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Executive Summary

“Keeping our citizens safe...is one of state government’s primary responsibilities. The challenge is great...”

Governor Nathan Deal
State of Georgia
Inaugural Address
January 10, 2011

The State of Georgia and its criminal justice system are at a pivotal point. The “Get Tough on Crime” policies and “Truth in Sentencing” movement of the 80’s and 90’s have combined to contribute to overcrowding in the Georgia prison system and exploding probation populations.

According to a recent PEW study, 1 in 13 Georgians is under some form of correctional supervision and correctional spending is at an all time high. (The PEW Center on the States, 2009) In fact, nationwide, correctional spending has quadrupled in the last twenty years, making it the second fastest growing area of state budgets, directly behind Medicaid. (The PEW Center on the States, 2011)

Georgia, like so many other states, is in the midst of an unprecedented budget crisis and is implementing cost cutting measures at all levels of state government. Corrections and public safety agencies are not immune to these cuts. The challenge Georgia faces is dealing with growing correctional populations while making the best use of its resources and continuing to enhance public safety?

Justice Reinvestment is a data driven approach to reduce spending and reinvest savings in cost effective, evidence based programming. (Justice Center - The Council of State Governments, 2010) The process is driven by continual analysis and assessment to improve those criminal justice practices, policies and procedures that are working and discontinue those that are not. Often, it includes changing the culture of an organization and the way it has historically responded to the factors driving these areas.

The Georgia Department of Corrections has chosen to focus its Justice Reinvestment efforts in the following areas – Admissions to Prison, Length of Stay in Jail, Length of Stay in Diagnostics and Length of Stay in State Prison. A very simple formula is being used in the process. Reducing Admissions and/or Length of Stay (LOS) = Savings. The savings generated when this formula is applied can be significant not only in monetary resources but in the resources of our people, processes and infrastructure.

There are numerous opportunities for reinvestment in this process. Many can be accomplished within the Department while others must include buy-in from many of Georgia’s criminal justice stakeholders such as the judiciary, prosecutors, public defenders, law enforcement as well as members of the community.
The newly established Criminal Justice Reform Council will review Georgia's correctional system, criminal justice structure, as well as sentencing laws during the upcoming 2012 legislative session. It is expected that many deliberate legislative decisions, as well as policy decisions, will emerge from the Council’s recommendations. The Department stands ready to assist the members of the Council as they examine the inner workings of the Georgia criminal justice system and is prepared to implement any findings that may arise from its research. This report is intended to provide information to the Council and other stakeholders within the criminal justice system and apprise them of the direction the Department has already taken in its Justice Reinvestment efforts and reform.

Georgia has been afforded a rare opportunity to look internally at its criminal justice system. It must address sentencing policy in the areas of sentencing caps, parole eligibility and recidivist statutes. Also funding for community resources such as substance abuse and mental health treatment and accountability courts is needed. These programs are proven effective both in rehabilitating offenders and reducing recidivism. Georgia must “think outside the box” and decide how the criminal justice system of tomorrow and the next decade will look and function. The Department of Corrections views this as an opportunity to self-analyze our policies and procedures, and as an agency, is committed to criminal justice reform through the process of Justice Reinvestment. It is further committed to public safety for the citizens of the great State of Georgia and to continual improvement as an organization.

“...Policy makers need updated information about the public safety return on corrections spending in their states. Specifically, they need knowledge about what is working – and what is not - to slow down the revolving door...”
(The PEW Center on the States, 2011)
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1. Analyze criminal justice trends to understand factors driving jail, prison and probation populations

2. Develop and implement policy options to generate savings and increase public safety

3. Quantify costs and potential savings

4. Reinvest in select, high-risk communities and other prevention-oriented strategies

5. Assess impact of reinvestment strategies and enhance the accountability of criminal justice system actors and policies

Interagency Strategic Planning

Figure 1: Justice Reinvestment Model (Bureau of Justice Assistance, 2010) (Urban Institute - Justice Policy Center, 2011)
Justice Reinvestment Defined

No discussion about Justice Reinvestment can be held until all stakeholders have a clear understanding of the processes involved. As previously seen Figure 1 is a representation of the processes typically seen as a state agency embarks on its journey of Justice Reinvestment. These processes are representative in nature and can be adjusted by each stakeholder as they immerse themselves and their agency into the strategies of Justice Reinvestment.

Justice reinvestment is a data driven approach designed to enhance public safety by reducing correctional spending and redirecting the savings into effective alternatives. Its primary goals are to decrease crime and reduce the recidivism rate. Data is collected from corrections, courts, crime statistics, etc. The data analysis is used to pinpoint specific factors driving the correctional system costs. A strategic plan to modify or control the factors and ensuing costs is developed based on policies and evidence-based practices. Generated savings are then reinvested into effective alternatives, programs and/or supervision strategies. Justice reinvestment is a continual process that seeks to refine its practices and policies using ongoing strategic planning involving all of the criminal justice stakeholders. (Bureau of Justice Assistance, 2010) (Urban Institute - Justice Policy Center, 2011)

Figure 2 (page3) shows the FY 2012 budget for the State of Georgia excluding the General Obligation Debt Sinking Fund. Only one of every 11 dollars appropriated or 9% goes to public safety which includes the Departments of Corrections, Defense, Juvenile Justice and Public Safety, the State Board of Pardons and Parole and the Georgia Bureau of Investigation (Figure 3 – page 3). (Georgia Office of Planning and Budget, 2011)

While Georgia manages the fifth largest prison system in the United States and has 1 in every 13 adults under correctional supervision, its leadership has managed the State’s resources so effectively it ranks 14th in total costs spent and 30th in the percentage of general funds appropriated. (See Appendix C)

Fact:

During FY 2008 nine of every ten correctional dollars was spent on prisons.

(The PEW Center on the States, 2009)
Figure 2: GA FY 2012 Budget by Category (General Obligation Debt Sinking Fund of $1,083,263,065 not Included)

Public Safety Portion of FY 2012 Budget
$1,542,126,919

Figure 3: GA Public Safety Budget - FY 2012
Chapter 1

Historical Background and Trends
In March of 2009 the PEW Center on the States released a comprehensive study entitled *One in 31: The Long Reach of American Corrections*. This study chronicled the meteoric rise of correctional populations in the United States and its associated cost by looking at each state in detail. The correctional population in the United States had reached 2.3 million with 1 in every 100 adults in prison or jail. Just as the prison populations had risen, so had the numbers of those under community supervision to an average of 1 in 45. Combined, these two areas total 1 in 31. A disturbing 3.2 percent of the population of the United States was under correctional supervision. (The PEW Center on the States, 2009) Figure 4.

In Georgia, those numbers were even more troubling. In 1982, 1 in 37 Georgians was under correctional supervision. (The PEW Center on the States, 2009) Upon the release of the PEW report in 2009, 1 in 13 Georgians was under correctional control and the state correctional budget was over $1.1 billion. (See Figure 5-7 on page 6 for national numbers and rankings.)

Georgia was not alone. Many of the states that had taken a traditional, Get Tough on Crime approach also had soaring correctional populations and costs. The totals shown in Figure 4 are for total correctional population including all forms of probation, parole and incarceration at the city, county, state and federal level. (The PEW Center on the States, 2009)

---

**Make no mistake. While this effort should ultimately uncover strategies that will save taxpayer dollars, first and foremost we are attacking the human cost of a society with too much crime, too many people behind bars, too many children growing up without a much needed parent and too many wasted lives.”**

Honorable Nathan Deal
Governor – State of Georgia
(Watchdog.org, 2011)
Figure 5: Top 15 – Remaining states spent less than $1 billion - Full list in appendix C

Figure 6: Georgia was 30th out of 50 states spending 5.9% of its general fund on corrections in CY 2008. Full list in appendix C

Figure 7: Top 10 States - Total # of Offenders CY 2008 – Full list in appendix C
Many factors led to this current state of affairs. The “War on Drugs” began in the 1970s after a great influx of cocaine and heroin and then later “crack” cocaine of the 80s. Numerous federal agencies were created to combat the spread of illegal drugs and the after-effects of them. 

In 1974, after extensive study of criminal rehabilitation programs from 1945 to 1967, New York Criminologist Robert Martinson and several other researchers came to the conclusion that “nothing works.” Specifically they stated, “With few and isolated exceptions, the rehabilitative efforts that have been reported so far have had no appreciable effect on recidivism.” (Sarre, 1999) 

In response, the school of thought pendulum swung from the “Treatment” approach that was being taken in many instances to the “Get Tough” approach that became predominant in the 80s and into the 90s. Martinson’s report effectively ended programs and efforts to rehabilitate offenders in many states. In 1978 Martinson submitted an amended report citing errors in his initial research and pointing out that programming in conjunction with effective supervision and swift and certain sanctions was effective. However, by this time the pendulum had already moved to the opposite end of the spectrum. (Sociologyindex.com, 2011)

The Get Tough on Crime approach was also big business politically and financially during the tough economic times of the 80s and 90s. Monies devoted to the construction and eventual staffing of prisons meant jobs – jobs that were very beneficial to communities hardest hit by economic recessions. Politically, taking a hard stance against crime was looked upon favorably by the constituency as well. Prison growth both in Georgia and nationwide continued to increase.

The Get Tough on Crime movement of the 1980s led to the Truth in Sentencing movement that lasted through much of the late 80s and 90s. Truth in Sentencing was made up of a number of initiatives at both the state and national levels – mandatory minimum sentences, abolition or curtailment of parole, “Three Strikes” laws, recidivist statutes and sentencing, among others. (Carr, 2008) In 1984, the Georgia legislature repealed the earned time statute, effectively meaning an offender would serve day for day unless paroled. The Truth in Sentencing goal was to make it clear at sentencing how long an offender would spend in prison or at least guarantee they would spend a “long time” in prison. (Georgia Budget and Policy Insitute, 2008)
By the 1980s and 1990s prison overcrowding had become a nationwide problem. At that time offenders might only serve one-third of the sentence imposed by the Court due to the fact that there simply was not enough prison bed space available. Compare the numbers in the Figure 8 below. In the late 80s and early 90s, the average Georgia offender would serve approximately 30-35 percent of the sentence handed down by the Judge. For example, in 1990 the average length of a prison sentence ordered by the Judge was 4.59 years (4 years and 7 months). Conversely, an offender averaged serving only 1.3 years (1 year and 4 months). These types of sentence serve times led to harsher and longer sentences being handed down, further exacerbating the problem and creating a vicious cycle. Compare those numbers to 2010 where the average sentence length is 4.55 years and the average serve time is 2.87 years. While the sentence lengths are almost the same, the serve time doubled. (Carr, 2011)

Truth in Sentencing trends sought to address the discrepancy between the sentences handed down by the Courts and the actual amount of time being served. Georgia’s responded by passing its “Two Strike” law in 1994 creating one of the toughest “Seven Deadly Sin” law in the nation.

That law, OCGA §17-10-6.1, stated that persons convicted of one of the “Seven Deadly Sins” – murder, rape, armed robbery, aggravated child molestation, aggravated sodomy, aggravated sexual battery and voluntary manslaughter – were to serve a mandatory minimum of 10 years of their sentence or the maximum allowed by law without the possibility of parole. This law also raised the possibility of parole to a minimum of 14 years on anyone serving a life sentence.
for a first strike and anyone convicted of a second strike serves Life without the Possibility of Parole. This law took the ability to parole individuals out of the Parole Board's hands and caused the numbers in prison to begin a sharp rise. (Georgia Board of Pardons and Parole, 1998)

In 1998, the Georgia Parole Board came up with an expanded list of twenty other crimes that were violent or sexual in nature, for which an offender would have to serve at least 90 percent of their sentence before being considered for parole. This law was struck down twice in court; but in 2006, the Board implemented the Board Designated Violent Offender Policy which required offenders convicted of certain crimes to serve 65, 75 or 90 percent of their sentence before being eligible for parole. (Welsh, 2008)

Another law passed in 2006 was HB 1059 which further lengthened the stay in prison for some under a life sentence. HB 1059 amended OCGA §42-9-39 by mandating that anyone previously sentenced to a life sentence and subsequently convicted of the crime of murder must serve 30 years before being pardoned or eligible for parole. It further required that anyone convicted of consecutive life sentences, one of which is for murder, must serve consecutive 30 year sentences up to a maximum of 60 years before becoming eligible for pardon or parole. Figure 9 shows how the average time served on a life sentence has almost doubled in the last seven years due to many of the new tougher laws that have been passed. (GDC, 2011) Sentences of these lengths have contributed, in part, to the growth and subsequent overcrowding seen in the prison system. This is not to say that these offenders should not be incarcerated for the offenses they have committed, but that their sentence length is a factor to be considered when looking at the Georgia prison population.

![Average Time Served on a Life Sentence](image)

Figure 9: Average Time Served on a Life Sentence

In 1995 the federal government began the Violent Offender Incarceration/Truth in Sentencing Program (VOITIS). VOITIS awarded funds to states to encourage the passage of tough new sentencing laws and to help offset the costs of building and operating additional prisons to
accommodate the new, longer sentenced offenders. VOITIS was in effect from FY 1996 through FY 2001 with Georgia qualifying for and receiving funds each of these years. Of the $2.7 billion nationwide funding, Georgia received more than $82 million (only eight states received more funds than Georgia). (Carr, 2008)

Figure 10 is a timeline outlining the construction of Georgia prisons. Each dot represents a prison being opened with the larger dots representing more than one prison opening in a year. Georgia currently operates only two prisons opened before 1965; Georgia State Prison and Lee Arrendale State Prison were opened in 1937 and 1951 respectively. As you can see there was a large increase beginning in the late 70s and ending in the mid 90s. VOITIS was a major factor in this expansion.

The “Two Strikes and You’re Out” laws impacted the State considerably and continue to have lasting effects today. By the middle of 1998, there were over 2000 offenders in the prison system for the Seven Deadly Sins. Almost 700 of these were first-strike, life-sentenced offenders, totaling six percent of Georgia’s total prison population at that time. The categories of 1st Strike, 2nd Strike - Life Without Parole (LWOP) and Life comprised over 6,600 offenders or 17 percent of Georgia’s prison population. By early 1999, another 600 had entered the system for an increase to 22 percent in about 6 months. (Georgia State Board of Pardons and Parole, 2011)

Overcrowding continued to be a problem with growth in the prison population every year from 1979 until 2003 with the exception of one year. The effects of the Two Strike laws were cumulative in nature and continue to have a snowball effect even today. A recent study estimated that offenders classified under the “Seven Deadly Sins” could cost Georgia taxpayers between $5 and $8 billion over a 10-31 year time period depending on whether the judges sentence them to the minimum (10 years) or the maximum. (Welsh, 2008)
Case Studies - Disparity in Sentencing and Sentencing Ranges

Five Most Frequently Sentenced Offenses since 2000

There are forty-nine Judicial Circuits in the State of Georgia. The charts and graphs shown in this report are actual representations of each circuit’s sentencing patterns from January 2000 to March 2011. To emphasize the information in this report and not an individual judicial circuit’s trends or practices, each circuit has been assigned a random number of 1 through 49. Each circuit’s assigned random numbers remain constant in the subsequent charts.

Broad sentencing ranges, disparity in sentencing from circuit to circuit and long probated sentences are among the factors that have led to increased growth and prison overcrowding. Georgia’s criminal codes have a broad range of possible sentences for most offenses, allowing great liberty in recommendation and sentencing. Sentencing patterns emerge based on public perception of the offense or historical precedence in the circuit. (Carr, 2011) A recent study of the top five felony offenses (Possession of Cocaine, Forgery – 1st Degree, Burglary, Theft by Taking and Aggravated Assault) received by the Department from January of 2000 to March of 2011 showed some marked trends. Table 1 outlines the five offenses, the corresponding OCGA reference, the sentencing range for that offense and the number of total sentences (prison and probation) for each offense. The five case studies follow in the order of most frequently sentenced – Possession of Cocaine – to the least sentenced of the five offenses – Aggravated Assault. (Carr, 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense name</th>
<th>OCGA Reference</th>
<th>Sentencing range</th>
<th>Prison sentences</th>
<th>Probation sentences</th>
<th>Total sentences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Possession of cocaine</td>
<td>16-13 -030e</td>
<td>1st conviction 2-15 yrs, or probation 2nd+ conviction 5-30 yrs, or probation</td>
<td>18,244</td>
<td>42,003</td>
<td>60,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgery 1st degree</td>
<td>16-09 -001</td>
<td>1-10 yrs, or probation</td>
<td>10,824</td>
<td>32,335</td>
<td>43,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>16-07 -001</td>
<td>1st conviction, 2-15 yrs, or probation 2nd conviction, 2-20 yrs, NO probation 3rd+conviction, 5-20 yrs, NO probation</td>
<td>19,043</td>
<td>20,645</td>
<td>39,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft by taking</td>
<td>16-08 -002</td>
<td>Less than $500 is a misdemeanor More than $500 is a felony 1-10 yrs, or probation</td>
<td>8,406</td>
<td>29,260</td>
<td>37,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>16-05 -021a</td>
<td>1-20 yrs 3-20 yrs, victim is family or over age 65 5-20 yrs, victim is officer or teacher</td>
<td>13,079</td>
<td>17,090</td>
<td>30,169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Five Most Frequently Sentenced Offenses since 2000
Possession of Cocaine

Possession of Cocaine showed interesting trends. It is the most frequently sentenced offense in the state and since 2000 there have been over 60,000 sentences given for this offense. Approximately 18,000 of these sentences were to prison and 42,000 were to probation. Figure 11 shows the sentencing trends for common sentence lengths on those cases that are prison bound and depicts the noticeable trends for 2, 3, 5, 10 and 15 year sentences.

Common Sentence Lengths for Possession of Cocaine

Figure 11: Common Sentence Lengths - Possession of Cocaine

Figure 12 (page 13) shows the average length of a prison sentence given for Possession of Cocaine within the last 10 years. Circuit 45 was highest at a little over 14 years for the average prison sentence, while Circuit 2’s average sentence was only 2.7 years. The average statewide sentence levied on prison cases was 6.46 years for the offense of Possession of Cocaine.

Figure 13 (page 13) shows the average percentage of cases that were sent to prison from the judicial circuits for this offense. The statewide average was 29 percent with Circuit 14 having the highest at 67 percent and Circuit 19 having the lowest at 10 percent – a substantial difference considering these cases were prosecuted under the same statute.
Figure 12: Possession of Cocaine – Avg. Prison Sentence

Figure 13: Possession of Cocaine - % to Prison
Forgery – 1st Degree

The offense of Forgery – 1st Degree was the second most commonly sentenced offense from January 2000 until March of 2011. There were over 43,000 sentences handed down for this offense with almost 11,000 of them being prison sentences and about 32,000 being probated sentences.

Of the almost 11,000 offenders sentenced to prison for Forgery, Figure 14 demonstrates the most common sentence lengths. Once again the propensity of the Courts to sentence at intervals of 2, 3, 5, and 10 years is shown in addition to some sentencing occurring at the 15 year mark.

![Common Sentence Lengths for Forgery - 1st Degree](image)

Figure 14: Common Sentence Lengths for Forgery

Figure 15 (page 15) delineates the average prison sentence for Forgery for the reporting period with a high in Circuit 35 of 8.77 years and a low in Circuit 46 of 3.01 years. The statewide average prison sentence was 5.96 years for the offense of Forgery.

Figure 16 (page 15) shows the average percentage of offenders sentenced to prison for the offense of Forgery – 1st Degree. The circuit with the highest average was Circuit 27 at 44 percent of its offenders going to prison for Forgery; while in Circuit 41, only 8 percent of the offenders went to prison.
Figure 15: Forgery 1st Degree – Avg. Prison Sentence

Figure 16: Forgery 1st Degree - % to Prison
Burglary

The offense of Burglary was the third most sentenced offense since January 2000. There were almost 40,000 offenders sentenced for this offense with 47 percent of those sentenced receiving a prison sentence. In Georgia, Burglary has a wide sentencing range depending on how many prior convictions an individual has for this offense.

Figure 17 once again shows the Courts inclination to sentences in specific intervals with obvious spikes at the 5, 10, 15 and 20 year marks for the offense of Burglary.

![Common Sentence Lengths for Burglary](image)

The statewide average prison sentence length on a Burglary charge since January 2000 was 8.14 years. Circuit 35 has the highest average with 11.24 years to prison on a Burglary sentence while Circuit 46 has the lowest at 4.37 years per sentence. Figure 18 (page 17)

Circuit 26 averaged sending 93 percent of its cases to prison on Burglary charges while in Circuits 19 and 22 only 22 percent of the cases are prison bound. The statewide prison case average for this category was 47 percent. Figure 19 (page 17)
Theft By Taking

Theft by Taking was the fourth most frequently sentenced offense over the past 10 years with a total of over 37,000 cases being sentenced. Of the 37,000, a little over 8,000 were sentenced to prison and approximately 29,000 were placed on probation.

Common prison sentence lengths for the offense of Theft By Taking are shown in Figure 20. As with the other most frequently sentenced offenses, there are spikes at 3, 5 and 10 years with a small bump at 15 years.

![Common Sentence Lengths for Theft By Taking](image)

The statewide average prison sentence for Theft by Taking is 6 years. Circuit 46 is below that average with an average of 3.71 years for offenders from that circuit while Circuit 25 is above the average at 8.27 years. Figure 21 (page 18)

Circuit 21 leads the state with 38 percent of its offenders sentenced for Theft By Taking sent to prison; while in Circuit 41, only 6 percent of offenders committing this offense are incarcerated. The statewide average for the percentage of offenders incarcerated for this offense is 22 percent. Figure 22 (page 18)
Figure 21: Theft By Taking - Avg. Prison Sentence

Figure 22: Theft By Taking - % to Prison
Aggravated Assault

The offense of Aggravated Assault, the fifth most frequently sentenced offense, demonstrated very interesting trends in a couple of areas. The study showed over 30,000 sentences received since January 2000. Of those sentences approximately 13,000 had some form of incarceration and 17,000 were straight probation.

The chart in Figure 23 clearly shows upturns at the 5, 10, 15 and 20 year marks on cases sentenced to prison - showing a propensity of the Courts to sentence in specific patterns for this offense.

![Most Common Sentence Lengths - Aggravated Assault](image)

In Figure 24 (page 21) the average prison sentence varied from 12.92 years in Circuit 37 to less than half that in Circuit 46 with 6.38 years.

The next area is the percentage of cases sent to prison for the offense of Aggravated Assault. These numbers shown in Figure 25 (page 21) vary from 66% in Circuits 21 and 29 to 22% in Circuit 22.

The information represented by these case studies show the tremendous disparity in sentence length as well as the percentage of those sent to prison from one end of the state to the other. These offenses are prosecuted under the same statutes; but as shown, the disposition of each case can be very different. The factors controlling and driving these types of practices must be considered for true criminal justice reform and subsequent justice reinvestment to take place.
Figure 24: Aggravated Assault – Avg. Prison Sentence

Figure 25: Aggravated Assault – % to Prison
Justice Reinvestment – The Main Goal

The Department, as every state agency, has faced repeated cutbacks and there is no “new” money on the horizon. Consequently each agency’s goal is to do more with less. To do this the Department had to fundamentally rethink the traditional approach to corrections and reengineer the processes by which offenders are supervised. The goal of this reengineering is to reinvest through cost-saving and cost-cutting measures in the Georgia justice system. The resources saved by these measures are being re-invested into more cost effective supervision and incarceration alternatives. What will be discussed in the pages to come is the correctional philosophy and as well as much of the policy that has been adopted by the Department of Corrections.

Reducing recidivism should always be a goal of any justice reinvestment process as it is a key indicator of the effectiveness of supervision and programming techniques. A 1% reduction in recidivism can generate millions of dollars of savings within a corrections system as large as Georgia’s.

A recent report by the PEW Center on the States entitled State of Recidivism studied recidivism and found a drop in recidivism nationwide (for those states reporting) from 45.4% in 1999 to 43.3% in 2004 - a drop of 2.1% in 5 years. Georgia was above the national average and showed a decrease in the numbers it posted. In the study of the years 1999 and 2004, 16,951 and 18,972 offenders were released, respectively. Of these releases, there was a 38% recidivism rate during the 1999 to 2002 reporting period and a 34.8% recidivism rate in the 2004 to 2007 period – a reduction of 3.2%. (The PEW Center on the States, 2011)

Figure 26 (page 24) shows, by percentage, the reason those offenders were returned to prison. There were three categories used - those committing a new crime, those committing a technical violation and those that did not return at all during the three year reporting period. As shown fewer offenders were returned to prison for the 2004 reporting period for both new criminal violations (1%) and technical violations (2%) with almost two-thirds of the offenders not returning at all. (The PEW Center on the States, 2011)
What factors affect recidivism rates and how can Georgia work to have a greater reduction in these numbers? Sentencing policy – past, present and future - and community corrections policy are two main factors addressed in this report. Already shown is the effect that past sentencing policy and legislation has had. The Department has taken a long hard look at its policy for community supervision as well as for facility operations and is seeing positive change in many areas. This change, the impact it has had and will continue to have will be discussed in detail throughout this report.

“By reducing the rate of offenders who return to prison, we keep our communities safer, our families more intact, and we’re able to begin reinvesting incarceration costs to other critical services.”

Kentucky Gov. Steve Beshear(D)
January 4, 2011
(The PEW Center on the States, 2011)
Reducing Admissions and/or Length of Stay (LOS) = Savings

Much of the opportunity for savings lies in reducing prison population. In past years prison admissions have been as high as 21,000 per year with releases of only 18,000 - a net gain of 3,000 offenders per year - a rate neither the prison system nor the taxpayers could sustain. These same numbers from calendar year 2010 show a marked improvement with admissions being 20,059 and releases 21,290, a net decrease of over 1,200 offenders. This is a trend in the right direction that must continue for the Department to accomplish the reinvestment goals it has set for itself. (GDC, 2010)

Currently prison population and backlog (those cases held in county jails) fluctuate between 55,000 and 60,000. With the departmental budget at almost $1.1 billion, reducing the average daily population in prison can produce tremendous savings.

By looking at the flowchart to the left you can see there are four areas in which the Department is working toward the ultimate goal of reducing the prison population and creating cost saving measures. These areas are:

- Admissions (Pre-Admission)
- Length of Stay (LOS) in County Jails
- LOS in Diagnostic Facilities
- LOS in Prisons

The first area is Admissions—more properly termed Pre-Admission. This is any case that has not yet been sentenced to serve time in the prison system. The second area of influence is the length of stay at the county jails—shortening the length of time sentenced offenders are spending in the county jails before they enter the state prison system to begin service of their sentence. The third area of influence would be the
length of stay at diagnostics—more quickly determining an offender’s needs and risks and getting them into the proper institution and programming. The last area is length of stay in the state prisons—reducing the time offenders are remaining in custody without compromising the Department’s core value of public safety.
INFLUENCING ADMISSIONS

“12,000 times a year Georgia Superior Court Judges bang their gavel, sentencing a defendant to an average of 4.5 years in prison, essentially appropriating over $80,000 of state funds with each sentence...”

Brian Owens
Commissioner
Georgia Department of Corrections
(Owens, 2011)
Georgia crime rates have steadily decreased yet prison and probation populations continue to steadily rise. Figure 27 shows the Uniform Crime Report (UCR) for the State of Georgia since 1980 (Georgia Bureau of Investigation, 2011). The UCR is a measuring stick of violent and property crimes committed per 100,000 in population. The graphic below represents the total of all violent and property crimes in Georgia since 1980.

As shown there has been a steady decrease in overall crime rates since the late 80s and early 90s. Factors affecting these trends include but are not limited to the following:

- Population density and degree of urbanization with size of locality and its surrounding area
- Variations in composition of the population, particularly youth concentration
- Stability of population with respect to residents' mobility, commuting patterns, and transient factors
- Modes of transportation and highway system
- Economic conditions, including median income, poverty level, and job availability
- Cultural factors and educational, recreational, and religious characteristics
- Family conditions with respect to divorce and family cohesiveness
- Climate
- Effective strength of law enforcement agencies
- Administrative and investigative emphases of law enforcement

Fact:

“During the past 10 years, all 19 states that cut their imprisonment rates also experienced a decline in their crime rates.”

(The PEW Center on the States, 2011)
- Policies of other components of the criminal justice system (i.e., prosecutorial, judicial and correctional)
- Citizens’ attitudes toward crime
- Crime reporting practices of the citizenry (North Carolina Department of Justice, 2011)

However, as shown in Figure 28 and 29, the prison and probation populations continue to grow. There are many factors that contribute to this and they will be discussed in the coming pages.
The split sentences and long probated sentences have contributed to the steady increase of prison and probation populations.

Figure 28: Percent of Prison Departures with Probation to Follow (split sentences) 1989 - 2010

Figure 30 demonstrates how the use of split sentences declined during the early 90’s. But as the “Get Tough on Crime” and “Truth in Sentencing” came into play, the use of split sentences increased.

Figure 31 illustrates the percentage of split prison sentences by judicial circuit since 2000. As noted there are some judicial circuits utilizing split sentences as little as 16.5% of time while other circuits use split sentences over 80% of the time.
Figure 32 shows the average percentage of cases per circuit that were ordered to serve a split sentences during the calendar year 2010. The statewide average for 2010 was 71.4% of all cases were ordered to serve some portion of their sentence in prison.

Not only is the use of split sentences at an all time high, but many times the offenders also have lengthy probated sentences awaiting them upon their release. Long probated sentences can become counter-productive. According to the PEW report *State of Recidivism*, “States that have shorter periods of post-prison supervision may have lower rates of revocation to prison, because their offenders must comply with probation supervision rules for shorter periods.” (The PEW Center on the States, 2011)

In Georgia many offenders complete the terms of their sentence within a few years and are placed in unsupervised (also known as administrative) status. The offender is then in a holding pattern until their probation expires in 10, 15, or 20 years. Many times the offender may commit a new crime and their probation is reactivated and they then face the new charges as well as probation violation charges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Circuit</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>87.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>91.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>89.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>89.8%</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>89.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 30: Percentage of Sentences with Probation to Follow (Split Sentences) CY 2010*
Figure 33 indicates the number of offenders sentenced since 2000 and the length of the probated sentences they must serve upon release. As shown, the majority of offenders have between five and fifteen years probation with some having probated sentences as long as fifty years. Long probated sentences after offenders have served a significant prison sentence can be counter-productive to future success.

Figure 34 (page 32) shows the average probation portion of a split sentence in years for calendar year 2010. As shown the lowest probated portion of a split sentence was 6.90 years in circuit 46 while circuit 25’s average was 17.74 years - almost two and one half times the amount of time to serve.

Figure 35 (page 32) represents the average straight probation sentence in years since January of 2000. This is for a probated sentence only at the time of sentence. The statewide average for this time frame was 5.29 years on probated sentences. Circuit 46 was on the low end with an average of 3.66 years and circuit 22 was on the high end with 8.58 years.
Figure 32: Avg Probation Portion of Split Sentence – CY 2010

Avg Probation Portion of Split Sentence (Yrs)
CY 2010 - Avg 11.1 years

Figure 33: Avg Straight Probation Sentence Since Jan 2000

Avg Straight Probation Sentence (Yrs)
since Jan 2000 - Avg 5.29 years
To determine if prison-overcrowding could be influenced early in the process, the Department examined cases being admitted to prison each year. Prison admissions are comprised of four types of cases: probation revocations, parole revocations, court ordered to serve more than 2 years, and court ordered to serve less than 2 years. The numbers shown in Figure 36 are approximate yearly admission numbers for each of the categories shown.

Table 2 is a graphic representation showing anticipated cost savings by affecting prison admission and length of stay.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admissions</th>
<th>Length of Stay</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Budget Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1000 X 1 year</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>$18,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>900 X 1 year</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>$16,425,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1000 X 9 months</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>$10,125,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Budget Impact based on $50 per day (actual cost is $49.35 per day in State Prison)

Table 2: Anticipated Savings by Reducing Admissions and/or Length of Stay

In Line A, the example is given of 1,000 offenders entering the system for a one year LOS. At $18,250 per year per offender the total cost is $18,250,000. Leaving LOS at one year and reducing admissions by 10% or 100 offenders (Line B) can reduce the budget impact from $18,250,000 to $16,425,000 – a savings of $1,825,000. In Line C the example is given of 1,000 offenders entering the system for only nine months rather than one year. This effectively reduces the population by one quarter for a savings of $8,125,000 from the original budget impact of over $18 million in Line A.
Taking the principles used in the previous equations and applying them to the actual number of offenders received each year and the average serve time can show a tremendous cost savings as shown in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Admissions</th>
<th>Length of Stay</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Budget Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>$1,149,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>18,900</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>56,700</td>
<td>$1,035,770,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>30 months</td>
<td>52,500</td>
<td>$945,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Budget Impact based on $50 per day (actual cost is $49.35 per day in State Prison)

Table 3: Anticipated Savings by Reducing Admissions and/or Length of Stay

In Line D, taking admissions of 21,000 and multiplying by a three year serve time, the average daily population is 63,000 with a total budget impact of $1,149,750,000. In Line E, using the three year serve time but reducing the population by ten percent brings admissions down to 18,900. This produces an average daily population of 56,700 and a budget impact of $1,035,770,000 with savings of over $113 million. Line F shows a reduction in serve time of 6 months (from 3 years to 30 months) and the population at 21,000. By reducing serve time by 6 months, the average daily population is reduced to 52,500 for a total budget impact of $945,000,000. A savings of over $200 million can be realized by something as small as a six month reduction. (GDC, 2011)
Influencing Admissions:

The 10 Step Framework (GDC, 2010)

A population that has shown steady growth is the probation population. In an effort to invest in community supervision and thus reducing the number of cases revoked to prison by probation and parole each year, the Department established a 10 Step Framework in March of 2009 with the stated goal of reducing recidivism while maximizing public safety and practicing sound public stewardship principles. The framework was based on a number of strategies recommended in studies by the PEW Center on the States and the Urban Institute. Below is a brief synopsis of each step of the framework.

1. Sort Offenders by Risk

The Department partnered with the Justice Mapping Center to physically map both the probation and the prison populations. From this mapping, “hotspots” were identified in each judicial circuit as areas that held high concentrations of probationers and also historically contributed to prison admissions in higher than average numbers. (See Figure 37-38)

Each probation circuit has field supervision teams outfitted and trained to work independently in these hotspots while providing community based supervision in a “we-go-to-them” model. These teams are outfitted with updated equipment such as cars with cages, radios, 3-G notebook computers, and standardized uniforms, promoting a more efficient manner for supervising the growing probation population. These officers are to be in the field supervising offenders rather than sitting behind a desk in the local probation office. (Click on maps below to go to Justice Mapping Center website.)
2. **Community Impact Programs (CIP)**
CIP programs are a collaborative effort between local law enforcement, probation, parole, juvenile justice as well as community providers of substance abuse, mental health, educational and employment based programs. The CIP model provides wrap-around services to probationers and parolees as well as those who may have maxed out in prison and are not under any form of supervision. The CIP programs have proven to be a cost-effective alternative while providing much needed services to offenders as well as reducing recidivism in probation populations.

3. **Evidence Based Programming**
Evidence Based Programming is programming that has been proven through research to be effective. In a commitment to the offender and the community, the Department assessed each program that was being delivered throughout the state either at a probation office or a facility. Any program that did not have research to support its effectiveness was discontinued and replaced with a program that did.

A key part of this process was to assign counselors to each judicial circuit and Day Reporting Center (DRC). This ensures the offender is enrolled in the program or programs most suited to their needs. Since many of the facilities that have been closed had staff already trained in general/mental health counseling, the Department has transferred many of these counselors to DRC and probation offices. This is another example of redirecting resources in an effort to combat a problem on the front end (probation) rather than on the back end (prison).

4. **GDC Sentencing Model/Specialty Courts**
The Department has developed a sentencing model that demonstrates the sentencing spectrum on which a case can move up or down based on their risk and needs. The model encompasses the alternatives and programs offered by the Department as well as the specialty courts. This model is used to guide officers to the appropriate sanction based on the offenders needs and offer a more cost effective continuum of sanctions to the judiciary.
Each offender is assessed using the Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions (COMPAS) instrument. The COMPAS is a statistical and actuarial based tool used to assess and prioritize the overall risk the offender presents to the community. The COMPAS does this by assessing criminogenic factors such as criminal history, associates and attitude. It also looks at needs in areas such as vocation and education when preparing its overall assessment of an individual. This assessment allows an officer to accurately identify areas of need for an individual and tailor a supervision plan to those needs providing effective and individualized supervision of that offender. The data gathered by COMPAS could also be used in the future to populate and generate a Pre-Sentence Investigation (PSI) for the Courts. The information gathered in the PSI is used by the Courts to make the best decision as to the disposition of a case.
To complement this supervision model, the Department has partnered with Applied Research Services (ARS) and is developing an automated risk assessment. This risk assessment when fully functional will assess each offender based on their risks, needs and progress while under supervision and will update itself as these factors change. Those changes will be based on input into the Statewide Correctional Repository and Information System (SCRIBE) generated from a number of different sources. This risk assessment will foster efficiencies in field supervision and promote effective case management.

Specialty Courts are another area that Department supports in an effort to effectively supervise offenders. There are currently over 30 Felony Drug Courts and 11 Family Dependency Treatment Courts operating through the Superior Court systems in Georgia in either a pre- or post-adjudication model (Figure 39 – page 40). At one time these were simply called drug courts. They have expanded to other areas besides substance abuse and are more often being called accountability courts. Mental Health, Family Violence, and Veterans Courts are just a few of the newer genres of courts beginning to emerge. These courts are a coordinated effort between the local judiciary, prosecution,
defense bars, probation, law enforcement and community providers of social services, behavioral health and substance abuse treatment. Accountability courts seek to hold an individual accountable for their actions and behavior by going through intensive treatment, frequent drugs screens and regular appearances before the Judges to give updates on their progress. (Georgia Accountability Courts, 2011)

Figure 37: Georgia Accountability Courts – Click on map to go to website
The Department is actively promoting involvement with the Accountability Courts. Departmental representatives are regular presenters at the Georgia Drug, DUI and Mental Health Conference and seek to be an active participant in the ongoing efforts of these courts. Accountability Courts have proven effective in terms of services provided and cost savings to the community. A recent study on the recidivism rates of Georgia drug court graduates from 2005 showed a recidivism rate of 7% for drug court graduates, compared to 15% for probation and 29% for state prisons. (Georgia Accountability Courts, 2011)

Accountability courts are much more cost effective than the incarceration alternative. According to the National Drug Court Institute, for every $1 spent on drug court, $2.14 is saved in criminal justice cost. In Georgia, it costs almost three and a half times more to house someone in a close security prison ($14,476) than it does for them to participate in a drug court ($5,275). (Judicial Council Standing Committee on Drug Courts, 2008) The Department benefits both fiscally and as a community partner by utilizing these courts and being an active participant in their processes.

5. **Utilize Technology to Improve Efficiencies and Enhance Supervision**

Technology can be used to assist officers as they supervise offenders in the community. The Department maintains the best available technology so officers will be better equipped to perform their jobs both in the office and the field.

Over 400 3G Mini Notebooks are deployed in several areas of probation. The field supervision teams use them to enter case information in the field as supervision occurs and also to look up offenders when working with local law enforcement. As an added benefit several teams utilize field fingerprint identification systems that allow offender identification in the field thus promoting officer safety. The Mini Notebooks are also used by Probation Officer Sentencing Specialists and court teams to provide real time case information to the Courts and prosecutors. Over 500 Blackberry phones allow for better communication in the field, thus promoting officer safety. The Department has also partnered with Google Earth to map caseloads so that officers can more effectively supervise their probationers. Creating a virtual office in a vehicle and only coming to the probation office when necessary. (Figure 40 – page 42 - Zip Code 31705 – East Albany.)
Example of Mapping Offenders using Google Earth

The Probation Reporting Contact Center (PRCC) is an example of technology benefiting the officer and the offender while reducing costs. Began in early 2010, the PRCC allows low-risk offenders to report via telephone to call handlers. The system is completely automated with Interactive Voice Response (IVR) technology allowing the majority of the calls to be answered by computer and the appropriate case notes to be automatically made directly into the SCRIBE computer system. The cases assigned to PRCC will be supervised and monitored by designated officers, who will be able to handle more cases with the use of technology. This system is designed to take up to 40,000 of the low-risk offenders and completely automate their supervision. As PRCC officers assume larger caseloads, more officer positions can be reassigned to field supervision teams.

6. **Impose Swift, Certain and Proportionate Sanctions**

The Probation Options Management Act (POM) of 2004 created an innovative pilot program allowing the Department of Corrections to administratively sanction
misdemeanor and technical probation violators. In April of 2009, SB 24 instituted POM as a permanent state-wide sentencing alternative. POM has five overarching goals:

- Enhance public safety via the application of swift, certain and proportionate sanctions to violations.
- Reduce the amount of jail time between arrests and application of sanctions.
- Reduce the amount of time spent in court on technical probation violation hearings.
- Expand alternatives to make use of non-custodial options for technical violations.
- Reduce recidivism by ensuring swift and certain response to all violations.

To utilize POM, Judges sentence a probationer to a period of probation under POM, setting a sanctioning ceiling for any future misdemeanor or technical violations. The sanction ceiling or limit is typically the Probation Detention Center or the Residential Substance Abuse Treatment Center.

If a probationer violates the conditions of probation, the Department can impose administrative sanctions as an alternative to judicial revocation. Violations are either disposed of via a waiver or a hearing with a POM Hearing Officer within 15 days of arrest. Hearings may be held in either a custodial or non-custodial setting.

POM allows sanctions for probation violations to be applied more swiftly, significantly shortening the amount of time probationers spend in a local jail awaiting a revocation hearing. The backlog of technical violations pending before the courts is reduced as well as the amount of time judges and officers spend in court handling revocations.

The overall goal of POM is to promptly correct the behavior of troublesome probationers, thereby reducing recidivism and protecting the public. There are currently over 16,500 cases sentenced under POM, and since its inception over 4,400 sanctions have been handled through POM. That is 4,400 cases that would have otherwise ended up on a court docket.

![Figure 39: POM Sanctions Imposed Since 2005](image)
In 2007, Applied Research Services (ARS) studied POM to see if it was meeting the legislative goals. ARS found that POM was meeting the goals as stated and Figures 42 and 43 demonstrate savings in the particular areas of time spent in jail and the jail cost associated with those stays in jail.

### Awards/Incentives for Probation Officers/Offenders

One recommendation of the PEW report was to incentivize staff and offenders. In response to that recommendation, there are awards which recognize probation staff that have excelled in their job performance. Also POST certified Field Training Officer (FTO) positions facilitate the positive growth and development of new probation staff as they begin their career.

For the offender, a number of incentives were developed from recommendations by a panel of Superior Court Judges. These incentives can be used by probation staff as well as the Courts. It can be as simple as a certificate of achievement or as rewarding as returning back in front of the Court for positive praise and possible early terminations. The goal is to incentivize offenders to adhere to the conditions of their probation.

### Seamless transition from incarceration to probation (Re-Entry)

Several different things facilitate a smooth transition from prison back to probation and/or parole. A re-entry checklist is associated with each prison case so that prison staff can assess the needs of the offender upon their pending release and begin addressing them prior to the actual release. Release notification procedures between prisons, probation, and parole push the offender information to the field prior to the actual release. Each office knows who is being released, where they are being released,
and what their supervision requirements will be. Points of contact in each office, prison and within any area that affects the successful re-entry of these cases facilitate the smooth progression towards release into society. Also when released, an offender is supervised at higher levels of supervision for at least the first 90 days to ensure a smooth and effective transition of the offender back into society.

The State of Michigan has taken a new approach to re-entry with its prison population. Their effort is called the Michigan Prisoner Reentry Initiative (MPRI). As in Georgia the key premise is that reentry begins at intake. Offender’s needs are assessed and they are enrolled in programming to address these needs. This reentry process follows them through a reentry facility and onto community supervision. By following this program Michigan has seen a drop in its recidivism rates of 18 percent between 1999 and 2004 and overall MPRI graduates are returning to prison 33 percent less frequently than similar offenders. Due to the success of this program the Parole and Commutation Board has been able to release more offenders to the program in an effort to build on the improvement already seen. (The PEW Center on the States, 2011)

9. Probation Accountability Report/COMPSTAT

The Probation Accountability Report (PAR) is a reporting mechanism within The Department’s Scribe computer system that shows a snapshot of the progress of each case toward its supervision goals on a day-to-day basis. The report allows anyone—management and officers alike—to drill down in the report and see what actions have been taken with a particular case for the month. It is broken into a number of different levels (circuit, office, officer and individual case) to accomplish this. This report is continually being tweaked to improve its efficiencies and the information it delivers to the field. It has become a vital part of an officer’s supervision tools. Figure 44 shows a mock up example of the Probation Accountability Reports. Note the color coding for quick visual assessment of case standing for the month.

“Although the roots of MPRI were clearly in a budget crisis, it was never only about saving money – it was a belief that doing corrections ‘right’ would result in a smaller prison system and large savings. We had to change our entire culture to focus on success.”

Patricia L. Caruso
Former Director
Michigan Department of Corrections
(The PEW Center on the States, 2011)
The PAR report is a large part of the COMPSTAT process. COMPSTAT stands for “comparative statistics” and is a law enforcement strategy adopted by the New York Police Department in 1994. (WordIQ.com, 2010) It involves the mapping of crimes, identifying “hotspots” and problems, and ultimately devising solutions. This strategy has been replicated by the Department, resulting in regular meetings where management and field supervisors take an in-depth look at all facets of probation supervision through statistical analysis. Regional COMPSTATs are held quarterly with Executive leadership; each Field Operations Manager hold monthly COMPSTATs with the Probation Chiefs. The Probation Chiefs in turn hold weekly COMPSTATs with their offices. These reviews have led to improved efficiencies in many areas including probationers’ employment, payments and drug screening.

### 10. Probation Legislation

The goal of this initiative is to research existing legislation in other states that could possibly be adopted or adapted within Georgia to meet the needs of Probation Operations. On April 22, 2011, HB 265 was signed into law establishing the Criminal Justice Reform Council. In deference to the work expected from the Council, no legislative initiatives were pursued in 2011. The Council is expected to recommend significant legislative changes to the 2012 General Assembly defining how the Georgia criminal justice system should operate. The Department is whole-heartedly committed to the Criminal Justice Reform effort and is making every effort to lead the way with the changes that will occur.
Influencing Admissions:

**Probation Substance Abuse Treatment Centers (PSATC) (Residential In-Patient Treatment)**
The Probation Substance Abuse Treatment Center (PSATC) program is an innovative way to divert chronic drug users from hard prison beds to soft community treatment beds. The PSATC is a six-month residential substance abuse treatment program which targets high-risk, high-need offenders with a history of substance abuse. This program is based on the Therapeutic Community Model, which has proven to be an effective form of treatment for substance abusers. The design is specific to the needs and risk factors commonly associated with substance abusers. The primary goal is for the program participants to learn real-life ways to help them live a pro-social, productive life free of alcohol and other drugs and crime. (GDC, 2010) There are currently almost 800 offenders receiving services in the PSATCs.

**Day Reporting Centers (DRCs)**
Day Reporting Centers provide intensive substance abuse treatment for offenders that are sentenced by the Courts. These offenders typically have not responded to more traditional supervision and treatment efforts. The program includes components such as substance abuse counseling, cognitive restructuring, adult basic education, employment, enhancement, intensive supervision, and community service. Substance Abuse Aftercare Services (SAAS) follows the programming delivered at the DRC, thereby helping offenders transition back into the community and successfully complete their probation supervision. While the DRCs are more costly than regular field supervision, they operate at only a fraction of the cost of a residential alternative. An initial study of DRCs completed in July 2010 suggests that participants in DRCs are less likely to reoffend than those not in DRCs. Additional DRCs will be located strategically throughout the state as funding is available. At 100 offenders per center, up to 1300 offenders are working daily toward their goals of staying clean and becoming productive citizens.
Figure 45 shows the treatment effect for DRCs for a 30 month period. Treatment effect is defined as the effect a program has on reducing recidivism. In this case, the offenders receiving treatment at the DRC have shown a positive result by not failing supervision in the months and years after their completion of the DRC. The percentage of offenders failing probation supervision after completion is significantly lower in each category.

![Treatment Effect for DRCs](image)

**Probation Officer Sentencing Specialist (POSS)**
The Probation Officer Sentencing Specialist (POSS) officer serves as a liaison with the Courts. In March of 2008, the Superior Court Judges were surveyed (1) to gauge their satisfaction with their knowledge of the Department of Corrections and (2) to ascertain if a single point of contact would benefit them. The overwhelming majority of Judges said they were not happy with their knowledge of the Department and a point of contact would be of great benefit. The POSS officer designated in each judicial circuit is that point of contact. The POSS officers are to be knowledgeable about all facets of the Department including programming, counseling, and alternative wait times, etc. They share this information with the local shareholders such as the Court, District Attorney’s office, Public Defenders, local law enforcement and community resource providers. The POSS officer makes this information available to the Court in an effort to assist them in making the most informed decision possible, thus influencing sentencing in a positive way. The POSS officers are trained quarterly to make sure they have the most up-to-date and accurate information possible to present to the Courts.
Revocation Policy and Practice
Another area that the Department has taken a closer look at is its policy on revocations. They seek to adhere to the adage, “It has been said we have to make sure we are incarcerating those we are scared of and not those we are mad at.” The Department does not seek revocation to prison on those cases that have violated their probation in a technical manner. Every effort is made to keep a case out of prison and supervised in the community. To ensure that consistent proportionate sanctioning is used with offenders, the Department developed the Consistent Sanctions Response Matrix (Matrix). The Matrix is a grid spreadsheet that takes into account the violations committed by the probationers and available sanctions. The Matrix ensures that all officers throughout the state are consistently applying the same sanctions for the same types of violations. The Matrix is designed to give the offender every available opportunity to successfully complete the terms and conditions of their probation successfully.
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Offenders sentenced by the Courts to prison are held in the local county jail until they can enter the prison system. Offenders not yet sentenced comprise about sixty percent of Georgia’s jail population. Growth in the number of pre-trial offenders since the mid 1990’s has been steep due to mandatory sentencing mentioned earlier and historically severe Parole policies. Offenders are willing to sit in jail longer awaiting trial rather than risk the uncertainty of a plea bargain and the possible associated prison sentence. Figure 46 compares those offenders awaiting trial (pre-trial) and those already sentenced to a state facility and awaiting pickup since 1993. (Carr T. S., 2011)

![Figure 44: Georgia Jail Population - Pre-Trial Offenders vs. State Offenders](image)
In an effort to save money and be more efficient in its processes, the Department is also attempting to influence the processes associated with the length of stay in jail. The length of stay is the amount of time a person spends in jail prior to entering the state prison system. There are numerous ways to calculate the number of state offenders in county jails depending on the purposes and parameters of the count. Figure 47 shows the difference between the county jail count and GDC count. An explanation for the difference follows.

Dr. Tim Carr, GDC Senior Researcher, puts it succinctly when describing Figure 47.

“The larger of the two counts, by the jailers, includes anybody who is serving any kind of state sentence who is in jail for any reason. The smaller count, GDC's, includes only those who have been committed to the state prison system and whose sentences or revocation orders have been received and certified by analysts in GDC's central office.

The two counts are different, but not discrepant. This is a matter of two governmental entities producing two different counts, each for its own legitimate purposes - GDC to count the number of offenders queued up to
enter the state prison system, and the jailers to tally their populations into broad categories.”

For more information on jail trends visit the Department of Community Affairs Jail Report archives by clicking on this link.

Table 4 shows why the jailers' count will always be larger than the Department’s count.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of jail offender</th>
<th>In jailers' count of state offenders</th>
<th>In GDC's Offender Jail Backlog</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offenders sentenced to prison; sentence documents received and OK'd by GDC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offenders sentenced to prison whose documents are still with the Clerk of Court</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parolees whose revocation orders have been received and OK'd by GDC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrested parolees have not yet been revoked to prison</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probationers whose revocation orders have been received and OK'd by GDC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probationers sentenced to jail-plus-street-time split sentences</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probationers awaiting entry to GDC boot camps &amp; detention centers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrested probationers who have not yet been revoked</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Why the jailers' count is higher than GDC's

The Department currently pays the counties a jail subsidy of $22 per day to house an offender that is awaiting pickup for a state facility. This subsidy begins 15 days after the Department receives the sentencing packet from the local clerk of court. (Neville, 2011) Based on the number of yearly prison admissions shown earlier in Figure 24, Figure 48 graphically represents the approximate cost of annual jail subsidy.

![Annual Jail Subsidy Costs](image)

**Figure 46: Approximate Annual Jail Subsidy Costs**

From May of 2009 until September of 2010, the Department had on average 2,773 offenders in jail awaiting pickup. (GDC, 2010) This equates to $61,000 per day being paid out to the counties to house offenders until the Department can assume custody of them. Typically, an offender is housed in a county jail approximately 30-35 days before they are accepted and
transported to Georgia Diagnostics and Classification Prison. (Neville, 2011) Offender population originates either from probation/parole revocations or direct sentences from court.

There are several ways the Department is seeking to actively influence how long prison bound cases stay in jail prior to entry into the system and to reduce the jail backlog by as many as 1500 cases. Two of these merge with current Clerk of Court practices, the other takes a proactive role in assessing the needs of offenders bound for prison.

**Improving Current Court Practices**

- **Standardized Sentencing** – Court sentences are submitted from the 159 counties to the Department. The Department must then take these sentences and determine—or decipher—what the sentence was in each case. This can be difficult because of numerous types of sentences, illegible writing, and circuit specific terminology. Currently there is no statewide standardized sentence form. Many circuits, in fact many judges, use sentences of their own design that are specific to their circuit and their particular needs. The Department is currently working with the Georgia Council of Superior Court Judges to develop a statewide standardized sentencing form that would be used by all Superior Court Judges. This form has been reviewed by the Council and is in the process of being approved for use. Standardized sentencing would streamline the process for the Department as they receive new sentencing packets. (Neville, 2011)

- **E-Packet Submission** – Another proposed change closely associated with the creation of a statewide sentencing document is the ability to submit the sentencing packets electronically. Currently the packets are prepared at the local level and mailed to the Department. The goal is for the Clerks or even the POSS officer to be able to submit the necessary information directly from the courtroom at the time of sentencing thus making receipt by the Department almost instantaneous.

Once the Standardized Sentencing and E-Packet system is approved, it will have to be implemented by each judicial circuit and county clerk. The results would be quicker processing of sentences by the Department, thus reducing the lag time in county jails between sentencing and pick-up by the DOC.

**Proactive Offender Assessment**

The Department is also attempting to influence LOS in county jails by having a probation officer assess each offender to see what type of person they are dealing with and what their needs might be. On each case that is sentenced to prison, probation staff will go to the county jail and complete an assessment called the Corrections Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions (COMPAS) and a Texas Christian University Drug Screen (TCUDS) on the
offender within 15 days of sentencing. The information from these two assessments is then entered into Scribe. This allows anyone who takes part in the admission of this case into the system to see the specific risks and needs of that offender and adequately determine how to best meet these needs.
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Each offender that enters the Georgia Prison System must complete the diagnostics program to be classified and receive a security level. They are assessed based on the type and nature of their offense, their past criminal history, and propensity for violence. They are further assessed for any substance abuse or medical needs. Much of this information has already been gathered at the local level by probation staff completing the COMPAS and the TCUDS on the offender. Based on the information gained during assessment, each offender is classified as close, medium or minimum security and transferred to the appropriate facility. Since time is money, reducing the LOS in the diagnostic process results in saved revenue.

At one time there were five facilities that conducted diagnostics. To streamline the process and to reduce duplication of effort, this has been reduced to one male classification facility at Georgia Diagnostic and Classification Prison (GDCP) and one female classification facility at Lee Arrendale State Prison.

Historically classification was a bottle neck within the admissions process that delayed persons being assigned to a facility. For a variety of reasons, the classification process was taking over 30 days to be completed and as few as 100 offenders per week were being classified. Backlog became more of an issue as more cases entered the system. A process action team (PAT) was formed to review the diagnostic/classification process and to make recommendations for improving the process. Once this team was established, they visited GDCP to review their diagnostic processes and determine how to shorten them. The team came away from their visits with numerous recommendations for Executive management which resulted in the following changes:

- **Logistics/Infrastructure** – It was found that various parts of the diagnostic process were taking place at different sites within the prison, necessitating a great deal of movement of offenders. As with any movement of offenders, security was an issue. The recommendation was made and later implemented that as many parts of the diagnostics process as possible be co-located together, thus increasing the efficiency and creating a time and money savings.

- **Paperwork/Communication** – The PAT found that a great deal of time was (1) spent filling out paperwork which had to follow the offender throughout the diagnostic and classification process and (2) that it was hard to keep all parties involved aware of an offender’s diagnostic progression. One suggestion was to combine the Parole History Statement (PHS) with the COMPAS report to give a better picture of the individual being assessed—reasoning that the more information available, the more accurate the assessment and subsequent programming would be. The team’s recommendation:
(1) computerize as much of the information and forms as possible, and (2) create check-off forms to replace questionnaire forms that had to be answered in long-hand. These recommendations have been followed and much of the time-consuming paperwork and voluminous information is entered into SCRIBE where anyone with a need to know has access to it from anywhere in the state.

- **Shortened Intake Process** – If an offender has been out of the system less than a year or is not going to be in the system long due to the length of sentence, they can be taken through a shortened intake process at Coastal State Prison. This is based on the premise that much of the information collected on them during their previous stay is still valid and does not need to be revisited. There are certain criteria an offender must meet to be eligible for referral to Coastal. A more detailed account of these qualifications is covered on page 58.

- **Transportation Hubs** – Another part of the diagnostic process that caused problems was the actual transporting of the offenders from the county jails to a diagnostic facility. Transportation routes and trends were studied and adjusted so that Monday through Thursday became intake days for the diagnostic units. Regional hubs were also established so that local sheriff’s offices could transport those offenders entering the system to a central location, and then GDC would transport them the remainder of the way to GDCP.

The implementation of these suggestions resulted in a decrease in the time it takes for an offender to complete diagnostics from over 30 days to 10 days, and in certain cases it can be completed in as little as 4 days. It also streamlined the process so that an average 100 offenders per day are being received for a total of 400 per week—quadrupling the previous rate. (Neville, 2011)

The goal in shortening length of stay at diagnostics has both monetary as well as tangible results. A streamlined diagnostics process allows offenders to be assessed and transported to the appropriate facility quickly reducing the jail backlog and associated costs.
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There are a number of measures being taken to influence how long an offender stays in the prison system. While prisons serve many purposes there must be a careful balance between sufficient time served, cost-saving initiatives and the Department’s core mission of protecting the public. On one hand, because of the “Get Tough on Crime” and the mandatory minimum sentences, offenders are now serving more of their prison time than ever before. Gone are the days when an offender served about a third of their sentence. They are now serving two-thirds or more of their court imposed sentences. Public perception says this is a good thing, yet on the other hand, ways must still to be found to reduce the staggering costs of incarceration.

The Department began looking at ways to save money by influencing the length of stay in prison while still accomplishing the overarching goal of public safety while confining offenders. Several ideas were generated and are currently in various stages of implementation.

**Sentencing in Months Rather than Years**

Sentencing in months rather than years was shown in Tables 2 and 3 to be an extremely cost-effective practice. The Courts are creatures of habit and have settled into sentencing patterns, especially on split sentences. As seen earlier some very common prison sentence length patterns are evident at 5, 10, 15 and 20 years respectively when charted over a period of time.

Here is how sentencing in months rather than years could be beneficial. Take the example of 10 serve 2. This means the offender will serve the first two years in prison and the remaining eight years on probation. If they are released early by parole they will be supervised on parole for the remaining portion of that two year prison sentence, or their sentence may be commuted or reduced directly to probation. Once they complete parole, they will report to probation for at least two of the eight years and complete any court ordered conditions. If they complete all court ordered terms and conditions, they can be placed in unsupervised status at the end of two years or considered for early termination.

What if the Courts were to sentence this same person in months rather than years? Rather than 120 months serve 24 months, the Courts could sentence this same offender to 100 months serve 20. If this were to occur, the overall sentence has been reduced by 20 months—almost two years—and the prison portion of this sentence has been reduced by only four months *without compromising security*. Though this sounds like a very short time with no great savings associated, the numbers tell a different story when multiplied out over thousands of sentenced offenders.
However slight it may seem, something as small as a four month reduction in a prison sentence can be a huge cost-saving measure. These types of reductions could apply not only to direct sentences from court but also to probation and parole revocations. As Department numbers show, prisons receive 9,000 commitments per year from probation and parole revocations. If a Court or the Parole Board traditionally ordered two years revoked, they could instead order 16 or 18 months revoked. Shaving a few months off each of the cases that are entering the prison system each year can equal big savings yet still meet the Department’s core mission of protecting the public.

The usage of months in sentencing rather than years will take a while to implement due to the culture change associated with it. The local probation staff, specifically the Chief Probation Officers, Probation Officers III and the POSS officers will have to actively educate their judiciary as well as the prosecutors and public defenders for this to become a reality.

**Coastal State Prison Category II Strategic Intervention Program (SIP)**

Another alternative to long stays in prison is the Coastal State Prison Category II Project (Coastal Cat II). (GDC, 2011) As previously stated, Coastal State Prison has been designated as a short term facility that has an abbreviated intake process for its SIP program. The programs offered at Coastal are designed to work with those offenders who will be in the system less than two years and have very specific needs such as substance abuse. Offenders sentenced to Coastal may be assigned to one of these programs to meet their specific needs. Should an offender be found to be ineligible for the programs offered at Coastal, they are transferred to an appropriate facility based on their needs and security classification. There are plans currently in place to develop a 100 bed Cat II program at Lee Arrendale dedicated to the treatment and programming of female offenders.

The **Strategic Intervention Program (SIP)** is comprised of a six-month Residential Substance Abuse Treatment (RSAT) program, a 90-day Intensive Re-entry Program (IRP), and a two-year Faith and Character Based Program. The RSAT program lasts six-months and consists of four six-week phases.
The **Intensive Re-Entry Program (IRP)** as part of the SIP program is a 90 day program that targets non-violent offenders with a history of substance abuse. The goal of IRP is to reduce recidivism by giving the offenders the tools they need to abstain from alcohol, drugs and criminal behavior once they are released. The SIP program currently houses 380 offenders.

The **Residential Substance Abuse Treatment (RSAT) Center** at Coastal State Prison has similar goals as the Probation Substance Abuse Treatment programs (page 46) and is a 6 month program targeting their substance abuse needs. To be eligible for Coastal, the offender must meet some very specific requirements: they must have a serve time of 24 months or less, a TCUDS score of 2 or more, no more than two prior felony incarcerations, no offenses of a sexual or violent nature, no drug manufacturing or trafficking offense, and no major health issues. (GDC, 2011) There are currently 336 offenders in the RSAT program.

**Parole Boot Camp Program** is also located at Coastal State Prison. It is structured after a military boot camp regimen where the offenders work during the day doing public service work and attend rehabilitative programming during the evening. The program is ninety days in length and houses up to 146 offenders. The offender must be less than 35 years of age at sentencing and had no previous incarcerations in an adult institution, no known physical limitations, and no medical or mental conditions. Parole determines who is eligible for this program, and once they complete the program the offender is eligible to be released on parole regardless of their initial sentence length.

Figure 49 (page 60) shows the treatment effect of programs in the prison setting and the subsequent reduction in recidivism gained from these programs. Treatment effect is defined as the effect a program has on reducing recidivism. In this case the general population is the control group and received no treatment compared to those offenders receiving treatment in the given areas. As shown several of these programs have show a marked improvement in recidivism for offenders completing them while in prison. A trend the Department is capitalizing on as more treatment programs are offered to more offenders.

“If two-thirds of public school students dropped out, or two-thirds of all bridges built collapsed within three years, would citizens tolerate it? The people of Georgia would never stand for that kind of failure. But that is exactly what is happening all across the United States in our prison systems.”

Newt Gingrich
Former Speaker
U.S. House of Representatives
(Newt.org, 2010)
Other Target Areas:
Several other aspects of the prison population are being targeted for improvement and cost savings. These facets are being studied and ways devised to better utilize prison space or various programs that will facilitate the release of offenders from the prisons.

Georgia Aging Offender Population
A consequence now being seen from the Get Tough on Crime movement is the aging prison population. The National Institute of Corrections defines older offenders as those 50 years of age or older. The main factors contributing to the aging trend are more offenders are entering the system; they have longer sentences on average to serve; and less chance of an early release. Also as the general population of the United States ages, so does the prison population. With the large influx of Baby Boomers growing older, it is expected that the average age of the offender population will continue to grow. In 2002, one in ten offenders was above the age of 50; now that ratio is approximately one in eight or about 13% of the prison population (see Figure 50 – page 61). (GDC, 2010)
As the average age of an offender increases so do the challenges associated with managing this older offender. Older offenders are twenty times more likely to be assigned a medical bed and to need medical attention. There are a number of facilities, such as the former Bostic State Prison, currently being studied for the possibility of re-missioning them into assisted living facilities for these offenders. Placing offenders in need of medical care in a facility together will produce cost savings in terms of care, treatment and staffing.

**Mental Health Population**

The population of mental health offenders in the state prison system as well as on probation rolls has steadily increased. As with all state agencies the Department of Human Resources has experienced cutbacks and as a cost saving measure closed numerous mental health facilities. Many persons who would or should be housed in a mental health facility are living in our communities. Unfortunately many of them self-medicate with street drugs rather than prescribed medications or turn to criminal methods to support themselves or their addiction. As these persons enter the prison system or are placed on probation, the Department becomes the de facto mental health care provider.

*Fact:*

54% of female offenders and 21% of male offenders in Day Reporting Centers are receiving Mental Health treatment.

*(DeGroot, 2010)*
Figure 51 is a chart showing the growth the Department has experienced in the prison settings. In a ten year period while the general population only grew by 14% the mental health population grew by 100%.

![Mental Health Growth - Prison Population](image)

As the mental health populations have increased in the prison population they have similarly increased in the probation population. Figure 52 (page 63) shows the growth of the mental health population on the probation rolls since 2006. These numbers represent those mental health offenders released from prison with probation to follow. These numbers do not include any offenders placed on straight probation having never entered the prison system. While the mental health populations have been tracked for years in the prisons they have only recently been tracked in probation. A recent survey of Day Reporting Centers indicated 54% of female offenders and 21% of male offenders are receiving mental health services. Better reporting methods, as well as the placement of mental health counselors in Day Reporting Centers, have led to improvement in identifying and treating mental health issues. (DeGroot, 2010)
Faith Based Dorms

The Department has eleven dorms located at various prisons throughout the state that are designated as faith based. These dorms are non-denominational dorms that promote personal accountability and responsibility as well as programming to assist offenders in their rehabilitation. Assignment to these dorms is voluntary and must be requested by the offender. Offenders housed in these dorms are typically lower-risk, free of disciplinary problems and present fewer management problems to staff. This provides a more secure environment for the offender living in these dorms and the staff working them. Many times the Department will offer to transition an offender through a faith based dorm prior to release to help prepare them for their re-entry into society. The goal is to reduce recidivism while successfully promoting re-entry of the offender into society.

Private Providers

The Department is currently making strides to involve private providers in community based efforts to supervise offenders. A good example of this is Grace Village, located in Perry, Georgia. Grace Village is a faith based partnership between Perry Volunteer Outreach, the City of Perry, the Small Cities Community Development Block Grant Program and the Department. It is a small group home where male and female offenders can be housed as they transition back into society. One added benefit to Grace Village is that the outreach is designed to house mothers and their small children thus reuniting families. (His Voice, 2006)

Another example of the Department’s collaboration with private providers is the venture with Holly Tree Services. Holly Tree, located in Riverdale, Georgia, is a collaborative effort between
many private and public sector providers. It provides alternative housing for those recently released from prison or being supervised on probation or parole. Holly Tree is designed to treat persons with addiction and substance abuse issues as well as those with mental health and also those with co-occurring disorders. Holly Tree also provides links to many other needed services such as education and community based supportive services. (Holly Tree, 2011) Many times when an offender is having difficulty establishing the required residence plan, they can utilize the services of Grace Village or Holly Tree.

**Parole Collaboration**

Since many of the functions of parole and probation overlap, collaboration between the two departments allows both to accomplish complementary goals.

**Tentative Parole Month**

There are currently over 4,500 offenders being held in prison past their Tentative Parole Month (TPM). TPM is the approximate date the offender can expect to be released. TPM can be affected by several things such as the offender’s progress while incarcerated or an unacceptable residence plan.

An unacceptable residence plan or “problem residence” is when the offender does not have an approved place to stay upon their release. (The Parole Board, in order to provide the offender with the best chance for success upon release, does not release an offender from custody unless they have an approved place to stay.) Sometimes the offender’s family has moved and cannot be located, or the offender has been convicted of a sex crime and is subject to the proximity laws. Many times the proximity laws prevent a convicted sex offender from living with family members and make it very difficult to locate a place to live.

The Chief Probation Officers in conjunction with the Chief Parole Officers work to find approved residences for many of these offenders. If they cannot be located with a family member, probation and parole staff attempt to locate places within the community where they can live and be in compliance with the proximity laws. Reducing the number of offenders being housed past their TPM due to unacceptable housing and other reasons is a top priority within the Department at this time.

**Enhance Performance Incentive Credit Program (PIC)**

PIC or Work Incentive Program (OCCA §42-5-101) (for full version of the statute see Appendix E) is an offender performance incentive program. It was created in 1992 by the Georgia Legislature and can be used by the Parole Board to grant an early release. It is based on a grid system that takes into account the offense for which the offender is incarcerated and the offender’s progress while incarcerated.
By statute the PIC program allows day for day credit for an offender as they work off their sentence. Currently there is only the possibility of an offender being released four months early thus hampering the effectiveness of this program. Efforts are under way to enhance the PIC process so that an offender is incentivized to comply with supervision and treatment while in the facility. The goal is to enhance this program so that an offender can gain credit at the rate of day for day past the currently allowed four month maximum. The statute also allows the Board to take into consideration those offenders who have refused to participate in the program when considering their parole and not granting them an early release. (Georgia State Board of Pardons and Parole, 2011)

Commuting Certain Sentences to Probation
Another consideration in collaboration with Parole is the possibility of commuting certain types of sentences straight to probation. As a general rule when an offender is released from prison they will have some period of parole supervision. This is essentially serving the remainder of their prison sentence in the community. The only cases that will not have parole supervision to follow are those cases that max out. Maxing out is when an offender serves their entire prison sentence and will have no parole supervision and may not have any probation supervision depending on their initial sentence.

The Department and Parole are working together regarding cases that have a short period of parole supervision by asking the Parole Board to commute the remainder of their sentence directly to probation. This would effectively end the prison portion of their sentence and send them to probation to be supervised. While not all cases would be appropriate for this option certain types of cases could be used to gain efficiency in this process. The offender is currently having to transition from prison to parole and later ultimately to probation. This proposal would basically eliminate a step; and since these transitions are difficult times for the offender, any effort to shorten, reduce or eliminate an unnecessary transition will benefit both the supervising agency and the offender.
“At the heart of this new strategy, is a simple, but critical question: What is the most effective way to spend limited resources in order to protect and improve public safety?”

Rep. Jerry Madden, Vice Chair, Corrections Committee, Texas State House of Representatives (Justice Center - Council on State Courts, 2011)
These changes, programs, initiatives and collaborations are to accomplish one goal—reducing the overall prison population and reinvesting those resources into more cost efficient best practices while maintaining public safety. Other measures have been taken as well changing the infrastructure of the Department itself and more wisely using available funds. By accomplishing this, the Department can reinvest current monies back into the system in more cost effective programs.

Facility Closures and Realignments (Prisons & PRCs)
Since 2008, the Department has closed or re-missioned over 30 facilities including diversion centers, detention centers, pre-release centers, state prisons and a boot camp. These closures were not made without extensive study and planning. Many of the facilities that were closed were determined to be “non-enduring” and were for the most part smaller, older, inefficient and expensive to operate. Many of them had been converted into correctional facilities from various available structures such as old mental hospitals or even World War II era military barracks. The closure of these facilities served to free up resources and staff that are being used in the reinvestment effort. Several of the closed diversion centers were reopened as Day Reporting Centers with the local probation office co-locating in the same building. Many displaced staff members from these facilities have gone to work in probation operations in jobs such as counselors, secretaries and probation and surveillance officers. The closing of these prisons and pre-release centers will account for a reduction in daily population of over 2,500 offenders. The savings realized from these closures can be reinvested in facility and community based programs that are more fiscally responsible and financially sustainable, such as Day Reporting Centers and prison and probation RSAT programs.

Fast Track Prison Units
An example of using resources more wisely is the Fast Track prison units. A Fast Track unit is designed to hold 256 offenders but to be more cost effective to run and staff than similar sized prison units. This is accomplished by the efficiencies gained in the layout of the unit. A traditional similarly sized unit would take up to 40 staff to run, while a Fast Track can be manned with around 25 staff members. These Fast Track Units are being located on the grounds and within the security measures of existing prisons, thus taking advantage of an already existing infrastructure. As many of the non-enduring prisons were closed, their offenders were moved to these Fast Track Locations:

1. Augusta State Medical Prison
2. Central State Prison
3. Coastal State Prison
4. Georgia Diagnostics & Classification Prison
5. Hays State Prison
6. Valdosta State Prison
7. Ware State Prison
units, which lower the cost of housing each offender. The Department currently has four Fast Track units in operation with three more slated to come online by fall of 2011 for a total of 1800 Fast Track beds.

**Private Prisons**
The Department has over 3,000 offenders located in private prisons such as Coffee and Wheeler Correctional Facilities. There are currently two more private facilities slated for opening during 2012. The prison in Baldwin County will open in January and the one in Jenkins County will be open by March of 2012. These facilities will add an additional 2,650 beds to the Departments prison capacity. The cost savings side of using private providers is that the employees are not state employees and do not end up on state health care or retirement rolls. Also the cost of building the prisons is absorbed by the private provider so the state does not end up paying interest on the bonds often used to fund prison construction. The Department simply pays the private corporations a daily per offender cost allowing the corporations to absorb all the operating costs.

So how are facility closures and other cost saving measures going to add up? This chart shows how the closure of several facilities and the reduction of jail backlog will give the Department a reduction of up to 5,000 offenders in the average daily prison population. It is anticipated that the closure of these facilities and the reductions in other areas will result in a savings of over $50 million.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anticipated Reduction of Offenders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metro SP Closure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRC (6) Closures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mens SP Closure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail Backlog Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation Segregation Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Reductions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Probation and Parole Interoperability**
Probation and Parole are very similar in their supervisory functions even though each agency supervises for a different entity. Probation upholds the sentences of the Courts while Parole follows the directives of the Parole Board. Yet Probation and Parole supervise many of the same offenders in the same neighborhoods. In fact many times officers pass each other while conducting field supervision. Why not harness the best practices of each into a collective synergy with Justice Reinvestment as the ultimate goal? That is exactly what began in August of 2010 when Probation and Parole Executive Management, Chief Probation Officers and Chief Parole Officers met together to begin interoperability measures. Eight areas were identified as being similar enough to combine all or most processes. Those areas were training, field supervision, business processes, re-entry, faith based, sex offender supervision and problem residences. Process action teams have studied each of these areas and made
recommendations to Executive Management on how to best combine resources. This process is a top priority within each agency and significant strides have been made to bring the two together for the greater good.

As stated earlier, the 10 Step Framework is a vital part of the process for reinvesting in the supervision of offenders in Georgia. The goal is to reduce the numbers of those entering the prison system by effectively supervising them in the community. As more offenders are kept out of the prison system this will free up more resources to be devoted to the Department’s community based efforts.

“Although we can all agree that incarceration is sometimes necessary for public safety, in our work to protect the American people, we must recognize that incarceration alone does not provide the entire solution. Simply building more prisons and jails will not solve all of our problems. Any effective and economically sustainable public safety strategy must include investments that will help to reduce recidivism and to address the root causes of crime.”

U.S. Attorney General Eric Holder
(Justice Center - The Council of State Governments, 2011)
Chapter 7

Opportunities

“We have proven that we can be tough on crime and that we can spend $1.2 billion a year doing it... But I think it might be time to transition to being smart on crime.”

Brian Owens, Commissioner
Georgia Department of Corrections
(The Atlanta Journal Constitution, 2010)
What is the way forward from here? Georgia has one of the highest incarceration rates in the nation. In 2009 that number was 1 in 13 under some form of correctional supervision. Nationwide the “Get Tough on Crime” and mandatory sentencing played a large part in the prison expansion of the 80s and 90s and the corresponding prison population explosion. Georgia was not immune to this phenomenon and took in offenders and probationers in record numbers.

Measures are being taken both short term and long term to change these numbers while staying committed to the core value of public safety. Some of these measures are cost saving in nature while others are achieved by the use of best practices. The Department has identified four areas to influence (Admissions, Length of Stay at Jail, Length of Stay at Diagnostics and Length of State in State Prisons) and has redefined the business processes in each of these areas to achieve effective reductions in spending. The refinements already made and those to come should reduce average daily prison population by an estimated 5,000 offenders, while producing a projected cost savings to the taxpayers of over $50 million—money that can be reinvested in more cost efficient and proven techniques for supervising offenders.

What are some other areas that can be addressed to help reduce burgeoning prison, probation and parole populations? The Department would ask for assistance from its stakeholders in looking at changing current practices in some of the following areas:

- **Narrower Sentence Ranges/Reduce Mandatory Sentences** – Length of sentences can more than double depending on where the crime was committed and mandatory sentences have contributed to an increase in the length of time an offender serves as well as the overall aging of our prison population. More equal distribution of sentence ranges as well as the reduction of some mandatory sentences could have a significant impact on correctional populations.

- **Cap Probated Sentences** – As previously shown lengthy probated sentences can and do contribute to the increase of those on prison and probation roles. A concerted effort to cap the length of probated sentences so there is statewide standardization would greatly assist in the Department’s efforts to control this growth.
• **Early Termination** - OCGA 17-10-1 specifically states “Probation supervision shall terminate in all cases no later than two years from the commencement of probation supervision unless specially extended or reinstated by the sentencing court upon notice and hearing and for good cause shown; provided, however, that in those cases involving the collection of fines, restitution, or other funds, the period of supervision shall remain in effect for so long as any such obligation is outstanding, or until termination of the sentence, whichever first occurs...” This statute further states “Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the court may shorten the period of probation on motion of the defendant or on its own motion, if the court determines that probation is no longer necessary or appropriate for the ends of justice, the protection of society, and the rehabilitation of the defendant.” Early termination of select offenders would help reduce the number of offenders that are being supervised by probation officers.

• **Parole Eligibility** – Many offenders, especially those committing crimes under the Seven Deadly Sins, are not eligible for parole. Amending the statute to consider the facts of the crime and to request the sentencing Court’s recommendation as to whether a portion of the sentence may be served under parole would reduce prison populations while still effectively supervising and rehabilitating the offender.

• **Performance Incentive Credit (PIC)** – The expansion of this program would allow many offenders the opportunity to work off portions of their sentence – possibly even as much as day for day – rather than the current four month cap that is in place. Offenders contribute back to communities every day by work details performed both inside and outside the prison walls. Construction crews, firefighters and equine rescue are just a few examples of offenders contributing back to society in a pro-social way.

• **PDC Sentence Length Cap** – The detention centers were never designed for long term incarceration. They were designed for short term stays for Habitual Violator offenders and property crime offenders. Their use has evolved into long term incarceration as many judges know an offender will serve every day to which they are sentenced while at a PDC. Capping the length of time an offender can be sentenced to the PDC will shorten the wait time for other offenders to enter the centers, returning them to their originally intended use.

• **Drug Treatment Funds/Specialty Courts** - Specialty Courts and associated drug treatment facilities are much more cost effective and beneficial than housing an offender in prison. Resourcing these Courts and programs will most certainly reduce recidivism and ultimately the correctional populations in Georgia.
• **Recidivist Statutes** – In some instances the recidivist statutes have been used for purposes other than their original intent. Revisiting this statute and reviewing the manner in which it is applied could help reduce prison and probation populations without affecting the safety of the public.

• **Electronic Sentence Reporting** – Technology can be very helpful in reporting to the Department when an offender has been sentenced to a prison term or even probation. If all Clerks were able to submit this information electronically if would streamline many of the processes that take place before an offender can enter the system. Electronic submission of documents on prison and probation cases would also lend itself to better tracking of our populations as well as the statistical data associated with those populations.

• **Mental Health Resources** – As the number of offenders with diagnosed mental illness continues to increase so does the Department’s need for resources to supervise these offenders. Facilities to stabilize the mentally ill are necessary to manage this growing segment of our population. These facilities would house offenders for short term stays of 7-10 days until stabilized and returned to the community. Community based treatment programs are also necessary to assist these offenders function in society once stabilized.

These are just a few areas that could be addressed to help reduce the growth of the correctional population in Georgia.

The Department of Corrections mission statement commits to “protect and serve the public...by effectively managing offenders while helping to provide a safe and secure environment for the citizens of Georgia.” This mission is non-negotiable and is being accomplished 24 hours a day 7 days a week by the faithful employees of the Department. The citizenry of Georgia can be assured that every effort is being made to be as fiscally responsible with state revenue and resources while accomplishing the core mission. The Department is entering partnerships with its stakeholders to reduce incarceration rates and bring them in line with other states. This time of crisis has allowed the Department to look internally and rethink how Georgia Corrections operates from the ground up. Governor Deal’s recent creation of a Criminal Justice Reform Council to address these issues will serve as an impetus and a conduit for all stakeholders to partner together to improve the state of Georgia. The Department stands on the brink of a new era and is poised to lead the field of corrections and the Great State of Georgia forward in the Justice Reinvestment movement.
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State correctional populations per 1,000 people

One in 31 adults in the United States is under correctional supervision, whether they are behind bars, on probation or on parole. With 77 supervised offenders per 1,000 people, Georgia leads the nation. Only 11 out of 1,000 adults in New Hampshire, meanwhile, is under correctional control.

Source: Pew Center on the States’ “1 in 31: The Long Reach of American Corrections,” March 2009

(Stateline.org, 2009)
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The State of Recidivism


(The PEW Center on the States, 2011)
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Cost Spent on Corrections (in millions)

CY 2008

% of General Fund

CY 2008

(The PEW Center on the States, 2009)
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Total # of Offenders
CY 2008

(The PEW Center on the States, 2009)
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Justice Reform Act – HB 265 (as passed)

11 HB265/SCSFA/2

SENATE SUBSTITUTE to HB 265

AS PASSED SENATE

A BILL TO BE ENTITLED

AN ACT

To amend Title 28 of the Official Code of Georgia Annotated, relating to the Georgia General Assembly, so as to create the 2011 Special Council on Criminal Justice Reform for Georgians and the Special Joint Committee on Georgia Criminal Justice Reform; to provide for related matters; to provide for legislative intent; to provide for an automatic repeal; to provide an effective date; to repeal conflicting laws; and for other purposes.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF GEORGIA:

SECTION 1.

Title 28 of the Official Code of Georgia Annotated, relating to the General Assembly, is amended by adding a new chapter to read as follows:

"CHAPTER 13

28-13-1.

The General Assembly finds and determines that:
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(1) It has been many years since there has been a systematic study of the State of Georgia's correctional system and criminal justice structure and there exists a need for such study today;
(2) A study of Georgia's criminal justice and correctional system is necessary to enhance public safety, reduce victimization, hold offenders more accountable, enhance probation and parole supervision, and better manage a growing prison population through increasing public safety, improving rehabilitation, and lowering state expense;
(3) Such a study and the formulation of recommendations for criminal justice structural changes can best be carried out through an established council; and
(4) Enactment of council recommendations, if deemed appropriate at the 2012 session of the General Assembly, is best carried out through a deliberative and specific legislative process.

28-13-2.

(a) There is created the 2011 Special Council on Criminal Justice Reform for Georgians (hereinafter 'council') which shall consist of 13 members as follows:
(1) The Governor or his or her designee;
(2) Three members appointed by the Governor;
(3) Three members appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, all of whom shall be members of the House of Representatives and one of whom shall be a member of the minority party;
(4) Three members appointed by the Lieutenant Governor, all of whom shall be members of the Senate and one of whom shall be a member of the minority party;
(5) The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Georgia or his or her designee; and
(6) Two members of the judicial branch, to be appointed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Georgia.

(b) A chairperson shall be selected by a majority vote of the members of the council. A quorum of the council shall consist of seven members. Any member of the council unable to serve shall be replaced in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.
(c) All departments and agencies of the state, including the Department of Corrections and State Board of Pardons and Paroles, shall, upon request of the council or the Governor, provide requested services, information, and technical support, notwithstanding any other law to the contrary.

(d) Members of the council shall receive no compensation for their services, except that any member may be reimbursed for actual expenses incurred in the performance of their duties by the agency or department in which they serve as an official or employee.

(e) The council shall conduct a thorough study of the state's current criminal justice structure and make a report of its findings and recommendations for legislation to the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Chief Justice of the Supreme Court no later than November 1, 2011.

28-13-3.

(a) There is created the Special Joint Committee on Georgia Criminal Justice Reform (hereinafter 'joint committee') which shall consist of 18 members as follows:

(1) The President Pro Tempore of the Senate and Speaker Pro Tempore of the House of Representatives;

(2) The majority leader of the Senate and the majority leader of the House of Representatives;

(3) The minority leader of the Senate and the minority leader of the House of Representatives;

(4) The chairpersons of the Senate Judiciary Committee, the Senate Public Safety Committee, the House Committee on Judiciary, and the House Committee on Judiciary, Non-civil;

(5) The chairpersons of the Senate State Institutions and Property Committee and the House Committee on State Institutions and Property;

(6) Three members of the Senate to be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor, someone of whom shall be a member of the minority party; and
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(7) Three members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, someone of whom shall be a member of the minority party.

(b)(1) The chairpersons of the Senate Judiciary Committee and the House Committee on Judiciary, Non-civil shall serve as co-chairpersons of the joint committee. A quorum of the joint committee shall consist of nine members.

(2) During the 2012 session of the General Assembly, the chairperson of the joint committee who is a member of the House of Representatives may cause to be introduced in the House of Representatives one or more bills or resolutions incorporating the recommendations of the council, and such legislation shall, after its introduction, be referred by the Speaker of the House of Representatives only to the joint committee and no other committee of the House of Representatives.

(3) If one or more bills or resolutions referred by the joint committee are passed by the House of Representatives, the measure or measures shall then be in order for consideration by the Senate and may be voted upon by the Senate.

(4) The rules of the Senate and the House of Representatives for the 2012 legislative session shall contain provisions necessary or appropriate to comply with the legislative process specified by this Code section.

28-13-4.

This chapter shall stand repealed by operation of law on July 1, 2012.

SECTION 2.

This Act shall become effective upon its approval by the Governor or upon its becoming law without such approval.

SECTION 3.

All laws and parts of laws in conflict with this Act are repealed.
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(a) The Department of Corrections is authorized to devise and to provide by agency rule a system of work incentive credits which may be awarded by the department to persons committed to its custody for any felony prison term other than life imprisonment.
(b) Work incentive credits may be awarded by the department to recognize inmates’ institutional attainments in academic or vocational education, satisfactory performance of work assignments made by the penal institution, and compliance with satisfactory behavior standards established by the department.
(c) The department may award up to one day of work incentive credits for each day during which the subject inmate has participated in approved educational or other counseling programs, has satisfactorily performed work tasks assigned by the penal institution, and has complied with satisfactory behavior standards established by the department.
(d) Any work incentive credits awarded an inmate by the department shall be reported by the department to the State Board of Pardons and Paroles which shall consider such credits when making a final parole release decision regarding the subject inmate. The department is authorized to recommend the board apply the work incentive credits to advance any tentative parole release date already established for the subject inmate.
(e) The department also shall report to the State Board of Pardons and Paroles the cases of inmates who decline or refuse to participate in work, educational, or counseling programs, who fail to comply with satisfactory behavior standards, and who therefore refuse to earn work incentive credits.
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Georgia Judicial Circuits & Districts

Map Courtesy of the Administrative Office of the Courts • David L. Ratley, Director
July 2002

(Administrative Office Of the Courts of Georgia, 2002)
## Appendix H

### GDC Acronyms, Terms and Definitions Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriation</td>
<td>Appropriation</td>
<td>An authorization by the General Assembly to a state agency to spend, from public funds, a sum of money for a specific purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations Act</td>
<td>Appropriations Act</td>
<td>Legislation that has been passed by the General Assembly to authorize the expenditure of state, federal and other funds during a given fiscal year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASMP</td>
<td>Augusta State Medical Prison</td>
<td>Provides centralized acute and specialized medical services and Level IV Mental Health services for male and female offenders primarily as transients or outpatients and houses severe medical cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>Boot Camp</td>
<td>Focus on military regimens combined with a full day’s work and includes comprehensive programming in the evening hours. Emphasis is placed on substance abuse programming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community Based Organizations</td>
<td>Community service organization that assists anyone with needs that lack financial means. EX: Lighthouse Ministries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP</td>
<td>Community Impact Program</td>
<td>A program that promotes offender’s successful re-entry into the community by partnering with local law enforcement, state and community agencies and organizations (Local PD, parole, probation, DJJ, DOL, DFACS, DHR, housing). Applies a &quot;one-stop shop&quot; concept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPAS</td>
<td>Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions</td>
<td>COMPAS: The Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions (COMPAS) is an automated, statistically based assessment instrument designed to assess key risk and criminogenic need factors for correctional populations. COMPAS is used for developing case plans for placement, supervision and case-management of offenders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD</td>
<td>Cost per Day</td>
<td>The daily cost to incarcerate and feed an offender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Crisis Stabilization Unit</td>
<td>A designated infirmary area expressly set-up and operated for the purpose of treating mental health offenders/probationers who are in crisis and need 24 hour health care presence while being in a safe environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>Day Reporting Center</td>
<td>Day Reporting Centers and Community Impact Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
provide intensive substance abuse treatment for offenders sentenced by the Courts or who have not responded to more traditional supervision and treatment efforts. Although the cost is slightly more than field probation, a DRC and Community Impact Program is only a fraction of the cost compared to providing a residential alternative. These community-based alternatives operate based on the Principles of Effective Intervention and utilize Evidence-Based Programs that have shown to have a positive effect on reducing recidivism.

<p>| EBP | Evidence Based Practices | Methodology for implementing and maintaining business practices and staff skills intended to increase public safety by reducing recidivism. Involves the study, implementation, monitoring and specification of practices, programs and skills that have been researched or have been modeled after research on similar subjects. |
| Fast Track (FT) | Fast Track | Prefabricated prison housing units quickly assembled onsite to create additional bed space at current prisons. |
| FCBD | Faith and Character Based Dorms | Prison-housed program in which a multi-faith curriculum is taught and a host of reentry issues are focused on with the offenders who volunteer for the program. Housing, career/employment, family, education, are some of the areas addressed in the program. |
| Federal Funds | Federal Funds | Funding from the federal government utilized to pay for all or portions of specific programs. Often, federal funds require a state fund &quot;match&quot; in order to receive the federal allocation. |
| FTO | Field Training Officer | An officer that provides mentorship and leadership to new Probation Officers and to prepare them for success as officer. |
| FY | Fiscal Year | Any 12 month period in which financial accounts are balanced. The state of Georgia's fiscal year begins on July 1 and ends June 30. The federal fiscal year begins October 1 and ends September 30. |
| GDCP | Georgia Diagnostics and Classification Prison | Conducts diagnostic processing for offenders and maintains a Special Management Program. GDCP also houses offenders under death sentence (UDS) and carries out state ordered executions. |
| GP | General Population | Term for all offenders under GDC supervision not on the mental health caseload. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IBC</td>
<td>Inmate Boot Camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPS</td>
<td>Intensive Probation Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRP</td>
<td>Intensive Re-Entry Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISO/SEG</td>
<td>Isolation/Segregation Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LASP</td>
<td>Lee Arrendale State Prison (Alto)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Out</td>
<td>Maximum Release Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>Mental Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>Mental Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRD</td>
<td>Maximum Release Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIC</td>
<td>National Institute of Corrections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCGA</td>
<td>Official Code of Georgia Annotated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAR</td>
<td>Probation Accountability Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBC</td>
<td>Probation Boot Camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDC</td>
<td>Probation Detention Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEW</td>
<td>PEW Center on the States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>Personal History Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIC</td>
<td>Performance Incentive Credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POM</td>
<td>Probation Options Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>Probation Officer Sentencing Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRCC</td>
<td>Probation Reporting Contact Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRI</td>
<td>Problem Residence Inmate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPH</td>
<td>Reentry Housing Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSAT</td>
<td>Residential Substance Abuse Treatment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The design is specific to the needs and dynamic risk factors commonly associated with substance abusers. The primary goal is for program participants to learn real-life ways to help them live a pro-social, productive life free of alcohol and other drugs and crime. Communities are formed when individuals and family groups join for mutual advantage, to protect against common enemies, and to organize to reach common goals. Individuals believe that their purpose can be achieved more effectively as a group than separately. In substance abuse TCs, the common enemy is the addiction, addictive thinking, and the criminal addictive lifestyle. The common goal is pro-social change. "Offenders who are referred to RSAT are parole mandated and have a Texas Christian University Drug Screen (TCUDS) score of three (3) or higher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SASS</th>
<th>Substance Abuse Aftercare Services</th>
<th>The Substance Abuse Aftercare Services (SAAS) Program is a six-month program which targets high risk, high needs offenders who have completed an intensive substance abuse services program. These programs include Day Reporting Centers, Residential Substance Abuse Treatment, and/or approved community programs lasting a minimum of 17 weeks of length.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCRIBE</td>
<td>Statewide Correctional Repository and Information System</td>
<td>Scribe is the computer system for the Department of Corrections that is used for various offender information. Scribe has replaced the OTIS system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIP</td>
<td>Strategic Intervention Program</td>
<td>Treatment program for substance abusers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>State Prison</td>
<td>A secure facility that houses incarcerated offenders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPS</td>
<td>Specialized Probation Supervision</td>
<td>Supervision of probationers who have committed sex crimes, crimes against children, violent crimes, and/or crimes of family violence and have been designated as high risk probationers by the court. An SPS Probation Officer is identified to provide specialized supervision to these mandated high-risk probationers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCUDS</td>
<td>Texas Christian University Drug Screen</td>
<td>The Texas Christian University Drug Screen (TCUDS) is a 15 question substance abuse screening device. It is a self-assessment of an offender’s need and readiness for substance abuse treatment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOR</td>
<td>Transitional Housing for Term</td>
<td>Term for the manual maintained by GDC and Parole that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender Reentry</td>
<td>is a compendium of possible housing options for offenders releasing back into the community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPM</td>
<td>Tentative Parole Month</td>
<td>A Tentative Parole Month (TPM) is the month during which an offender release is projected to occur. The Parole Board may change or cancel the tentative release for any reason up to the time that the offender is actually released. Some of the more common reasons that an offender is not released during the tentative Parole Month include: 1) invalid post-release residence or employment plans, 2) detainers filed by authorities requiring resolution prior to the offender's release, 3) outstanding warrants requiring resolution prior to the offender's release, 4) disciplinary infractions by the offender, 5) community or judicial opposition to the release.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix I:
Corrections Division Directory

## Division Offices

### Probation Operations Division Office
PO Box 1529
300 Patrol Road
Gibson Hall, 1st Floor
Forsyth, GA 31092
478-992-5102

### Facilities Operations Division Office
PO Box 1529
300 Patrol Road
Gibson Hall, 1st Floor
Forsyth, GA 31029
478-992-5104

## PROBATION OFFICES and DAY REPORTING CENTERS

### Adel Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Alapaha
107 North Parrish Avenue
Adel, GA 31620
Counties Served: Cook
229-896-7525

### Albany Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Dougherty
1303 Evelyn Avenue
Albany, GA 31705
Counties Served: Dougherty
229-430-4182

### Americus Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Southwestern
128 E. Forsyth St., Rm 224
P.O. Box 226
Americus, GA 31709
Counties Served: Lee, Macon, Schley, Stewart, Sumter, Webster
229-931-2537

### Athens Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Western
171 Old Epps Bridge Road
P.O. Box 1146
Athens, GA 30603
Counties Served: Clarke, Oconee
706-369-6000

### Athens Day Reporting Center
Judicial Circuit: Western
171 Old Epps Bridge Road
P.O. Box 1146
Athens, GA 30603
Counties Served: Clarke, Oconee
706-369-5688

### Atlanta Central Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Atlanta
1100 Sylvan Road
Atlanta, GA 30310
Counties Served: Fulton
404-756-3707

### Atlanta Court Services
Judicial Circuit: Atlanta
160 Pryor St., Room JG-54
Atlanta, GA 30303
Counties Served: Fulton
404-656-4600

### Atlanta Southwest Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Atlanta
1102 Sylvan Road
Atlanta, GA 30310
Counties Served: Fulton
404-756-3800

### Atlanta Specialized Supervision Unit (SSU)
Judicial Circuit: Atlanta
1100 Sylvan Road
Atlanta, GA 30310
Counties Served: Fulton
404-756-3707

### Atlanta Metro Day Reporting Center
Judicial Circuit: Atlanta
1100 Sylvan Road
Atlanta, GA 30331
Counties Served: Fulton
404-756-3706

### Augusta Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Augusta
901 Greene Street
Augusta, GA 30901
Counties Served: Burke, Columbia, Richmond
706-721-1122

### Augusta Day Reporting Center
Judicial Circuit: Augusta
3439 Mike Padgett Hwy
Augusta, GA 30603
Counties Served: Burke, Columbia, Richmond
706-771-4155
Bainbridge Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: South Georgia
205 West Water Street
Bainbridge, GA 39817
Counties Served: Decatur
229-248-2671

Baxley Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Brunswick
69 Tippins Street, Suite 104
Baxley, GA 31513
Counties Served: Appling
912-366-1064

Blairsville Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Enotah
395 Cleveland Street, Suite 3
Blairsville, GA 30512
Counties Served: Union, Towns
706-781-2360

Blakely Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Pataula
148 Court Square
P.O. Box 772
Blakely, GA 30823
Counties Served: Early
229-723-4277

Blue Ridge Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Appalachian
990 East Main Street, Suite 9
Blue Ridge, GA 30513
Counties Served: Fannin
706-632-2149

Brunswick Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Brunswick
1729 Norwich Street
Brunswick, GA 31521
Counties Served: Appling, Camden, Glynn, Jeff Davis, Wayne
912-262-3065

Buchanan Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Tallapoosa
24 Magnolia Street
P.O. Box 156
Buchanan, GA 30113
Counties Served: Haralson
770-646-3810

Cairo Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: South Georgia
24 Third Avenue, NE
Cairo, GA 39828
Counties Served: Grady
229-377-5347

Calhoun Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Cherokee
210 A South King Street
Calhoun, GA 30701
Counties Served: Gordon
706-624-1414

Camilla Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: South Georgia
16 N. Court Street
Camilla, GA 31730
Counties Served: Baker, Calhoun, Mitchell
229-522-3572

Canton Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Blue Ridge
130 E. Main Street, Suite G-101
Canton, GA 30114
Counties Served: Cherokee
770-479-2602

Carrollton Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Coweta
497 Rome Street
Carrollton, GA 30117
Counties Served: Carroll, Heard
770-836-6704

Cartersville Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Cherokee
123 West Main Street
Cartersville, GA 30120
Counties Served: Bartow
770-387-3780

Cedartown Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Tallapoosa
100 A County Loop Road
P.O. Box 1771
Cedartown, GA 30125
Counties Served: Polk
770-749-2206

Clarkesville Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Mountain
201 Monroe Street
Clarkesville, GA 30523
Counties Served: Habersham, Rabun
706-754-9315

Claxton Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Atlantic
105 Daniel Street
Claxton, GA 30417
Counties Served: Evans, Tattnall, Bryan
912-739-9612

Clayton Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Mountain
25 Courthouse Square, Suite 217
Clayton, GA 30525
Counties Served: Rabun
706-782-4727

Clayton Day Reporting Center
Judicial Circuit: Clayton
1331 Citizens Pkwy
Morrow, GA 30260
Counties Served: Clayton
770-960-2005
Columbus PO
Judicial Circuit: Chattahoochee
1328 Second Avenue
Columbus, GA 31901
Counties Served:
Chattahoochee, Harris, Marion, Muscogee, Talbot, Taylor
706-649-7484

Columbus Day Reporting Center
Judicial Circuit: Chattahoochee
1334 Second Avenue
Columbus, GA 31901
Counties Served:
Chattahoochee, Harris, Marion, Muscogee, Talbot, Taylor
706-649-0584

Conyers Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Rockdale
365 Salem Gate Drive, Suite 1
Conyers, GA 30013
Counties Served: Rockdale
770-388-5011

Cordele Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Cordele
1304 South Seventh Street
Cordele, GA 31015
Counties Served: Crisp, Dooly
229-276-2346

Covington Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Alcovy
4186 Baker Street
P.O. Box 348
Covington, GA 30015
Counties Served: Newton
770-784-2700

Cumming Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Bell Forsyth
310 Tribble Gap Road
Cumming, GA 30040
Counties Served: Forsyth
770-781-2170

Cuthbert Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Pataula
76 West Pearl Street
Cuthbert, GA 39840
Counties Served: Randolph, Quitman, Clay
229-732-2123

Dahlonega Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Enotah
163 Tipton Drive
Dahlonega, GA 30533
Counties Served: Lumpkin, White
706-867-2929

Dallas Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Paulding
250 Butler Industrial Drive
P.O. Box 82
Dallas, GA 30132
Counties Served: Paulding
770-443-7861

Dalton Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Conasauga
307 South Hamilton Street, Suite 102
Dalton, GA 30722
Counties Served: Murray, Whitfield
706-272-2306

Danielsville Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Northern
97 Sunset Drive, Suite A
P.O. Box 392
Danielsville, GA 30633
Counties Served: Madison
706-795-3845

Darien Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Atlantic
213 Walton Street
P.O. Box 1238
Darien, GA 31305
Counties Served: McIntosh
912-437-5583

Dawson Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Pataula
513 South Main Street
Dawson, GA 39842
Counties Served: Terrell
229-995-6459

Dekalb Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Stone Mountain
547 Church Street, 1st Floor
Decatur, GA 30030
Counties Served: Dekalb
404-370-5113

Donalsonville Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Pataula
223 South Wiley Avenue
Donalsonville, GA 39845
Counties Served: Seminole, Miller
229-524-2836

Douglas Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Waycross
319 East Ward Street
Douglas, GA 31533
Counties Served: Coffee, Bacon
912-389-4431

Douglasville Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Douglas
8473 Durelee Lane, Suite 400
Douglasville, GA 30134
Counties Served: Douglas
770-489-3070

Dublin Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Dublin
105 East Jackson Street
P.O. Box 2012
Court Square Station
Dublin, GA 31040
Counties Served: Johnson, Laurens, Twiggs, Treutlen
478-275-6637
Eastman Probation Office  
Judicial Circuit: Oconee  
5505 Anson Avenue  
Eastman, GA 31023  
Counties Served: Dodge, Bleckley, Pulaski  
478-374-6501

Eatonton Probation Office  
Judicial Circuit: Ocmulgee  
105 S. Jefferson St.  
Eatonton, GA 31024  
Counties Served: Putnam & Jasper  
706-484-2970

Elberton Probation Office  
Judicial Circuit: Northern  
233 North Oliver Street  
P.O. Box 725  
Elberton, GA 30635  
Counties Served: Elbert, Oglethorpe  
706-213-2032

Ellijay Probation Office  
Judicial Circuit: Appalachian  
1 Board Street, Suite 002  
Ellijay, GA 30540  
Counties Served: Gilmer  
706-635-5125

Fayetteville Probation Office  
Judicial Circuit: Griffin  
135 A Bradford Square  
Fayetteville, GA 30215  
Counties Served: Fayette  
770-460-2730

Forsyth Probation Office  
Judicial Circuit: Towaliga  
145 L. Cary Bittick Dr.  
Forsyth, GA 31029  
Counties Served: Monroe  
478-994-7002  
*Mailing Address*:  
163 Ernest Biles Drive  
Jackson, GA 30233

Fort Valley Probation Office  
Judicial Circuit: Macon  
205 West Church St., Ste 226  
Fort Valley, GA 31030  
Counties Served: Peach, Crawford  
478-825-3136

Greensboro Probation Office  
Judicial Circuit: Ocmulgee  
113 North Main Street, Suite 306  
Greensboro, GA 30642  
Counties Served: Greene, Morgan  
706-453-7131

Greenville Probation Office  
Judicial Circuit: Coweta  
North Court Square, Health Bldg  
P.O. Box 582  
Greenville, GA 30222  
Counties Served: Meriwether  
706-672-4971

Gray Probation Office  
Judicial Circuit: Ocmulgee  
161 James Street  
P.O. Box 753  
Gray, GA 31032  
Counties Served: Jones  
478-986-6611

Greensboro Day Reporting Center  
Judicial Circuit: Ocmulgee  
161 James Street  
P.O. Box 753  
Gray, GA 31032  
Counties Served: Jones  
478-986-6611

Gainesville Probation Office  
Judicial Circuit: Northeastern  
1002 Aviation Blvd  
Gainesville, GA 30501  
Counties Served: Dawson, Hall  
770-535-5710

Gainesville Day Reporting Center  
Judicial Circuit: Northeastern  
1002 Aviation Blvd  
Gainesville, GA 30501  
Counties Served: Dawson, Hall  
770-535-5723

Griffin Probation Office  
Judicial Circuit: Griffin  
1498 D.F. Fuller Drive  
Griffin, GA 30224  
Counties Served: Pike, Spalding  
770-229-3132

Griffin Day Reporting Center  
Judicial Circuit: Griffin  
1498 D.F. Fuller Drive  
Griffin, GA 30224  
Counties Served: Pike, Spalding, Upson, Fayette  
770-229-3345

Hartwell Probation Office  
Judicial Circuit: Northern  
68 Maret Street  
P.O. Box 715  
Hartwell, GA 30643  
Counties Served: Hart, Franklin  
706-856-2711

Hazlehurst Probation Office  
Judicial Circuit: Brunswick  
15 Jeff Davis Street, Suite #3  
P.O. Box 1060  
Hazlehurst, GA 31539  
Counties Served: Jeff Davis  
912-375-4441
Hinesville Probation Office  
Judicial Circuit: Atlantic  
104 A Commerce Street  
P.O. Box 94  
Hinesville, GA 31313  
Counties Served: Bryan, Evans, Liberty, Long, McIntosh, Tattnall  
912-370-2571

Jackson Probation Office  
Judicial Circuit: Towaliga  
163 Ernest Biles Drive  
Jackson, GA 30233  
Counties Served: Butts, Lamar, Monroe  
770-504-2370

Jasper Probation Office  
Judicial Circuit: Appalachian  
37 Court Street  
Jasper, GA 30143  
Counties Served: Pickens  
706-692-4805

Jesup Probation Office  
Judicial Circuit: Brunswick  
243 North Brunswick Street  
Jesup, GA 31546  
Counties Served: Wayne  
912-427-5894

LaFayette Probation Office  
Judicial Circuit: Lookout Mtn  
109 Main Street  
LaFayette, GA 30728  
Counties Served: Catoosa, Chattooga, Dade, Walker  
706-638-5531

LaGrange Probation Office  
Judicial Circuit: Coweta  
206 Rear Ridley Avenue  
LaGrange, GA 30240  
Counties Served: Troup  
706-845-4125

Lakeland Probation Office  
Judicial Circuit: Alapaha  
6 Brantley Street  
Lakeland, GA 31635  
Counties Served: Lanier, Atkinson, Cook, Clinch, Berrien  
229-482-3303

Lawrenceville Probation Office  
Judicial Circuit: Gwinnett  
410 Oak Street  
P.O. Box 1305  
Lawrenceville, GA 30046  
Counties Served: Gwinnett  
770-339-2222

Leesburg Probation Office  
Judicial Circuit: Southwestern  
104 Leslie Highway  
P.O. Box 510  
Leesburg, GA 31763  
Counties Served: Lee  
229-759-3034

Louisville Probation Office  
Judicial Circuit: Middle  
142 East Broad Street  
Louisville, GA 30434  
Counties Served: Jefferson  
478-625-3648

Lyons Probation Office  
Judicial Circuit: Middle  
113 Moody Circle  
Lyons, GA 30436  
Counties Served: Candler, Toombs  
912-526-8311

Macon Probation Office  
Judicial Circuit: Macon  
543 Second Street, Suite 102  
Macon, GA 31201  
Counties Served: Bibb  
478-751-6092

Macon Day Reporting Center  
Judicial Circuit: Macon  
543 Second Street, Suite 101  
Macon, GA 31201  
Counties Served: Bibb  
478-751-4191

Marietta North Probation Office  
Judicial Circuit: Cobb  
590 Commerce Park Drive, Suite 102  
P.O. Box 910  
Marietta, GA 30061  
Counties Served: Cobb  
770-528-4923

Marietta South Probation Office  
Judicial Circuit: Cobb  
2275 Northwest Pkwy, Suite 170  
P.O. Box 910  
Marietta, GA 30061  
Counties Served: Cobb  
770-916-2115

McDonough Probation Office  
Judicial Circuit: Flint  
165 McDonough Pkwy  
McDonough, GA 30253  
Counties Served: Jefferson  
478-954-2004

McRae Probation Office  
Judicial Circuit: Oconee  
37 South Second Avenue  
McRae, GA 31055  
Counties Served: Montgomery, Telfair, Wheeler  
229-868-3200
Milledgeville Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Ocmulgee
2271 Vinson Hwy
Arnall Bldg 1st Floor
Hardwick, GA 31034
Counties Served: Baldwin, Hancock, Wilkinson
478-445-4468

Milledgeville, GA 31059

Millen Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Ogeechee
Jenkins County Courthouse
P.O. Box 486
Millen, GA 30442
Counties Served: Jenkins
478-982-2050

Monroe Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Alcovy
226 Alcovy Place, Suite C-7
P.O. Box 129
Monroe, GA 30655
Counties Served: Walton
770-267-1347

Morrow Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Clayton
1331 Citizens Pkwy, Suite 201
Morrow, GA 30260
Counties Served: Clayton
770-960-4100

Moultrie Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Southern
18 South Main Street
Moultrie, GA 31768
Counties Served: Colquitt
229-891-7270

Nashville Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Alapaha
495 County Farm Road
Nashville, GA 31639
Counties Served: Berrien
229-686-9329

Newnan Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Coweta
51 B Perry Street
Newnan, GA 30263
Counties Served: Carroll, Coweta, Meriwether, Troup
770-254-7204

Northwest Day Reporting Center
Judicial Circuit: Conasauga
307 South Hamilton Street
Dalton, GA 30720
Counties Served: Murray, Whitfield
706-272-2111

Perry Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Houston
201 Perry Pkwy
Perry, GA 31069
Counties Served: Houston
478-988-6898

Reidsville Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Atlantic
108 Brazell Street, Second Floor
P.O. Box 636
Reidsville, GA 30456
Counties Served: Tattnall
912-557-1166

Rome Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Rome
100 Marable Way, NW, Suite A
Rome, GA 30165
Counties Served: Floyd
706-295-6323

Rome Day Reporting Center
Judicial Circuit: Rome
100 Marable Way, NW, Suite B
Rome, GA 30165
Counties Served: Floyd
706-368-7800

Rouse Day Reporting Center
Judicial Circuit: Waycross
3019 Memorial Drive
Waycross, GA 31502
Counties Served: Brantley, Charlton, Pierce, Ware
912-285-6028

Sandersville Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Middle
111 Brookins Street
Sandersville, GA 31082
Counties Served: Washington
478-553-2450

Savannah Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Eastern
8 Southern Oaks Court, 1st Floor
Savannah, GA 31405
Counties Served: Chatham
912-651-2204

Soperton Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Dublin
202 MLK Street, South
Soperton, GA 30457
Counties Served: Treutlen
912-529-6670

Springfield Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Ogeechee
103 South Laurel Street
Springfield, GA 31329
Counties Served: Effingham
912-564-7382

Statesboro Probation Office
Judicial Circuit: Ogeechee
15 North Main Street
Statesboro, GA 30458
Counties Served: Bulloch, Effingham, Jenkins, Screven
912-871-1119
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Swainsboro Probation Office</th>
<th>Thomson Probation Office</th>
<th>Washington Probation Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Circuit: Middle</td>
<td>Judicial Circuit: Toombs</td>
<td>Judicial Circuit: Toombs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 North Main Street</td>
<td>1025 Warrenton Highway</td>
<td>23 East Court Street, Room 401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swainsboro, GA 30401</td>
<td>P.O. Box 337</td>
<td>Washington, GA 30673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counties Served: Emanuel</td>
<td>Thomson, GA 30824</td>
<td>Counties Served: Wilkes, Lincoln, Taliaferro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>478-289-2602</td>
<td>Counties Served: Glascock, McDuffie, Thomson</td>
<td>706-678-2373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvana Probation Office</td>
<td>Tifton Probation Office</td>
<td>Watkinsville Probation Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Circuit: Ogeechee</td>
<td>Judicial Circuit: Tifton</td>
<td>Judicial Circuit: Western</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216 Mims Road, Screven</td>
<td>541 South Main Street, Suite D</td>
<td>203 North Main Street, Waycross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Courthouse</td>
<td>Tifton, GA 31794</td>
<td>Waycross, GA 31503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvana, GA 30467</td>
<td>Counties Served: Irwin, Tift</td>
<td>Counties Served: Brantley, Charlton, Pierce, Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counties Served: Screven</td>
<td></td>
<td>912-285-6028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>912-564-7382</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvester Probation Office</td>
<td>Tifton Day Reporting Center</td>
<td>Waycross Probation Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105 East Liberty Avenue</td>
<td>115 South Davis Ave</td>
<td>3019 Memorial Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvester, GA 31791</td>
<td>Tifton, GA 31794</td>
<td>Waycross, GA 31503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counties Served: Worth, Turner</td>
<td>Counties Served: Irwin, Tift</td>
<td>Counties Served: Brantley, Charlton, Pierce, Ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229-777-2183</td>
<td>Worth, Turner, Ben Hill, Berrien, Cook</td>
<td>912-285-6028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>229-386-3503</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomaston Probation Office</td>
<td>Toccoa Probation Office</td>
<td>Toccoa Probation Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Circuit: Griffin</td>
<td>Judicial Circuit: Mountain</td>
<td>Judicial Circuit: Mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113 B East County Road</td>
<td>27 Doyle Street</td>
<td>27 Doyle Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomaston, GA 30286</td>
<td>Toccoa, GA 30577</td>
<td>Toccoa, GA 30577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counties Served: Upson</td>
<td>Counties Served: Stephens</td>
<td>Counties Served: Stephens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706-646-6000</td>
<td>706-282-4570</td>
<td>706-282-4570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomasville Probation Office</td>
<td>Valdosta Probation Office</td>
<td>Valdosta Probation Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Circuit: Southern</td>
<td>Judicial Circuit: Southern</td>
<td>Judicial Circuit: Southern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800 West Jackson Street</td>
<td>209 North Ashley Street</td>
<td>209 North Ashley Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomasville, GA 31792</td>
<td>Valdosta, GA 31601</td>
<td>Valdosta, GA 31601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counties Served: Thomas</td>
<td>Counties Served: Lowndes, Echols, Brooks</td>
<td>Counties Served: Lowndes, Echols, Brooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229-225-4021</td>
<td>229-333-5274</td>
<td>229-333-5274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomasville Day Reporting Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Circuit: Southern</td>
<td>Winder Probation Office</td>
<td>Winder Probation Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800 West Jackson Street</td>
<td>Judicial Circuit: Piedmont</td>
<td>Judicial Circuit: Piedmont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomasville, GA 31792</td>
<td>22 Lee Street</td>
<td>22 Lee Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counties Served: Thomas</td>
<td>Counties Served: Barrow, Banks, Jackson</td>
<td>22 Lee Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229-227-2447</td>
<td>678-963-7020</td>
<td>678-963-7020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Probation Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Circuit: Toombs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 East Court Street, Room 401</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, GA 30673</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counties Served: Wilkes, Lincoln, Taliaferro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706-678-2373</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waycross Probation Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Circuit: Waycross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3019 Memorial Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waycross, GA 31503</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counties Served: Brantley, Charlton, Pierce, Ware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>912-285-6028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waynesboro Probation Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Circuit: Augusta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105 Liberty Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O. Box 89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waynesboro, GA 30830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counties Served: Burke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706-437-6849</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winder Probation Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Circuit: Piedmont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Lee Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winder, GA 30680</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counties Served: Barrow, Banks, Jackson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>678-963-7020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Woodbine Probation Office  
Judicial Circuit: Brunswick  
207 East Second Street  
P.O. Box 400  
Woodbine, GA 31569  
Counties Served: Camden  
912-576-5998

PRISONS

Arrendale State Prison  
2023 Gainesville Highway, S  
PO Box 709  
Alto, GA 30510-0709  
(706) 776-4700

Augusta State Medical Prison  
3001 Gordon Hwy  
Grovetown, GA 30813  
(706) 855-4700

Butter Stone State Prison  
3178 Mount Zion Church Rd  
PO Box 648  
Pelham, GA 31779  
(229) 294-2940

Baldwin State Prison  
Laying Farm Road  
PO Box 218  
Hardwick, GA 31034  
(478) 445-5218

Burruss Correctional Training  
Center and Boot Camp  
GPSTC Complex  
1000 Indian Springs Dr.  
PO Box 5849  
Forsyth, GA 31029  
(478) 994-7511

Calhoun State Prison  
PO Box 249  
Morgan, GA 39866  
(229) 849-5000

Central State Prison  
4600 Fulton Mill Road  
Macon, GA 31208  
(478) 471-2908

Coastal State Prison  
200 Gulfstream Road  
PO Box 7150  
Garden City, GA 31418  
(912) 965-6330

Coffee Correctional Facility  
(Private)  
1153 North Liberty St.  
PO Box 650  
Nicholls, GA 31554  
912-345-5058

Dodge State Prison  
2971 Old Bethel Road  
PO Box 276  
Chester, GA 31012-0276  
(478) 358-7200

Dooly State Prison  
1412 Plunkett Road  
PO Box 750  
Unadilla, GA 31091  
(478) 627-2000

Emanuel Women’s Facility  
714 Gumlog Rd  
Swainsboro, GA  
478-289-2748

GA Diagnostic and Classification State Prison  
Hwy 36, West  
PO Box 3877  
Jackson, GA 30233  
(770) 504-2000

Georgia State Prison  
300 1st Ave. South  
Reidsville, GA 30453  
912-557-7301

Hancock State Prison  
701 Prison Blvd.  
PO Box 339  
Sparta, GA 31087  
706-444-1000

Hays State Prison  
777 Underwood Rd.  
PO Box 668  
Trion, GA 30753  
706-857-0400

Helm’s Facility  
1275 Constitution Road  
Atlanta, GA 30316  
(404) 624-2413

Johnson State Prison  
290 Donovan-Harrison Rd.  
PO Box 344  
Wrightsville, GA 31096  
478-864-4100

Lee State Prison  
153 Pinewood Dr.  
Leesburg, GA 31763  
229-759-6453

Long State Prison  
1434 US 84 East  
PO Box 70  
Ludowici, GA 31316  
912-545-3779

Macon State Prison  
2728 Hwy 49 South  
PO Box 426  
Oglethorpe, GA 31068  
478-472-3400

Montgomery State Prison  
650 Mt. Vernon/Alston Rd.  
PO Box 256  
Mt. Vernon, GA 30445  
912-583-3600
Phillips State Prison
2989 West Rock Quarry Rd.
Buford, GA 30519
770-932-4500

Pulaski State Prison
Rt. 2, Upper River Rd
PO Box 839
Hawkinsville, GA 31036
478-753-6000

Rogers State Prison
1978 GA Hwy 147
Reidsville, GA 30453
912-557-7771

Rutledge State Prison
7175 Manor Rd.
Columbus, GA 31907
706-568-2340

Smith State Prison
9676 Hwy 301 North
PO Box 726
Glennville, GA 30427
912-654-5000

Telfair State Prison
210 Longbridge Rd.
PO Box 549
Helena, GA 31037
229-868-7721

Valdosta State Prison
3259 Valtech Rd.
PO Box 310
Valdosta, GA 31603
229-333-7900

Walker State Prison
97 Kevin Lane
PO Box 98
Rock Springs, GA 30739
706-764-3600

Ware State Prison
3620 North Harris Rd.
Waycross, GA 31503
912-285-6400

Washington State Prison
13262 Hwy 24 East
PO Box 206
Davisboro, GA 31018
478-348-5814

Wheeler Correctional Facility
(Private)
195 N. Broad St.
Alamo, GA 30411
912-568-1731

Wilcox State Prison
470 South Broad St.
PO Box 397
Abbeville, GA 31001
229-467-3000

COUNTY PRISONS

Athens/Clarke County Prison
2825 County Farm Road
Athens, GA 30605
(706) 613-3400

Bulloch County Prison
17301 U.S. 301 North
Statesboro, GA 30458
(912) 764-6217

Carroll County Prison
96 Horsley Mill Road
Carrollton, GA 30117
(770) 830-5905

Clayton County Prison
11420 S.L. R. Boulevard
PO Box 309
Lovejoy, GA 30250
(770) 473-5777

Colquitt County Prison
PO Box 339
Moultrie, GA 31776
(229) 616-7490

Coweta County Prison
101 Selt Road
Newnan, GA 30263
(770) 254-3723

Decatur County Prison
1153 Airport Road
Bainbridge, GA 39817
(229) 248-3035

Effingham County Prison
PO Box 235
Springfield, GA 31329
(912) 754-2108

Floyd County Prison
329 Blacks Bluff Road
Rome, GA 30161
(706) 236-2490

Gwinnett County Prison
750 High Hope Road
Lawrenceville, GA 30043
(678) 407-6000

Hall County Prison
1694 Barber Road
Gainesville, GA 30507
(770) 536-3672

Harris County Prison
9982 Hwy 116
Hamilton, GA 31811
(706) 628-4959

Jackson County Prison
255 Curtis Spence Drive
Jefferson, GA 30549
(706) 387-6450
Jefferson County Prison  
1159 Clarks Mill Road  
Louisville, GA  30434  
(478) 625-7230

Mitchell County Prison  
4838 Hwy 37, East  
Camilla, GA  31730  
(229) 336-2045

Muscogee County Prison  
7175 Sacerdote Lane  
PO Box 84041  
Columbus, GA  31908  
(706) 561-3220

Richmond County Prison  
2314 Tobacco Road  
Augusta, GA  30906  
(706) 798-5572

Screven County Prison  
859 Rockyford Road  
PO Box 377  
Sylvania, GA  30467  
(912) 863-4555

Spalding County Prison  
295 Justice Boulevard  
Griffin, GA  30224  
(770) 467-4760

Sumter County Prison  
346 McMath Mill Road  
PO Box 484  
Americus, GA  31709  
(229) 928-4582

Terrell County Prison  
3110 Albany Hwy  
Dawson, GA  31742  
(229) 995-5381

Thomas County Prison  
324 County Farm Road  
Thomasville, GA  31757  
(229) 226-4394

Troup County Prison  
2508 Hamilton Road  
LaGrange, GA  30240  
(706) 883-1720

LaGrange Transitional Center  
100 Jim Hester Road  
LaGrange, GA  30241  
(706) 845-4018

Macon Transitional Center  
200 Henry Street  
Macon, GA  31206  
(478) 751-6090

Phillips Transitional Center  
2989 West Rock Quarry Rd  
Buford, GA  30519  
(770) 932-4646

Smith Transitional Center  
8631 U.S. Highway 301  
Claxton, GA  30417  
(912) 739-1018

Valdosta Transitional Center  
363 Gil Harbin Blvd.  
Valdosta, GA  31601  
(229) 293-6280

PROBATION DETENTION CENTERS

Bacon Probation Detention Center  
PO Box 904  
165 E. Eastside Industrial Blvd.  
Alma, GA  31501  
912-632-8157

Bleckley Probation Detention Center  
PO Box 519  
179 Jac Arts Rd.  
Cochran, GA  31014  
478-934-3303

Colwell Probation Detention Center  
189 Beasley Street  
Blairsville, GA  30512  
706-745-3610
Emanuel Probation Detention Center
PO Box 1430
121 Casa Dr.
Twin City, GA 30471
478-763-2400

McEver Probation Detention Center
PO Box 1430
2100 Kings Chapel Rd.
Perry, GA 31069
478-988-7024

Patten Probation Detention Center
PO Box 278
1009 North 10th Street
Lakeland, GA 31635
229-482-8241

Paulding Probation Detention Center
1295 Industrial Blvd.
Dallas, GA 30132
770-443-7807

Treutlen Probation Detention Center
PO Box 707
401 Cascade Circle
Soperton, GA 30457
912-529-6760

Women's Probation Detention Center
PO Box 920
8662 US Hwy 301 North
Claxton, GA 30417
912-739-0716
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