



State of New Jersey

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

WHITTLESEY ROAD

PO Box 863

TRENTON NJ 08625-0863

PHILIP D. MURPHY
Governor

TAHESHA WAY
Lt. Governor

VICTORIA L. KUHN, ESQ.
Commissioner

June 10, 2024

Thomas Koenig
Legislative Finance and Budget Officer
Office of Legislative Services
State House Annex
PO Box 068
Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0068

Dear Mr. Koenig:

Please find the Department of Corrections' responses to questions raised by members of the Assembly Budget Committee:

Chairwoman Pintor Marin:

Question:

- Please provide a breakdown of the consolidation savings from the closure of the four State prison facilities in total and per fiscal year, including projected savings in FY 2026. Please also provide the avoided facility maintenance cost.

Response:

Closed Facilities	Fiscal Year	Savings	Capital Project Costs Avoided	Annual Avoided Maintenance Costs*
Albert C. Wagner Youth Correctional Facility	2020	\$40.0 million	\$140.0 million	\$750,334
Vroom Central Reception and Assignment Facility	2021	\$20.0 million	\$83.4 million	\$592,187
William H. Fauver Youth Correctional Facility	2022	\$17.6 million	\$152.6 million	\$818,770
Southern State Correctional Facility	2023	\$20.3 million	\$7.4 million	\$1,145,390
		\$97.9 million	\$383.4 million	\$3,306,681
FY 2026 Projected Savings				
East Jersey State Prison	2026	\$30.0 million	\$350.0 million	\$1,347,489

*Based on an average of the last 3 years of maintenance expenditures. The Savings column includes maintenance appropriations that were cut as a result of the prison closures.

Assemblywoman Muñoz:

Question:

- How will the department ensure that the new prison facility for women and the Edna Mahan satellite facility are not plagued by the same abuses, harassment, and complaints as before? Are there concerns that oversight may still be lacking? What input has the department received from prisoners?

Response:

The NJDOC has been instrumental in enhancing the privileges and opportunities available to incarcerated persons (IPs) while simultaneously implementing best practices and policies aimed at ensuring safety and preventing abuse and harassment—issues that have historically impacted those housed at the Edna Mahan Correctional Facility (EMCF).

Long-Term Operational Goals

Ensure the safety and well-being of the female population at EMCF while fostering a culture rooted in respect and human dignity. Central to operations is a firm commitment to a safe and secure environment where both staff and IPs are treated with integrity and respect.

The forthcoming correctional facility is being modernized to address critical areas including housing, recreation, visiting spaces, and work detail opportunities. These improvements are designed to reinforce a safe, rehabilitative environment for all incarcerated individuals.

Ongoing Best Practices and Prevention Strategies

The NJDOC and EMCF Administration have implemented effective, sustainable practices that will continue at the new facility. Below is an overview of our comprehensive prevention and safety strategies.

Safety and Security Measures

- **Routine Facility Tours**
Administrative staff conduct facility tours during all three shifts (1st, 2nd, and 3rd). Custody staff and supervisors conduct additional rounds per departmental procedure, with every tour documented. This will continue at the new facility.
- **Surveillance and Monitoring**
The new facility will be equipped with extensive camera coverage throughout the institution. All activity will be recorded, with footage regularly reviewed by the Special Investigations Division (SID) and Administration to ensure operations are conducted safely and respectfully and to support incident investigations.

Consent Decree Compliance

Since 2021, EMCF has operated under a federal consent decree that mandates oversight to ensure compliance with institutional reforms. While the decree remains in effect, a motion to terminate 38 of its provisions has recently been granted—reflecting meaningful progress.

Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) Compliance

- To ensure both staff and incarcerated individuals adhere to the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) standards for reporting sexual abuse claims.
- Zero Tolerance for Sexual Abuse and Staff Misconduct: NJDOC strictly enforces a zero-tolerance policy toward all forms of sexual abuse. Disciplinary measures are applied consistently to any staff member found in violation of these standards.

Reporting Channels

IPs are provided with multiple confidential avenues to report allegations of sexual abuse, including reporting to SID, Administration, Mental Health or Medical staff, or any staff member. A confidential SID hotline is also available. These efforts aim to ensure all individuals feel safe reporting concerns without fear of retaliation.

Training and Staff Development

- **Ongoing Training**
All staff receive regular and comprehensive training on the prevention, intervention, and response to sexual abuse. Topics include recognizing signs of abuse, responding to allegations appropriately, and maintaining a secure and respectful environment.
- **Gender-Responsive Training**
Staff undergo specialized Gender Response Training. This program prepares them to effectively communicate with and support a diverse incarcerated population in a gender-informed, respectful, and safe manner.
- **Enhanced Supervision Skills**
Training includes guidance on effective inmate supervision, de-escalation techniques, and best practices for addressing abuse allegations.

Policy Awareness and Updates

All relevant policies and procedures are regularly reviewed and updated. Staff are promptly informed of any policy changes to ensure compliance and awareness across all levels of operation.

Education for Incarcerated Persons

During orientation, IPs are educated about PREA standards, their rights, reporting procedures, and available confidential channels. PREA-related informational materials and posters will be displayed throughout the facility to reinforce awareness.

Facility Design and Surveillance

The new facility design prioritizes open sightlines and the elimination of isolated areas. This strategic layout will enhance visibility and monitoring, significantly reducing opportunities for misconduct and ensuring a safer environment.

Current stationary and body worn camera coverage, stringent quality assurance and tracking of safety areas, and the growing number of candidates entering the NJDOC training academy all demonstrate that there is extraordinary oversight. There has been investment in specialized administrative staffing at EMCF at multiple levels. In additional succession planning for future leadership is undertaken at the executive level of the NJDOC to ensure that practices and commitment are solidified for the future.

In conversation with some of the incarcerated persons at the maximum and satellite units, they did not express any security concerns regarding the new institution. However, the incarcerated individuals did express a preference for single and double cells, assurance that the institution will

be ADA-compliant, access to quiet rooms, designated day spaces, and the opportunity to dine in their cells. Multiple visioning sessions with the NJDOC expert consultant as well as the design team for the project have taken place in person with the incarcerated population. Their needs and wishes factor heavily into the design of the new institution.

Question:

- Please provide the Edna Mahan prison population for each year since 2000 through this year to date.

Response:

YEAR	EMCF Population
5/21/2025	393
2025	396
2024	386
2023	356
2022	408
2021	404
2020	555
2019	609
2018	599
2017	646
2016	708
2015	774

YEAR	EMCF Population
2014	752
2013	783
2012	747
2011	814
2010	837
2009	892
2008	997
2007	1059
2006	1094
2005	1133
2004	1159
2000	1026

* Population numbers reflect the first business day of the year.

Assemblyman Scharfenberger:

Question:

- How many inmates have overdosed on drugs while inside the State prison system, broken down by death and recovery? Please let us know the answer in subsequent follow-up if the Department of Health has not yet provided the data.

Response:

Overdoses that do not result in death are difficult to track and validate. Reliable medical overdose must be validated by external hospital clinical staff. Currently, verified overdoses are recorded by county by the Department of Health, and those in correctional facilities are not singled out in that data. The NJDOC is hopeful that this data will become available through the DOH in the future. Notably, most intoxication incidents are not overdoses, and symptoms similar to intoxication may be due to an unrelated medical condition. Often, incarcerated persons are sent to local hospitals when an overdose is suspected. IPs "suspected" of being under the influence are recorded. However, being suspected of being under the influence does not equate to a medical overdose.

All deaths are reviewed by the Medical Examiner's (ME) office, which performs its own toxicology testing. Therefore, the only overdoses that can be reported with certainty are those that resulted in death and were confirmed by the ME office.

In 2024, there were two deaths due to overdoses, as confirmed by Medical Examiner reports. (There are three deaths that occurred in 2024 for which the Medical Examiner report is still pending and is not included.)

In 2024, there were a total of 1,374 suspected intoxication incidents. It cannot be determined how many of these incidents were medical overdoses.

Overdose Deaths by Calendar Year:

Year	Overdose Deaths
2020	0
2021	1
2022	6
2023	4
2024	2 (3 ME Reports are still pending)

Based on this data, the unvalidated recovery rate in 2024 is 1,372 survivals/1,374 incidents.

Question:

- Do you have estimates on the quantities of drugs and other contraband seized in State prisons? Have new technology and pilot programs lowered the supply of drugs entering the prison system? By how much?

Response:

Since mail copying services were launched in January 2025, the following data is available and provides solid preliminary information to show that the mail copying program is working to disrupt the infiltration of drugs and contraband into the prisons, and in reducing inmates being under the influence of suspected illicit substances:

Suspected Illicit Substance Responses

	<i>Monthly Average in CY 24</i>	<i>First 4 Months of CY25 Post Mail</i>	
Copying			
Narcan Deployment:	45	24	47% decrease
IP suspected of being under the influence of an illicit substance:	128	57	56% decrease
Detox Protocols initiated:	90	48	47% decrease

Contraband Seizures

	<i>Monthly Average in CY 24</i>	<i>First 4 Months of CY 25 Post Mail</i>	
Copying			
Suspected CDS finds:	12	9	25% decrease
Total CDS in each find:	104	64	39% decrease
Total found on paper:	12	13	Static
Total Drug paraphernalia:	7	2	71% decrease

Mail Totals

	<i>Monthly Average in CY24</i>	<i>First 4 Months of CY25 Post Mail Copying</i>	
U.S. Mail:	15,845	2,352	85% decrease
Legal Mail:	2,230	2,867	29% increase (Not subject to Mail copy)

Question:

- How many requests have you received for placement in a prison or transfer to a prison that does not correlate with the inmate's biological sex? How many are on the mental health roster? How much does it cost the State to provide care for inmates who are in a prison that does not correlate to their biological sex? How does that compare to the average cost per inmate, both male and female?

Response:

From January 1, 2024, to December 31, 2024, the department received seven transfer requests by individuals seeking to be housed according to their gender identity. Two of those individuals voluntarily rescinded their requests, one request for housing at EMCF based on gender identity was denied, and four were housed in accordance with gender identity. Of the seven incarcerated persons that requested housing based upon their gender identity, two were on the mental health roster at the time of their request. There are no additional costs associated with providing care for incarcerated persons who are in a prison that does not correlate to their biological sex.

Question:

- What specific funding was cut from the department's budget to meet the Governor's five-percent reduction directive, and did those cuts include supplemental funding?

Response:

Reductions to the Department's FY 2026 funding total \$100.3 million. Increases total \$86.3 million resulting in a net decrease in FY 2026 funding of \$14.0 million.

Question:

- How much spending in total did the department cut? Did that equal five percent of department funding? Please provide a list of each spending reduction in your department, not including supplemental funding.

Response:

	(,000)
	Spending
Description	Reduction
Purchase of Community Services - Shift to Non-State Resources	\$ 46,924
East Jersey State Prison Consolidation - Technical Parole Violation Reform)	\$ 30,000
Hudson County Jail - Capital Renovations	\$ 11,000
Union County - County Jail Rehabilitative Services	\$ 3,500
Fuel & Utilities Reduction Trend	\$ 3,200
Internet Infrastructure for Incarcerated Persons	\$ 2,000
County Reentry Coordinators	\$ 1,050
The Moss Group - Consulting Expert for Litigation Related Issues at EMCF	\$ 800
Replacement of Department Transport Buses	\$ 750
Incarcerated Veterans Initiative Pilot Program	\$ 400
Pre-Release Employment Navigation - Shift to Non-State Resources	\$ 350
Custody Officer Scheduling System Replacement	\$ 350
Total FY 2026 Reductions	\$ 100,324

The Department's five percent (5%) reduction, based on the Preliminary Target provided by Treasury, was \$59,878,000. Note that the 5% reduction exercise excluded costs for custodial care of individuals, including incarcerated persons under DOC supervision. The above spending cuts exceeded the 5% reduction amount.

Question:

- Please provide the return on investment for each line-item in the departmental budget.

Response:

The \$1.107 billion Department of Corrections FY2026 proposed budget is comprised of \$1.062 billion in operational funding (95.9%) that supports the programs and services operated directly by the Department, and \$45.6 million in State Aid/Grant-In-Aid (4.1%).

The majority of Department's operating budget, about 65.8%, supports salaries, including overtime, for both custody and civilian staff; 18.7% supports outside services which mainly consists of healthcare payments for the incarcerated population; 9.1% supports materials, supplies, facility maintenance, and equipment required to operate the department; and 6.4% for special purpose funding that has been appropriated for specific uses. Following are some examples of Special Purpose Accounts included as line-items in the Department's budget and how they have benefited the incarcerated population:

- The Mid-State Licensed Drug Treatment Program special purpose account is funded at \$4.0 million. In FY 2024, approximately 200 incarcerated persons completed the program. Approximately 700 incarcerated persons completed one or more of the psychoeducation programs.

- The Offender Re-Entry Program special purpose account is funded at \$1.184 million and provides for a series of reentry programs. There is currently an 80% completion rate for those incarcerated persons participating in the program.
- The Medication Assisted Treatment (MAT) Program special purpose account is funded at \$2.550 million, and the average monthly number of incarcerated persons receiving MAT is approximately 1,300.
- The Hepatitis C Treatment of Offenders with Substance Use Disorder (SUD) Diagnosis special purpose account is funded at \$3.7 million and has provided treatment to hundreds of IPs testing positive for Hepatitis C prior to their release back into the community.

The State Aid/Grants-In-Aid funding acts as a pass through for programs and services from third-party providers—non-profit organizations or county governments—that support the NJDOC mission of meeting the reentry needs of individuals preparing to transition back into the community.

The key return on investment is that, for the third year in a row, NJDOC has had one of the lowest recidivism rates in the nation. Five percent (5%) of releases were readmitted within three years for a new criminal conviction.

The Governor’s proposed budget has recommended an investment of \$1.5 million for security food ports within the Restorative Housing Units (RHU). With assaults on staff having increased by 328% and bodily fluid assaults on staff having increased by 722% since 2018 and with most bodily fluid assaults on staff occurring in the RHU (housing unit for those serving disciplinary charges), the Department launched a pilot program to install security food ports. These new food ports have proven to be a crucial tool in preventing assaults, with a 90% reduction in bodily fluid assaults on staff in the 246 cells outfitted with them. The data clearly shows that the proper use of the new food port greatly reduces the ability to assault an officer via an open food port.

This investment in infrastructure will directly contribute to reducing assaults on staff. This investment has a significant return for the Department, the staff, and incarcerated population as it reduces the number of staff needing to seek outside medical evaluation, take leave of absence, and work overtime. This financial benefit, coupled with the increase in staff morale from reduced assaults, makes the budget proposal a sound and secure investment.

Assemblyman Freiman:

Question:

- Please specify the State-budgeted amount that is recommended for department salaries in FY 2026. If only currently filled State-budgeted positions were funded in FY 2026, what would the appropriation be?

Response:

The State-budgeted amount recommended for department salaries in FY 2026 total \$723.5 million. If only filled State-budgeted positions were funded in FY 2026, the appropriation would not change. Any savings related to regular payroll costs for custody staff would be offset by an increase in overtime costs.

Assemblywoman Dunn:

Question:

- Costs for housing civilly committed sex offenders at the Adult Diagnostic and Treatment Center are over \$120,000 annually, or \$333 per day. What accounts for this high expenditure, especially given that incarceration at the maximum-security NJ State Prison costs 23.5 percent less (about \$92,000 annually or \$254 daily)? What oversight mechanisms exist for the center to ensure taxpayer dollars are being spent prudently without compromising public safety?

Response:

Costs for housing civilly committed sex offenders at the Special Treatment Unit (a building located on the property of the Adult Diagnostic Treatment Center) total \$87,694 annually, or \$240.26 per day per resident.

The \$333 referenced in the above question is the daily cost to house an incarcerated person at the Adult Diagnostic Treatment Center. The higher per diem rate for the Adult Diagnostic Treatment Center is the direct result of the approximately 260 vacant beds at this facility.

Under the New Jersey Sexually Violent Predator Act, the New Jersey Department of Corrections has limited discretion to assign non-ADTC eligible sex offenders for placement in ADTC, which results in vacant beds and directly contributes to an inflated per diem rate and reduces the availability of bed space for individuals not sentenced under the act.

Under *Charles Williams v. New Jersey Department of Corrections*, the court decided that the Commissioner of Corrections "must review the status of NUA offenders (individuals not sentenced under the act) at the ADTC and take the steps necessary to ensure that only ADTC-eligible offenders are incarcerated there."

Under N.J.S.A. 2C:47-3(h)(2) and (3), NJDOC is only permitted to transfer ADTC-eligible inmates to the ADTC once they are within five years of release and inmates "shall not be transferred" to the ADTC if the inmate is either not *amenable* to treatment or not *willing* to participate.

Currently, the 260 vacant beds are contributing to the inefficiency of the ADTC.

The funding for the civilly committed residents (\$38.1 million) is appropriated in a Special Purpose Account, Civilly Committed Sexual Offender Program. The isolation of this funding in one account allows the Department to easily oversee and monitor expenditures to ensure taxpayer dollars are being spent prudently without compromising public safety.

Question:

- Could you please compare the recidivism rate for civilly committed sex offenders released from the Adult Diagnostic and Treatment Center and other inmates?

Response:

Recidivism is calculated by examining the number of individuals released from a Department of Corrections (DOC) facility within a specific timeframe. These individuals are then tracked over a three-year period to assess instances of recidivism or their first reincarceration following their release.

In calendar year 2020, there were 33 releases from the Special Treatment Unit (STU). Of these, only one has returned to NJDOC for a new offense as of 5/14/2025. NJDOC does not compute a

readmission rate for each release facility. Overall, the three-year readmission rate for a new offense for all incarcerated persons released in CY2020 was 5%.

Question:

- What is the recidivism rate of inmates released during the pandemic and, of those, the recidivism rate of those who were released after being denied parole in comparison to those not denied parole? How many released inmates were previously denied parole prior to being released?

Response:

The three-year readmission rate for a new criminal conviction for all incarcerated persons released in CY2020 was 5%.

The readmission rate for technical parole violations is 17%. NJDOC would defer to the State Parole Board regarding those denied parole in comparison to those not denied parole, as NJDOC does not have information on parole approvals/denials.

Question:

- Which disciplinary tools do best practices suggest work to prevent violent behavior, such as assaulting officers and other inmates that violate rules and protocol in state and county prisons?

Response:

Best practices in correctional facility management emphasize the use of structured, secure, and rehabilitative approaches to prevent violent behavior, such as assaults on officers, incarcerated persons, and violations of institutional rules and protocols. Among the most effective disciplinary tools are specialized close custody units, including the Management Control Unit (MCU) and the Restorative Housing Unit (RHU).

These units are specifically designed to house individuals who exhibit violent or highly disruptive behavior. By segregating these offenders from the general population, the MCU and RHU serve a dual purpose: they protect staff and incarcerated persons from harm and provide an environment where behavior can be closely monitored and managed. The confinement is strategic—aimed not only at containment but also at promoting behavioral change through structured programming, increased supervision, and clear behavioral expectations.

In addition to close custody housing, the agency utilizes a structured disciplinary process to curtail inmate violence. This includes formal sanctions such as removal from the general population, loss of privileges (e.g., commissary, visitation, telephone, recreation), and the forfeiture of earned good time or computation credits.

For incarcerated persons that assault staff, the agency follows a zero-tolerance policy, pursuing criminal charges to ensure accountability through the external legal system. These charges not only uphold justice but also serve as a strong deterrent against future violence toward staff.

Additionally, the agency has the authority to enact interstate transfers for incarcerated persons who consistently pose a threat to staff safety. Transferring these individuals to out-of-state facilities removes them from the current environment, disrupts negative behavioral patterns, and reinforces the seriousness of such conduct.

To further reduce opportunities for violence, the agency employs enhanced security measures, including frequent and targeted searches of incarcerated persons and cells, and the expanded use

of advanced scanning technologies—such as full-body scanners, metal detectors, and ion scanners—to detect and prevent the introduction of contraband and weapons.

Facility design features further support safety efforts. The increased use of splash-resistant food ports limits physical contact and mitigates the risk of assaults during daily operations, such as meal service.

Assemblyman Schaer:

Question:

- How do annual costs for housing an incarcerated person in State facilities in New Jersey compare with other neighboring states? Please provide details.

Response:

NJDOC’s average annual cost to house an incarcerated person is \$73,495 and is based on FY 2024 actual expenditures. The projected FY2025 cost to house an incarcerated person is \$74,152 and for FY2026 is projected at \$71,514.

State Comparison of Costs to House State Incarcerated Persons			
State	Cost	Fiscal Year	Source
Pennsylvania	\$67,744	FY 2025	PA DOC Budget Testimony
Delaware	\$89,001	FY 2024	Delaware DOC 2024 Annual Report
Maryland	\$59,640	FY 2023	Maryland Division of Corrections at a Glance Report
California	\$133,110	FY 2024	California Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO)
Connecticut	\$105,485	FY 2024	Correctional Leaders of America Survey
Massachusetts	Range of \$67,301.82 to \$318,508.57 depending on institution	FY 2023	Massachusetts Department of Correction Per Capita Cost Report

Question:

- Please provide a breakdown of the incarcerated person’s housing costs by component, specifically, in terms of healthcare spending. Are there any machinations that could be employed to take advantage of Medicaid for cost saving purposes?

Response:

The annual cost per incarcerated person to provide physical health care services is approximately \$10,000 or \$27.50 per day. The annual cost to provide mental health services to an incarcerated person on the Special Needs Roster is approximately \$12,000 or \$60.50 per day.

An individual’s Medicaid benefits are suspended upon incarceration under federal law. The only exception is for those incarcerated individuals that are admitted to the hospital for greater than 24 hours. The costs for an incarcerated person’s inpatient hospitalization stay is eligible to be covered by Medicaid. The Department and its health care provider, Rutgers UCHC, work with hospital providers and the Department of Human Services to assure that inpatient hospitalization claims are processed through the State Medicaid system.

Assemblyman Barlas:

Question:

- One way the department proposes to decrease spending is by shifting \$46.9 million for the Purchase of Community Services appropriation from the General Fund to the Cannabis Regulatory, Enforcement Assistance, and Marketplace Modernization Fund. Can you describe what the Purchase of Community Services appropriation provides?

Response:

The New Jersey Department of Corrections (NJDOC) purchases services from qualified non-profit bidders to provide and operate performance-based Residential Community Reintegration Programs (RCRP) for Incarcerated Persons (IPs). The Department recognizes the need for incarcerated persons to reintegrate into society with prerelease opportunities through a continuum of care of treatment services that will ensure rehabilitation and reentry needs are addressed, education and training opportunities are provided for viable employment, and assistance is offered for obtaining and retaining employment. The various types of RCRPs create a continuum of care for community reintegration through the use of evidence-based practices in collaboration with community and criminal justice partners.

Question:

- Are there any risks associated with shifting these critical services to a tax stream contingent upon consumer behavior? What assurances are there that there is enough money in the Cannabis Regulatory, Enforcement Assistance, and Marketplace Modernization Fund to sustain this appropriation, as well as the other \$159 million that has been shifted to this fund? What happens if the proposed social equity excise fee increase is not passed, or if a 1,100 percent year-over-year tax increase negatively affects cannabis sales and funding is not available as expected?

Response:

The Purchase of Community Services is a vital reentry program for the Department. The Department defers to the Governor's Office and the Legislature as to how this funding is provided.

Assemblywoman Reynolds-Jackson:

Question:

- Please provide the cost breakdown of the recently negotiated telecommunications contract for the prison population. What is the total value of the contract? How much will be collected from inmates and how much will the State contribute? What are the current telecommunications rates for the prison population?

Response:

In December 2024, the New Jersey Department of Corrections signed a new contract with ViaPath to provide communications and services to the incarcerated population. This new contract includes revised rates for phone calls and various forms of communications and services, including email and video messaging, as well as money transfers. The transition to ViaPath is a carefully planned process that will be phased in throughout the year, including the installation of technology to support a new tablet system. The new money transfer system and rates went into effect on March 24, 2025, and new phone rates were implemented on May 1, 2025.

Following is a chart comparing the rates for communication services under JPay and the new vendor, ViaPath Technologies:

	<u>ViaPath</u>	<u>Jpay</u>	
Phone Calls*	\$0.03384	N/A	
External Electronic Mail	\$0.20	\$0.35	
Video Visitation	\$0.16/minute	\$4.80 per 30 minutes	
*Phone services have always been provided by GTL (d/b/a ViaPath Technologies). The new rate will go into effect on May 1, 2025 and represents a \$0.01 decrease from the previous rate.			

This is a no cost contract for the Department since all telecommunication charges are borne by the incarcerated person and/or their family and friends.

Should you have need for additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me at your convenience.

Sincerely,



Victoria L. Kuhn, Esq.
Commissioner

- c: Erin Nardelli, Deputy Commissioner
- Darcella Sessomes, Chief of Programs & Reintegration Services
- Kristina Chubenko, Chief of Staff
- Donna M. Gies, Assistant Commissioner
- Melinda Haley, Assistant Commissioner
- Dan Sperrazza, Executive Director