

HV
8335
.A74
1976

AREA CORRECTIONAL CENTERS

Preliminary Study

Full
7/20/79



PREPARED FOR:

IOWA CRIME COMMISSION

IOWA DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL
SERVICES - LIBRARY
Lucas Building
Des Moines, Iowa 50319

WINTER 1979

PREPARED BY

Iowa Crime Commission's Committee
On Area Correctional Facilities

PREFACE

This report is being presented for use by committees and members of the Iowa Legislature, members of the Iowa Crime Commission and citizens of Iowa who are interested in encouraging improvement of the present jailing system and the present correctional system. The two are definitely inter-related and should be examined together.

During the preparation of this report and through discussions with people interested in the problem before us, it becomes obvious that there is a general lack of understanding of either system and a more serious lack of understanding of how they relate to one another and the total criminal justice system.

The attached information is actually dealing with two processes within one system, namely the housing process and the corrective process. The proposed concept came about when the housing process (jailing) began facing critical needs and the corrective process (corrections) began developing community based programs. The report intends to support the relationship between the two processes. Unfortunately, it is easier to present cold figures when discussing spaces and costs than it is to present figures about people and indirect costs. Consequently, this report may appear to place a greater emphasis upon the brick and mortar when, in fact, the emphasis must be placed upon people and programs to decrease the need and high cost of brick and mortar. The authors apologize for not

II

clearly breaking out both processes but perhaps the mixing of the two is the only way to emphasize the relationship which exists. The result desired is truly a service center, which includes appropriate programming toward corrective goals and appropriate housing for only those who need to be removed from the community.

More data and facts concerning the problem are being compiled and will be used in post-legislative planning. A volume equal to a large city directory would be required if all details were included in this report. As will be mentioned later, planning to this point has been pre-legislative and to realize the benefits of the area correctional center concept, a great deal of post-legislative planning and community involvement will be necessary.

OUTLINE

	PAGE
SECTION I. GENERAL INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose and Background of Report	
Identification of Problem: National	
Identification of Problem: State and Local	
Alternatives	
Committee's Recommendations	
SECTION II. THE AREA CORRECTIONAL CENTER CONCEPT	30
Introduction	
Purpose of the Center Concept	
Definition of Functional Units	
Operational Functions of the Center Complex	
Anticipated Results and Benefits	
Community Based Treatment Programs	
SECTION III. A STATE-WIDE PROJECTION	60
Introduction	
Long Range Plan	
Short Range Plan	
SECTION IV. THREE PROPOSED PILOT PROJECTS	64
Introduction	
Region One - Council Bluffs (Pottawattamie)	
Region Two - Des Moines (Polk)	
Region Three - Dubuque (Dubuque)	
SECTION V. LEGISLATIVE REQUESTS	76
Enabling Legislation	
Appropriation Necessary for Pilot Projects	

SECTION I

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF REPORT

Prior to the reading and interpretation of any portion of this report, the reader should be aware of the background leading to it's existence and should understand fully the intent of the report. Any interpretation without this understanding is likely to lend to the confusion, misunderstanding and mistrust which has continued to exist since the first mention of regional jails or area correctional facilities.

Growing concern for the crime problem, law enforcement needs, problems in the courts, coupled with general concern for human rights and problems, led to an increased public awareness of long ignored elements of the criminal justice system; the confinement and correction of persons housed in city, county and state institutions. Iowa was not unique in this area. Citizens requested that city and county jails be inspected and required to meet certain minimum standards of operation and supervision. State institutions were realizing that most of its residents were individuals who had spent considerable time in city and county jails. Programs at state institutions were being developed to place individuals in less expensive programs located in the communities. High cost increase in institution programs did not appear to produce a proportionately higher success rate. Generally all systems appeared to be failing and caught up in a never-ending cycle.

Jail inspection resulted in the closing of several jails with many others restricted in usage. Requests to the Iowa Crime Commission for Federal funds to assist in remodeling or rebuilding individual jails were increasing while certain authorities were requesting the establishment of an area correctional facility (regional jail) system. It became apparent that before either plan was pursued too far, an investigation of the alternatives was of paramount importance and that a decision was soon necessary to avoid expensive duplication of services, facilities and resources.

The Iowa Crime Commission elected to appoint a committee to objectively explore the alternatives and to present its recommendations to the Iowa Crime Commission.

The committee is not proposing that the enclosed report suggests a panacea to the crime problem or to the correction problem. Nor does the committee intend to conduct a witch hunt and suggest there are simple and unexcusable reasons for the complex problems that exist. But the committee does recognize that the problems exist and that before we duplicate mistakes of existing systems, careful study of those systems must take place and well thought out decisions must be made in an attempt to avoid the same mistakes of the past.

It should also be made clear that the committee is well aware of difficulties that exist in the major remodeling of traditional institutions as well as the opposition which resists this remodeling. There appears to be a general agreement that the present systems, both at the local and state level, have not been successful at keeping people out of the criminal justice system. There is, however, a definite lack of understanding concerning the relationship between the local crime problem and the local and state corrections systems. The major areas of contention seem to be - what should be done and who should do it.

This committee would like to make clear at the onset, that this proposal is not intended to support the simple overlay of another system upon the already cumbersome complex of systems and services. It should also be pointed out, particularly in the area of maximum security. It becomes obvious that in some cases construction may be necessary because suitable facilities do not exist. It is also likely that due to the endorsement of an increased use of human resources for corrections, at the local level, monies for these resources will be required.

✓ If local and state agencies lay aside their feelings of mistrust for one another, their concern for personal inconvenience, and their fears that roles may require changing, this committee is

confident that a system can be developed which incorporates existing facilities, services, systems and resources. Such a cooperative effort should result in a system which is more efficient and more effective in dealing with the problems that exist. Human resources in the community must be mobilized, for the community is the source of the problems in question. If public agencies and governmental bodies refuse to come to grips with the real issues, unnecessary building and duplication of services will be the result and positive impact on the crime problem will be minimal.

It is clear that some of the recommendations may appear idealistic and may not address themselves to the real world. This report is not intended to be final in terms of how a system must operate. It is primarily a pre-legislative report with suggestions for implementation following legislative approval. Time did not allow for the involvement of all agencies and resources at this time. Details for operation must be worked out later.

The purpose of the report is to seek the vehicle to allow for the post-legislative development. Plans must be flexible and allow for errors in judgment. Mistakes must be tolerated. Problems are too complex to expect all answers at this stage. This report is offered with the faith that complex solutions are possible through a unified public effort to combat an equally complex problem.

IDENTIFICATION OF PROBLEM: NATIONAL

During the past five years, the conditions and effectiveness of local and state correctional systems have been questioned repeatedly by present and past Presidents and numerous public officials and private citizens. The "Corrections" system; which includes jails, prisons, juvenile institutions and probation and parole; is the segment of the total criminal justice system of which the public sees and knows the least. The institutions responsible for housing approximately one-third of the corrections population are situated for the most part, in remote rural areas, or in the basements of police stations or court houses. The other two-thirds are on probation or parole and generally invisibly dispersed in the community. Corrections is not only difficult to see; traditionally, society has been reluctant to look at it.

This apparent invisibility runs counter to the systems size, complexity and importance to the control of crime. On any given day in 1965, corrections were responsible for approximately 1.3 million offenders. In the course of a year, it handled nearly 2.5 million admissions, and spent over one billion dollars in doing so. If it could have restored all or even most of those people to the community as responsible citizens, America's crime rate would have dropped significantly.

It is projected that by 1975 the average daily population in

corrections will increase to more than 1.8 million, with 588 thousand being juveniles, 482 thousand misdemeanants and 771 thousand adult felons. The juvenile system and the parole and probation systems will be the most hard pressed due to the rapid increase in the number of young people in the population and the trend toward probation or early parole rather than prolonged confinement.

In 1967 the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice presented its report entitled "Task Force Report; Corrections". This report indicates that in 1965 there was an average daily population in jails and other local correctional institutions of 141,303 persons. Operating expenditures for these institutions totaled \$147,794,214, or an average cost per person per year of \$1,045. Projections for 1975 indicate an average daily population in these same facilities of 178,000 people. Based on the same per person cost, total operating expenditures for that year will be \$186,221,000.

Prior to this time very little sound information and statistics on the various institutions of the criminal justice system were available. Few state law enforcement officials could say how many or what kinds of jails existed in their state. To correct the situation, the National Criminal Justice Statistical Center took a census of the jails throughout the country and are now in the process of

completing their report. Preliminary results indicate that there are a total of 4,021 locally and administered jails with 48 hour detention authority. Of that total, 3,300 are in cities or counties with less than 25,000 population. As of March 15, 1970, a total of approximately 153,000 adult and 7,800 juveniles were confined in the nations jails. The census will provide data on other situations or conditions of the jails, but tabulations and analysis of the results are not completed at this time. It appears however, that current figures pointed out by this census seem to support the projections made in the earlier report by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice.

Misdemeanant corrections or the local jails, developed as a locally administered system because the misdemeanants, less serious offenses and shorter sentences usually made the greater security of most state prisons unnecessary, and transfer to distant facilities inconvenient. Local facilities were generally run by the local law enforcement personnel, since in most cases they were the only ones in a position to do the job of running the security institution. These authorities also, in most cases, had the responsibility of locking up suspects pending trial.

The organization and management system of the jails remains today almost exclusively a local concern. The national survey shows that the jails are overwhelmingly a county or county-city function. Most

jails continue to be operated by law enforcement officials. The basic police mission of apprehending offenders usually leaves little time, commitment or expertise for the development of rehabilitative programs, although notable exceptions demonstrate that jails can indeed be settings for correctional treatment. The survey also pointed out that many law enforcement officials, particular those administering large and professionalized forces, have advocated transfer of jails to correctional control. There are examples throughout the United States of jailing systems that are administered primarily by the state; such as Alaska, which is administered by the Youth and Adult Authorities; Connecticut which has a system administered by the State Jail Administration; Rhode Island, by the Department of Social Welfare and Vermont's Department of Corrections just recently took over the operation of the jails in their state. A number of states throughout the country, such as North Dakota and Minnesota are presently in the process of developing plans for a regional jail system either administered by the state or administered by multi-county governmental bodies.

In a national survey presented, it was revealed in 1965 that over one-third of the nation's jails had been built more than 50 years ago. And another one-half were built between 25 and 50 years ago. It was also reported that plans for adding about 47,000 new beds to the current capacity or an over-all increase of nearly 25%, were

being made. Capital outlay for the planned construction for the year 1975 were expected to be in the neighborhood of \$471,000,000. It was clearly pointed out, however, that in view of the age of the current institutions most of these facilities being planned would simply serve as a replacement for the obsolete ones. Therefore, it is very unlikely that by 1975 there will be sufficient bed space for the number of prisoners projected for that year. Institutions that are now over-crowded will even be more so unless there is a definite reversal of the present trends in the incarceration of offenders.

Very little money is actually spent in the community programs which are again dealing with misdemeanants in corrections. Of the total operating cost of corrections in the United States, only 2.9% of this cost is devoted to the community correction aspect of misdemeanants corrections, populations of which is 15.7% of the total number of persons in the correctional system.

In the area of adult felony corrections, particularly at the institution level, a definite contrast is notable. The average daily population in 1965 at adult correction institutions generally operated by the state totaled 221,597 people. This amounted to 7.3% of the total correctional population. However, the annual operating cost of these institutions amounted to \$435,594,500 or 43.3% of the total operating cost of the correctional system in the United States. The paradox lies in the contrast between the percentage of persons

housed in the adult correctional institutions, or adult felony correctional institutions as opposed to the percentage housed in misdemeanor correctional facilities and the inequities that exists in the expenditures of these two elements of the correctional system. The difference in cost distribution can be accounted for by the difference in the number of employees required to operate the various units of the two elements. Of all the employees involved in corrections, 42.8% devote their time to institutional programs for adult felons while only 15.8% of the total number of persons in corrections devote their time to institutions for misdemeanor corrections.

Other interesting contrasts can be shown if we look at the number of people served by correctional institutions which include juveniles, adult felons and misdemeanants and the amount of money expended for those services as opposed to the number of individuals served in the community and the amount of money expended for these services. Of the total correctional population on any given day, 33.2% are housed in the institutions while 80.5% of the total operating costs of the correctional system are devoted to these institutions. This leaves 66.8% of the population located in the community with only 19.5% of the total operating costs devoted to these particular programs. It is true that many of the individuals located in the institutions are then transferred to the community

programs through parole systems. However, the figures tend to support the need for an increase in the number of community based programs as opposed to the expensive operation of correctional institutions. It appears to be logical that the expensive institutions should be maintained only for those who cannot be served in any other way which is less expensive per person. If a person would examine the dollars actually spent on direct "corrective services", the contrast would be even greater.

Dr. Daniel Glaser of Rutgers University makes it quite clear in his book entitled "The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System" that a definite relationship exists between a number of times a person has been convicted of felony type offenses and the chance of success. Simply stated, the study supports the logical assumption that the more times a person is sentenced and the younger the person is when this occurs, the greater the chances of failure. It seems logical to follow that the greater emphasis for treatment must be placed at the community level in an attempt to get at the younger, first and second offenders. Only then can a reversal in the crime problem take place. Studies also indicate that approximately 75% of the crimes are committed by individuals with prior convictions. Juvenile programs have generally been underfunded and understaffed. Once a person is convicted as an adult misdemeanor or felon and placed in a jail, very little effort is made toward correction until

crimes are committed often enough or serious enough to warrant a prison or reformatory sentence.

It was pointed out in the Task Force Report mentioned earlier, that in large, the success of correctional innovations at any level depends upon the strengthening of the correctional resources at the intake stage of a person's involvement with the criminal justice system. On the knowledgeable diagnosis and disposition of offenders depends the success or failure of treatment. Police prosecutors and courts should work with correctional agencies to develop procedures permitting maximum use of correctional expertise in intake decisions. Corrections itself must expand research into offender classification and diagnostic methods and undertake extensive improvement in jails and detention facilities.

Improvements in the correctional aspects of intake will require the investment of funds substantially beyond current levels. It will also require a vastly expanded leadership role for the states. In many local jurisdictions the size of the population will warrant development of full correctional intake facilities and services. In many areas with smaller populations it will be impractical to maintain all of the specialized personnel and facilities required for a fully operative correctional intake program. Here the only practical solution appears to be through state sponsorship of services on a regional contract arrangement with public and private agencies.

On November 13, 1969 President Richard M. Nixon listed 13 specific concerns in the field of corrections. He stated: "19 out of every 20 persons who were sent to prison eventually returned to society. What happens to them while they are in confinement is a tremendously important question for our country." President Nixon's concern is equally applicable to what happens in our jails. Confinement for 30 days in jail is not the solution to the problem. Many sentenced misdemeanants are returning again and again to our jails.

The President noted a high national recidivism rate and pointed to evidence that indicate our institutions actually compound crime problems, by bringing young delinquents into contact with experienced criminals. Among President Nixon's concerns was that a great number of existing city and county jails are antiquated and overcrowded. Correctional experts believe that the local jail concept should be replaced with a comprehensive community oriented facility which would bring together a variety of detention efforts, adult and juvenile court diagnostics, treatment programs, both for those who are incarcerated and for those who are on supervisory release, and the half-way house concept.

The following comments from the Corrections Task Force from the President's Crime Commission provide some appropriate observations on the role of the community in the correctional process:

"The general underlying premise for the new directions in

corrections is that crime and delinquency are symptoms of failures and disorganization of the community as well as of the individual offenders. In particular, these failures are seen as depriving offenders of contact with institutions that are basically responsible for assuring the development of lawabiding conduct.....

The tasks of corrections, therefore, includes building or rebuilding solid ties between the offender and the community, integrating, reintegrating the offender into community life - restoring family ties, obtaining employment and education, securing in the larger sense a place for the offender in the routine functioning of society... This requires not only efforts directed toward changing the individual offender, which has been almost the exclusive focus of rehabilitation, but also mobilization and change of the community and its institutions."

In summarizing the Federal picture of corrections the President's Task Force made recommendations in its 1967 report. Some of these recommendations are as follows:

1. Federal and State governments should finance the establishment of model, small-unit correctional institutions for flexible, community-oriented treatment.
2. All institutions should be run to the greatest possible extent with rehabilitation a joint responsibility of staff and inmates. Training of correctional managers and staff should reflect this mode of operation.
3. Graduated release and furlough programs should be expanded. They should be accompanied by guidance and coordinated with community treatment services.
4. Seperate detention facilities should be provided for juveniles. All jurisdictions should have shelter facilities outside the correctional system for abandoned, neglected

or run-away children.

5. Whenever possible persons awaiting trial should be housed and handled separately from offenders.
6. Screening and diagnostic resources should be strengthened at every point of significant decision making. Jurisdictions should classify and assign offenders according to needs and problems, giving separate treatment to all special offender groups when this is desirable. They should join together to operate joint regional facilities or make use of neighboring facilities on a contract basis when necessary to achieve these ends.
7. Local jails and misdemeanor institutions should be integrated to state correctional systems. They should not be operated by law enforcement agencies, but rehabilitative programs and other reforms should be instituted.
8. Correctional authorities should develop more extensive community programs for providing special, intensive treatment as an alternative to institutionalization for both juveniles and adult offenders.
9. Parole and probation services should be available in all jurisdictions for felons, juveniles and those adult misdemeanants who need or can profit from community treatment.
10. Probation and parole services should make use of volunteers and sub-professional aides in demonstration projects in

regular programs.

11. Substantial service purchase funds should be made available to probation and parole agencies for use in meeting imperative needs of individual offenders that cannot otherwise be met.

IDENTIFICATION OF PROBLEM: STATE

The situation in Iowa is quite a bit similar to the national picture. But two major factors allow for improvement of the corrections system with a great deal less difficulty than would be the case in many other states. They are; (1) a relatively stable population and (2) ample bed space in most parts of the state. Overcrowded jails and rapidly increasing populations are inhibiting factors in correction reform. Iowa is experiencing a shift in population which tends to enhance the possibility of a major correctional system overhaul.

Existing systems in Iowa include locally operated detention facilities, state facilities for adults and juveniles and adult and juvenile probation and parole administered by county and state agencies. All agencies receive products of the communities and it is unfortunately true, that the greater the distance between product and the producer, the easier it becomes for the community to forget the product and ignore the reason for that product. This distance is achieved not only by miles, but by isolative attitudes. Neither system will have much chance of success without the communities awareness of the problem, and willingness to accept partial responsibility.

In 1970 nearly 1,800 adults were confined in state correctional institutions with a total institution budget of more than \$6,500,000.

These figures do not reflect probation and parole services or state administrative costs.

As of June 30, 1970, the state was supervising 1,648 probation and parole cases. Costs for these services were approximately 10% of the total institutional budget or one dollar per day per person supervised. Actual costs are even less when an individual's earning power and spending capabilities in the community are considered.

Cost estimates for local systems were difficult to estimate due to the mixing of facilities and services. Conservative estimates would show jail costs at approximately \$5.00 per day while actual costs are much higher when salaries, utilities and services are included.

In 1969, a total of 26,218 prisoners were held in county jails for a total of 158,843 days. Applying the \$5.00 per cost figure to this total, results in a minimum operation cost of \$794,215. In 1970, total days of jail confinement were 175,712. Jails are inexpensive in the short run but expensive institutions are necessary partially due to low investment at the early stages of criminal behavior. The unwillingness to invest wisely which could result in a net savings is not the sole responsibility of the sheriffs or the local jurisdictions operating the jails. Taxpayers are making the short-sighted investment. Local and state officials are simply

charged with handling this investment.

Carefully examine the following facts and comparisons:

1. As high as 95% of all persons confined in state institutions, have served sentences in county jails, 70% serving at least one jail sentence for thirty days or more and 75% spending time as misdemeanants.
2. There were at least 2,400 county jail beds with an average daily population of 585 persons in 1969.
3. In 1969 2,526 juveniles spent a total of 8,619 days in county jails.
4. If we assume a \$4,000 annual income loss for those adults held in jails, basic direct loss to the economy is approximately \$2,340,000 per year. Every 10% decrease in idle jail population is equivalent to \$234,000. Tax loss amounts to \$34,200 for each 10%.
5. Welfare payments to families with fathers in prison in Iowa amount to \$100,000 per month or \$1,200,000 per year. For every 10% diverted from this category to a self-supporting individual produces a savings of \$120,000 per year. The latter figure reflects only 50 families.
6. Based upon an average state institution cost of \$4,000 per year per inmate any positive impact on future institution populations, will in theory result in a net savings in institution cost. Savings will not be equivalent to the per

person cost since a lower population will result in a higher person cost. Long range results will be a savings, however.

7. Idle time spent by adult males in jails in 1969 was equivalent to 428 years.
8. It is estimated that 43 counties need improved jailing facilities which will require major remodeling or replacement.
9. Many of the facilities that would be closed in the near future could perhaps remain open with minor remodeling if needed for short-term holding only.
10. There are an increasing number of non-correctional resources in most communities which could be mobilized in an effort to create a program for the reintergration of misdemeanants and felons into the community.
11. Limitations on local financing prohibit the attainment of the corrections objective in the vast majority of Iowa counties on a county by county basis or a multi-county basis.
12. Sheriffs offices are seen primarily as law enforcement officers and with the increased responsibility connected with that role, they should be allowed to devote more time and money in carrying out that responsibility.
13. Under the present jail inspection program, 10 jails are closed or ordered closed while 8 are restricted for various reasons.

14. Construction costs in the area of maximum security can be as high as \$15,000 to \$20,000 per person.
15. Approximately 75% of crimes are committed by persons with prior convictions.
16. Figures indicate that 75% of confined offenders are not considered dangerous and do not require continuous maximum security confinement.
17. Over \$60,000,000 is spent each year in Iowa for the apprehending, conviction and confinement of law breakers. Less than 10% of this is spent on personnel and programs relating to retraining offenders to become contributing members of our society.

The central idea of imprisonment of any kind is not to simply carry the individual at public expense, but to help him toward responsible self-direction. The fact that he is jailed calls our attention to his irresponsible behavior. Society has been momentarily forced to physically hold the prisoner, stopping socially destructive behavior. Instead of freeing him after the passage of time so that he might again require this close support, it is in his best interest as well as the interest of society to help the offender back to responsible behavior, to help find a way to increase his capacity for self-support.

ALTERNATIVES

The problems have been identified, realities concerning costs of a system which is not working have been pointed out, and hopefully there is an increase in the awareness of the relationships between; (1) the small investment in corrections at the community level and the high cost of institution operation, (2) what is not carried on at the early stages of criminal activity and what is required later, (3) lack of community concern and involvement and the resulting problems and expenses and (4) all segments of the criminal justice system and the crime problem.

The following presents the three major alternatives. There are several variations of each which are discussed later. Some have been tried, some have failed in the past and others are being proposed or attempted by several states. It becomes obvious when examining the alternatives, that a few are variations of the past while a few lend themselves to sound and logical programming for the future.

Alternative One

Reconstruct the county jail system on a county by county basis. It is likely that all cost would be borne by the individual counties. Replacement cost estimates have ranged from 25 to 83 million dollars, over the next ten years. These figures undoubtedly include sheriffs offices or other facilities so actual cost is probably closer to 45

million dollars. These costs would not, however, include much more than construction with little consideration given to programs.

Reconstruction would result in a massive overbuilding due to the decreasing population in nearly 80% of Iowa's counties. Some authorities continue to project space needs at three times current requirements, even though the decreases exists.

Alternative Two

Establishment of a regional jail with no attempt to increase corrective services would result in a total cost less than alternative one due to the pooling of jail populations. The margin needed to allow for population fluctuation would not as great as needed on a county by county basis.

Regional facilities could be established voluntarily or be required by statute. Several states have had statutes allowing for regionalization of jails, but few have made the effort. A voluntary development tends to result in a hodge-podge of programs and systems with no indication toward improvement of services. An overbuilding is still likely due to the fact that many counties insist on operating separate jails.

The Legislature could require the establishment of a state-operated jail system to totally replace all county jails. The system could result in new facilities in eleven to sixteen major cities. Costs

would run high and would result in a duplication of facilities. The absence of a cooperative effort would tend to further isolate the offender from the community and would not be conducive to the efficient use of community resources. It would probably add the polarization of major elements of criminal justice system.

Alternative Three

Local correctional facilities could be developed in conjunction with local or regional jails. The chances of each county developing a corrective service program are slight due to small jail populations and/or the lack of funds or resources at the local level.

A cooperative effort is the most likely to occur if the correctional process is accepted as a necessity to curb the ever-increasing problem. Existing facilities would be utilized when feasible and maximum benefit would be derived from community resources and services. The resulting system would minimize new construction and keep full-time staff to a minimum.

Costs of such a system would be concentrated on people and programs, not brick and mortar. A fully operational system, based upon current total jail populations only and present costs, the total cost of operation would be approximately \$2,190,000 per year. This may appear high but the figure does not reflect anticipated impact on the total criminal justice system and does not reflect the large

number of people served during the year. Nor does the figure reflect the total cost savings to the local jurisdictions.

Summary Comments

Any of the alternatives will cost money and all will produce some problems. But the State of Iowa must make a decision soon. The decision makers must clearly view the facts as they are and must carefully examine the true economic picture, not only in terms of two or five years from now, but in terms of ten or twenty years.

The three major alternatives may be varied by specifying who has total or partial administrative and financial responsibility. To what extent services are offered is also variable. These questions are important but should not stand in the way of objective decision making.

The opposition to corrective processes based upon short-run economics is not sound opposition. The fact that risk is involved is obvious. But it should be equally obvious that a \$5,000 investment at age 18 or 19 or early in a criminal career may divert a cost of \$5,000 per year for ten years at a later point in time.

The committee is making recommendations on what should be done and how it could be done. The major concern is that someone must do it. If counties can afford it and will assure that it will be carried

through, no objections will be raised. But action must be taken by someone and it is felt that proposed system would allow for the most flexible, efficient and effective plan. We simply cannot afford to continue being unable to afford it.

COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS

After examination of the alternatives available to the citizens of Iowa, it is this committee's recommendations that an area approach to the jailing process should be tried on a pilot basis. In addition, emphasis should be placed on providing correctional programming at the community level so that "jails" can be kept to a minimum size. A comprehensive change in the total correctional process is needed immediately with major impact at the local level.

Specific recommendations are based upon a study of existing systems, programs and procedures and it is felt that recommendations are valid. Any suggestions on how to improve upon these recommendations are welcomed. The committee does, however, caution against the debating of minor issues and questions which should be handled administratively, not legislatively.

Major recommendations which the committee feels should be inaugurated legislatively and administratively are as follows:

1. That legislation be enacted allowing for the establishment of area correctional facilities throughout the State of Iowa.
2. That the establishment of said area correctional facilities be the responsibility of the Department of Social Services, Bureau of Adult Correction Services.

3. That the cost of establishing these facilities and all costs of operation be paid from funds appropriated by the General Assembly. The Department of Social Services may accept private and public funds available for this purpose, such as Federal funds available through the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.
4. That the facilities shall serve persons charged and/or convicted of any crimes in counties served by an established center.
5. That any persons sentenced to or confined in state institutions may also be housed and served in an area facility when appropriate for pre-lease planning and adjustment.
6. That suitable holding facilities may continue to operate serving single or combined jurisdictions for periods of confinement not to exceed 72 hours. In some locations or cases transfers may be immediate or within a few hours.
7. That construction be kept to a minimum whenever possible through the incorporation of available facilities.
8. That the facilities shall make use of community services and resources whenever possible and feasible and may contract with private and public agencies for housing and/or services.
9. That transportation and transportation costs to and from a center shall be the responsibility of the center.

10. That a provision be made allowing for the immediate or swift transfer out of jails, those persons charged with intoxication, or drunkenness, to an appropriate and suitable treatment facility.
11. That the center utilize diversion techniques to allow for a minimum number housed full time in traditional and expensive "institution" settings.
12. That the center report progress to the courts and provide supervision and services to probationers and parolees on a jail sentence when determined feasible.
13. That the center cooperate with juvenile authorities at the state and local levels but that confinement be segregated and limited to no more than 48 hours. The center and courts should discourage detention of juveniles in jails or centers and encourage use of other resources and services.
14. That authorities and jurisdictions cooperate in an effort to establish a system which will bring together services and resources to provide an efficient and effective approach to a common, complex and critical problem.

SECTION II

THE AREA CORRECTIONAL CENTER CONCEPT

INTRODUCTION

It is nearly impossible to develop a model of an area correctional system which will apply to all regions within the State. Rather than to attempt such a task, it was felt that it would be much more meaningful to present various elements of a center model and to discuss these elements in general terms. No attempt will be made at this point to identify who would be doing what and how specifically the functions would be carried out. The purpose of this section is however, primarily concerned with the definition of a center complex, its functional units, the operational functions and process, and a projection of anticipated results and benefits.

PURPOSE OF THE CENTER CONCEPT

The basic role and function of the area correctional center is to provide the citizens of Iowa, persons accused or convicted of crimes, the courts, and law enforcement officials, a more efficient and effective criminal justice system from a social and economic standpoint. The successful functioning of the area correctional centers should result in the following:

1. A reduction in crime and the recidivism rate.
2. A lower number of offenders confined in maximum security institutions.

3. A long range reduction in capital expenditures for incarceration.
4. A more effective use of law enforcement officers.
5. A long range reduction in the cost of prisoner maintenance.
6. An increase in the effective use of available resources.
7. Prompt diagnosis, classification and treatment of offenders.

The area correctional center should provide service or housing for a variety of clients. Through the pooling of clients from various counties it is felt that segregation can be provided for juveniles, female offenders, first offenders, and those awaiting trial or sentence. It appears that only through the consolidation of smaller populations, can a sufficient number of persons be reached which will allow for this segregation. Examples of the types of persons that can be served by the center are:

1. Persons serving a jail misdemeanor sentence up to one year.
2. The retention of persons awaiting trial who cannot be released without bond or for whom bond has not been set and those who cannot provide bond.
3. Those who are on Work Release while serving jail sentences.
4. Those persons serving felony sentences up to one year.
5. "Out-patient" type services to probationers, persons out on bond, or those out on their own recognizance.
6. Persons out of correctional institutions on furlough who are in need of housing.

7. Those awaiting final release to parole or discharge from a correctional institution.
8. Those individuals on Work Release from a correctional institution who are either working or attending academic or vocational sessions or applying for employment.
9. Parole and probation services to those who are out before and after receiving a jail sentence for one year or less.

It should be understood that even though the individuals mentioned constitute a large group of people in some regions, many of these individuals will be actually housed in existing half-way houses, or housing units of other agencies in the community as presently being done with Work Release clients from state institutions. The center must be viewed as a complex of services and facilities, not simply one large facility. The total concept is not a complex, administered or operated by one agency. The total concept is an approach or system which involves city, county and state agencies in a combined effort to achieve common goals.

Changes in the total system should encourage changes at the local level, particularly as more citizens become involved with programs, more agencies share services, etc. Examples are:

1. Increased sharing of local facilities rather than continue with highly inefficient use of space.

2. Increased use of alcoholic treatment centers, if available.
3. A higher degree of cooperation between municipal, county, and state law enforcement agencies.

DEFINITION OF FUNCTIONAL UNITS

The following definitions of terms are used to describe the operational function of the area correction center. It was pointed out earlier that it is not an attempt at this point to identify who is actually going to be carrying out the various functions but simply to establish a common base of understanding as to how a center might work. In many cases, one facility, whether it be an existing facility or a new facility, will provide a number of services or carry out several functions.

1. Admitting Center

An admitting center refers to the facility or facilities used within a county where the accused is given a citation, summons, arrested or booked. The admitting center may be part of a holding facility. In many cases this center will be an existing city or county jail.

2. A Short-Term Holding Facility

The term "short-term holding facility" refers to a county or city facility wherein persons accused of a crime are kept in custody for a period not to exceed 72 hours, subsequent to arraignment but prior to the transfer to another

section of the area correctional center complex. A short-term holding facility may also serve as an admitting center, and intermediate holding center in certain localities. The basic purpose for a short-term holding facility is to insure appearance in the community for arraignment and preliminary hearing and to allow time for authorities to make a decision as to appropriate planning and appropriate action.

3. Intermediate Holding Facility

The term "intermediate holding facility" applies to areas where, from a geographical standpoint, it would be practical to have a facility for holding offenders at a geographic halfway point between the short-term holding facility and the area correctional center. This would allow a reduction in traffic in larger areas with a sparsely distributed jail population. These facilities would be primarily for pre-trial detention and work release. The number of such facilities required are few and existing facilities could be used. Services could be provided from the community or by field staff.

4. Intake Function of the Area Center

The term "intake center" refers to a function performed by the major correctional center. All offenders entering the area correctional center will be processed and screened and their case analysis developed through the intake center,

prior to classification and disposition.

An important activity at any facility shall be the gathering of basic information concerning the subject. This will be done only with prior approval of the subject and/or the subject's attorney. The information shall be standardized to a degree and may be collected by a team of volunteers or part-time employees of the center. It will be used in different ways, depending on whether in the person is held, released, or sentenced. Immediate purpose is to determine whether or not there are problems which may be causing immediate anxiety for the subject. Perhaps a phone call to a wife, friend or employer will be all that is necessary to reduce this anxiety.

The information gathered at the time of intake will become part of the persons case file for programming purposes if the individual remains at the center or is transferred to a state institution. But perhaps the most important use will be to assist authorities in determining whether or not the individual is eligible for release on his own recognizance, released on bond, or pre-trial work release. In the event that an individual is found guilty and sentenced, the information may assist the Judge in making a decision as to whether or not he is eligible for probation. Interviews

with the individual, self-administered questionnaires and telephone interviews are methods that may be used in collecting the base information necessary. Some cases may require very little work while other individuals may present a multitude of problems and require a longer period of time and greater amount of work.

5. Alcoholic Treatment Center

The alcoholic treatment center may be a part of the area correctional center, or may be contracted as an independent function. Assignment to and treatment in the alcoholic treatment center will be dependent upon the case history developed after processing through the intake center. Processing should be rapid and allow for swift transfer to an appropriate treatment unit.

6. Post-Conviction Detention

This term refers to a facility wherein certain offenders will be detained under security measures in accordance with the requirements of each individual case. The post-conviction detention facility may be a part of the area correctional center or the service may be provided by a facility with necessary security requirements in the near vicinity.

7. Work and Educational Release

This term refers to persons in custody awaiting trial or serving a sentence who may be released during the daytime to

perform work. Generally speaking, these persons will be expected to return to the facility at night and to pay for transportation and their support in the facility.

8. Probation and Parole

The term "probation" includes offenders who have received sentences to be served in city and county jails and who can be released under a probationary status.

Parolees are those persons serving jail sentences who are released with the approval of the court.

OPERATIONAL FUNCTION OF THE CENTER COMPLEX

Fundamentally, we lock people up who have committed criminal offenses because they are dangerous to themselves or others and to assure their presence for legal proceedings and to serve their sentences. The area correctional concept recognizes that many offenders are not dangerous to themselves or others, that there are various ways in which the offender's presence for legal proceedings can be assured without lock-up, and that serving the sentence under a work release procedure could produce more meaningful results for the offender as well as society. The area correctional center in operation may be described as a working attitude, a willingness to assist offenders in availing themselves of resources already available in the community. The area correctional center coordinates

and makes those services available to the offender needing them.

The operational function of the total area correctional center system is described by the following hypothetical outline of events and procedures, commencing from the time an offender or suspect is apprehended by law enforcement officers.

1. Short-term Holding Facility and/or Admitting Center

When the suspect or offender is apprehended by a town marshal, city police, county sheriff, or a state law enforcement officer, he is transported to the nearest short-term holding facility. The short-term holding facility is under the direct supervision of the local authority responsible for operating that designated facility. Standards presently applied to jails, in terms of facilities and supervision, shall apply to these facilities.

When an offender is arrested and booked, issued a citation or summons, it is essential that he is provided with assistance by a third party or parties.

If the offender is booked and held for arraignment, consideration will be given for release on bond, or release on his own recognizance. After arraignment and preliminary hearing, the offender may be released due to charges being dismissed, released on bond, released on his own recognizance, or the offender may continue to be housed in the area

correctional complex with further processing.

2. Transportation

The area correctional center will provide daily transportation or transportation as required, to each short-term holding facility in the area by use of a bus or van with adequate security provisions. This method of transportation can be effectively used in moving offenders from a short-term holding facility to the area center or returning the offender from the center to the holding facility for hearings, pre-trial counseling, and court proceedings. By the proper scheduling and planning of transportation requirements, offenders can also be transported to maximum security locations, alcoholic, dental, medical and psychiatric treatment facilities and to areas of employment, recreation or education. The question of transportation has been pointed out particularly by county law enforcement officers as a major problem in the operation of area correctional centers. A well conceived and planned transportation program provided by the area correctional center and coordinated with the requirements of each of the short-term holding facilities, can reduce the involvement of local law enforcement officers in the transporting of offenders. Available information and facts indicate that more effective transportation can be provided at less cost.

3. Area Correctional Center

All offenders transferred from short-term holding facilities shall be promptly processed through the intake or receiving section of the area correctional center. The offender's arrival shall be scheduled in advance with the short-term holding facility and a copy of the preliminary evaluation and all other pertinent facts and information shall be forwarded to the center. Upon the offender's arrival at the center, males, females and juveniles will be kept separated and placed in appropriate holding quarters. Routine processing for all offenders shall include the following: completion of regular booking procedures, search, shower, and a basic medical evaluation. A preliminary interview will be conducted as soon as possible to determine if the offender is in need of immediate psychiatric, drug, alcoholic or major medical treatment. If it is determined that the offender requires special treatment in these special areas, he will be transferred to the appropriate facility.

All offenders not requiring immediate special treatment may be processed through a series of in-depth interviews, academic, vocational, aptitude and psychological testing. In performing the diagnostic evaluation and classification of the offender, all available services and resources in the community will be utilized to avoid an excessive staff in the

area center. It should be understood that routine admitting procedures will apply to all persons, however, services which are evaluative or treatment oriented will generally be made or offered on a voluntary basis or if so ordered by the court for those awaiting trial.

Offenders must recognize that committing an offense against another person or the public does not give them the privilege of living a non-productive life supported by society. Self-respect and a sense of responsibility can be rebuilt in many offenders by assisting them in finding suitable employment. When an offender is employed and paying for his board and room at the area correctional center, as well as contributing to the support of his dependents, a feeling of self-esteem and dignity should begin to return. The feeling that someone cares enough to help him rebuild or repattern his life and not isolate him as a misfit from society can be the beginning of a more meaningful existence.

Opportunities for employment of offenders, coordinated by the area correctional centers, has many possibilities. In addition to placing persons in vocational areas where they have already established their skills, assistance can be rendered in developing new skills and knowledge through many existing community programs.

Any person serving a jail sentence in an area correctional facility who interferes by action, behavior or conduct in the programs or climate of the facility may be considered for transfer to a more suitable institution. Considering the safety of the community, the facility should also be allowed to transfer persons who may considered dangerous to themselves or others.

ANTICIPATED RESULTS AND BENEFITS

The role and function of the area correctional center can best be described by setting forth the results which are to be achieved by the area center and the general method or plan for accomplishment. Specific methods or plans for accomplishments should be left to the discretion of those responsible for the administration of the area correctional center.

DESIRED RESULTS

Reduction in crime recidivism

Fewer individuals in confinement

GENERAL PLAN OR METHOD

1. Prompt separation of offenders; male, female, and juvenile.
2. In-depth analysis and classification of the offender and the problem.
3. A specific plan of rehabilitation for each offender covering a broad range of services including educational, vocational, medical, psychiatric, dental, counselling and recreation.

1. By increasing the number of

DESIRED RESULTS

A reduction in capital expenditures for incarceration

Reduction in prisoner maintenance cost

More effective use of law enforcement officers.

GENERAL PLAN OR METHOD

offenders on furloughs, work and educational release, probation, custody of the third party, own recognizance, and revision of our present bail procedure.

1. Building fewer maximum security facilities.
2. A reduction in the total number of jails and state penal institutions.
3. More effective use of present facilities.
4. Combining the jail requirements of a number of counties.
5. Reduction in crime and recidivism by improved correctional programs.
6. Avoiding over-building and duplication of requirements.

1. Reducing the number of offenders in maximum confinement.
2. Improving the ratio of the number of supervisors required to the number of offenders.
3. Utilization of community resources and services.
4. The payment of board and room by an increased number of offenders on work-release.

1. By reducing local law enforcement officers' time involved in prisoner confinement and transportation of prisoners.

The area correctional center coordinates and makes available various community services to offenders in helping them become productive, law-abiding citizens. It involves providing offenders with decent, clean living quarters, recreation, special treatment for drug addiction, alcoholism, mental health, special programs for juveniles, and opportunities for employment with special assistance to each individual in aiding them in their return to a meaningful existence in society.

The purpose of this section is to present many of the benefits found to substantiate the area correction and rehabilitation concept as a positive, practical and effective plan in the field of crime prevention in social rehabilitation.

The concern for benefits should be primarily directed at society in general. Following society, the concern should be for the restraint and/or correction of the offender, in order to either isolate the offender from society or to rehabilitate the offender and return him to society.

Benefits to hired or elected public officials and employers are important, but their importance is secondary to the principle objective of providing maximum benefits to society and to the establishment of a more efficient and effective criminal justice system.

BENEFITS TO SOCIETY (TAYPAYERS)

The adoption of the Area Correction Center concept will, to a large extent, be dependent upon the benefits that may be derived by the public who would be paying for the program. For this reason, it is important to review all of the indirect benefits and savings the area correctional program may develop. Even though the concept is new, there is evidence (See Appendix) that the stated benefits can be realized through community programs and the area concept. Some of the benefits that can be anticipated include:

1. Reduction in Recidivism Rate

Virtually 100% of the offenders receiving jail sentences will return to society. In the past, practically nothing has been done to change these individuals to enable them to adapt and function more effectively within society. Conversely, jail has caused many to increase their antipathy toward and isolation from society. A significant number of those receiving jail sentences in excess of 30 days under our present system can be expected to return to jail or graduate to the penitentiary or reformatory. The majority of all penitentiary inmates have received jail sentences prior to their penitentiary sentence. The area correction center concept will allow the rehabilitation process to start at the first offense rather than at the second or third offense. Under our present system, corrective programs usually do not start until the

offender reaches the penitentiary or reformatory.

2. An Increase in the Number of Offenders that are Actually Placed In Supervisory Custody

There is much concern today regarding the number of offenders that are not incarcerated and who are allowed to return immediately to the community because they received suspended bench paroles with little supervision. Many judges have been hesitant and rightfully so, to send offenders, particularly the young and first offender to jail, because they have felt it would do more harm than good. It is quite probable that because of the improved facilities and additional services that can be provided through the area concept, both the number of and the length of jail sentences will actually be increased. In a poll of about 50% of the district judges in the State of Iowa, 79% indicated that it was possible that the number of bench paroles and probations would decrease under an area correctional system. There appears to be little doubt that the public can expect to see more offenders being served under the area correctional plan than under our present county jail system.

3. Reduction in the Beds Occupied in Existing State Correctional Institutions

It is quite probable that the number of persons housed at the present state institutions will be reduced as the area correctional programs are adopted on a state wide basis. Immediate cost savings will not be as great as long range cost

savings, due to the built-in duplications necessary in implementing new programs. The reduction in number of penitentiary inmates will be derived from two principle sources:

- A. Reduction in recidivism and the historic pattern of jail to penitentiary followed by many jail incarcerations.
- B. Reduction in the number of penitentiary sentences from our district court system as judges utilize the area correctional centers more effectively.

4. Decrease in the Welfare Benefits Paid to Dependents of Prisoners

Only 2.5% of the families who receive ADC benefits have fathers in prison. Although this is a small percentage this does represent about 500 families and the direct cost of about \$100,000 per month for welfare benefits. It is difficult to project actual savings realized due to the question of how much impact the area concept can have upon the prison population. Assuming a decrease of 10% in the number of welfare families represented in prison, this in turn would result in a \$120,000 savings per year to the taxpayers of Iowa, based upon an average welfare cost per family of \$2,400. Some may argue that the participants are increasing generally and therefore such a reduction is meaningless. However, it can also be argued that even a positive effect on the amount

of increase will result in cash savings. In addition, the center will increase the number of prisoners able to lend family support through earnings received from Work Release programs. Hopefully, there will also be the opportunity for prisoners to improve their earning capacity through the development of better work habits and changes of attitudes in training opportunities.

5. Reduction in the Loss of Tax Dollars

In addition to the direct cost of feeding, housing and supervising a prisoner, and sometimes his family, a prisoner makes no contribution to local, county, state or federal governments through income or sales tax. It is estimated that over \$300,000 is lost each year in state sales and income taxes because these men are not productive members of society. Returning a large number of offenders to society who are better prepared to earn a living through honest work will enable them to support governments, rather than receiving support from them.

6. Better Utilization of Rehabilitative Resources and Personnel

Over \$60,000,000 is being spent each year in the State of Iowa for the apprehension, conviction and confinement of people who break our laws. Less than 10% of this total is being spent on personnel and programs relating to retraining offenders to become contributing members of society. It is anticipated

that under the area concept a higher percentage of the criminal justice dollar can be used for rehabilitative programs. The number and cost of the people required for guarding and supervising prisoners can be reduced at one central facility and the facility can be operated much more efficiently than several county jails. The dollar saved can be utilized for trained personnel to work on prisoner rehabilitation. In addition, better use can be made of local and area resources that are not being presently employed in the correctional system at the local level. These include agencies that are presently providing mental health, medical, dental, education, alcohol treatment and drug services.

7. Increased Restitution to Victims of Crimes

Less than 10% of the sentences given to offenders include any provision for reimbursing the victim of the crime for property loss, for damage or for bodily injury. There is quite a practical reason why restitution is not required. The offender seldom is financially able to make restitution and cannot earn money while sitting in jail or prison. Through an increase in Work Release programs that will be possible under the area concept, prisoners will have an opportunity to earn money which could be applied to reimbursing the victim. Should Work Release programs result in future steady gainful employment of the prisoners, payments could

continue after his release from jail.

8. Reduction of Crime

Statistics are not available that set forth the direct cost of crime to the Iowa public in terms of property loss, property damage and bodily injury. There is little question that it costs the people of Iowa several millions of dollars annually and is increasing every year. Furthermore, a dollar value cannot be placed on anguish suffered by many victims.

Thousands of people that have never been actual victims of crime, also suffer from the fear of crime in their own personal safety on the streets or in their homes. Despite increasing investment in criminal justice activities, nothing has been accomplished towards decreasing actual psychological cost of crime. The area correctional concept is the first step toward the actual reduction of crime through more effective treatment of causative factors of crime than the treatment of symptomatic factors.

BENEFITS TO OFFENDERS

Under the proposed area correctional and rehabilitation system the benefits to offenders are many. They must also be viewed as benefits to society, since the ultimate goal of society will be better reached. The rejuvenation and re-education of the offender is essential to restore him to the status of a contributing citizen.

By simply isolating him as a non-contributing "vegetable" in a penitentiary or jail does not usually bring about a penitence or a changed attitude towards his role in society. Dr. Karl Menninger, a noted psychiatrist and eminent writer concerning rehabilitation and correction, made the following observation: "Once the hospital was despised and rejected as the pest house, a place to die in, a stinking horror, a taboo in the civilized community. Today towns and cities alike are proud of their beautiful, efficient hospitals and rely on them as protectors of health. But the jails remain where they have been for centuries, and where the hospitals once were."

The following benefits are a few which are presented as worthwhile reasons for the implementation of the proposed correctional system:

1. Offenders awaiting arraignment or trial may be restrained, in more humane living conditions than presently exist in some areas.
2. Offenders will receive more consideration by both prosecution and defense attorneys, as greater choices will exist for disposition of each individual case.
3. More appropriate sentencing can take place since more options will be available to the court.
4. Offenders can be segregated by age, sex, offense and prior record.
5. The correctional system will generate a feeling of hope, rather than of despair and futility.

6. Offenders qualifying will be able to participate in work and education release programs which have proper supervision.

BENEFITS TO LAW ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL

A few of the benefits to law enforcement personnel are indicated below:

1. Law enforcement personnel will be able to utilize their time more effectively in apprehending offenders, controlling, studying, preventing crime and other necessary functions by operating a limited holding facility instead of a full time jail in many cases.
2. With the implementation of an efficient shuttle service within each area, travel to and from state institutions can be reduced for local officers.
3. With the shuttle service, pick-up and/or delivery of offenders can be within a few hours. This operational detail must be worked out as the system becomes operational.
4. Cost of operating both the centers and local holding facilities can be reduced by the utilization of pre-release personnel, after thorough screening and rehabilitation efforts indicate a sufficient reliability factor.
5. As the system becomes operable and the results start to verify the forecast, the improved recidivism rate will substantially effect the law enforcement officials in a positive and healthy manner.

As one local law enforcement official of many years stated: "This whole area correctional system will really work and pay for itself, if we help it work".

BENEFITS TO JUDICIARY PERSONNEL

Judges, prosecution and defense attorneys generally recognize that correctional centers could assist them in the arriving at the decision of sentencing, because the choice of where to sentence would exist. One attorney stated: "It would provide better criminal justice, even though it may be inconvenient to some of us." An idea expressed several times was that prosecuting attorneys would push harder and more diligently for prosecution if there was a proper place for correction.

Administration of justice would be more uniform, with sentences more compatible with the offenses. Judges would sentence offenders to a center for an appropriate length of time, rather than a short period to an inadequate local jail. One defense attorney commented: "The best way to make a criminal is to send him to the county jail for six months." Longer sentences, and better facilities with rehabilitation services, are favored by many. Another defense attorney commented: "Much of the time, the principal concern of the defense attorney is not proving a man innocent, but trying to get the court to establish a program which will help the client return as a con-

tributing member of society. Area rehabilitation will be a big asset to concerned attorneys. The whole idea of criminal law is to rehabilitate before it is too late."

SUMMARY

The benefits to be derived from the area concept, are principally for society in general, followed by the offenders involved, with residual benefits accruing to public officials in law enforcement, corrections and judicial fields. Instead of assessing the benefits of the planned system with emphasis focused on benefits to public officials, the focus must be transposed. The focal point must be the benefit to the tax paying public and not the tax supported public employee. If the new system can break the pattern of criminal behavior at an earlier age, i.e. juvenile and first offenders, the benefits to society can be of enormous proportions.

Concern for immediate and instantaneous benefits is not practical. To reap the future benefits of reduced crime and the accompanying safer society and reduced operational costs, the initial cost must of necessity be higher than the present unsuccessful correctional system cost. As the new system becomes functional, higher operational costs will prevail until sufficient time has elapsed for the benefits to become evident.

When discussing the concept with public officials as well as citizens,

it becomes apparent there is a strong concern for juveniles and first offenders. This indicates that even though some resistance to the planned centers exists, there is a recognition of the need for improvement in our present system, its significant modification, or an entirely new system. The fact remains, that the present system is acknowledged to be costly and ineffective. There is a need for change, but many are reluctant to give approval of a change that personally inconvenience them. The benefits exist beyond a doubt, but re-education of the public and appropriate officials proposes a great challenge. A change of attitude must be engendered in society, from punitive attitudes towards criminals and potential criminals, to one of rehabilitative and a corrective nature.

COMMUNITY BASED TREATMENT PROGRAMS

Even though there are currently no hard figures indicating the impact of a state-wide community-based correctional system, there are examples of what can be accomplished in terms of reduced cost and higher success rates with offenders. The following discussion will touch on a few of these and also review briefly what is happening in other states.

Fortunately Iowans need not go far to find evidence of what can be done with jailed defendants. The Des Moines Model Neighborhood Corrections Project is a striking example of a major segment of the

area corrections center concept. It is being used as an example or model for other programs throughout the country. Its primary goal has been the selection and safe pre-trial release of defendants jailed, due to the inability to post money bail or to meet "release on recognizance" community stability requirements. The project has been successful in this area with a 98-100% appearance rate and has demonstrated much more. The major points are listed below:

1. Obtain employment for unemployed defendants.
2. Remove defendants from welfare rolls.
3. Significantly reduced jail costs.
4. Alleviated the hardship of innocent defendants.
5. Had a direct impact upon the criminal justice system. Defendants released to the project, compared to a pre-selected control group of comparable non-released defendants, were less likely to be incarcerated subsequent to conviction.
6. Based upon a comparison of project cost and direct savings attributed to the project, the project pays for itself.

The State of Vermont has been operating "regional jails" the past few years with much success. In a discussion with the Vermont director of the center, he pointed out that they are having a significant impact on the jailed offender through community programming. Individuals who in the past would have been expected back in the system, are not returning as frequently.

Recommendations based upon their experience to this point are:

1. The system must emphasize the use of community resources on a contract basis.
2. Transportation must be the responsibility of the center.
3. The system should be state operated.

The programs at the Riverview Release Center at Newton, Iowa are showing significant differences between the success rates of the group involved in community programming for three months or more and those involved in community programming for less than three months. The return rate for the latter group is three times the rate of the first group since March, 1969.

The Work Release Program has been operating in Iowa within the state correctional system since July of 1967. In 1970 308 inmates participated in the program with gross earnings of nearly \$250,000. State and Federal taxes paid totaled \$40,109.05 while \$40,142.46 was contributed for room and board. In Vermont, participants in the work release program at the community correctional centers earned over \$161,000 and paid out \$28,560 for room and board and \$32,383 in state and federal taxes. Complete reports are available from both states.

The state of North Dakota is in the process of establishing ten area correction centers with the major center referred to as a

Human Resource Center. The major center complex will contain Social Services offices, state employment service offices, courts, correctional services and others.

Minnesota is also considering area centers and has a plan before the legislature. Their statutes have allowed for the voluntary establishment of centers for several years but no counties have taken the initiative to do so.

The following is a list of model studies which relate to community based corrections programs and alternatives to incarceration in state and local facilities.

1. The Des Moines Pre-Trial Release Project - 1964-1970, Roger P. Owens, Co-Director, Polk County and the City of Des Moines. The Howley Welfare Foundation.
2. Des Moines Model Neighborhood Corrections Project: Research Evaluation Report Number 1. February 3, 1970 to December 16, 1970. Research Center of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, Davis, California. February, 1971. (Soon to be released)
3. Rehabilitation Orleans Parish Prison, Appendix D., Crisis Clinic. A Project Report Submitted to Louis A. Heyde, Jr., Criminal Sheriff at Orleans Parish, Louisiana. Roger O. Fox, June 1970.
4. The Manhattan Court Employment Project, Vera Institute of Justice Summary Report on Phase One: November 1, 1967 to October 3, 1969.
5. Project Crossroads, Phase I, Final Report, January 15, 1968 - March 15, 1969. The Manpower Administration United States Department of Labor. National Committee for Children and Youth, 1970.

6. Law Advocacy in a New Setting, Report on Para-Professional Work with Inmates in a State Prison, Dixwell Legal Rights Association, Inc., 294 Dixwell Avenue, New Haven, Connecticut 06511, May 1969.
7. Washington State Reformatory M.2. Program - Citizen Advocacy in Prisons.
8. Toward Citizen Advocacy for the Handicapped. Wolf Wolfensberger, Ph.d., Nebraska Psychiatric Institute, University of Nebraska Medical Center, January, 1970.

SECTION III

A STATE-WIDE PROJECTION

INTRODUCTION

Traditionally, major institutions intended for correction and punishment were located in areas which were generally removed from the larger population centers. This removal from resources has contributed to the increased cost in services with the change in direction of the correctional system. The trend toward community involvement has been hampered by the fact that the location of institutions is generally not the major source of an institution's inmates.

In projecting the location of area centers - population, resources, crime rates, employment opportunities and many other factors, must be considered in determining the best location. A basic premise of the concept proposed is to utilize services, resources and facilities currently available in the community whenever possible. Therefore, designated locations do reflect these considerations. Studies conducted by the Office for Planning and Programming support the selected locations. Due to the smaller jail populations in some of the cities, not all sixteen cities recommended by the Office of Planning and Programming were selected. It should also be pointed out that projections are for the maximum number of centers anticipated. Operating the pilot projects for a period of time may result in a number of centers less than projected. Contrary to some persons' beliefs, competent administration is concerned with keeping the over-

all expense to the minimum necessary to do the job properly.

LONG RANGE PLAN

The ultimate goal is to provide service to every jurisdiction in the State through the area correctional system. If plans can begin in 1971 it is anticipated that the entire system can be operational no later than 1980. Remembering the facts that extensive study has not been conducted in all regions and that projections are based upon current jail populations and general population trends, it is projected that no more than eleven centers will be necessary throughout the State.

Centers are expected to be necessary at or near the following locations:

Sioux City	Waterloo
Council Bluffs	Dubuque
Fort Dodge	Cedar Rapids
Des Moines	Davenport
Mason City	Ottumwa
Burlington	

Flexibility should be permitted since in all but the Dubuque, Des Moines and Council Bluffs areas, there is currently adequate bed space for the number of persons presently confined and if the concept can have a positive affect on the jail population, this space should be adequate for many years. Of the centers listed, all but the Des Moines center will directly serve less than 100 persons at any given time. Beds will not be necessary for all persons served

when alternatives are developed. Some centers may be as small as 40 persons but it is anticipated that an average size should be closer to 55 persons to allow for greater effectiveness and efficiency. The smaller centers will obviously not employ a full-time employment of professional staff as many believe. Services in the community will be employed on a contract or voluntary basis.

The Des Moines area center will be the exception to the above in terms of size. Housing may be required for up to 200 persons in the very near future. All are not in need of maximum security, however, so the new facilities would be less expensive if developed according to need. At the time of this writing, alternatives are being developed which may reduce the amount of housing needed to a point where little construction will be necessary.

In several locations good and even new jails are available. These should be utilized whenever possible especially for pre-trial detention and maximum security cases. These facilities should be used even if it may be less convenient for a time to allow for the careful planning and growth of a joint effort. Higher operating expenses initially may avoid unnecessary expensive overbuilding later.

It becomes apparent that cooperation between agencies is most important. Much of the concept could be implemented immediately if full cooperation could be guaranteed.

SHORT RANGE PLAN

Plans for the next biennium include the development of centers in the three areas determined as being the most critical; namely Dubuque, Council Bluffs, and Des Moines.

All three cities are lacking adequate facilities and major construction may be necessary to rebuild adequate "jails". Hopefully, these areas can serve as good test sites for the concept. An attempt should be made, prior to the major reconstruction of an antiquated system, to develop a new approach to reduce the necessity for maximum security facilities.

Enabling legislation and flexible funding should be made available to allow for a meaningful attempt at bringing corrections back to the community. Projects have been established on a small scale in isolated communities throughout the country. Iowa could produce a major breakthrough in the crime problem and institution reform.

Implementation should be gradual and flexible, phasing in services to jurisdictions as the services and resources develop. Results of the short range plan will be difficult to measure since duplication may be expected until the system is "debugged". Agencies should be expected to tolerate errors in judgment and problems in operation. But going through these growing pains at three locations rather than eleven should assist in later development and implementation.

SECTION IV

THREE PROPOSED PILOT PROJECTS

INTRODUCTION

Of the eleven projected areas, three are currently critical in terms of jailing conditions. These are the Dubuque, Polk and Pottawattamie areas. Major jails in all three areas have been closed or ordered closed. Several are expected to need major remodeling or replacement during the next ten years.

It should be re-stated that plans presented are not intended to be final but are simply suggestions on how the system might be developed. Facilities recommended were determined by investigation of available inspection reports and no attempt was made to solicit the support of local officials at this point in time. Therefore, agencies and authorities should not feel the recommendations are intended to imply their involvement in this stage of planning. Sites have not been selected and other alternatives may be suggested by later planning.

Cost projections are based upon current jail populations. Since it is unknown what impact the system can or will have on the numbers confined, it is felt that a flexible plan should be adopted to allow for expansion of services, resources and facilities as the needs are identified. More details are available than presented here but due to the general nature of this report, only major areas are covered.

Community resources were examined and it became apparent that many services that can and should be utilized exist in all counties included in the three pilot regions. Obviously, the greatest concentration of services and service agencies are located in the major metropolitan areas. Many of the services will be available on a volunteer basis, while others will require purchase on a contract basis.

The lists of resources in each category for each area are too lengthy to include in this report, but will be available for post-legislative planning. Types of resources identified include:

1. Educational Resources
2. Mental Health Services
3. General Health Services
4. Training Resources
5. Legal Services
6. Religious Services
7. Alcoholic Treatment Programs
8. Drug Treatment Programs
9. Employment Services
10. Volunteer Agencies

Existing State institutions can and should provide service in many areas. In the area of planning and operation, two institutions of higher education were contacted concerning their support and the possibility of utilizing them as resources.

The University of Iowa at Iowa City can provide services if appropriate, as it has been confirmed that resource talent is available. The College of Law, the Department of Psychology, the Department of Sociology (with a Criminology Section) and the School of Social Work

have been contacted and found willing to consider participation as appropriate in the post-legislative planning and implementation phases of the correctional center concept.

Drake University in Des Moines has resource talent in their College of Law, Department of Psychology and Department of Sociology. These resources have been contacted and found agreeable to consideration of providing service to the State.

The services of both of these institutions could be utilized anywhere in Iowa, even though one of the institutions is not located within the area of the three proposed correctional centers. Other universities, such as Iowa State University and the University of Northern Iowa also possess resources which should be tapped.

Organizations such as the School of Social Work at the University of Iowa can make a measurable contribution. The United State Bureau of Prisons can provide additional counsel and direction to the Bureau of Adult Corrections, the Iowa Crime Commission and local jurisdictions. The National Council on Crime and Delinquency have resources available to assist with the planning and implementation. There is an abundance of professional, technical and non-technical assistance available to the administration of the correctional centers, and to the initial organization prior to actual operation of the centers.

This abundance of assistance does not require extensive cost. Much

voluntary participation is available, but it must be on an organized basis, with requests appropriately made to interested parties, agencies and other entities.

Cost comparisons are difficult to make due to the mixing of Sheriff's office and jail operation expenses in most counties. These comparisons can also be misleading. Examples of why they may be misleading are as follows:

1. Any cost savings to a county by a decrease in jailing activities will undoubtedly be diverted for other purposes rather than returned to the taxpayer. A major goal of the concept is to return more of the sheriff's time and money to law enforcement activities so such a diversion is appropriate.
2. Reduction in transportation to state institutions will allow for a more productive activity by law enforcement officials but will probably go unnoticed by the taxpayer as savings.
3. Services proposed in the concept are not presently being offered on a wide scale, therefore, actual costs must go up. Long range benefits are often ignored in terms of financial savings but will result in a real savings.

Building cost savings are real however, and should be appreciated by avoiding the costly rebuilding of facilities which are utilizing

space as little as 11% of the time. Much of this inefficiency cannot be avoided if jails are rebuilt county by county. For example: one cell may be required 80% of the time, while eight cells may be necessary occasionally. Only a cooperative effort can insure an increase in efficiency. Local lock-ups may be required but costs of such spaces are much less than complete replacement of county jails.

The proposed pilot projects are to provide administrators with a flexible tool to allow for later development of the most effective and efficient approach to a problem. The three pilots proposed lend to this process. They purposely differ in geographic size, general population distribution, jail population, facilities and resources available. People should not be alarmed at the many problems which present themselves due to these differences. They can and will serve a purpose if handled properly and flexibility is allowed.

REGION ONE - COUNCIL BLUFFS

Present status of county jails in the area.

<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>CAPACITY</u>	<u>CONDITION</u>
Harrison	14	Fair
Shelby	7	Fair
Audubon	18	Good
Guthrie	16	Good
Pottawattamie	48	Closed
Cass	26	Good
Adair	18	Good
Mills	12	Fair
Montgomery	14	Fair *
Adams	14	Good
Union	18	Fair *
Fremont	12	Fair *
Page	36	Good
Taylor	10	Fair
Ringgold	8	Fair *

*Major remodeling or replacement may be anticipated within 10 years.

A "fair *" rating should not imply current status but projected need. Several city jails in the area can be utilized for short-term holding and most county facilities can be adapted for this purpose. Intermediate holding facilities may be required but suitable facilities are available for this purpose.

Costs

Replacement costs for the facilities needing major remodeling or replacement are estimated at approximately \$600,000 on a county by county basis. This estimate is based upon current jail populations and does not allow for the overbuilding which is likely to occur. All counties in the area, with the exception of Pottawattamie, de-

creased in general population according to the 1970 census.

Costs of operating sheriff's offices and jail operation is an anticipated total of \$549,311 for 1971. By 1975 these costs could be \$733,588 based upon past levels of increase. Using 1970 jail confinement totals for the area and an average of \$5.00 per day per-person cost, total prisoner maintenance costs ran approximately \$50,230. If all those confined had been held for the maximum 72 hour period proposed, which is highly unlikely, direct costs to the county would have been a maximum of \$29,440.

The five dollars per day figure is probably low when actual costs of supervision and maintenance are computed, especially when we consider that in many jails the average population is three persons or less. One to one or two to one supervision costs elevate costs rapidly when salaries are included. Most maintenance figures received, only reflected room and board costs.

Jail space utilization in this 15 county area ranged from 1% to 20% usage. Most facilities are the maximum security type. If replacement was made with similar type housing and the utilization of space available did not increase appreciably, replacement costs of \$40 to \$45 per square foot would be difficult to justify.

Current Needs

The following table indicates confinement totals for 1969 and 1970.

	<u>1969</u>		<u>1970</u>	
	<u>Persons</u>	<u>Days confined</u>	<u>Persons</u>	<u>Days confined</u>
Adult Males	1040	5904	1285	9176
Adult Females	41	217	43	266
Juvenile Males	137	376	147	570
Juvenile Females	17	27	23	34
Total	1235	6524	1498	10046

Approximately 38% of all adults confined were held for 72 hours or less. Population figures indicate a need for no more than 50 beds for the area. Very few maximum security units will be necessary. Suitable short-term holding facilities are available in all counties. Intermediate holding facilities could be easily developed by utilizing existing facilities in the area.

REGION TWO - DES MOINES

Present status of county jails in the area.

<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>CAPACITY</u>	<u>CONDITION</u>
Boone	22	Closed
Story	40	New
Marshall	34	New
Dallas	20	Good
Polk	172	Ordered closed effective
Jasper	24	Fair
Madison	12	Fair *
Warren	12	Fair
Marion	16	Fair *

*Major remodeling or replacement anticipated within 10 years. A

"fair *" rating should not imply current status but projected need.

There are several city jails in the area which could be utilized for

short-term holding. Most of the jails above could be adapted for the purpose of 72 hour detention.

Costs

It is estimated that replacement costs for the questionable facilities would be at least \$2,200,000 on a county by county basis with no consideration for anything beyond a jail. Since all counties needing replacements, with the exception of Polk, experienced a decrease or negligible increase in the general population, any rebuilding would probably result in an immediate overbuilding.

From county reports it was determined that for the region, total annual cost of combined sheriff's office and jail operations will amount to \$1,135,550 in 1971 and \$1,723,845 by 1975. Sheriff's office mileage expense was \$72,906 in 1968 for the area. Based upon the total prisoner population and days confined in 1970 and a per person maintenance cost of \$5.00 per day, \$311,785 was spent to hold people with little effort made to correct. If all persons confined had been held for the maximum three day period proposed, total maintenance costs to counties would have been \$120,930 for the area.

Space utilization in all counties but Polk ranged from 11% to 31% in 1969. With the high cost of construction, such overbuilding in the future will be difficult to justify.

Current Needs

The following table indicates confinement totals for 1969 and 1970.

	<u>1969</u>		<u>1970</u>	
	<u>Persons</u>	<u>Days confined</u>	<u>Persons</u>	<u>Days confined</u>
Adult Males	6760	48443	7091	55343
Adult Females	377	1959	391	2205
Juvenile Males	567	2535	504	2881
Juvenile Females	46	139	76	214
Total	7750	53076	8062	60643

Approximately 27% of the adult males confined in 1969 were held for 72 hours or less. Current population figures indicate an immediate need for no more than 200 beds. If existing facilities are incorporated into the system, minimal construction will be needed in the area of maximum security. Facilities at Story and Marshall counties should be utilized in an attempt to keep costs down in the area.

Suitable holding facilities are available in all counties by utilizing county or city jails. The Des Moines city jail could be used as an "admitting center" for Polk county with the center providing service within hours of arrest. If groups, such as those charged with drunkenness, can be diverted shortly after arrest, more space would be available in the city facility. This facility could also be used for day-time holding during trial.

REGION THREE - DUBUQUE

Present status of county jails in the area.

<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>CAPACITY</u>	<u>CONDITION</u>
Allamakee	8	Good

<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>CAPACITY</u>	<u>CONDITION</u>
Clayton	12	Fair *
Delaware	12	Good
Dubuque	26	Closed
Jackson	14	Fair *

*Major remodeling or replacement anticipated within 10 years. A "fair *" rating should not imply current status but projected need. All counties have city jails which are classified as good and have sufficient space for short-term holding. Situation in this area is unique since the city jail in Dubuque is not the most desirable facility. Facilities may be required which will serve not only as a correctional center but also as an admitting center.

Costs

Combined costs of operating jails and sheriff's offices totaled \$264,291 in 1969. By 1975 these costs should be nearly \$425,000 at the current rate of increase. Based upon the total days of confinement in the five county area, in 1970 prisoner maintenance costs totaled \$20,370. If all persons had been confined for the 72 hour maximum proposed, county maintenance costs would have been \$13,350. It is highly likely that many persons would not be housed for the maximum period so costs would have actually been less.

Current Needs

The following table indicates confinement totals for 1969 and 1970.

	<u>1969</u>		<u>1970</u>	
	<u>Persons</u>	<u>Days Confined</u>	<u>Persons</u>	<u>Days Confined</u>
Adult Males	669	3416	851	3894

	<u>1969</u>		<u>1970</u>	
	<u>Persons</u>	<u>Days Confined</u>	<u>Persons</u>	<u>Days Confined</u>
Adult Females	13	14	6	29
Juvenile Males	36	181	31	141
Juvenile Females	6	6	2	10
	<hr/>		<hr/>	
Total	724	3617	890	4074

Daily prisoner population for the area is quite low due to the lack of admitting facilities, additional space will be required. Architects estimated space requirement at 35. This figure appears high and flexibility should be allowed for gradual expansion. Other possibilities are available for this area including the temporary use of the state facility at Anamosa. Specific recommendations are not made at this time due to several alternatives which exist.

SECTION V

LEGISLATIVE REQUESTS

ENABLING LEGISLATION

Major recommendations of the Committee on Area Correctional Facilities were discussed in Section I of this report. Due to the pre-filing of bills concerning the area correctional center concept, it is felt by the committee that it would be most expeditious for all concerned if representatives of the Iowa Crime Commission work closely with the legislators in an attempt to incorporate recommendations. This is being done at the time of this writing.

Any elaboration of or further justification for any of the recommendations can be provided by this committee. Action taken during this session of the Iowa Legislature concerning this subject is likely to shape the direction of corrections for many years to come. Assistance in reaching these decisions is kindly offered.

APPROPRIATIONS NECESSARY FOR PILOT PROJECTS

The attached budget projection indicates the funds necessary to establish and operate the three pilot projects. As mentioned earlier, long-range projections indicate no more than eleven centers with major construction needed only in the three pilot projects. All centers except the Des Moines center will be serving approximately 50 to 60 persons at any given time. Shift in population before full implementation could change this picture but considering a relatively

stable overall population, the total should be similar. Positive impact on the crime problem could result in fewer or smaller centers.

Budgets will be submitted in the form of appropriation request if the Legislature chooses to support the concept. State funds actually needed are only 25% of the total cost due to the availability of Federal Funds through the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration and the Iowa Crime Commission. It should be clear that these monies will not continue indefinitely and that the State should gradually assume a greater share of the operating costs.

As alternatives to maximum security confinement for all persons are developed within the communities, fewer funds will be required for construction and housing allowing for a greater emphasis on programs and people. Therefore, distribution of budget projected may differ when appropriation requests are actually submitted. It may also result in service to a greater area than projected. Flexibility must be allowed to make maximum use of the Federal and State monies.

BUDGET PROJECTION FOR PROPOSED PILOT PROJECTS

PROJECT	71-72	72-73	73-74	74-75	75-76	76-77
<u>DES MOINES</u>						
Capital Improvements	2,027,000					
Equipment			20,000	20,000	24,000	24,000
Operation Cost		730,000	803,000	803,000	883,300	883,300
<u>COUNCIL BLUFFS</u>						
Capital Improvements	663,000					
Equipment			7,000	7,000	8,000	8,000
Operation Cost		219,000	240,900	240,900	265,000	265,000
<u>DUBUQUE</u>						
Capital Improvements	480,000					
Equipment			5,000	5,000	6,000	6,000
Operation Cost		174,200	191,600	191,600	210,800	210,800
<u>TOTAL</u>						
Capital Improvements	3,170,000					
Equipment			32,000	32,000	48,000	48,000
Operation Cost	1,123,200	1,235,500	1,235,500	1,359,100	1,359,100	
Total Funds Required	4,293,200		2,534,000		2,814,200	
State Funds	1,073,300	25%		1,267,500	50%	2,814,200 100%
Federal Funds	3,219,900	75%		1,267,500	50%	

