NOTES FOR DOC INSTITUTIONAL FACT CARDS AS OF JULY 1, 2013

The Mass. DOC has computed Fact Cards for each of seventeen prisons and for the total DOC Jurisdictional Population as of July 1, 2013. The Fact Cards list population counts and breakdowns for gender, race, age, governing offense, governing sentence length, and average length of stay in days. The DOC computed the same statistics effective July 1, 2011. The following tables present the data for July 1, 2013. There are a few observations which need to be noted.

1) The statistics given for the DOC Jurisdictional Population exceeds the totals for the individual prisons added together as of July 1, 2013. This was also true for the statistics for July 1, 2011. For July 1, 2013, the total population Fact Card showed a Total Facility Count of 11,249. The total population for the seventeen institutions was, however, 10,856 - a difference of 394. Thus, there are 394 prisoners under DOC jurisdiction who are being held somewhere other than in one of the seventeen DOC institutions. At least one of those prisoners is age 16, i.e., the age of the youngest prisoner noted in the Total DOC Fact Card. In addition, Lemuel Shattuck Hospital is not one of the seventeen institutions; the capacity for the unit there is 24. Where the remaining prisoners are being held is not disclosed by the DOC. For July 1, 2011 the difference between the DOC Total Fact Card (11,891) and the total of the institutions (11,590) was 301.

2) The total DOC jurisdictional count decreased from July 1, 2011 to July 1, 2013 by 642. On the DOC Fact Card for Total Jurisdiction, the criminally sentenced population decreased by 673 (from 10,619 to 9,946), the number of civil commitments decreased by 48 (from 652 to 604), while the pre-trial population increased by 79 (from 620 to 699).

3) The population of those serving governing sentences for drug offenses decreased by 743 (from 2374 to 1631), a decrease of 6%, from July 1, 2011 to July 1, 2013.

4) The population of those serving governing sentences for person offenses increased by 110 (from 5197 to 5217), an increase of 4%, from July 1, 2011 to July 1, 2013. One contributing factor is the precipitous decline in parolees given out by the reorganized Parole Board after the Dominic Cinelli case which occurred late in 2010. Thus, fewer prisoners are leaving on parole than are entering the prisons with convictions for offenses against persons.

5) A similar effect is a factor in the increase in those serving life sentences. From July 1, 2011 to July 1, 2013, the number of second degree lifers increased by 58 (from 872 to 930), an increase of from 8% to 9% of the total criminally sentenced population. Similarly, from July 1, 2011 to July 1, 2013, the number of first degree lifers increased by 63 (from 994 to 1057), an increase from 9% to 11% of the total criminally sentenced population. Overall, from July 1, 2011 to July 1, 2013, the percentage of lifers of the total criminally sentenced population increased from 17% to 20%.

6) The numbers of criminally sentenced Hispanics showed the largest decrease - 291, (from 3064 to 2773); the percentage of Hispanic prisoners of those criminally sentenced dropped from 26% to 25%. Criminally sentenced African-American prisoners decreased from July 1, 2011 to July 1 2013 by 192 (from 3312 to 3120), while remaining 28% of the total of the criminally sentenced prisoners. Criminally sentenced Caucasian prisoners decreased by 182 (from 5197 to 5115), but the percentage of Caucasian prisoners of those criminally sentenced increased from 44% to 45%.

7) The total lengths of stay for the seventeen institutions, as of July 1, 2013 as compared to July 1, 2011, increased by 525 days or 5% (from 10,067 to 10,592).
8) The total population in maximum security institutions decreased by 224 (from 2092 to 1868), a decrease from 18% to 17% in the total population in all of the seventeen institutions from July 1, 2011 to July 1, 2013. The total population of prisoners in medium security institutions decreased by 307 (from 7872 to 7565), yet the percentage of medium security prisoners of the total population in the seventeen institutions increased from 68% to 70%. The total population of minimum and pre-release institutions decreased by 204 (from 1626 to 1422), the percentage of prisoners in minimum security institutions as a percentage of the total population in the seventeen institutions decreased from 14% to 13%. Notably, the number of prisoners held in pre-release facilities remained constant at 284, therefore, the entire decrease in population of 204 was in minimum security institutions (from 1342 to 1138).

9) In the latest DOC Prison Population Trends Report, published in June 2012, daily average costs were listed for each institution, as of January 1, 2011. Using those daily average costs, the total daily average cost, due to the increases in length of stays totaling 525 days, increased by $37,749, or an annual cost of $13,778,385; due solely to the increase in the length of stays from July 1, 2011 to July 1, 2013.

10) The 5% increase in length of stays cannot be accounted for by an analysis of the Fact Cards. One contributing factor, however, can be postulated. Undoubtedly, the steep decline in parole rates, since the Parole Board has been chaired by Josh Wall, has had a significant impact on the increase in the overall length of stays in the DOC. For lifers alone, the parole rate had dropped from 34% in 2010 to 17% in 2012. The parole rate for all state institutions also dropped by 17% from 2010 to 2012. How much of the increase in the annual costs of nearly $14 million can be attributed to the Parole Board needs an answer, as well as what other factors may be contributing to the increase in the length of stays.

11) It should be noted that the length of stay for maximum security institutions increased by 72 days, for medium security institutions - an increase of 589 days (over nineteenth months), and for minimum/pre-release facilities - a decrease of 136 days for length of stay. Maximum and medium security institutions are more expensive to operate than minimum and pre-release facilities. Thus, the lengthening of stays in maximum and medium security prisons translates into and additional expenditure of funds which is, at best, questionably necessary and, at worst, a waste of taxpayers’ funds which could have been put to better use, e.g., education or health care.