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**EXECUTIVE** **SUMMARY**

This study explores issues surrounding the operation of the 44 rural county jails in

Pennsylvania. County jails house two primary categories of inmates – presentenced detainees

and sentenced inmates. Presentenced detainees are inmates who have not made bail or have not

yet been sentenced (and may or may not yet have been convicted of an offense). Some of these

presentenced detainees may be bailed at any moment, and, thus, are in custody for widely

varying lengths of time. At any given time, over half of a county jail’s population may be

presentenced detainees. Sentenced inmates are those who have been convicted and are serving

their sentence in a county facility. Sentenced inmates in county jails nationwide typically have

sentences of less than one year, but in Pennsylvania they can serve up to two years or more.

County jails in general face a unique set of challenges, including large numbers of

inmates who spend only a very short time in custody, difficulty in classifying and assessing a

short-term inmate population, challenges in providing treatment services to inmates who may be

in custody for only a short period, and financial issues related inmate medical costs and strained

county budgets. County jails are often quite small, in some cases housing just over 20 inmates,

making it difficult to maintain specialized staff positions to deliver needed services to inmates.

In Pennsylvania, county jails in recent years have begun to serve as a relief valve for the

increasingly strained state prison system. The state system has transferred hundreds of inmates to

county jails since 2009, as many of these jails have excess capacity.

The current study examines trends in rural county jail populations and demographics, jail

capacity, capital projects and development (undertaken and planned), budgets, and staffing over

the period 2004 through 2011. This study also documents types of treatment programs and

services being offered at the jails and compares them to what is known about effective offender

rehabilitation practices. Finally, this study also explores fiscal and other challenges facing the 44

rural county jails.

The principal source of data for this project was information that is collected by the

Pennsylvania Department of Corrections (PADOC) as part of their annual obligatory inspections

of the county jails. As part of this process, PADOC collects extensive information related to the

research objectives noted above. This study also conducted an original survey of the county jails

to collect information on planned capital projects and on financial challenges facing the jails.

The system-wide average annual total rural jail population (2004-2011) was 7,520

inmates per year, which is 22 percent of the total Pennsylvania county jail population in 2009

(that is, all 63 county jails combined). The rural county jail population has grown by 17 percent

during the 2004-2010 time period. There is significant variation in the size of the rural county

jails, with the smallest rural jail housing only 26 inmates per year on average, and the largest

rural jail housing 421 inmates per year on average. Thus, the largest rural jail houses more than

fifteen times the number of inmates as the smallest. The rural jail population was

overwhelmingly young, white, and male.

While some jails had an excess of inmates, on average, the rural county jail system was

operating at only 84 percent of capacity during the study period. By way of comparison, the

PADOC operated at 113 percent of capacity. Thus, there does appear to be available capacity at

the rural jails. Again, given the prevalence of presentenced detainees, jail populations can be

quite dynamic from day to day, compared to the more stable (although growing) state prison

population. During the period of June 2009 through December 2010, the PADOC transferred

1,507 state inmates to nine rural county jails through contractual agreements, in order to relieve

the burden on the state system.

The mean cost per inmate per day in the county jail system was $60.41, ranging from a

low of $37.54 to a high of $127.71. By way of comparison, the mean cost per inmate per day in

the state system was $88.23.

Nineteen of the 44 rural county jails (43 percent) reported having undertaken a major

capital expansion or restoration project during the study period. But, 92 percent of responding

jails reported having no new capital projects planned, in spite of 44 percent of responding jails

reporting a major capital project need.

All of the jails reported offering some sort of rehabilitative and related programming

during the study period, although two of the most common types of programming were

educational/vocational and general psychological counseling, both of which are generally

mandated under law or as part of accreditation standards. Drug and alcohol programming was

also universally offered, although the most common mode of such service was self-help groups,

which are not found to be effective in the research literature. There was less evidence of

intensive programs that address key recidivism risk factors, such as programs addressing anti-

social attitudes and decision making skills. Only a minority of jails clearly offered such

programs. Rural county jails also offered a wide variety of programs for which the evidence of

effectiveness is unclear (such as general life skills programs), or where the research clearly

indicates no impact on recidivism (such as meditation and art therapy).

In sum, Pennsylvania’s rural county jails represent a potential source of bed space for the

state prison system. While rehabilitative programs are in evidence, more focus could be placed

on programs that have been shown to be effective in an extensive body of correctional research.
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**INTRODUCTION**

County jails are assuming increasing importance in Pennsylvania’s overall correctional

system, in recent years serving as a relief valve for the rapidly growing state prison system. At

the same time, data and information about county jails is incomplete and fragmented, and little

formal research has been done on services provided by the jails, especially in rural areas. Thus,

this project offers a timely examination of county jail operations and systems.

The Center for Rural Pennsylvania defines 48 of Pennsylvania’s 67 counties as rural.1 As

of January 30, 2009, 44 rural counties operated their own jails,2 with a total population of 6,995

inmates, representing nearly 21 percent of the 33,580 total county jail inmates in Pennsylvania

(PADOC, 2009).

In Pennsylvania, as in most states, county jails operate under policies and procedures

promulgated by the local county government. There is, however, an overlay of state law and

1 The Center for Rural Pennsylvania defines a county as rural when the number of persons per square mile within the county is less than 284. Counties and school districts that have 284 persons or more per square mile are considered urban. Accordingly, there are 48 rural and 19 urban counties in Pennsylvania.

2 According to the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections, the four rural counties that do not operate their own jails are Cameron, Forest, Fulton and Sullivan.
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regulations governing county jails’ reporting requirements, under 37 Pa. Code Ch 95.3 The

Pennsylvania Department of Corrections (PADOC) also conducts inspections of county jails and

provides training to county jail staff.4 The point remains, though, that Pennsylvania county jails

represent 63 separate correctional systems, presenting a challenge to comprehensive research and

jail development efforts.

County jails face a unique set of challenges (Allen et al., 2007). Unlike state prisons,

which typically house only sentenced inmates, county jails are responsible for a complex mix of

sentenced offenders, presentenced detainees, and others. Detainees can make up half of a jail’s

population at any given time (Allen et al., 2007). Due to the large proportion of detainees, the

population of county jails is often less predictable and more transient than is the case with state

prisons, posing challenges for proper inmate classification. Moreover, the typical sentenced

county jail inmate serves a relatively short time (less than a year), making it difficult to deliver

meaningful treatment, educational, and other services (Allen et al., 2007). Further, it is often

difficult to know what sort of services to provide to the presentenced detainees, given that some

of them may be released on bail at any moment, and it is difficult to mandate programming for

those who have not been convicted yet since their status as “offenders” is not yet established.

County jails are also often quite small. This study found, as presented below, that the

January 31, 2011, average in-house rural county jail population in Pennsylvania was 172

inmates. This is roughly the norm of county jails nationwide, and which is a fraction of the size

of a typical state prison (Allen et al., 2007). For example, a typical state prison in Pennsylvania

houses between 1,000 and 2,000 inmates, with some prisons housing over 3,000. Indeed, many

3 For more information about reporting requirements, see http://www.pacode.com/secure/data/037/chapter95/chap95toc.html#95.242 4 For more information about the county jail inspection process, see

http://www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/hide\_county\_jails/11433
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individual cell blocks in Pennsylvania state prisons house more inmates than the average rural

county jail. Thus, it is difficult for many county jails to support specialized staff positions and

treatment services.

One also finds wide variation in the populations and capacities of county jails. Urban

jails, such as in Allegheny and Philadelphia counties, often find themselves in the same position

as large state prison systems – too many inmates and too few beds. Rural jails, however, may

find themselves with excess bed capacity (Bennett & Lattin, 2009), which provides an

opportunity to “sell” available bed space to other local jails, the state department of corrections,

or other corrections institutions. Indeed, in Pennsylvania, the PADOC has been able to use the

excess capacity in rural county jails as a relief valve for the rapid growth in the state prison

population, while also providing revenue to the counties that house state inmates (PADOC, 2008,

2010).

At the same time, Act 81 of 2008 established new guidance on which sentenced offenders

are committed to state prison versus county jails. Previously, the typical pattern was that

offenders sentenced to two years or less would be committed to a county jail, those sentenced to

five years or more would go to a state prison, and those with sentences between two and five

years could go to either—a decision typically left to the discretion of the sentencing judge.

However, Act 81 requires that, as of November 2011, offenders with sentences of two to five

years be committed to state prison (with some exceptions). It is possible that Act 81 will result in

more sentenced offenders being committed to an already-stressed state system (Pew Center on

the States, 2010). While it is unclear how many of these inmates might then potentially be

housed back in county jails under the recent state-county transfer mechanism discussed later, the

policy change reinforces the need for research on county jail population, capacity, and services.
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County jails, then, are complex and under-researched components of the overall

correctional system that are often challenging to study due to local control and fragmented data

systems (Allen et al., 2007). Pennsylvania is witnessing an increasing use of excess county jail

capacity to relieve pressure on the growing state prison population, thus making it important to

examine county jail population trends, operations, cost structure, and services.

**GOALS** **AND** **OBJECTIVES**

This project examined Pennsylvania’s rural county prison system, including population

trends and infrastructure, using data from an eight-year study period, primarily defined as

January 2004 through January 2011 (as data permitted). The original study period was January

2001 through December 2010, however, as discussed later, this period was adjusted based on the

availability of data to answer each research question. There were two primary research goals.

The first primary research goal was to measure population trends for Pennsylvania’s 44

rural county jails over the study period. Within the first primary research goal were four specific

research objectives: (1a) determine the annual population for each rural county jail for each year

during the study period; (1b) examine how rural county jail population compares to jail capacity,

and how this has changed during the study period; (1c) determine the demographic breakdown of

the rural county jail population (gender, race, age), including how it has changed over the study

period; and (1d) examine the extent to which rural county jails have been housing offenders from

other jurisdictions (state, federal, other counties, etc.) during the study period.

The second primary research goal was to examine jail infrastructure (physical plant,

finances, staffing, programs, etc.) over the study period. Within the second primary research goal

were seven specific research objectives: (2a) determine the capital projects undertaken at each
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rural county jail during the study period; (2b) identify the currently planned capital projects at

each rural county jail; (2c) examine each rural county jail’s perceived major capital project

needs; (2d) determine the current operating budget for each rural county jail, including how this

has changed during the study period and how per inmate costs compare to the state prison

system; (2e) examine each rural county jail’s perceived major financial challenges over the next

five years; (2f) determine the current staffing level (including staffing ratios) for each rural

county jail, using the following staff categories: Corrections Officers, Treatment Staff, Jail

Administration/Management, Support Staff, Other5; and (2g) identify treatment/rehabilitative

services/programs (drug treatment, GED, etc.) offered at each rural county jail.

Finally, public policy considerations are examined in light of the findings and

conclusions derived from this study.

**METHODOLOGY**

The study utilized existing administrative data sources and also collected original data by

means of surveys in order to compile the most comprehensive dataset to date on the

aforementioned research objectives related to Pennsylvania’s rural county jails. As previously

stated, most states’ county jails are county controlled agencies with data systems that tend to be

fragmented and incomplete.6 Moreover, there is no comprehensive, national or even state-level

source of data on county jail populations. Several existing administrative data sources within

Pennsylvania (e.g., Justice Network (JNET), PADOC Legacy Data) were either accessible only

5 The staffing categories were based on those derived by Young et al. (2009).

6 County jails are run by the state DOC in the following six states: Alaska, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Rhode Island, Vermont. In all other states, county jails are locally controlled.
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to law enforcement (JNET)7 or too fragmented to be useful (PADOC Legacy Data)8. With these

limitations in mind, the project exploited data from three sources: PADOC’s Office of County

Inspection Services (OCIS), the U.S. Department of Justice Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS),

and an original, follow-up survey of the rural county jails. *Table* *1* identifies specific data sources

for each research question (a more detailed explanation of each source follows).

Table 1: Data Sources for Each Research Question

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Research** **Question** | **Data** **Source** |
| 1A: Jail population | PADOC OCIS Data, BJS Data |
| 1B: Jail population vs. capacity | PADOC OCIS Data, BJS Data |
| 1C: Population demographics | PADOC OCIS Data, BJS Data |
| 1D: Inter-jurisdiction transfers | PADOC OCIS Data, BJS Data |
| 2A: Jail capital projects undertaken | PADOC OCIS Data, BJS Data |
| 2B: Jail capital projects planned | Follow-up County Survey Data |
| 2C: Perceived capital project needs | Follow-up County Survey Data |
| 2D: Current operating budget | PADOC OCIS Data |
| 2E: Perceived financial challenges | Follow-up County Survey Data |
| 2F: Current staffing level | PADOC OCIS Data |
| 3A: Treatment programs offered | PADOC OCIS data |

7 For more information on JNET reporting see http://www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt?open=512&objID=14682&mode=2&PageID=599922

8 PADOC Legacy Data refers to data the county jails are supposed to report on a daily and monthly basis to the PADOC pursuant to37 Pa. Code Ch 95. This data, however, has been inconsistently reported by the counties over the years and there is far too much missing data in this system to have been of use to this study
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*PADOC* *OCIS* *Data*

Pursuant to 37 Pa. Code Ch. 95, the PADOC operates the Office of County Inspection

and Services (OCIS), which, among other tasks, conducts an annual survey and physical

inspection of county jails. Information collected in this process pertains to summary population

data, as well as basic information on staffing, budgets, and related matters.9 PADOC OCIS

offered three relevant data sources: the General Information Form (GIF); the Supplemental

Information Form (SIF); and in-house electronic data files.

The GIF is a paper survey mailed to each jail annually, with a relatively high response

rate from rural county jails (95-100 percent for 2006-2011). Unfortunately, PADOC’s retention

of GIFs was limited to 2006 through 2011. Additionally, the GIF contains some questions related

to a “snapshot date” in the year coincident with when the form is received (e.g., population on

January 31, 2011), while other items ask for data from the previous year (e.g., total annual

admissions 2010). Thus, a missing GIF would impact data collection for both the given year and

the previous year.

PADOC OCIS also provided the two relevant SIF sections, related to staffing and

services/programs. The SIF is a longer inspection form that an OCIS inspector completes during

the inspection process. While the PADOC maintained SIF records for 2004-2010, the SIF is only

conducted (and, thus, available) for a county if the county was not 100 percent compliant with

OCIS regulations in the previous year. Thus, if a county was compliant in one year, the SIF for

the following year would be unavailable. In no year were there more than 19 counties’ (43

percent) SIF data missing.

9 See following link for more information on the OCIS and for sample data tables: http://www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/hide\_county\_jails/11433
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Finally, the PADOC provided their in-house 2004-2011 electronic data files, which

augment data available in the GIF. These electronic files were used to run quality assurance

checks and complete data gaps where possible.

*BJS* *Data*

The federal Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) conducts an *Annual* *Survey* *of* *Jails*, and a

*National* *Jail* *Census* every five years, and produces various reports from this data, such as the

*Jail* *Inmates* *at* *Midyear* series.10 These datasets are accessible through the National Archive of

Criminal Justice Data.11 The *Annual* *Survey* *of* *Jails* was available for a good portion of the

relevant study period (2001-2004 and 2006-2009). One limitation of this source, however, is that

it is simply a representative survey, and does not capture every jail. Thus, only 15 Pennsylvania

rural county jails (34 percent) were included in each relevant year. The *National* *Jail* *Census* is

more comprehensive, reaching all relevant jails, but was only available for 2005. Moreover, both

of these national data collection efforts are dependent upon the willingness of each county jail to

respond. Data from these sources was used to run quality assurance checks and to fill in data

gaps wherever possible.

*Primary* *Survey* *Data*

While the PADOC and BJS data populated and refined the study’s database, their

limitations necessitated a follow-up survey of each rural county jail to answer some of the

research questions. Based on prior research experience and commonly accepted principles of

survey development, mailing with follow-up phone calls, as needed, was selected as an

10 See the following link for more information on these reports: http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/index.cfm?ty=tp&tid=1

11 See following link for more information on the NACJD: http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/NACJD/
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appropriate data collection method. The basic Dillman Tailored Design Method approach, which

is widely used in survey research, was employed (Dillman et al., 2009). Thus, after the available

administrative data sources were substantially exploited, a paper survey was developed in order

to capture supplementary or missing information related to capital projects approved/planned,

perceived capital project needs, and perceived financial challenges. Another survey item

requested respondents to include GIFs that were missing or other documents/records with similar

data. This item was unique to jails, based upon which GIFs were missing for that jail.12 A copy

of the survey instrument is available in Appendix A.

The survey was mailed to the 44 wardens/sheriffs13 of each rural county jail along with a

cover letter that explained the purpose of the study and the voluntary nature of the survey. A self-

addressed, post-marked reply envelope was also provided. Survey participants’ names and

addresses were acquired from PADOC, and then confirmed based on information available on

the jails’ websites. Based upon responses reported from other surveys of local corrections

administrators (see, for example, Taxman et al., 2007), a 70 percent response rate was

anticipated. There was an initial response rate of 57 percent (25 jails), and two follow-up phone

calls to non-respondents as a reminder to complete the survey was conducted for the remaining

jails. The final response rate was 82 percent (36 jails), which was above the expected rate. There

was no pattern to the non-respondents in terms of geography or jail characteristics (i.e., the non-

response appeared random). From a methodological point of view, random non-response is much

less problematic than systematic non-response.

12 GIFs were missing for every jail for 2002-2005. GIFs were also missing from Franklin County for 2006 and 2008; Lawrence County for 2009; Montour County for 2010; and Schuylkill County for 2009. GIFs for 2001 were not requested as the 2011 GIFs were available, thus providing the sought-after ten-year study period.

13 In most states, jails are run by the sheriff’s office. Pennsylvania jails, however, are typically run by wardens, who are not associated with the sheriff’s office, except for McKean and Potter County jails, which are run by the dually titled Warden/Sheriff.
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*Codebook* *and* *Database*

Based on the research goals and objectives, plus knowledge of the data available from the

abovementioned sources, a comprehensive codebook and database was created to manage and

analyze the data. The database comprehensively included all relevant research items: inmate

population and demographic trends, infrastructure and financial issues, staffing and

programming statistics. The original study period was to cover a ten year span, January 2001

through December 2010. However, a combination of data limitations and the fact that some data

were available for 2011, resulted in adjusting the study period based on data availability.

Generally, however, the study period was limited to January 2004 through January 2011.

Subsequent data analysis methods involved basic descriptive statistics (e.g., frequencies, means).

Missing data were either excluded from analyses or, if possible, the mean was imputed (that is,

the missing value was replaced with the mean of the observed values for a given variable and a

given county) in order to derive summary statistics. A copy of the codebook and database, which

includes comprehensive data for each rural county jail, is available in Appendix B.

**RESULTS**

In general, the results presented below are discussed both in terms of overall rural jail

system findings—i.e., for all the 44 rural county jails combined (denoted as “system wide” or

“overall”)—and then also for the average rural county jail (denoted as “per jail”). This allows for

an understanding of the county jail system as a whole, while also creating a profile of a typical

rural county jail. As noted in the data below, there is substantial variation between county jails –

some house only a few dozen inmates, while others house hundreds. Thus, the portraits of a

“typical” rural county jail presented below should be understood in the light of these variations.
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As noted earlier, Appendix B contains detailed data for each county jail for each study year for

each variable in this study. For selected variables, data for each jail is also shown in tables in the

main body of the report below.

**First Research Goal: Measure population trends for Pennsylvania’s 44 rural county jails**

**over the study period**.

*Research* *Objective* *1A:* *Determine* *the* *annual* *population* *for* *each* *rural* *county* *jail* *for* *each*

*year.*

The system-wide average annual total rural jail population (2004-2011) was 7,520

inmates per year (*Figure* *1*), which is 22 percent of the total Pennsylvania county jail population

in 2009, that is for all 63 county jails combined (PADOC, 2009). There were a minimum of

6,891 total rural jail inmates in 2004, and a maximum of 8,074 total inmates in 2010. Thus, the

rural county jail system has grown by 17 percent during that time period.

Figure 1: Overall Annual Rural Jail Inmate Population (2004-2011)
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*Source:* *PADOC,* *BJS*

The average annual total population per jail was 171 inmates per year (2004-2010), with

a minimum average of 34 inmates per year in Montour County, and a maximum average of 425
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inmates per year in Cambria County. Thus, as noted above, there is significant variation in the

size of rural county jails, with the largest rural jail being more than ten times the total size of the

smallest.

System-wide, Pennsylvania’s rural county jails averaged 7,105 total *in-house* inmates per

year (2004-2011), which is less than one-tenth of one percent of Pennsylvania’s average

population during the period. Of this in-house population, there were an average of 3,536

presentenced detainees per year, and an average of 3,739 sentenced inmates per year (2006-2011

average). In other words, approximately one-half of the overall in-house population was

comprised of presentenced detainees.

The average in-house population per jail was 162 inmates per year (2004-2011), with a

minimum average of 26 per year inmates in Montour County, and a maximum average of 421

inmates per year in Cambria County. As with the overall proportions, the presentenced detainees

represented approximately half of the in-house population: There were an average of 80 in-house

presentenced detainees per jail each year, and an average of 85 sentenced inmates per jail each

year (2006-2011).14

System-wide, Pennsylvania’s rural county jails housed an average of 379 inmates

*elsewhere* per year (2006-2011) (see *Table* *2*, below, for the average number of inmates housed

elsewhere per year, for each rural county jail). As discussed below, Pennsylvania’s rural county

jails received an average of 781 inmates per year (2005-2011) *from* other jurisdictions (state,

federal, other county, etc.) (see *Table* *15*, below, for the average number of in-house inmates

other-jurisdiction inmates per year, for each rural county jail). The rural county jail system, then,

receives almost double the number of inmates from other jurisdictions as it houses elsewhere.

14 Jails reported total population and in-house population counts for a “snapshot date” (the last business day in January for that year) and calculations are based on these snapshot figures.
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Table 2: Average Number of Inmates Housed Elsewhere per Year, by County Jail (2006-2011)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **County** **Jail** | **Average** **Number** **of** **Inmates** **Housed** **Elsewhere** | **County** **Jail** | **Average** **Number** **of** **Inmates** **Housed** **Elsewhere** |
| Adams | 13 | Lawrence | 6 |
| Armstrong | 4 | Lycoming | 45 |
| Bedford | 3 | McKean | 5 |
| Blair | 8 | Mercer | 11 |
| Bradford | 5 | Mifflin | 3 |
| Butler | 82 | Monroe | 5 |
| Cambria | 3 | Montour | 8 |
| Carbon | 7 | Northumberland | 2 |
| Centre | 14 | Perry | 13 |
| Clarion | 4 | Pike | 9 |
| Clearfield | 1 | Potter | 1 |
| Clinton | 2 | Schuylkill | 2 |
| Columbia | 1 | Snyder | 1 |
| Crawford | 1 | Somerset | 3 |
| Elk | 6 | Susquehanna | 1 |
| Fayette | 5 | Tioga | < 1 |
| Franklin | 2 | Union | 29 |
| Greene | 2 | Venango | 4 |
| Huntingdon | 20 | Warren | 1 |
| Indiana | 25 | Washington | < 1 |
| Jefferson | 10 | Wayne | 7 |
| Juniata | 5 | Wyoming | 1 |

*Underline* *denotes* *the* *top* *five* *counties* *in* *terms* *of* *number* *of* *inmates* *housed* *elsewhere.* *Source:* *PADOC*
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Of the eleven jails that were high on housing inmates elsewhere (defined as having

averages greater than the system-wide mean), ten (91 percent) of them were actually below

capacity during the study period (*Table* *3*). (For a discussion of why inmates are transferred

between institutions, see *Research* *Objective* *1D*, below.). This finding is partly explained by the

fact that *most* jails are in fact under capacity, as shown later. As may be expected, most of the

jails that were high on housing inmates elsewhere (7 jails, 64 percent) also had high average

costs per day per inmate (*Table* *4*). There was no discernible pattern between the age of the

institution and whether it was likely to house inmates elsewhere (*Table* *5*). Thus, cost per day

may play an important role in how jails shift inmates to other counties.

Table 3: Number of Jails, by Housing Inmates Elsewhere (2006-2011) and Capacity (2005-2010)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | Housed Elsewhere | | |
| High | Low | Total |
| Capacity |  | Above | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Below | 10 | 31 | 41 |
| Total | 11 | 33 | 44 |

*Source:* *PADOC,* *BJS*
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Table 4: Number of Jails, by Housing Inmates Elsewhere (2006-2011) and Average Cost per

Day per Inmate (2004-2010)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Housed Elsewhere | | |
| High | Low | Total |
| Average Cost Per Day Per Inmate | High | 7 | 11 | 18 |
| Low | 4 | 22 | 26 |
| Total | 11 | 33 | 44 |

*Source:* *PADOC*

Table 5: Number of Jails, by Age of Facility and Housing Inmates Elsewhere (2006-2011)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Age of Facility | | | | | | |
| 2000s – No Renovation | 2000s + Renovation | 1990s - No Renovation | 1990s + Renovation | Before 1990 - No Renovation | Before 1990 + Renovation | Total |
| Housed Elsewhere | High | 4 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 11 |
| Low | 3 | 1 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 13 | 33 |
| Total | 7 | 2 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 16 | 44 |

*Source:* *PADOC*

System-wide, the average total admissions for rural jails were 55,979 per year, and

average total discharges were 55,563 per year (2005-2010) (*Figure* *2*). The admission and

discharge statistics are indicative of a correctional system characterized by large and rapid

turnover of its inmate population. As discussed earlier, this is not unusual for county jails. By

comparison, the state prison system admitted an average of 16,331 inmates and discharged an

average of 16,026 inmates during 2005-2009 (PADOC, 2011a).
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Figure 2: Overall Rural County Jail Admissions and Discharges (2005-2010)
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There were an average of 1,272 admissions and 1,264 discharges per jail during the study

period (2005-2010).

*Research* *Objective* *1B:* *Examine* *how* *rural* *county* *jail* *population* *compares* *to* *jail* *capacity,* *and*

*how* *this* *has* *changed.*

Capacity refers to the number of available beds. Percentage of capacity can be calculated

as the proportion of available bed space comprised by the in-house inmate population. Where

there are more inmates than available beds, a jail said to be over capacity. Despite an increasing

overall total population, the capacity of Pennsylvania’s rural jail system has also increased (and,

thus, percentage of capacity has decreased). Overall, the rural county jail system averaged 84

percent capacity per year (2005-2010), with a minimum of 78 percent capacity in 2010, and a

maximum of 86 percent capacity in 2005 and 2006 (*Figure* *3*). By comparison, the state system

operated at 113 percent average capacity during the 2005-2009 time period (PADOC, 2011a).
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Figure 3: Overall Rural County Jail Percentage of Capacity (2005-2010)
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On average, only three jails (seven percent) were over capacity during the study period

(2005-2010). Of the 41 jails that were below capacity, 25 (61 percent) of them likewise had low

average costs per day per inmate (defined as having averages less than the system-wide mean)

during the study period (*Table* *6*). There was no discernible pattern between the age of the

facility and its capacity (*Table* *7*). Once again, since the vast majority of jails were under

capacity (i.e. there is a very small sample of over capacity jails), it is difficult to conduct

meaningful analysis of the differences between over and under capacity jails.

Table 6: Number of Jails, by Capacity (2005-2010) and Average Cost per Day per Inmate (2004-

2010)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Capacity | | |
| Above | Below | Total |
| Average Cost Per Day Per Inmate | High | 2 | 16 | 18 |
| Low | 1 | 25 | 26 |
| Total | 3 | 41 | 44 |

*Source:* *PADOC,* *BJS*
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Table 7: Number of Jails, by Age of Facility and Capacity (2005-2010)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Age of Facility | | | | | | |
| 2000s – No Renovation | 2000s + Renovation | 1990s - No Renovation | 1990s + Renovation | Before 1990 - No Renovation | Before 1990 + Renovation | Total |
| Capacity | Above | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| Below | 6 | 2 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 15 | 41 |
| Total | 7 | 2 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 16 | 44 |

*Source:* *PADOC,* *BJS*

Per jail, capacity ranged widely, from a minimum of 22 percent average annual capacity

in Potter County, to a maximum of 121 percent annual average capacity in Indiana County

during the study period (2005-2010) (*Table* *8*). As previously mentioned, this sort of variation

exemplifies the perspective that simply reporting system-wide figures masks important

differences between each jail. To address the question of how jails handle excess capacity, the

rated capacity of a correctional institution can be calculated in various ways (Bennett & Lattin,

2009). In general, though, common variables used in most capacity calculations include the

number of physically present beds, the size of the cells, the age of the facility, available staff, and

programming and other services available. Capacity then is more than just the number of beds

available. Capacity represents the “ideal” number of inmates that can be managed in a given

facility, although in reality additional inmates can be added by placing additional beds into larger

cells or by converting common areas of the jail (e.g., gyms, auditoriums, and even conference

rooms) to sleeping areas, often using bunk beds or cots. Capacity can also be a fluid construct,

especially in county jails which as noted earlier can fluctuate in population from day to day.

Thus, if there is a spate of arrests on a given day, a jail normally under capacity may become
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temporarily over capacity. Ideally, jails want to be at or near their rated capacity (Bennett &

Lattin, 2009). A jail severely over capacity runs the risk of inmate distrubances, staff injuries,

and even inmate litigation due to poor living conditions. Conversely, a jail that is consistently

and significantly under capacity may represent a waste of resources. Referencing *Table* *8* below,

two of the three over capacity rural jails (McKean and Schuylkill) are only slightly over their

rated capacity, with the third (Indiana) being the highest, at 121 percent. Many of the jails under

capacity were near the 90 percent range, which does allow for the temporary population spikes

that are characteristic of county jails.

Table 8: Average Percentage of Capacity per Year, by County Jail (2005-2010)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **County** **Jail** | **Percentage** **of** **Capacity** | **County** **Jail** | **Percentage** **of** **Capacity** |
| Adams | 69% | Lawrence | 79% |
| Armstrong | 94% | Lycoming | 88% |
| Bedford | 91% | McKean | 109% |
| Blair | 89% | Mercer | 89% |
| Bradford | 86% | Mifflin | 71% |
| Butler | 90% | Monroe | 86% |
| Cambria | 94% | Montour | 66% |
| Carbon | 83% | Northumberland | 85% |
| Centre | 77% | Perry | 81% |
| Clarion | 75% | Pike | 97% |
| Clearfield | 97% | Potter | 22% |
| Clinton | 94% | Schuylkill | 103% |
| Columbia | 82% | Snyder | 79% |
| Crawford | 78% | Somerset | 60% |
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|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Elk | 73% | Susquehanna | 63% |
| Fayette | 94% | Tioga | 51% |
| Franklin | 78% | Union | 96% |
| Greene | 67% | Venango | 95% |
| Huntingdon | 96% | Warren | 87% |
| Indiana | 121% | Washington | 97% |
| Jefferson | 95% | Wayne | 85% |
| Juniata | 68% | Wyoming | 75% |

*Underline* *denotes* *jails* *that* *were* *over* *capacity,* *on* *average.* *Source:* *PADOC,* *BJS*

*Research* *Objective* *1C:* *Determine* *the* *demographic* *breakdown* *of* *the* *rural* *county* *jail*

*population* *(gender,* *race,* *age),* *including* *how* *it* *is* *has* *changed.*

Males represented an average of 88 percent of total rural county jail inmates per year, and

females represented the remaining average of 12 percent of overall inmates per year (2004-2011)

(*Figure* *4*). System-wide, there were an average total of 6,231 male inmates per year, and 889

female inmates per year (2004-2011).

Figure 4: Overall Annual Rural County Jail Population, by Gender (2004-2011)
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Per jail, there were an average of 142 males and 20 females per year during the study

period (2004-2011). This gender breakdown is typical of correction systems in general, with

males constituting the large share of the inmate population. This reflects deeper gender-based

patterns of criminal offending and sentencing practices which are largely invariant nationally,

and has been well-established in the criminal justice research for decades (Blumstein et al.,

1986).

During the study period (2004-2011), on average, white inmates represented more than

three-quarters of all rural county jail inmates per year, black inmates represented less than one-

fifth of inmates, and Hispanic and other-race inmates combined represented five percent of all

rural county jail inmates per year (*Table* *9,* *Figure* *5* and *Figure* *6*). It is more difficult to

establish whether this racial/ethnic breakdown is typical of correctional systems in general, as the

racial composition of a county correctional institution is highly dependent on the racial

demographics of the local community. It is not surprising, though, to find a large white

population housed in these rural county jails.

Table 9: Average Annual Rural County Jail Population, by Race (2004-2011)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Race** | **Average** **Number** **and** **Percentage** |
| White | 5,482 (77%) |
| Black | 1,254 (18%) |
| Hispanic | 340 (5%) |
| Other | 74 (1%) |
| Total | 7150 (101%\*) |

*\*Total* *greater* *than* *100* *percent* *due* *to* *rounding.* *Source:* *PADOC,* *BJS*
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Figure 5: Overall Rural County Jail White Inmate Population (2004-2010)
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Figure 6: Overall Rural County Jail Black, Hispanic, and Other-Race Inmate Populations (2004-

2011)
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Inmates younger than 30 years old represented half of the average total rural county jail

inmate population during the study period (2004-2011).15 The system-wide annual averages, and

respective percentages, for each age category are presented in *Table* *10*. As noted in *Table* *10*,

15 Data were missing for 2005; analyses are based on data from 2004 and 2006-2011.
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there are a very small number of inmates under the age of 18. The federal Juvenile Justice and

Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDPA) generally requires that juveniles not be held in secure

facilities with adults, but that where such temporary housing may occur, that the juveniles be

held so as to ensure “sight and sound” separation between adult and juvenile offenders (i.e., there

can be no mixing of the two populations). Each state is required to monitor compliance with the

JJDPA. In Pennsylvania, the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency maintains the

Secure Detention Monitoring Project to audit and enforce compliance with this act.16 In practice,

juveniles may periodically end up being detained in county jails (or police lock-ups) until their

identities and ages are determined, at which point other housing arrangements are made (e.g.,

transfer to a juvenile facility, release to parents, etc.). Thus, a small number of inmates under the

age of 18 will invariably show up in county jail data sets.

16 See the following link for more information about PCCD’s compliance monitoring efforts: http://www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt?open=512&objID=5411&&PageID=495426&level=3&css= L3&mode=2
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Table 10: Average Annual Rural County Jail Population, by Age Category (2004-2011)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Age** **Category** | **Average** **Number** **and** **Percentage** |
| Under 18 | 31 (<1%) |
| 18-19 year olds | 434 (6%) |
| 20-24 year olds | 1,709 (24%) |
| 25-29 year olds | 1,425 (20%) |
| 30-34 year olds | 1,009 (14%) |
| 35-39 year olds | 817 (11%) |
| 40-44 year olds | 774 (11%) |
| 45-54 year olds | 771 (11%) |
| 55 years old or older | 226 (3%) |
| Total | 7195 (100%) |

*Source:* *PADOC*

The system-wide total inmate population, by age group and year, is provided in *Figures* *7*

*and* *8*. Again, this is typical of correctional systems in general, with a large proportion of the

inmate population being in their 20s and 30s. As with gender, this reflects deeper age graded

patterns of criminal offending which are largely invariant nationally – younger people are more

criminally active than older people, which has been well-established in the criminal justice

research for decades (Blumstein et al., 1986).
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Figure 7: Overall Rural County Jail Population, by Age Category (Under 18 to 25-29) (2004-
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Figure 8: Overall Rural County Jail Population, by Age Category (30-34 to 55 or Older) (2004-

2011)
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*Research* *Objective* *1D:* *Examine* *the* *extent* *to* *which* *rural* *county* *jails* *have* *been* *housing*

*offenders* *from* *other* *jurisdictions* *(state,* *federal,* *other* *counties,* *etc.).*

System-wide, rural county jails housed 779 inmates per year, on average, from other

jurisdictions (2005-2011), with a minimum of 643 other-jurisdiction inmates per year in 2006,

and maximum of 995 other-jurisdiction inmates per year in 2011 (*Figure* *9*).

Figure 9: Overall Rural County Jail In-House Inmates from Other Jurisdictions (2005-2011)
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Of the twelve jails that were high on housing other-jurisdiction inmates (defined as

having averages greater than the system-wide mean), eleven (92 percent) of them were below

capacity during the study period (*Table* *11*). Somewhat paradoxically, however, half of the jails

that were high on housing other-jurisdiction inmates (6 jails, 50 percent) were also high on

housing their own inmates elsewhere (*Table* *12*). To be sure, inmates can be housed out of

jurisdiction for a number of reasons, including overcrowding in the home institution (which,

according to the data collected for this study, is less of an issue), conflicts with other inmates in

the home institution, need for specialized services, pursuant to court orders, or at the petition of

the inmate (e.g., a sentenced inmate may actually be from another county and petitions to be

housed in his home county in order to facilitate contact with family) .
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Table 11: Number of Jails, by Housing of Other-Jurisdiction Inmates (2005-2011) and Capacity

(2005-2010)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | Housing Other-Jurisdiction Inmates | | |
| High | Low | Total |
| Capacity |  | Above | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Below | 11 | 30 | 41 |
| Total | 12 | 32 | 44 |

*Source:* *PADOC,* *BJS*

Table 12: Number of Jails, by Housing of Other-Jurisdiction Inmates (2005-2011) and Inmates

Housed Elsewhere (2006-2011)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | Housing Other-Jurisdiction Inmates | | |
| High | Low | Total |
| Housed Elsewhere |  | High | 6 | 5 | 11 |
| Low | 6 | 27 | 33 |
| Total | 12 | 32 | 44 |

*Source:* *PADOC,* *BJS*

As may be expected, most of the jails that were high on housing other-jurisdiction

inmates (7 jails, 58 percent) had low average costs per day per inmate (*Table* *13*). There was no

discernible pattern between the age of the facility and whether it was likely to house other-

jurisdiction inmates (*Table* *14*).
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Table 13: Number of Jails, by Housing Other-Jurisdiction Inmates (2005-2011) and Average

Cost per Day per Inmate (2004-2010)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Housing Other-Jurisdiction Inmates | | |
| High | Low | Total |
| Average Cost Per Day Per Inmate | High | 5 | 13 | 18 |
| Low | 7 | 19 | 26 |
| Total | 12 | 32 | 44 |

*Source:* *PADOC,* *BJS*

Table 14: Number of Jails, by Age of Facility and Housing Other-Jurisdiction Inmates (2005-

2011)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Age of Facility | | | | | | |
| 2000s – No Renovation | 2000s + Renovation | 1990s - No Renovation | 1990s + Renovation | Before 1990 - No Renovation | Before 1990 + Renovation | Total |
| Housing Other-Jurisdiction Inmates | High | 4 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 12 |
| Low | 3 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 14 | 32 |
| Total | 7 | 2 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 16 | 14 |

*Source:* *PADOC,* *BJS*

Other-jurisdiction inmates, on average, represented 11 percent of the system-wide

average total in-house population (2005-2011). The percentage of in-house inmates comprised

by inmates from other jurisdictions, per year, is provided in *Figure* *10*.
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Figure 10: Overall Percentage of Rural County Jail In-House Population Comprised of Other-

Jurisdiction Transfers (2005-2011)
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The average number of in-house inmates from other-jurisdictions per year (2005-2011),

for each rural county jail, is shown in *Table* *15*.

Table 15: Average Number of In-House Inmates from Other-Jurisdictions per Year, by County Jail (2005-2011)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **County** **Jail** | **Average** **Number** **of** **Other-Jurisdiction** **Inmates** | **County** **Jail** | **Average** **Number** **of** **Other-Jurisdiction** **Inmates** |
| Adams | 27 | Lawrence | 52 |
| Armstrong | 19 | Lycoming | 20 |
| Bedford | 6 | McKean | 1 |
| Blair | 7 | Mercer | 3 |
| Bradford | 2 | Mifflin | 8 |
| Butler | 12 | Monroe | 5 |
| Cambria | 73 | Montour | 4 |
| Carbon | 5 | Northumberland | 6 |
| Centre | 22 | Perry | 26 |
| Clarion | 4 | Pike | 148 |
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|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Clearfield | 1 | Potter | 4 |
| Clinton | 172 | Schuylkill | 3 |
| Columbia | 25 | Snyder | 33 |
| Crawford | 0 | Somerset | 0 |
| Elk | 3 | Susquehanna | < 1 |
| Fayette | 5 | Tioga | 7 |
| Franklin | 15 | Union | 1 |
| Greene | 11 | Venango | 5 |
| Huntingdon | 0 | Warren | 8 |
| Indiana | 18 | Washington | 2 |
| Jefferson | 4 | Wayne | 8 |
| Juniata | < 1 | Wyoming | 4 |

*Underline* *denotes* *the* *top* *five* *counties* *in* *terms* *of* *number* *of* *other-jurisdiction* *inmates.* *Source:* *PADOC,* *BJS*

The PADOC entered into agreements with nine rural county jails (plus six additional

urban county jails) to house excess inmates, with the first transfers beginning in June 2009. As of

December 2010, the PADOC transferred a total of 1,507 inmates to nine rural county jails.17

These jails are shown in *Table* *16*, along with the number of PADOC inmates transferred and the

average cost per day per inmate for each jail (2009-2010 average).18 By comparison, the average

cost per day to house an inmate in the PADOC was $89.82 in the 2009-2010 fiscal year

(PADOC, 2011b).

17 An additional 433 state inmates were transferred to six urban county jails.

18 The number of PADOC transfers is not necessarily included in the data for in-house inmates from other jurisdictions, and the average cost per day per inmate is not necessarily the cost charged to the PADOC for housing state inmates.
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Table 16: Total Number of PADOC Inmate Transfers and Average Cost per Day per Inmate, by

Receiving County (2009-2010)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **County** | **Number** **of** **PADOC** **Transfers** | **Average** **Cost** **Per** **Day** **Per** **Inmate** **(2009-2010)** |
| Armstrong | 31 | $45.51 |
| Bedford | 171 | $55.46 |
| Butler | 56 | $79.05 |
| Cambria | 630 | $45.07 |
| Centre | 74 | $70.81 |
| Clinton | 250 | $53.09 |
| Indiana | 100 | $76.58 |
| Lawrence | 135 | $55.00\* |
| Wayne | 60 | $72.88 |

*\*Average* *Cost* *Per* *Day* *Per* *Inmate* *for* *Lawrence* *County* *is* *from* *2007only* *(the* *most* *recent* *figure* *available).* *Source:* *PADOC*

**Second Research Goal: Examine jail infrastructure (physical plant, finances, staffing,**

**programs) over the study period.**

*Research* *Objective* *2A:* *Determine* *the* *capital* *projects* *undertaken* *at* *each* *rural* *county* *jail.*

Nineteen jails (43 percent of all rural county jails) self-reported and described 26 major

capital projects undertaken during the study period, including eight new facility constructions

and 18 expansions, renovations, or additions (2001-2010). The number and type of major capital

projects each year are shown in *Figure* *11*.
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Figure 11: Overall Rural County Jail Capital Projects Undertaken (2001-2010)
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Of the 19 jails with major capital projects during the study period, eleven (58 percent) of

them were high population jails (defined as having averages greater than the system-wide mean)

(*Table* *17*). Most of them (18 jails, 95 percent), however, were below capacity (*Table* *18*). Again,

since the vast majority of jails were under capacity, it is difficult to explore differences between

over and under capacity jails that undertook major capital projects.

Table 17: Number of Jails, by Major Capital Projects Undertaken (2001-2010) and Population

(2004-2010)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | Major Capital Projects Undertaken | | |
| Yes | No | Total |
| Population |  | High | 11 | 6 | 17 |
| Low | 8 | 19 | 27 |
| Total | 19 | 25 | 44 |

*Source:* *PADOC,* *BJS*
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Table 18: Number of Jails, by Major Capital Projects Undertaken (2001-2010) and Capacity

(2005-2010)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | Major Capital Projects Undertaken | | |
| Yes | No | Total |
| Capacity |  | Above | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Below | 18 | 23 | 41 |
| Total | 19 | 25 | 44 |

*Source:* *PADOC,* *BJS*

Most of the jails that had major capital projects were not heavily involved in inmate

transfers; they were low on both housing their own inmates elsewhere (12 jails, 63 percent)

(*Table* *19*), and housing other-jurisdiction inmates (13 jails, 68 percent) (*Table* *20*).

Table 19: Number of Jails, by Major Capital Projects Undertaken (2001-2010) and Inmates

Housed Elsewhere (2006-2011)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | Major Capital Projects Undertaken | | |
| Yes | No | Total |
| Housed Elsewhere |  | High | 7 | 4 | 11 |
| Low | 12 | 21 | 33 |
| Total | 19 | 25 | 44 |

*Source:* *PADOC*
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Table 20: Number of Jails, by Major Capital Projects Undertaken (2001-2010) and Housing

Other-Jurisdiction Inmates (2005-2011)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | Major Capital Projects Undertaken | | |
| Yes | No | Total |
| Housing Other-Jurisdiction Inmates |  | High | 6 | 6 | 12 |
| Low | 13 | 19 | 32 |
| Total | 19 | 25 | 44 |

*Source:* *PADOC,* *BJS*

There was no discernible pattern between the age of the facility and major capital projects

undertaken (*Table* *21*).

Table 21: Number of Jails, by Age of Facility and Major Capital Projects Undertaken (2001-

2011)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Age of Facility | | | | | | |
| 2000s – No Renovation | 2000s + Renovation | 1990s - No Renovation | 1990s + Renovation | Before 1990 - No Renovation | Before 1990 + Renovation | Total |
| Major Capital Projects Undertaken | Yes | 6 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 19 |
| No | 1 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 10 | 25 |
| Total | 7 | 2 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 16 | 44 |

*Source:* *PADOC*
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*Research* *Objective* *2B:* *Identify* *the* *currently* *planned* *capital* *projects* *at* *each* *rural* *county* *jail.*

Rural county jail wardens were asked to describe current, approved plans to renovate,

expand, or conduct any other major capital projects. Four jails described major capital projects

underway or planned, including roof renovation, completion of a geothermal project,

construction of a new work release center, and expansion of the current intake/booking area. The

majority of the 36 survey respondents (33 jails, 92 percent) reported no capital projects planned

or underway.

Of the four jails with capital projects planned, three (75 percent) of them were low

(defined as having averages below the system-wide mean) in terms of population (2004-2010),

capacity (2005-2010), and housing inmates elsewhere (2006-2011). Half of them were high on

housing other-jurisdiction inmates (2005-2011), and three-quarters of them had high average

costs per day per inmate (2004-2010).

*Research* *Objective* *2C:* *examine* *each* *rural* *county* *jail’s* *perceived* *major* *capital* *project* *needs.*

Rural county jail wardens were asked to describe any unmet major renovation, expansion,

or other project needs. Sixteen wardens (44 percent of the 36 respondents) self-reported major

capital project needs, listed by type and number of respondents (note that respondents could

select more than one capital project need) in *Table* *22*.
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Table 22: Number of Respondents Reporting a Major Capital Project Need, by Project Category

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project** **Category** | **Number** **of** **Respondents** **Reporting** **a** **Need** |
| New facility | 5 |
| Expansion of housing area | 5 |
| Expansion of medical department | 1 |
| Expansion of administrative area | 1 |
| Security fencing upgrades | 1 |
| Other additions, renovations | 6 |

*Source:* *Survey* *(36* *respondents)*

Many of the comments surrounding the self-identified need for a new or expanded

facility related to issues with overcrowding and/or outdated and antiquated facilities. Three

respondents noted a need for a new space to house inmates needing special programs or services

(e.g., work release, females, restricted housing, mentally ill). One respondent who cited a need

for a new facility specifically said the jail could capitalize on the deficit capacity that would

result from such construction by selling excess space to other overcrowded corrections facilities.

Other miscellaneous project needs included inmate shower upgrades, new roof, additional

recreation yard, and fire damage reparations. The majority of the 36 respondents (20 wardens, 55

percent) reported no major capital project needs.

Of the ten jails reporting a major capital project need, most (six jails, 60 percent) were

low population jails (2004-2010) (defined as having averages below the system-wide mean).

Eight of them (80 percent) were low on housing their own inmates elsewhere (2006-2011), and

all of them (100 percent) were also low on housing other-jurisdiction inmates (2005-2011).

Likewise, most of the respondents without a major capital need were low on both housing their
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own inmates elsewhere (17 jails, 73 percent) and housing other-jurisdiction inmates (16 jails, 62

percent).

Six of the ten jails with a major capital project need (60 percent) had high average costs

per day per inmate; and 17 of those without a need (73 percent) had low average costs per day

per inmate (*Table* *23*). Thus, reporting a need for a capital project may reflect a desire to reduce

the cost per inmate per day by constructing more modern and cost efficient facilities.

Table 23: Number of Jails, by Major Capital Project Need and Average Cost per Day per Inmate

(2004-2010)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Major Capital Project Need | | |
| Yes | No | Total |
| Average Cost Per Day Per Inmate | High | 6 | 9 | 15 |
| Low | 4 | 17 | 21 |
| Total | 10 | 26 | 36 |

*Source:* *Survey* *(36* *respondents)*

There was no discernible pattern between the age of the facility and capital project need

(*Table* *24*).
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Table 24: Number of Jails, by Age of Facility and Major Capital Project Need (2001-2011)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Age of Facility | | | | | | |
| 2000s – No Renovation | 2000s + Renovation | 1990s - No Renovation | 1990s + Renovation | Before 1990 - No Renovation | Before 1990 + Renovation | Total |
| Major Capital Project Need | Yes | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 10 |
| No | 7 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 26 |
| Total | 7 | 2 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 12 | 36 |

*Source:* *Survey* *(36* *respondents)*

*Research* *Objective* *2D:* *Determine* *the* *current* *operating* *budget* *for* *each* *rural* *county* *jail,*

*including* *how* *this* *has* *changed* *during* *the* *study* *period* *and* *how* *per* *inmate* *costs* *compare* *to* *the*

*state* *prison* *system.*

System-wide, the average total approved budget for the 44 rural county jails combined

was $155,887,586 per year (2005-2011), ranging from a minimum total approved budget of

$137,785,816 in 2006, to a maximum total approved budget of $192,428,403 in 2011 (*Figure*

*12*).19 The system-wide average total budget spent was $142,554,391 per year (2004-2010), with

a minimum total budget spent of $124,531,840 in 2005, and maximum total budget spent of

$168,749,381 in 2010. As may be expected, all high-budget jails (16 jails, 100 percent) (defined

as having averages greater than the system-wide mean) were also high-population jails, and most

low-budget jails (27 jails, 96 percent) were low-population jails (*Table* *25*).

19 Throughout the report, financial figures have not been adjusted for inflation.
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Figure 12: Overall Rural County Jail Budget Approved and Spent (2004-2011)
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Table 25: Number of Jails, by Approved Budget (2005-2011) & Budget Spent (2004-2010) and

Population (2004-2010)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Approved Budget & Budget Spent | | |
| High | Low | Total |
| Population | High | 16 | 1 | 17 |
| Low | 0 | 27 | 27 |
| Total | 16 | 28 | 44 |

*Source:* *PADOC,* *BJS*

The average annual approved budget per jail was $3,669,166, with a minimum average

approved budget of $747,302 per year, and a maximum average approved budget of $9,785,244

per year (2005-2011). The average annual budget spent per jail was $3,400,034, with a minimum
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average budget spent of $768,338 per year, and a maximum average budget spent of $8,952,459

per year during the study period (2004-2010). These data are provided for each rural county jail

in *Table* *26*.

Table 26: Average Annual Approved Budget (2005-2011) and Average Annual Budget Spent (2005-2010), by County Jail

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **County** **Jail** | **Approved** **Budget** | **Budget** **Spent** |  | **County** **Jail** | **Approved** **Budget** | **Budget** **Spent** |
|  |
| Adams | $6,712,772 | $6,314,148 | Lawrence | $5,092,877 | $4,733,333+ |
| Armstrong | $2,843,165 | $2,656,304 | Lycoming | $7,305,568 | $7,177,356 |
|  |
| Bedford | $2,830,245 | $2,888,296 | McKean | $2,001,866 | $2,071,837 |
| Blair | $4,241,051 | $4,322,136 | Mercer | $6,557,669 | $6,001,185 |
| Bradford | $2,766,871 | $2,507,909 | Mifflin | $2,224,460 | $2,196,228 |
|  |
| Butler | $8,137,187 | $6,588,474 | Monroe | $9,785,244 | $8,952,459 |
|  |
| Cambria | $6,448,891 | $5,390,693 | Montour | $747,302 | $783,678 |
| Carbon | $3,592,983 | $3,314,230 | Northumberland | $3,349,961 | $3,056,421 |
|  |
| Centre | $5,687,548 | $5,660,806 | Perry | $3,476,425 | $3,304,228 |
|  |
| Clarion | $2,125,812 | $2,008,894 | Pike | $8,577,351 | $8,167,476 |
| Clearfield | $2,762,175 | $2,616,065 | Potter | $911,588 | $768,338 |
|  |
|  |
| Clinton | $4,509,940 | $4,515,969 | Schuylkill | $3,889,285 | $3,718,889 |
|  |
| Columbia | $3,117,374 | $3,248,615 | Snyder | $2,257,440 | $2,610,613 |
|  |
|  |
| Crawford | $4,723,333 | $3,881,758 | Somerset | $2,233,234 | $2,173,132 |
|  |
| Elk | $1,902,606 | $1,849,021 | Susquehanna | $2,087,562 | $2,008,281 |
|  |
| Fayette | $4,129,528 | $3,823,832 | Tioga | $2,266,873 | $1,764,898 |
| Franklin | $7,777,978\* | $5,066,054\* | Union | $1,403,902 | $1,255,900 |
| Greene | $1,708,396 | $1,895,105 | Venango | $2,217,795 | $2,148,519 |
|  |
|  |
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*\*Based* *on* *two* *years* *of* *available* *data.* + *Based* *on* *three* *years* *of* *available* *data.* *Not* *adjusted* *for* *inflation.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Huntingdon | $1,696,758 | $1,625,348 |  | Warren | $2,515,546 | $2,463,670 |
| Indiana | $3,334,719 | $3,029,815 | Washington | $5,284,793 | $5,062,681 |
|  |
| Jefferson | $2,165,841 | $2,165,631 | Wayne | $1,974,427 | $1,778,127 |
|  |
| Juniata | $860,334 | $868,067 | Wyoming | $1,206,612 | $1,167,067 |

*Source:* *PADOC*

The system-wide mean average cost per day per inmate was $60.41 during the study

period (2004-2010) (*Figure* *13*). Each county jail’s costs ranged from a minimum mean average

cost per day per inmate of $37.54 in Washington County, to a maximum mean average cost per

day per inmate of $127.71 in Potter County during the study period (2004-2010). By

comparison, the state correctional institution’s mean average cost per day per inmate during the

2007-2010 fiscal years was $88.23 (PADOC, 2011b). Cost per day per inmate is influenced by a

complex mix of a number of factors, including age of the facility, security levels of the inmates

housed (higher security inmate require more staffing), average seniority level of the staff (long

tenured staff will be earning higher salaries), union status of staff, inmate turnover rates (high

turnover leads to higher costs due to intake and processing expenses for new inmates), and other

factors. Older prisons are often more expensive to operate due to higher maintenance costs, but

this can be somewhat offset by any of the other factors mentioned (e.g., less senior staff earning

lower salaries). *Table* *27* below provides some support for the conclusion that high population

jails can achieve greater per inmate efficiencies.
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Figure 13: Overall Rural County Jail System Average Cost per Day per Inmate (2004-2010)
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*Not* *adjusted* *for* *inflation.* *Source:* *PADOC*

Of the 18 jails with high average costs per day (defined as having averages above the

system-wide mean), 13 (72 percent) were low population jails (*Table* *27*).

Table 27: Number of Jails, by Average Cost per Day per Inmate (2004-2010) and Population

(2004-2010)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | Average Cost Per Day Per Inmate | | |
| High | Low | Total |
| Population |  | High | 5 | 12 | 17 |
| Low | 13 | 14 | 27 |
| Total | 18 | 26 | 44 |

*Source:* *PADOC,* *BJS*

System-wide, the average total rural county jail gross revenue was $20,012,722 per year

(2005-2010), with minimum total gross revenue of $13,921,093 in 2006, and maximum total

gross revenue of $27,803,171 in 2010 (*Figure* *14*). Revenue sources include funds received for

housing out of county inmates (including from Immigration and Customs Enforcement) and

inmate fines/fees.
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Figure 14: Overall Rural County Jail System Gross Revenue (2005-2010)
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Per jail, the average annual gross revenue was $490,801, with minimum average gross

revenue of $36,588 per year in Susquehanna County, and maximum average gross revenue of

$4,616,716 per year in Pike County during the study period (2004-2010).

*Research* *Objective* *2E:* *Examine* *each* *rural* *county* *jail’s* *perceived* *major* *financial* *challenges*

*over* *the* *next* *five* *years.*

Rural county jail wardens were asked to select the top three financial challenges facing

their jails. The financial challenge categories are listed in *Table* *28* along with the number and

percentage of respondents who selected the category as one of the top three challenges facing

their jail.

43

Table 28: Number and Percentage of Respondents Who Selected Each Category as One of the

Top Three Financial Challenges Facing Their Jail

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Financial** **Challenge** | **Number** **and** **Percentage** **of** **Respondents** |
| Medical and/or mental healthcare costs | 27 (77%) |
| Staffing costs (wages, benefits, training) | 24 (69%) |
| County budget cuts | 15 (43%) |
| Physical plant costs (utilities, upkeep) | 12 (34%) |
| Vendor/contractual costs (food, services) | 11 (31%) |
| Costs associated with overcrowding | 4 (11%) |
| Legal costs (inmate liability filings) | 3 (9%) |
| Unfunded mandates (changes in law that are not financed and require use of local general funds to carry out) | 3 (9%) |
| Other20 | 1 (3%) |
| **Total** | **100** **(286%)**21 |

*Source:* *Survey* *(35* *respondents)*

The three most pressing financial challenges were medical/mental health costs, staffing

costs, and county budget cuts, with medical/mental health costs being the predominant fiscal

concern facing county jails. Costs for medical and mental health services are a challenge facing

correctional systems nationwide (Kinsella, 2004). Inmates often arrive at the prison or jail with a

significant constellation of medical and mental health needs that, in many cases, have not been

previously addressed. Corrections agencies are also typically required by law to provide basic

20 The respondent who selected “Other” cited costs associated with having to house female inmates in another county.

21 Calculations were based on the 35 jails that responded to the survey and selected no more than three items. The total number adds to 100, not 105, and total percentage adds to 286 percent, not 300 percent, as there were five respondents (14 percent) for which only two selections were recorded.
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levels of health care to their inmates (Allen et al., 2007). Thus, given the high demand and

service mandate, it is not surprising that medical/mental health costs represent a significant

financial challenge for the jails in this study.

*Research* *Objective* *2F:* *Determine* *the* *current* *staffing* *level* *(including* *staffing* *ratios)* *for* *each*

*rural* *county* *jail,* *using* *the* *following* *staff* *categories:* *Corrections* *Officers,* *Treatment* *Staff,* *Jail*

*Administration/Management,* *Support* *Staff,* *Other.22*

*Table* *29* shows the system-wide average total number of persons per year within each

staffing category during the study period (2005-2011).

Table 29: Overall Average Rural County Jail System Staff Persons per Year, by Staffing

Category (2005-2011)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Full-Time | Part-Time |
| Corrections Officers | 1816 | 400 |
| Treatment Staff | 183 | 177 |
| Administration/Management | 197 | 12 |
| Support Staff | 171 | 50 |
| Other Staff | 46 | 14 |
| Total Staff | 2413 | 653 |

*Source:* *PADOC*

*Table* *30* shows the average total number of persons *per* *jail* within each staffing category

during the study period (2005-2011).

22 The staffing categories were based on those derived by Young et al. (2009), however the rural jails used a variety of different staffing categories, in which case they were fit into the most comparable prescribed category.
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Table 30: Per Jail Average Number of Staff Persons per Year, by Staffing Category (2005-2010)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Full-Time | Part-Time |
| Corrections Officers | 41 | 9 |
| Treatment Staff | 4 | 4 |
| Administration/Management | 4 | 0 |
| Support Staff | 4 | 1 |
| Other Staff | 1 | 0 |
| Total Staff | 54 | 14 |

*Source:* *PADOC*

As is common to correctional systems nationwide, security staff personnel in the rural

county jails comprise the bulk of personnel. During the study period (2005-2010), the system-

wide average security staff-to-inmate ratio each year was one officer for every 3.2 inmates, and

the average total staff-to-inmate ratio was one staff member to every 2.4 inmates.23 Each jail’s

security staff-to-inmate ratio ranged from a minimum average of one officer to every six inmates

in Schuylkill County, to a maximum average of one officer to every one inmate in Potter County

during the study period (2005-2010). Each jail’s total staff-to-inmate ratio ranged from a

minimum average of one staff member to every 4.5 inmates in Schuylkill County, to a maximum

of one staff member to every 0.6 inmates in Potter County during the study period (2005-

2010).24 These staffing data are shown for each rural county jail in *Table* *31.*

23 Calculations are based on the average daily in-house inmate population.

24 Ratios are provided for informational purposes only. Comparison between institutions based on relative staffing ratios is regarded as an inaccurate practice due to the complexities involved in staffing decisions and jail characteristics (Liebert & Miller, 2003).
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Table 31: Average Security Staff-to-Inmate Ratio Total Staff-to-Inmate Ratio per Year, by

County Jail (2005-2010)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **County** **Jail** | **Security** **Staff-to-Inmate** | **Total** **Staff-to-Inmate** | **County** **Jail** | **Security** **Staff-to-Inmate** | **Total** **Staff-to-Inmate** |
| Adams | 1:2.8 | 1:2.2 | Lawrence | 1:3.6 | 1:2.7 |
| Armstrong | 1:2.7 | 1:2.2 | Lycoming | 1:5.4 | 1:2.8 |
| Bedford | 1:3 | 1:2.3 | McKean | 1:3.6 | 1:2.6 |
| Blair | 1:4.3 | 1:3.4 | Mercer | 1:3.2 | 1:2.3 |
| Bradford | 1:3.3 | 1:2.4 | Mifflin | 1:3.2 | 1:2.3 |
| Butler | 1:3.4 | 1:2.4 | Monroe | 1:3.2 | 1:2.4 |
| Cambria | 1:4.4 | 1:3.5 | Montour | 1:2.3 | 1:1.4 |
| Carbon | 1:2.7 | 1:2.2 | Northumberland | 1:3.8 | 1:2.9 |
| Centre | 1:3.1 | 1:2.2 | Perry | 1:2.8 | 1:1.7 |
| Clarion | 1:3 | 1:1.9 | Pike | 1:3 | 1:2.1 |
| Clearfield | 1:4 | 1:3.1 | Potter | 1:1 | 1:0.6 |
| Clinton | 1:5.5 | 1:4 | Schuylkill | 1:6 | 1:4.5 |
| Columbia | 1:3.4 | 1:2.9 | Snyder | 1:2.1 | 1:1.7 |
| Crawford | 1:2.9 | 1:2.3 | Somerset | 1:2.4 | 1:1.6 |
| Elk | 1:1.7 | 1:1.2 | Susquehanna | 1:2.2 | 1:1.7 |
| Fayette | 1:4.3 | 1:3.5 | Tioga | 1:1.8 | 1:1.2 |
| Franklin | 1:3.9 | 1:2.8 | Union | 1:2.9 | 1:1.6 |
| Greene | 1:3.4 | 1:2.7 | Venango | 1:3.8 | 1:2.9 |
| Huntingdon | 1:2.3 | 1:1.9 | Warren | 1:4.2 | 1:3.2 |
| Indiana | 1:2.8 | 1:1.9 | Washington | 1:5.4 | 1:3.9 |
| Jefferson | 1:2.8 | 1:1.9 | Wayne | 1:2.2 | 1:1.8 |
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Juniata | 1:2.5 | 1:1.4 | Wyoming | 1:2 | 1:1.3 |

*Source:* *PADOC,* *BJS*

*Research* *Objective* *2G:* *Identify* *treatment/rehabilitative* *services/programs* *(drug* *treatment,*

*GED,* *etc.)* *offered* *at* *each* *rural* *county* *jail.*

This study collected data on both the level of treatment services being offered (i.e., hours

of service per week), as well as the specific types of programs and services being delivered. The

OCIS dataset collected from the PADOC listed specific programs offered at each jail, showing

specific program name or at least program type (i.e., drug treatment). While information was not

available on important program characteristics such as the qualifications of staff delivering the

programs or the number of inmates in each treatment group, the OCIS program dataset does

allow for broad benchmarking of these programs against what is known in the research literature

about evidence-based correctional programs, as discussed in greater detail below.

System-wide, rural county jails offered an average of 17 hours of drug and alcohol

treatment per week; 22 hours of education programs per week; 11 hours of social services

programs per week; and 28 hours of counseling programs per week during the study period

(2005-2010). Note that these are the number of hours that a treatment provider is available and

that programs operate, but there may be considerable variation in the number of hours of

treatment an individual inmate actually receives (Lieutenant Sandra Leonowicz, Prison

Inspector, Pennsylvania Department of Corrections, Office of County Inspection and Services,

personal communication, January 2012).

It is difficult to conclude whether the amount of treatment services delivered to the

county jail inmates reported above (in hours) is sufficient. As a general rule, the literature on

effective correctional programming (see further discussion of this below) indicates that
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individual clients should be occupied in structured treatment program and related activities for

40 to 70 percent of their time in order to maximize treatment effects, and that programs should

last between three to nine months, depending upon the goals of the program and the needs of the

client (Andrews & Bonta, 2003). Programs that follow these guidelines are characterized as high

intensity programs. Low intensity programs – those that offer only a few hours of service per

week to individual clients – are found to be much less effective than more intensive programs.

Turning to program type, this study found a wide variety of program types being offered

at the 44 rural county jails. There was a fair degree of consistency in program offerings across

the time period of the study, although not all counties reported program information for all of the

years covered by this study. Thus, the following discussion represents a composite of programs

offered by the rural jails across the study time period. The researchers grouped the various

program offerings reported by the jails into the following 11 categories (in order of frequency of

being offered in the county jails): Educational/Vocational Programs; Substance Abuse

Treatment/Services; General Psychological Counseling; Anger/Stress Management Programs;

Parenting Programs; Reentry Programs; Life Skills Programs; Sex Offender Programs; Programs

Targeting Criminal Thinking and Decision Making Skills; Other Programs; and Non-Evidence-

Based Programs. The prevalence of these programs in the 44 rural county jails during the study

period is summarized in *Table* *32.* As discussed later, jails are typically required to provide

educational services (to selected inmates) and mental health services, but other program types are

more discretionary.
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Table 32: Number and Percentage of Rural Jails Offering Treatment Programming, by Program

Category (2004-2011)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Program** **Category** | **Number** **and** **Percentage** **of** **Jails** |
| Educational/Vocational Programs\* | 44 (100%) |
| Substance Abuse Treatment/Services\* | 44 (100%) |
| General Psychological Counseling | 44 (100%) |
| Anger/Stress Management Programs | 32 (73%) |
| Parenting Programs | 31 (70%) |
| Reentry Programs | 27 (61%) |
| Life Skills Programs | 20 (45%) |
| Sex Offender Programs\* | 11 (25%) |
| Programs Targeting Criminal Thinking and Decision Making Skills\* | 7 (16%) |
| Other Programs | 29 (66%) |
| Non-Evidence-Based Programs | 12 (27%) |

*\*Denotes* *evidence-based* *program,* *see* *discussion* *below.*

*Source:* *PADOC,* *2011* *data* *from* *county* *jails’* *websites.*

Program density, or the total number of each category of program offered at a given jail

(except non-evidence-baed programming) was also examined. Of the 18 jails with high program

density (defined as having averages above the system-wide mean), 11 (61 percent) were also

high population jails (*Table* *33*). Likewise, the majority of those low on program density (20

jails, 77 percent) were low population jails. This same pattern was evident in the relationship

between density and operating budget – the majority of jails high on program density (11 jails,
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61 percent) were also high budget jails, and those low on program density (21 jails, 81 percent)

were low budget jails (*Table* *34*).

Table 33: Number of Jails, by Program Density (2004-2011) and Population (2004-2010)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | Program Density | | |
| High | Low | Total |
| Population |  | High | 11 | 6 | 17 |
|  | 7 | 20 | 27 |
| Low |
|  | 18 | 26 | 44 |
| Total |

*Source:* *PADOC,* *BJS*

Table 34: Number of Jails, by Program Density (2004-2011) and Approved Budget (2005-2011)

& Budget Spent (2004-2010)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Program Density | | |
| High | Low | Total |
| Approved Budget & Budget Spent | High | 11 | 5 | 16 |
| Low | 7 | 21 | 28 |
| Total | 18 | 26 | 44 |

*Source:* *PADOC*

As a preface to the examination of the specific types of programs being offered at the

rural county jails, this report begins with an overview of what constitutes an effective

correctional program. This review will allow for some broad conclusions about the effectiveness

of the programs being offered in the rural jails. There is an extensive body of research on what

constitutes an effective correctional treatment program, and what differentiates effective,
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evidence-based programs from ineffective programs (Andrews & Bonta, 2003; MacKenzie,

2006). This body of correctional research is commonly referred to as the “what works” literature

(MacKenzie, 2006). In most of this research, effective, evidence-based correctional programs are

defined as those that are likely to reduce recidivism and to promote other pro-social outcomes in

inmates, such as sobriety and employment. Ineffective programs do not produce these effects,

although they may have some impact on other outcomes not related to recidivism, such as

improving the subjective sense of well-being of the offender. Again, while these types of

outcomes may be desirable from a humanitarian perspective, they show little relationship to

recidivism or to other critical reentry outcomes (Gendreau et al., 1996).

There are many important aspects to understanding evidence-based correctional

programming, including the characteristics and treatment needs of inmates who are placed into

programs, dosage or quantity of treatment given, characteristics of staff facilitating the programs,

manner in which the programs are delivered, and program leadership. Many of these factors were

beyond the scope of the current study. Given the information available to this study through the

OCIS dataset, though, the most relevant program feature examined in this report is the specific

type of program being delivered and the inmate treatment needs that are being addressed by the

program.

The “what works” literature has identified specific types of programs that are likely to be

effective if they are implemented properly, other programs that are unlikely to be effective

regardless of how well they are implemented, and still other programs about which there is

insufficient knowledge.

The following types of programs are found to be effective in reducing recidivism for

adult offenders: programs targeting antisocial attitudes that are supportive of criminal behavior
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(cognitive restructuring); programs targeting decision making, problem solving, and coping skills

(cognitive skills); programs targeting antisocial peer associates (delinquency networks);

programs targeting self-control/self-regulation; programs targeting substance use (in-

patient/residential and intensive outpatient programs); programs targeting educational and

vocational deficits; specialized programs targeting sex offenders; and programs targeting social

and family relationships. Within this category, the most effective program types are those that

address anti-social attitudes and decision making skills, commonly referred to as “criminal

thinking” (Landenberger & Lipsey, 2005). Such programs most commonly use what is known as

cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT), which is a structured approach to changing how offenders

think about their behavior and how they make decisions that affect their behavior in real world

situations.

The following types of programs, by themselves, are found to be ineffective in reducing

recidivism for adult offenders: programs targeting personal/emotional distress and subjective

well-being (e.g., pure psychotherapy); programs targeting anxiety/self-esteem; programs

targeting physical and mental health; programs targeting socio-economic status; programs

targeting other types of issues such as artistic skill and creativity; programs relying solely on

discipline and punishment (e.g., boot camps or other programs that rely on shaming); and other

types of vague, unstructured programs with no clear targets that are related to criminal behavior

(MacKenzie, 2006).

The following types of programs do not have enough research behind them to know if

they are effective or ineffective in reducing recidivism for adult offenders: programs targeting

parenting skills; broad based reentry programs that focus on structural factors such as getting a
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job, resume writing, and general social service brokerage; general purpose life skills programs;

and programs for psychopathic offenders.

The following is a summary of the program types being offered in the 44 rural county

jails, using the eleven categories introduced earlier. These program types are also discussed in

relation to the preceding review of evidence based practice in correctional treatment.

Education/Vocational Programs – All 44 of the rural jails (100 percent) reported offering some

sort of educational or vocational program during the study time period. This program category

can include GED preparation, Adult Basic Education, Special Education, other general education

courses, as well as specific vocational training tracks. The frequency of educational programs in

these jails is not surprising, as correctional institutions are required to offer educational services

to inmates under the age of 21, and it is also common to offer services such as GED preparation

to inmates of all ages (Allen et al., 2007). The vast majority of jails reported that their

educational services were being delivered largely by local school districts or intermediate units,

augmented by in-house jail teaching staff. As an aside, it is also not uncommon in correctional

institutions for inmates themselves to serve as tutors to other inmates (Allen et al., 2007),

although no data was specifically noted on this. As discussed above, educational/vocational

programs are evidence-based correctional services.

Substance Abuse Treatment/Services – All 44 rural county jails (100 percent) also reported

offering some sort of substance abuse or related services during the study time period. The broad

category of “substance abuse treatment/services” reported here actually conceals a wide variety

of different program subtypes, however. Based upon the rural county jail program data available

to this study, the researchers further broke this category out into the following sub-types: drug
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and alcohol education programs; drug and alcohol self-help groups (e.g., AA); relapse

prevention; individual or group counseling; inpatient/residential treatment; and

other/miscellaneous. As discussed above, substance abuse programs, as a broad category, are

evidence-based. Some specific subtypes of substance abuse programs, however, are more

effective than others. Specifically, the strongest evidence of effectiveness exists for

inpatient/residential treatment, individual and group counseling, and relapse prevention (Mitchell

et al., 2007; Welsh & Zajac, 2004a). Indeed, the evidence for inpatient treatment, commonly

referred to in the prison setting as a therapeutic community, is especially strong (Welsh & Zajac,

2004b). Conversely, there is little or no evidence of effectiveness for self-help programs and

drug and alcohol education programs (e.g., DARE). Thus, it matters what specific type of

substance abuse program is being offered.

The most common type of substance abuse program offered in rural county jails were

self-help programs (44 jails, or 100 percent). Again, as with substance abuse education (17 jails,

or 39 percent), these types of programs show little evidence of effectiveness yet they are

commonly found in correctional institutions and are relatively easy and inexpensive to deliver,

often relying on volunteer staff, even inmate peer counselors (Taxman et al., 2007). Indeed, the

jails in this study most commonly reported that their self-help groups were being delivered by

outside organizations.

While both are evidence-based programming categories, individual and group counseling

(38 jails, or 86 percent) was more prevalently offered than relapse prevention programs (nine

jails, or 20 percent). Less commonly offered was inpatient/residential drug treatment (three jails,

or seven percent), which, again, is generally regarded as the most evidence-based of the various

types of substance abuse programs. Given the expense and difficulty of operating (or contracting
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for) residential substance abuse programs, it is perhaps not surprising that few of the rural county

jails are operating such services. Finally, 16 jails (36 percent) reported offering some other type

of substance abuse program.

General Psychological Counseling – General psychological counseling was also reportedly

offered by all 44 rural jails (100 percent) during the study time period. As with

educational/vocational programs, this is not a surprising finding. Correctional institutions of all

types are generally required by law and/or accreditation standards to offer at least basic

psychological services to inmates with mental disorders (Allen et al., 2007). As with the

educational programs, the vast majority of the jails reported using outside vendors to deliver

mental health services, although some jails also reported having in-house mental health

professionals. Building an in-house mental health staff can be a challenge for small jails. While

mental health services are a necessity within correctional institutions, as noted above, there is

little evidence that general psychological counseling by itself contributes greatly to recidivism

risk reduction.

Anger/Stress Management Programs – Thirty-two of the rural jails (73 percent) reported offering

some type of anger management program. The research on anger management programs is

mixed, but generally few treatment effects are found from such programs by themselves

(Landenberger & Lipsey, 2005). It is also unclear what role anger itself plays in recidivism, even

for violent offenders (Mills & Kroner, 2003).
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Parenting Programs – Programs targeting parenting were offered by 31 of the rural jails (70

percent). Such programs typically focus on providing information on child development and

child care, teaching basic parenting skills, and sometimes attempting to build more positive

attitudes towards parental responsibilities, although there can often be significant variation in

program content from one institution to the other (Loper & Tuerk, 2006). While parenting

programs have been found to have some effects on parenting knowledge, skills, and attitudes,

these effects are inconsistent, and generally no effects are found on recidivism (Loper & Tuerk,

2006; Skarupski, 2003; Surratt, 2003). One of the greatest challenges facing inmate parenting

programs is that the most effective parenting programs generally rely upon intensive

involvement and interaction between the parents and their children, in order to afford parents the

opportunity to practice skills they have learned in the program (Kaminski et al., 2008). This can

be problematic in a prison/jail setting, as visitation by inmates’ families is often fragmented or

inconsistent, and the prison setting itself allows for only limited interaction between the inmates

and their children.

Over the longer term, improved parenting skills of inmates may have some effect on the

delinquency of their children over the life course, but the connection between delinquency

reduction and jail-based parenting programs has not been established (Wright & Beaver, 2005).

Still, parenting programs remain popular in prison settings, in part because they are relatively

easy to deliver.

Reentry Programs – The majority of jails provided reentry programs, with 27 (61 percent)

offering some sort of reentry programming or services during the study time period. There was

significant variation in the type of reentry programming offered, with some jails reporting
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programs directly relating to reentry (and even called by that name), but with many others

offering more general programs, such as work release, job skills, and referral to community

services, which can be placed into the reentry category. As discussed earlier, there is insufficient

evidence to determine whether broad-based reentry programs are effective, although a few major

studies of reentry programs have found little effect from them (Smith, 2008; Wilson & Davis,

2006). One key issue surrounding reentry programs is that they are often “catch all” programs

that offer a variety of services that can vary from one jurisdiction to the other, and may often be

uncoordinated, poorly structured, and bear little relationship to factors that are important to

reducing recidivism (Bucklen & Zajac, 2009). What one jail calls a reentry program may differ

greatly from what another jail calls a reentry program. Thus, while reentry programs can be a

valuable part of an overall package of inmate programming, careful attention must be paid to

how such programs are structured and operated, and exactly what sorts of services are being

delivered under the rubric of reentry.

Life Skills Programs – Life skills programs were less commonly offered, with 20 (45 percent) of

the rural jails offering some sort of life skills programming or services during the study time

period. As with general reentry programming, life skills programs can vary widely between

institutions, and may sometimes be subsumed under reentry programs. Life skills programming

can cover a variety of different factors, such as financial management (e.g., opening and

maintaining a checking account), securing housing, and, for lower functioning inmates, even

activities of daily living, such as personal hygiene and dress. As noted above, there is insufficient

evidence about the effects of general life skills programs by themselves on recidivism.
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Sex Offender Programs – Programs specifically targeting sex offenders were offered by 11 (25

percent) of the rural jails. Sex offender programs can be some of the most difficult types of

programs to operate, requiring specialized staff and dedicated groups. Sex offender treatment is

also often a long term proposition, with some programs running for a year or longer (Losel &

Schmucker, 2005). Thus, it was somewhat surprising to see that any of the county jails were

offering such programming.

Programs Targeting Criminal Thinking and Decision Making Skills – As discussed earlier,

programs that target factors such as anti-social attitudes, anti-social peer associates, poor

decision making and problem solving skills, and related cognitive factors, are found to be some

of the most effective types of offender programming. These types of programs are often referred

to as cognitive restructuring/skills building programs, utilizing a specific program approach

called cognitive-behavioral therapy, or CBT. CBT can be delivered within the context of a stand-

alone program, or basic CBT techniques can also be incorporated into other types of programs,

such as substance abuse programs. Stand-alone curricula include programs like the widely used

*Thinking* *for* *a* *Change* program, which was developed by the National Institute of Corrections,

and is available free of charge to correctional agencies. The PADOC, for example, operates

*Thinking* *for* *a* *Change* in most of the State Correctional Institutions. Other examples of widely

used CBT curricula include *Changing* *Offender* *Behavior*, and *Moral* *Reconation* *Therapy*.

Very few of the 44 rural county jails, however, reported offering anything that could be

identified as addressing criminal thinking or decision making skills, with only seven (16 percent)

of the rural jails offering some sort of clearly identifiable criminal thinking or CBT program

during the study time period. Examples of specific, “off the shelf” criminal thinking programs
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being offered at the jails include *Thinking* *for* *a* *Change* and *Moral* *Reconation* *Therapy*. But,

overall, very little use is being made of this evidence-based program type.

Other Programs – Twenty-nine of the rural jails (66 percent) reported offering other types of

programs that could not easily be placed into one of the above categories. Examples include

women’s programs, veterans’ programs, and victim impact programs. Absent a more detailed

evaluation of exactly what is being offered in these programs, and how it is being provided, it is

difficult to determine if they are evidence-based.

Non-Evidence-Based Programs – Finally, 12 of the rural jails (27 percent) reported offering

other types of programs that on their face appear to fall squarely into the category of non-

evidence-based programs. Examples include art therapy, crafts, self-empowerment, self-esteem,

wellness, teen challenge, meditation, nutrition, and cultural diversity. As discussed earlier, such

programs may serve some legitimate purposes, such as keeping inmates busy or general

enrichment, but there is absolutely no evidence that such program types have any impact on

recidivism. While it is possible that these programs are merely ancillary to more substantive

programs also offered by the jails in question, the fact that the jails named them among their

offerings suggests that they consider them to be of sufficient importance to include in their

programming list.

**CONCLUSIONS**

Despite a steadily increasing overall population (total rural county jail inmate population

increased 17 percent between 2004-2010), the capacity of Pennsylvania’s rural county jail
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system has also increased (and percentage of capacity decreased). Thus, it still appears poised to

act as an available relief valve to other jurisdictions’ crowding issues. In fact, the rural county

jail system, overall, received almost double the number of inmates from other jurisdictions as it

housed elsewhere during the study period. System-wide, rural county jails averaged 84 percent

capacity per year, with 93 percent of jails below capacity during the study period. The majority

of the jails that were high on housing other-jurisdiction inmates were below capacity and had

low average costs per day per inmate. Indeed, the 2010 average cost per day per inmate in rural

county jails ranged from $40 (Northumberland County) to $134.02 (Elk County), with 90

percent25 of rural jails reporting an average cost per day per inmate lower than the PADOC’s

$89.82 (PADOC, 2011b).

In fact, the state prison system has been under tremendous population pressure over the

past several years. Beginning in June 2009, the PADOC entered into agreements with nine rural

county jails to house excess inmates and had transferred a total of 1,507 inmates to nine rural

within 18 months. In addition to sending state inmates to county jails, the PADOC transferred

more than 2,000 inmates to state prisons in Michigan and Virginia as part of its efforts to relieve

its population pressures.26 Population management is all the more critical in light of the provision

of Act 81 of 2008, which will result in more sentenced offenders being sentenced to state prison,

as opposed to county jails, and perhaps an increasing reliance on county jails housing state

transferred inmates. Provided it is properly financed and managed, then, Pennsylvania’s rural

county jail system has the potential to alleviate overcrowding issues demonstrated by other

jurisdictions across the state.

25 Thirty-seven of the 41 jails that reported 2010 data.

26 The inmates housed in Michigan have since been transferred back to Pennsylvania, and PADOC may be planning to reclaim the Virginia-housed inmates (Reilly, 2011).
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While facing population management pressures, and helping to relieve other jurisdictions

of overcrowding, 77 percent of respondents reported medical and/or mental healthcare costs as

one of their top financial challenges. Given that rural county jails inherit the responsibility of

inmate health care when receiving other-jurisdiction transfers, ensuring they have the financial

resources to provide the services seems to be a critically important issue. Moreover, if rural

county jails are to properly manage the influx of other-jurisdictional transfers, their available

staffing complement needs to be appropriately financed. However, 69 percent of respondents

listed staffing costs, including wages, benefits, and training, as one of the top financial

challenges facing their jails.

Another important consideration for inter-jurisdictional transfers is the quality of

rehabilitative programs and services available within the rural county jails. This study found that

the 44 rural county jails are indeed offering program and treatment services that can be classified

as evidence-based. All of the jails reported offering some sort of educational/vocational

programming, general psychological counseling, and substance abuse/treatment services. As

discussed earlier, educational/vocational deficits and substance abuse are both appropriate targets

for evidence-based treatment, but there is little evidence that general psychological counseling

by itself contributes greatly to recidivism risk reduction.

Other types of important evidence-based programming, however, were not as common.

Most notably, this study found little evidence that the jails were offering any sort of

programming that targets factors such as anti-social attitudes, anti-social peers, poor decision

making, and problem solving skills. Such programs are often referred to as cognitive-behavioral

therapy, or CBT programs. Only 16 percent of jails reported offering any programs that could be

identified as explicitly fitting this model, although a CBT focus may be subsumed within other
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programs being offered, such as substance abuse treatment. Again, a strong body of correctional

research finds that CBT programs produce the largest recidivism reduction effects.

Rural jails reported offering many types of programs whose effects on recidivism are

unclear or have not been sufficiently researched. These include parenting programs, anger

management, life skills, and broad-based reentry programs. Indeed, a majority of jails reported

offering some level of these types of programs (63 percent).

More than one-quarter of the jails (27 percent) reported offering programs that have

either shown no effect on recidivism, or are not clearly related to the goal of recidivism

reduction. These include programs focusing on nutrition, arts and crafts, meditation, and

women’s studies. While these programs may contribute to the general wellbeing of the inmates,

they cannot be considered evidence-based treatment.

Moreover, within the category of substance abuse programs, the majority of the programs

being offered utilize specific program models, such as self-help groups, that produce only very

modest effects by themselves. Very few of the jails (seven percent) were offering more intensive

residential substance abuse programs, which have been found to produce significant treatment

effects.

This study represents the most comprehensive narrative and dataset of issues related to

Pennsylvania rural county jails, constituting a solid basis for future research on this topic.

Moreover, this study can provide a basis for data-driven state and local prison bed space and

program management, as well as budget and capital project-related decisions.
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**POLICY** **CONSIDERATIONS**

First, the results of this study provide a useful summary report on county jail populations,

infrastructure and programs, and may aid in population management efforts. Given the

overcrowding issues faces by local and state agencies, the data derived by this study, especially

those related to capacity and costs per day per inmate for each jail, may be used to inform

economical approaches to distributing sentenced offenders between the state and county

correctional systems. Other states, most notably California, have used this approach (Vera

Institute of Justice, 2010). For example, California is transferring tens of thousands of primarily

non-violent inmates from state prisons to county jails in response to extreme and longstanding

overcrowding in the state prison system, which has resulted in intervention by the federal courts

(Dolan, 2011).

Next, this study offered an in-depth analysis of the available rural county jail programs,

the results of which may be used to inform rural county jails’ decisions to augment their current

offerings, whether by eliminating or adding certain types of programs. While the jails are

offering a wide variety of programs and services, much of this program activity focuses on

services that are non-evidence-based, have uncertain effects, or do not utilize the most effective

treatment modalities. To be more effective in reducing recidivism, the Pennsylvania’s rural

county jails could shift resources towards program types that show the strongest impact on

recidivism, most especially programs addressing criminal thinking and decision making skills

and utilizing cognitive-behavioral approaches, while devoting less time to non-evidence-based

programs.

As noted earlier, while this study has documented the presence of various types of

programs within the county jails, a more detailed examination of the quality of these programs
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was beyond the scope of this study. Valuable insight would be gained by an evaluation of

program quality in at least some of the jails, examining factors such as qualifications of program

leadership and staff, appropriate placement of inmates into programs that match their needs,

fidelity of program implementation, and the correspondence of the programs as delivered to the

principles of effective intervention. Such an evaluation would allow for stronger conclusions

about the potential for these county jail programs to reduce recidivism, and would generate

suggestions for program improvements.

Finally, this study has the potential to impact the county jail data management systems.

County jail data are often fragmented, incomplete, and unreliable. In Pennsylvania, as in most

states, county jails operate under policies and procedures promulgated by the local county

government, which, in effect, results in 63 separate correctional systems. Without a stronger

network and more comprehensive data collection and management, research and jail

development efforts are hindered. This project served to test the adequacy of the Pennsylvania

data system specifically, finding that while the relevant data is collected, it is not generally

retained beyond a five year period. It is difficult to make fully informed decisions about state and

county jail population management without robust data systems. Thus, another recommendation

is to create better data management practices, to include taking deliberate steps to preserve the

information collected beyond just five years. Ideally, this data management would be performed

by a single entity so as ensure standardized administration practices. This study represents the

most comprehensive narrative and dataset of issues related to Pennsylvania rural county jails,

constituting a solid basis for future research on this topic.
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**APPENDIX** **A** **–** **SURVEY** **INSTRUMENT**

**PENNSYLVANIA** **RURAL** **COUNTY** **JAIL** **SURVEY** ***Please*** ***return*** ***in*** ***the*** ***envelope*** ***we*** ***have*** ***provided*** ***by*** ***September*** ***16,*** ***2011***

As the Jail Warden/Director, please complete the following survey, which asks about capital projects, challenges, transfers, and other issues related to your jail operation. We at the Penn State University Justice Center for Research recognize the unique concerns and increasing importance of rural county corrections systems, and are working to develop a more complete understanding of the issues facing jails like yours. Currently, there is very little formal research on rural jails, and the available information is fragmented and incomplete. Accordingly, your feedback is critical to understanding this important and complex area. Your participation in this survey is completely voluntary and you have the right to refuse to answer any question. The Center for Rural Pennsylvania, a legislative service agency of the Pennsylvania General Assembly, requested and sponsored this project. Please feel free to attached additional pages if needed.

Part A: Capital Projects

1. Approved capital projects: Please describe any current, approved plans to renovate, expand, or conduct any other major capital projects at your jail (for example, add a new cell block or building):

2. Unmet capital project needs: Aside from the approved capital projects discussed in Question 1 above, what do you feel are other unmet major renovation, expansion, or other capital project *needs* at your jail?

Part B: Financial Challenges

1. Please select the top three (3) major financial challenges facing your jail: County budget cuts

Medical and/or mental healthcare costs Vendor/contractual costs (food, services) Staffing costs (wages, benefits, training) Legal costs (inmate liability filings) Physical plant costs (utilities, upkeep)

Costs associated with overcrowding

Unfunded mandates (changes in law that are not financed and require use of local general funds to carry out)

Other (please explain):

Part C: General Information Forms

1. Each year, your jail submits a General Information Form (GIF) to the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections Office of County Inspection & Services. We are missing this form for a few years for your jail. Can you please enclose a copy of your jail’s GIF for the following years:

2002 2003 2004 2005

Also: GIFs from Franklin (2006, 2008), Lawrence (2009), Montour (2010), & Schuylkill (2009)

If you do not have copies of your GIF for these years, but you can provide documents or records with similar information, please include them in the return envelope, or email them to Dr. Gary Zajac at gxz3@psu.edu, or Lindsay Kowalski at lko103@psu.edu.

**THANK** **YOU** **FOR** **PARTICIPATING** **IN** **THIS** **SURVEY!**

**APPENDIX** **B** **–** **CODEBOOK** **&** **DATABASE**