

LEGISLATIVE BUDGET BOARD
Austin, Texas

FISCAL NOTE, 78TH LEGISLATIVE REGULAR SESSION

April 7, 2003

TO: Honorable Ray Allen, Chair, House Committee on Corrections

FROM: John Keel, Director, Legislative Budget Board

IN RE: HB1715 by Hodge (Relating to the operations of the Board of Pardons and Paroles and the pardons and paroles division of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice and to the supervision of persons released on parole or mandatory supervision.), **As Introduced**

No significant fiscal implication to the State is anticipated.

Section 1 of the bill would amend the Government Code by shifting the responsibility for gathering the information contained within offender parole packets away from the parole division of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice (TDCJ) to the Board of Pardons and Paroles (BPP). No significant fiscal impact is anticipated for TDCJ from this section of the bill, assuming the intent of this bill is for the Board to assume the duties currently performed by the institutional parole officers of the parole division.

Section 2 of the bill would specify that the parole panel that made the initial decision may review additional information received that is relevant as to whether the inmate should be under supervision as a releasee or should be imprisoned. It is assumed that this section would not significantly affect the operations of state government.

Section 3 of the bill would require the BPP parole guidelines to include the average time of imprisonment served for certain offenses. It is assumed that this section would not significantly affect the operations of state government.

Section 4 of the bill would specify procedures for early termination of parole supervision. The Parole Division would be allowed to recommend to the BPP termination for parolees who have successfully served more than five years on parole, or who have served 2/3rds of their entire sentence. The parole division has estimated that 3,901 offenders who have successfully served more than 5 years, are under minimum supervision, and are not convicted of sexual or assaultive offenses. Potential savings from this section of the bill would depend on the extent to which early termination of parole supervision is utilized.

Section 5 of the bill would restrict the issuance of warrants except for certain public safety threats, parolees subject to intensive supervision, and absconders. In FY 2001 and FY 2002, 47,705 warrants were issued and then withdrawn. Depending on implementation of the bill, a savings to the State could be realized through a decrease in issued warrants.

Section 6 of the bill would work in conjunction with Section 5 of the bill to make the issuance of a summons the default. No fiscal impact is anticipated from the section.

Section 7 of the bill would repeal the requirement that an offender return to the county of legal residence. The parole division currently must research where an offender lived during the time of the offense, since the judgment of sentence only reflects where the offense was committed. Implementation of this provision could mean less work for the parole division and thus result in savings to the State.

Local Government Impact

No fiscal implication to units of local government is anticipated.

Source Agencies: 696 Department of Criminal Justice

LBB Staff: JK, WK, VDS, GG, KG