

# Institute for Law and Policy Planning

5297 College Avenue, Oakland, CA 94618 (415) 652-2842

153079

## COST EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION OF THE PLANNING OF NEW INSTITUTIONS (PONI) PROGRAM

NCJRS

MAR 1 1984

ACQUISITIONS

153079

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.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

Institute for Law and Policy  
Planning

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

**MARCH 5, 1984**

# Institute for Law and Policy Planning

## DIRECTORS

Dr. Alan Kalmanoff  
Executive Director

Dr. Bryan Rogers  
Vice President

Ms. Linda Gudden CPA  
Treasurer

## ADVISORY BOARD

Dr. Egon Sittner  
Sociology, Brandeis Univ.

Mr. Allen Breed  
Retired Director, National  
Institute of Corrections

Ms. Sarah Carey  
Public Interest Law

Prof. Bayard Rustin  
Admin. Geo. Washington Univ.

Prof. Bernard Diamond, M.D.  
Univ. of California, Berkeley

Mr. Nick Franklin  
Vice President, ENREC

Mr. Robert Funk  
Disability Rights Law, CIL

Ms. Judith Heumann  
Disability Rights, CIL

Dr. Blanche Isaac  
Research Psychology

Mr. Lowell Jensen  
Associate Attorney General  
of The United States

Prof. Sheldon Messinger  
Law Univ. of California, Berkeley

Ms. Lili Nguyen-Duv  
Refugee Resettlement

Ms. Ruth Rusnen  
Retired Director, Calif  
Dept. of Corrections

March 5, 1984

Mr. Ray Nelson, Director  
Mr. Michael O'Toole, Corrections Specialist  
Jail Center  
National Institute of Corrections  
1790 30th Street  
Boulder, CO 80301

Dear Ray and Mike:

Attached are copies of the PONI Evaluation. The study shows that PONI is extremely cost effective, and suggests that expansion is both warranted and likely to further result in cost-savings for county jail systems.

As you expected, the limits of this effort stem from difficulty in quantifying actual cost savings in the face of great variety in local conditions. The strengths are a demonstration of clear and undeniable cost savings, a showing of broad and positive reaction from the field to the program, and some findings that may improve curriculum and program quality.

We have enjoyed this work and hope that the product is useful.

Sincerely,

Alan Kalmanoff  
Executive Director

Enclosure

ASK/tfs

COST EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION OF THE  
PLANNING OF NEW INSTITUTIONS (PONI) PROGRAM

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	1
II. INTRODUCTION .....	8
III. METHODOLOGY .....	12
IV. GENERAL SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS .....	14
V. DATA ANALYSIS .....	22
VI. COST SAVINGS IMPLICATIONS .....	38
VII. CONCLUSION .....	41
VIII. INTERVIEWEES .....	45
IX. BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	47
X. APPENDICES .....	48

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

COST EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION OF  
THE PLANNING OF NEW INSTITUTIONS (PONI) PROGRAM

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The objective of the present evaluation is to determine whether participation in the PONI program leads to cost savings, either in planning or construction of a new detention facility within the participating jurisdiction. Given the content of the PONI program, this evaluation began with the assumption that PONI participation does result in some savings for jurisdictions and that these cost savings can be quantified in some crude yet useful way to develop a cost-effectiveness analysis for use in further program budgeting.

NIC's Planning of New Institutions (PONI) program is designed to assist jurisdictions, (primarily counties), in careful and systematic planning of new corrections facilities. It has been presented to 200 jurisdictions over the 4 years it has been federally funded. The typical participating jurisdiction was planning a new facility, rather than a remodeled or expanded existing structure. Most jurisdictions had participated in both Phase I, a one or two-day community meeting, and in Phase II, a 7-day training seminar in Boulder, Colorado.

Survey data clearly demonstrated that the approximately one half-million dollars in federal costs associated with PONI return to cost savings in corrections that are hundreds of times greater than the program's cost. **Potential savings**

for a typical PONI jurisdiction can range from \$765,000 to \$1.4 million in construction costs and \$17.65 million to \$22.85 million in operations costs over the life-cycle of a new jail. Savings can thus range from 100 to 1,000 times the cost of the PONI program, delivered to one county.

The survey received responses from participants in 41 states. Study participants were clearly representative of the typical jurisdictions within the country. There was a complete range of population, geographic region, funding amounts, planned beds, economic and political environments, etc. The respondents ranged from county sheriffs or deputies to directors of a large correctional system to elected officials.

The scope of the cost-effectiveness analysis was reduced after responses to questionnaires had been tabulated. Given PONI's attempt to provide training at the earliest point in the planning process, many jurisdictions did not have the necessary information to perform a pre-PONI planning and post-PONI planning comparison. Responding jurisdictions thus represented various stages of planning; only two had actually completed construction of a facility and only one, a renovated project, had been occupied at the time of the study.

Nevertheless, in addition to evidence of positive PONI impact, the following areas of cost savings were identified.

Planning: PONI teaches that a cost-effective jail begins with careful and thorough planning. To ensure such planning, PONI recommends the incorporation of at least six elements into the planning process: data collection, cost analysis, site analysis, development of a master plan, a feasibility study and a needs assessment.

These elements had been incorporated by 46% of the jurisdictions with funded projects and 50% of those with unfunded projects. Those jurisdictions which adopted only one or two of these elements usually adopted a needs assessment or feasibility study, elements which may or may not have included examination of the other suggested elements. Although 38% of the funded projects reported PONI participation led to an average of \$26,000 in increased planning costs, the importance of these elements to the planning process tends to offset the initial cost with much higher "avoidance" costs.

Jail beds: Funded jurisdictions which reduced the number of planned beds after PONI participation reported a reduction range from 15% to 28% (based on what had previously been planned); unfunded project jurisdictions reported slightly lower range of 14% to 25%. Since the average cost to construct a new bed is \$51,000, the potential cost savings are significant if beds are reduced. Even if beds were increased as a result of PONI participation, the primary reasons reported was that initial needs had been underestimated. The increase in beds planned, moreover, was generally accompanied by a plan to utilize a more balanced

classification scheme that included reductions in the number of maximum security beds and an increase in medium and minimum security beds. Several jurisdictions added a work release program and other forms of non-secure release, such as trustees or medical release, and increased the size of existing work furlough programs.

Staffing: PONI exposes its participants to alternative designs and operating procedures in an attempt to achieve cost-effectiveness in a new facility. As a result, the majority of jurisdictions planning a new facility had chosen a pod-type design and reported that staff reductions had been achieved or that the new facility would be more staff efficient. The latter was confirmed by calculating staff to bed ratios for the new facility and comparing them to the ratios for existing facilities, which were traditional high-rise, cell-block structures. Reductions in the staff to bed ratio were found in 67% of the jurisdictions for which complete information was available. Where there was an increase in the staff to bed ratio for the new facility, the increase was generally accompanied by an explanation that existing staffing was inadequate to meet the facility's needs.

Classification: PONI emphasizes the need for a balanced classification system to avoid overbuilding, and, as a result, 88% of the participating jurisdictions (for which such information was available) altered existing classification schemes. Almost half of these jurisdictions

had existing facilities classified as 100% maximum security; only one planned to construct a new facility with the same classification. Of the jurisdictions with existing all maximum security facilities, 63% planned a balanced system utilizing at least 3 levels of classification and 38% planned to develop a work release program where none had existed before. Costs avoided by not overbuilding are substantial since a medium security bed costs 36% less to build than a maximum security bed; a minimum security bed 58% less; and a work release bed 68% less.

Fixtures: Several jurisdictions reported that PONI's emphasis on the use of common materials and fixtures led to cost savings in fixtures. The most typical response was shifting from a facility with all stainless steel fixtures which were estimated to cost one-third more than conventional porcelain fixtures to one where stainless steel fixtures were limited to maximum security units. Although not all jurisdictions could not report expected savings, the experience of one county indicated as much as 3% of the initial construction costs could be reduced by the use of common materials.

Construction costs: By learning about project management from PONI, some jurisdictions reported substantial costs were saved through the bidding process. The two types of bidding procedures cited were "construction management" and "prime bidding". In one jurisdiction, the former procedure led to a savings of \$500,000 despite a slight increase in the amount of paperwork required to process

several contracts instead of one contract. "Prime bidding" was expected to result in savings up to 10% of override because negotiations between a general contractor and the mechanical and electrical contractors could be avoided.

Facility Design: The most difficult area for quantifiable cost savings was facility design because none of the jurisdictions actually had a new facility in operation. Nevertheless, 81% of the funded jurisdictions and 85% of the unfunded jurisdictions were planning pod-type facilities and anticipated significant reductions in operating costs over the facility's life-cycle.

Because operating costs are 10-16 times construction costs. These savings must be seen as enormous savings in ultimate costs. Such reductions were believed possible because the pod design allows for more staff-efficiency, easier classification or separation of inmates; and better use of space.

In addition to potential quantifiable costs, responding jurisdictions reported benefits that cannot be easily quantified, although they clearly have value and save costs: better conditions for inmates leading to lowering of stress levels inherent to incarceration; an ability to manage the facility consistent with personal philosophies of the local sheriffs; and less isolation of staff from inmates with an increase in security.

The conclusion of the present evaluation is that PONI has had a positive impact on most jurisdictions who have participated in its program and a generally positive impact in terms of very major cost savings in jail construction. Although not all jurisdictions were able to report exact and specific cost savings, those that did each indicated savings sufficient to offset over the cost of PONI.

Potential bed savings for a typical jurisdiction can range from \$765,000 to \$1.4 million in construction costs and \$7.65 million to \$22.85 million in life-cycle costs. If only one post were eliminated (requiring 5 staff over a 24 hour period), \$125,000 per year could be saved and \$3.75 million over the facility's life-cycle.

While local factors will influence the degree of PONI impact and subsequent cost savings, jurisdictions can save money as a result of PONI participation or at least construct a facility that is well-designed and flexible enough to meet future needs, thus avoiding present expensive mistakes and minimizing costs in the future.

# INTRODUCTION

## II. INTRODUCTION

During the last decade, the inability of correctional institutions to meet the needs and demands of their legal and social environment has become increasingly apparent. The county jails of today are often outdated facilities with problems of chronic overcrowding and overuse. The pressures on these institutional facilities will continue as legislatures become even more responsive to public concern about crime and public expenditures and as the courts, in response to litigation, mandate improved jail or prison conditions and treatment for prisoners.

Given the competing or contradictory pressures upon correctional institutions to change, good planning of a new correctional facility becomes especially important if correctional systems are to develop appropriate responses to complex problems. Nevertheless, local jurisdictions may lack the expertise and resources to plan systematically and effectively. Local planners are often unaware of the complexity of the criminal justice system, characterized by interdependent relationships between the courts, law enforcement, corrections, and the community.

For the past four years, the National Institute of Corrections Jail Center (NIC/JC) has addressed the need to develop planning expertise and support among local officials, administrators and corrections managers through its funding of the Planning of New Institutions (PONI) Program. During this period, 200 jurisdictions, including counties as well as states, have participated in PONI. PONI is a three-phase process designed to develop planning skills and to provide technical assistance to states and counties which have begun to plan, have planned or are planning to build, expand or remodel their jails or prisons.

The primary purpose of Phase I is to heighten local awareness of the complex issues and problems related to facility planning from a systematic planning perspective and to develop a participatory planning process. During Phase I, two NIC staff members and/or consultants organize and present a program at a one or two-day community meeting attended by criminal justice personnel and other interested members of the community. The community meeting is essentially a forum in which to explore a community's values and philosophies underlying incarceration; allow the exchange of information and ideas; and provide the impetus to begin preliminary planning in a systematic way.

Phase II emphasizes skill development through team building and the mastery of planning techniques and tools. Teams, ranging in size from four to eight members, from a participating jurisdiction are sent to NIC/JC in Boulder, Colorado for a week-long training seminar. Team members not

only are taught planning techniques but also are exposed to designs and management practices that have been found to be effective and efficient alternatives to the resource-intensive and limited-use "traditional" correctional facility.

Phase III consists of technical assistance to jurisdictions enrolled in or entering PONI. Such assistance must be requested by the jurisdiction and is intended to address special local problems related to jail planning, design, construction, staffing or transition. NIC staff may make an additional on-site visit or provide documents or other resources to the requesting jurisdiction.

The overall objective of PONI is rationalization of the corrections facility planning process to ensure optimal allocation of scarce resources. PONI neither encourages nor discourages the building of new facilities; its focus is to help local jurisdictions make a reasoned decision and to provide support for the implementation of their solutions.

A reasoned decision requires knowing not only how and when to build, but also the costs of all options. The PONI program is thus based on the assumption that a carefully planned and well-designed jail will lead to cost savings. To effect such cost savings, PONI emphasizes the use of cost-effective materials and fixtures and the use of less staff through facility design.

When first presented in 1978 by Voorhis Associates, Inc., of Boulder, PONI was funded directly out of NIC/JC.

Since 1980, however, PONI has been funded through federal grants. The first grant was for approximately \$155,000; the largest grant was for \$490,000 in 1982 which included travel expenses for PONI participants. In 1983, when travel expenses were taken over by the NIC Academy, the grant was for \$297,855 and for 1984, the grant is \$309,900 which represents a 7% increase over the 1983 grant. As part of its funding, PONI is obligated to present 40 Phase I community meetings (although 60 were conducted in 1983) and 6 Phase II seminars per year. Excluding overhead, the direct delivery costs of a Phase I community meeting is \$2300 and about \$5000 for the Phase II week-long seminar. A crude measure of the actual costs of the different phases of the PONI program can be calculated by delivering total number of delivery days into total budget. Based on 1983 data, the cost of one delivery day is approximately \$900:

60 Phase I community meetings (4 delivery days each)	= 240 days
6 Phase II seminars (7 delivery days each)	= 42 days
10 Phase III technical assistance (5 delivery days each)	= 50 days
TOTAL (1983)	= 332 days

$\$297,855/332 = \$897.15$  per delivery day

Since most jurisdictions participate in both Phase I and Phase II, the actual cost of PONI per jurisdiction is approximately \$9,870. This study suggests that the cost savings can range from 100 to 1,000 times this cost, or \$1-10,000,000.

# METHODOLOGY

### III. METHODOLOGY

The objective of the present evaluation is to determine whether participation in the PONI program does lead to cost savings, either in planning or construction of a new detention facility within the participating jurisdiction. Given the content of the PONI program, this evaluation began with the assumption that PONI participation does result in cost savings for jurisdictions and that these cost savings can be quantified in some crude yet useful way to develop a cost-effectiveness analysis for use in further program budgeting.

Initially, a list of contact persons from each of the participating jurisdictions was obtained from the PONI program. To avoid duplication of responses, a letter was sent to the contact person, asking for the identification of the person to whom a PONI evaluation questionnaire should be sent. There were 130 responses to this letter, identifying either the PONI team leader or project consultant to whom a questionnaire was then sent.

Those participants who did not respond within a month were sent up to two follow-up letters. If there was still no response, a follow-up telephone call was made. After follow-up efforts, 80 questionnaires or explanatory letters were returned, of which only 59 were valid for the purposes of the present evaluation. A questionnaire was eliminated for one of three reasons: 1) the jurisdiction was no longer planning a facility; 2) the PONI participant was no longer in the

jurisdiction and answers to the questionnaire were unknown; and 3) the participant completing the questionnaire was connected with a state planning agency and not directly involved in the planning of a local facility.

The valid completed questionnaires were evaluated for completeness of information and categorized into jurisdictions with funded and those with unfunded jail construction projects. Numerous telephone interviews were conducted with those respondents whose questionnaires were incomplete or who indicated areas of cost savings that could be further explored. Nearly all of the interviews were with participants from jurisdictions with unfunded projects still in the preliminary planning stage or with no present plans to pursue funding. Planning costs, funding and construction costs, and even facility design and size were often unavailable or unknown.

The data from the questionnaires were coded and tabulated for analysis. The information gained from telephone interviews was used to augment the data base and to perform a preliminary qualitative evaluation of participant satisfaction with the PONI program. The qualitative evaluation, which showed PONI participants to be overwhelmingly supportive of the program, is included as an Appendix.

**GENERAL SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS**

#### IV. GENERAL SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

Despite the fact the sample does not include any jurisdictions from the East South Central region of the United States, the sample can fairly be said to represent the planning experience of jurisdictions actually planning and intending to construct a new jail. (The two responses from the East South Central region were from the states of Kentucky and Tennessee. The Kentucky questionnaire was eliminated because no jail was planned and the Tennessee questionnaire was invalid because PONI participation had not yet occurred.)

The sample included jurisdictions with a population range from 11,000 to nearly 870,000. These jurisdictions represented rural agricultural counties, moderately sized counties with one dominant employer, such as the federal government, and large urban counties. Local economic conditions ranged from a depressed construction industry (Midwestern states); high rates of persons on welfare (Arkansas); and accelerated growth rates (Pennsylvania and California). The local governing body involved in the planning process was usually a board of supervisors or commissioners and represented the political spectrum from conservative to liberal. The political spectrum was particularly evident in court sentencing attitudes: some used incarceration as a sentence heavily and others relied on alternatives to incarceration and viewed jail time as a last resort.

The sample jurisdictions predominantly had existing traditional correctional facilities; usually multi-story. Only about 5 had an existing pod-type facility (modular design). Planning projects ran the gamut from building a new facility to remodeling or expanding an existing facility. The planning projects included jails with only 10 beds to ones with as many as 450 beds. Estimated or actual funding for a new jail ranged from \$1.2 million to \$73 million. Construction funds came from every conceivable source: state grants, general obligation bonds, existing county funds, sales tax, some combination of these, loans, and even a federal grant. Some jurisdictions were innovative, (e.g., using television or video for arraignment) while others were committed to the use of traditional practices.

The respondents were primarily county sheriffs or sheriff's deputies. Nevertheless, other actors in the criminal justice planning system were represented: corrections specialists or consultants, architects, county commissioners, corrections administrators, and even one judge.

Overall, there was a general desire to build a facility that would meet constitutional standards. The respondents from some jurisdictions indicated there was substantial local support for building such a jail regardless of the cost while other respondents reported planning for a new jail was constrained by the money available.

Given the broad range of represented characteristics, the sample is really a microcosm of the types of

jurisdictions that can be found throughout the United States. It can thus be expected that the analysis presented in this evaluation of the planning experience of jurisdictions which have participated in PONI can provide a basis for the development of policy relevant to the continuation of the PONI program and its impact on jail planning in other jurisdictions.

### Regional Representation

As described earlier, questionnaires were sent to PONI participants in 130 jurisdictions of whom 80 responded (62%); these jurisdictions represented 41 states. The different jurisdictions were organized for analysis into 9 geographical regions; the response rate and representation in the study sample are presented below.

#### REGIONAL REPRESENTATION AND RESPONSE RATES

<u>Geographical Region</u>	<u>% of Total</u>	<u>Response Rate</u>	<u>% of Sample</u>
Pacific	14%	83%	20%
Mountain	12%	56%	14%
East North Central	14%	78%	22%
East South Central	5%	33%	0
Middle Atlantic	11%	71%	12%
New England	4%	40%	2%
South Atlantic	14%	33%	8%
West North Central	15%	53%	14%
West South Central	12%	44%	8%

As can be seen from the table, the disproportionate representation in the sample is due to the variances in response rate from the 130 jurisdictions to which questionnaires were sent; sample representation was also affected by the elimination of invalid questionnaires.

Within regions, certain states dominate as far as PONI participation. This "overrepresentation" of some states can be attributed to state agency requirements or recommendations that a local jurisdiction participate in PONI as an actual or virtual condition precedent to state funding; these states include California, Washington, Louisiana and Ohio. States with the most participation by region are presented below:

REGIONAL PARTICIPATION BY STATE REPRESENTATION

<u>Geographical Region</u>	<u>States Most Represented</u>	<u>% of Total Region</u>
Pacific	California	39%
	Washington	33%
Mountain	New Mexico	38%
East North Central	Ohio	28%
	Illinois	22%
East South Central	Mississippi	67%
Middle Atlantic	New Jersey	50%
New England	No state dominated	
South Atlantic	Florida	39%
West North Central	Minnesota	58%
West South Central	Louisiana	50%

## Population and Construction Costs Sample

In terms of population, the sample jurisdiction ranged from a low of 11,000 to a county with a population of 869,000. Most of the sample (16) represented a county with a population of less than 20,000 and 9 had populations between 250,000 and 700,000. The sample consisted of both funded and unfunded jail construction projects: 32 (54%) had been funded while 27 (6%) had not been funded or had attempted but failed to obtain funding.

The following table represents only those jurisdictions which have been funded: unfunded project jurisdictions were not included because building costs were either not available or only estimated. The table is intended to show average construction costs by average size of jurisdiction. It should be noted that population categories were determined by similarities in funding amount.

### CONSTRUCTION AMOUNT OF POPULATION

<u>Population-County</u> <u>(Average)</u>	<u>New Const.</u> <u>(Average)</u>	<u>Renovation</u> <u>(Average)</u>	<u>New/Renov/Exp</u> <u>(Average)</u>
13,000 (N=6)	\$2.67 million	\$ .47 million	N/A
40,000 (N=3)	\$3.67 million	N/A	
64,670 (N=3)	\$2.9 million	\$1.05 million	
142,890 (N=9)	\$10.56 million	N/A	\$8.2 million
550,400 (N=5)	\$21.35 million	\$6.1 million	N/A
864,000 (N=2)	N/A	N/A	\$12.45 million

Average costs to build a new bed were not calculated because there were so many differences in the number of beds built within a population category; for example, in the 550,400 average population category, the number of planned beds ranged from 253 to 520. In addition, construction costs (represented by funding and bid amounts) were often dependent on the local economy; some respondents indicated the funded amount was low because of a depressed economy for the construction industry. There were also significant differences between jurisdictions building a similar number of beds and construction costs. The most extreme example is between Dakota County, Minnesota and Ross County, Ohio, both of which were planning to build new facilities with 84 beds. For Dakota County which had a population of 194,000, construction would cost approximately \$7.8 million; in comparison, Ross County, with a population of 64,000 anticipated costs of only \$2.6 million.

#### PONI participation

Most of the respondents had participated in both Phase I and Phase II of the PONI program: 87% from jurisdictions with funded projects and 89% from unfunded project jurisdictions. Only 4% of the participants with unfunded jail construction projects had participated in Phase I only compared to 13% for those with funded projects. The number of participants who had received Phase III technical assistance reflects the more advanced planning efforts of the funded projects: 28% - funded; 15% - unfunded.

### Reasons for project

Respondents generally listed multiple reasons for the planning or building of a new jail: 2.78 for funded; 2.93 for unfunded projects. Only 4% of the unfunded jurisdictions reported just one reason for planning; this compares to 13% for jurisdictions with funded projects. The reasons for building by funded and unfunded projects are presented below:

#### REASONS FOR JAIL CONSTRUCTION PROJECT

<u>Reason</u>	<u>% of Funded Projects</u>	<u>% of Unfunded Projects</u>
Crowding	69%	74%
Compliance w/ standards	78%	74%
Court action/litigation	22%	44%
Outdated Facility	75%	81%
Damaged Facility	9%	11%
Other	6%	7%

From the table, it is clear that jail crowding, lack of compliance with state standards and outdated facilities are the primary reasons for building. (Some respondents reported that the existing facility had been built in the mid-1800's or early 1900's.) Court action or pending litigation may have been a less significant reason in the funded project jurisdictions because of state action whereby facilities had been condemned and jail population limited to well-below rated capacity.

Of the funded projects, 69% were for new jails; 13% for renovation and 19% a combination of both new and renovation or expansion. For the unfunded projects, 74% were for new jails; 4% for renovation; 15% for a combination of new and renovation; and 7% still undetermined. For 63% of both funded and unfunded projects, a new county jail was planned. About one-fourth of the responding jurisdictions planned a city/county facility and a regional facility was planned in 6% of the funded jurisdictions and in 11% of the unfunded jurisdictions.

### Project status

Construction of a new facility had begun in 50% of the jurisdictions with funded projects. Construction was scheduled to begin in 31%; had been completed in 6% and a facility occupied in 3% (1). Three of the funded jurisdictions (9%) were still in the planning stage. About 63% of the unfunded project jurisdictions were still in the planning stage; 37% had more advanced planning and had sought or would be seeking funding.

# DATA ANALYSIS

## V. DATA ANALYSIS

Quantitative data which could be used to identify patterns or trends in cost savings were either nonexistent, incomplete or extremely difficult to calculate.

After the questionnaires sent to participants had been returned, it became apparent the scientific validity of the anticipated cost-effectiveness analysis would be limited in various ways. For example, because many of the PONI participants entered the program early in the local planning process, pre-PONI planning costs and post-PONI planning costs could not be compared for the total sample. In addition, operating and final planning costs were difficult to identify since only one of the responding jurisdictions had a facility that was occupied (two indicated the facility had been constructed but was not yet occupied at the time of the study). Of the sixteen jurisdictions that had begun construction, several indicated that staffing requirements were either tentative or not yet determined. Nevertheless, certain significant cost savings areas were identified including construction, beds built, staffing, and facility design.

When areas of cost savings varied considerably among jurisdictions which made it difficult to project a typical savings range for the particular area. It was also found through interviews that a number of factors exist within a local jurisdiction that will impact on planning and construction costs independent of any impact from the PONI

participation. These factors include the local economy, philosophical attitudes of law enforcement and political officials, local incarceration rates related to judicial sentencing patterns, mandatory state staffing requirements, and site availability for a new jail. In some jurisdictions, cost savings was not a consideration in the planning of the construction project; in others, the planning was determined less by what was needed than by what amount of money was available.

The following analysis describes the areas where cost savings could be achieved based on survey responses by PONI participants. Savings, if calculated are for a particular jurisdiction, not necessarily what can be expected in similar or other jurisdictions. The analysis also focuses on funded projects because of the better availability of data; where possible, however, discussion of unfunded projects has been included.

#### Preliminary planning costs

In response to criticism by some participants that the PONI program leads to increased planning costs, preliminary planning costs by jurisdictional staff and consultants hired by that jurisdiction were tabulated. Preliminary planning was defined to include data collection, development of a master plan, site analysis, cost analysis, needs assessment, and feasibility study.

Average planning costs were not calculated by jurisdiction because of the wide disparity in such costs; there was also no correlation between planning costs and facility size or jurisdiction population. For example, a jurisdiction with a population of 869,000 used a consultant costing \$27,000 while another jurisdiction with a population of 54,000 hired a consultant for \$42,000. The difference appears to be related to the use of staff for preliminary planning. In other words, those jurisdictions with high staff planning costs generally had lower consultant costs and those with low or no staff planning costs had high consultant costs. In several jurisdictions, planning costs could not be calculated because responsibility for preliminary planning was included in an architects contract.

The preliminary planning elements identified by PONI are emphasized as necessary to a thorough and careful planning effort. Several jurisdictions, through comments, indicated a more thorough planning effort had to be undertaken because of their PONI participation; these comments are consistent with the tabulation of the elements of preliminary planning: 46% of the funded projects had incorporated six or more of the planning elements suggested by PONI while 50% of the unfunded projects had done so. About 35% of the funded projects and 23% of the unfunded projects reported 1 or 2 elements had been incorporated. The latter finding is somewhat misleading, however, as to completeness of preliminary planning efforts, since the one element usually performed was either a needs assessment or feasibility study which may or

may not include other preliminary planning elements such as data collection, cost analysis, and site analysis.

Preliminary planning is usually performed by a consultant for the responding jurisdictions: a consultant (or architect) was responsible for such planning in 95% of the funded jurisdictions which answered this question and in 93% of the unfunded project jurisdictions. Jurisdiction staff did all or part of the preliminary planning in half of the funded projects and in 58% of the responding unfunded jurisdictions.

Nevertheless, despite the extensive use of consultants, only 38% of the funded and 29% of the unfunded projects reported that PONI led to increased preliminary planning costs. Where such an increase was reported, it was invariably in the range of \$25,000 to \$27,000. One jurisdiction (unfunded) indicated PONI was responsible for all preliminary planning costs - \$118,000 - but this figure is exceptionally high and well beyond the amount consistently reported.

The criticism that PONI leads to increased planning costs thus appears to be unfounded or at least exaggerated and ignores the potential benefits of a careful planning process. The elements that led to increased preliminary planning costs included at least one of the following for responding jurisdictions: site analysis, feasibility study, data collection and needs assessment. Given the importance of these particular elements to the planning of a new facility,

it is difficult to see added costs related to these elements as a negative impact of PONI. It is more appropriate to view the incorporation of these elements as a positive PONI influence which may have increased short term costs but are virtually certain to reduce or avoid much higher costs over the long run.

An example of the danger of not conducting a thorough preliminary planning effort is Jackson County, Missouri. In that jurisdiction, only a site analysis was performed (although it appears a population projection was used by the architect to determine beds needed) and funding requirements were determined by local officials before any data analysis. The planned 520-bed facility will be all maximum security despite the fact that a second county facility which presently houses medium to minimum security inmates will be closed. It is estimated that the new facility, funded for \$22.9 million, will actually cost \$30 million by the time it is built. Operating costs will also be inflated because it is inevitable that medium to minimum security inmates will have to be housed in the maximum security facility in the future.

### Areas of cost savings

Jurisdictions reported specific cost savings related to PONI participation in at least six areas: number of beds built, staffing, classification, facility design, fixtures, and construction costs. The analysis of beds, staffing and classification changes is limited to those jurisdictions which had conducted planning before PONI participation; this was 50% of the sample for funded projects and 44% of the sample for unfunded projects.

### Jail Beds

The following table shows the comparison of number of beds planned both before and after PONI participation and is divided according to funded and unfunded projects:

<u>Impact*</u>	<u>IMPACT OF PONI ON BEDS PLANNED</u>	
	<u>Funded Projects</u> (N=16)	<u>Unfunded Projects</u> (N=12)
Increase in beds	56%	42%
Decrease in beds	25%	25%
No change	19%	33%

---

\*Impact is defined as the change in number of beds between pre-PONI plans and post-PONI plans.

Although the sample is very small, where a jurisdiction had already planned bed needs, PONI participation led to a decrease in number of beds planned in one-fourth of the sample. Bed reductions ranged from 15 to 28% for funded

projects and 14% to 25% for unfunded projects. The reduction of beds built has an enormous cost savings impact on operating costs, staffing, and life-cycle costs.

For funded jurisdictions where the number of beds planned increased after PONI participation, the range of increase was 6% to 67% over the number of beds planned pre-PONI. Much of the increase in number of beds planned can be attributed to an increase in the number of beds allocated to work-release type programs; this occurred in 67% of the funded projects reporting an increase in planned beds. The increase in work release beds (as a proportion of total increase over pre-PONI plans) ranged from 22% to 62%, with half of the jurisdictions (3) showing an increase of work release beds in the range of 40% to 42%.

Other reasons given for an increase in planned beds were: original estimates were found too low after a needs assessment had been performed; and, contracts with federal agencies, such as the United States Marshall Service, for more beds. Thus, despite an increase in beds (and a subsequent increase in construction costs) after PONI participation, the planned more expensive facilities will clearly better serve their jurisdictions' needs, both in terms of housing inmates and in classification.

## Staffing

Interviews with and comments by respondents indicated that PONI participation led to reductions in staffing or to the design of facilities that were staff efficient (minimized number of staff needed). Nearly all of these respondents attributed the reduction or improved staff efficiency to PONI's emphasis that a jurisdiction explore alternatives to traditional cell-block type facilities. To minimize staffing needs, jurisdictions planning new jails overwhelmingly selected the pod design (also called "modular" or "soft approach"). One jurisdiction reported two staff positions could be saved by going from a four-story high-rise facility to a two-story pod design, (state law required one staff person on each floor at all times).

STAFF TO BED RATIOS FOR EXISTING AND PLANNED FACILITIES

N = 13 (New Construction and Funded Only)

<u>Facility Design</u>	<u>Existing Ratio</u>	<u>Adequate for Needs</u>	<u>New Ratio</u>	<u>Adequate</u>
Pod	.50	Yes	.50	Yes
Pod	.39	No	.38	Yes
Pod	.45	N/A	.38	N/A
Pod	.45	No	.35	No
Pod	.15	No	.19	Yes
Pod	.26	Yes	.22	Yes
Pod	.34	No	.47	Yes
Pod	.26	No	.27	Yes
Pod	.30	Yes	.24	Yes
Pod	.35	No	.31	No
Pod	.57	No	.47	Yes
Cell-block	.35	N/A	.24	N/A
Pod	.32	Yes	.31	Yes

Although the staff to bed ratio is a crude measurement, the ratio was reduced in 9 of the jurisdictions (67%). Of this group, 2 of 22% felt the staffing for the new facility would be inadequate. In the three jurisdictions where the staff to bed ratio increased, such increases are seemingly due to the degree of inadequacy in number of existing staff to meet the jail's needs. It does appear that the pod design can lead to a more efficient use of staff. This is particularly true in those jurisdictions where the present ratio is adequate and the new ratio will be adequate but, at

the same time, lower. In the two instances in the above table where this occurred, the change in design was from a traditional cell-block facility to a pod design (in fact, nearly all of the jurisdictions planning a change in design went from cell-block to pod).

### Classification

Classification of inmates by level of security needed (maximum, medium and minimum) can affect both operating and life-cycle costs of a facility. PONI not only exposes participants to the need for a balanced classification scheme but also other types of classification such as work release beds and other non-secure classes which can minimize or reduce the number of high-cost maximum security beds. (A jurisdiction's security needs can be determined from a needs analysis, and it appears such an analysis, in combination with PONI's program, classification systems have been significantly reviewed.) That cost savings which result is evident from the experience of Burnett County, Wisconsin which reported a \$40,000 saving by going from a 100% maximum security facility (20 beds) to one with both minimum security and work release classifications.

Data on classification changes in the existing facility to the planned facility after PONI participation were tabulated for 17 of the funded jurisdictions. Eight of these jurisdictions had existing facilities that were classified as 100% maximum security. After PONI participation, the range of maximum security beds planned by such jurisdictions ranged

from a low of 7% to 72%, (one jurisdiction made no change). Five of the eight 100% maximum security facilities adopted classification schemes utilizing maximum, medium and minimum security levels. In three of these jurisdictions, a work release program was created where none existed before.

The results of classification in the other nine jurisdictions on which data could be tabulated are mixed: some reduced maximum security and increased minimum security while others increased maximum, and reduced either medium or minimum security levels. Two jurisdictions did not change classification levels from the existing to the planned facility. Five of these jurisdictions, however, did increase the number of work release beds over the existing program, the range of increase was from 14% to 58%.

Awareness of different classification levels can prevent a jurisdiction from overbuilding. By building a facility that has a balanced classification system, a jurisdiction can substantially reduce cost associated with the fixtures, materials, staffing, and security devices needed for maximum security levels.

### Fixtures

As described earlier, an assumption built into the PONI program is that the use of materials common to an industry can reduce construction costs. The fixture cited most frequently as a cost saving feature was the porcelain commode/sink combination. Several jurisdictions had planned

to buy a similar fixture but made of stainless steel. After PONI participation, at least 4 planned to reduce the number purchased or not to buy any at all.

Estimates of what could be saved varied because prices of the stainless steel commode apparently varied by jurisdiction. For example, Phillips County, Arkansas estimated it could save \$1000 to \$1100 per unit and had changed its plans from 100% installation to 10% installation. The stainless steel fixtures were planned only for the maximum security cells (7 out of 70 beds). Cowlitz County, Washington which abandoned plans to purchase the stainless steel commode, estimated it would save \$300 per unit (132 bed facility planned). For Cowlitz County, the projected \$30,096 saving represents 3% of its total funding for the jail project (funding approved for \$1.02 million).

#### Construction Costs

Among the concepts taught by PONI is project management which, broadly stated, is ensuring a job is completed on schedule within the allocated budget and available resources. Two jurisdictions reported cost savings through such project management. Cumberland County, Pennsylvania indicated \$500,000 was saved in the bidding process through a "construction management" procedure whereby a general contractor was hired by the county to oversee contracts with subcontractors, (the general contractor did not take part in the construction). By letting out bids to several different subcontractors, the bidding process became more competitive,

and savings resulted. (The money saved was used to add a basement to the new facility.) Shawnee County, Kansas believed it would save at least 10% in override by letting contracts to the three prime contractors: It was anticipated costs would be reduced because it would eliminate negotiations between the general contractor and mechanical and electrical contractors required in traditional construction settings.

### Facility Design

The area where cost savings were most difficult to quantify is facility design. Although PONI does not tell a jurisdiction which type of facility to build, it does expose participants to various designs of which the pod is one. The pod design was the choice for 81% of the funded jurisdictions planning new facilities and for 85% of the unfunded projects. This represents an increase of 50% and 57%, respectively, over the percent of jurisdictions which were building pod design facilities in an in-house PONI evaluation conducted in 1982.

While over half of the respondents planning pod-design jails believed money would be saved in staffing, operations, and life-cycle, none could specifically identify a cost savings. At least two jurisdictions believed the pod design would lead to higher construction costs but such costs would be offset by long-term savings benefits. Other jurisdictions reported the pod would be less expensive to build than a

traditional cell-block facility, these costs, however, could not be compared because the costs of building a similar traditional high-rise facility had not been calculated. It would be more accurate to say that construction costs for any facility including a pod design, depend upon the local jurisdiction; it could be that the jurisdictions that reported higher construction costs for a pod facility would also experience higher construction costs for a traditional cell-block facility.

The reasons cited for the potential cost savings of a pod design were greater staff efficiency; easier separation or classification of inmates; better control over inmates; operational efficiency; and better use of space. Given the preceding analysis of staff to bed ratios and changes in classification schemes, it is very likely cost savings will result in these areas.

Respondents reported that the pod design would make it easier to supervise the inmates in a facility; they also reported that rovers (staff who moved through the facility) would be used as part of the supervision procedures. The combination of improved supervision capabilities and "rovers" are intended to stop vandalism and destruction to the interiors of cells and other parts of the facility open to inmates.

The availability of more usable space in a pod-type facility is demonstrated by the experience of Aitkin County, Minnesota. By going from a traditional square building to a modular pod design, blind corners were eliminated and areas

hidden to security cameras were opened up. In addition, the staff person assigned to the dispatch room would now have the ability to see into a key corridor, thus increasing security while using a small staff. Aitkin County also reported that the better visual security allowed in a pod design as well better use of staff would result in cost savings for overtime and safety devices.

One of the primary reasons why cost savings for jurisdictions that chose a pod design could not be calculated is that there were potential benefits which cannot be quantified. These are best described as externalities; based on the reasons given by jurisdictions, they are also external economies (benefits) rather than external diseconomies (losses that cannot be calculated or could not be internalized in construction estimates). Several jurisdictions chose the pod design because of a desire to provide a constitutional jail or a jail that allowed for the humane treatment of inmates. Better living conditions in turn are believed by these jurisdictions to have an ameliorating impact on the inherent stress of a jail environment. At least two jurisdictions believed levels of violence would decrease as a result of the pod design. Other jurisdictions favored the pod design because it allowed the local sheriff to manage the jail in the manner most comfortable for him. Such sheriffs liked the idea of direct supervision and "rovers" rather than staff isolated from the inmates. Finally, some jurisdictions reported that staff stress would be reduced

because a pod design allowed easier supervision and greater security.

Not all plans for a facility design led to the construction of a facility. Luna County, New Mexico had originally planned a \$500,000 new facility. After participation in PONI's Phase II, however, plans were reviewed and a renovation project was found to be more appropriate for Luna County's needs. As a result, \$320,000 in direct construction costs were saved and staff positions were saved as well (those required to maintain a separate facility).

Other revisions were made in preliminary plans in at least three jurisdictions from a traditional high-rise facility to the pod design. For Shawnee County, Kansas, this meant abandoning not only the traditional design but a move to another site where expansion was possible if necessary, (the original site was considered "landlocked" with no possibility of expansion).

# **COST SAVINGS IMPLICATIONS**

## VI. COST SAVINGS IMPLICATIONS

By averaging population and cost data from the entire sample, a hypothetical county can be created to illustrate the ranges of cost savings that are possible after participation in the PONI program. Such a jurisdiction would have a population of 187,930 and would be planning a new jail costing \$13.88 million. For the purposes of illustration, a further assumption is that a 100 bed facility has been planned prior to PONI participation.

Potential bed savings. The 1982 in-house PONI evaluation found an average cost of \$51,000 to construct a new bed. The present study found that a funded jurisdiction, if beds were reduced after PONI participation, could reduce the number of planned beds from 15% to 28%. Thus, if the hypothetical jurisdiction reduced beds by 15 (from 100 to 85), it could save \$765,000 immediately in construction costs immediately and between \$7.65 million to \$12.24 million in life-cycle operating costs (over 30 years). If planned beds were reduced by 28, the immediate savings would be \$1.43 million with a range of life-cycle savings from \$14.28 to \$22.85 million.

Potential staff savings. Based on the staff to bed ratios, our hypothetical jurisdiction could reduce the number of staff needed in a new pod-design facility by 1 to 10 positions. Assuming a salary of \$25,000 (excluding overtime and benefits), \$25,000 to \$250,000 could be saved in the short-term with substantial life-cycle savings of \$750,000

for one position. If 10 staff positions were reduced, \$250,000 in short-term costs could be saved and approximately \$7.5 million over the facility's life-cycle.

If the jurisdiction built a pod-design facility instead of a three-story traditional facility, at least 1 post could be saved in a state where statutes require at least one staff person at all times on a floor. Where one post is saved, 5 staff positions can be eliminated and the following cost savings would result:

1 post X 5 staff X \$25,000 = \$125,000 per year

\$125,000 X 30 years = \$3.75 million over the facility's life-cycle.

These savings would be even higher by factoring in inflation and salary increases during a typical employment period.

Potential classification savings. Assuming the existing facility is classified 100% maximum security; substantial savings could occur if the jurisdiction adopted a more balanced classification scheme. The typical classification scheme adopted by a jurisdiction with an existing all-maximum security facility (from study findings) was 14% maximum, 46% medium and 40% minimum. A maximum security bed in a traditional facility costs \$73,000 to construct; a medium security bed - \$47,000 and a minimum security bed, \$31,000. Thus, by constructing a facility with a balanced classification scheme, a jurisdiction could save \$2.88 million at the outset of the project.

Even if the jurisdiction increased the number of its

beds after PONI participation (such as, discovering initial needs had been underestimated), the adoption of a balanced classification scheme suggested by PONI to avoid overbuilding, costs could be minimized. Cost savings would range from 36% to 58%, these percentages representing the cost differential between maximum security beds and medium or minimum. Greater savings would occur if the jurisdiction opted for more work release or non-secure beds which cost 68% less to construct than a maximum security bed.

Potential fixture savings. Combined with classification changes and better planning, certain fixture savings can be achieved by incorporating only those fixtures needed for a particular security level. Thus, if a jurisdiction wished to purchase stainless steel commode fixtures, a minimum of \$300 per unit could be saved with careful planning. Instead of installing stainless steel units in all (assuming a 100 bed single cell facility), and limiting such installation to the maximum security cells, \$25,800 could be saved initially.

Obviously, the hypothetical jurisdiction presented here represents the "best case" experience. Given local factors, not all jurisdictions can be expected to achieve savings in all the areas described above nor in the depicted ranges. Nevertheless, even if one staff position is saved or fixtures changed, enough savings would result to offset any costs of the PONI program or additional planning costs expended as a result of the PONI participation.

# CONCLUSION

## VII. CONCLUSION

Whether or not PONI continues to exist, local jurisdictions will still need to build new jails. The profile for PONI respondents showed that the primary reasons for jail construction were an out-dated facility, lack of compliance with state standards, and jail crowding. Even if these reasons are not compelling enough to a jurisdiction to embark on a jail construction project, court action or litigation will provide additional pressure. Combined with public demands that lawbreakers be incarcerated, it is inevitable new jails will continue to be built in the future.

PONI's answer is a rational and systematic approach to planning and construction of a new jail. PONI also emphasizes alternatives to incarceration, but these are not always feasible for jurisdictions with conservative judges and prosecutors or legislatures. This is not to say that the development of alternatives does not work; the experience of counties in reducing the number of jail beds through the use of a de-tox center for drunk drivers shows their potential. For the near future, however, it appears a new jail is often the right solution to a jurisdiction's incarceration needs and problems.

The public which is demanding more incarceration also will have to pay for its request. Of the funded projects, 44% were funded by general obligation bonds; 22% from a combination of state grants and county general funds. Overall, 97% of jail funding came from local and state money

which ultimately comes from the public. Based on the PONI respondents profile (average jurisdiction), a new jail will cost \$10.56 million. Any savings that can be achieved at any point in the planning or construction project reduces the amount of funding required of the public.

While cost savings could not be identified in every jurisdiction that sent a planning team through PONI's program, areas where costs savings could result were identified. The degree of cost savings obviously will depend on local characteristics and political climate. Those jurisdictions that can save money because of their PONI participation, however, will directly benefit the public during the short-term and over the long term if mistakes can be avoided through a thorough planning process and a well-designed facility. Needless to say, the jurisdictions where construction was determined less by need than cost reported their jails would probably be crowded on the day they opened. Such "mistakes" can be avoided, and PONI provides a feasible alternative.

Delivery costs of a PONI Phase I community (excluding overhead) is approximately \$2300. The week-long Phase II seminar in Boulder costs about \$5000 to present to an average of 33 participants. For a jurisdiction that takes part in both Phase I and Phase II, the total delivery cost of the PONI program is approximately \$7300. If that jurisdiction could save that amount in its planning or construction, PONI will have paid for itself and any additional savings reflect a major benefit to the public.

Savings in excess of \$7300 are clearly possible for PONI participants. Even adding in a \$26,000 factor for increased planning costs (which occurred in only 38% of reporting jurisdictions), substantial cost savings are likely because jail construction is so expensive. By reducing one bed, at least \$51,000 could be saved. In fact, jurisdictions reporting reductions in beds could reduce by 10 to 100 beds. This presents a potential savings range of \$510,000 to \$5.1 million. As described earlier, a jurisdiction could save up to \$500,000 in construction costs through careful project management. At least \$10,000 per beds could be saved by reducing classification levels from maximum security to minimum security. As much as 3% of total construction costs could be saved by utilizing common fixtures rather than more expensive newer models.

The only conclusion that can be reached is that PONI offers its participants an opportunity to reduce planning and construction costs. Several jurisdictions (44%) with funded projects specifically identified dollar savings. Since PONI incorporates the sharing of experiences with other participants, it is possible to share these positive experiences with others to increase the potential of cost savings.

Finally, it must also be recognized that PONI teaches its participants how to avoid mistakes or common pitfalls in jail planning. It is impossible to calculate savings from these "avoidable costs", but the overwhelming support for and belief in the PONI program suggests the lessons were well learned.

**INTERVIEWEES**

## VIII. INTERVIEWEES

Dave Voorhis  
Voorhis Associates Inc.  
Boulder, CO

### FUNDED

Gene Albaugh  
Nevada County  
Nevada City, CA

Ralph Anderson  
Kitsap County  
Port Orchard, WA

Robert J. Barada  
Ross County  
Chillicothe, OH

David Calhoun  
Licking County  
Newark, OH

Donald Chell  
Burnett County  
Grantsburg, WI

Jeffrey Conell  
Dakota County  
Hastings, Minnesota

Ray C. Culver, Jr.  
Phillips County  
Helena, Arkansas

Ken Hanson  
Swift County  
Benson, MI

Jeffrey D. Hubert  
Cumberland County  
Carlisle, PENN

Bob Lauer  
Bernalillo County  
Albuquerque, NM

Joseph V. Lisiewski  
Camden County  
Camden, NJ

Darold D. Main  
Shawnee County  
Topeka, Kansas

Charles Megerman  
Jackson County  
Kansas City, MO

Andrew Neiditz  
Pierce County  
Tacoma, Washington

Gerald E. Shuttlesworth  
Luna County  
Deming, NM

Jay B. Skewes  
Kent Police Department  
Kent, WA

Bill Sobey & Elsie Specht  
Aitkin County  
Atikin, MINN

**NON-FUNDED**

Dennis Lyon  
Richardson County  
Lincoln, NEB

Philip Murphy  
Sacramento County  
Sacramento, CA

Patrick D. Rackers  
Lancaster County  
Lincoln, NEB

Alan K. Wheeler  
Jasper County  
Newton, IOWA

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

## IX. BIBLIOGRAPHY

National Institute of Corrections, Action Planning, Voorhis Associates, Inc., Boulder, Colorado, 1981.

National Institute of Corrections, Phase One - Community Meeting, Voorhis Associates, Inc., Boulder, Colorado, 1981.

National Institute of Corrections, Phase One - Community Meeting, Lesson Plans, Voorhis Associates, Inc., Boulder, Colorado, 1981.

National Institute of Corrections, Phase One - Technical Assistance Report, Gary Frank, April 27-28, 1982.

National Institute of Corrections, Program Evaluation, Voorhis Associates, Inc., Boulder, Colorado, November 12, 1982.

National Institute of Corrections, Workbook, Voorhis Associates, Inc., Boulder, Colorado, June 13-19, 1982.

# APPENDICES

## X. APPENDICES

1. Sample letter and form sent to PONI participants, September 20, 1983.
2. Sample reminder letter sent to PONI participants, October 5, 1983.
3. Sample cover letter to PONI questionnaire, October 21, 1983.
4. PONI questionnaire.
5. List of PONI participants questionnaires mailed to.
6. Sample reminder letter, November 15, 1983.
7. Sample reminder letter, January 13, 1984.
8. Cover letter and Interim PONI Report on Qualitative Issues to Michael O'Toole, December 31, 1983.
9. Follow-up to Qualitative Evaluation, February 29, 1984.

September 20, 1983

# 1

&Mr-Ms& &FirstName& &LastName&  
&Firm&  
&Address&  
&City&, &State& &Zip&

Dear &Mr-Ms& &LastName&,

The Institute for Law and Policy Planning is conducting a study for the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) to evaluate the cost-effectiveness impact on counties, of the Planning of New Institutions (PONI) training program. As you know, PONI aims at providing training so as to improve jail planning. As part of our evaluation, a questionnaire will be sent to past PONI participants. We hope that former PONI participants will take the small amount of time necessary to complete these questionnaires to provide us with the necessary information to evaluate the program; the information will be used to provide NIC's Board and others with financial planning data and to make recommendations for improvements or continuation of the program.

NIC has provided us with the names of all PONI participants. To facilitate the information collection and to avoid duplication of efforts from any one jurisdiction, we would appreciate knowing the most knowledgeable member or current team leader in your jurisdiction (as regards your jail efforts) to whom the questionnaire should be sent. Because of the need to complete the evaluation as soon as possible, we would like the name of this contact person for your jurisdiction by return mail. For your convenience, a form for this information is enclosed, along with a pre-addressed, stamped return envelope.

Thank you for your time. Your efforts and those of other PONI participants will provide valuable planning information and feedback on how to deal with one of the most critical issues facing corrections today.

Sincerely,

Alan Kalmanoff  
Study Director

Enclosure

JURISDICTION: \_\_\_\_\_  
(City and State or County and State for PONI project)

CONTACT PERSON: \_\_\_\_\_  
(or more knowledgeable team leader, etc.)

ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

TELEPHONE: ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) \_\_\_\_\_

October 5, 1983

&Mr-MS& &FirstName& &LastName&  
&Firm&  
&Address&  
&City&, &State& &Zip&

Dear &Mr-MS& &LastName&,

About two weeks ago, we sent you a letter requesting the name of a contact person for your jurisdiction to whom a questionnaire could be sent as part of our NIC evaluation of the PONI program. As yet, we have received no response.

We would appreciate very much your taking the time to complete the attached form so that we may begin our evaluation. It is evident that PONI has been helpful to program participants. The issue now is whether PONI should be continued or expanded to allow other jurisdictions to take advantage of its services, resources, and training. This question depends on the cost-effectiveness data we want to collect from your County. Your efforts will enable us to complete the study. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Alan Kalmanoff  
Study Director

Enclosure

October 21, 1983

#3

&Mr-Ms& &FirstName& &LastName&  
&Firm&  
&Address&  
&City&, &State& &Zip&

Dear &Mr-Ms& &LastName&,

Enclosed is a questionnaire that has been prepared by the Institute for Law and Policy Planning which will form the basis of a cost-effectiveness assessment of the PONI program. The questionnaire has been made as short as possible, and its focus is on financial data or variables which impact on the cost-effectiveness of PONI training. The information you provide will be coded and analyzed to provide the data base necessary for assessment of cost-effectiveness.

Because the questionnaire has been designed to minimize the amount of time required of you to complete it, it is essential that every question be answered, with the exception of those asking for comment. We encourage you to answer the comment questions, however, since your input will provide valuable qualitative information and aid in the identification of impact that cannot be quantified. If you are willing, you should also attach any documents (budgets, proposals, planning memoranda, etc.) you feel may be helpful to the study.

After all the questionnaires have been returned, we will randomly select a sample of jurisdictions for additional information. The information for the second phase of our study will be obtained from telephone interviews. The purpose of these interviews will be to identify particular problems or special factors that can be used to develop a planning model.

If you have any questions about the questionnaire, please contact me at (415) 652-2847. Thank you for participating in this important evaluation.

Sincerely,

Alan Kalmanoff  
Study Director

Enclosure

PONI QUESTIONNAIRE

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

This questionnaire is part of an evaluation of the cost-effectiveness of the Planning of New Institutions (PONI) program. Please answer each question carefully because the information you provide will be used to determine the future of PONI. Please feel free to use additional sheets of paper to expand on your answers or to make additional comments.

I. Background Information

1. Name of person completing questionnaire:

\_\_\_\_\_

2. Job title/position: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone No.: (        ) \_\_\_\_\_

3. Jurisdiction:

City: \_\_\_\_\_

(01) County: \_\_\_\_\_

(01) State: \_\_\_\_\_

(02) County population: \_\_\_\_\_  
(as of 1980 census)

4. PONI participation

(03) Phase I completion date: \_\_\_\_\_

Phase II completion date: \_\_\_\_\_

Phase III assistance:    \_\_\_ yes    \_\_\_ no

Type of Phase III assistance: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

5. Reasons for construction/planning (check all that apply):

- (04) \_\_\_\_\_ crowding
- \_\_\_\_\_ court action/pending litigation
- \_\_\_\_\_ compliance with State standards
- \_\_\_\_\_ out-dated facility
- \_\_\_\_\_ damaged facility
- \_\_\_\_\_ other: \_\_\_\_\_

6. Type of construction/planning:

- (05) \_\_\_\_\_ new
- \_\_\_\_\_ renovation/remodel
- \_\_\_\_\_ expansion
- \_\_\_\_\_ purchase modular units
- \_\_\_\_\_ other: \_\_\_\_\_

7. Scope of project:

- (06) \_\_\_\_\_ County jail
- \_\_\_\_\_ city/county facility
- \_\_\_\_\_ regional facility
- \_\_\_\_\_ number of counties: \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_ number of states involved: \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_ other: \_\_\_\_\_

8. a. How many detention facilities are there in your jurisdiction? \_\_\_\_\_

b. For how many of these facilities is planning or construction anticipated? \_\_\_\_\_

c. If more than one, which ones?  
\_\_\_\_\_

d. Does the planning or construction project involve an increase in the number of facilities for your jurisdiction?

\_\_\_\_\_ yes      If yes, how many? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ no

9. a. Has construction of a new or remodelled facility:

\_\_\_\_\_ begun      Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ been completed      Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ been scheduled to begin  
Date: \_\_\_\_\_

b. If construction or remodelling has been completed, is facility occupied?

\_\_\_\_\_ yes      \_\_\_\_\_ no  
Date of occupancy: \_\_\_\_\_

II. PONI Impact

(07) 10. Has your project been funded? \_\_\_\_\_ yes \_\_\_\_\_ no

If yes, please answer the following:

(08) a. Amount of funding: \_\_\_\_\_

(09) b. Type of funding: \_\_\_\_\_

(i.e., general obligation bond, sales tax, state loan or grant, etc.)

(10) c. Was funding obtained before or after PONI participation? \_\_\_\_\_

If after, please answer the following:

d. How many times did you try to get funding before you were actually funded? \_\_\_\_\_

e. Were amounts sought in previous funding efforts:

\_\_\_\_\_ the same as amount actually funded

\_\_\_\_\_ greater by \$ \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ lesser by \$ \_\_\_\_\_

12. Did participation in PONI lead to tactics or strategies that helped obtain funding?

\_\_\_\_\_ yes \_\_\_\_\_ no

If yes, in what way? \_\_\_\_\_

13. Project costs

	<u>Planning Costs</u>	<u>Jurisdiction Staff</u>	<u>Consultant</u>
(11) a.	Data collection	\$ _____	\$ _____
(12) b.	Development of master plan	\$ _____	\$ _____
(13) c.	Site analysis	\$ _____	\$ _____
(14) d.	Cost analysis	\$ _____	\$ _____
(15) e.	Needs assessment	\$ _____	\$ _____
(16) f.	Feasibility study	\$ _____	\$ _____
(17) g.	Other: _____	\$ _____	\$ _____

\_\_\_\_\_

h. Which of the above costs would have been expended even without PONI participation?

\_\_\_\_\_

13. Facility Costs

(18) a. Architect: \$ \_\_\_\_\_

b. Architectural services provided in above cost:

\_\_\_\_\_ Pre-architectural program/decision

\_\_\_\_\_ On-site inspection services

\_\_\_\_\_ Project management

\_\_\_\_\_ Construction management

\_\_\_\_\_ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

(19) c. Construction

Initial cost estimate: \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Final cost estimate: \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Bid cost: \$ \_\_\_\_\_

d. Costs comparison

	<u>Old/existing facility</u>	<u>New/planned facility</u>
(20) Life-cycle cost est.	\$ _____	\$ _____
Energy cost est.	\$ _____	\$ _____
Other cost est.	\$ _____	\$ _____
_____		
_____		

e. Were construction cost estimates revised after participation in PONI? \_\_\_\_\_ yes \_\_\_\_\_ no

If yes, in what way? \_\_\_\_\_

14. Facility Design

	<u>Old/existing facility</u>	<u>New/planned facility</u>
a. Cell-block type housing	_____	_____
Pod-type housing	_____	_____
Other: _____	_____	_____
_____		
b. Single-cell housing	_____ %	_____ %
Dormitory housing	_____ %	_____ %
Other: _____	_____ %	_____ %
_____		
c. Compliance with standards for correctional facilities (check all that apply).		
State standards	_____	_____
DOJ standards	_____	_____
CAC standards	_____	_____
AMA standards	_____	_____
ACA Accreditation standards	_____	_____
NFPA standards	_____	_____
Other: _____	_____	_____
_____		

Old/existing facility

New/planned facility

d. Type of construction

pre-pressed concrete	_____	_____
poured in place, reinforced	_____	_____
concrete block, reinforced with rebar	_____	_____
steel plate	_____	_____
Other: _____	_____	_____

e. Facility has been designed to:

\_\_\_\_\_ expand up

\_\_\_\_\_ expand out

\_\_\_\_\_ be built oversized

\_\_\_\_\_ have other expansion plan: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ allow no expansion

15. Facility Capacity

	<u>Existing/old Facility</u>	<u>Planned Prior to PONI Participation</u>	<u>New/planned Facility (Post-PONI)</u>
a. Total beds	_____	_____	_____
b. Classification (number of beds)			
Max. security	_____	_____	_____
Med. security	_____	_____	_____
Min. security	_____	_____	_____
Work release	_____	_____	_____
Non-secure (describe)	_____	_____	_____
<hr/>			
Other:	_____	_____	_____
<hr/>			

16. Facility Staffing

a. Total facility staff	_____	_____	_____
b. Number support staff	_____	_____	_____
c. Number staff working inside inmate housing units	_____	_____	_____
d. Number "rovers" to supervise inmate units	_____	_____	_____
e. Number control room staff	_____	_____	_____
g. Number control rooms	_____	_____	_____

h. Is number of total staff adequate? (yes or no)

17. Alternatives to Incarceration (check all that apply).

	<u>Already Existed</u>	<u>Developed Post-PONI</u>	<u>Used More Post-PONI</u>
Field Citation	_____	_____	_____
Stationhouse Citation	_____	_____	_____
Release on Own Recognizance (ROR)	_____	_____	_____
Supervised ROR	_____	_____	_____
Residential Supervised ROR	_____	_____	_____
10% Bail	_____	_____	_____
House Arrest	_____	_____	_____
Holds Clearance	_____	_____	_____
Pre-trial Diversion	_____	_____	_____
Deferred Sentencing	_____	_____	_____
Deferred Prosecution	_____	_____	_____
Mediation/ Arbitration	_____	_____	_____
Decriminalization of:			
Drunk in public	_____	_____	_____
Prostitution	_____	_____	_____
Panhandling	_____	_____	_____
Loitering	_____	_____	_____
Fines	_____	_____	_____

	<u>Already Existed</u>	<u>Developed Post-PONI</u>	<u>Used More Post-PONI</u>
Suspended Sentences	_____	_____	_____
Alcohol Diversion	_____	_____	_____
Drug Diversion	_____	_____	_____
Counselling	_____	_____	_____
Home Probation	_____	_____	_____
Shock Probation	_____	_____	_____
Community Service	_____	_____	_____
Work/Education Release	_____	_____	_____
Furlough	_____	_____	_____
Restitution	_____	_____	_____
Residential Treatment	_____	_____	_____
Re-entry Program	_____	_____	_____
Weekend Sentence	_____	_____	_____
Weekend Work Program	_____	_____	_____

18. What things do you think were done differently because of your involvement with PONI?

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

19. In what ways were your PONI involvement unsatisfactory?

---

---

---

---

---

20. Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

Lochotzki  
Yuma County Sheriff Department  
P.O. Box 110, Yuma AZ

Mr. Gene Albaugh  
Nevada County Administrator  
Courthouse  
Nevada City, CA 95959

Mr. Greg Delgado  
Columbia County Sheriff Department  
P.O. Box 650  
Lake City, FL 32055

Chief Deputy Robert W. Simcox  
Saint Charles County Sheriff Department  
120 South Second  
St. Charles, MO 63301

Sheriff Gerry Billy  
Licking County Sheriff Department  
46 South Third Street  
Newark, OH 43055

Sheriff Donald Ohell  
Burnett County Sheriff Department  
Burnett County  
Grantsburg, WI 54840

Sheriff Gary Carmichael  
Delaware County Sheriff Department  
100 West Main  
Muncie, IN 47305

Mr. Alva Lary  
Grant Parish Sheriff Department  
P.O. Box 187  
Colfax, LA 71417

Sheriff Lou Chalich  
Cass County Sheriff Department  
P.O. Box 100  
Walker, MN 56484

Sheriff Orielle Norland  
Beltrami County Sheriff  
Law Enforcement Center  
Bemidji, MN 56601

Sheriff Bill D. McDowell  
Bergen County  
Courthouse  
Hackensack, NJ 07601

Mr. Randolph Pisane  
Union County Department of Public Safety  
Administration Building  
Elizabeth, New Jersey 07207

Undersheriff Neal J. Grover

Cleveland County Sheriff's Office  
200 South Peters  
Norman, Oklahoma 73069

Sheriff Wayne McEveven  
Calcasieu Parish Sheriff's Department  
P.O. Box V  
Lake Charles, LA 70602

Sheriff Joe E. Vigil  
Colfax County Sheriff's Department  
P.O. Box 39  
Raton, NM 87740

Undersheriff Tom Dawson  
Jefferson County Sheriff's Office  
Jefferson County Courthouse  
Boulder, MO 59632

Chief Deputy Wayland R. Clifton, Jr.  
Alachua County Sheriff's Department  
P.O. Box 1210  
Gainesville, FLA 32602-1210

Sheriff Larry Spencer  
Lincoln County Sheriff's Office  
225 W. Olive Street  
Newport, Oregon 97365

Mr. Edgar Estes  
Commonwealth of Kentucky  
P.O. Box 772  
Richmond, Kentucky 40475

Mr. James W. Freeman  
D.C. Department of Corrections  
Box 25  
Lorton, Virginia 22079

Mr. Vernon Chang  
Corrections Administrator III, Hawaii Youth Corr. Facility  
42-477 Kalaniana'ole Highway  
Kailua, Hawaii 96734

Ms. Norma Alene Davis  
Human Resources Developer, Dept. of Corr.  
P.O. Box 531  
Lynchburg, VA 24505

Mr. Brian Gendron  
Assoc. Commissioner, Dept. of Corr.  
100 Cambridge Street  
Boston, Mass 02202

Mr. Robert McCracken  
Montana Dept. of Commerce, Div. of Economic & Comm. Dev.  
1424 9th Avenue  
Helena, Montana 59620

Mr. Carl Wilkins  
Louisiana Dept. of Correctins Executive Officer

501 Government  
Baton Route, LA 70804

Commissioner Morris L. Thigpen  
Mississippi Department of Corrections  
723 North President  
Jackson, Mississippi 39201

Dr. James G. Ricketts  
Executive Director, Colorado Dept. of Corrections  
6385 North Academy Blvd.  
Colorado Springs, CO 80907

Mr. Donald E. Fisor  
Correction Captain, New Jersey Dept. of Corr.  
P.O. Box 3787  
Trenton, NJ 08628

Mr. Robert B. Klug  
Texas Youth Council  
P.O. Box 9999  
Austin, TX 78766

Mr. George Ray Hardinger  
Projects Planner, Maryland Div. of Corr.  
6314 Windsor Mill Road  
Baltimore, Maryland 21207

Commissioner Don Allen  
Maine Department of Corrections  
State Office Bldg., Room 400  
August, Maine 04333

Mr. Richard M. Steinert  
Superintendent, Connecticut Corr. Institution  
P.O. Box G  
Enfield, Conn 06082

Mr. William Miller  
Morgan County Coordinator  
Courthouse  
Berkeley Springs, West Virginia 25411

Mr. Norm Risavi  
Berkeley County Administrator  
119 West King Street-Room 14  
Martinsburg, West Virginia 25401

Mr. Dave Ash  
Jefferson County Administrator  
Courthouse  
Charles Town, West Virginia 25414

Sheriff James A. Gondles, Jr.  
Arlington County Sheriff's Office  
1400 N. Courthouse Road, Room 500  
Arlington, VA 22201

Sheriff Robert L. Ryan  
Madison County Sheriff's Department  
N. Court Street

Wampville, NY 13163

Sheriff Dale Carson  
Jacksonville Sheriff's Office  
501 E. Bay Street  
Jacksonville, FLA 32202

Sheriff Alan Wheeler  
Jasper County Jail  
115 N. 2nd Avenue East  
Newton, Iowa 50208

Sheriff Harry J. Berkener  
Franklin County Sheriff's Department  
369 S. High Street  
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Col. Russell L. Dwyer  
Middletown Police Department  
1 City Centre Plaza  
Middletown, Ohio 45042

Undersheriff Donald McLeod  
Rockland County Sheriff's Dept.  
Sheriff's Headquarters  
New City, New York 10956

Captain Clint Hutchens  
Jail Administrator  
Washington County Sheriff's Dept.  
Fayetteville, Arkansas 72701

Sheriff Zane Grey  
Benzie County Sheriff's Department  
P.O. Box 116  
Beulah, Michigan 49617

Sheriff John H. Shelley  
Will County Sheriff's Office  
14 W. Jefferson Street  
Joliet, Illinois 60431

Sheriff James C. Freeman  
Spalding County Sheriff's Department  
232 East Broad Street  
Griffin, Georgia 30223

Mr. Mark D. Martin  
Senior Field Representative, Nebraska Comm. on Law Enforcement &  
Crim. Justice  
301 Centennial Mall South  
Lincoln, Nebraska 68509

Mr. Art J. Jackson Jail Administrator, Martin County Sheriff's Dept.  
P.O. Box 87  
Stuart  
FLA, 33495 Mr.

Warden Jeffrey D. Hubert  
Cumberland County Prison  
37 East High Street

Carlisle, Pennsylvania 17013

Undersheriff Charles A. Wheeler  
Kitsap County Sheriff's Department  
614 Division Street  
Port Orchard, Washington 98366

Sheriff Joseph Gilmore  
Mercer County Sheriff's Department  
125 W. Livingston Street  
Celina, Ohio 45822

Mr. Jack Sapp  
Jail Inspector, Department of Corrections  
P.O. Box 158  
Lowell, FLA 32663

Mr. Luke Smith  
Director of Correctinal Services Training Academy  
1134 New Scotland Road  
Albany, New York 12208

Undersheriff Bob Stinnett  
Dawson County Sheriff's Department  
P.O. Box 766  
Glendive, Montana 59330

Sheriff William F. Miller  
Rusk County Sheriff's Department  
311 Miner Avenue, East  
Ladysmith, Wisconsin 54848

Sheriff Norm Counts  
Lincoln County Sheriff's Department  
225 W. Olive Street  
Newport, Oregon 97365

Chief Deputy Sheriff Glen Barron  
Union Parish Sheriff's Dept.  
Union Parish Courthouse  
Farmerville, Louisiana 71241

Lt. Gordon Ogden  
Coos County Courthouse  
Coquille  
Oregon, 97423 Lt.

Mr. Arthur Scheeren  
Indian River County Public Safety Committee  
12525 Roseland Road  
Sebastian, FLA 32958

Mr. John Southern  
Coordinator, Georgia Peace Officer Standards and Training Council  
4301 Memorial Drive, Suite 1  
Decatur, Georgia 30032

Chief Jay B. Skewes  
Kent Police Department  
220 4th Avenue South  
Kent, WA 98031

Sheriff Tim Dobeck  
Indian River County Sheriff's Department  
P.O. Box 608  
Vero Beach, FLA 32960

Mr. William R. Barham  
Capital Programs Unit, Admin. Bldg.  
1301 Concordia Court  
Springfield, Illinois 62702

Mr. Robert Williamson  
Pike County Sheriff's Office  
Pike County Courthouse  
Magnolia, Mississippi 39652

Sheriff Dennis L. Hogue  
Richardson County Sheriff's Department  
Courthouse  
Falls City, Nebraska 68355

Warden Joseph Wagner  
Atlantic County  
Atlantic County Jail  
Mays Landing, New Jersey 08330

Chief Deputy Wally Moll  
Jefferson Parish Sheriff's Office  
3300 Metairie Road  
Metairie, Louisiana 70001

Sergeant R. Dean Stephens  
St. Charles County Sheriff's Dept.  
120 So. Second  
St. Charles, Missouri 63301

Sheriff Al C. Rierson  
Flathead County Sheriff's Dept.  
Box 1076  
Kalispell, Montana 59901

Mr. George Riedel  
Eau Claire County Board Supervisor  
515 Fall Street  
Eau Claire, Wisconsin 54701

Warden Gene A. Scroggy  
Dauphin County Prison  
501 Mall Road  
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17111

Sheriff Les Nelson  
Cowlitz County Sheriff's Dept.  
312 So. 1st Avenue West  
Kelso, Washington 98626

Mr. Richard Mills  
Director, Dept. of Corrections  
200 East 7th - Courthouse  
Topeka, Kansas 66603

Sheriff Louis F. Gianoli  
Marathon County Sheriff's Dept.  
P.O. Box 1706  
Wausau, Wisconsin 54401

Mr. Clifton Mickelson  
Butte County Administrative Officer  
#25 County Center Drive  
Oroville, CA 95965

Sheriff Richard E. Kienast  
Pitkin County Sheriff's Dept.  
506 East Main Street  
Aspen, CO 81611

Chief Criminal Deputy Willie W. Johnson  
Tangipahoe Parish Sheriff's Dept.  
P.O. Box 727  
Amite, LA 70422

Warden Robert Sharr  
Warren County  
Courthouse  
Belvidere, New Jersey 07823

Sheriff Jack Canfield  
Grand Traverse Co. Sheriff's Dept.  
320 Washington Street  
Traverse City, Michigan 49684

Asst. Chief Harvey L. Suwol  
Correction Division  
2575 Center Street, North East  
Salem, Oregon 97310

Sheriff Ralph P. Moore  
Gibson Co. Sheriff's Dept.  
301 No. College St.  
Trenton, Tenn. 38382

Sheriff Ken Hanson  
Swift Co. Sheriff's Dept.  
Box 291  
Benson, Minn. 56215

Sheriff Paul Moe  
Yellow Medicine Co. Sheriff's Dept.  
365 Ninth Ave.  
Granite Falls, Minn. 56241

Sheriff Don Skogrand  
Chippewa Co. Sheriff's Dept.  
Box 130  
Montevideo, Minn. 56265

Captain Nelson Goodfield  
Strafford County Jail  
County Farm Road  
Dover, New Hampshire 03820

Liaison, Kennebec Co. Sheriff's Dept.  
115 State Street  
Augusta, Maine 04330

Sheriff Norman Fletcher  
Natchitoches Parish Jail  
Box 266  
Natchitoches, LA 71457

Sheriff Robert Winter  
Santa Clara Sheriff's Dept.  
180 West Hedding Street  
San Jose, CA 95110

Sergeant John Maher  
Peoria County Sheriff's Dept.  
Courthouse, Room 23  
Peoria, Illinois 61602

Deputy Gerald Shuttleworth  
Luna Co. Sheriff's Dept.  
700 South Silver  
Deming, New Mexico 88030

Chief Deputy Edward Garm  
Ross County  
Sheriff's Dept.  
Chillicothe, Ohio 45601

Mr. Mark O. Morris  
Project Director, State Board of Corrections  
1924 T Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Sheriff Don Moreland  
Marion County Sheriff's Dept.  
P.O. Box 1987  
Ocala, FLA. 32678

Mr. Steve Loeding  
Exec. Director, Minnesota Sheriff's Assn.  
P.O. Box 623  
South St. Paul, Minn. 55075

Sheriff William J. Sodey  
Aitken Co. Sheriff's Dept.  
Aitkin  
Minn., 56431 Sheriff

Mr. Jim McFadden  
Acting Dir., Planning & Research, Bureau of Adult Corr.  
30 Monrovia Avenue  
Smyrna, DE 19977

Mr. George Mutimer  
Jailer, Richmond County Jail  
621 Fourth Street  
Augusta, GA 30901

Sheriff Leo Snider

Porton County Sheriff's Dept.  
Courthouse  
Mandan, ND 58554

Mr. Craig Campbell  
Dir. of Corr. - Sheriff's Dept.  
P.O. Box 1748  
Austin, TX 78767

Mr. Richard J. Lally  
Jail Administrator, Whitman Co. Sheriff's Dept  
P.O. Box 470  
Colfax, WA 99111

Sheriff William B. Derosier  
Lake County Sheriff's Dept.  
613 Third Avenue  
Two Harbors, Minn. 55616

Sheriff Pat W. Smith, Jr.  
LeSueur County Sheriff's Dept.  
130 South Park Avenue  
LeCenter, Minn. 56057

Sheriff Ronnie Peterson  
Hancock County Sheriff's Dept.  
P.O. Box 262  
Bay St. Louis, Miss. 39520

Sheriff Glen G. Osborne  
Cascade County Sheriff's Office  
Courthouse Annex  
Great Falls, Montana 59401

Sheriff Marion S. Hickey  
Phillips County  
Sheriff's Dept.  
Helena, Arkansas Sheriff

Deputy Sheriff Glenn Griffin  
Monroe County Sheriff's Dept.  
123 Madison Street  
Clarendon, Arkansas 72029

Chief Deputy Carl W. Oxner  
Lee County Sheriff's Dept.  
15 East Chestnut  
Marianne, Arkansas 72360

Mr. Neil Zinn  
Field Representative, Board of Corrections  
1924 T Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Sheriff Ron E. Whitehead  
Yolo County Sheriff's Dept.  
P.O. Box 179  
Woodland, CA 95695

Sheriff Jack Haynes  
Eagle County

Eagle, CO 81631

Sheriff Wayne Huck  
Lincoln Parish Sheriff's Dept.  
P.O. Box 267  
Ruston, LA 71270

Sheriff Robert D. Dykstra  
Ottawa County  
Sheriff's Dept.  
Grand Haven, Michigan 49417

Mr. Andrew Neiditz  
Jail Project Coordinator, Pierce County  
County-City Building  
Tacoma, WA 98402

Captain Braxton Bonner  
Sacramento Sheriff's Dept.  
711 G Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Sheriff Howard L. Hobbs  
Harrison County Sheriff's Department  
P.O. Box 1480  
Gulfport, Miss. 39501

Mr. Sammy Garcia  
County Commissioner, Santa Fe County Jail  
P.O. Box 5071  
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

Sheriff-Warden Forrest B. Sebring  
Monroe County  
Courthouse  
Stroudsburg, Penn. 18360

Chief Deputy John Baker  
Wicomico County Sheriff's Department  
Wicomico County Courthouse  
Salisbury, MD 21801

Sheriff Rod Boyd  
Dakota County Sheriff's Department  
Box 247  
Hastings, MN 55033

Warden John Parker  
Warden's Office  
Camden County Jail, Sixth Floor Courthouse  
Camden, NJ 08101

Chief Louis J. Scavo  
Department of Corrections  
P.O. Box 7387  
Trenton, NJ 08628

Sheriff William Hasenauer  
Oneida County Sheriff's Department  
Law Enforcement Building, Judd Road

Sheriff L.E. Driscoll  
Grayson County Sheriff's Department  
100 West  
Houston, TX 75090

Sheriff Bill Carpenter  
Dhaves County Sheriff's Department  
P.O. Box 1396  
Roswell, NM 88201

Sheriff Ira Schoppmann  
Iron County  
Sheriff's Department  
Cedar City, UT 84720

Sheriff Robert E. Baldwin  
Madison County Sheriff's Department  
204 E. 8th Street  
Anderson, IN 46016

Sheriff Richard P. Doria  
DuPage County Sheriff's Department  
Box 300  
Wheaton, IL 60187

Sheriff Frank Kanekoa  
Clark County  
Clark County Jail, P.O. Box 5000  
Vancouver, WA 98663

Ms. Susan Stanton  
Director of Corrections, Dept. of Corrections  
415 E. 12th Street  
Kansas City, MO 64106

Lt. Ken Keller  
City of Albuquerque Police Dept.  
4th & Marquette  
Albuquerque, NM 87103

Commissioner J.R. Dickenson  
Clovis City  
121 East Christopher  
Clovis, NM 88101

Mr. Patrick D. Rackers  
Corrections Administrator  
City-Co. Bldg., Room B429, 555 So. 10th St.  
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508

Commissioner John Waters  
Bullock County  
208 West Conecuh Street  
Union Springs, Alabama 36089

Mr. Tim McCauley  
Criminal Justice Facilities  
City County Building  
Helena, Montana 59601

November 15, 1983

&Mr-Ms& &FirstName& &LastName&  
&Firm&  
&Address&  
&City&, &State& &Zip&

Dear &Mr-Ms& &LastName&,

About two weeks ago, we sent you a questionnaire for your jurisdiction as part of our evaluation of the PONI program. As yet, we have received no response.

We would appreciate very much your taking the time to complete the attached questionnaire so that we may begin our evaluation. It is evident that PONI has been helpful to program participants. The issue now is whether PONI should be continued or expanded to allow other jurisdictions to take advantage of its services, resources, and training. This question depends on the cost-effectiveness data we want to collect from your County. Your efforts in the evaluation will enable us to resolve this issue. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Alan Kalmanoff  
Executive Director

Enclosure

January 13, 1984

We recently sent you a questionnaire regarding your participation in PONI. The questionnaire is a major part of the data gathering required to evaluate the cost impact of PONI.

Your input is extremely important to our evaluation effort, and we ask that you complete the questionnaire as soon as possible. The final report is due mid-March; therefore, it is essential your completed questionnaire is returned to us by February 3, 1984. Thank you for your cooperation.

December 31, 1983

#8

Michael O'Toole  
Corrections Specialist  
NIC Jail Center  
1790 30th Avenue  
Boulder, CO 80301

Dear Michael:

Enclosed is the promised interim report on the qualitative aspects of the PONI project. The preliminary data findings are derived from our research questionnaires and follow-up interviews from the cost/impact study.

I want to stress that this report is aimed at helping you and NIC to fashion possible changes in the PONI curricula and strategy, rather than at an evaluation of the program as presented in the field. The feedback we used to develop this report is useful to review the big picture, but not to know what exactly is happening in the field.

Our study of PONI's cost effectiveness impact is progressing well. We have nearly 70 questionnaires, and we have been in telephone contact with most of the 64 delinquents. We expect a high final return rate.

I'm anxious to hear from you regarding the requested extension. I feel confident of providing you, NIC's Board and others at the higher funding levels with a study that sheds light on the cost impact of the PONI effort.

Thanks for your consideration and support.

Sincerely,

Alan Kalmanoff  
Executive Director

ENCLOSURES

ASK/dds

To: Michael O'Toole  
NIC Jail Center

From: Alan Kalmanoff  
Consultant

Re: Interim PONI Report on  
Qualitative Issues

Date: 12/31/83

## INTRODUCTION

A qualitative evaluation of any program must be performed within the context of the program's goals. NIC's Planning of New Institutions Program (PONI), designed to provide basic training and technical assistance to jurisdictions planning new jails, has established goals for each of its three program delivery phases (Phase I Community Meeting, Phase II Boulder Week-long Training, and Phase III Technical Assistance.

In general, the goals of Phase One can be stated as creating an awareness through a two-day training/community meeting of the scope and complexity of a jail construction project; and, as encouraging systemwide participation in the corrections planning process. Phase Two's goals focus on technical aspects of planning such as providing program participants with planning goals and specialized techniques. The overall goals of Phase Three are to provide specific assistance to special local jail planning problems within a jurisdiction.

It is clear from PONI participants' viewpoints that the PONI program is meeting its goals. Because this brief attempt at some qualitative evaluation and input into NIC's program and contract monitoring is based almost entirely on participant's question-

naire comments and follow-up interviews, it is necessarily subjective.

Nevertheless, PONI participants were not asked to evaluate PONI in terms of its goals, nor were they given a list of PONI's program goals to consider while writing their answers to the survey. It is thus particularly significant that, in allowing participants an opportunity to make open-ended responses to the survey and interviews, that the many positive responses they offered were in fact reflective of the established goals of the PONI program.

## **METHODOLOGY**

The PONI survey questionnaire, sent to all past PONI participants, was chiefly designed to elicit quantitative cost data. By definition, however, the broad survey also sought qualitative information based on the participants' experiences. Although a qualitative evaluation of PONI was not the primary purpose of the present project, and is in no way possible without a carefully planned evaluation design, still an analysis based on participant comments and follow-up telephone interviews was accomplished to assist the NIC Jail Center in fashioning program curricula planning and contract elements for the coming program cycle.

Forty-eight valid completed questionnaires were evaluated for this preliminary and qualitative review of the PONI program. (Five questionnaires were eliminated either because the participant had only attended PONI training sessions as an observer, or the jurisdiction no longer had a jail or plans to build a jail.) Of the 48 valid responses, 25 were from jurisdictions that had

obtained funding for a jail construction project and 23 had not yet been funded. Of the nonfunded projects, two had attempted to obtain funding; in one of these jurisdictions, a bond issue had failed twice.

Information pertaining to the quality of the PONI program was obtained chiefly from interviews and from responses to the following questions on the survey instrument:

1. "What things do you think were done differently because of your involvement with PONI?"
2. "In what ways was your PONI participation unsatisfactory?"
3. "Comments."

PONI participants were given an opportunity to expand or clarify comments made on the questionnaire about the PONI program through telephone interviews conducted as part of the overall evaluation. (It should be noted, however, that the telephone interviewing process is an ongoing follow-up effort; as a result, not all PONI participants have as yet been interviewed.) In addition, several participants wrote letters accompanying their completed questionnaires from which relevant comments were taken. A selection from these letters is attached, (as well as the evaluation design).

## EVALUATION

### General Program Satisfaction

PONI participants were overwhelmingly supportive of and enthusiastic about the PONI program. There were very few purely

negative comments; most concerns were phrased in terms of "constructive criticism". In every case, "constructive criticism" was accompanied by comments of praise and satisfaction.

Program satisfaction appears to be directly correlated to the level of PONI participation. The purely negative comments came from those participants who had only participated in the Phase I training. Phase I only participants constituted 8% of the total responses evaluated and, of this group, only 2 (out of 4) had negative comments. These responses were similar, however, in finding the Phase I presentation superficial and irrelevant. One participant not only found the presentation to be of little value to county officials and planners, but also inaccurate in certain areas such as legal citations.

In contrast, the majority of the PONI participants who completed more than Phase I had positive comments or positive descriptions of the PONI program. (About one-fifth of the PONI participants whose questionnaires were evaluated did not answer the qualitative questions.) Positive reactions to PONI fell into three general areas:

- Greater awareness of or sensitivity to planning concepts.
- Increased involvement of criminal justice stakeholders and the community in the planning process.
- Opportunity to learn from or share problems with other jurisdictions.

**Awareness of/sensitivity to planning concepts**

Most of the comments made by participants fell into this

category of increased awareness. The comments reflected an awareness of the complexity of jail planning and the need to conduct extensive early planning. This increased awareness of, or sensitivity to, planning concepts was often accompanied by greater confidence for respondents in dealing with other stakeholders, the public, architects and consultants.

#### Involvement of criminal justice stakeholders/community

There appeared to be a cumulative beneficial effect of a better understanding of planning concepts in that a better understanding made participants feel better prepared to work with other stakeholders and more willing to include them in the planning process. Comments in this category demonstrated that broader involvement improved public education and levels of support. The impact on local politicians or community leaders was particularly noted: i.e., exposing them to the "big picture" or "opening their eyes".

#### Learning from/sharing with other jurisdictions

PONI participants noted that they appreciated the opportunity to learn from the mistakes of other jurisdictions ("knowing what to avoid") and the chance to share similar problems or needs. These comments show that valuable learning experiences were gained not just through the staff presentations in Boulder, but also from interaction with participants in the PONI program. Sheriffs and corrections administrators were especially gratified to learn they were not "alone" in the kinds of problems and pressures they faced.

## "Constructive Criticism"

With the exception of three suggestions from participants of a funded project, all of the "constructive criticism" came from PONI participants with nonfunded jail projects. Not surprisingly, several of these unfunded participants felt PONI needed to address how to sell a construction project to both voters and political decision-makers, as well as how to finance such a project. PONI participants also believed that the PONI program could be improved in training participants to deal with the political environment and by identifying the special needs of smaller jurisdictions.

### Selling a project/funding

The most frequently suggested improvement for the PONI program was greater emphasis on media and public relations to "sell" a jail construction project and developing tactics to obtain funding for such a project. In making these suggestions, participants cited a lack of expertise in public relations among local law enforcement and corrections personnel and public resistance to tax increases, despite crowded and "unconstitutional" jails.

It is unclear, however, whether the need for ways to sell and fund a jail project are only a shortcoming of the PONI program or also a function of local politics. Of the 25 projects that had been funded, 9 had been funded before PONI participation. For those projects that were funded after PONI participation, one-half of the participants noted that participation in PONI helped in obtaining funding and the other half noted otherwise. The

participants who believed PONI participation helped in obtaining funding cited the same factors or areas that other PONI participants felt were areas needing improvement: i.e., gaining public support, educating the public, and learning ideas and techniques for funding from other jurisdictions.

Regardless of how the PONI program is structured in the future, it is clear that funding or financing is a major concern for corrections and law enforcement personnel; and thus jail financing strategies and issues should probably receive some increased emphasis. One participant whose jail was being financed from available local funds, noted that his jurisdiction was making every effort to limit construction and planning costs in order to avoid having to employ a bond issue, which he felt would fail. Other participants believed that planning efforts were circumscribed not by what was needed in the PONI curricula, but rather by the amount of money that was or would be available locally.

#### Dealing with the political environment

Closely related to the perceived need to improve training in public relations and funding efforts was a concern that PONI give greater emphasis in preparing participants to deal with the political environment. Problems in dealing with local and internal politics were cited by participants from both large as well as small counties (in terms of population).

Typical problems described by participants were an unwillingness on the part of local officials to change attitudes or to modify a construction proposal which was not based on "hard

data". Even participants whose projects had been funded felt PONI should provide more help in aiding participants in understanding and working with the special needs of local political environments.

### Special needs of smaller jurisdictions

The suggestion that the PONI program give more consideration to smaller communities or jurisdictions came from participants in counties with a population of 45,000 and under. It was the impression of one participant that the PONI program was oriented toward the needs of larger facilities and thus less relevant for jurisdictions planning small jails with 10 to 25 beds.

There were several comments from participants in smaller jurisdictions who reported that their problems or needs were "unique". Examples, which overlap with a need to understand the political environment, include local politicians who exert a great deal of power because of their economic and social positions, or who come from an entrenched and conservative political dynasty, (e.g., fathers serving for many years who are replaced in the same position by their sons).

Other problems discussed were difficulties in compiling data for a needs analysis to determine an optimum number of jail beds in jurisdictions which did not previously have jails. Such analysis was complicated by judicial sentencing patterns designed to accommodate jurisdictions which had a limited number of available beds.

Regional facilities are particularly well suited to small jurisdictions; in fact, three of the nonfunded projects were

planning such facilities. One participant whose jurisdiction is now building its own jail, reported his participation in PONI was originally to develop expertise in planning a regional facility. This project was abandoned, however, after an inability among participating counties to agree on a site and to obtain the support of local officials.

### Technical Assistance

Suggestions for improvement in technical assistance came from participants whose projects had been funded. The dominant concern was that PONI staff provide assistance in how to operate a new facility when construction has been completed. These comments came from different jurisdictions; e.g., one planning a \$50 million project and another planning a \$1.9 million project.

Other suggestions for improvement in technical assistance included data collection and preparation of PONI staff reports. The need was cited for better methods for data collection within a jurisdiction, particularly data required for a cost analysis. One jurisdiction felt the PONI report prepared for its participants was "canned" and therefore not totally helpful.

## RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

Despite overwhelming support and substantial progress toward meeting its goals, the PONI program can be improved. On the basis of PONI participants' written comments and follow-up telephone interviews, three areas can be identified in which the PONI program can be strengthened. These areas, might suggest a third training day for Phase I, and/or a juggling and revision of certain program training units. The three areas are treated separately below.

### Dealing with the political environment

The need to train PONI participants to deal with the political environment was not only directly expressed but also indirectly apparent in problems described in the planning process, funding, and in developing alternatives to incarceration. Given the current highly politicized corrections and criminal justice issues, it is critical that PONI participants identify, understand and learn how to use state and local political factors.

Exposure to the political environment of corrections is already an element in the Phase One curricula, but such exposure needs to be expanded in Phase Two. The increased participation of interested stakeholders and the public is necessary, but creates problems for corrections officials who may not understand the political dynamics, or feel free to "play". Phase Two is well suited to training PONI participants to deal with the political environment. Such training can be presented as a planning "tool" or "technique" which has particular relevance in issue

identification and program implementation.

The need for more effective training to deal with the political environment is demonstrated in the area of development of alternatives to incarceration. The local planning and development and use of alternatives to incarceration requires system-wide cooperation and a willingness to accept responsibility before a crime-conscious public. In many jurisdictions, alternatives to incarceration are also dependant on state or county action. The preliminary data on use of alternatives to incarceration in the present evaluation show only 22% of the participating jurisdictions had developed at least one new alternative to incarceration that could be attributed to PONI's influence; this funding compares to 51% in the earlier 1982 in-house PONI evaluation. In some instances, the development of an alternative to incarceration was court ordered. While 32% of the participants indicated alternatives were used more after PONI participation, several reported such use was a response to litigation over crowded conditions, (rather than a response to PONI). From the preliminary data, it appears that the use of alternatives to incarceration, which is in part dependent on skill in dealing with the political environment, is more often a last resort rather than a planning adjunct.

#### Funding of a project

While PONI's primary focus is on the planning and construction of a new jail, it is clear participants need to learn how to implement the results of a jurisdiction's planning

effort. The preliminary data show most jurisdictions lack provision for planning costs, such as hiring a consultant or preparing a needs assessment; these are costs that would not have been expended in the absence of PONI participation. Some participants expressed frustration because such expenditures of money (and time) were wasted when no new facility resulted.

Funding problems for corrections, nationally, are readily apparent when present data are compared to the 1982 PONI in-house evaluation results. In 1982, 63% of the participating jurisdictions reported they had been funded, which led the evaluators to conclude PONI participants could have been aided by the PONI program. The present data show, however, that the proportion of funded projects has declined to 52% and, of the funded projects, 68% reported they had been funded before PONI participation or that such program participation did not help. Given the changing economic environment, it is extremely important that PONI participants be given implementation tools which include various techniques and ways of obtaining project funding.

#### Expanding PONI participation

Although some state corrections administrators have participated in the PONI program, the increased dependence of local jurisdictions on state assistance for planning and funds presents the need for even more PONI involvement of state personnel. This need is particularly true for jurisdictions in states such as Washington or Minnesota where required local data analyses, needs assessments, and bed capacity analyses are performed by state corrections staff. The presence of well-

trained state corrections personnel could directly benefit state planning within their responsibility and indirectly benefit local jurisdictions through their advisory rôles.

It should also be noted that local corrections officials rely heavily on architects during the planning process. Whether or not such reliance is desirable or justified, it exists, therefore consideration should be given to PONI training for local architects. Although county architects are often included on the PONI team, most jurisdictions turn to outside architects for their jail designs.

### Conclusion

Overall, the PONI program has been very successful. The proposed recommendations are designed not to correct major shortcomings, but to "further" the program. Taken together, the recommendations are intended to make PONI even more responsive to the needs of participating jurisdictions, although this responsiveness is already the program's strength.

To augment the more specific training in jail planning and construction, the recommendations have incorporated broader planning concepts which include an understanding of the external environment, particularly political and economic factors. The result can lead PONI to enhancing a planning process that is not only systematic, but truly system-wide.

QUALITATIVE EVALUATION FOLLOW-UP - 2/29/84

In December 1983, a preliminary qualitative evaluation of the PONI program was performed based on respondents' comments on the survey questionnaires and telephone interviews. Although the December evaluation was based on only a partial sample (only 38 valid questionnaires had been received at that time), the responses of the rest of the sample since then have been consistent with earlier findings that PONI participants were overwhelmingly satisfied with and in favor of the PONI program.

One of the early recommendations for the December evaluation was that PONI provide more training in program implementation, including methods or techniques for obtaining funding. Based on later responses, it is now clear that PONI does have a positive impact on a jurisdiction's ability to obtain support for and subsequently funding for a new jail. Where PONI was reported to have helped in funding efforts, respondents invariably cited the Phase I community meeting as helpful because it exposed local officials with no criminal justice background to the complexity of jail construction issues. At least one jurisdiction reported the turn-around in support for a new jail led to approval of and passage of a bond issue, thereby leading to substantial savings in boarding costs (the existing facility had been condemned and had been limited to only male inmates with sentences of less than 45 days).

Another area where PONI participation assisted in

Another area where PONI participation assisted in developing project support was the inclusion of local officials with no criminal justice backgrounds on the PONI planning team sent to the Phase II seminar. Such officials became more knowledgeable about both jail construction issues and planning techniques and were often instrumental in convincing a reluctant local board of commissioners or supervisors of the need for a new jail and to fund such a facility.

Finally, there were virtually no "constructive criticisms" in the later responses. The later responses reinforced earlier findings that PONI participants felt the PONI program led to a better awareness of jail issues; more participation of relevant policy-makers; a better and well-designed facility; a greater degree of cooperation with other criminal justice agencies (which also aided in the development and use of alternatives to incarceration); and an improved ability to deal with architects and other construction personnel. Based on the responses, PONI is clearly an unusual program in the degree of enthusiasm for its existence and high regard for the program quality and content.