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Prison admissions are down 19% over the last decade, driven by 43% decline in admissions from Baltimore City.
Prison Drivers

- Average sentence length for newly sentenced prisoners has risen 25% over the last decade, with growth across all offense types.
- Driven by increased sentences, time served is up 23%.
Time Served Up for All Offense Types

Average Time Served for New Court Commitments by Offense Type, FY05 vs FY14

- **Person**: 61.6 months in 2005, 75.3 months in 2014, 22% increase for person offenders.
- **Property**: 27.9 months in 2005, 31.4 months in 2014, 13% increase for property offenders.
- **Drugs**: 30.1 months in 2005, 33.3 months in 2014.
- **Public order**: 18.5 months in 2005, 24.7 months in 2014, 34% increase for public order offenders.
58% of prison admissions were sentenced for nonviolent crimes

- Statewide decline in drug offenders sentenced to prison over the last decade
- Possession with intent to distribute is still the #1 crime for which offenders are sentenced to prison, and possession is still in the top 10 crimes at admission
### Top 10 Offenses at Admission in FY14, Newly Sentenced Prisoners Admitted to Prison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>% Change, 2005-2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Possession w/ Intent to Distribute Narcotics</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>-52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault-2nd Degree</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery with a Deadly Weapon</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcotics Distribution</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>-16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft Felony</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault-1st Degree</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary-1st Degree*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession of a CDS (Excluding Marijuana)</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>-19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder-1st Degree</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Burglary-1st Degree did not exist in its current form in 2005*
2/3 of Drug Offenders Receive Some Incarceration Time
Transition and Reentry

- **Utah**: 2015 legislation included almost $1 million in reinvestment dollars to create reentry specialists that would establish consistency in their case plan objectives from prison to the community and with their supervision as well as assist offenders with needs-based programming upon reentry.

- **Pennsylvania**: 2013 legislation provided specialty Transitional Coordinators for mid- to high-risk parolees in their first 180 days of supervision. Transitional Coordinators become involved with the offenders prior to their release to address possible housing, employment, and treatment issues. Parolees are reassigned to general supervision once successfully stabilized.

- **Oregon**: 2013 legislation allowed certain inmates to be released up to 90 days before their release date to engage in a post-prison supervision reentry case plan.

- **Kentucky**: 2011 legislation carved out a 6-month period of mandatory reentry supervision from the end of the sentences of offenders who were parole eligible but who had not been released to parole supervision before 6 months of their release date.
Swift, Certain, and Proportionate Sanctions

- **Louisiana:** 2015 legislation capped the amount of time parolees could return to prison for a technical revocation.
- **Georgia:** 2012 legislation enabled probation officers to impose graduated sanctions short of incarceration and capped the amount of time probationers could serve in a probation revocation center.
- **Kentucky:** 2011 legislation required the department of corrections to impose graduated sanctions to respond to technical violations.
- **California:** 2009 legislation established a performance incentive fund allowing the state to share up to 50 percent of prison savings with probation agencies that reduced probation revocation rates below baseline levels. The law required that money be reinvested into evidence-based programs proven to hold offenders accountable and reduce recidivism.