



## Agency Legislative Proposal - 2018 Session

**Document Name** (e.g. OPM1015Budget.doc; OTG1015Policy.doc): 2018 DOC CorrectEnterprise.docx

(If submitting electronically, please label with date, agency, and title of proposal – 092611\_SDE\_TechRevisions)

State Agency: Department of Correction

**Liaison:** David McCluskey

**Phone:** (860) 692-7510

**E-mail:** david.mccluskey@ct.gov

Lead agency division requesting this proposal: Legislative Unit

Agency Analyst/Drafter of Proposal: David McCluskey

**Title of Proposal:** Enhancing Correctional Enterprises within the Department of Correction

**Statutory Reference:** C.G.S. 18-88 (f)

**Proposal Summary:**

To add Benefit corporations, as defined in C.G.S Section 33-1350, to the list of entities that the Department of Correction Correctional Enterprises of Connecticut may sell articles, materials, products or services.

### PROPOSAL BACKGROUND

◇ **Reason for Proposal**

Please consider the following, if applicable:

- (1) Have there been changes in federal/state/local laws and regulations that make this legislation necessary?
- (2) Has this proposal or something similar been implemented in other states? If yes, what is the outcome(s)?
- (3) Have certain constituencies called for this action?
- (4) What would happen if this was not enacted in law this session?

Benefit corporations were first authorized in October 2014 and have begun to be established in the state. The Correctional Enterprises section of Title 18 has not been revised to reflect this new entity under state law. These Benefit Corporations have the ability to hire returning citizens and reduce recidivism; as well as increase the opportunities for inmate employment within the Correction Department.

◇ **Origin of Proposal**

**New Proposal**

**Resubmission**

If this is a resubmission, please share:

- (1) What was the reason this proposal did not pass, or if applicable, was not included in the Administration’s package?
- (2) Have there been negotiations/discussions during or after the previous legislative session to improve this proposal?
- (3) Who were the major stakeholders/advocates/legislators involved in the previous work on this legislation?
- (4) What was the last action taken during the past legislative session?



Click here to enter text.

### **PROPOSAL IMPACT**

◇ **AGENCIES AFFECTED** *(please list for each affected agency)*

<p><b>Agency Name:</b> Uncertain or N/A <b>Agency Contact (name, title, phone):</b> Click here to enter text. <b>Date Contacted:</b> Click here to enter text.</p> <p>Approve of Proposal    <input type="checkbox"/> YES    <input type="checkbox"/> NO    <input type="checkbox"/> Talks Ongoing</p>
<p><b>Summary of Affected Agency's Comments</b> Click here to enter text.</p>
<p>Will there need to be further negotiation?    <input type="checkbox"/> YES    <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p>

◇ **FISCAL IMPACT** *(please include the proposal section that causes the fiscal impact and the anticipated impact)*

<p><b>Municipal</b> <i>(please include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation)</i> N/A</p>
<p><b>State</b> It is unclear whether this proposal will have any fiscal impact, either positive or negative, given the small number of benefit corporations which may take advantage of purchasing products and services from DOC's Correctional Enterprises.</p>
<p><b>Federal</b> N/A</p>
<p><b>Additional notes on fiscal impact</b> Click here to enter text.</p>

◇ **POLICY and PROGRAMMATIC IMPACTS** *(Please specify the proposal section associated with the impact)*



By adding Benefit Corporations to the list of entities DOC's Correctional Enterprises may sell goods and services, more inmate employment opportunities will be created allowing additional inmates to develop work skills and habits; and potentially more employment opportunities for returning citizens by these Benefit Corporations which will be working with DOC.

**Insert fully drafted bill here**

**Sec. 18-88. (Formerly Sec. 18-14). Industrial activities. State agencies required to purchase necessary products from institution industries. Retail hobby stores.**

(f) Any political subdivision of the state or federal government [or] any private nonprofit entity, including one which receives all or part of its revenues from any political subdivision of the state or federal government or any benefit corporation established under Chapter 604, may purchase any articles, materials or products required by it which are produced or manufactured by the institution industries, and any person may purchase products and by-products of farming operations in accordance with section 53-329. The commissioner may promulgate and circulate at sufficiently frequent intervals for distribution to the Commissioner of Administrative Services, the Comptroller and such political subdivisions a catalog showing styles, designs, sizes and varieties of all articles, materials and products manufactured and produced at the institutions and periodical price lists for all such articles.



## Agency Legislative Proposal - 2018 Session

**Document Name** (e.g. OPM1015Budget.doc; OTG1015Policy.doc): 2018 DOC FirstChance.docx

(If submitting electronically, please label with date, agency, and title of proposal – 092611\_SDE\_TechRevisions)

State Agency: Department of Correction

**Liaison:** David McCluskey

**Phone:** (860) 692-7510

**E-mail:** david.mccluskey@ct.gov

Lead agency division requesting this proposal: Office of the Commissioner

Agency Analyst/Drafter of Proposal: David McCluskey

**Title of Proposal:** Establishing the Connecticut First Chance Trust Fund

**Statutory Reference:** New Language

**Proposal Summary:**

Establishing a public charitable trust to address the needs of at-risk youth in crime & victim ridden neighborhoods in our state.

### PROPOSAL BACKGROUND

◇ **Reason for Proposal**

Please consider the following, if applicable:

- (1) Have there been changes in federal/state/local laws and regulations that make this legislation necessary?
- (2) Has this proposal or something similar been implemented in other states? If yes, what is the outcome(s)?
- (3) Have certain constituencies called for this action?
- (4) What would happen if this was not enacted in law this session?

The Department of Correction believes this new initiative, modeled after a recent program enacted in Pennsylvania, will greatly assist efforts to reduce both new criminal activity and the recidivism of returning citizens.

◇ **Origin of Proposal**

**New Proposal**

**Resubmission**

If this is a resubmission, please share:

- (1) What was the reason this proposal did not pass, or if applicable, was not included in the Administration's package?
- (2) Have there been negotiations/discussions during or after the previous legislative session to improve this proposal?
- (3) Who were the major stakeholders/advocates/legislators involved in the previous work on this legislation?
- (4) What was the last action taken during the past legislative session?

Click here to enter text.



## PROPOSAL IMPACT

### ◇ **AGENCIES AFFECTED** *(please list for each affected agency)*

<b>Agency Name:</b> Department of Administrative Services <b>Agency Contact (<i>name, title, phone</i>):</b> N/A <b>Date Contacted:</b> N/A
Approve of Proposal <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Talks Ongoing</b>
<b>Summary of Affected Agency's Comments</b> N/A
Will there need to be further negotiation? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO

### ◇ **FISCAL IMPACT** *(please include the proposal section that causes the fiscal impact and the anticipated impact)*

<b>Municipal</b> <i>(please include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation)</i> Potential cost avoidance to local law enforcement agencies associated with lower levels of criminal activity.
<b>State</b> Potential cost avoidance to State Police, Judicial Branch, States Attorneys and the Department of Correction associated with lower levels of criminal activity. Costs associated with establishing and administering the Connecticut First Chance Trust Fund will be paid for by private, tax-deductible donations and a 1% surcharge on all private, for-profit vendor contracts serving the Department of Correction. Other state agencies will have the option to add such a 1% surcharge for private, for-profit vendor contracts serving their agency.
<b>Federal</b> N/A
<b>Additional notes on fiscal impact</b> <a href="#">Click here to enter text.</a>

### ◇ **POLICY and PROGRAMMATIC IMPACTS** *(Please specify the proposal section associated with the impact)*



The Connecticut First Chance Trust Fund will provide grants to evidence-based programs which address the needs of at-risk youth in crime/victim ridden neighborhoods that have above-average high school dropout rates and risk of incarceration.

**Insert fully drafted bill here**

There is established a First Chance Trust Fund which shall be within the Office of Policy and Management for administrative purposes only. The Trust Fund will be administered by the Criminal Justice Policy Advisory Commission which shall adopt regulations in accordance to Chapter 54 to provide grants to evidence-based programs which benefit at-risk youth. The Trust Fund is authorized to: accept private, tax-deductible donations and apply for appropriate state, federal and private, non-profit foundation funding. The Trust Fund is authorized to accept all funds associated with a 1% surcharge on all private, for profit vendor contracts providing products and services for the Department of Correction and any other state agency which authorizes such a 1% surcharge on contracts with private, for provide vendors serving them.



## Agency Legislative Proposal - 2018 Session

**Document Name** (e.g. OPM1015Budget.doc; OTG1015Policy.doc): 2018 DOC Psychtest.docx

(If submitting electronically, please label with date, agency, and title of proposal – 092611\_SDE\_TechRevisions)

State Agency: CT Department of Correction

**Liaison:** David McCluskey

**Phone:** (860) 692-7510

**E-mail:** david.mccluskey@ct.gov

Lead agency division requesting this proposal: Office of the Commissioner

Agency Analyst/Drafter of Proposal: David McCluskey

**Title of Proposal:** Psychological Testing for Department of Correction Employees

**Statutory Reference:** New Language

**Proposal Summary:**

To add Psychological Testing as part of Pre-Employment Screening for any employee of the Department of Correction.

### PROPOSAL BACKGROUND

◇ **Reason for Proposal**

Please consider the following, if applicable:

- (1) Have there been changes in federal/state/local laws and regulations that make this legislation necessary?
- (2) Has this proposal or something similar been implemented in other states? If yes, what is the outcome(s)?
- (3) Have certain constituencies called for this action?
- (4) What would happen if this was not enacted in law this session?

Psychological Testing is becoming the national standard in the Corrections hiring process in order to identify those candidates best suited for the rigors of employment in jails/prisons. Currently, DOC is unable to fund such testing. Once the DOC job postings have been reduced through the other portions of the testing/selection process, a Psychological Test would be performed and paid for by the DOC employee candidates.

◇ **Origin of Proposal**

**New Proposal**

**Resubmission**

If this is a resubmission, please share:

- (1) What was the reason this proposal did not pass, or if applicable, was not included in the Administration's package?
- (2) Have there been negotiations/discussions during or after the previous legislative session to improve this proposal?
- (3) Who were the major stakeholders/advocates/legislators involved in the previous work on this legislation?
- (4) What was the last action taken during the past legislative session?

Click here to enter text.



## PROPOSAL IMPACT

◇ **AGENCIES AFFECTED** *(please list for each affected agency)*

<b>Agency Name:</b> N/A <b>Agency Contact (name, title, phone):</b> Click here to enter text. <b>Date Contacted:</b> Click here to enter text.
Approve of Proposal <input type="checkbox"/> <b>YES</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>NO</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Talks Ongoing</b>
<b>Summary of Affected Agency's Comments</b> Click here to enter text.
Will there need to be further negotiation? <input type="checkbox"/> <b>YES</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>NO</b>

◇ **FISCAL IMPACT** *(please include the proposal section that causes the fiscal impact and the anticipated impact)*

<b>Municipal</b> <i>(please include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation)</i> N/A
<b>State</b> N/A. The costs associated with the Psychological Testing will be paid for by the prospective Correction Officer candidates.
<b>Federal</b> N/A
<b>Additional notes on fiscal impact</b> Click here to enter text.

◇ **POLICY and PROGRAMMATIC IMPACTS** *(Please specify the proposal section associated with the impact)*

Implementing Psychological Testing will increase the likelihood of identifying the best Department of Correction candidates for employment. It will reduce the human and
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------





employment costs associated with hiring Department of Correction employees who are unable to adjust to the challenging/stressful work environment.

**Insert fully drafted bill here**

After all other portions of any Department of Correction Job Title testing and selection process have been completed, but before an offer of employment has been made, all Department of Correction employee candidates shall undergo a Psychological Evaluation as determined by the Commissioner of Correction. The costs associated with the Psychological Evaluation shall be paid for by the Department of Correction employee candidates.



## Agency Legislative Proposal - 2018 Session

**Document Name** (e.g. OPM1015Budget.doc; OTG1015Policy.doc): 2018 DOC TechRiv.docx

(If submitting electronically, please label with date, agency, and title of proposal – 092611\_SDE\_TechRevisions)

State Agency: CT Department of Correction

**Liaison:** David McCluskey

**Phone:** (860) 692-7510

**E-mail:** david.mccluskey@ct.gov

Lead agency division requesting this proposal: Legislative Unit

Agency Analyst/Drafter of Proposal: David McCluskey, Legislative Liaison

**Title of Proposal:** Technical Revisions To Acts Affecting The Department Of Correction

**Statutory Reference:** Public Act 15-216 and C.G.S. Section 18-84a

**Proposal Summary:**

The proposal makes technical changes to a Public Act passed in the 2015 regular General Assembly Session and, in addition, eliminates Section 18-84a of the General Statutes.

### PROPOSAL BACKGROUND

◇ **Reason for Proposal**

*Please consider the following, if applicable:*

- (1) *Have there been changes in federal/state/local laws and regulations that make this legislation necessary?*
- (2) *Has this proposal or something similar been implemented in other states? If yes, what is the outcome(s)?*
- (3) *Have certain constituencies called for this action?*
- (4) *What would happen if this was not enacted in law this session?*

The changes reflect how certain functions are actually performed in the Department of Correction and the Auditors' findings concerning the Department.

◇ **Origin of Proposal**

**New Proposal**

**Resubmission**

*If this is a resubmission, please share:*

- (1) *What was the reason this proposal did not pass, or if applicable, was not included in the Administration's package?*
- (2) *Have there been negotiations/discussions during or after the previous legislative session to improve this proposal?*
- (3) *Who were the major stakeholders/advocates/legislators involved in the previous work on this legislation?*
- (4) *What was the last action taken during the past legislative session?*

The chief reason why the first two technical revisions have not yet been enacted is because they reference Risk Reduction Earned Credits. The proposal to eliminate Section 18-84a of the General Statutes is new.



## PROPOSAL IMPACT

◇ **AGENCIES AFFECTED** *(please list for each affected agency)*

<p><b>Agency Name:</b> N/A <b>Agency Contact (name, title, phone):</b> <a href="#">Click here to enter text.</a> <b>Date Contacted:</b> <a href="#">Click here to enter text.</a></p> <p>Approve of Proposal    <input type="checkbox"/> YES    <input type="checkbox"/> NO    <input type="checkbox"/> Talks Ongoing</p>
<p><b>Summary of Affected Agency's Comments</b></p>
<p>Will there need to be further negotiation?    <input type="checkbox"/> YES    <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p>

◇ **FISCAL IMPACT** *(please include the proposal section that causes the fiscal impact and the anticipated impact)*

<p><b>Municipal</b> <i>(please include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation)</i> N/A – See Fiscal Note on House Bill 5633 of the 2016 Session</p>
<p><b>State</b> N/A – See Fiscal Note on House Bill 5633 of the 2016 Session. In addition, the elimination of Section 18-84a may result in potential savings to the Department.</p>
<p><b>Federal</b> N/A – See Fiscal Note on House Bill 5633 of the 2016 Session</p>
<p><b>Additional notes on fiscal impact</b> <a href="#">Click here to enter text.</a></p>

◇ **POLICY and PROGRAMMATIC IMPACTS** *(Please specify the proposal section associated with the impact)*

<p>The first two changes are to Public Act 15-216. In Section 1 of the PA, the change would be for OPM, not DOC, to report to the General Assembly on Risk Reduction Earned Credits. DOC does not have the capacity to generate such a report which is currently being done by OPM's Division of Criminal Justice Policy &amp; Planning. In Section 9 of the PA, the change would be for the Commissioner or his designee to review and verify inmates Risk Reduction Earned Credits</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------



instead of the wardens. DOC has centralized all inmates discharge decisions to increase consistency. Wardens no longer make the release decisions. The last change would be to eliminate Inmate Discharge Accounts which are operationally problematic to implement. The State Auditors have commented that this section of Title 18 has not yet been implemented.

**Insert fully drafted bill here**

**Revisions to Public Act No. 15-216 AN ACT CONCERNING RISK REDUCTION CREDITS, CARRY PERMITS AND PAROLE OFFICER ACCESS TO STATE FIREARMS DATABASE.**

**File No. 544**

*February Session, 2016*

Substitute House Bill No. 5633

*House of Representatives, April 7, 2016*

The Committee on Judiciary reported through REP. TONG of the 147th Dist., Chairperson of the Committee on the part of the House, that the substitute bill ought to pass.

**AN ACT CONCERNING MINOR REVISIONS CONCERNING THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION AND THE EARNED RISK REDUCTION CREDIT PROGRAM.**

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Assembly convened:

Section 1. Section 18-98f of the 2016 supplement to the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (*Effective October 1, 2016*):

Not later than January 1, [2016] 2017, and quarterly thereafter, [the Commissioner of Correction, after consultation with] the Criminal Justice Policy and Planning Division within the Office of Policy and Management, after consultation with the Commissioner of Correction, shall, in accordance with the provisions of section 11-4a, report to the General Assembly details about earned risk reduction credits awarded to reduce an inmate's sentence pursuant to section 18-98e, as amended by this act. Such report shall include: (1) The number of inmates released overall and the number of inmates released early as a result of the award of such credit; (2) the crimes for which such released inmates were convicted; (3) the amount of risk reduction credit earned by inmates released early pursuant to such credit; and (4) any recidivism data regarding inmates who were released early pursuant to such credit, including any data such as rate of reentry into the correctional system, elapsed time between release and such reentry, and the crimes for which such inmates were convicted that resulted in such reentry. Not later than thirty days after submission of the report to the General Assembly, said commissioner shall post the report on the Department of Correction's Internet web site.

Sec. 2. Subsection (e) of section 18-98e of the 2016 supplement to the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (*Effective October 1, 2016*):



(e) Prior to release of any inmate whose sentence is being reduced due to risk reduction credits earned pursuant to this section, the [warden of the correctional facility from which such inmate is to be released] commissioner or the commissioner's designee shall review such inmate's records and verify that the inmate earned the risk reduction credits being applied to reduce such inmate's sentence.

Sec. 3. Section 18-84a of the General Statutes is repealed.

This act shall take effect as follows and shall amend the following sections:		
Section 1	October 1, 2016	18-98f
Sec. 2	October 1, 2016	18-98e(e)

**Statement of Legislative Commissioners:**

In Section 1, the reporting date was changed to eliminate any implication that the changes might apply retroactively.

**OFA Fiscal Note**

**State Impact:** None

**Municipal Impact:** None

**Explanation**

There is no fiscal impact associated with making changes to reporting requirements within the Department of Correction and the Office of Policy and Management.

**The Out Years**

**State Impact:** None

**Municipal Impact:** None

**OLR Bill Analysis**

**HB 5633**



## Agency Legislative Proposal - 2018 Session

**Document Name** (e.g. OPM1015Budget.doc; OTG1015Policy.doc): 2018 DOC Wellness.docx

(If submitting electronically, please label with date, agency, and title of proposal – 092611\_SDE\_TechRevisions)

State Agency: CT Department of Correction
<b>Liaison:</b> David McCluskey <b>Phone:</b> (860) 692-7510 <b>E-mail:</b> david.mccluskey@ct.gov
Lead agency division requesting this proposal: Deputy Commissioner of Administration
Agency Analyst/Drafter of Proposal: David McCluskey, Legislative Liaison

<b>Title of Proposal:</b> Improving Employee Wellness in the Department of Correction
<b>Statutory Reference:</b> Public Act 17-239
<b>Proposal Summary:</b> To improve the wellness of employees of the department who interact with inmates by coordinating, supporting and promoting: Employee assistance programs, Peer support programs, Stress management training, Critical Incident Stress Response, Employee Safety and Health Committees, Wellness Fairs and other initiatives/programs determined to be important and effective.

### PROPOSAL BACKGROUND

#### ◇ Reason for Proposal

<p><i>Please consider the following, if applicable:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) <i>Have there been changes in federal/state/local laws and regulations that make this legislation necessary?</i></li> <li>(2) <i>Has this proposal or something similar been implemented in other states? If yes, what is the outcome(s)?</i></li> <li>(3) <i>Have certain constituencies called for this action?</i></li> <li>(4) <i>What would happen if this was not enacted in law this session?</i></li> </ol> <p>Correction Employees who interact with inmates have stressful and hazardous positions. By coordinating, supporting and promoting Wellness, DOC can reduce employee / retiree morbidity, use of sick time, workers compensation injuries/accidents and their combined impact on the prison environment for employees and inmates.</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

◇ **Origin of Proposal**       **New Proposal**       **Resubmission**



If this is a resubmission, please share:

- (1) What was the reason this proposal did not pass, or if applicable, was not included in the Administration's package?
- (2) Have there been negotiations/discussions during or after the previous legislative session to improve this proposal?
- (3) Who were the major stakeholders/advocates/legislators involved in the previous work on this legislation?
- (4) What was the last action taken during the past legislative session?

[Click here to enter text.](#)

### PROPOSAL IMPACT

◇ **AGENCIES AFFECTED** *(please list for each affected agency)*

**Agency Name:** N/A

**Agency Contact (name, title, phone):** [Click here to enter text.](#)

**Date Contacted:** [Click here to enter text.](#)

Approve of Proposal     **YES**     **NO**     **Talks Ongoing**

**Summary of Affected Agency's Comments**

Will there need to be further negotiation?     **YES**     **NO**

◇ **FISCAL IMPACT** *(please include the proposal section that causes the fiscal impact and the anticipated impact)*

**Municipal** *(please include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation)*

N/A

**State**

N/A. This initiative will be done within available resources.

**Federal**

N/A

**Additional notes on fiscal impact**

[Click here to enter text.](#)

◇ **POLICY and PROGRAMMATIC IMPACTS** *(Please specify the proposal section associated with the impact)*



See the Reason for Proposal section.

**Insert fully drafted bill here**

Within available appropriations, there is established in the Department of Correction a Wellness Initiative to coordinate, support and promote: Employee assistance programs, Peer support programs, Stress management training, Critical incident stress response, Military peer support, Employee safety and health committees, Wellness fairs and other initiatives/programs determined to be important and effective in addressing the needs of employees which interact with inmates. With the approval of the Commissioner, the Wellness Clearinghouse shall be able to apply for any federal, state or private non-profit funding to advance its mission.