Adj. Approp. FY 2006</th>
<th>Recomm. FY 2007</th>
<th>Dollar Change</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
<th>Budget Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locking System Upgrade</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>($1,000)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>D-83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The FY 2006 appropriation for locking system upgrade funded the replacement of antiquated manual locking systems at correctional facilities. The department's long term plans include the replacement of locking systems within Northern State Prison, Albert C. Wagner Youth Correctional Facility and East Jersey State Prison. No funding is recommended for this purpose in FY 2007.

| Replace Modular Units | $4,000 | 0 | ($4,000) | (100.0%) | D-83 |

The FY 2006 recommendation funded brick-and-mortar replacement of trailer units which have outlived their original ten-year life expectancy. The existing units, which were installed in 1981 in response to the rapidly expanding State prison population, required an inordinate amount of maintenance and were not energy efficient. No funding is recommended for this purpose in FY 2007.

| FEDERAL FUNDS Administration and Support Services | $180 | $191 | $11 | 6.1% | D-83 |

The FY 2007 recommendation represents a $21,000 increase in the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education grant, offset by a $10,000 decrease in the Neglected and Delinquent—Indirect Costs federal grant.

The Carl D. Perkins Vocational Educational grant is anticipated to receive $157,000 in FY 2007, an increase of $21,000 over the FY 2006 appropriation of $136,000. The program provides grant funds for criminal offenders who are in correctional facilities. Funding is used to expand, improve, modernize, and develop vocational education programs to meet workforce demands.
Significant Changes/New Programs ($000) (Cont'd)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Item</th>
<th>Adj. Approp. FY 2006</th>
<th>Recomm. FY 2007</th>
<th>Dollar Change</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
<th>Budget Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL OTHER FUNDS</td>
<td>$1,583</td>
<td>$569</td>
<td>($1,014)</td>
<td>(64.1%)</td>
<td>D-83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The budget anticipates the receipt of $34,000 for the indirect costs for the federal Neglected and Delinquent program in FY 2007. The Neglected and Delinquent program, which provides supplementary educational skills in the basic skills area to student offenders under 21 years of age and not possessing a high school diploma or equivalent, is funded based on the number of students served during the previous school year.

The FY 2007 reductions consists of two programs, central support for the State Facilities Education Act and administrative costs for the Correctional Facilities Bond Fund.

SFEA funding is recommended at $569,000 in FY 2007, $550,000 less than the amount appropriated in FY 2006. The FY 2007 budget anticipates that funding for administrative costs or the Correctional Facilities Bond fund will be eliminated, a reduction of $464,000.
Language Provisions

2006 Appropriations Handbook

No comparable language.

2007 Budget Recommendations

p. D-81

The unexpended balance at the end of the preceding fiscal year in the Satellite Based Monitoring of Sex Offenders Pilot Program account is appropriated.

Explanation

P.L.2005 c.189, enacted August 11, 2005, establishes a two year pilot program for satellite-based monitoring of certain sex offenders and authorizes certain sex offenders to submit to annual polygraph. The statute appropriates $3 million for the program. The recommended language would permit the State Parole Board to carry forward the unexpended balances in this account into FY 2007.

2006 Appropriations Handbook

p. B-39

Of the savings from Administrative Efficiencies, $1,000,000 shall be allocated to the State Parole Board.

2007 Budget Recommendations

No comparable language

Explanation

FY 2006 Appropriations Act language provided that $1 million in efficiencies generated by the Department of Corrections be allocated to the State Parole Board. The FY 2007 management efficiencies are allocated within the State Parole Board’s budget recommendation. This language is not required in FY 2007.
Discussion Points

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

1. During FY 2006 the Assembly Prison Violence Gang Task Force conducted hearings on gang activity in the prisons. During those hearings, custody staff testified that they receive insufficient training to deal with gangs.

- **Question:** Please provide a summary of the annual training that is provided to custody staff. What components are included in this training (i.e. firearms training, gang training, personal interaction with inmates)? What is the cost of this annual training?

2. The Governor’s Correction Transition Policy Group recommended that the Department of Corrections establish a Division of Gang Intelligence unit within the department and appoint an Assistant Commissioner of Gang Intelligence.

- **Question:** How pervasive is the problem of gang activity in the prisons? What steps have been taken by the department to minimize gang activity? What additional measures need to be taken?

3. Among the disagreements between custody staff and the Department of Corrections is the department’s elimination of shift overlap overtime. Custody staff argues that shift overlap overtime is necessary to facilitate effective communication among the guards during the change of shifts. The department states that the payment of overtime during overlap periods is unnecessary and communication can be conducted through alternate means. The Governor’s Corrections Transition Policy Group recommends that shift overlap overtime be reinstated.

- **Question:** Please evaluate the role of shift overlap in the effective operation of the prison facilities. How would you recommend the department institute an effective communication system among the guards as they change shifts? What would be the cost of reinstating shift overlap overtime for custody staff?

4. The FY 2007 Budget in Brief states that “recent audits of State benefit programs have uncovered numerous repeat claims, suggesting that the availability of dual programs for sick leave and work-related injuries encourages fraud and abuse”. The FY 2007 budget recommends the elimination of the Sick Leave Injury program for a potential savings of $3 million. Sick Leave Injury is a salary continuation program that provides full pay to employees for one year after being injured on the job.

- **Question:** How many corrections officers are currently on Sick Leave Injury status? How many officers have made use of the sick leave injury program during the past three fiscal years? What is the salary cost? What impact would the elimination of this benefit have on the department’s staffing and overtime requirements and expenditures?

5. The Department of Corrections has been receiving funding under Title IV-A of the Social Security Act through the Department of Human Services for the provision of needy families. According to a Memorandum of Understanding between the Department of Human Services and the Department of Corrections dated July 1, 2005, the department received
Discussion Points (Cont'd)

$500,000 for the provision of a Responsible Parenting Program for individuals under supervision by the Department of Corrections.

- **Question:** Please provide a summary of the activities that are provided by this funding. Which institutions offer the program? How many inmates are served under the program? What procedures have the department instituted to evaluate the effectiveness of the program?

6. The Governor's Transition Policy Group recommended that the State "make a serious commitment to discharge planning and transitional support and eliminate unnecessary legal and other barriers for returning inmates."

- **Question:** What discharge planning and transitional support actions does the Department of Corrections currently conduct? How does the department coordinate these services with the State Parole Board's services for parolees? What other actions could be taken to improve services to discharged inmates?

7. The Capital Planning Commission recommended that the Department of Corrections receive $8 million in FY 2007 to replace the high temperature hot water underground distribution system which was installed from 1995 to 1997, and which has experienced a complete and catastrophic system failure. The Budget (page D-65) indicates that $8 million in capital funding "from other sources" is recommended.

- **Question:** What "other sources" are available to fund the cost of this capital project? What steps has the department taken to recoup the cost of the replacement system from the original vendor? What must be done in order to recoup this cost? What is the status of the proposed repair work? On what timetable does this project need to be undertaken in order to ensure the health and safety of corrections officers and inmates?

8. The Department of Corrections received $5 million in capital funding in FY 2006 to fund locking system upgrades and to replace 9 modular housing units with brick and mortar construction.

- **Question:** What is the status of these projects? Has the department retired the modular units, or are they still in use?

9. The FY 2007 budget recommends no funding for critical repairs and renovations at Department of Corrections' institutions. Due to the lack of funding in the past and the age of the various institutions, numerous facilities have deteriorated to the point of requiring repair.

- **Question:** How does the department plan to address the needs of the facilities requiring immediate repair? What impact has deferred maintenance had on the availability of inmate bed spaces throughout the department? What safety and security issues, if any, have emerged as a result of building repair needs?


Discussion Points (Cont’d)

STATE PAROLE BOARD

10. P.L.2005, c.189, the “Sex Offender Monitoring Pilot Project Act”, established a two-year pilot program for the satellite-based monitoring of certain sex offenders and appropriated $3 million for this purpose. The statute authorizes the Parole Board to use both “active” monitoring which continuously tracks and transmits the offender’s movements to a central station and “passive” monitoring which is downloaded from the offender’s tracking device at the end of each day to the central station. Funding would support 250 participants in the program.

- **Question:** What is the status of the program? What is the total number of offenders eligible for the program? How many offenders are currently enrolled in the program? How many offenders are under “active” supervision? How many are under “passive” supervision? What are the criteria for placing offenders in each program? What is the cost of each type of supervision?

11. The FY 2007 Budget in Brief states that “recent audits of State benefit programs have uncovered numerous repeat claims, suggesting that the availability of dual programs for sick leave and work-related injuries encourages fraud and abuse”. The FY 2007 budget recommends the elimination of the Sick Leave Injury program for a potential savings of $3 million. Sick Leave Injury is a salary continuation program that provides full pay to employees for one year after being injured on the job.

- **Question:** How many parole officers are currently on Sick Leave Injury status? How many officers have made use of the sick leave injury program during the past three fiscal years? What is the salary cost? What impact would the elimination of this benefit have on the parole board’s average caseload and overtime expenditures?

12. The Governor’s Transition Policy Group recommended that the State “make a serious commitment to discharge planning and transitional support and eliminate unnecessary legal and other barriers for returning inmates.”

- **Question:** What services are provided by the State Parole Board to ease the transition of parolees from the institutions into the community? How does the Parole Board measure the impact of these measures on parolees? Based on demonstrated rates of success, which services should be expanded?

13. Evaluation data indicate that the Division of Parole anticipates that the number of parolees under the supervision of the Division of Parole will increase from 14,800 parolees to 16,000, an increase of 1,200 parolees. In addition, the budget reports that $2.2 million in efficiencies are anticipated, including the elimination of 26 positions through attrition.

- **Question:** How will the reduction in parole positions affect the monitoring of the increasing population of parolees under the Parole Board’s jurisdiction? Which positions are being eliminated? What efficiencies are being put into place to effectuate the proposed savings?
Background Paper: Inmate Population Growth

From the late 1980's through the late 1990's, the number of criminals housed within the State's correctional system grew at a steady pace. Since 1999 the growth trend has reversed with a modest 11 percent decline in the inmate population from 1999 to 2005. The earlier growth was due primarily to the enactment of various laws that provided new and longer sentences for various drug offenses, drug related criminal activity and violent crimes. In addition, minimum mandatory sentences imposed on several offenses required longer prison stays for convicted offenders. Finally, statutes mandating stiffer parole eligibility criteria served to keep offenders incarcerated longer, swelling the State prison population.

The Department of Corrections (DOC) has attempted to accommodate its population through a variety of ways. New construction, increasing the capacity of its standing facilities, housing inmates in county jail facilities, expanding the number of bed spaces in community treatment centers and expanding the number and types of alternatives to incarceration have all been used to alleviate overcrowding and to find space for the State's offender population.

**TOTAL INMATE POPULATION**

![Graph showing total inmate population from 1987 to 2005.](chart)

Source: New Jersey Department of Corrections, "Residents, Admissions and Releases" report, issued monthly by the DOC Division of Policy Analysis and Planning.

The preceding graph tracks the State prisons' population from the late 1980's through 2005. On December 31, 1987, the Department of Corrections housed 15,945 adult and young adult State sentenced inmates in State and county correctional facilities and in various community based halfway house facilities. By December 31, 1999, the high point in the
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State prison population, the number of State sentenced inmates totaled 30,818 adult and young adult inmates in State and county correctional facilities and community placements.

Recent trends in the inmate population have shown a modest decline in the number of State sentenced prison inmates. The graph illustrates this trend. Between December 31, 1999 and December 31, 2005 the State sentenced prison population declined from 30,818 inmates to 27,481 inmates, a reduction of 3,337. The reduction can be attributed to the fact that many inmates who had been sentenced under the new mandatory minimum sentences statutes began to reach the end of their terms of incarceration and were paroled. In addition, increases in State Parole Board staff permitted the Parole Board to expand its alternatives to incarceration programs and to reduce the backlog of inmates awaiting parole hearings.

Offender Characteristics

While the population of inmates housed by the Department of Corrections continued to grow over the past two decades, the types of criminal have also changed.

On December 31, 1986, a total of 11,558 offenders were housed in State prison facilities. Of this number, 1,291, or 11 percent were drug offenders. The number convicted of violent crimes numbered 7,048 or 61 percent of the inmate population. The remaining 3,219, or 28 percent of the inmates were convicted of all other types of crimes.

By January 11, 2005 the total population numbered 26,239 inmates, more than twice the number incarcerated in 1986. Drug offenders totaled 8,729, or 33 percent of the total prison population, violent offenders numbered 10,537 or 40 percent, and those convicted of other offenses totaled 6,973 or 27 percent of the inmate population. Thus, while the total number of inmates increased in all categories, the proportion of inmates convicted of drug offenses increased while the proportion of those convicted of violent crimes declined. The proportion of inmates who were convicted of other crimes remained constant from 1986 through 2005.

Inmate Population by Offense

![Inmate Population by Offense Chart]
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The preceding chart illustrates prison population trend by type of offense: drug, violent and other, from 1986 to 2004.

Mandatory Minimum Sentences

During the 1980’s and into the 1990’s, the Legislature enacted statutes imposing mandatory minimum sentences on individuals convicted of criminal offenses. Under a mandatory minimum term, an inmate must serve a specified minimum amount of time in prison before becoming eligible for parole. Prior to the enactment of these laws, convicted offenders generally served from one-third to one-half of the sentence imposed due to time and work credits earned while incarcerated and the parole process.

The following chart illustrates that since 1986, the number of inmates serving mandatory minimum terms has grown at a greater pace than the total number of inmates in the correctional population. For example, in 1986, about 42 percent of the state’s total adult population were serving mandatory minimum terms. By 2004, this number increased to 65 percent of the total inmate population.

Mandatory Minimum

![Mandatory Minimum Chart]


Departmental Strategies for Bed Space Expansion

The Department of Corrections has used a variety of techniques to accommodate the State’s growing inmate population. Between FY 1986 and FY 2006, the department constructed additional bed spaces in existing institutions and opened new institutions,
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increasing its rated capacity from 10,889 bed spaces in FY 1986 to 16,924 bed spaces in FY 2006.

Further, the department succeeded in housing inmates in excess of each facility's rated capacity by double bunking inmates in some cells, and converting space originally intended for administrative, recreational, and other purposes to inmate living space. In this way, the institutional population has surpassed rated capacity and grown from 11,163 inmates in FY 1986 (2.5 percent over rated capacity) to 23,359 inmates in FY 2006 (38 percent over rated capacity). The following chart illustrates the growing gap between the department's rated capacities and its population.

![Capacity vs. Population Chart]

Source: State of New Jersey Annual Budgets

Alternative Housing Options

While this expansion of the number of bed spaces within many institutions caused populations to exceed the original design capacities, the department continued to confront the need to acquire secure housing for its growing population. Addressing this, DOC enlisted county jails and expanded its use of community based halfway house and treatment facilities and various alternatives to incarceration. Recent trends show the department placing more reliance on halfway house alternatives than the counties as a housing option. However county jails represent an important facet of the department’s overall housing strategy because this is where the overflow of State sentenced prison inmates are housed. The number of inmates housed in the counties is thus largely dependent upon the number of admissions processed each month offset by the number of releases and paroles granted, and is subject to monthly fluctuations.

In December, 1986, while the Department of Corrections had a total of 14,346 inmates, 11,937 of them were housed in State facilities. Of the remaining number, 2,244 were housed in county facilities and 165 were housed in community setting (which includes
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both community based treatment centers and alternatives to incarceration). By December, 2005, the number of State sentenced inmates totaled 27,481, of which 23,020 were housed in State operated facilities. The number of county placements totaled 1,861, and the number of community placements totaled 2,600.

The following graphs demonstrate the shift in the use of county facilities and the department's increasing reliance on community based alternatives to incarceration.

Population Distribution
December 1986
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- Total Inmates Housed in Counties
- Total Inmates Housed in Community Settings

Population Distribution
January 2005

- 9%
- 7%
- 84%

- Total Inmates Housed in State Facilities
- Total Inmates Housed in Counties
- Total Inmates Housed in Community Settings

Source: New Jersey Department of Corrections, "Residents, Admissions and Releases" report, issued monthly by the DOC Division of Policy Analysis and Planning.
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Summary

New Jersey’s adult and young adult State prison population has steadily increased through the eighties and into the nineties. Commencing with 2000, the stress of prison population growth abated as inmate populations decreased, providing some relief to the Department of Corrections. Over this same time period, the makeup of the prison population has changed from primarily violent offenders to primarily drug offenders. In addition, increasing reliance on community based alternatives to incarceration as well as increased parole programs have allowed more inmates to leave the institutions and to enter supervised settings as an alternative to the higher cost of incarceration. While the State prison population has remained relatively stable since 2000, future population trends will dictate the need for the allocation of resources in future years.
Background Paper: Custody Staff Overtime

Overtime is a major chronic issue facing the Department of Corrections (DOC). Because of the nature of custody supervision, all posts must be filled in order to assure adequate security to the institution and to the community at large. Therefore, when a post would stand empty as a result of position vacancy, illness, vacation or any other leave, that post must still be covered by trained custody staff. In the past, the department has addressed this issue by employing its current staff on an overtime basis.

Overtime has been divided into four categories: regular overtime, holiday overtime, shift overlap and shift change overlap and are defined as follows:

- **Regular overtime** is used to cover vacant posts as a result of position vacancies or temporary leave.
- **Holiday overtime** is budgeted to cover time worked by corrections officers during any State holiday.
- **Shift overlap**, which provided for overtime payments for an extra 30 minutes per day to accommodate the exchange of information among guards between outgoing and incoming shifts, was shortened and then eliminated by the Department of Corrections. Formerly, a part of the correctional officers' negotiated contract, subsequent negotiations eliminated shift overlap.
- **A new category of shift change overlap** was instituted upon the elimination of shift overlap to account for any overtime required by guards between shifts when it became necessary to communicate between shifts. Unlike shift overlap, shift change overlap is not included in the negotiated contract.

Regular overtime and shift change overlap overtime are subject to control by DOC. Holiday and shift overlap overtime are not.

According to the DOC, a variety of initiatives have been implemented over the years in an effort to reduce its overtime expenditures or to keep overtime growth in check. These initiatives include:

- A post by post review by DOC staff and the National Institute of Justice (NIC) was conducted as well as a post by post review with the appropriate bargaining units. Posts considered to be unnecessary were eliminated and posts were added where circumstances warranted. This initiative resulted in the elimination of 110 posts for a reduction of approximately 409,000 hours. The addition of 211 new custody uniform positions reduced the need for overtime and resulted in a reduction of approximately 570,000 overtime hours.

- Through contract negotiations, the DOC eliminated a daily shift overlap period previously paid at an overtime rate. Prior to FY 1998 custody staff were paid for 30 minutes of overlap daily. In each subsequent fiscal year this
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period was reduced incrementally until it was eliminated in FY 2001, reducing overtime consumption by 481,000 hours.

- A baseline reporting information system was implemented allowing continual monitoring of staffing assignments by post, shift and day. The department has developed regular reports to monitor staffing assignments.

- A committee was established to review and make recommendations regarding any requests to modify baseline staffing levels.

- The Bureau of Training continues to maintain an aggressive schedule to ensure full staffing despite an historical department-wide custody staff attrition trend of 12 staff per pay.

The following charts illustrate the growth in overtime hours and expenditures for the DOC since FY 1995. As shown in the charts, the department's custody staff worked 1.86 million overtime hours in FY 1995 at a cost of $62.9 million. While fluctuating over the years, the number of overtime hours worked in FY 2005 declined to 833,447 hours at a cost of $35.6 million. The department projects that its FY 2006 overtime hours and expenditures will total 718,693 hours at a cost of $33.8 million.

**Overtime Expenditures ($000)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Exp</th>
<th>FY95</th>
<th>FY97</th>
<th>FY99</th>
<th>FY01</th>
<th>FY03</th>
<th>FY05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exp</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Regular
- Shift Change
- Shift Overlap
- Holiday
Overtime Hours

The issue of shift overlap has been an ongoing source of friction between the DOC and custody staff. Custody staff claim that shift overlap is essential to facilitate effective communication among the guards between shifts and to maintain institutional security. The department states that the payment of overtime during overlap periods is unnecessary and communication can be conducted through alternate means. The Governor’s Corrections Transition Policy Group recommended that shift overlap be reinstated to “facilitate the meaningful and productive dissemination of information throughout the State’s fourteen facilities, improving the safety of both staff and inmates.” In FY 2000, the last year the full 30 minutes of shift overlap was allotted to custody staff, the department logged in 482,000 hours of shift overlap overtime hours at a cost of $18.5 million.
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The Office of Legislative Services Central Staff provides a variety of legal, fiscal, research and administrative services to individual legislators, legislative officers, legislative committees and commissions, and partisan staff. The central staff is organized under the Central Staff Management Unit into ten subject area sections. Each section, under a section chief, includes legal, fiscal, and research staff for the standing reference committees of the Legislature and, upon request, to special commissions created by the Legislature. The central staff assists the Legislative Budget and Finance Officer in providing services to the Appropriations Committees during the budget review process.

Individuals wishing information and committee schedules on the FY 2007 budget are encouraged to contact:

Legislative Budget and Finance Office
State House Annex
Room 140 PO Box 068
Trenton, NJ 08625
(609) 292-8030 • Fax (609) 777-2442