

QB.00
Division of Correction
Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services

Operating Budget Data

(\$ in Thousands)

	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02		% Change
	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Working</u>	<u>Allowance</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Prior Year</u>
General Fund	\$450,504	\$463,143	\$499,542	\$36,399	7.9%
Special Fund	58,013	56,460	59,384	2,923	5.2%
Federal Fund	4,567	5,878	5,760	(118)	(2.0%)
Reimbursable Fund	<u>5,033</u>	<u>5,905</u>	<u>6,007</u>	<u>102</u>	<u>1.7%</u>
Total Funds	\$518,117	\$531,386	\$570,692	\$39,305	7.4%

- \$6,992,422 deficiency appropriation for fiscal 2001 to provide: \$4,051,969 for increased employee health benefit costs at the House of Correction and \$2,940,453 for increased overtime costs at the House of Correction Annex.
- \$27,668,460 increase over the fiscal 2001 working appropriation is due to normal growth in personnel expenses.
- \$7,418,554 for 278 new positions at 17 locations throughout the division; 112 of the new positions are to staff the new 256-bed maximum security housing unit on the south compound of the Western Correctional Institution that is scheduled to open in January 2002.

Personnel Data

	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	
	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Working</u>	<u>Allowance</u>	<u>Change</u>
Regular Positions	7,302.50	7,398.50	7,676.50	278.00
Contractual FTEs	<u>78.30</u>	<u>176.71</u>	<u>176.61</u>	<u>(0.10)</u>
Total Personnel	7,380.80	7,575.21	7,853.11	277.90

Vacancy Data: Regular

Budgeted Turnover: FY 02	386.13	5.03%
Positions Vacant as of 12/31/00	363.40	4.91%

- The Governor's allowance includes 278 new regular positions; 112 of the new positions are to staff the new 256-bed maximum security housing unit on the south compound of the Western Correctional Institution that is scheduled to open in January 2002.

Note: Numbers may not sum to total due to rounding.

For further information contact: Victoria L. Barron

Phone: (410) 946-5530

Analysis in Brief

Issues

Inmate Mental Health Services: As screening techniques and assessment tools become more sophisticated, an increasing number of inmates are being diagnosed with a variety of mental health conditions that may have previously remained undetected. As such, the system may have to continue to expand mental health care services and programs. **The division should discuss with the committees: population size, facility adequacy, the new medical contract, effectiveness of current mental health services provided, training of custody staff, and fiscal and policy requirements and impacts.**

Aging Inmate Population: The portion of the incarcerated population that is aging and/or ill is growing. Therefore, population trends, operating costs, and capital impacts of the aging inmate population should be investigated and monitored. **The division should discuss housing considerations, medical parole, recidivism, population growth, staffing considerations, and all facets of an aging inmate population.**

Audit Regarding Spring Grove Hospital Center and State Use Industries: The Office of Legislative Audits issued a special report in December 2000 related to the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene's Spring Grove Hospital Center and the Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services' State Use Industries as a result of certain questionable or unsubstantiated transactions and practices that were revealed during the course of the regularly scheduled audits of these agencies. **The division should explain to the committees how the lack of agency controls came to be, and what has been done to rectify the issue -- specifically to Spring Grove Hospital Center, and generally to all other agency interactions.**

Recommended Actions

	<u>Funds</u>	<u>Positions</u>
1. Adopt language requiring timely information for local jail reimbursements.		
2. Eliminate PIN 052291, Correctional Dietary Manager, which has been vacant for two years.	\$ 52,057	1.0
Total Reductions	\$ 52,057	1.0

Updates

Uniform Program: Starting on July 1, 2001, the pilot project of issuing a complete uniform complement for all inmates who are classified as maximum security will begin. The division expends considerable administrative and correctional resources on the management and control of inmate clothing without having achieved the desired control.

QB.00
Division of Correction
Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services

Operating Budget Analysis

Program Description

The Division of Correction (DOC) is the largest criminal justice organization in the State of Maryland. The division supervises a portion of the State's adult prison population. Offenders are sentenced to the division by the courts. Upon entering the division, offenders' needs and security risks are assessed, the offender is then assigned to a facility that best matches the needs that were revealed by the assessment. While an offender is under the division's supervision, opportunities to aid the offender in a successful transition back into society are provided. Transition preparation opportunities, available to offenders based on objective security criteria, include life skills development, vocational training, and traditional academic education.

The division's origins can be traced to the nineteenth century when the first State prisons, the Maryland Penitentiary and the Maryland House of Correction, opened in 1811 and 1878, respectively. Throughout the twentieth century, various boards and commissions controlled the State correctional facilities. In 1968, the governing authority was renamed the Department of Correctional Services. In accordance with Chapter 401, Acts of 1970, all State correctional responsibilities were assigned to the Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services (DPSCS) and the Department of Correctional Services was reorganized as the Division of Correction under the Secretary of Public Safety and Correctional Services.

Proposed Deficiency

The budget provides for a \$6,992,422 deficiency appropriation for fiscal 2001 to provide: \$4,051,969 for increased employee health benefit costs at the House of Correction and \$2,940,453 for increased overtime costs at the House of Correction Annex.

DPSCS agencies have had difficulty not incurring overtime expenses that are greater than what has been appropriated for overtime. DPSCS has requested deficiencies for overtime the last two fiscal years. Several factors impact overtime expenses, chiefly among those are: recruitment and retention difficulties, and the overuse of sick leave by employees who are required to work overtime to ensure adequate staffing. The staffing-overtime-sick leave situation is circular in that DOC has difficulty hiring and keeping a full complement of staff, which means that posts are filled by existing staff working overtime. Employees tire of working every day without a day off and call in sick. Once employees start resorting to using sick leave as a means of receiving time off, many days are frequently taken but generally always less than five days because absences less than five days in length do not require a doctor's slip. The situation of multiple days exacerbates the problem of the staffing level already being low, thus causing the need for overtime from available staff and increasing overtime expenses. Management's constant reliance on overtime to staff posts due to recruitment and retention difficulties and the overuse of sick leave cause

QB.00 - DPSCS - Division of Correction

DOC to spend the full overtime appropriation and to then request a deficiency appropriation to cover the additional expense.

In addition to the staffing-overtime-sick leave cycle, DOC must pay correctional staff overtime for the 12 minutes of roll call that each custodial staff member must be present for at the start of each shift. Roll call, conducted by shift commanders and supervisors, is time allotted for correctional officers to gather prior to the start of a shift and disseminate information. Due to the recession of the early 1990s, roll call was reduced to 6 minutes from 15 minutes as an austerity measure in 1992. In fiscal 1999, the 12-minute roll call was instituted, and overtime costs rose. The current cost of roll call overtime is approximately \$4.8 million.

Exhibit 1 shows the deficiency appropriations DOC has received since fiscal 1997 for overtime expenses.

Exhibit 1

Deficiency Appropriations for Overtime Expenses

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Amount of Deficiency</u>
1997	\$3,600,000
1998	\$3,000,000
2000	\$1,031,152
2001	\$2,940,453

Source: Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services

In fiscal 1999, DOC did not request a deficiency appropriation because an additional \$3,752,832 was added to the division's request. \$2,428,147 was to fund the restored 6 minutes of roll call and the remaining \$1,342,685 was for overtime expenses. DOC also received 155 permanent positions that should have reduced overtime costs. The \$3.7 million figure was determined by the annualization of the fiscal 1998 appropriation and deficiency.

In fiscal 2000, DOC received a deficiency appropriation of \$1,031,152 and 107 additional positions designed to combat high overtime expenses incurred due to staffing shortages and increasing demands upon custody staff. Actual overtime expenses totaled \$25,234,627.

The fiscal 2001 allowance provided for 114 new positions, of which 100 were correctional officers. The addition of the new positions was to reduce the overtime previously required to man those posts. Therefore, overtime expenditures for the entire division were estimated to decline from \$25.2 million in

QB.00 - DPSCS - Division of Correction

fiscal 2000 to \$19.2 million in fiscal 2001. The reduction in overtime expenses is expected to occur in the latter half of fiscal 2001, once the positions are hired and trained. However, as evidenced by a deficiency request of \$2,940,453, the \$6 million reduction does not appear to be materializing.

The fiscal 2002 allowance provides \$18,302,361 in overtime for this division. This is a decrease of \$932,865 relative to the working fiscal 2001 appropriation. It also provides 287 new positions, of which 209 are Correctional Officer I positions. The filling of current vacancies and additional positions should allow the division to contain overtime expenses within the appropriated level. However, data regarding overtime from fiscal 2000 and 2001 from DOC's staffing analysis and overtime reports show that the primary overtime drivers are staff relief entitlements. These include such mandated allowances as annual leave, personal leave, sick leave, and military leave. It also includes the coverage for vacant positions which are in the process of being filled. These mandated relief days for the first half of fiscal 2001 accounted for over 153,000 overtime days, or 78.5% of the total overtime days.

There are many secondary drivers that affect overtime and many of these, for the most part, cannot be changed. These include such uses as dietary support/security, inmate work details (which are reimbursed), searches, court escorts, medical security, construction security, and transportation. These staffing requirements, many of which are assignments for which there is not enough staff, account for 21.5% of the overtime as reported on the staffing analysis and overtime reports.

The Sick Leave Incentive Program, signed into law by the Governor on April 25, 2000, encourages State employees to reduce their usage of sick leave by allowing them to receive compensation for unused days if they meet certain conditions. Eligible employees may receive payment for a maximum of 56 hours of unused sick leave per calendar year if certain parameters are met.

Of all the job classes eligible at DOC, those that the division would most like to see take advantage of the program are the least likely to do so. Correctional Officer I's, Correctional Officer II's, and Correctional Officer Sergeants are the most likely to be pressed into overtime service, either voluntarily or through service based on seniority due to inadequate post coverage because of staff shortages and/or gaps in coverage caused by staff calling in sick. This causes employees to use sick leave hours which lowers the sick leave balances and prevents employees from qualifying for the cash-out.

The second factor that prevents many in these three positions from taking advantage of the program is that State employees accrue 15 sick leave days or 120 hours per year but the program requires at least 30 days or 240 hours in an employee's sick leave bank. Therefore an employee would need to work two years-plus without using any sick leave. The likelihood of employees in these three named positions not using sick leave is remote.

A final factor, which is rather unique to the Correctional Officer I position is that after one year the promotion from Correctional Officer I to Correctional Officer II is nearly automatic, meaning that almost no individual from the Correctional Officer I job title would qualify for the program because most Correctional Officer I's are only in that position for one year and would not have accrued enough sick leave to qualify.

QB.00 - DPSCS - Division of Correction

Theoretically, DOC will pay out little under the cash-out program, since both sick leave usage and overtime expenses are high. That does not appear to be what is happening DPSCS-wide. To date, over \$2 million in requests for payout have been received, which is approximately \$500,000 more than the department received in the fiscal 2002 allowance for the program. The vast majority of the employees applying for the payout are not in the job titles -- Correctional Officer I, Correctional Officer II, and Correctional Officer Sergeant -- that would have the greatest effect on overtime expenses. Consequently, the impact of the program to reduce overtime expenses will be minimal.

The second portion of the deficiency is to cover the shortfall in health care benefits. In fiscal 1999, the deficiency was covered and additional funds were added into the fiscal 2000 base to prevent a future deficiency.

The fiscal 2001 appropriation for health insurance benefits was calculated on a \$4,438 per person expense. The appropriation was deficient at the start of the fiscal year because the actual per person expense was \$4,666. In September 2000, the department submitted a \$4,051,969 deficiency request for fiscal 2001 based on two factors: the difference between the budgeted health insurance rate and the actual rate, and on the anticipated 8.5% increase that would become effective January 2001. Rates rose by 14.1% as of January 9, 2001, to \$5,324 per person. The actual amount to fully fund the fiscal 2001 deficiency, based on the latest figures, is roughly \$8.4 million.

The fiscal 2002 allowance may also prove to be deficient. The allowance as calculated on a 16.3% rate increase per Department of Budget and Management's instructions.

There are several theories relating to the source of the increase. It appears that rural participants tend to select the point-of-service option since health maintenance organization facilities are not easily accessible. And even participants that do live in an area serviced by health maintenance organizations are tending to choose point-of-services plans which are generally more expensive than health maintenance organizations. Additionally, pharmacy costs are skyrocketing.

The department should be prepared to clearly define reasons that caused the deficiencies, articulate plans to rectify the known mitigating circumstances, and further investigate other possible causes. Secondly, the department should also comment on the difference between the projected overtime and health care expenses and actual expenses for the last two fiscal years and the projections for fiscal 2002. Finally, the department should discuss whether the sick leave incentive program enacted last year has had an impact on lowering sick leave hours.

Governor's Proposed Budget

The fiscal 2002 allowance totals \$570.7 million; \$39.3 million greater than the working appropriation. **Exhibit 2** shows that \$36.4 million of the growth is due to an increase in general funds, while the remaining \$3 million is due to special and reimbursable fund increases.

QB.00 - DPSCS - Division of Correction

Exhibit 2

**Governor's Proposed Budget
Division of Correction
(\$ in Thousands)**

How Much It Grows:	<u>General Fund</u>	<u>Special Fund</u>	<u>Federal Fund</u>	<u>Reimbursable Fund</u>	<u>Total</u>
2001 Working Appropriation	\$463,143	\$56,460	\$5,878	\$5,905	\$531,386
2002 Governor's Allowance	499,542	59,384	5,760	6,007	570,692
Amount Change	\$36,399	\$2,923	(\$118)	\$102	\$39,305
Percent Change	7.9%	5.2%	(2.0%)	1.7%	7.4%
Where It Goes:					
Personnel Expenses					
New positions					\$7,419
Fiscal 2002 general salary increase					5,719
Increments, fiscal 2001 increase phase-in, and other					6,375
Employee and retiree health insurance rate change					9,923
Retirement contribution rate change					(2,834)
Workers compensation premium assessment					6,100
Turnover adjustments					1,992
Other fringe benefit adjustments					394
Other Expenses					
Utilities					1,340
Inmate medical contract					2,425
Communications, one-time expense reductions					(112)
Contractual services reduction -- advertising, equipment rental, trash removal, other					(530)
Payments to local jurisdictions					(286)
Supplies, materials, and equipment for new positions and State Use Industries					1,627
Other					(235)
Total					\$39,305

Note: Numbers may not sum to total due to rounding.

QB.00 - DPSCS - Division of Correction

The bulk of the increase, \$35 million, is in personnel costs. Specific adjustments include the following: \$5.7 million increase for general salary; \$9.9 million increase for health insurance; \$7.4 million for 278 new positions at 17 locations throughout the division; \$6.1 million increase for workers' compensation; \$1.5 million for the newly instituted Sick Leave Incentive Program; \$2.8 million decrease in retirement contributions.

A communication decrease of \$111,797 is attributable to the one-time purchase in fiscal 2001 of telephone installation and equipment primarily for the Centralized Commitment Office, Baltimore Pre-Release Unit, and Baltimore City Correctional Center.

A \$1,339,745 increase over the fiscal 2001 working appropriation in utilities is attributable to the 256-bed maximum security housing unit on the south compound of Western Correctional Institution (WCI) that is scheduled to open in January 2002 and the sharp increase in energy costs, particularly natural gas and fuel oil. The average cost of fuel oil increased from \$0.3528 per gallon in January 1999 to \$0.8815 in January 2000 and is currently about \$0.9534 per gallon.

Decreases in certain contractual services such as:

- advertising -- primarily from State Use Industries (SUI) (\$135,584) based on prior actuals;
- equipment rental -- principally due to new contract for the rental of home monitoring equipment -- Home Detention Unit (\$251,256);
- trash and garbage removal -- based upon the current contract cost, which at most facilities was lower than the prior contract (\$105,743); and

were off-set by the \$2,425,509 increase over the fiscal 2001 working appropriation in the new inmate medical contract that became effective on July 1, 2000. The total increase in contractual services was \$1,895,751.

In addition to needing materials and supplies to equip the 278 new positions, institutions required the following:

- security supplies;
- identification and fingerprinting supplies;
- packing and shipping supplies;
- shop and raw materials; and
- miscellaneous supplies for SUI.

The fiscal 2002 allowance for supplies is a \$1,626,876 increase over the fiscal 2001 working appropriation.

QB.00 - DPSCS - Division of Correction

The payments to local jurisdictions for housing inmates with sentences of 18 months or less are based upon the local jail per diem rate and the number of inmates housed. As the number of inmates housed may fluctuate from year to year, so do payments to local facilities. The \$285,618 decrease in the fiscal 2002 allowance is based upon prior actuals.

Federal funds are decreasing by \$118,358 in the fiscal 2002 allowance due to the reduction in the grant amount for the Residential Substance Abuse Treatment for Incarcerated persons.

Personnel

The allowance provides for a net increase of 278 new regular positions. One hundred twelve of the new positions are to staff the new 256-bed maximum security housing unit on the south compound of the Western Correctional Institution that is scheduled to open in January 2002. Since staffing levels and overtime are major issues, 238 of the positions are correctional officers. The additional positions should allow the division to contain overtime expenses to the appropriated level.

Performance Analysis: Managing for Results

Performance indicators relating to four of the DOC's five goals are provided in **Exhibit 3**. For fiscal 2002, the division adjusted Managing for Results (MFR) documentation in accordance with legislative direction from the fiscal 2001 analysis. The division modified performance measures so that each one was quantifiable. Additionally, the division adopted three common objectives that were applied to all correctional facilities. SUI has separate measures since its mission is different from that of the correctional facilities.

The first three indicators on the chart relate to population. Though a population figure is not a performance indicator, the figures are important because nearly every activity, service, and function performed at a facility is based on population. All variable inmate expenses -- food, non-food material, laundry services, inmate wages and medical care -- are driven by population, as are non-variable expenses such as security, utilities, and insurance. Therefore, the population is a major key to all planning and budgeting endeavors.

The indicators relating to sick leave used by staff and overtime incurred due to sick leave usage are common measures that apply to all correctional facilities. The figures in the chart are consolidated figures for the entire division. Each facility has the same measures so that an individual facility can be assessed, as well as the division, as a whole. As DOC has received deficiency appropriations for overtime expenses in four of the last five fiscal years, closely monitoring the sick leave usage and overtime expenses incurred is crucial. The division's strategy that "the Commissioner will monitor, collect and report information relative to sick leave and overtime hours incurred as a result of sick leave usage to the Office of the Secretary on a quarterly basis" conveys that the division is cognizant of these issues but does not to explain how inappropriate use of sick leave or overtime expenses will be curtailed so the 10% objective will be met.

QB.00 - DPSCS - Division of Correction

Exhibit 3

**Program Measurement Data
Division of Correction
Fiscal 1998 through 2002**

	<u>Actual 1998</u>	<u>Actual 1999</u>	<u>Est. 2000</u>	<u>Actual 2000</u>	<u>Est. 2001</u>	<u>Est. 2002</u>	<u>Ann. Chg. 98-00</u>	<u>Ann. Chg. 00-02</u>
Total Inmates in DOC facilities	20,798	21,344	22,055	21,712	22,701	22,701	2.2%	2.3%
Total female inmates in DOC facilities for women	992	1,003	1,016	976	1,016	1,016	-0.8%	2.0%
Backlog of inmate in local jails awaiting transfers	145	137	94	161	94	94	5.4%	-23.6%
Number of sick leave hours used by staff	n/a	n/a	n/a	666,841	636,676	613,007	n/a	-4.1%
Number of overtime hours incurred due to sick leave usage	n/a	n/a	n/a	170,072	164,427	158,596	n/a	-3.4%
Number of meritorious medical complaints	n/a	n/a	n/a	37	35	32	n/a	-7.0%
Number of escapes from medium/maximum security facilities	0	3	n/a	2	0	0	n/a	-100.0%
Number of escapes from minimum/pre-release/alternative confinement security facilities	95	116	n/a	144	97	87	23.1%	-22.3%
Number of inmate-on-inmate assaults	n/a	n/a	n/a	1,187	1,085	1,001	n/a	-8.2%
Number of inmate-on-staff assaults	n/a	n/a	n/a	520	481	441	n/a	-7.9%
Number of inmates employed by SUI	n/a	n/a	n/a	1,302	1,416	1,472	n/a	6.3%

Source: Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services

QB.00 - DPSCS - Division of Correction

As incarcerated defendants and sentenced offenders are constitutionally required to be confined in humane conditions and receive appropriate medical, mental health, social work, and addiction treatment services, tracking the number of meritorious medical complaints will allow the division to assess the services delivered. The strategy to reduce meritorious complaints by 25% from the fiscal 2000 level is that "the Commissioner will ensure that the medical contract is monitored and receive weekly reports on deficiencies in contract performance and take appropriate action to ensure compliance in the delivery of health care services." DPSCS entered into a new three-year inmate medical contract on July 1, 2000, that will service all DOC, Patuxent Institution, and Division of Pretrial and Detention Services.

The second common indicator is the number of escapes. The goal of zero escapes each year is indeed something the division should strive for; however, the attainment of that goal is probably not likely in that escapes occur at each type of facility every year. This goal may best serve the division as an indicator of what security measures need to be increased or altered to prevent escapes. The 1999 escapes from the Maryland Correctional Institution -- Jessup served notice that the facility's perimeter fence height was inadequate and that electronic monitors and fence shaker systems needed to be installed. The first phase of the enhanced security was funded in fiscal 2001 and the second phase, which will complete the upgrades, has been included in the Governor's 2002 allowance.

In-house assaults can range from very minor to fatal, but regardless of the outcome all assaults must be treated seriously. The inmate-on-inmate and inmate-on-staff assault indicators are common to all facilities. The objective for each type of assault is to reduce the incidents by 25% from the fiscal 2000 levels. Attainment of this objective will more than likely vary from facility to facility. Facilities with higher levels of security tend to experience more assaults because the inmates housed in those facilities are generally more violent and tend to exhibit a greater degree of anti-social behavior than inmates housed in lower security facilities. Attainment of a 25% reduction in maximum security facilities may be more difficult to achieve than a 25% reduction in a minimum security facility. Although a uniform reduction level for all facilities may be an admirable goal, it may not be realistic.

The measurements for SUI are unique since it is not a correctional facility. SUI provides job training and work opportunities for inmates incarcerated by the DOC by producing goods and supplies services. By doing so, SUI improves inmates employability upon release while being a financially self-supporting State agency, but more importantly the jobs and training that SUI provides combats inmate idleness which in turn diminishes detrimental inmate behavior. Similar to the population figures, the number of inmates employed by SUI is not an outcome per se. When more inmates are working, more goods are being produced so SUI clients are benefitting and fewer infractions occur. This is positive for both inmates and staff.

The division should be prepared to discuss the alterations to it's MFR submission in terms of what changes were made, why the changes were made, and how the new indicators will provide better assessments. Additionally, the division should discuss the impact the sick leave incentive program has had upon the use of sick leave and consider adding a measurement that would assess how the sick leave incentive program is impacting sick leave and overtime expenses. The tracking of inmates employed upon release in a field where the skills to perform the job function were obtained through SUI job training would assess the effectiveness of the job training provided.

Issues

1. Inmate Mental Health Services

The number of mentally ill individuals in the criminal justice system has grown dramatically during the past 30 years. According to national research, the growth of the population of incarcerated mentally ill individuals has mirrored the policy of deinstitutionalization that resulted in the release of thousands of mentally ill people from psychiatric facilities to the community. Many mentally ill persons recidivate because of homelessness, substance use/abuse, and no viable follow-up and/or after-care plan.

Where We Are Today

Mental health care within DPSCS parallels that in the community at large. Some individuals with mental health issues need only medication and minimal monitoring of the medication to carry out a normal existence at home with a job. Similarly, some inmates need only medication and can function normally in the general population. Some need counseling as a supplement to the medication. Likewise, there are inmates that receive counseling services at a regular correctional facility (maintaining institution) in addition to medication. Other offenders need some type of assisted living, and within maintaining institutions there are "special needs" tiers that simulate an assisted living environment. Finally there are offenders who need to spend short periods of time in a mental hospital to stabilize. DPSCS's "inpatient" or "mental hospital" setting is the Correctional Mental Health Center -- Jessup (CMHC-J) located at the Patuxent Institution. Assignment to CMHC-J is temporary and once the inmate is stabilized, the inmate is returned to the general population. There is also a "step-down" unit at the Patuxent Institution for inmates that have difficulty transitioning from CMHC-J to the general population again.

Inpatient services for women are provided at the Maryland Correctional Institution for Women in a separate section of the infirmary, and a second inpatient facility is maintained for the Baltimore City pretrial population at the Baltimore City Detention Center for Men and at the Women's Detention Center.

Actual Service Delivery at Institutions

The provision of mental health services to offenders, while incarcerated, helps to maintain order and safety for the inmates and officers within the institutions. Inmates with mental illnesses that receive treatment are more likely to utilize other programs, like academic education, vocational training, substance abuse treatment, and life skills, that are available to all inmates.

The identification of individuals with mental health needs begins at the time of intake into a State correctional facility, whether it be at a detention center or pretrial facility prior to trial or during incarceration after sentencing in a DOC facility. The identification process relies on individual's self-reporting mental health information, observation of behavior by medical or custody staff, and evaluation by psychology staff. Approximately 16.4% of the DOC population suffers from mental illness. Roughly 30% are mild, receiving

QB.00 - DPSCS - Division of Correction

occasional assistance, and the remaining 70% receive regular assistance. Acute cases are included in the 70% that receive regular assistance.

The medical contract, effective July 1, 2000, is for three years, with a renewal option for an additional two years. Psychiatric services at all institutions are provided within the terms of the medical contract. The inpatient units are also staffed with psychiatrists, psychologists, and psychiatric nurses under the terms of the medical contract. All medications are also provided under the medical contract.

Each DOC institution has mental health professionals on staff to provide mental health services to individuals that are identified as having a need whether it is on an as-needed basis, a regular basis for medication monitoring, or for a crisis situation. Mental health staff formulates a plan of services that will best help the mentally ill offender maintain adjustment during incarceration.

The most common mental illness that is diagnosed is depression, followed by bi-polarism, and schizophrenia; 3,780 inmates received some form of mental health treatment in 2000, which is the first year that statistics were collected; 2750 inmates are on medication for mental health reasons.

There are inmates that do not need full inpatient acute care but cannot function in the general population setting. Those inmates are placed in the Step Down Unit at Patuxent which is designed to allow individuals to participate in a structured environment to assist them in the development of skills that will enhance their emotional and behavioral functioning with the goal of eventually returning them to a maintaining institution. A review of this population suggests that the majority of the individuals in this category suffer from adjustment difficulties, social withdrawal, life skill deficiencies, depression, substance abuse, and aggression.

Should an inmate require more intensive services, the acute in-patient unit is available to stabilize the individual through medication and therapy to achieve maximum functioning so that the individual may return to the maintaining institution. In the event that an individual has a chronic mental illness that prevents him/her from functioning in the general population of a prison, the individual may remain at CMHC-J for the balance of the incarceration period. There are approximately 40 inmates who have been at CMHC-J for two years or more.

Discharge Planning and Aftercare

Prior to release, there is an effort to develop a follow-up and/or after-care program for individuals that will continue to require care. Upon release from DOC, those that need a lower level of care are referred to programs, clinics, or other service providers by the parole and probation agents assigned to their case. Other individuals that require more significant additional care are referred to the inpatient treatment programs available through the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene at Clifton T. Perkins State Hospital.

QB.00 - DPSCS - Division of Correction

Inmates receive care while incarcerated, but discharge planning and continuing care are weak because:

- the availability of continuing care is limited due to a lack of service availability, in particular geographic regions of the State;
- limitations exist due to lack of space availability in programs;
- the parole and probation agent assigned to the released offender is the insurance mechanism for followup care which is based on self-reporting in several areas where electronic notifications of no-show are not available. This agent may not know for a considerable period of time if an offender is continuing to participate in a program or not; and
- most importantly, since aftercare is not comprehensive, the array of additional services an offender may need such as transportation, housing, food, clothing, and other necessities that were provided, at least in part during incarceration, are no longer available to the offender, which may cause the offender to recidivate because there is no safety net per se.

This void in the continuity of care needs to be addressed on a systemic basis where all entities that provide services or facilitate offenders' reentry to the community develop a comprehensive plan of delivery with safeguards so that the care an offender has received while incarcerated is not diminished by recidivism.

The division should discuss with the committees:

- **population size -- how much it is projected to increase, are inmates with mental health needs residing in special areas of maintaining institutions;**
- **facility adequacy -- are current facilities large enough to house all the offenders with mental health issues, and are the current facilities of the proper configuration;**
- **new medical contract -- what will the contract provide in terms of expanded or enhanced treatment and cost savings, if any;**
- **effectiveness of current mental health services provided;**
- **training of custody staff -- can custody staff augment services provided by the mental health staff and is custody staff aware of issues specific to inmates with mental health issues; and**
- **fiscal and policy requirements and impacts.**

2. Aging Inmate Population

With three-strikes laws becoming more common and many states abolishing parole altogether, the portion of the incarcerated population that is aging and/or ill is growing. Some states, like Mississippi, are nearly in a crisis situation due to the number of aged or infirm inmates ballooning and causing a severe drain on financial resources, staff, and space. Nationally, it costs nearly three times as much to incarcerate them, or about

QB.00 - DPSCS - Division of Correction

\$65,000 a year per inmate. Many custody staff members are not familiar with specialized medical procedures that some infirm inmates require and the burgeoning population in many states is either being housed in special housing units or in the case of Pennsylvania, new facilities.

In Maryland, the situation is not dire, but certainly needs to be monitored closely. The average age of inmates in the State system is now 34 years old, less than five years ago it was 30. The definition of “aged” or “elderly” varies widely among correctional professionals. DOC has found that the majority of inmates that have chronic medical or functional problems are over the age of 60. As of February 21, 2001, there were 243 inmates in the State correctional system that are 60 years of age or older. At this time the population is low enough to be managed within existing facilities with less than half of these inmates being housed in designated areas where staff and facilities are sufficient to administer specialized care.

Facilities that have special housing areas:	Maryland House of Correction Eastern Correctional Institution
---	--

Facilities with handicapped housing:	Western Correctional Institution Roxbury Correctional Institution Jessup Pre-Release Unit
--------------------------------------	---

However, it should be noted that if more specialized areas must be created in the future for aged/infirm/ill inmates new consent orders could be placed due to current overcrowding. At present, 962 inmates are housed in non-conventional areas.

As space is scarce, the division should continue to investigate the possibility of relocating elderly/infirm inmates that are currently in maximum security facilities to a less secure or less restrictive environment. This should be closely scrutinized, since the majority of inmates entering the system have committed violent offenses, many of which are connected to drugs, and the need for maximum security space is increasing. Another reason the move to a less secure environment should be investigated is that, statistically, the risk of recidivism drops significantly with age. Even though the average age of inmates has increased, the average length of stay is only 3.5 years, so the inmates that are being released and recidivating are younger than the older inmates that should be considered for placement in a less secure environment.

Medical paroles are sought for inmates that have terminal conditions and/or are no longer a threat to society due to medical conditions. These inmates are considered for medical parole by the Maryland Parole Commission. From 1997 to 1999, 252 inmates were referred to the commission from DOC for parole and 123 were granted parole.

Due to limitations in the Parole Information System (PARIS) database, only 94 of the 123 medical paroles from 1997-1999 period were located, and of those 94 only 67 were found in the Offender Based State Correctional Information System (OBSCIS) which is the tracking database for the Division of Parole and Probation. Once paroled and released from custody, an offender is still under State supervision and is therefore placed in OBSCIS. The status of the 67 offenders that were located are shown in **Exhibit 4**.

Exhibit 4

**Status of 67 Offenders
Offender Based State Correctional Information System
1997 through 1999**

<u>Status</u>	<u>Number of Offenders</u>
Deceased	33
Active--currently under supervision	11
Case closed at expiration of sentence	16
Case in unsatisfactory status*	2
Parole revoked	3
Outstanding parole retake warrant	2

*Unsatisfactory status means the offender has violated some condition of parole but the infraction was not so egregious, defined as something not a threat to public safety, that a parole retake warrant was issued

Source: Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services

The new inmate medical contract that DPSCS entered into on July 1, 2000, is structured so as to limit the possibility of escalating costs due to the more intensive treatment that many elderly inmates require. The contract is comprehensive and provides primary services, clinical services, mental services, hospitalization, pharmacy items, and laboratory testing. DPSCS believes that the new medical contract provides a greater level of service that will cost less than the last contract, because a greater number of services are provided that required additional charges in the last contract.

The division should discuss housing considerations, medical parole, recidivism, population growth, staffing considerations, and all facets of an aging inmate population.

3. Audit Regarding Spring Grove Hospital Center and State Use Industries

The Office of Legislative Audits issued a special report in December 2000 relating to the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene's Spring Grove Hospital Center and the DPSCS's State Use Industries (SUI) as a result of certain questionable or unsubstantiated transactions and practices that were revealed during the course of the regularly scheduled audits of these agencies.

QB.00 - DPSCS - Division of Correction

Major Findings

- ***Senior Management Override of Controls:*** SUI and the center each had a senior management employee who was primarily responsible for the activities commented upon in the report. The senior management employee at SUI (who was terminated in November 1999) was responsible for the majority of SUI's construction activities, including maintaining the project files and overseeing the related billings. The employee was able to override customary operating procedures and controls relating to the procurement of goods and services and approval of certain vendors' invoices. Oversight and monitoring of these activities were limited.
- ***Lack of Control Agency Involvement/Competitive Bidding for Construction Projects:*** During fiscal 1997 through 2000, SUI provided construction services totaling approximately \$6.7 million to the center for a variety of construction projects using minimal inmate labor. Instead, SUI used private contractors to perform the work and assessed the center an administrative fee (generally 10%) for arranging the work. Legal advice obtained from the Office of the Attorney General indicated that this practice runs counter to the purposes of SUI's statute. This statute provides, in part, that SUI develop programs that provide training and meaningful experience for eligible inmates with the objective of improving employability of the inmates upon release.

Under the aforementioned arrangement, the center did not competitively bid the work and the contracts were not subjected to control agency approvals (such as the State Department of General Services (DGS) and the Board of Public Works) as would normally occur for construction projects as stipulated by State law and regulations. For example, the auditors identified 14 construction projects at the center (with a total value of \$2 million) that individually exceeded the threshold that would normally require board approval. Furthermore, DGS subsequently advised that it believes SUI was not authorized to provide construction services to State agencies outside of the DPSCS based on the procurement provisions of the Code of Maryland Regulations.

- ***Billing Process Enabled Circumvention of State Budgetary Law and Procedures:*** Based upon requests received from the center, SUI frequently billed and received full payment from the center for construction services not yet rendered. This enabled the center to routinely circumvent State budget law by charging the expenditures against its current year appropriation instead of reverting such amounts to the State general fund or seeking appropriate approvals to retain such funds (e.g., encumbrances). For example, SUI had \$1,116,323 on deposit from the center as of June 30, 1999, of which \$839,446 had been advanced over a year earlier.
- ***Questionable or Unsubstantiated Transactions and Practices:*** There was a lack of adequate records and billing procedures that raised questions as to the validity of the construction services provided by SUI and the related amounts charged for these services. Additionally, certain actions of the former senior management employee responsible for the majority of SUI's construction services were questionable, causing doubt as to whether the center received full value for payments made to SUI. Furthermore, management personnel at the center did not actively monitor expenditures related to these construction projects.

QB.00 - DPSCS - Division of Correction

Questionable transactions of this former senior management employee were identified in a report, completed in January 2000, by the DPSCS' Internal Investigative Unit. The report indicated that this employee acknowledged preparing invoices on behalf of one contractor that received payments totaling approximately \$583,000 from SUI during calendar 1998 and 1999, primarily related to the center's projects. The report also indicated that this employee acknowledged diverting building materials from a construction site and using the materials for his personnel residence. In November and December 1999, SUI terminated the senior management employee and two employees who worked under his direction.

Various questionable transactions and practices were identified at SUI. For example, in certain cases only one vendor was contacted and when multiple vendors were reported as contacted, there was no independent documentation (such as written bid submissions from contractors) on file. Due to the lack of detailed specifications (such as square footage for paving work) documentation was lacking to evidence that full value was received for payments made. Furthermore, on other center projects, the auditors noted instances in which the dates on the subcontractor's invoices preceded the dates on the related bid tabulation sheets and receiving reports. In other instances, several subcontractor invoices that were paid appeared to be for the same construction activities at the center.

The center was overcharged in excess of \$100,000 for 13 construction projects totaling approximately \$1.1 million, because the same subcontractor's billings were used by SUI more than once to support the costs on separate projects.

The division should explain to the committees how the lack of agency controls came to be, and what has been done to rectify the issue -- specifically to Spring Grove Hospital Center, and generally to all other agency interactions.

Recommended Actions

1. Add the following language to the general fund appropriation:

, provided that funds appropriated for the purpose of making local jail per diem reimbursement payments or estimated payments (as provided under the Correctional Services Act, Section 9-402 of the Annotated Code), to any jurisdiction shall be subject to the following conditions:

- (1) Each jurisdiction shall submit fiscal 2001 per diem closeout data to the Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services by the close of business on December 1, 2001. Further, each jurisdiction shall submit fiscal 2001 inmate days reports not later than October 1, 2001. For any jurisdiction for which the Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services has not received fiscal 2001 per diem closeout data by December 1, 2001, and/or inmate days reports by October 1, 2001, the Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services shall deduct a non-recoverable 20% penalty from the net annual reimbursement payment for that jurisdiction.
- (2) For any jurisdiction for which the Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services has not received the fiscal 2001 inmate days or per diem closeout data by the above-stated due dates, an additional non-recoverable 20% deduction will be taken for every 30 days after the due date that the reports are not received.

Explanation: The State partially reimburses local jurisdictions for inmates sentenced between 91 and 365 days. This language will ensure that local jurisdictions submit data in a timely manner, and has been included in previous budgets.

	<u>Amount Reduction</u>		<u>Position Reduction</u>
2. Eliminate PIN 052291, Correctional Dietary Manager, located at Maryland Correctional Institution - Jessup, which has been vacant for two years.	\$ 52,057	GF	1.0
Total General Fund Reductions	\$ 52,057		1.0

Updates

1. Uniform Program

Starting on July 1, 2001, the pilot project of issuing a complete uniform complement for all inmates who are classified as maximum security will begin. The division expends considerable administrative and correctional resources on the management and control of inmate clothing without having achieved the desired control.

The uniform pilot project will be implemented in two phases. The first phase is the change-over of inmate uniforms at the Maryland Reception, Diagnostic, Classification Center (MRDCC) from current issue/style uniforms to the new issue/style uniforms. The change-over from old uniforms to new uniforms is not projected to have a fiscal impact. Inmates at MRDCC already wore uniforms so funds dedicated for old-style uniforms will simply be applied to the purchase of new-style uniforms. The second phase is the rollout at the Maryland House of Correction (MHC) and the Maryland House of Correction Annex (MHCX) starting on October 1, 2000. In the fiscal 2002 allowance there is \$265,000 split equally between MHC and MHCX for the program.

The policy includes the provision of a complete uniform complement for all inmates who are classified as maximum security and housed at MRDCC, MHC and MHCX. This pilot will cover over 3,000 inmates.

In fiscal 2002, inmates who are transferred to the maximum security institutions will receive a State issued uniform; personal clothing will be inventoried and sent to the offender's home. Additional uniform clothing articles, up to the amount allowed, may be purchased at the commissary and will be marked with identification for that inmate.

Starting in fiscal 2003, there are plans to rollout the program to inmates in medium and minimum security levels if the expected outcomes are realized. The annual rollout is shown in **Exhibit 5**.

Exhibit 5

Annual Uniform Rollout

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Facility</u>
2003	Maryland Correctional Institution - Jessup Eastern Correctional Institution Western Correctional Institution
2004	Maryland Correctional Institution - Hagerstown Roxbury Correctional Institution
2005	Maryland Correctional Training Center
2006	Metropolitan Transition Center

Source: Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services

QB.00 - DPSCS - Division of Correction

The agency expends considerable administrative and correctional resources on the management and control of inmate clothing without having achieved the desired control. The policy of providing inmate uniforms will address both of these concerns. The program is expected to result in the promotion of a more secure and orderly environment, and smoother correctional operations. Security elements include:

- immediate identification of an offender as an inmate;
- reduction of items received from the outside which must be searched successfully to eliminate contraband;
- increased effectiveness of officers conducting cell and person searches;
- reduction of inmate-on-inmate assaults;
- elimination of theft, selling and trading of clothing;
- decreased ability to hide weapons; and
- a diminished ability to identify oneself as a member of a gang, or security threat group.

All of these impacts are expected to lead to specific outcomes related to safety and security like a reduction in assaults, escapes, and disruptive infractions.

Current and Prior Year Budgets

**Current and Prior Year Budgets
Division of Correction
(\$ in Thousands)**

	<u>General Fund</u>	<u>Special Fund</u>	<u>Federal Fund</u>	<u>Reimb. Fund</u>	<u>Total</u>
Fiscal 2000					
Legislative Appropriation	\$445,403	\$53,044	\$525	\$5,573	\$504,545
Deficiency Appropriation	1,031	0	0	0	1,031
Budget Amendments	4,070	6,079	4,916	30	15,095
Reversions and Cancellations	0	(1,111)	(875)	(570)	(2,556)
Actual Expenditures	\$450,504	\$58,013	\$4,567	\$5,033	\$518,117
Fiscal 2001					
Legislative Appropriation	\$463,540	\$56,460	\$5,878	\$5,905	\$531,783
Budget Amendments	-397	0	0	0	(397)
Working Appropriation	\$463,143	\$56,460	\$5,878	\$5,905	\$531,386

Note: Numbers may not sum to total due to rounding.

Actual expenditures in fiscal 2000 totaled \$518.1 million and were \$13.6 million greater than the legislative appropriation. The division received a deficiency appropriation of slightly over \$1 million for overtime expenditures at the Maryland House of Correction Annex due to the actual overtime expenditures exceeding the budgeted amount due to staffing shortages and increasing demands upon custody staff.

QB.00 - DPSCS - Division of Correction

The amended, reverted, and canceled funds are due to the following:

- An amendment for \$4,866,272 in general funds funded the implementation of the annual salary increase and the deferred compensation match program statewide.
- A second general fund budget amendment for \$1,335,000 was to transfer surplus funds at year-end from other agencies within the department to cover deficits within DOC.
- Through a departmental reorganization, the Internal Investigation Unit, Central Hiring Unit, and Employee Health Unit were relocated to the Office of the Secretary from DOC -- total general funds transferred -- \$2,131,149.
- A special fund amendment of \$867,209 from the catastrophic event fund covered overtime costs during the snow emergency in January 2000.
- Additional special fund amendments for increased State Use SUI sales, greater inmate welfare funds, work release earnings and home monitoring fees totaled \$5,211,849.
- \$2,300,000 in federal funds were received from the U.S. Department of Justice's Marshal Service for housing federal prisoners at MCAC. The reimbursement covered costs related to housing federal prisoners such as custodial salaries, contractual food service, and inmate medical care. The reimbursement rate is \$50 per inmate per day.
- Other federal fund amendments included the "Drug Free State Prison Demonstration Project" for \$136,266, the "K-9 Enforcement Grant" for \$20,240, the "Bullet Proof Vest Program" for \$32,184, and the "State Criminal Alien Assistance Program" for \$2,474,289.
- The only reimbursable amendment was \$30,000 for laundry services for the Thomas Financial Center at the Western Correctional Institution.
- Cancellations of special, federal, reimbursable funds totaled \$2,555,127 and are attributable to the non-attainment of federal and reimbursable funds while the special fund cancellation was due to unspent inmate welfare funds.

In fiscal 2001, there have been two general fund budget amendments. The first amendment of \$1,692,788 was for implementation of the cost of living adjustment and the annual salary review. The second was a decrease of \$2,090,095 due to the transfer of positions and funding associated with the Central Hiring Unit and the Employee Health Unit from DOC to the Office of the Secretary.

Governor's Allowance Position Summary

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Number</u>
Maryland House of Correction Annex	Correctional Officer I	10
Maryland Correctional Institution -- Jessup	Correctional Officer I	19
	Correctional Officer Lieutenant	2
Metropolitan Transition Center	Correctional Officer I	20
Maryland Correctional Adjustment Center	Correctional Officer I	9
	Correctional Officer Lieutenant	3
Maryland Reception, Diagnostic & Classification Ctr.	Correctional Officer I	20
	Correctional Officer Lieutenant	2
Maryland Correctional Training Center	Correctional Officer I	17
Roxbury Correctional Institution	Correctional Officer I	20
Maryland Correctional Institution for Women	Correctional Dietary Officer I	5
	Correctional Dietary Supervisor	1
Brockbridge Correctional Facility	Correctional Officer I	5
	Correctional Officer Lieutenant	1
Jessup Pre-Release Unit	Correctional Officer I	3
Eastern Pre-Release Unit	Correctional Officer I	1
Baltimore Pre-Release Unit	Correctional Officer I	1
Baltimore City Correctional Center	Correctional Officer I	5
	Correctional Officer Lieutenant	1
Central Laundry Facility	Correctional Officer I	3
	Correctional Officer Lieutenant	1
	Correctional Maintenance Officer	5
Toulson Boot Camp	Correctional Officer I	2
Western Correctional Institution	Warden	1
	Administrative Aide	1
	Personnel Associate	1
	Personnel Clerk	1
	Personnel Specialist I	1
	Correctional Security Chief	1

QB.00 - DPSCS - Division of Correction

	Correctional Officer I	72
	Correctional Officer Sergeant	12
	Correctional Officer Lieutenant	6
	Correctional Officer Captain	3
	Office Secretary II	1
	Correctional Dietary Officer I	4
	Correctional Dietary Manager	1
	Correctional Maintenance Officer I	3
	Correctional Maintenance Supervisor	1
	Correctional Case Mgmt. Specialist	2
	Correctional Case Mgmt. Supervisor	1
State Use Industries	SUI Office Trainee	2
	SUI Supervisor	1
	SUI Plant Supervisor	1
	Operator Tractor-Trailer	2
	Industries Representative	1
	Data Processing Programmer Analyst	1
	Administrator V	1
	Administrator VI	1
		<hr/>
Total		278
Correctional Officer Summary:	Correctional Officer I	207
	Correctional Officer Sergeant	12
	Correctional Officer Lieutenant	16
	Correctional Officer Captain	3

Cumulative Recidivism Rates

<u>FiscalYear of Release</u>	<u>Total Released</u>	<u>First Year After Release</u>		<u>Second Year After Release</u>		<u>Third Year After Release</u>	
1987	5,326	1,074	20.17%	1,931	36.26%	2,508	47.09%
1988	5,310	941	17.72%	1,876	35.33%	2,354	44.33%
1989	5,496	1,027	18.69%	1,857	33.79%	0	0.00%
1990	7,756	1,439	18.55%	2,640	34.04%	3,418	44.07%
1991	8,664	1,771	20.44%	3,085	35.61%	3,863	44.59%
1992	9,495	1,827	19.24%	3,234	34.06%	4,123	43.42%
1993	9,301	1,731	18.61%	3,102	33.35%	4,044	43.48%
1994	9,947	1,916	19.26%	3,441	34.59%	4,317	43.40%
1995	11,794	2,560	21.71%	4,327	36.69%	5,502	46.65%
1996	13,623	3,050	22.39%	5,302	38.92%	6,863	50.38%
1997	13,536	3,300	24.38%	5,702	42.12%	7,189	53.11%
1998	14,654	3,556	24.27%	6,055	41.32%	n/a	n/a
1999	13,853	3,442	24.85%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Source: Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services

QB.00 - DPSCS - Division of Correction

Object/Fund	Object/Fund Difference Report DPSCS - Division of Correction					
	FY00 Actual	FY01 Working Appropriation	FY02 Allowance	FY01 - FY02 Amount Change	Percent Change	
Positions						
01 Regular	7302.50	7398.50	7676.50	278.00	3.8%	
02 Contractual	78.30	176.71	176.61	(0.10)	(0.1%)	
Total Positions	7380.80	7575.21	7853.11	277.90	3.7%	
Objects						
01 Salaries and Wages	\$ 342,468,367	\$ 351,746,038	\$ 386,833,052	\$ 35,087,014	10.0%	
02 Technical & Spec Fees	1,970,646	3,320,467	3,307,963	(12,504)	(0.4%)	
03 Communication	1,849,102	2,048,923	1,937,126	(111,797)	(5.5%)	
04 Travel	344,771	242,320	289,343	47,023	19.4%	
06 Fuel & Utilities	21,798,290	20,309,107	21,648,852	1,339,745	6.6%	
07 Motor Vehicles	3,045,090	2,521,397	2,402,133	(119,264)	(4.7%)	
08 Contractual Services	58,992,854	64,988,917	66,884,668	1,895,751	2.9%	
09 Supplies & Materials	53,714,803	51,559,741	53,186,617	1,626,876	3.2%	
10 Equip -- Replacement	922,979	1,061,638	1,298,229	236,591	22.3%	
11 Equip -- Additional	1,082,625	915,002	566,635	(348,367)	(38.1%)	
12 Grants, Subsidies, Contr	30,094,704	31,576,967	31,291,349	(285,618)	(0.9%)	
13 Fixed Charges	1,365,010	1,095,961	1,045,770	(50,191)	(4.6%)	
14 Land & Structures	467,391	0	0	0	0.0%	
Total Objects	\$ 518,116,632	\$ 531,386,478	\$ 570,691,737	\$ 39,305,259	7.4%	
Funds						
01 General Fund	\$ 450,504,490	\$ 463,143,086	\$ 499,541,682	\$ 36,398,596	7.9%	
03 Special Fund	58,012,666	56,460,268	59,383,562	2,923,294	5.2%	
05 Federal Fund	4,566,678	5,878,218	5,759,860	(118,358)	(2.0%)	
09 Reimbursable Fund	5,032,798	5,904,906	6,006,633	101,727	1.7%	
Total Funds	\$ 518,116,632	\$ 531,386,478	\$ 570,691,737	\$ 39,305,259	7.4%	

Note: Full-time and contractual positions and salaries are reflected for operating budget programs only.

**Fiscal Summary
DPSCS - Division of Correction**

<u>Unit/Program</u>	FY00	FY01	FY01	FY00 - FY01	FY02	FY01 - FY02
	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Legislative Appropriation</u>	<u>Working Appropriation</u>	<u>% Change</u>	<u>Allowance</u>	<u>% Change</u>
01 General Administration	\$ 6,301,885	\$ 9,219,183	\$ 7,172,492	13.8%	\$ 7,002,486	(2.4%)
02 Classification, Education & Religious Services	16,817,552	18,142,994	18,173,220	8.1%	17,941,484	(1.3%)
03 Canine Operations	1,745,501	1,759,546	1,764,720	1.1%	1,797,903	1.9%
01 Maryland House of Correction	35,527,558	37,175,582	37,293,309	5.0%	39,082,690	4.8%
02 Maryland House of Correction Annex	31,629,973	30,928,915	31,017,769	(1.9%)	33,671,329	8.6%
03 Maryland Correctional Institution -- Jessup	23,624,021	23,390,968	23,475,945	(0.6%)	25,549,521	8.8%
01 Metropolitan Transition Center	35,081,471	35,738,626	35,859,923	2.2%	38,400,357	7.1%
03 Maryland Correctional Adjustment Center	14,272,022	14,837,697	14,870,620	4.2%	15,648,273	5.2%
04 Maryland Reception, Diagnostic, and Classification	26,355,099	26,500,725	26,623,163	1.0%	27,764,753	4.3%
01 Maryland Correctional Institution -- Hagerstown	41,090,144	42,312,937	42,455,970	3.3%	44,651,920	5.2%
02 Maryland Correctional Training Center	41,178,919	41,482,222	41,606,843	1.0%	44,134,117	6.1%
03 Roxbury Correctional Institution	29,980,437	30,113,264	30,246,261	0.9%	31,910,714	5.5%
01 Maryland Correctional Institution for Women	16,162,870	17,238,603	17,294,250	7.0%	18,456,778	6.7%
02 Pre-Release Unit for Women	3,284,129	3,416,353	3,427,691	4.4%	3,801,915	10.9%
01 General Administration	7,058,065	6,738,586	6,794,638	(3.7%)	7,483,890	10.1%
02 Brockbridge Correctional Facility	11,361,774	12,269,705	12,310,527	8.4%	12,575,326	2.2%
03 Jessup Pre-Release Unit	9,648,539	9,869,213	9,891,779	2.5%	10,472,355	5.9%
05 Southern Maryland Pre-Release Unit	2,901,586	2,911,561	2,918,371	0.6%	3,110,780	6.6%
06 Eastern Pre-Release Unit	2,844,343	2,956,572	2,962,975	4.2%	3,069,855	3.6%
08 Baltimore Pre-Release Unit	3,301,645	3,194,780	3,204,301	(2.9%)	3,310,643	3.3%
09 Home Detention Unit	4,712,668	5,391,607	5,415,465	14.9%	4,919,226	(9.2%)
10 Baltimore City Correctional Center	8,667,403	8,586,728	8,605,842	(0.7%)	8,838,606	2.7%
11 Central Laundry Facility	7,788,989	7,989,771	8,006,549	2.8%	8,711,166	8.8%
12 Toulson Boot Camp	6,744,018	6,915,892	6,931,587	2.8%	7,438,924	7.3%
01 Eastern Correctional Institution	56,880,280	58,527,215	58,741,048	3.3%	66,612,916	13.4%
02 Poplar Hill Pre-Release Unit	2,810,575	2,829,610	2,836,212	0.9%	3,176,666	12.0%
01 Western Correctional Institution	31,566,819	33,798,083	33,938,161	7.5%	41,050,871	21.0%
01 State Use Industries	38,778,347	37,546,847	37,546,847	(3.2%)	40,106,273	6.8%
Total Expenditures	\$ 518,116,632	\$ 531,783,785	\$ 531,386,478	2.6%	\$ 570,691,737	7.4%
General Fund	\$ 450,504,490	\$ 463,540,393	\$ 463,143,086	2.8%	\$ 499,541,682	7.9%
Special Fund	58,012,666	56,460,268	56,460,268	(2.7%)	59,383,562	5.2%
Federal Fund	4,566,678	5,878,218	5,878,218	28.7%	5,759,860	(2.0%)
Total Appropriations	\$ 513,083,834	\$ 525,878,879	\$ 525,481,572	2.4%	\$ 564,685,104	7.5%

Fiscal Summary
DPSCS - Division of Correction

<u>Unit/Program</u>	FY00	FY01	FY01	FY00 - FY01	FY02	FY01 - FY02
	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Legislative Appropriation</u>	<u>Working Appropriation</u>	<u>% Change</u>	<u>Allowance</u>	<u>% Change</u>
Reimbursable Fund	\$ 5,032,798	\$ 5,904,906	\$ 5,904,906	17.3%	\$ 6,006,633	1.7%
Total Funds	\$ 518,116,632	\$ 531,783,785	\$ 531,386,478	2.6%	\$ 570,691,737	7.4%