

George Hill

NYS Parole Reform Campaign
P.O. Box 6355
Albany, New York 12206

January 8, 2014

Dear Mr. Terrance,

I recently read in Building Bridges Newsletter the two new factors the parole board *may* consider when determining the release of an inmate appearing before them. The new factors (*most current risk and needs assessment and most current case plan pursuant to section seventy-one-a of Correction Law*) in my opinion gives them room to not use it at all if it's not readily available to them. What sense does it make to create guidelines that don't have to be used?

These new guidelines do nothing to create a *fair* parole hearing for anyone anymore than the original ten factors/guidelines. I believed that with the new Executive mandate of 2011 things would certainly be changing. I was wrong at my first parole hearing July 2011 and I was wrong again at my second parole hearing in July 2013. In both parole hearings the "**nature of the crime and deprecate the serious of nature of the crime as to undermine respect for the law.**" was used to deny parole. These two new factors/guidelines do nothing to change the continued abuse of the parole board denying parole release for factors I am already sentenced for and can never change. Where is the liberty and justice for all! This of course is not limited to me. Here in Sing Sing Correctional Facility if ten people have a parole hearing one and maybe two are released. The general reasoning is the "nature of the crime" and if a real study is done under the equal protection of the law

During my second appearance, the parole commissioner acknowledged my change through disciplinary and my many positive accomplishments (volunteer programs, Dept. of Labor Certification and college participation just to name a few). However, all the things showing my change of attitude, thinking and living was somehow not enough to be given a second chance after twenty two years of incarceration. This is a reoccurring thing and overall it conveys that the parole board is all about **politics, retribution and punishment**. What does it say if so few people are "rehabilitated" at a minimum of \$50,000.00 per year? Many people already agree it says the system is broken and is in need of reform. So, why is it being allowed to continue wasting taxpayer money?

My family is all taxpayers and they want parole reform for me and the many others who are deserving of a second chance. They are starting to feel as if this broken system will never change and the struggle is becoming more difficult everyday. They stay in it is because of me and they know it is an important battle! This is my blessing and I will not let them down by ever returning to criminal activity.

It is my hope that the **SAFE Parole Act** is supported by the Governor and State Legislatures.

Respectfully sent,
George Hill