

# **FEES PAID BY JAIL INMATES: FINDINGS FROM THE NATION'S LARGEST JAILS**

*Special Issues in Corrections*

*February 1997*

---

LIS, Inc.

**U.S. Department of Justice  
National Institute of Corrections  
Information Center  
Longmont, Colorado**

# **National Institute of Corrections**

Morris L. Thigpen  
Director

Michael O'Toole  
Chief, Jails Division



responses from the six states with unified jail/prison correctional systems (Connecticut, Delaware, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Rhode Island, and Vermont) and the Federal Bureau of prisons. Staff made no follow-up contacts among responding agencies to obtain missing data or clarify the data reported; added information on statutes was obtained from the National Conference of State Legislatures.

## **Major Findings**

---

Responses confirmed that the charging of inmate fees is both prevalent and increasing among the agencies surveyed. Among the 100 responding agencies, only 23 neither collect fees from jail inmates nor are planning to do so. Table I in Appendix A presents overall data on the fees charged by agencies responding to the survey. The table also presents reported total revenues and the percentage of fees collected.

Other main findings:

- At least 41 states have passed legislation authorizing assessment of inmate fees for jail services and operations. The legislation most often identifies specific functions for which fees can be collected, e.g., room and board, medical services, or programs. Table 1, page 3, indicates the statutory authority for jail fees in each state.
- More than three-quarters of the agencies surveyed are charging fees for one or more programs and/or services or are implementing systems for doing so. At least seven jails initiated their fees-for-service operations in 1996 or plan to do so in 1997.
- Inmates are most commonly charged fees for medical care (56 agencies) and participation in work release programs (46 agencies).
- Most agencies charging inmate fees impose them for more than one service or function; however, 13 agencies in the survey sample charge inmate fees only for medical services.
- Major functions generating the most revenues in 1996 included telephone services (averaging \$544,000 per year), work release programs (aver-

aging \$230,500 per year), and home detention programs (averaging \$161,000 per year). Booking charges in three California jurisdictions-Raid by arresting agencies and collectible from inmates-<sup>7</sup> produced average revenues of \$978,500.

- Fees for medical services resulted in average annual revenues of \$22,800.

## **Fees Imposed: Data and Discussion**

---

Jail inmate fees are imposed in four major areas:

- **Medical Services**-Collecting co-payments or other fees for medical care;
- **Per diem**-Requiring jail inmates to reimburse the county for all or a portion of the daily incarceration costs, including housing, food, and basic programs;
- **Other non-program functions - Charging** for services such as bonding, telephone use, haircuts, release escort, and drug testing; and
- **Participation in programs-Imposing** a fee or collecting a portion of any compensation earned by inmates in programs such as work release, weekend incarceration, and electronic monitoring, or charging for participation in rehabilitation programs such as education or substance abuse treatment.

Presenting information obtained about inmate fees in each category, this report includes:

- A general discussion of the issues surrounding fee collection in that category;
- An examination of the legislative or local decisions that have authorized collection of fees in that category; and
- A summary of the data on the extent to which responding agencies collect fees in the category, the amount of the fees, and the resulting revenues.

Table 1. Statutes on Charging Fees to Jail Inmates

	Statutes Provide Authority to Charge Fees For:					No Statutory Authority Indicated
	General costs of incarceration	Medical services	Per diem	Specific programs	Other specific functions	
Alabama <sup>1</sup>	(Legislation is specific to individual counties; intent varies)					
Alaska	(No data available)					
Arizona		✓				
Arkansas						✓
California		✓	✓	✓	✓	
Colorado				✓		
Connecticut	✓					
Delaware		✓				
D.C.						✓
Florida		✓	✓	✓		
Georgia		✓				
Hawaii		✓		✓		
Idaho		✓				
Illinois <sup>1</sup>		✓	✓			
Indiana <sup>1</sup>		✓				
Iowa			✓			
Kansas				✓		
Kentucky		✓		✓		
Louisiana	(No data available)					
Maine		✓				
Maryland		✓				
Massachusetts						✓
Michigan		✓	✓			
Minnesota		✓				
Mississippi		✓				
Missouri		✓		✓		
Montana		✓	✓			
Nebraska				✓		
Nevada		✓	✓			
New Hampshire		✓	✓	✓		
New Jersey		✓		✓		
New Mexico						✓ <sup>2</sup>
New York						✓ <sup>2</sup>
North Carolina		✓	✓			
North Dakota				✓		
Ohio		✓	✓		✓	
Oklahoma <sup>1</sup>		✓	✓			
Oregon		✓		✓		
Pennsylvania						✓
Rhode Island		✓	✓	✓	✓	
South Carolina		✓				
South Dakota		✓	✓	✓	✓	
Tennessee		✓		✓		
Texas		✓	✓	✓		
Utah						✓
Vermont						✓
Virginia		✓		✓		
Washington	✓					
West Virginia <sup>1</sup>		✓				
Wisconsin		✓	✓	✓		
Wyoming		✓	✓		✓	
United States Code						✓

1. Statutory data for these states was supplemented by information from the National Conference of State Legislatures ("Selected Laws on Offender Fees," January 1997).
2. Jail standards in New York permit the charging of a per diem fee for work release participation; statutes permit payment of medical charges by third-party insurance.

## 1. Medical Services

Provision of medical services for jail inmates has traditionally been seen as a public responsibility. However, the idea of making jail inmates pay for all or part of the medical services they receive holds great appeal for policy makers and large segments of the public. One reason is that such a practice shifts the burden from taxpayers to inmates whose possible or proven criminal actions have placed them in a jail setting. An additional motive is interest in reducing inmates' over-utilization of medical services. Many local jurisdictions are also under increasing financial pressure to identify cost-cutting approaches to jail operations and ways to offset or recoup costs.

Charging jail inmates for medical services is a relatively new practice, instituted only in the past two or three years in most of the jurisdictions that charge medical fees. Agencies commonly charge a nominal fee to deter inmates' frivolous medical visits and thereby reduce the jail's overall costs for inmate medical care, rather than to significantly offset actual costs.

As the California Medical Association Committee on Corrections and Detention Health Care notes, assessing fees for medical services will never directly offset or pay for medical care; "rather, savings would be realized through reduced utilization of services." ("Guidelines for Implementation of Inmate Co-payment for Health Services," the Committee, 1993.) Assessing a nominal fee for services is intended to ensure better allocation of medical resources by encouraging inmates to evaluate their need for medical care. In jurisdictions that contract with an outside provider for medical services, there may be less incentive to charge fees to inmates, as fixed contracts may specify the total medical costs regardless of the level of inmate use.

Recognizing the legal, moral, and economic issues inherent in charging inmates for medical services that have traditionally been provided by local jails without charge, the California committee developed guidelines for local decision makers considering fees for medical services to inmates. In brief, they are:

Keep fees low;

- Institute a single fee (or entry fee) for requested services;

- Waive fees for services required or initiated by correctional staff, medical staff, and statute; emergency services; and pregnancy-related services;
- Provide equal care for indigent inmates;
- Educate inmates about the fee system prior to initiating it;
- Evaluate the fee system to ascertain not only its fiscal impact but also its long-term effect on inmate health care. (For example, do the fees cause inmates to forgo preventive care? Do inmates postpone attention to serious illness?)

**Authority to charge fees for medical services.** In a few locations, jails are charging inmates medical fees on the basis of local authority rather than state statute. For example, jails in Sedgwick and Johnson Counties, both in Kansas, charge medical fees on the basis that no state law prohibits them from doing so. The agencies acted on advice from one county's legal department based on court cases and on other jurisdictions' experience.

In most cases, however, local jails collect fees for medical care only if such fees have been authorized by state legislative action. (See Table 1, page 3.) At least 33 state legislatures have passed statutes specifically authorizing local jails to charge inmates fees for medical services. Most of these statutes have been enacted within the past three years. Statutes authorizing fees for medical care passed during the 1996 legislative session in seven states—Delaware, Kentucky, Minnesota, Montana, Rhode Island, Tennessee, and West Virginia. The Michigan statute is apparently the longest-standing, having been enacted in 1982.

State laws take widely varying approaches to fees for inmate medical services.

- **Payment by pretrial or sentenced inmates.** Laws in many states require both pretrial and sentenced jail inmates to pay fees for medical and other services. Other states, such as Rhode Island, Washington, and Wyoming, require only sentenced inmates to pay for medical care.
- **Amount of fees charged.** Some states' statutes define the amount of the fees that can be charged.

Idaho law authorizes a nominal \$1 medical fee to non-indigent inmates. Similarly, a Maryland statute defines a \$2 medical co-payment, Arizona and California statutes specify a \$3 co-payment, and Georgia law specifies that the fee cannot exceed \$5. On the other hand, some statutes, including those in Florida and Maryland, broadly permit jails to seek reimbursement for medical treatment, hospitalization, or transportation without specifying the amount that can be charged.

In practice, even in states in which jails are authorized to collect "reimbursement for costs of services," most jails actually charge a straight and minimal fee for services initiated by the inmate and no fees for those initiated by medical or facility staff or for emergencies.

- Sources of reimbursement. Michigan law directs counties to seek reimbursement for medical services in the following order: 1) from the persons seeking care; and 2) from their insurance providers. Missouri and Florida statutes provide for medical costs to be paid, first, through any health insurance policy held by the inmate and, secondarily, by the inmate him- or herself. In several states, such as California, Georgia, and Minnesota, reimbursement may be sought only from the inmate's personal account.
- Types of medical care for which fees are charged. Statutes commonly define services that

are exempt from medical fees or w-pay requirements. For example, Florida law exempts psychiatric or psychological counseling, treatment, or medication; staff-initiated medical physicals, screening, treatment, or evaluation; follow-up visits and treatment; treatment of catastrophic illnesses or injuries; emergency treatment, as determined by medical staff; and prenatal or postnatal care.

Other states define the medical costs that inmates must bear. Inmates may bear the costs of emergency medical care if injuries are self-caused, e.g., in a disturbance. Wyoming law specifies that non-indigent inmates must pay only for care related to: 1) injuries sustained while incarcerated, unless they resulted from staff negligence; and 2) any condition existing before the inmate was in custody, including injuries, illness, or dental conditions. Wyoming sheriffs may also require inmates to pay for any voluntary or involuntary mental health evaluations.

- Provision of care to indigent inmates. Legislators have often provided specific definitions of indigency and requirements for medical care for indigent inmates. For example, Georgia law specifies that medical fees will not be charged if the balance in an inmate's account is less than \$10. Minnesota statute gives counties the authority to determine the co-pay amount for indigent inmates; another law states that an inmate "shall incur copayment and coinsurance obligations for health care services received, to the extent the inmate has available funds."

Table 2. Medical Care

	Fees for Medical Care		Where Fees Are Credited			
	Base fee	Annual revenues	County general fund	Sheriff/detention budget	Inmate welfare fund	Other
Jefferson Co., AL	\$3	\$8,000	✓			
Pima Co., AZ	3	—				Med. fund
Maricopa Co., AZ	3	—				Med. fund
Contra Costa Co., CA	3	3,295		✓		
Fresno Co., CA	3	7,698	✓			
Riverside Co., CA	3	37,000		✓		
San Bernardino Co., CA	3	23,926	✓			
San Diego Co., CA	3	67,385	✓			
San Mateo Co., CA	3	10,651				Pub. health
Ventura Co., CA	3	—	✓			
Arapahoe Co., CO	5-10	—	✓			

	Fees for Medical Care		Where Fees Are Credited			
	Base fee	Annual revenues	County general fund	Sheriff/ detention budget	Inmate welfare fund	Other
Denver City/Co., CO	\$7	\$70,000	✓			
Broward Co., FL	(varies)	28,824	✓			
Escambia Co., FL	2-5	44,800		✓		
Hillsborough Co., FL	(varies)	61,569				
Orange Co., FL	(varies)	35,000	✓			
Palm Beach Co., FL	3	21,259				
Pinellas Co., FL	4-8	—		✓		
Volusia Co., FL	8	—	✓			
City of Atlanta, GA	5	—			✓	
Chatham Co., GA	—	(Begins '97)				
DeKalb Co., GA	5	2,000				
Ada Co., ID	1	6,393		✓		
Lake Co., IN	10	—	✓			
Polk Co., IA	5-10	8,579	✓			
Sedgwick Co., KS	5	7,674	✓			
Johnson Co., KS	3-5	15,000				
Jefferson Co., KY	—	(Begins '97)				
York Co., ME	Actual cost	—	✓			
Maryland D.P.S.	2	2,600				State gen. fund
Prince George's Co., MD	4	6,600	✓			
Macomb Co., MI	10	18,000	✓			
Oakland Co., MI	10	20,000	✓			
Wayne Co., MI	10	—	✓			
Ramsey Co., MN	3	(Begins '97)				
St. Louis Co., MO	—	—				
Clark Co., NV	—	(Begins '97)				
Hillsborough Co., NH	3-5	17,949	✓			
Bergen Co., NJ	10	14,781	✓			
Camden Co., NJ	10	7,000	✓			
Middlesex Co., NJ	10	12,657	✓			
Mecklenburg Co., NC	10	40,777	✓			
Allegheny Co., PA	2-3	—	✓			
Greenville Co., SC	—	—				
Pennington Co., SD	5-8	4,919	✓			
Bexar Co., TX	—	—				
El Paso Co., TX	5-10	(Begins '97)				
Harris Co., TX	—	80,000		✓		
Nueces Co., TX	—	5,612				Hosp. district
Travis Co., TX	—	—	✓			
Arlington Co., VA	(varies)	9,060	✓			
Fairfax Co., VA	5-15	5,864	✓			
City of Norfolk, VA	5	—			✓	
King Co., WA	5	17,051	✓			
Pierce Co., WA	15	60,000	✓			
Laramie Co., WY	10	(New; no data)	✓			



*Data on fees for jail medical services.* Table 2, pp. 5-6, presents tabulated data from the agencies in the survey sample that report charging fees for medical care

Key findings include:

- Fifty-six (56) of 100 responding jurisdictions report charging fees for medical care, with five more scheduled to begin in 1997.
- Fees range from \$3 to \$15 for each medical visit. The most common fee amount is \$3. One facility (in York Co., Maine, a state with a combined jail-prison system) charges inmates the actual cost of services.
- Many jails use a scale on which cost is determined by type of treatment. For example, a jail may charge \$6 for care from a nurse or physician's assistant, \$10 to see a doctor, \$12 for a dental exam, and additional amounts for lab work, X-rays, prescription medications, etc.
- Dental care is usually considered part of broader medical services. Separate data on revenues generated through dental care were not available.
- Annual revenues from medical fees tend to be modest; two-thirds of the jails surveyed report collecting less than \$20,000 last fiscal year, and reported revenues averaged \$22,800. This reflects the fact that in most cases medical fees are charged to control rather than cover or offset expenses.

**Care for indigent inmates.** Provision of medical care to indigent inmates in an otherwise fee-based environment takes two main forms:

- Seventeen (17) agencies disregard the fee for inmates who cannot pay.
- In 32 jurisdictions, staff debit the inmate's account, creating a negative balance, and collect the fees if additional funds are received. Some jurisdictions maintain these records after the inmate is released, and collect the funds if the inmate is re-booked into the jail with additional funds.

Information in response to this question was not provided by the remaining agencies that charge medical fees.

**Impacts of fees for medical care.** Three-quarters of the agencies that collect medical fees have evidence indicating that inmates' use of medical services has declined since the fees were initiated. Most of these declines are attributed to reductions in inmates' frivolous medical requests. As one respondent commented, "The demand for sick call has been greatly reduced, as fewer inmates are using this avenue as a way to get out of their cell for a couple of hours. They now only use the doctor when they need the doctor." Another county (Laramie Co., Wyoming) noted that medical w-pay requirements have cut sick calls by two-thirds.

Approximately one-quarter of the agencies that charge fees have either not experienced a clear decline in medical use after initiating fees or have found that the collection burden outweighs the benefits. Other jails, such as those in Fresno Co., California, and Denver, Colorado, saw an initial drop in requests for medical visits, but report that rates rose to their original levels within 6 months. The data suggest that utilization rates tend to remain lower in agencies that assess fees even when inmates are out of funds.

## 2. Per Diem

Thirteen (13) jails in the survey sample charge inmates all or a portion of the daily cost of their incarceration, in what is sometimes termed a pay-to-stay program. Since the expense of housing and caring for prisoners has traditionally been viewed as a public responsibility, charging inmates is somewhat controversial. However, many policy makers and legislators concerned about the increasing financial burden on local jails are seeking to recover the costs of maintaining inmates in these jails from the inmates themselves.

Per diem fees are popular among those who believe the costs of incarceration should be borne by those whose conduct has earned it rather than by taxpayers. Some also maintain that requiring inmates to pay for their room and board will instill a sense of responsibility and accountability.

Those opposed to charging inmates per diem fees contend that the practice discriminates against the poor or indigent, and that imposing these costs may set some inmates up for failure. A more pragmatic objection is that a county's or jail's costs of collecting the fees may exceed the amount collected.

**Authority to collect per diem fees.** Most local jurisdictions require state authorization to charge for the costs of incarceration. Only one responding jail, in Camden Co., New Jersey, indicated that it was collecting per diem costs from jail inmates solely on the basis of a local decision, that of the county commission. Camden Co. charges inmates \$5 a day for incarceration.

Sixteen (16) states have enacted laws that specifically authorize jails to charge inmates for all or a portion of the county's actual costs of room and board and other basic services. (See Table 1, page 3.) Statutes in two other states authorize fees to offset general "costs of incarceration," potentially providing for specific per diem charges as well as fees for medical and other services while incarcerated.

State statutes giving counties or jails the authority to seek reimbursement for the costs of incarceration vary significantly in substance:

- Payment by pretrial vs. sentenced inmates. Most state statutes addressing per diem charges do not distinguish between pretrial and post-conviction inmates. However, statutes in California, Connecticut, Michigan, and Wyoming, for example, provide that only sentenced inmates may be charged all or a portion of per diem costs. Michigan inmates must also pay, after they are convicted and sentenced, for any period of pretrial detention. By contrast, jail inmates in North Carolina can be required to pay only for a period of incarceration while awaiting trial, and the fee is voided if charges are dismissed or the inmate is acquitted.
- Actual vs. prescribed per diem charges. Language in most statutes addressing per diem charges permits counties to seek reimbursement for either room and board generally or "all or a portion of" these costs. In contrast, Michigan statute specifies a limit of \$60 per day, which was recently raised from an original amount of \$30.

Table 3. Institutional Per Diem

	Fees for Per Diem Costs		Where Fees Are Credited			
	Base fee	Annual revenues	County general fund	Sheriff/detention budget	Inmate welfare fund	Other
Pima Co., AZ	—	\$157,234	✓			
Ventura Co., CA	\$59	—	✓			
Broward Co., FL	2	118,917*				
Palm Beach Co., FL	2	53,696*				
Macomb Co., MI	6-56	284,000	✓			
Oakland Co., MI	60	200,000	✓			
Wayne Co., MI	60	3,000	✓			
Camden Co., NJ	5	125,000	✓			
Pennington Co., SD	6	13,932	✓			
Bexar Co., TX	16	95,000				Hosp. district
Travis Co., TX	—	—	✓			
Pierce Co., WA	49.32	4,894,520	✓			
Laramie Co., WY	53	(New; no data)	✓			

\* Data from Broward and Palm Beach Cos. in Florida are for 3 months only.

- **Ability to pay.** Ability to pay is considered in most state laws that authorize charging inmates for costs of incarceration. Under Florida's 1996 statute, the local jail determines the financial status of inmates based on their income, assets, and obligations. If the inmate's cash account at the jail does not contain sufficient funds to cover subsistence costs, the administration may place a civil restitution Lien against the account or other personal property. The lien may continue for a period of 3 years and applies to the cash account of anyone incarcerated again in the same county.

A Texas statute, effective September 1997, provides that, if the county and inmate do not agree on the amount of the inmate's liability, either may file a civil action in a district court to determine the amount of liability. By agreement with the county, an inmate may also pay for part or all of the cost of confinement by performing community service or work after release from the jail

- **Role of the courts in imposing fees.** In four states-California, Montana, Rhode Island, and Washington-only a judge can require an inmate to pay the costs of incarceration, and the requirement can be imposed only on those determined to be able to pay. Such a determination is usually made by the court at the time of sentencing.

For example, the 1995 California statute permits the court, after a hearing, to make a determination of a convicted offender's ability to pay all or a portion of incarceration costs. The court may set the amount and authorize the county or city to collect it. The bill is operative only in jurisdictions that adopt an ordinance to this effect; no California agency responding to this survey indicated that such a local ordinance is in effect at present. The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors has determined that revenues would be insufficient to justify the court costs involved.

A proposed ordinance in King Co., Washington, runs counter to state statute requiring judicial action for payment of fees. If passed, the ordinance would direct the Department of Adult Detention to create a separate procedure that would allow recovery of incarceration costs. In addition, the ordinance would provide for collection of all costs of incarcer-

ation, rather than a maximum of \$50 per day as defined by state law.

South Dakota law assumes that inmates are responsible for all costs, including per diem costs, but gives the sentencing judge authority to waive all or part of the costs.

*Data on per diem fees.* Though 16 state legislatures have authorized some form of per diem charges to local jail inmates, only 13 jails in nine states report actually charging costs of incarceration to inmates. (See Table 3, page 8.) Several of these jails began collecting for incarceration costs within the past year.

Per diem fees charged range from a token-e.g., \$2 per day in Palm Beach Co., Florida-to the substantial-e.g., \$60 per day in Oakland Co., Michigan. Annual revenues from per diem charges last year ranged from \$3,000 in Wayne Co., Michigan, to \$4.9 million in Pierce Co., Washington. Average annual revenues, excluding the dramatically higher Pierce Co. figure, were \$125,000. Revenues are credited to the county general fund.

### **3. Other Non-Program Services**

Pressed by the need to uncover additional resources for operating jails, local policy makers and jail administrators have identified a number of services for which inmates could logically be charged. The fees charged for these services are often referred to as user fees. Examples of such revenue sources are commissary services, release escort, drug testing, and telephones. Inmates may also be charged for one-time services such as booking, bonding, and detoxification. Collection of fees for additional services such as check processing or electricity for personal appliances may be under way in some jurisdictions but was not reported by the survey respondents.

*Authority to charge fees for other services.* In a few cases, state legislation refers to fees for other functions within general provisions addressing the overall costs of incarceration. However, most decisions to charge fees for other services provided by jails are made locally, either by the sheriff or via approval by the county supervising board or commission

**Data on fees for other services.** Twenty-five (25) jails report that they charge fees for a variety of other services.

- Booking. Among the agencies surveyed, five are collecting a booking fee. (See Table 4, below.) In California, these fees are substantial-between \$100 and \$200 for each person booked- and are first charged to the arresting agency and later reimbursed by the offender as a condition of probation. A booking fee is charged for two purposes: 1) to offset costs, particularly when the tax base for a

municipality is greater than that of the county; and 2) to discourage police departments from booking arrestees into the jail unless it is truly necessary. Revenues are typically credited to the county general fund.

- Release escort. Five agencies provided information on their release escort fees, charged to inmates who leave the jail under escort to attend a funeral or other important personal event. (See Table 5, below.) Fees are based on officer salaries and are substantial-from \$25 to \$52 per hour. One agency

**Table 4. Booking**

	Fees for Booking		Where Fees Are Credited			
	Base fee	Annual revenues	County general fund	Sheriff/detention budget	Inmate welfare fund	Other
Contra Costa Co., CA	\$145*	\$960,338	✓			
Riverside Co., CA	110.40*	1,800,000		✓		
Ventura Co., CA	120	175,000	✓			
Travis Co., TX	—	—	✓			
Pierce Co., WA	45.26	—	✓			

\* In Contra Costa and Riverside Cos., the booking fee is charged to the arresting agency, which can bill the inmate. The Contra Costa respondent specified that the county administrator, rather than the jail, processes the booking fee.

**Table 5. Release Escort**

	Fees for Release Escort		Where Fees Are Credited			
	Base fee	Annual revenues	County general fund	Sheriff/detention budget	Inmate welfare fund	Other
Riverside Co., CA	\$35/hr.	\$1,000		✓		State fund
San Mateo Co., CA	258 avg.*	1,635		✓		
Santa Ana Co., CA	52/hr.	1,048		✓		
Macomb Co., MI	(officer wages)	—				
Wayne Co., MI	150	—	✓			

**Table 6. Drug Testing**

	Fees for Drug Testing		Where Fees Are Credited			
	Base fee	Annual revenues	County general fund	Sheriff/detention budget	Inmate welfare fund	Other
Hawaii DOC	\$31.50	—				State fund
Macomb Co., MI	4	—	✓			
Hillsborough Co., NH	11	\$5,000				
Pennington Co., SD	9	783	✓			
Milwaukee Co., WI	25	9,500	✓			

requires a two-officer, 3-hour minimum, which results in average charges of \$258. Revenues are usually retained by the sheriffs department.

- Drug testing. Fees for drug testing were reported by five agencies. (See Table 6, page 10.) The

Hawaii DOC specified that its fee is charged for a second drug test if that test corroborates the positive result of a first test. Similarly, Milwaukee's fee is charged only if the test results are positive. Drug testing charges range from \$4 to \$31, and revenues are typically credited to the county general fund.

Table 7. Telephones

	Fees for Telephone Use		Where Fees Are Credited			
	Base fee	Annual revenues	County general fund	Sheriff/ detention budget	Inmate welfare fund	Other
Contra Costa Co., CA	—	\$580,390			✓	
Riverside Co., CA	—	900,000			✓	
San Bernardino Co., CA	—	2,330,176			✓	
Santa Ana Co., CA	—	—			✓	
Denver City/Co., CO	\$1.50/hr.	—	✓			
Broward Co., FL	—	—	✓			
Escambia Co., FL	1.00	142,140			✓	
Pinellas Co., FL	1.50	500,000			✓	
City of Atlanta, GA	—	—			✓	
Sedgwick Co., KS	1.60/call	—	✓			Hosp. district
Jefferson Co., KY	2.05 (avg.)	755,000		84%	16%	
York Co., ME	—	—	✓			
Macomb Co., MI	—	—				
Oakland Co., MI	—	1,200,000	✓			
City of St. Louis, MO	1.50/30 min.	72,189			✓	
St. Louis Co., MO	0.95	194,961	✓			
Hillsborough Co., NH	—	226,888	✓			
Mecklenburg Co., NC	—	471,018	✓			
Greenville Co., SC	—	—				
Pennington Co., SD	—	50,423	✓			

Table 8. Haircuts

	Fees for Haircuts		Where Fees Are Credited			
	Base fee	Annual revenues	County general fund	Sheriff/ detention budget	Inmate welfare fund	Other
Arapahoe Co., CO	Actual cost	—				(Not specified)
Polk Co., IA	\$7	—				Barber
York Co., ME	Actual cost	—	✓			(Not specified)
Prince George's Co., MD	6	\$23,600	✓			
Macomb Co., MI	7	—				Barber
Wayne Co., MI	8	—				Barber
Greenville Co., SC	5	—				Barber
Pennington Co., SD	—	—				Barber/stylist
Fairfax Co., VA	2-5	7,009				Barber
Milwaukee Co., WI	1/admin. fee + 9	—	✓			Barber

- **Telephones.** Table 8, page 11, presents data on telephone revenues. Phone charges are so common that many jail administrators do not consider them fees. Charges are most often levied on the person being called rather than on the inmate placing the call, though some agencies report that a per-minute or other fee is collected from inmates. Annual revenues averaged \$544,200 in 1996, and in two agencies they exceeded \$1 million. Telephone revenues in about half of these jails go wholly or in part toward an inmate welfare fund; in other jurisdictions, they are credited to the county general fund.

- **Haircuts.** Fees for haircuts are somewhat common but minimal and most often go directly to the barber. (See Table 8, page 11.) One agency also collects an administrative fee, which goes to the county general fund.
- **Other non-program fees.** Table 9, below, identifies additional, non-program fees that have been implemented by the responding agencies. Examples include bonding, recreational clothing and gear, transportation, and a transaction fee for debit card use at the commissary.

**Table 9. Other Non-Program Fees**

Type of Service	Jurisdiction Charging Fee	Base fee	Annual revenues	Where Fees Are Credited			
				County general fund	Sheriff/detention budget	Inmate welfare fund	Other
Bonding	Arapahoe Co., CO	\$10	(Begins '97)	✓			
	Ada Co., ID	10	\$131,160		✓		
Clothing	Broward Co., FL	10	—	✓			
	Arlington Co., VA	—	—				
Commissary (general)	King Co., WA	—	487,702			✓	
	Laramie Co., WY	—	18,000			✓	Costs
Commissary (debit card transaction fee)	King Co., WA	—	18,818			✓	
Detoxification	Bergen Co., NJ	12	—	✓			
Laundry	Rhode Island DOC	1/load	9,875				State
	King Co., WA	—	4,505			✓	
Meals	Rhode Island DOC	1/meal	6,676				State
Notary service	Laramie Co., WY	1	150	✓			
Property damage	Hillsborough Co., FL	Actual costs	243				
	Macomb Co., MI	Actual costs	—				
	Arlington Co., VA	—	—				
Recreational clothing/gear	Pima Co., AZ	(varies)	—			✓	
	Arlington Co., VA	—	—				
Sheriff's fee, criminal court clerk	Davidson Co., TN	—	236,147				
Transportation	Rhode Island DOC	1	18,802				State fund
	San Diego Co., CA	(varies)	6,352	✓			
Vending machines	King Co., WA	—	14,395			✓	

#### 4. Program Participation

For a number of years it has been common practice for jails or counties to charge a fee or collect a portion of any compensation earned by inmates on work release. Revenues from work release programs are generally returned to the county general fund for partial or complete reimbursement of expenses related to the program.

Similarly, jurisdictions often charge inmates for participation in other types of programs—such as “weekender” incarceration and electronic monitoring—that allow inmates to remain employed while they serve time either at home or on weekends in the jail. Such program-related fees are well established around the country.

*Authority to charge for programs.* Among the responding agencies, eight collect fees from program participants on the basis of local decisions, either by a county/city board or by the sheriff and jail. One jurisdiction (Hampden Co., Massachusetts) requires program participants to pay fees on the basis of a local decision, but, at the same time, has for the past two years actively pursued state legislation that would allow counties to charge medical and per diem costs.

As indicated on Table 1, page 3, 18 states have passed statutes authorizing local jails to collect fees from inmates participating in work release, weekender, electronic monitoring, home detention, and/or other programs. About half of these statutes permit local

agencies to determine the rate to be reimbursed; the other half establish either a daily rate or a percentage of inmates’ income to be collected. In New York, authority to collect program fees is specified in state jail standards.

#### *Data on fees for program participation*

- Work release. Forty-six (46) jails report charging fees for participation in work release programs. (See Table 10, pp. 13-14.) The fees are generally calculated in one of three ways: 1) as a percentage of the inmate’s earnings; 2) as a flat fee per day or week; or 3) as a fee set according to a sliding scale.

Jurisdictions basing a work release fee on a percentage of an inmate’s earnings usually take the percentage from the gross income, but a few take it from the net. Percentages collected range from a low of 15 percent to a high of 35 percent; the most common proportion is 25 percent. Some jurisdictions set a maximum dollar amount that can be charged against an inmate’s earnings.

Nearly twice as many jails charge a flat fee as collect a percentage of work release income. The fees range from a low of \$5 per day to a high of \$50. Among jails charging a flat daily or weekly fee, many can set different fee amounts based on an inmate’s circumstances. Thus, “fixed fees” often seem to become sliding fees.

Table 10. Work Release Programs

	Fees for Work Release		Where Fees Are Credited			
	Base fee	Annual revenues	County general fund	Sheriff/detention budget	Inmate welfare fund	Other
Pima Co., AZ	\$8–\$14	\$67,832	✓			
Contra Costa Co., CA	100 + 10/day	490,000		✓		
Riverside Co., CA	75	—		✓		
San Bernardino Co., CA	80	76,720		✓		
San Diego Co., CA	15	63,962	✓			
Santa Ana Co., CA	29/day	32,913		✓		
Arapahoe Co., CO	10–15	—	✓			
Denver City/Co., CO	7/day	162,866	✓			
Broward Co., FL	84/week	132,302	✓			
Dade Co., FL	7/day	98,393	✓			

	Fees for Work Release		Where Fees Are Credited			
	Base fee	Annual revenues	County general fund	Sheriff/detention budget	Inmate welfare fund	Other
Duval Co., FL	\$100/week or 35% of wages	\$268,007	✓			
Escambia Co., FL	10/day	92,980	✓			
Hillsborough Co., FL	1 hr. wages	137,014				
Orange Co., FL	50/week	355,000	✓			
Pinellas Co., FL	20% of wages, max. 50/week	—	✓			
Ada Co., ID	105/week	278,778		✓		
Lake Co., IN	25% of gross wages	125,000	✓			
Sedgwick Co., KS	Up to 10/day	—	✓			
Jefferson Co., KY	25% of gross wages	270,000				
York Co., ME	15% of wages	10,000	✓			
Hampden Co., MA	15% of gross wages	—				
Macomb Co., MI	12–56/day	575,000	✓			
Oakland Co., MI	10–30/day	750,000		✓		
Ramsey Co., MN	9–15/day	95,000	✓			
St. Louis Co., MO	—	140,027				Trust fund
City of St. Louis, MO	21/week	273	✓			City general fund
Lancaster Co., NE	4/day, county residents	33,440	✓			
	50/day, non-county residents	13,000	✓			
Hillsborough Co., NH	25% of gross wages	32,510	✓			
Bergen Co., NJ	6/day	44,312	✓			
Camden Co., NJ	7/day	53,000	✓			
Middlesex Co., NJ	30/week	13,469	✓			
Bernalillo Co./Albuquerque, NM	(Sliding scale)	—				City general fund
Monroe Co., NY	25% of net wages	22,097	✓			
Cass Co., ND	—	—				
Rhode Island DOC	17.5% of net wages	152,715				State general fund
Greenville Co., SC	25% of net wages	—				
Pennington Co., SD	25% of gross wages	100,590	✓			
Davidson Co., TN	25% of net wages, 60/week max.	164,242				
Bexar Co., TX	25 admin. fee, 8 ID card fee, + 5/day	357,812	✓			
Travis Co., TX	—	—	✓			
Arlington Co., VA	25% of gross wages	585	✓			
Fairfax Co., VA	25% gross wages, 42/day max.	197,542	✓			
City of Norfolk, VA	6/day	—			✓	
King Co., WA	Admission fee + sliding scale	29,508 admissions, 550,651 per diem	✓			
Dane Co., WI	10.44/day	700,000	✓			
Milwaukee Co., WI	17/day	1,743,500	✓			



A jails levy all work release fees according to a sliding scale. Details of such scales were not provided.

Revenues derived from jail work release programs vary enormously. The data indicate that, while some work release programs provide little annual revenue, others realize substantial income, and a few garner very significant revenue (\$500,000 or more). Annual revenues in the survey sample averaged \$230,500 in 1996.

The revenues are usually credited to the general fund of the county or city. In a few agencies, revenues are credited directly to the sheriff's budget, and two jails report placing them in an inmate welfare fund.

- **Weekender programs.** Fifteen (15) agencies report charging inmates fees for participation in weekender programs, in which inmates serve time over weekends only. (See Table 11, below.) Separate fees typically are levied for admission and for days of incarceration; admission fees range from \$10 to \$188, and per diem charges range from \$5 to \$150. One jail charges 15 percent of the inmate's wages.

Average annual revenues for weekender programs were \$120,000 in 1996. As with work release programs, the income derived from weekender programs most often goes to the county or city in which the jail is located. Income from some programs is credited directly to the sheriff's budget

**Table 11. Weekender Programs**

	Fees for Weekender Programs		Where Fees Are Credited			
	Base fee	Annual revenues	County general fund	Sheriff/detention budget	Inmate welfare fund	Other
Alameda Co., CA	Up to \$55 admission + up to 8/day	\$494,978	✓			
Riverside Co., CA	75	—		✓		
San Bernardino Co., CA	80	321,297		✓		
San Diego Co., CA	15% of wages	16,817	✓			
Santa Ana Co., CA	188 admission + 24/day	38,455		✓		
Dade Co., FL	100	2,700			✓	
Duval Co., FL	15/day	63,734	✓			
Pinellas Co., FL	5/day	—	✓			
Polk Co., IA	78.92	—	✓			
York Co., ME	150	15,000				Program fund
Macomb Co., MI	40/day	—				
Oakland Co., MI	10-30/day	(Included in work release total)		✓		
Bernalillo Co./Albuquerque, NM	5/weekend	—				City general fund
Pennington Co., SD	6	(Included in per diem total)				
Bexar Co., TX	10 admission/first booking, 2 other bookings, + 5/day	5,768	✓			

- Home detention/electronic monitoring. Twenty-six (26) agencies report charging fees for participation in home detention or electronic monitoring programs. (See Table 12, below.) Most agencies simply levy a daily fee for participation, which ranges from a low of \$3.55 to a high of \$27. Two jails charge a percentage of the inmate's earnings, and three apply a sliding scale in determining daily fees. Some jurisdictions impose an initial start-up fee as well as a daily or weekly charge. The program initiation fees in these counties range from \$30 to \$100.

Revenues derived from such programs are usually credited either to the county general fund or the

sheriff, though some jails assign all or part of the revenues to the program fund or directly to the electronic monitoring vendor. Average annual revenues were \$161,000 in 1996.

- Other programs. Table 13, page 17, presents data on other program fees charged to inmates. Fourteen (14) jurisdictions in the survey sample charge fees for participation in programs such as community service, county parole, sheriffs' work programs, substance abuse treatment and education, and traffic offender classes. Revenues for these programs typically are credited to the sheriff's budget rather than the county general fund; some programs are directly self-funding.

**Table 12. Home Detention/Electronic Monitoring Programs**

	Fees for Home Detention/ Electronic Monitoring		Where Fees Are Credited			
	Base fee	Annual revenues	County general fund	Sheriff/ detention budget	Inmate welfare fund	Other
Alameda Co., CA	Up to \$287/week	\$257,707	✓	✓		
Contra Costa Co., CA	100 to start + % of wages	290,000		✓		
Riverside Co., CA	75 to start + 18/day	—			✓	
San Bernardino Co., CA	20	2,550 (4 months)		✓		
San Diego Co., CA	10-13	—				Vendor
San Mateo Co., CA	12-27/day	88,616		✓		
Dade Co., FL	7/day	292,216		✓		
Duval Co., FL	10/day	40,910	✓			
Hillsborough Co., FL	1 hr. wages	65,861				
Orange Co., FL	5/day	106,617	✓			
Ada Co., ID	—	5,130		✓		
Jefferson Co., KY	(Sliding scale)	425,200				
York Co., ME	7/day	10,000				Self fund
Ramsey Co., MN	2-15/day	120,000	✓			
City of St. Louis, MO	3.55/day	—	✓			City general fund
Hillsborough Co., NH	20% of gross wages	—	✓			Self fund
Bergen Co., NJ	6/day	—	✓			
Bernalillo Co./ Albuquerque, NM	30 to start + sliding scale	—				City general fund
Cass Co., ND	—	—				
Rhode Island DOC	1/day	100,681				State general fund
Greenville Co., SC	8/day	—		2.21/day		
Arlington Co., VA	7/day	2,058	✓			
City of Norfolk, VA	7/day	—			✓	
King Co., WA	(Sliding scale)	250,000	✓			
Pierce Co., WA	18	323,500	✓			
Milwaukee Co., WI	13.50/day	203,500	✓			

Table 13. Other Programs

Type of Program	Jurisdiction Charging Fee	Base fee	Annual revenues	Where Fees Are Credited			
				County general fund	Sheriff/detention budget	Inmate welfare fund	Other
Community service	Riverside Co., CA	\$75	—		✓		
	Santa Ana Co., CA	38	\$72,264		✓		
	St. Louis Co., MO	60	87,627				Self fund
	Fairfax Co., VA	10/day	48,320				
County parole	Contra Costa Co., CA	100 + % of wages	305,000		✓		
Court monitoring center	Jefferson Co., KY	15	109,800				
Diversion	Dade Co., FL	(varies)	41,021		✓		
	Orange Co., FL	40/month	271,732	✓			
Education	Hawaii DOC	20	2,340				State general fund
Substance abuse assessment	St. Louis Co., MO	125	—				
Substance abuse education	St. Louis Co., MO	100	71,633				Self fund
Substance abuse treatment	Oakland Co., MI	(varies)	20,000				(Not specified)
Traffic offender class	St. Louis Co., MO	70	72,646				Self fund
Work programs	Alameda Co., CA	Up to 15	—	✓			
	San Mateo Co., CA	50 + 12/day	301,379		✓		
	Ada Co., ID	25/week	66,575				

## Administrative Issues

### Responsibility for Fee Collection

In most jurisdictions that charge jail inmate fees, the jail is directly responsible for collecting the fees. In the vast majority of cases, however, the jail does not actively pursue fee collection after inmates are released. Some jails turn over this responsibility to county or private collection agencies or the county attorney.

Thirteen (13) agencies surveyed report that they actively pursue collection of inmate fees; in some cases this is done only for fees related to specific programs, such as work release or home detention. Some agencies use court orders, and others send letters to the inmate requesting payment. Jails in some states, e.g., Florida, are legislatively authorized to file a lien on the released inmate's property. In Macomb Co., Michigan—which collects per diem, medical, program, and other fees—a variety of legal alterna-

tives for collection are pursued, including small claims and district court. The agency can also seize the inmate's assets, including garnishing payroll and bank accounts.

### Staffing for Fee Processing

Reported staffing levels for administration of jail inmate fees ranged from zero to six full-time equivalent (FTE) positions. Several agencies noted that such responsibilities were absorbed by existing staff. A review of the data showed no apparent relation between staffing levels and types or amount of fees imposed, or revenues received.

### Rates of Fee Collection

Agencies report that the actual revenues from their fee-based operations equal from 6 to 100 percent of the fees assessed. In 15 jurisdictions, revenues were less than 50 percent of fees assessed. Revenues equalled 50 percent of fees assessed, or better, in 33 agencies.

Ten jurisdictions report collecting 100% of the fees assessed.

Among agencies providing percentage data on revenues for medical services, revenues ranged from 25 to 100 percent of fees assessed.

### Results of Fee Implementation

Eighteen (18) responding jurisdictions have conducted formal evaluation studies of the costs and benefits of their inmate fee programs.

Overall, the findings supported the charging of fees:

- Evaluation results in 15 jurisdictions strongly supported the fee systems;
- Evaluation results in 2 jurisdictions moderately supported the fee systems; and
- Evaluation results in 1 jurisdiction did not support the fee system.

Agencies provided additional observations on the effect of new fees. For example, a Florida respondent noted that the creation of a subsistence fee has meant that jail inmates have less money available to spend in the commissary. This has caused a shift of revenues to the county, which receives the subsistence fee, and away from the inmate welfare fund, which is funded through commissary revenues.

### Conclusions

Findings of this study suggest that the practice of charging fees to jail inmates will continue to grow. Fees are a logical solution for local governments that face rising costs for incarcerating and providing programs for inmates, and jails around the country are continually identifying new options for offsetting costs. Local jails looking for ways to deter inmates' inappropriate use of services view charging fees as

one way to do so. Certainly, jail programs that allow inmates to continue working are natural sources of self-supporting revenue. Philosophically as well, inmate fees are being embraced as part of a "get-tough" approach to crime.

Unless their distribution is otherwise defined by the authorizing statute, resources collected from inmate fees can be used creatively. For example, one agency reports that program fees not only offset supervision costs but also fund medical care for inmates with terminal or catastrophic illnesses, resulting in sizeable taxpayer savings.

Further, the survey data suggest that a number of local jurisdictions are unaware of statutes already in place that authorize them to collect inmate fees. As more agencies learn of their option to do so, many will likely develop new fee programs.

Limitations to fee programs do exist. In addition to the controversial aspects of charging for medical services or costs of supervision, limitations include the question of whether the collection effort will result in sufficient revenues to make the fees worthwhile. According to some agencies, the burden of tracking accounts and collecting fees is not matched by the revenues generated. One agency is considering rescinding its policy of charging for services because "the process is cumbersome and unworkable" and "does not enhance the goals and objectives of the department." At least two agencies have decided not to collect a medical w-pay from inmates because the anticipated administrative burden would have been too great for the amount that they would actually collect. The effectiveness of fees as a source of significant revenue also depends on the local economy's relative strength and on the actual resources of inmates.

Despite these limitations, however, there is no question that the trend to charge inmates fees for program participation, medical services, per diem costs of incarceration, and other services will continue. ●

**APPENDIX A.**

**Table I. Responding Jurisdictions' Use of Inmate Fees for Jail Services**

	No Inmate Fees Imposed	Inmate Fees Charged: Non-Program Services				Inmate Fees Charged: Programs				Annual Revenues	Percent of Fees Actually Collected
		Per diem	Medical care	Phone calls	Haircuts	Other	Work release	Week-enders	Home detention /E.M.		
Jefferson Co., AL			✓							\$8,000-10,000	60%
Pima Co., AZ		✓	✓			✓				221,623	
Maricopa Co., AZ			✓							101,342	26%
Washington Co., AR	✓										
Alameda Co., CA			✓						✓	20,000	60%
Contra Costa Co., CA			✓						✓	2,629,023	
Fresno Co., CA			✓							7,698	41%
Los Angeles Co., CA	✓		✓								
Riverside Co., CA			✓						✓	3,253,000	95%
San Bernardino Co., CA			✓						✓	2,754,669	
San Diego Co., CA			✓						✓	154,516	100% programs; 61% medical
San Francisco Co., CA	✓										
San Mateo Co., CA			✓						✓	402,281 + phones	
Santa Ana Co., CA			✓						✓	144,680	25%
Santa Clara Co., CA	✓										
Ventura Co., CA		✓	✓							203,000	
Arapahoe Co., CO			✓								
City/Co. of Denver, CO			✓						✓	70,000	85%
Connecticut DOC	Unified system; planning underway										
Delaware DOC	Unified system; fees will be charged beginning in 1997										
D.C. DOC	Unified system; fees charged for community-based programs only										
Broward Co., FL		✓	✓						✓		
Dade Co., FL									✓	431,630	
Duval Co., FL									✓	832,241	
Escambia Co., FL			✓						✓	279,928	100% work release; 90% phones; 25% medical

	No Inmate Fees Imposed	Inmate Fees Charged: Non-Program Services					Inmate Fees Charged: Programs				Annual Revenues	Percent of Fees Actually Collected
		Per diem	Medical care	Phone calls	Haircuts	Other	Work release	Week-ends	Home detention /E.M.	Other		
Hillsborough Co., FL			✓			✓	✓		✓		264,687	86%
Orange Co., FL			✓				✓		✓	✓	2,103,160	85% medical, 70% CCD
Palm Beach Co., FL		✓	✓								74,955	25% per diem
Pinellas Co., FL			✓	✓			✓	✓			\$35,000 + \$500,000 phones	50%
Volusia Co., FL			✓								(New; no data)	—
City of Atlanta, GA			✓	✓							—	50%
Chatham Co., GA			✓								(Begins 1997)	—
DeKalb Co., GA			✓								2,000	100%
Hawaii DOC						✓				✓	—	—
Ada Co., ID			✓			✓	✓		✓	✓	347,464	100%
Cook Co., IL	✓											
Lake Co., IN			✓				✓				125,000	—
Polk Co., IA			✓		✓			✓			—	—
Sedgwick Co., KS			✓	✓			✓				12,790	24%
Johnson Co., KS			✓								8,214 (6 mo.)	57%
Jefferson Co., KY			✓	✓			✓		✓	✓	805,700	72%
Cumberland Co., ME	Will begin collecting fees in 1997											
York Co., ME			✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓		19,000	—
Maryland D.P.S.			✓								—	—
Prince George's Co., MD			✓		✓						30,200	100%
Hampden Co., MA							✓				—	—
Plymouth Co., MA	✓											
Suffolk Co., MA	✓											
Macomb Co., MI		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			858,564	15%
Oakland Co., MI		✓	✓	✓			✓	✓			200,000	7%
Wayne Co., MI		✓	✓		✓	✓					3,000	0.0006%
Hennepin Co., MN	✓											
Ramsey Co., MN			✓				✓		✓		215,000	98%
Harrison Co., MS	✓											
Hinds Co., MS	✓											
St. Louis Co., MO			✓	✓			✓			✓	483,964	58%
of St. Louis, MO				✓			✓		✓		72,462	100%

	No Inmate Fees Imposed	Inmate Fees Charged: Non-Program Services					Inmate Fees Charged: Programs				Annual Revenues	Percent of Fees Actually Collected
		Per diem	Medical care	Phone calls	Haircuts	Other	Work release	Week-enders	Home detention /E.M.	Other		
Yellowstone Co., MT	✓											
Lancaster Co., NE							✓				92,755	—
Clark Co./Las Vegas, NV			✓								(Begins 1997)	—
Hillsborough Co., NH			✓	✓			✓			✓	17,949	57%
Bergen Co., NJ			✓				✓			✓	44,312	33%
Camden Co., NJ		✓	✓				✓				185,000	6%
Essex Co., NJ	✓											
Middlesex Co., NJ			✓				✓				\$26,126	77%
City of Albuquerque/ Bernalillo Co., NM							✓	✓		✓	2,870 (2 mo.)	1.5%
Monroe Co., NY							✓				22,097	99%
Suffolk Co., NY	✓											
Westchester Co., NY	✓											
Mecklenburg Co., NC			✓	✓							—	—
Cass Co., ND							✓			✓	36,540	90%
Franklin Co., OH	✓											
Oklahoma Co., OK	✓											
Tulsa Co., OK	✓											
Washington Co., OR	✓											
Allegheny Co., PA			✓								(New; no data)	—
Rhode Island DOC							✓			✓	289,203	100%
Greenville Co., SC			✓	✓	✓		✓			✓	23,050	100%
Pennington Co., SD		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓			18,886	10%
Davidson Co., TN							✓				400,389	100%
Shelby Co., TN (Sheriff)	In planning process											
Bexar Co., TX		✓	✓				✓	✓			458,580	100%
El Paso Co., TX			✓								(Begins 1997)	—
Harris Co., TX			✓								80,000	—
Nueces Co., TX			✓								5,612	56%
Tarrant Co., TX	✓											
Travis Co., TX		✓	✓	✓			✓				—	—

	No Inmate Fees Imposed	Inmate Fees Charged: Non-Program Services					Inmate Fees Charged: Programs				Annual Revenues	Percent of Fees Actually Collected
		Per diem	Medical care	Phone calls	Haircuts	Other	Work release	Week-ends	Home detention /E.M.	Other		
Salt Lake Co., UT	✓											
Vermont DOC	Unified system; field supervision fees only											
Arlington Co., VA			✓			✓	✓		✓		12,502	—
Fairfax Co., VA			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	436,040	73% medical
City of Norfolk, VA			✓				✓		✓		2,230 (8 mo.)	20%
King Co., WA			✓	✓		✓	✓		✓		—	—
Pierce Co., WA		✓	✓	✓		✓			✓		—	—
Dane Co., WI							✓				—	—
Milwaukee Co., WI (Sheriff)	May begin charging fees in 1997											
Milwaukee Co., WI (DOC)					✓	✓	✓		✓		—	—
Laramie Co., WY		✓	✓	✓		✓					(New; no data)	—
Federal Bureau of Prisons	Only convicted offenders are charged fees											



