



**U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Corrections**

The NIC Information Center

The National Institute of Corrections (NIC), created by Congress in 1974, provides services in five categories to state and local corrections: training, information, technical assistance, research and evaluation, and policy formulation and implementation.

Library Information Specialists, Inc., under contract DP-5, operates the NIC Information Center to serve in the second of NIC's mandated areas as a "clearinghouse and information center for the collection, preparation, and dissemination of information on corrections."

The Corrections Information Series consists of publications on priority topics in corrections. Each report in the series contains material from several sources collected into a single document.

Library information Specialists, Inc.

1790 30th Street
Suite 130
Boulder, Colorado 80301

**Proceedings of the First Meeting of the
Large Jail Network**

**June 3-5, 1990
Denver, Colorado**

Sponsored by the National Institute of Corrections, Jails Division.
Michael O'Toole, Chief

Karen Fisher, Editor
L.I.S.I.

August 1990

FOREWORD

Large jails are growing faster than any other segment of local detention. Data from the 1988 U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics jail census show that the number of inmates in jails with more than 500 inmates increased 249 percent between 1978 and 1988; jails with more than 250 inmates now hold more than 60 percent of the nation's jail population.

To help these jails meet the challenge of managing such large populations-frequently in crowded conditions-the National Institute of Corrections in 1989 established the Large Jail Network. This group now comprises sixty-seven jurisdictions with average daily jail populations of more than 1,000 inmates. Through this network, coordinated by the NIC Jails Division, the Institute intends to foster information exchange and technology transfer among these facilities by publishing the *Large Jail/ Network Bulletin* and by convening regular meetings of administrators of member jails and jail systems.

The first network meeting was held June 3-5 in Denver, Colorado, and the proceedings are summarized in this publication. Judging from the enthusiastic response of participants, I believe the network is an effective means of sharing experience. We hope it will continue to be a positive influence in the correctional system.

M. Wayne Huggins
Director, National Institute of Corrections
August 1990

CONTENTS

Agenda	iv
Overview	1
Welcome	3
Panel and Group Discussions	5
Topic Session 1: Systems Approaches to Jail Crowding and Population Management	5
Topic Session 2: Managing the Crowded Jail	8
Topic Session 3: Special Programs	11
Topic Session 4: Boot Camps	15
Closing Session: Large Jail Network Agenda	18
Appendix I Participant List.	21

AGENDA

Large Jail Network Meeting, June 3-5, 1990
The Registry Hotel
3203 Quebec Street
Denver, Colorado

Sunday, June 3

3:00 on Registration at hotel
6:30 - 8:30 Dinner

Monday, June 4

7:30 - 8:30 Breakfast buffet
8:30 - 9:00 Welcome M. Wayne Huggins
Overview Mike O'Toole
9:00 - 10:30 Panel and Group Discussion: Systems Approach to Jail Crowding and
Population Management
. Tom Allison, Barbara Bostick, and Ray Coleman
10:30-10:45 Break
10:45-12:15 Panel and Group Discussion: Managing the Crowded Jail
. Robert Glotz, Mark Kellar, and John Simonet
12:15- 1:15 Lunch
1:15 - 2:45 Panel and Group Discussion: Special Programs
. David Bosman, Frank Hall, and Jerry Krans
2:45 - 3:00 Break
3:00 - 4:30 Panel and Group Discussion: Boot Camps
. Richard Bryce, Robert Ciulik, and Charles Foti
4:30 Adjourn
5:30 - 6:30 Dinner

Tuesday, June 5

7:30 - 8:30 Breakfast buffet
8:30 - 9:30 Large Jail Network Agenda: Nominal Group Technique . . Mike O'Toole
9:30 -11:00 Discussion of Future Meetings Mike O'Toole
11:00 Adjourn

OVERVIEW

Presented by Michael O'Toole, Chief, NIC Jails Division

The Large Jail Network

This first meeting of the Large Jail Network is the culmination of several years' effort of the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) to respond to the unique needs of administrators of large jails and large jail systems. The concept for the network originated when participants in "mega-jail" seminars in the early 1980s said that they would like opportunities to interact with other large-jail administrators and find out what their peers are doing in their respective jurisdictions.

To facilitate communication among these administrators, the NIC Jails Division identified jurisdictions with an average daily jail population of 1,000 or more inmates to be part of a network. The number of those jurisdictions has increased to sixty-seven.

In April 1989, the Jails Division introduced the *Large Jail Network Bulletin* at a meeting of jail administrators in Phoenix. The *Bulletin* is, in part, an expansion of the mega-jail survey data published in previous years by Maricopa County (Arizona) Deputy Director Phillip Severson and now included in the *Bulletin*. The *Bulletin*, produced quarterly by staff of the NIC Information Center, is a means for jail administrators to share information about effective program initiatives. Each issue contains articles submitted by jail practitioners themselves; Maricopa County's mega jail data are included annually.

To further facilitate administrators' interaction, the Information Center and Jails Division developed a referral guide that enables administrators to identify others willing to share expertise in specific areas of facility management. In early 1990 the Jails Division polled those who responded to the initial referral guide survey regarding topics they would most like to discuss with their peers. Respondents were invited to this first network meeting, and the four topics mentioned most frequently became the meeting's agenda. Administrators who said they would like to speak on the selected topics were asked to make brief presentations to the group.

Large Jails In Perspective

Large jails are playing an increasingly important role in the corrections system, as illustrated by the following statistics from the U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics' 1988 census of local jails:

- Large jails (more than 250 inmates) make up only 9 percent of the nation's 3,316 jails, but they hold more than 60 percent of the country's 343,569 jail inmates.
- Between 1978 and 1988, the number of inmates in large jails (250 to 499 inmates) increased 125 percent, and the number in very large jails (more than 500 inmates) increased 249 percent. By comparison, the number of inmates in small jails (less than 50 inmates) and medium jails (50 to 249 inmates) increased 13 percent and 68 percent, respectively.
- While bed space in jails increased by almost 95,000 beds between 1978 and 1988, the number of inmates held in American jails increased by more than 185,000. This increase resulted in a net deficit of almost 91,000 beds.

- In 1988 large and very large jails were occupied at 107 percent and 122 percent, respectively, of their rated capacity, compared with 64 percent for small jails and 93 percent for medium jails.

Thus, the larger facilities appear to be bearing the brunt of the problems associated with increasing populations, especially crowding. The goal of the Large Jail Network is to help those facilities pool their collective experience to better deal with the problems they face.

WELCOME

M. Wayne Huggins, Director, National Institute of Corrections

Current Jail Initiatives and Issues

A number of developments, some of which the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) is initiating, are likely to have an impact on large jails in the near future. These developments include the Corrections Options Incentive Act, NIC jail resource centers, joint projects of NIC and the U.S. Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), accreditation, and tobacco-free facilities.

- *Corrections Options Incentive Act.* Currently in congressional hearings, the Corrections Options Incentive Act (HR. 4158), introduced by New Jersey Representative William Hughes, proposes to allocate \$208 million to state and local correctional agencies to develop and implement intermediate sanctions. Although the Bureau of Justice Assistance is now named custodian of the funds, I recently recommended to the House Subcommittee on Crime that NIC should administer the program because NIC is the only federal agency created solely for corrections. If passed, the law may provide NIC with a significant opportunity to help state and local corrections agencies with some of their problems.
- *Jail/ resource centers.* In an effort to decentralize its assistance, NIC is currently reviewing applications from agencies around the country to become jail resource centers. Each center will specialize in one of the Jails Division's areas of targeted technical assistance: direct supervision, facilities planning, jail industries, and objective classification. Each will coordinate information-sharing and become a regional training site for its topic.
- *NIC/BJA collaboration.* In one of five joint NIC/BJA efforts, money will be made available to jails to develop and enhance local jail industries. In another effort, a land procurement specialist will develop a database of surplus or underutilized state and federal government lands that might be acquired by local corrections agencies and, after the local agency has conducted a feasibility study, will help the agency with the procurement process. Joint funds are also targeted to improve and expand the NIC Jails Division's Planning of New Institutions (PONI) program.
- *Accreditation.* Accreditation is the most positive thing that has happened to corrections in the last twenty years, in part, because it helps facilities win conditions of confinement lawsuits. I can't imagine running a jail and not seeking accreditation, and I strongly recommend that all jails become involved. Forty jails are currently accredited, and twenty to thirty more are in the process.
Among the efforts of the Commission on Accreditation and the American Correctional Association to be responsive to local corrections are reduction of accreditation fees, development of standards for small jails, and certification programs that allow program components to be certified, even if physical plant conditions prevent an entire jail from being accredited.
- *Tobacco-free jails.* Local correctional facilities throughout the nation are setting the pace in successfully banning smoking; these include facilities in King County

(Seattle), Washington; Fairfax County, Virginia; and Weld County, Colorado. In the landmark federal case on banning smoking, *Wilson and Doughty v. Weld County*, the court upheld the sheriff's action by saying that the government's interest in life, health, and safety far outweighs inmates' right to smoke in a correctional facility.

Although inflation has in effect decreased NIC's budget, the commitment and dedication of the staff have enabled the level of service to remain high. We hope to be able to help you in any way that we can.

PANEL AND GROUP DISCUSSIONS

Topic Session 1: Systems Approaches to Jail Crowding and Population Management

Approaches to population management vary according to local circumstances. Panelists described one system that focused on internal organization by developing a structured inmate management system, another system that resulted from a combination of internal changes and support from sources outside the facility, and a third in which recommendations were made by an external, community-wide criminal justice committee.

The Orange County inmate Management System

Tom Allison, Director, Orange County Corrections Division, Orlando, Florida.

The Orange County Inmate Management System (IMS) is based on the recognition that all organizations are “cybernetic,” or living, systems that respond to the environment. Therefore, it is useful to create a management situation for staff that is alive and that enables all individuals within the system to have input into it and knowledge about how it works. The Orange County system encourages the flow of information among administration, mid-management, and line staff.

Orange County’s inmate management and classification systems reflect the staff management system, which in turn reflects the division’s vision and mission. The IMS encompasses a number of levels of confinement, each of which has incentives, such as contact visits, recreation, and telephone use. Inmates’ behavior governs their movement between levels. Thus, inmates know how the system will respond to their behavior, and they have an incentive to participate in it, even though 88 percent of them are not sentenced.

Delegation is essential in this system. Each staff position has specific responsibilities, and all staff are encouraged to make immediate decisions within their level of authority; every decision is reviewed within three days.

In large measure because inmates’ behavior influences their classification and because staff react immediately to inmates’ behavior, violence in the facility has decreased, even though the population has more than doubled since the system went into effect. In addition, the system provides the inmates with opportunities for decision making and change that may influence their future behavior in the community.

*(Note: The Orange County IMS is described in more detail in Tom Allison’s article, “A Structural Approach to Inmate Management: Orange County’s Inmate Management System,” which appeared in *Large Jails Network Bulletin* Vol. 1, No. 1, April 1989, pp. 9-13.)*

The Baltimore City Jail's Approach to Overcrowding

Barbara Bostick, Commissioner, Baltimore City Jail, Baltimore, Maryland.

Because the Baltimore City Jail was 395 over its federally mandated population cap of 2,622, jail administrators met with the mayor in June 1989 to discuss the pressures and problems caused by overcrowding. The mayor responded by issuing an executive order authorizing the commissioner to release 300 to 800 low-risk, low-bail (i.e., less than \$25,000) inmates into the community.

This order resulted in the conditional release of more than 300 inmates who had been on home monitoring or work release and who were within fifteen to thirty days of release. These inmates were required to return to the jail for random drug testing, to maintain jobs in the community, and to be observed by counselors who went to the inmates' workplace to assure that they were conforming to the plan.

In addition, approximately 200 sentenced inmates who were more than thirty days from release were put on home monitoring, and work release programs became pretrial release centers to accommodate low-bail inmates who had not been sentenced and could not be released. (Effective July 1, 1990, pretrial inmates will be eligible for electronic surveillance.)

These actions provoked a political uproar, attracting a great deal of attention to the jail. But the attention given to the release process resulted in substantial support from state and local agencies, as well as from NIC and private organizations, which has helped keep the jail population within the federal cap for the past seven months.

The following programs and policies are among those that contribute to the population reduction effort:

- *The Offender Aid and Restoration (OAR) program.* Funds allocated by the city and state and by private sources are used to post bail for low-bail defendants.
- *Expedited trials.* The state attorney's and public defender's offices identify and schedule cases for expedited trial to divert inmates from the jail.
- *"Recog" policy.* The administrative judge from the district court instituted a policy that defendants charged with one of fourteen designated crimes are automatically granted release on personal recognizance.
- *Increased capacity.* The federally ordered capacity was increased by 200 beds, and 900 beds will be added within two years, 800 of which will be funded by the state.

Key to such an effort is communicating what the jail is trying to accomplish, especially to those who disagree with the new policies. In addition, administrators must have the support of those who appoint them, must be willing to take risks, and must be decisive and then try hard to make those decisions work.

King County Criminal Justice Committee

Ray Coleman, Assistant Director, King County Department of Adult Detention, Seattle, Washington.

The new King County Jail was forty-five inmates over its 1,080-bed capacity the day it opened, so it was infeasible to immediately begin planning another new facility. Therefore, the

jail director and the county executive decided to convene a local criminal justice committee to make recommendations for reducing jail crowding.

Previous experience had shown that strategy is all-important in assembling such a committee. The key member is the chair, who helps select the other members. The chair should be neutral but familiar with the criminal justice system and should be someone everyone in the system respects. In King County, they chose the deputy civil prosecutor because he had legal knowledge and the criminal justice community's respect but was not involved in criminal proceedings. The committee was named after him.

A second strategic consideration is the importance of each member's investment in the committee's work. The King County committee members were the jail director, the sheriff, the police chief of the largest municipality, a suburban police chief (twenty-five suburbs use the jail), the criminal prosecutor, two judges, a county executive staff member, city and county council members, and the correctional officers' union representative. (A committee's composition might vary in other communities.) Each member had to designate one or two alternates, who must attend meetings in the member's absence. All members and alternates attended the first meeting to receive the charge to the committee.

The committee's staff person also has a key role because that individual can control how information is summarized and presented to the group. In King County the staff person was someone from the jail. The committee met once a week for the first four months, then monthly. Meetings were open to the public.

Because committee members were defensive at first, the strategy was to have each member report statistics of concern from his or her area. This process not only gave the members time to build rapport and construct a database, but it helped them avoid blaming others for problems and figure out what they were doing with regard to sentencing, booking, and other activities.

The next step was to coordinate, fill in, and challenge information, which frequently varied from source to source. The assumptions that resulted from the discussion were then examined in light of their effect on the jail population.

The committee made forty-seven recommendations for reducing jail crowding. As a result, the police have been cooperative and hearings have been added and expedited. Although a new jail was still needed, the committee has enabled the players in the criminal justice community, which continues to meet, to work together more effectively.

Highlights of Group Discussion, Session 1/Overcrowding

- Jurisdictions use an eclectic approach to building systems for managing the jail population. These approaches include early release, credit card bonding, and low-bail programs. In general, it is clear that diversion programs are needed for inmates who are not a danger to the community. Nevertheless, it is also necessary to recognize that some people should be in jail and, therefore, jails are going to be built.
- Because each player in the system has an agenda, efforts should be made to band together to build a effective system. Judges in particular should be involved in the process to gain their support. Support is also needed from policymakers and the community. Because jail crowding is, in part, the result of state-level problems, some coordination should be done with state officials.

- By capping facilities, the federal courts have essentially forced jails to use community programs to cope with crowding. Examples include the church-operated residence center in Baltimore-an idea that deserves further consideration-and intensive supervision in the community. In Pennsylvania, judges can allow jail officials to place inmates outside jails, if it is appropriate; however, few beds are available in the community.
- In one effort to reach out to the private sector, a New York system has established an “adopt-an-inmate” program in which eighty-four mentors work individually with inmates. Part of the mentors’ responsibility is to develop resources for their adopted inmates to use after their release.
- Although finances are frequently cited as the reason for releasing inmates from jails, the booking process and related services are the highest-cost procedures in the jail. Lax early release programs may only increase the likelihood of inmates’ returning to jail and repeating the expensive booking process.
- Jails have had particular difficulty accommodating the needs of female inmates, the fastest growing segment of the inmate population. there is a clear need for programs for women, especially with regard to parenting skills and programs for reuniting families. One California administrator noted that processing time is slower for females than for males, which contributes to the crowding problem. Another agency released on recognizance male defendants with minor charges but not female defendants.

<p>Topic Session 23 Managing the Crowded Jail</p>
--

Although jails are crowded, it is likely that conditions would have been worse if jurisdictions had not taken measures both to reduce the number of inmates and to manage the population within their facilities. Sharing experiences enables administrators to better manage scarce resources.

Strategies for Reducing Jail Crowding

John Simonet, Director, Denver County Jail.

The first step in reducing the jail population is to keep people out of jail. Most agencies that put people in jail do not have standards of incarceration; for example, police officers can use a great deal of discretion about whom they arrest. In some jurisdictions, incarceration standards are being developed by jail management committees. Jail administrators, however, can also impose standards, such as by not accepting people who have minor municipal ordinance offenses. The Denver County Jail diverted 8,000 to 9,000 people from the jail in 1989, 1,500 to 2,000 of them by imposing stricter standards on police.

Jails can also divert the chronically mental ill by having their misdemeanor charges dropped and getting them into the mental health system. In Colorado, the corrections system

has worked with the state to increase case management services for the mentally ill. Denver successfully diverted approximately 2,800 mentally ill offenders in 1989.

Home detention, pretrial release programs, stays of execution, and refusal to accept offenders such as parole violators can also be used to keep people out of jail.

Other actions can be taken to manage the population within jails. Especially in old, dark jails, increasing outside recreation time reduces tension by effectively doubling inmates' space. Expanding outside work programs for sentenced misdemeanants also frees jail space.

Among the players in the criminal justice system, jails have the least control over who is incarcerated. However, for the sake of improving conditions in their facilities, jail administrators should be willing to be creative and take risks (e.g., by releasing inmates through early release programs or on personal recognizance bonds), even though those actions may offend prosecutors, police, or courts, who may be reluctant to give up control.

Contingency Planning for Crowded Facilities

Mark Kellar, Director, Harris County Central Jail, Houston, Texas.

Emergency management is a dimension of overcrowding that may be overlooked but for which planning is important. Jail administrators generally do a good job of preparing for most emergencies, including fires and riots. Extreme overcrowding, however, in which populations reach 160 to 190 percent of jail capacity, can precipitate problems for which most facilities are not prepared. Contingency planning for these predictable situations can avert management crises.

Harris County has identified several areas for which contingency plans should be developed and implemented when overcrowding becomes extreme: they involve programming, building maintenance, logistics, communications, and medical services. For example:

- Programs can be expanded to accommodate crowded conditions. In Harris County, visitation and recreation hours have been extended to make full use of the facility, even to the extent of allowing basketball at 3:00 a.m.
- Because extreme overcrowding causes more wear on buildings, administrators should plan for extra spare parts, such as toilets and kitchen equipment.
- Apparently mundane activities, such as providing sufficient underwear for inmates, can cause the most problems when jails are overcrowded.

A medical emergency brought home the importance of contingency planning in Harris County. In September 1989, two inmates died, and twelve more became seriously ill within a short time. Although all of the sick inmates had high fevers and sore throats, the medical administrator did not know the cause of death, and apprehension was high. After three weeks of working with the federal Centers for Disease Control and state and local health agencies, the cause of the disease was identified as a pneumococcal bacteria.

The situation demonstrated that crowded conditions can transform simple "bugs" into serious epidemics, as was the case with the "barracks epidemics" in World War I, and that Harris County was unprepared to handle the situation in several respects.

Attention to the following factors may alleviate problems related to medical emergencies in other jails and jail systems:

Communication. Large jails should have communication systems in place that enable administrators to inform inmates, their families, staff, and the press about the medical emergency. A closed circuit television system is an inexpensive, effective way to inform inmates in the facility within a few hours. Activities should be communicated to the media, although in medical emergencies administrators may be working with medical and scientific reporters instead of the regular criminal justice reporters who are familiar with jail procedures.

Coordination with public health officials. Before a medical emergency occurs, administrators should know which agencies should be involved so that those contacts can be made immediately. These agencies could include the immediate hospital district as well as federal agencies and state and local health departments.

Cost and availability of vaccines. If the emergency is a disease that can be prevented by vaccination, departments must consider the cost and availability of the vaccine. In facilities with several thousand staff and inmates, sufficient vaccine may be difficult to obtain.

Provision for overtime. Medical emergencies can require a considerable amount of overtime to handle mass vaccinations, for example. In some situations, health authorities might even recommend that bookings be halted for a period of time.

Highlights of Group Discussion, Session 2/Crowding

Planning Issues

- The first response to jail overcrowding is to control the jail population at the front end wherever possible. More attention should be given to intermediate sanctions, such as electronic monitoring and work release, including weekend work assignments.
- Administrators should plan for emergencies based on current populations and projections for the future. Although some believe that an ACA standard regarding the need for contingency plans for dealing with overcrowding might help, it is difficult to write a standard that can be audited. Because populations differ, it may be more effective to deal with the operational issues associated with overcrowding as they occur, rather than deal with “overcrowding” in general.
- Planning and a proactive approach are essential. Population projections should be made, even though they frequently are not accurate. Jail administrators must educate judges, budget officers, and others in the criminal justice system regarding their needs and what they are trying to accomplish, and they should work with adversaries to build new solutions. New facilities should be constructed with the possibility of overcrowding in mind; for example, is a centralized or decentralized facility better for managing a large population?
- In preparing for jail crowding, facilities can set a trigger population that will activate emergency responses before crisis conditions occur. Arrangements might include an agreement with a nearby military base to house inmates in an emergency and with the public transportation system to move inmates, if necessary.

Inmate Classification and Programming

- An effective classification system can ease problems caused by crowding. If one group of inmates has an average stay of 100 days and another group an average of thirty days, it is better to crowd the group with the shorter stay. In spite of crowding, it is important to have isolation areas for handling disciplinary problems.
- Some facilities have dealt in part with crowding by reviewing and revising their classification systems. One jail has found it helpful to house like inmates together (e.g., older inmates, young and violent inmates) and then focus attention where it is needed.
- Adding or expanding programs and activities helps diffuse stress by keeping inmates busy. These activities include visitation, intramurals, and recreation and leisure time activities. Special programs, such as forensic mental health programs, also help administrators work with special populations.
- Small changes can go a long way toward reducing stress. For example, adding a telephone can eliminate friction caused by long waits for a single phone.

Facility issues

- Cleanliness is important for disease control, as well as for staff and inmate morale. Provision should be made for daily maintenance, clean clothes, and clean linens. Inmates and staff can work together to keep the facility clean; inmates respond to incentives (e.g., soft drinks, popcorn) for cleaning their living areas.
- Air circulation systems, essential for staff and inmate health, may not be adequate for crowded facilities. Smoking creates additional strain on ventilation systems.

Staff Issues

- Crowding puts additional stress on jail employees, a factor that influences turnover and recruitment. A proactive approach to crowding is essential because if jail staff believe that the administrators are giving up, they will give up, too.
- The stress on employees exacerbated by crowding can cause problems in their personal and professional lives. A cultural awareness training program helped staff in one facility cope with the pressures. Another facility used reserve deputies to implement increased program and recreation activities.
- Crowding makes it difficult for most facilities to meet their staffing needs. Some approaches to recruitment have included hiring correctional staff as full deputy sheriffs and lowering standards, including lowering the minimum age requirement to 18 years of age.

Topic Session 3: Special Programs

Whereas fifteen years ago discussions centered on whether jail programming is appropriate, today administrators ask which programs are best for specific populations and how to fund them. The assumption is that good programming is good management. In large jurisdictions, programs are big business and major administrative considerations.

Special Programs in the Pima County Jail

David Bosman, Director, Pima County Jail, Tucson, Arizona.

A pragmatic view of the value of programs is that when inmates are “doing programs,” they are not feeling sorry for themselves, making weapons, or planning to bring in contraband. Programs in Pima County include drug and alcohol self-help and treatment; education, including GED programs, computer training, and literacy tutoring; library; arts; needlework; religious programs; and family assistance.

Many programs can be obtained at no cost from the community or from local, state, or federal government sources. For example, the PALS national literacy program is available in most communities, and county or local libraries can provide branches inside jails. The local religious community in Pima County has a jail ministry that, in addition to religious counseling, provides Christmas baskets and other donations that help alleviate inmates’ loneliness at holiday times. Another especially useful program is a set of tapes to teach living skills that help inmates cope in the outside world.

With a minimum of training in security issues, volunteers can learn how to act and be careful around inmates. Not one volunteer has been assaulted in Pima County in ten years.

An important goal of programs is to break the cycle of crime, particularly with the 20 percent of criminals who are committing 80 percent of the crime. Unless the criminal justice system intercedes, inmates will probably return to the same friends and conditions and nothing will change. Programs, especially alcohol and drug programs, help break the cycle and should be kept in place, even in crowded facilities.

Special Programs in Santa Clara County

Frank Hall, Director, Santa Clara County Department of Correction, San Jose, California.

Programs are a tool for managing the population and a means to intervene in a positive way. Most inmates do not have an education, a good job, or positive involvement in the community, and 80 percent of offenders are on alcohol or drugs when they come into jail. Although jail programs do not affect everyone, they do make an impact on some people and even turn some lives around.

Santa Clara County uses intermediate sanctioning programs to keep people out of the system. These include work furlough and public service programs, as well as electronic monitoring. In public service programs, inmates go to work every day for a nonprofit or government agency and go home at night. They are screened for alcohol and drugs, and if they do not come to work, they are brought back to the system with no need for a warrant because they are still in custody.

All inmates are charged for these programs: \$5 a day for the work furlough program and \$10 a day for a weekend work program. Charging inmates makes them accountable and generates support in the community.

Some programs provided inside the county's six facilities are somewhat unusual. High school classes and a literacy program are offered through an outside school district. An especially powerful program for drunken drivers is offered through the county Bureau of Alcohol Services. In this program, inmates with multiple offenses participate in intensive therapy twenty-four hours a day because they live together in a module. In another program, community drug treatment staff provide an intensive treatment program in the jail.

Isolating programs (e.g., drug and alcohol treatment, GED, and prenatal programs) within a single module reinforces program values and can be effective.

The number of inmates on drugs and alcohol has increased dramatically in the last twenty years and has had a significant effect on the criminal justice system. Unless steps are taken to handle this issue, it will be difficult to manage the population and to provide other programs. Some of the federal money allocated for interdiction should come to local government to affect the people who buy, use, and sell drugs.

Funding Sources for Jail Programs

Jerry Krans, Assistant Sheriff, Orange County Sheriff's Department, Anaheim, California.

One sign of academic programs' success in jails is that Orange County found that fewer than 10 percent of inmates who had successfully completed the GED program came back to jail.

Partnerships between jails and school and community college districts can be mutually beneficial. Districts are funded, in part, on the basis of the number of students who attend and the number of hours in class, called "average daily attendance" (ADA). By cooperating with jails, which can supply a large number of students, school districts can increase their ADA funds, and jails can use some of those funds for educational programs. For example, Orange County offers some of its GED testing through school and community college districts' independent studies with ADA funds. After eligible unskilled youth complete GED training, staff funded through the federal Job Training Partnership Act help these younger offenders find jobs and then follow up on their progress.

Community college ADA funds also support continuing education programs. In one program, the jail uses ADA funds to supplement cooks' pay to allow them to become certified as vocational instructors through community colleges. The cooks then serve as inmates' instructors in a culinary arts program, and the inmates can become certified as cooks. Approximately 1,400 inmates are participating in the program, which nets \$250,000 per year in ADA funds.

Because the jail is operating a school, the facility is eligible for the school lunch and breakfast program for inmates who qualify for the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program. Approximately 300 school-age inmates qualify for the program, which will bring in \$250,000 per year.

ADA funds are used for vocational education programs in job-seeking skills, positive parenting, and childbirth preparation. Other vocational education programs help operate the jail

system. Inmates in a commercial sewing program make a high percentage of inmates' clothing and mattress covers and repair other items.

Work experience programs also receive funds from the school district. The district bought some equipment for a furniture building and repairing operation, and instructors' salaries are paid through ADA funds. The operation maintains the furniture for all county agencies, as well as building some new furniture.

School funds have proven invaluable in helping maintain the facility's buildings. Jail employees who have become certified as instructors in the building trades, primarily plumbing, electricity, and carpentry, then teach inmates these skills. Inmate labor has been used to repair, and even to build, housing to help relieve jail crowding. The inmates develop a strong sense of pride in their work and learn marketable skills; in several cases, county and private contractors have asked when inmates will be released so that they can hire them. Recidivism for these inmates has dropped drastically. Thus, this program is beneficial to the inmates, and it helps keep the facility operating.

Highlights of Group Discussion, Session S/Special Programs

- Programs are a positive influence in jails. So many programs are available and are being used that it is difficult to keep up with what is going on. A computer data bank or other means of sharing information about jail programs might be useful to administrators.
- Programs are no longer merely something that jails have to do or something to keep inmates busy, but are something that might really help inmates after their release. Because substance abuse is such an important issue, administrators need help with developing programs for substance abusers.
- Expectations of programs should be realistic. A good program may not be appropriate for all inmates. Program evaluations are needed to determine which programs are most effective, especially for the 18 to 26 year olds who are the majority of inmates.
- Some measures can increase program success. Programs that coordinate with community agencies for follow up can help the inmate make the transition to the community. The military is interested in inmates after they complete the GED. Inmates can be encouraged to complete training if they are paid in increments; for example, a percentage can be paid for training and additional payments made for obtaining and keeping a job.
- Inmate welfare funds and volunteer tutors are program resources. Funds are available for programs concerning battered women and child abuse; these programs will have a payback to the system. American Correctional Association (ACA) accreditation standards for programs can be used as an argument for program funds. Industries can reduce the cost of incarceration. Program space is less expensive when it is built into a new jail instead of being added later.
- Resources include local boards of education, church councils, community colleges, and bar associations. In one situation, the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) assisted a jail in obtaining an inmate library. Support for programs can come from

county boards, the ACLU, ACA accreditation standards, and even federal court mandates.

- Inmate welfare programs, jail industries, and inmate phone systems can generate funds for jail programming.
- Some jail industry programs not mentioned in the presentations include carpet laying, fleet maintenance, and print shop industries for county agencies. In another unique program, inmates groomed dogs in animal shelters, making them more attractive to potential owners and thus reducing animal mortality.
- Programs for women should also be included in jails. Additional industry programs include: carpentry, nursing assistant training, janitorial and maid service, fire science training, data entry (in cooperation with other county agencies), sewing programs, and first aid classes. Volunteer coordinators can oversee extensive volunteer programs.
- Domestic violence programs are also important, but they require a great deal of time and resources and often inmates' length of stay is too short to do more than raise their awareness of problems.

Special Topic 4: Boot Camps

Dubbed "boot camps" by the media, military-style work camps are a new approach to custody programming in prisons. Now jails, too, are adopting a variety of similar approaches to motivate selected, non-violent inmates. Panelists described three currently operating or planned boot camps.

Rose Valley Work Camp

Dick Bryce, Assistant Sheriff, Ventura County Sheriff's Department, Oxnard, California.

In 1986 the Ventura County Sheriff's Department was looking for additional space to alleviate crowded jail conditions. The department approached the U.S. Forest Service about converting a former Navy Seabee camp in the Los Padres National Forest to a minimum security work camp. After the Forest Service approved the work camp and the County Board of Supervisors approved \$311,000 for renovation, extensive renovation by honor camp inmates began in August 1988. The first inmates were admitted May 1, 1989.

The facility is in a remote area of the National Forest north of Ventura. Hot and cold running water is available, but power is diesel-generated. Telephones are just now being installed.

The work camp's morning program resembles that of a U.S. Marine Corps barracks. The day begins with physical exercise, followed by breakfast, formation and inspection, military drill, and work assignments. Work is continued after lunch, and a variety of recreational activities are allowed in the evenings. The program is modeled, to some extent, after San Francisco's Delancey Street program.

All inmates must participate in an educational or a substance abuse counseling program, offered twice a week for a total of four to six hours. Educational opportunities include a

complete automobile repair course provided by Ventura College, a high school program, and literacy classes. Inmates may continue the programs after their release.

Work assignments include construction, landscaping, carpentry or metal-working shops, Santa's workshop, and Forest Service projects.

Selection of inmates is critical to the program's success. Inmates must be in custody for at least thirty days to apply for the work camp. To participate in the program, inmates must be classified minimum security and must pass a background check to assure that they do not have potentially serious medical conditions, continuing court cases, gang affiliation, or behavior problems. Inmates who have shown combative or violent behavior or who have committed violent crimes or crimes involving weapons are ineligible. This camp accommodates only males.

Once approved for the program, inmates must sign a contract agreeing to obey the camp's rules. If they violate the rules or are combative, they are returned to the main jail with no second chance.

Because of the inmates' screening and the discipline instilled, they are allowed more freedom than inmates in other facilities. For example, any number of family members and up to four nonfamily members may visit inmates. Visitation is held weekend afternoons on the camp's lawn, and physical contact is allowed.

Inmates have responded well to the program. They take pride in their accomplishments, and many say that, for the first time, they see some value in staying clean and sober. The camp is proving to be an innovative alternative to the traditional custody facility.

The Regimented inmate Diversion Program

Bob Ciulik, Chief, Custody Division, Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, Los Angeles, California.

The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department will open a boot camp-type facility for up to 336 inmates in August 1990. The Regimented Inmate Diversion (RID) program will be the sole program in the minimum security compound of an existing facility.

RID will target eighteen- to twenty-five-year-old males who would otherwise be sentenced to one year in jail. The jail is working with judges and attorneys to select appropriate candidates. The program will offer ninety days in the camp and ninety days of intensive supervision by the probation department. To save pretrial jail time, attorneys will encourage offenders to plead guilty early in the process.

RID will emphasize physical training and strict discipline. The program will include mandatory reading instruction and job skills training, substance abuse education and counseling, and intensive group therapy. All inmates will work under close supervision in the system's laundry.

Modeled after the New York state shock incarceration program, RID will suspend inmates' rights and privileges. They will be allowed one visit every other week after thirty days in the program; visitors will be limited to preapproved family members. Telephone calls will also be strictly limited. No books, magazines, or newspapers will be allowed.

The program's goal for inmates is to help them develop self-respect and motivation. Ideally, the program will demonstrate to inmates that, although jail is not a pleasant experience, they can come out of jail better people with skills that will help them keep jobs. The goals for the system are to reduce the need for future jails, to cut costs in pretrial time, and to cut recidivism. The program will be evaluated after one year of operation.

RID will cost \$3.7 million in additional funds: \$2.4 million for the sheriff's department and \$1.3 million for the probation department. For at least the first year, the program will be funded with drug forfeiture money. In a unique arrangement, the sheriff's department will pay the probation department's costs.

Staff will receive three weeks training; U.S. Marine Corps drill instructors, staff from the New York Department of Correctional Services, and current jail staff will each be responsible for one week of the training.

At this stage, the program has the support of all players in the criminal justice system, including judges and the ACLU.

The About Face Program

Charles Foti, Orleans County Criminal Sheriff, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Begun in 1986, the Orleans County About Face program is a voluntary regimented program for developing inmates' self-discipline and a sense of purpose. Although the program was completely military at first, jail administrators soon realized that education, counseling, and job training were essential for changing inmates' behavior.

The program is open to nonviolent, sentenced felony offenders who have between six months and two years left on their sentence. Applicants are chosen through a rigorous screening process. Ninety inmates can participate in the program at one time. Inmates are expected to stay in the program at least six months; the average stay is nine months.

About Face is housed in barracks within the Community Correction Center but is totally isolated from the rest of the inmate population. Inmates in the program wear bright yellow sweatsuits or flight suits for further identification as About Face participants. They are grouped in platoons of thirty men, supervised by full-time drill instructors. The instructors have prior military experience and must become certified commissioned deputies.

The inmates' day begins with roll call at 5:00 a.m., followed by a strict schedule of physical exercise and military drill, educational classes, life skills training, drug and alcohol counseling, and community work projects. Inmates are expected to progress toward earning a GED, beginning with literacy classes, if necessary. Delgado Community College offers credit vocational education classes ranging from cooking to carpentry to automobile repair.

About Face inmates have established a good relationship with the community through neighborhood improvement projects and participation in events, especially athletic races. In one project, in cooperation with the National Home Builders Association, inmates tore down three crack houses and built a senior center in three months. During the project, inmates received detailed instruction in house construction.

Louisiana law permits judges to recommend some offenders for About Face and allows the parole board to consider About Face graduates for immediate parole. No one who has gone through the program has been denied a request for parole.

Highlights of Group Discussion: Session 4/Boot Camps

- In selecting boot camp staff, it is important to screen out personnel prone to the use of excessive force or who have a "bad attitude." The ideal is to have staff who can communicate to inmates that if they conduct themselves in a respectful manner, they will be treated with respect.

- Although boot camps have been primarily for males, the ACLU may force the camps to accept females.
- Some individual facilities are beginning to evaluate boot camps' effectiveness, primarily through assessing recidivism. The NIC Jails Division is collecting information about which jails are operating these programs.

(Note: Videotapes on Ventura County's Rose Valley Work Camp and Orleans County's About Face program are available on loan from the NIC Information Center, 1790 30th Street, Suite 130, Boulder, Colorado 80301, (303) 939-8877.)

<p>Closing Session: Large Jail Network Agenda</p>
--

Mike O'Toole, Chief, NIC Jails Division

The National Institute of Corrections Jails Division is committed to facilitating information exchange and technology transfer in the areas identified by the members of the Large Jail Network. Current plans are to convene three network meetings during fiscal year 1991, to provide technical assistance when possible, and to continue to publish the *Large Jail Network Bulletin*. An extra unbound copy of each future issue of the *Bulletin* will be sent to network members to facilitate its duplication and internal dissemination to staff.

Based on participants' feedback at this meeting, future meetings will be conducted in a similar format: a one and one-half day agenda composed of approximately four topics to be addressed through presentations and small and large group discussions. Approximately thirty-five participants will be invited to each meeting so that administrators from each member jurisdiction will be able to attend one or two meetings.

Because a primary purpose of the meetings is to establish a dialogue among administrators of large jail systems, attendance at the meetings will be limited to sheriffs or appointed directors of corrections in member jurisdictions or their designated detention chiefs.

Topics for discussion at future gatherings will be selected from a list of priority topics generated at this meeting. A list of proposed topics follows. As was done prior to this meeting, members will be contacted and asked to choose the issues of greatest importance to them.

In addition to suggesting these topics for discussion, participants mentioned several issues for consideration regarding the network itself:

- Explore the networks power as a group, for example, for purchasing, standardizing operations, making policy statements, or communicating.
- Review the possibility of having off-site visits or holding meetings at facilities with special areas of expertise.
- Focus on expanding the group.
- Use the network for personnel exchanges (job banks).

Participants commented that the network process is important to them personally and professionally. As much as possible, the National Institute of Corrections will continue to foster these exchanges.

Proposed Topics for Future Network Meetings

1. Public policy, the media, and public relations
 - Developing a mission statement for corrections
 - Educating the public and the legislatures
 - Managing the media
2. Crowding strategies-external
 - Managing the politics of corrections/developing a program for local political issues
 - Home incarceration programs: operations, advantages/disadvantages, future directions
 - Working with the judicial branch regarding corrections
 - Intermediate sanctions
3. Crowding strategies-internal
 - Staff training for overcrowding and for isolation in newer jail designs
 - Managing crowded jails
 - Developing group recommendations for "crowding" standards
4. Resource management and jail operations
 - Developing exemplary projects
 - Controlling the internal budget: staffing needs
 - Management strategies
 - Training techniques with limited resources
 - Handling budget reviews: assessing whether money is well managed
 - Supervisor training for emergencies
 - Using study teams to analyze needs/problems/issues, e.g., medical, food, costs
5. Public/private sector relationships
 - Privatizing jail facilities: total or partial (discussion within network, without vendors)
 - Public/private combinations/initiations
 - Assessing contract services
 - Using county vs. private sector medical services
 - Recruitment techniques (obtain information from private industry)
6. Program issues
 - Mental health management issues
 - Policy statement on inmate programs
 - Information exchange regarding programs
7. Legal issues and liability
 - Insurance needs
 - Medical issues
 - Remedies
 - Consent decrees/agreements
8. New technology
 - Overview of new technologies, e.g., video imaging, robotics
 - Design and construction issues from user's perspective

Appendix I

Participant List

Tom Allison, Orange County Corrections Division
P.O. Box 4970, Orlando, FL 32802
(407) 648-3273

Terry Baker
Dallas County Sheriffs Department
LB 31, 133 N. Industrial, Dallas, TX 75207
(214) 653-2601

David Bosman, Pima County Sheriffs Department
P.O. Box 910, Tucson, AZ 85702
(602) 740-2848

Barbara Bostick, Baltimore City Jail
401 East Eager St., Baltimore, MD 21202
(301) 396-5219

Richard Bryce, Ventura County Sheriff's Department
800 South Victoria Ave., Ventura, CA 93009
(805) 654-2383

Robert Ciulik, Los Angeles County Sheriffs Department
441 Bauchet Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012
(213) 974-4901

Ray Coleman, King County Department of Adult Detention
500 5th Ave., Seattle, WA 98104
(206) 296-1269

Thomas Dever, Fairfax County Sheriffs Office
10520 Judicial Drive, Fairfax, VA 22030
(703) 246-4432

William Godfrey, Alameda County Sheriffs Department
5325 Broder Blvd., Dublin, CA 94586
(415) 272-6872

Charles Felton, Pinellas County Corrections Bureau
14400 49th St., North, Clearwater, FL 35622
(813) 530-6336

Charles Foti, Orleans Parish Criminal Sheriff's Office
2800 Gravier St., New Orleans, LA 70119
(504) 827-8557

Joe Payne, Jefferson County Corrections
600 W. Jefferson St., Louisville, KY 40202
(502) 588-2167

Frank Hall, Santa Clara County Department of Correction
180 West Hedding St., San Jose, CA 95110-1772
(408) 299-4005

Charles Kozakiewicz, Allegheny County Jail
440 Ross St., Pittsburgh, PA 15219
(412) 255-0100

Mark Kellar, Harris County Sheriff's Department
1301 Franklin Street, Houston, TX 77002
(713) 221-6067

Jerry Krans, Orange County Sheriffs Department
550 North Flower St., Santa Ana, CA 92702
(714) 647-1802

Lonnie Lawrence, Dade County Correction & Rehabilitation Dept.
1500 N.W. 12th Ave., Suite 722, Miami, FL 33130
(305) 547-7385

Wayne Melton, DeKalb County Sheriff's Department
3630 Camp Circle, Decatur, GA 30032
(404) 294-2405

Charles Megerman, Jackson County Department of Corrections
1300 Cherry St., Kansas City, MO 64106
(816) 881-4231

Fred Oliva, Denver Sheriffs Department
P.O. Box 1108, Denver, CO 80201
(303) 375-5656

Carol James Richardson, New York City Department of Corrections
60 Hudson Street, New York City, NY 10013
(212) 266-1120

John Schweitzer, Multnomah County Sheriffs Department
1120 S.W. 3rd Ave., Room 307, Portland, OR 97204
(503) 248-5088

John Simonet, Denver Sheriffs Department
P.O. Box 1108, Denver, CO 80201
(303) 375-5650

Tom Slyter, Multnomah County Sheriffs Department
1120 S.W. 3rd Ave., Room 307, Portland, OR 97204
(503) 248-5088

Pat Sullivan, Arapahoe County Sheriffs Department
5686 S. Court Place, Littleton, CO 80120
(303) 795-4711

Dorothy Way, Escambia County Corrections Division
P.O. Box 17789, Pensacola, FL 32522
(904) 436-9814

Thomas White, Connecticut Department of Corrections
340 Capitol Avenue, Hartford, CT 06106
(203) 566-3717

Ken Wigginton, San Diego County Sheriff's Department
222 West "C" St., San Diego, CA 92101
(619) 531-3311

Guests

Karen Fisher, L.I.S., Inc./NIC Information Center
1790 30th St., Suite 130, Boulder, CO 80301
(303) 939-8877

Ed Meachum, L.I.S., Inc./NIC Information Center
1790 30th St., Suite 130, Boulder, CO 80301
(303) 939-8877

Hardy Rauch, American Correctional Association
8025 Laurel Lake Court, Laurel, MD 20707
(301) 206-5100

Anthony Trivisono, American Correctional Association
8025 Laurel Lake Court, Laurel, MD 20707
(301) 206-5100

Cory Whitmore, L.I.S., Inc./NIC Information Center
1790 30th St. Suite 130, Boulder, CO 80301
(303) 939-8877

National Institute of Corrections Staff

Wayne Huggins, Director, National Institute of Corrections
320 1st St., NW, Washington, DC 20534
(202) 307-3106

NIC Jails Division Staff

1790 30th St., Suite 440, Denver, CO 80301
(303) 939-8866
Jim T. Barbee
Richard Geaither
Dee Halley
Ginny Hutchinson
Patti Lanier
Mike O'Toole
Jim Robertson
Tracey Vessels

