



ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
RESEARCH AGENCY

C.R. sent
1-23-86

M.F.I

Pouch Y, State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska 99811
(907) 465-3991

103110

May 2, 1986

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

MEMORANDUM

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

House Research Agency
State of Alaska

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

TO: Representative Niilo Koponen

ATTN: Shari Paul

FROM: Mark Torgerson *MT*
Legislative Analyst

RE: Utilization of Probation and Parole in Alaska
Research Request 86-158

ACQUISITIONS

You asked this agency to provide information on probation and parole in Alaska and other states. Your request included the following questions:

- 1) What is the total number of offenders under parole/probation supervision in Alaska? What has the ratio of those on parole and probation to confined offenders in Alaska been since 1972? How does the current ratio compare with other states, specifically Arizona, California, Idaho and Texas? What is the national norm?
- 2) What percentage of offenders apply for parole? Have parole releases increased as the State's prison population increased? Do other states have mandatory parole statutes?
- 3) What is the cost per incarcerated offender versus the cost per offender on probation/parole? What percentage of the corrections budget is allocated for institutional operations, probation/parole, and administrative activities? What are the projected costs if present patterns continue through 1991?

This memorandum summarizes information obtained from the Alaska Department of Corrections; the Departments of Corrections in Arizona, California, Idaho and Texas; the Federal Bureau of Prisons; the National Institute of Justice; and the United States Department of Justice.

103110

Representative Koponen
May 2, 1986
Page Two

Under Alaska's criminal sentencing system, there are two types of supervision imposed on offenders: 1) institutional supervision; and 2) community supervision. Institutional supervision consists of incarceration in a State prison or confinement in a community residential center--so-called half-way houses.¹ Imprisonment can be imposed on both felons and misdemeanants. Community supervision includes probation and parole. Both probationers and parolees are supervised by probation/parole officers employed by the Department of Corrections.

Probation is a type of criminal sentence imposed in lieu of or in addition to a term of incarceration. When a judge sentences an offender to a probationary term, he or she can set any number of conditions (e.g., no drinking) which must be complied with during the probationary term. Judges can impose a probationary term of any length on felons and misdemeanants.

Parole is the release of a felony prisoner before he or she has served the entire sentence imposed by the court. The parole period equals the difference between the offender's sentence and the time served in prison. During their parole period, offenders may be subject to conditions imposed by the Alaska Parole Board.

There are two types of parole in Alaska--discretionary and mandatory. Discretionary parole is available to felony offenders jailed under either nonpresumptive or mandatory sentencing; mandatory parole is imposed on prisoners subject to presumptive or mandatory sentencing.²

¹Some State felony prisoners are incarcerated in the Federal Bureau of Prisons system. According to Sam Trivette, Executive Director of the Alaska Parole Board, these prisoners will be returned to Alaska and placed in the Spring Creek prison which is scheduled to open by December 31, 1987.

²Presumptive sentences are imposed for conviction of serious offenses--the so-called Class A offenses and the major sexual assault crimes. In addition, presumptive sentences are imposed for conviction of less serious offenses if the crime is the offender's second felony conviction during the past ten years. If a less serious felony is the offender's first conviction, a nonpresumptive sentence is imposed. In Alaska, the less serious felonies are labeled Class B and C offenses. Finally, mandatory sentences are imposed for murder, kidnapping and misconduct involving a controlled substance I.

Under discretionary parole, offenders become eligible for release after serving a legally required portion of their sentence.³ Eligible prisoners who apply for discretionary parole are released if their application is approved by the parole board. Under mandatory parole, felony inmates must be released when they have served their full term less accumulated good time credit.⁴ All felony prisoners who have not been released under discretionary parole are released under mandatory parole.

Comparison of Probationers and Parolees to Prisoners

Table 1 presents Alaska's total prison population, the number of sentenced felony offenders and the probation and parole caseloads since 1980.⁵ The table also shows the ratio of the parole/probation caseload to sentenced felony prisoners. Note that the parole caseload includes discretionary and mandatory parolees.

As indicated in Table 1, the ratio of those on parole and probation to incarcerated felons ranged between 1.6:1 and 2.0:1 during the 1980-1986 period. The ratio has remained relatively stable during the past few years. According to Sam Trivette, Executive Director of the Alaska Parole Board, this ratio will probably decrease in future years because the number of presumptively sentenced prisoners who are released on mandatory parole is expected to increase.

³Nonpresumptively sentenced felony inmates are eligible for parole after serving one-fourth of their term. Prisoners subject to mandatory sentencing are eligible for discretionary parole after serving one-third of their sentence, provided that the prisoner has served the mandatory minimum time for the specific crime.

⁴Good time credit, like parole, allows the release of a prisoner before he or she has served the full sentence imposed by the judge. Good time is awarded for "good behavior" (i.e., prisoners get good time if they simply stay out of trouble while imprisoned). Currently, Alaska law provides that prisoners may accumulate one day of good time for every two days served in prison; that is, a prisoner's sentence can be reduced by up to 33 percent for good time credit.

⁵According to Bob Sylvester of the Department of Corrections, the department has been unable to locate data prior to 1980. The sentenced prison population includes prisoners sentenced presumptively and non-presumptively. Mr. Sylvester also stated that prisoners subject to presumptive sentencing comprise 35 percent of the prison population. However, data provided by the department indicate that prisoners sentenced presumptively and incarcerated in 1984 and 1985 will serve 75 percent of the total time to be served by those jailed during that time.

TABLE 1
 COMPARISON OF PROBATION/PAROLE CASELOAD TO PRISONERS
 ALASKA 1980-1986

Year	Total Prison Population	Total Sentenced Felons	Parole Caseload	Probation Caseload	Total Parole/ Probation	Ratio of Parole/Probation to Sentenced Felons
1980	770	530	125	853	978	1.8:1
1981	877	554	124	984	1,108	2.0:1
1982	1,130	717	116	1,118	1,234	1.7:1
1983	1,388	890	121	1,319	1,440	1.6:1
1984	1,731	1,103	208	1,760	1,968	1.8:1
1985	2,073	1,238	267	1,886	2,153	1.7:1
1986	2,420	1,449	254	2,348	2,602	1.8:1
1986*	2,475	1,472	246	2,357	2,603**	1.8:1

*This row represents data for March 1986. Data for other years reflect January totals.

**The Department of Corrections states that 34 percent of the current caseload is located in the state's northern region, while 57 percent live in the Southcentral region and nine percent in Southeast.

* * * *

Comparison of Alaska and Other States. Table 2 compares Alaska's current sentenced felony population and parole/probation caseload with those in four states for which you requested data.⁶ The parole/probation figures represent mandatory and discretionary parolees. Alaska's sentenced felony offenders include those in State prisons and the Federal Bureau of Prisons.

Idaho and Alaska have roughly the same ratio of probation/parole caseload to felony inmates. The ratio in these states is significantly higher than that in the other three states. As noted previously, Alaska's ratio will likely decrease in the future as an increasing number of presumptively sentenced felons are released on mandatory parole. Factors which affect the ratio include a state's sentencing laws, prosecution policies and the sentencing philosophies of the sentencing judges.

⁶Comparable data from the states were available for only the number of sentenced felons, rather than total prison populations.

However, the ratio of felony offenders to those on probation and parole does not necessarily reflect the type of sentencing used by a state. Idaho and Texas, the states with the highest and lowest ratios, apply nonpresumptive sentencing while Alaska, Arizona and California use some form of presumptive sentencing.

TABLE 2
COMPARISON OF PAROLE/PROBATION CASELOAD TO FELONY PRISONERS
MARCH 1986

Type of Supervision	<u>Alaska</u>	<u>Arizona</u>	<u>California</u>	<u>Idaho</u>	<u>Texas</u>
Parole	246	2,500	30,797	288	38,061
Probation	2,357	18,176	197,413	2,187	274,394
Inmates	1,472	9,000	50,841	1,434	37,808
Ratio of Parole/ Probation to Inmates	1.8:1	2.3:1	4.5:1	1.7:1	8.3:1
		* * * *			

The U.S. Department of Justice's Bureau of Justice Statistics completed a study recently which shows the ratio of confined prisoners--both felons and misdemeanants--to offenders under parole and probation in all the states. We will forward a copy of that study when it is received.

Parole Eligibility

You asked for the total number of offenders who have become eligible for parole consideration and the percentage who are seen by the parole board after becoming eligible. According to Sam Trivette, the number of parole-eligible offenders changes constantly and is not monitored at the State level. Mr. Trivette stated that all prisoners subject to discretionary parole are notified of their parole eligibility date within 60 days after their incarceration. The prisoners are also notified in time to apply and have their case decided by the parole board at the board's quarterly hearings. Although the board will hear a prisoner's case before his or her eligibility date, the prisoner is not released until that date.

Each eligible prisoner decides whether or not to apply for parole release (i.e., there is no requirement to apply for parole release). Mr. Trivette stated that a 1983 study of most of the State's prisons

revealed that roughly 50 percent of prisoners eligible for discretionary parole had applied for release, and an additional 25 percent stated they would apply soon. The remaining 25 percent stated they did not wish to apply for parole release. According to Mr. Trivette, the usual reason given for deciding not to apply was that the prisoner was within three to six months of release and preferred serving his or her time to going through the parole hearing process.

Changes in Parole Releases and the Prison Population.

Data provided by the Alaska Parole Board indicate that although discretionary parole releases have increased in recent years, they have not kept pace with the rise in the prison population. The absolute number of discretionary parole releases has increased by roughly seven percent annually, from 70 in 1977 to 110 in 1985. During this period, the prison population increased by an average of 31 percent annually, from 600 in 1977 to 2,073 in 1985. Consequently, the number of discretionary parole releases relative to the prison population decreased from 12 percent in 1977 to five percent in 1985.

The data illustrate the impact of the 1980 sentencing law on discretionary parole. Before the law's implementation, most felony prisoners were eligible for discretionary parole after serving one-third of their prison term. Under current law, only first-time offenders of Class B and C felonies and some of those subject to mandatory sentencing are eligible for discretionary parole. All other felony offenders are subject to mandatory parole. As noted, the total number of parolees--discretionary and mandatory--is expected to rise as an increasing number of presumptively sentenced prisoners are released on mandatory parole.

In terms of impact on prison populations, mandatory and discretionary parole laws affect prison growth to the extent they reduce the amount of time offenders must serve in prison. However, other factors also affect prison populations. These include the sentence length imposed by the court, the number of crimes which require incarceration, and the use of good time credit for early release.

Mandatory Parole in Other States. As previously noted, Alaska law requires prisoners subject to presumptive sentencing to be released on mandatory parole when they have served their sentence less accumulated good time credit. According to Sam Trivette, most other states have some form of mandatory parole statute. Upon release, the convicts are usually placed on mandatory parole (or post-release supervision) for a statutorily prescribed period.

The length of this supervision varies widely in the states. In Alaska and some states (e.g. Indiana), the mandatory parole period equals the amount of the offender's accumulated good time. For example, if a judge sentenced an offender to a three-year presumptive term and the offender accumulated one year of good time credit, the offender would be released after two years. The mandatory parole period would then be for one year following release.

In other states (e.g. Arizona, California and Massachusetts), the length of the mandatory parole period is based on the seriousness of the crime or the number of prior offenses rather than the sentence length and good time. In California, for example, released offenders are placed on post-release supervision for up to three years, or five years if the offender was sentenced to life. However, offenders must be discharged from parole in one year unless the parole board shows good cause why the offender should remain on parole. This statutory provision has effectively established a one-year period of parole in California.⁷

Corrections Costs in Alaska

The following figures show average daily costs of offender supervision for the Alaska Department of Corrections in fiscal year 1985. As these figures demonstrate, institutional supervision costs roughly \$78 more per inmate day than the cost of probation/parole supervision. Average daily costs for supervision in community residential centers (so-called half-way houses) are approximately \$36 per day less than the prison costs. Half-way houses serve as a transition between prison and the community. They house inmates nearing the end of their incarceration, inmates participating in substance abuse counseling, and inmates requiring more structure and control than parole/probation provides.

<u>Level of Supervision</u>	<u>Average Cost per Inmate Day, 1985</u>
Institutions	\$82.49
Community Residential Centers	46.16
Probation/Parole	4.92

⁷California applies a presumptive sentencing law to all felonies except those punishable by a life sentence or death (generally, Murder I).

Table 3 presents the Department of Corrections operating and capital budget for FY 80 through FY 86. Prison operations have consumed a larger percentage of the operating budget each year since FY 80. Moreover, the parole and probation programs have represented a decreasing share of the operating budget each year since 1980. The capital budgets reflect annual expenditures for prison construction, expansion and renovation; there are no capital costs for probation/parole supervision.

TABLE 3
 DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS OPERATING AND CAPITAL BUDGETS
 FISCAL YEARS 1980-1986 (THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

FISCAL YEAR	-----OPERATING BUDGET-----						---CAPITAL BUDGET---		---TOTAL BUDGET---			
	PRISONS	PERCENT OF TOTAL	PAROLE/PROBATION	PERCENT OF TOTAL	ADMINI-STRATION	PERCENT OF TOTAL	ANNUAL TOTAL	ANNUAL CHANGE	DOLLARS	ANNUAL CHANGE	DOLLARS	ANNUAL CHANGE
1980	\$16,287	75.4%	\$4,162	19.3%	\$1,150	5.3%	\$21,599		\$2,000		\$23,599	
1981	19,374	80.0	3,067	12.3	1,900	7.6	24,342	15.0%	19,137	1358.5%	43,479	128.7%
1982	25,461	80.4	4,789	14.5	1,671	5.1	32,922	32.5	18,246	(37.4)	51,168	(5.2)
1983	33,240	82.8	5,181	12.7	1,700	4.2	40,121	21.9	20,440	12.0	60,562	
1984	49,188	85.0	3,716	6.4	1,946	6.5	57,849	44.2	24,147	18.1	81,996	35.4
1985	63,647	89.0	4,395	6.1	3,455	4.8	71,497	23.6	32,740	35.6	104,237	37.1
1986	69,608	89.6	4,611	5.9	3,473	4.5	77,592	8.7	500	(98.5)	78,092	25.0

SOURCE: ALABAMA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS.
 PREPARED BY THE HOUSE RESEARCH AGENCY, APRIL 1986.

Projected Costs. There is no known method of projecting the State's corrections costs during the next five years because there has been an inconsistent pattern in the Department of Corrections budget. Moreover, the State's revised sentencing law has been amended frequently since its implementation in 1980. Depending on the specific provisions, these amendments have generated increases or decreases in average time served and the number of offenders incarcerated in the State's prisons. These frequent changes make it problematic to project both the size and composition of the prison population as well as the attendant costs.

For example, the amendments included the recent change in good time, which has effectively reduced total prisoner time of prisoners incarcerated under presumptive sentencing in 1984 and 1985 by 8.2 percent. With this reduction, pressure on prison capacity should ease because prison releases will increase until the reducing effects of the amended good time provision level off.

Representative Koponen
May 2, 1986
Page Nine

If the legislature does not appropriate funding for prison construction, capital costs will be limited to expenses for maintenance and security upgrades in existing facilities. As Table 3 suggests, operating costs appear to be leveling off. However, these costs will rise significantly when the Spring Creek prison at Seward opens in 1987. According to Suzy Reilly of the Department of Corrections, that 300 bed facility will be expensive to operate because it will be a maximum security institution, the most costly of all security levels to operate.

Additional information on prison population projections, corrections costs and alternatives to incarceration will be addressed in Interim Report 86-D. We will forward a copy to you as soon as it is published.

* * * *

I hope that this information is helpful to you. Please call me if you have additional questions.

MT



ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
RESEARCH AGENCY

Pouch Y, State Capitol
Juneau, Alaska 99811
(907) 465-3991

May 12, 1986

MEMORANDUM

TO: Representative Niilo Koponen

ATTN: Shari Paul

FROM: Mark Torgerson *MT*
Legislative Analyst

RE: Utilization of Probation and Parole in Alaska
Research Request 86-158 (Supplemental information)

As indicated in our May 2 memorandum on this subject, I am forwarding a copy of "Probation and Parole 1984," a report issued recently by the U. S. Department of Justice's Bureau of Justice Statistics. Table 7 on page 6 of the article presents data on adults under correctional supervision in all states in 1984. The table shows: 1) the total number of adults in jails, prisons, on probation and parole; 2) the percent of the general adult population under correctional supervision; and 3) the percent of the correctional population which was incarcerated in prisons and jails.¹ Alaska had the highest percent of correctional population incarcerated of any state or federal jurisdiction.

According to Lawrence Greenfield, director of correctional statistics programs with the Bureau of Justice Statistics, a conclusion cannot necessarily be drawn that Alaska is the toughest jurisdiction on crime. A number of factors can influence the percent of correctional population incarcerated, including a high percentage of misdemeanants, probation/parole and sentencing policies, and bail release policies (which affect the number of unsentenced persons in institutions). On the other hand, the data appear to indicate that Alaska utilizes probation and parole less than they are used in other states.

¹The jail and prison populations in all jurisdictions include all sentenced and unsentenced felons and misdemeanants. Unsentenced offenders are those awaiting arraignment, bail release, trial and sentencing.

Representative Koponen
May 12, 1987
Page Two

Page two of the original memorandum on this subject stated that discretionary parole is available to felony offenders jailed under either nonpresumptive or mandatory sentencing. While this statement is accurate, it should also indicate that discretionary parole is available to any prisoner who is sentenced to a prison term of more than six months. Therefore, a small percentage of those on discretionary parole are misdemeanants.²

I hope that this additional information is valuable to you. Please let me know if you have additional questions.

MT

Attachment

²According to Sam Trivette, Executive Director of the Alaska Parole Board, less than five percent of those on parole are misdemeanants.



Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin

Probation and Parole 1984

At yearend 1984 a record 1,711,190 adults were on probation in the United States, an increase of 128,000, or 8.1%, in 1 year. During the same period, the adult parole and mandatory release population increased by more than 22,000 (9.0%) to a record 268,515. Since yearend 1979 the adult probation population has increased by 57% and the adult parole and mandatory release population has grown by nearly 23%, compared to a 48% increase in the Nation's sentenced prison population (table 1).

Approximately 3.8 adults were on probation at yearend 1984 for each sentenced adult in a State prison; and 1.7 adults were in prison for each adult under parole supervision. A total of 2,665,386 adults were under the custody or supervision of a correctional authority—or about 1 out of every 65 adults in the Nation. For adult males the ratio was 1 of every 35 and for adult females the ratio was 1 of every 278. One-quarter of the correctional population were incarcerated (jail or prison); three-quarters were under supervision in the community (probation or parole).

Probation populations increased during 1984 in 45 of the 52 jurisdictions (the 50 States, District of Columbia, and the Federal system). Parole populations increased in 32 jurisdictions. More than 1 million adults received a probation sentence during the year and 180,000 entered parole supervision. About four-fifths of those discharged from probation were classified as successful completions, compared to less than two-thirds of those exiting parole. In 12 jurisdictions more than two-fifths of those discharged from parole were classified as unsuccessful terminations, most of these the result of reincarceration for violating parole conditions or for committing new crimes.

February 1986

This is the fourth annual Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin reporting data on probation and parole populations in the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the Federal system. These data supplement the extensive BJS program for collecting and disseminating information on prison and jail populations and thereby present a more complete picture of the criminal sanctions imposed in the United States. The import-

ance of reliable data on probation and parole populations is underscored by the fact that, as this report shows, there are about three times as many offenders being supervised in the community as there are incarcerated.

BJS is pleased to acknowledge the generous cooperation of probation and parole agencies in these data collection efforts.

Steven R. Schlesinger
Director

Probation

During 1984, 45 of the 52 jurisdictions reported increases in their probation populations; 6 reported declines; and 1 reported no change (table 2).¹ The largest percentage increase was reported by Maine (25.0%). Utah reported the largest percentage decline (18.5%), attributed by that State to a change in the law restricting probation to a limited number of months and to the less frequent use of probation for minor

crimes. The Federal probation population grew by 4.7%.

The largest probation population at yearend 1984 was in Texas with a reported 235,568 adult offenders under supervision—or 13.8% of all the adult probationers in the Nation. Other States reporting large probation populations were California (197,413), Florida (108,833), Georgia (100,821), and New York (90,361).

Across the Nation nearly 1 of every 100 adults was under probation supervision at yearend 1984 (986 per 100,000 adults). Per capita rates of probation

¹ See "Jurisdiction notes" at end of report for limitations in State data.

Table 1. Comparison of the sentenced prison population to the probation and parole populations, 1979-84

	Sentenced prison population*	Probation population	Ratio of probationers to prisoners	Parole population	Ratio of prisoners to parolees
1979	301,470	1,086,535	3.60	218,690	1.38
1980	315,974	1,118,097	3.54	220,438	1.43
1981	353,673	1,225,934	3.47	223,774	1.58
1982	395,948	1,357,264	3.43	224,604	1.76
1983	419,731	1,582,947	3.77	246,440	1.70
1984	445,381	1,711,190	3.84	268,515	1.86
Percent change, 1979-84	47.7%	57.5%		22.7%	

Note: All data are for December 31 of each year.

*Defined as prisoners in State/Federal institutions with sentences greater than 1 year.

were highest in Georgia (2.4% of all adults), the District of Columbia (2.1%), Texas (2.1%), Maryland (2.0%), and Connecticut (1.9%). Another eight States reported that more than 1% of their adult resident populations were serving probation sentences: California, Delaware, Florida, Minnesota, North Carolina, Oregon, Vermont, and Washington.

34% of the Nation's adult residents, accounted for 43% of the Nation's probationers. Midwestern States, by contrast, had 25% of the Nation's adult population but 18% of those on probation. Growth rates during the year were highest in the Northeast (9.3%) and lowest in the Western States (6.9%).

More than 1 million persons received a probation sentence during

Southern States, with approximately

1984 and 904,000 were terminated from probation. Nationally about one-third of those who were under probation supervision at some time during 1984 exited probation. In Florida, Nebraska, and Iowa this proportion was one-half. Some States may have had higher turnover rates than others because larger proportions of their probationers were convicted of less serious crimes resulting in shorter probation sentences. Nebraska, for example, with a turnover rate of 53.4%, reported that 4 of 5 probationers were convicted of misdemeanor offenses. Alabama, on the other hand, with a turnover rate of 21.5%, reported that 9 in 10 probationers were convicted of felonies. Overall, reporting States indicated that approximately 51% of those on probation were convicted of felonies and 49% were convicted of misdemeanors.

Generally there are three ways in which sentences to probation occur:

- **Suspended execution of sentence**—the judge imposes a term of incarceration that is then suspended on the condition that the offender follow specific rules of conduct under the supervision of a probation officer; an estimated 52.3% of all probationers were reported to be under this type of sentence.

- **Suspended imposition of sentence**—after an adjudication of guilt final disposition of the case is suspended pending a specified period of future good conduct by the offender, violations of which will result in the imposition of a final sentence; an estimated 5.9% of all probationers were reported to be in this category.

- **Direct sentence to probation**—the judge sentences the convicted offender to a term of supervision in the community under specific rules of conduct, violations of which may be adjudicated as a new crime or provide grounds for resentencing; an estimated 41.7% of all probationers were found to be in this category.

Sentences to probation may also be accompanied by a brief period of incarceration preceding supervision in the community. This combination of incarceration and probation may be part of the original sentence (split sentence) or result from re-sentencing an offender who has served part of a prison or jail sentence (shock probation). For 1984, 22 jurisdictions reported the use of incarceration in connection with sentences to probation. About one-third of those entering probation in Idaho, New Jersey, Tennessee, Utah, and Vermont also received a period of confinement as part of their sentence.

Table 2. Adults on probation, 1984

Region and jurisdiction	Probation population 12/31/83	1984		12/31/84		Percent change in probation population 1983-84
		Entries	Exits	Probation population	Probationers per 100,000 residents*	
United States, total	1,582,947	1,032,202	903,959	1,711,190	986	8.1%
Federal	50,226	23,666	21,309	52,583	30	4.7
State	1,532,721	1,008,536	882,650	1,658,607	956	8.2
Northeast	265,772	157,519	132,712	290,579	774	9.3%
Connecticut	40,041	36,663	30,023	46,681	1,939	16.6
Maine	3,495	3,730	2,857	4,368	514	25.0
Massachusetts	22,160	18,372	17,391	23,141	522	4.4
New Hampshire	2,323	2,364	1,905	2,782	384	19.8
New Jersey	41,740	24,920	19,607	47,053	831	12.7
New York	81,570	37,200	28,409	90,361	677	10.8
Pennsylvania	63,684	27,653	27,027	64,310	715	1.0
Rhode Island	6,495	3,841	3,189	7,147	971	10.0
Vermont	4,264	2,776	2,304	4,736	1,214	11.1
Midwest	290,181	215,893	195,079	310,995	721	7.2%
Illinois	58,512	39,000	34,035	63,477	754	8.5
Indiana	30,401	34,766	29,163	36,004	903	18.4
Iowa	11,672	12,567	12,315	11,924	561	2.2
Kansas	13,607	6,396	7,516	12,487	699	-8.2
Michigan	52,778	33,852	30,956	55,674	845	5.5
Minnesota	27,745	31,599	27,904	31,440	1,035	13.3
Missouri	24,174	16,458	14,732	25,900	701	7.1
Nebraska	10,935	12,141	12,313	10,763	925	-1.6
North Dakota	1,367	853	703	1,517	311	11.0
Ohio	36,225	16,585	15,755	37,055	471	2.3
South Dakota	1,530	1,066	1,082	1,514	303	-1.0
Wisconsin	21,235	10,610	8,605	23,240	666	9.4
South	670,156	474,196	415,102	729,250	1,241	8.8%
Alabama	15,732	5,090	4,484	16,338	567	3.9
Arkansas	6,800	2,200	2,200	6,800	401	0
Delaware	5,419	4,016	3,062	6,373	1,391	17.6
District of Columbia	9,602	8,861	8,144	10,319	2,115	7.5
Florida	95,994	122,146	109,307	108,833	1,286	13.4
Georgia	91,183	45,940	36,302	100,821	2,398	10.6
Kentucky	14,450	4,867	4,387	14,930	555	3.3
Louisiana	24,494	14,448	12,209	26,733	860	9.1
Maryland	61,481	40,561	37,215	64,827	1,986	5.4
Mississippi	6,293	2,761	2,484	6,570	365	4.4
North Carolina	45,863	30,135	23,398	52,600	1,152	14.7
Oklahoma	16,012	7,798	5,703	18,107	762	13.1
South Carolina	16,599	3,310	8,147	16,762	706	1.0
Tennessee	23,318	21,213	20,933	23,598	680	1.2
Texas	217,350	146,993	128,775	235,568	2,090	8.4
Virginia	16,387	6,953	6,742	16,598	394	1.3
West Virginia	3,179	1,904	1,610	3,473	244	9.2
West	306,612	160,928	139,757	327,783	963	6.9%
Alaska	1,791	854	581	2,064	611	15.2
Arizona	15,757	6,289	5,359	16,687	760	5.9
California	180,474	102,814	85,875	197,413	1,041	9.4
Colorado	15,580	10,316	9,203	16,693	719	7.1
Hawaii	6,092	4,610	4,016	6,686	889	9.8
Idaho	3,163	2,010	2,022	3,151	464	-4
Montana	2,471	1,172	931	2,712	461	9.8
Nevada	5,095	2,210	2,079	5,226	772	2.6
New Mexico	4,050	2,277	2,172	4,155	421	2.6
Oregon	20,067	10,127	8,535	21,659	1,102	7.9
Utah	8,035	3,458	4,943	6,550	638	-18.5
Washington	42,245	13,792	12,948	43,089	1,351	2.0
Wyoming	1,792	999	1,093	1,698	484	-5.2

*These calculations used unpublished Bureau of the Census estimates of the adult (age 18 and older) population for July 1, 1984.

Information on how offenders were discharged from probation was available for approximately two-thirds of all exits during 1984 (table 3). Nearly 81% of all those exiting probation were considered to be successful completions; 18.5% were unsuccessful terminations. Florida reported the lowest percentage of successful completions (68.5%) and New Hampshire reported the highest (99.3%). Of the 37 reporting jurisdictions, 4 reported successful completions of 90% or more and 24 reported 80-89% successful completions.

Parole

Prisoners enter parole supervision either by discretionary parole board decision or by fulfilling the conditions for a mandatory release. In 38 States, the District of Columbia, and the Federal system the parole board has discretionary authority to release prisoners to community supervision based on statutory or administrative determinations of eligibility. (Usually some fraction of the minimum or maximum term must be served before becoming eligible.) In the other States, those with determinate sentencing statutes, inmates are released from prison and enter a period of community supervision when they have served their original sentence minus time off for good behavior or program participation. For both discretionary parole release and mandatory release, conditions of the release are supervised by a parole officer and rule violations or new crimes may result in a return to prison for the balance of the unexpired sentence.

During the past 10 years the percentage of inmates released from State prisons by a discretionary parole board decision peaked in 1977 at nearly 72% of all releases (table 4). Discretionary parole board releases declined steadily after 1977, reaching 46% in 1984. Conversely, mandatory releases have grown considerably, from about 5% of prison releases in 1975 to nearly 29% in 1984.

Thirty-two of the 52 jurisdictions reported increases in parole populations in 1984 (table 5). Tennessee's increase of more than 83% in 1 year was the largest, resulting from a court order to release a large number of inmates from prison in excess of the number admitted in 1984. Louisiana's growth of more than 57% during 1984 reflects as well the struggle to adjust its crowded prisons to court-ordered capacities. The growth in the Federal parole population (3.1%) was about one-third of the increase in the States (9.4%).

Jurisdiction	Number of those exiting probation ^a	Percent of those exiting probation through:			
		Successful completion of term	Incarceration for current or new offense	Other unsuccessful termination ^b	Death
Total	587,604	80.9%	10.8%	7.7%	.6%
Federal	20,494	86.7	11.1	.9	1.2
Alabama	4,484	84.4	15.6
Arizona	5,359	86.4	13.6
Colorado	9,203	82.1	7.4	10.5	...
Delaware	3,062	88.1	...	11.4	.5
District of Columbia	7,283	87.4	12.6
Florida	108,530	68.5	5.3	26.2	—
Georgia	36,302	83.4	11.4	4.4	.8
Indiana	24,716	86.3	7.8	5.9	...
Iowa	9,346	82.2	11.6	6.2	...
Kansas	7,516	88.3	11.7
Louisiana	11,593	89.2	10.17
Maine	2,857	77.2	22.2	.5	.1
Maryland	35,174	83.1	12.8	3.1	1.0
Michigan	28,060	76.7	10.1	12.7	.5
Mississippi	2,429	71.3	27.7	...	1.0
Missouri	14,732	83.9	6.4	9.2	.5
Montana	931	80.5	14.6	4.1	.9
Nevada	2,079	88.1	11.37
New Hampshire	1,905	99.3	.4	.3	...
New Jersey	19,607	77.9	12.8	6.4	2.8
New Mexico	2,172	81.0	9.1	9.4	.5
New York	26,305	78.8	19.8	...	1.4
North Carolina	22,912	83.3	15.6	...	1.1
North Dakota	703	75.8	21.1	2.6	.6
Oklahoma	5,698	82.7	16.48
Oregon	6,546	86.3	12.4	...	1.2
Rhode Island	3,189	91.2	8.8
South Carolina	8,146	71.6	23.1	4.1	1.1
South Dakota	1,082	92.5	7.5
Tennessee	20,933	89.0	.6	10.5	...
Texas	107,348	84.8	14.39
Utah	4,943	84.9	4.2	10.2	.7
Virginia	6,363	74.4	12.6	12.4	.7
Washington	12,948	95.0	5.0
West Virginia	1,610	88.0	8.9	2.5	.6
Wyoming	944	81.1	10.0	8.7	.2

Note: Data were not available for all States.
^aExcludes cases where method of discharge was not reported.
^bIncludes discharged absconders and those discharged to custody, detainer, or warrant.
 ... Data not available.
 — Less than 0.1%

Year	Total releases from prison	Percent of releases by:						
		All	Discretionary parole	Mandatory release	Expiration of term	Probation	Commutation	Other
1975	106,742	100%	68.3%	5.1%	19.1%	2.9%	2.1%	2.5%
1976	106,928	100	68.9	5.8	19.2	2.9	1.3	1.8
1977	115,213	100	71.9	5.9	16.1	3.6	1.1	1.4
1978	119,796	100	70.4	5.8	17.0	3.3	.7	2.8
1979	128,954	100	60.2	16.9	16.3	3.3	.4	3.0
1980	136,968	100	57.4	19.5	14.9	3.6	.5	4.0
1981	142,489	100	54.6	21.4	13.9	3.7	2.4	4.0
1982	157,144	100	51.9	24.4	14.4	4.8	.3	4.2
1983	191,237	100	48.1	26.9	16.1	5.2	.5	3.2
1984	191,499	100	46.0	28.7	16.3	4.9	.5	3.6

Source: National Prisoner Statistics, 1975-84

The largest percentage decline in parole population occurred in Connecticut (32.6%), where post-release supervision was abolished by the legislature in 1981. North Carolina, which enacted determinate sentencing that same year, experienced a drop of more than 23%. Maine, which abolished both

the parole board and post-release supervision in 1976, maintained a few offenders on parole (122) who were sentenced prior to the change in the law.

As with probation, the largest parole supervision population was in

Table 5. Adults on parole, 1984

Region and jurisdiction	Parole population 12/31/83	1984		12/31/84		Percent change in parole population 1983-84
		Entries	Exits	Parole population	Parolees per 100,000 residents*	
United States, total	246,440	179,735	157,660	268,515	155	9.0%
Federal	16,325	8,128	7,629	16,824	10	3.1
State	230,115	171,607	150,031	251,691	145	9.4
Northwest	54,110	26,142	24,310	55,942	149	3.4%
Connecticut	1,287	481	900	868	36	-32.6
Maine	135	8	21	122	14	-9.6
Massachusetts	5,039	3,830	2,902	5,967	135	18.4
New Hampshire	471	167	183	455	63	-3.4
New Jersey	12,287	5,824	5,905	12,206	216	-7
New York	23,489	11,003	10,280	24,212	181	3.1
Pennsylvania	10,726	4,286	3,641	11,371	126	6.0
Rhode Island	371	376	350	397	54	7.0
Vermont	305	167	128	344	88	12.8
West	46,588	34,301	33,868	47,021	109	9%
Illinois	11,556	7,433	7,606	11,383	135	-1.5
Indiana	2,954	3,675	3,729	2,900	73	-1.8
Iowa	1,556	1,673	1,567	1,662	78	6.8
Kansas	2,036	1,103	1,142	1,997	112	-1.9
Michigan	8,939	6,223	5,753	9,409	143	5.3
Minnesota	1,498	1,289	1,369	1,418	47	-5.3
Missouri	3,330	2,512	1,279	4,563	124	37.0
Nebraska	364	405	408	361	31	-8
North Dakota	170	178	189	159	33	-6.5
Ohio	10,327	7,006	8,268	9,065	115	-12.2
South Dakota	399	474	435	438	88	9.8
Wisconsin	3,459	2,330	2,123	3,666	105	6.0
South	89,367	68,734	56,479	101,622	173	13.7%
Alabama	1,985	1,452	1,243	2,194	76	10.5
Arkansas	3,417	1,528	1,482	3,463	204	1.3
Delaware	718	583	471	830	181	15.6
District of Columbia	2,348	1,257	1,410	2,195	450	-6.5
Florida	6,359	5,129	5,827	5,661	67	-11.0
Georgia	6,577	8,129	7,560	7,246	172	8.5
Kentucky	3,722	2,274	2,379	3,617	134	-2.8
Louisiana	1,963	1,942	818	3,087	99	57.3
Maryland	6,076	4,710	3,740	7,046	216	16.0
Mississippi	3,207	1,537	1,636	3,108	173	-3.1
North Carolina	5,074	4,619	5,801	3,892	85	-23.3
Oklahoma	1,922	774	802	1,894	80	-1.5
South Carolina	3,338	1,270	1,236	3,372	142	1.0
Tennessee	3,563	7,993	5,032	6,524	188	83.1
Texas	32,131	20,144	11,492	40,783	362	26.9
Virginia	6,268	4,970	5,252	5,986	142	-4.5
West Virginia	599	423	298	724	51	20.9
West	40,050	42,430	35,374	47,106	138	17.6%
Alaska	104	116	73	147	43	41.3
Arizona	1,684	1,901	1,925	1,660	76	-1.4
California	25,462	30,641	25,260	30,843	163	21.1
Colorado	1,520	1,930	1,741	1,709	74	12.4
Hawaii	457	155	86	526	70	15.1
Idaho	421	383	223	581	86	38.0
Montana	691	291	288	694	118	.4
Nevada	1,082	1,034	929	1,187	175	9.7
New Mexico	1,079	634	564	1,149	116	6.5
Oregon	1,558	1,834	1,605	1,787	91	14.7
Utah	1,216	666	662	1,220	119	.3
Washington	4,403	2,632	1,782	5,253	165	19.3
Wyoming	373	213	236	350	100	-6.2

*These calculations used unpublished Bureau of the Census estimates of the adult population (age 18 and over) for July 1, 1984.

California (40,783), accounting for more than 15% of the Nation's total. Other States reporting large numbers of offenders under supervision were California (30,843) and New York (12).

During 1984 parole populations grew most in the West (18%) and the South (1%) and slowest in the Midwest (1%) and the Northeast (3.4%). The Western

increase of more than 7,000 offenders on parole was largely the result of California's increase of more than 5,000.

Jurisdictions reported more than a third of a million movements into or out of parole supervision during 1984. There was considerable variation, however, in the relative proportions of those entering parole through the dif-

ferent types of prison release. In California, for example, about 80% of those entering parole left prison through a mandatory release and 4% through a parole board decision. In Texas parole admissions were evenly divided between mandatory releases from prison and parole releases. In 12 States all the parole entries were by discretionary parole board decisions: New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Carolina, West Virginia, Hawaii, Oregon, Utah, and Wyoming.

Data were reported on the type of parole discharge for 90% of the parole exits in 1984. Overall, about 64% of all terminations were classified as successful completions; 31% were unsuccessful because the offender was returned to prison for violating the conditions of parole or for committing new crimes; and an additional 4% were unsuccessful because the offender either was taken into custody on a detainer or warrant or absconded from the jurisdiction (table 6). The percentage of unsuccessful terminations of parole supervision (35%) was almost twice as high as unsuccessful terminations of probation (19%), perhaps indicating that as a group parolees are more likely to return to criminal activity than probationers.

In 12 jurisdictions more than two-fifths of those discharged from parole were classified as unsuccessful terminations, most of these the result of reincarceration for violating parole conditions or for committing new crimes. With the exception of Maine, which had only 21 parole exits, the States with the highest reincarceration rates were California (57.3%), Kansas (52.9%), and Idaho (51.1%). In 10 States more than four-fifths of those exiting parole successfully completed parole supervision. North Dakota had the highest rate of successful completions (91.5%).

Correctional populations

Approximately 1 of every 65 adults in the Nation were on probation, in jail, in prison, or under parole supervision on December 31, 1984 (table 7). Of the 2,665,386 adults under correctional custody or supervision on that date, 64.2% were on probation, 8.3% were in local jails, 17.4% were in prison, and 10.1% were under parole supervision. Thus, about one-quarter of the correctional population were incarcerated (jail or prison) and three-quarters were under supervision in the community (probation or parole). States with the smallest percentage of their correctional populations incarcerated were Vermont

Source: Selected Role of Probation and Prisons, 1984. Jurisdictional Probation and Prisons, 1984. Arkansas exit, Indiana exit, Ohio exit, California exit, South Carolina exit, Virginia exit, fiscal year 1983. Probation and Prisons, 1984. Federal estimates for Alaska, for an release.

(9.2%), Connecticut (10.7%), and Minnesota (11.1%). States with the highest proportions incarcerated were Alaska (47.9%), Mississippi (47.0%), and Alabama (44.6%).

West Virginia and North Dakota reported the lowest proportions of their adult residents under some type of correctional custody or supervision (about 1 of 208 adults in each State). By contrast, about 1 of 24 adults in the District of Columbia, 1 of 31 in Georgia, 1 of 34 in Texas, and 1 of 36 in Maryland were under correctional custody or supervision at the end of 1984. Georgia, Texas, and Maryland, however, had smaller percentages of their total correctional populations incarcerated than the Nation as a whole.

Appendix

The 12 States with determinate sentencing and the year of enactment are:

- Arizona, 1978
- California, 1976
- Colorado, 1979
- Connecticut, 1981
- Florida, 1983
- Illinois, 1978
- Indiana, 1977
- Maine, 1976
- Minnesota, 1980
- New York, 1983
- North Carolina, 1981
- Washington, 1984

Source: Palmer, Joseph R., "Parole Selection and Abolishment and Determinate Sentencing Creation: Role and Influence in the Change Process," National Institute of Corrections (Washington, D.C., Sept. 1984.)

Jurisdiction notes

Probation

Arkansas. Population, entries, and exits are estimates.

Indiana. Data reported are for calendar year 1983.

Ohio. Population counts are estimates.

South Dakota. Data reported are for July 1, 1983, through June 30, 1984.

Virginia. Data reported are for the fiscal year 1983 ending June 30, 1983.

Parole

Federal. Data reported are estimated to be 97% complete.

Alaska. No information is available for an estimated 100 mandatory releases.

Table 6. Types of exits from parole by jurisdiction, 1984

Jurisdiction	Number of those exiting parole ^a	Percent of those exiting parole through:			
		Successful completion of term	Reincarceration on current term or incarceration for new offense	Other unsuccessful termination ^b	Death
Total	142,429	63.7%	31.2%	4.0%	1.0%
Federal	7,444	72.1	23.0	3.0	1.9
Alaska	73	74.0	24.7	0	1.4
Arizona	1,925	73.7	15.2	10.9	.3
California	20,403	38.5	57.3	3.5	.7
Colorado	1,741	85.2	14.8	0	...
Connecticut	891	57.0	42.2	.3	.4
Delaware	471	86.6	...	13.4	...
District of Columbia	1,352	34.5	28.6	33.8	3.1
Florida	5,427	60.2	24.1	15.8	...
Georgia	7,560	75.6	24.2	0	.3
Hawaii	86	83.7	16.3	0	0
Idaho	223	48.9	51.1
Illinois	6,121	62.9	36.1	0	1.0
Indiana	3,540	84.7	12.5	2.3	.6
Iowa	1,183	67.0	26.5	6.4	...
Kansas	849	45.5	52.9	...	1.6
Kentucky	2,022	62.2	36.4	...	1.3
Louisiana	667	70.9	27.3	0	1.8
Maine	21	19.0	76.2	0	4.9
Maryland	3,733	74.6	17.2	7.0	1.2
Massachusetts	2,902	81.0	19.0
Michigan	5,746	55.9	42.4	.5	1.1
Minnesota	1,369	74.7	24.5	0	.7
Mississippi	1,593	63.6	32.7	1.9	1.8
Missouri	1,279	58.5	40.5	0	1.0
Montana	288	61.8	32.6	4.5	1.0
Nebraska	408	75.2	24.3	0	.5
Nevada	592	61.3	26.4	11.3	.5
New Hampshire	180	67.8	27.8	4.4	0
New Jersey	5,902	71.7	27.0	0	1.3
New Mexico	476	67.6	31.58
New York	10,236	64.2	34.2	0	1.6
North Carolina	5,792	85.8	13.57
North Dakota	189	91.5	8.5	...	0
Ohio	8,105	64.4	24.4	10.7	.5
Oklahoma	802	94.3	14.3	0	1.4
Oregon	1,415	79.2	19.9	0	1.0
Pennsylvania	3,641	55.5	42.7	0	1.8
Rhode Island	338	79.0	20.4	.3	.3
South Carolina	1,236	63.2	28.1	6.6	2.2
South Dakota	435	74.5	24.8	0	.7
Tennessee	4,579	84.7	11.6	2.8	.9
Texas	11,492	57.8	40.2	0	2.0
Utah	632	51.4	45.4	2.1	1.1
Vermont	128	54.7	44.58
Virginia	4,423	64.1	...	35.1	.8
West Virginia	298	75.2	24.8	0	0
Wisconsin	1,972	66.5	31.9	.5	1.0
Wyoming	189	84.1	13.8	1.1	1.1

Note: Data were not available for all States.

^aExcludes cases where the method of discharge was not reported.

^bIncludes discharged absconders and those discharged to custody, detainer, or warrant. ... Data not available.

California. Includes adults released from the California Youth Authority.

Connecticut. Inactive parole cases are excluded.

District of Columbia. Inactive parole cases are excluded.

Iowa. No data reported on deaths.

Kansas. Data reported are for June 30, 1983, through June 30, 1984.

Kentucky. Inactive cases and absconders are excluded.

Minnesota. Exit data for discharged absconders and discharges to custody,

detainer, or warrant cannot be distinguished from successful completions.

Mississippi. Inactive cases and absconders are excluded.

Nevada. All data on entries and exits are estimates.

New Jersey. Data are not available for those exits returned to jail pending revocation.

New Mexico. Data reported are for July 1, 1983, to June 30, 1984.

New York. Discharges to custody, detainer, or warrant cannot be distin-

guished from successful completions. North Carolina. Data are not available for discharged absconders or those exits discharged to custody, detainer, or warrant.

Ohio. Inactive cases and absconders are excluded.

Oklahoma. Returns to prison are estimates.

Oregon. Cases of concurrent probation and parole supervision are reported with the probation data and excluded from the parole data.

Inactive cases and absconders are excluded. Data are not available for cases where revocations or new charges are pending.

Pennsylvania. Exit data for discharged absconders and discharges to custody, detainer, or warrant cannot be distinguished from successful completions.

South Carolina. Absconders missing more than 90 days are excluded.

South Dakota. Data reported are for July 1, 1983, through June 30, 1984.

Texas. Data reported are for September 1, 1983, through August 31, 1984.

Utah. Inactive cases are excluded.

Vermont. All data reported are estimates.

Virginia. Exit data for discharges to custody, detainer, or warrant are included with all returns to prison.

Washington. All data are estimates. Inactive cases and absconders are excluded.

Wyoming. The number of those discharged from parole who were returned to jail with new sentences is not known.

Table 7. Adults under correctional supervision by jurisdiction, 1984.

Region and State	Adults in jail, in prison, on probation, or on parole	Percent of adult population under correctional supervision	Percent of correctional population incarcerated
United States, total	2,665,386	1.54%	25.7%
Federal	103,670	.06	33.1
State	2,561,716	1.48	25.4
Northeast	453,373	1.21%	23.6%
Connecticut	53,257	2.21	10.7
Maine	6,057	.71	25.9
Massachusetts	37,302	.84	22.0
New Hampshire	4,267	.59	24.1
New Jersey	75,578	1.34	21.6
New York	163,605	1.23	30.0
Pennsylvania	98,938	1.10	23.5
Rhode Island	8,764	1.19	13.9
Vermont	5,595	1.43	9.2
Midwest	483,075	1.12%	25.9%
Illinois	100,866	1.20	25.8
Indiana	51,698	1.30	24.7
Iowa	17,250	.81	21.2
Kansas	20,027	1.12	27.7
Michigan	87,314	1.33	25.5
Minnesota	36,966	1.22	11.1
Missouri	43,032	1.16	29.2
Nebraska	13,564	1.17	18.0
North Dakota	2,346	.48	28.6
Ohio	71,901	.91	35.9
South Dakota	3,179	.64	38.6
Wisconsin	34,932	1.00	23.0
South	1,112,797	1.89%	25.3%
Alabama	33,466	1.16	44.6
Arkansas	16,257	.96	36.9
Delaware	9,403	2.05	23.4
District of Columbia	20,168	4.13	38.0
Florida	155,913	1.84	26.6
Georgia	134,011	3.19	19.4
Kentucky	26,992	1.00	31.3
Louisiana	52,240	1.68	42.9
Maryland	89,569	2.74	19.8
Mississippi	18,275	1.01	47.0
North Carolina	76,337	1.67	26.0
Oklahoma	30,037	1.26	33.4
South Carolina	32,843	1.38	38.7
Tennessee	43,399	1.25	30.6
Texas	328,209	2.91	15.8
Virginia	38,867	.92	41.9
West Virginia	6,811	.48	38.4
West	512,471	1.51%	26.8%
Alaska	4,240	1.25	47.9
Arizona	29,098	1.33	36.9
California	313,226	1.65	27.1
Colorado	24,505	1.06	24.9
Hawaii	9,146	1.22	21.1
Idaho	5,580	.82	33.1
Montana	4,805	.82	29.1
Nevada	10,851	1.60	40.9
New Mexico	3,757	.89	39.4
Oregon	30,313	1.54	22.7
Utah	10,095	.98	23.0
Washington	58,758	1.84	17.7
Wyoming	3,097	.88	33.9

Note: Jail population counts are for June 30, 1983, the most recent published data.

Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletins are prepared principally by the staff of BJS. This bulletin was written by Lawrence A. Greenfeld, director, correctional statistics programs. It was edited by Joseph M. Bessette, deputy director for data analysis, assisted by Marianne Zawitz. Marilyn Marbrook, publication unit chief, administered production, assisted by Millie Baldea, Betty Sherman, Dorothea Proctor, and Joyce Stanford. Tabulations of data were provided by Stephanie Brown and Art Ciampa of the U.S. Bureau of the Census.