U.S. Department of Justice National Institute of Corrections

The Development of Jail Industries

The National Institute of Corrections is grateful to the employees of the Institute for Economic and Policy Studies, Inc., for their dedication to the development of this document. A special thanks to Thomas McCrae Crawford, who invested endless hours of telephone work collecting the information contained between these covers.

We are only beginning to recognize the value of correctional industry programs to local jurisdictions. The National Institute of Corrections is available to assist those agencies interested in developing and implementing an industry program at the local level. Interested jurisdictions should contact the National Institute of Corrections Jail Center, 1790 30th Street, Suite 440, Boulder, Colorado 80301; (303) 497-6700.

Victor J. Jacobsen
Project Manager
National Institute of Corrections
Boulder, Colorado
February 1985

The Developrent of Jail Industries

Robert C. Grieser
Thomas McCrae Crawford
Gail S. Funke

Institute for Economic and Policy Studies, Inc.
1018 Duke Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

February 1985

This report was prepared under contract number TA 85-4004 from the National Institute of Corrections. The opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice or the National Institute of Corrections.

Table of Contents

	Page
INTRODUCTION	
PROJECT OVERVIEW	1
The Sample	1
The Methodology	2
Jail Sample Highlights	2
SUMMARY OF SURVEY FINDINGS	2
PROFILE OF SITES WITH INDUSTRY OPERATIONS	4
Industry Types	5
Markets	5
Organization	7
Employment and Compensation	7
Staff	8
Fiscal Data	8
Sales	8
Auspices and Origins	9
Post-Release Program Availability	9
Problems and Benefits	9
Summary of Existing Industries	10
PLANNED INDUSTRY INITIATIVES	10
DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL FOR JAIL INDUSTRIES	11
CONCLUSION	13
FOOTNOTES	14
Appendix A. Participating Sites	15
Appendix B. Jail Industry Survey	17

List of Tables

Table 1. Survey Sampling Characteristics	3
Table 2. Jail Industry Activities	4
Table 3. Profile of Industry Sites	5
Table 4. Jail Industries Types and Markets	6
Table 5. Planned Industry Programs	11

INTRODUCTION

The last decade has seen a reemergence of interest in work and industry programs carried out in a closed, correctional setting. This new interest began with federal initiatives and found acceptance and subsequent activity at the state level. A changing corrections atmosphere in which inmate work was believed to have both retributive and rehabilitative value, coupled with crowding and concerns about rising corrections costs,continues to fuel this interest. No less a public figure than Chief Justice Warren Burger has made the development of prison industries a national priority, and a blue ribbon task force is currently addressing issues and actions to set the course of industries for the future.[1] In addition, an emerging body of knowledge about industries is being documented in government publications and other sources.[2]

Much of this renewed attention on inmate work programs has focused on the role of state correctional systems that house the majority of the nation's sentenced prisoners.[3] However, on any given day, one-third of the nation's prisoners are housed in local jails and detention facilities, and nearly half of these are sentenced inmates.[4] Typically these jails can house an inmate up to one year and thus most jails do not have programs comparable to those in state prison facilities. Yet jail inmates are people most in need of developing work skills to prevent them from returning to the courts or incarceration. This argument has been advanced by advocates of jail industry such as Don Murray, Director of the Criminal Justice Program of the National Association of Counties.

The need for work programs has not gone unnoticed by practitioners and was a topic at a recent national conference.[5] Little, however, is known about jail industries--the level of activity, types of industry, organizational structure, marketing arrangements, and implementation feasibility. Yet in many ways jail industries represent the next logical step in a work-focused system of corrections in this country.

It was in this context that the Institute for Economic and Policy Studies undertook a study to examine the status of jail industry programs for the National Institute of Corrections. The focus of this study was a survey of the field in which users were questioned about the current state of jail industries. While a good deal of interest has been expressed on this topic, the survey is the first systematic attempt to identify how many jails operate an industry, what types of programs exist, and what potential exists for future development of industries at the local level.

PROJECT OVERVIEW

The Sample

The initial survey focused on large jails since they were more likely to have vocational and other work activities that are prerequisites for industry programs. Moreover, large jails house over 40 percent of all jail inmates.[6]

The sample used as the basis for data collection was the U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin that lists the 100 largest jails in the nation.' In addition to these 100 jails representing 69 county sites, 5 other localities that were believed to have either current jail industries or an interest in developing them were added to the sample. (See Appendix A.) Thus the final sample size was 74 sites. The geographical mix was evenly distributed with 25 jails from the South, and 18, 17, and 13 from the Northeast, Western, and North Central states respectively.

The Methodology

The approach used to collect the data was a telephone survey of jail administrators or deputies. Background questions were asked on inmate population size, number of facilities, etc., as was a 'screen' question on whether the jail operates an industry. (See Appendix B for the sample questionnaire.) Depending on the response to the screen question, one of two detailed questionnaires was administered: a set of developmental questions for jails that lack an industry program or a set of operational questions for jails that operate an industry. The survey response rate was excellent, with nearly 99 percent of all jails contacted providing the requested information. Five jail administrators requested that the survey be sent by mail and only two of these were not returned.

Jail Sample Highlights

The 72 sites responding to the survey represented 196 facilities and over 108,000 jail inmates. The average site consisted of 2.5 facilities housing just over 1,500 inmates. The distribution of pretrial and sentenced inmates was virtually even with roughly half holding more than 50 percent sentenced. Two-thirds of the latter, however, were reported by jail administrators as having populations with greater than 90 percent sentenced. Nearly three-fourths, or 53, reported 1 year as the maximum sentence length for those incarcerated; 2 reported 6 months as the maximum sentence duration; and 17 reported that maximum sentence length ranged from 2 to 12 years. As to the prevalence of work programs, approximately 4 out of 5--or 80 percent--of the jail administrators reported having vocational programs; 68 percent have work release; about half have public works; and 30 percent operate farms. (See Table 1.)

SUMMARY OF SURVEY FINDINGS

The major findings from the survey can be capsulized into the following four points.

- Greater jail industry activity is taking place in the larger jails, both in terms of current programs and programs being planned.

- While there are differences in scale between jail industries and state industries, many commonalities exist in their operations.

Table 1
SURVEY SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

Jail Site Description

Feature	Number
Number of Sites Responding	72
Total Number of Jail Facilities	196
Average Number of Jails per Site	2.5
Total Jail Population	108,086
Average Jail Population per Site	1,500

Inmate Sentence Length

Maximum Duration	Number	Percentage
One Year or Less	19	26.4
More than One Year	53	73.6

Prevalence of Traditional Work Programs

Program Type	Number	Percentage
Vocational Training	57	79
Work Release	49	68
Public Works	27	51
Farms	21	29

For example, there are similarities in markets, staffing, and in type of operations.

- Administrators of active jail industries report many advantages and only minor problems associated with their industry programs. Benefits cited include reduction of idleness, facilitation of management, value of training to inmates, and reduction of costs.

- Jail sites that had no current industries expressed substantial interest in pursuing them if legal and political obstacles could be overcome.

The most significant finding was the level of activity and interest in jail industries. (See Table 2.) Nearly 30 percent, or 21 of the sites surveyed, had operating industry programs or were planning an industry

component. Development potential exists for an industry program in another 9 cases, or 12.5 percent, based on interest expressed by jail administrators. The remaining 42 sites had mixed reactions about jail industries; in many cases there was interest in the idea tempered by concern that legal or political obstacles would constitute major impediments. There were only 30 cases in which no interest under any circumstances was expressed. (For a fuller discussion of these issues, see the final section, Development Potential for Jail Industries.)

Table 2
JAIL INDUSTRY ACTIVITIES

Activity	Number	Percentage
Operational	13	18.1
Planned	8	11.1
Development Potential	9	12.5
Interest if Obstacles Can Be Overcome	12	16.7
Little or No Interest	30	41.6
	72	100.0

PROFILE OF SITES WITH INDUSTRY OPERATIONS

The starting point for a jail industry program, as defined in the survey, was the production of goods and/or services for use outside of the jail. For further refinement of thisdefinition, jail administrators were asked first if a good or service produced is sold or the jail account is credited for work performed. They were also asked if the primary emphasis is on production. In such cases, a formal written contract exists to provide the good or service on a regular basis. Satisfaction of one or both of these criteria constituted the basis for determining that a jail industry did indeed exist.

The 13 sites with industry operations were typical of the other jail sites in the survey. The sites with industry programs were only slightly larger than the average of the total sample. The major difference lies in the maximum length of sentence allowable: over half of the 13 jails with industry could house sentenced inmates over one year, while about one-fourth of the total sample exhibited this characteristic. Another significant difference exists with inmate compensation. While 36 percent of the administrators in the sample reported that they pay inmates for work performed, this statistic was better than 50 percent for the administrators with jail industry programs.[9] Table 3 summarizes these findings.

Table 3
PROFILE OF INDUSTRY SITES

Industry Types	Number	Percentage
Manufacture-Based	3	61
Farm	3	13
Public Works	2	15

Selected Characteristics	Number	Percentage
Maximum Sentence Exceeds One Year	7	54
Inmates Compensated	7	54
Private Sector Clients	6	46
Extra Good Time Provided	6	46

Miscellaneous Characteristics	Mean	Range
Length of Stay in Program	3.5 mos.	1.5 - 5 mos.
Workday Length	5.3 hrs.	2 - 8 hrs.
Civilian Staff per Shop	1.5	--
Inmate/Staff Ratio	8:1	--

Industry Types

Eight of the 13 industry programs are manufacturing or manufacture-based; three operate a farm enterprise: and two operate a public works-type of industry. The manufacturing group includes both pure manufacturing industries such as mattress, textiles, and furniture shops and more service-oriented industries such as tailoring, laundry, and print shops. Items produced in these shops include computer tables, bed pillows, flat goods, and, in one case, children's toys. Table 4 describes the industries and markets.

New York City and Philadelphia have the most industries, with 7 and 9 shops respectively. Two sites have industries that may be characterized as public works-type programs since they involve inmates who work off the premises under contract. One of these operations provides labor for a water and sewer board, while the other involves landscaping work for county agencies. One site, Hennepin County, Minnesota, reported a number of unique operations, including the refurbishing of silverware for a major airline. At least one of the 13 sites had plans in process to expand--by starting a fish hatchery--while another was undergoing reorganization and putting more emphasis on the production aspect of its program.

Markets

Most of the industry programs reported dealt in whole or in part with public sector clients, usually in the county or city in which the jail is located. But nearly half of the 13 industry sites do have clients in the

Table 4
JAIL INDUSTRIES TYPES AND MARKETS

Site	Industry Type	Market
Alameda County, CA	Farm	Private
San Francisco, CA	Logo print shop	Private/public
Dade County, FL	Nursery Landscape Office furniture manufacturing	County agency
Caddo Parish, LA	Farm	Private
Orleans Parish, LA	Public works	Water and sewer authorities
Prince Georges County, MD	Wood and metal furniture manufacturing Furniture refurbishing	County/non-profit clients
Middlesex County, MA	Mattress/pillow manufacturing	Other counties' correctional facilities
Hennepin County, MN	Labor-intensive services (e.g., assembly operations) Pallet shop	Private only
Erie County, NY	Farm	Social service/old-age home Correctional agencies
New York City, NY	Bakery Laundry Mattress manufacturing Tailor shop Bed shop Print shop Wood shop	Human resources agencies Juvenile facilities Police
Delaware County, PA	Wood object and toy manufacturing	County government Park authority
Philadelphia, PA	Print shop Laundry Carpentry shop Upholstery shop Textile manufacturing Shoe manufacturing Tailor shops (3)	Human service agencies Police Health Department
Milwaukee County, WI	Furniture manufacturing Print shop	Private Social service agencies

private sector, including non-profits.. Two of these sites had farm operations and dealt exclusively with private markets. Another site, Hennepin County, Minnesota, has manufacturing and service-related shops that work exclusively with the private sector. The typical public customers included other correctional agencies, health and mental health agencies, social service agencies, police departments, and park authorities. Thus, jail industry serves a wide spectrum of consumers from diverse groups.

Organization

In 5 of the 13 industry programs, a designated program chief for industry reports directly to the jail administrator. In the remaining sites, including the two largest, a deputy administrator or other senior staff person serves a liaison role between industries and the top jail administration.

The age of jail industries may account in part for this mix in administrative responsibility; over half of the programs were created within the last five years, highlighting the recent trend toward development of industry programs in jails. Of all the industries surveyed, farm operations have been in existence the longest, with three sites having a combined total of 100 years of operation. This reflects the historical development of farm operations as an integral facet of corrections.

Employment and Compensation

Within the 13 industry sites, a total of 786 inmates are directly employed In the industry programs. This constitutes an average of approximately 20 inmates per industry, excluding the older and larger industry operations in Philadelphia and New York City that employed 225 and 340 respectively. Most of the sites employ only sentenced prisoners in industry; over two-thirds, or nine, of the sites do not employ women or pretrial Inmates in their industry programs. Four sites reported employing females, and one of these also employs pretrial inmates on a voluntary basis. This site, Philadelphia, has a manufacture-based industry with the largest number of work shops surveyed and one of the two largest work forces. New York had the highest number of females employed, a total of 25. The majority of the sites employed their inmates for 6 hours a day. The range of daily work hours was from 3 to 8 hours and the average was 5.3 hours per inmate a day.

Seven sites pay inmates for work performed. The average daily wage was just under $3.00. This figure excludes Hennepin County, Minnesota, which pays its inmates at least the minimum wage, or nearly $30.00 a day. (Deductions are taken from this amount for room and board.) Extra good time was awarded to inmates at six sites, four of which did not pay inmate wages. However, the majority of sites did not award extra good time for work performed.

Assignment criteria for placing inmates in industry programs provided interesting data. Security is clearly the overriding concern when assigning inmates for work in industry programs. Nearly half of the sites reported that security considerations were the basis for selecting inmates for Industry

Summary of Existing Industries

The 13 sites with industry programs represent a diverse mix in terms of the type of operation, staffing, sales, compensation, and hiring criteria. In some respects these operations are similar to state industries: they have both public and private clients, a comparable workday, dedicated staff, inmate compensation, and, in some cases, show a profit. Yet jail industries may be more service-oriented in nature than their state counterparts as evidenced by existing programs (e.g., public works, bakery, and landscaping operations). This may, in part, be due to their urban location and proximity to other county agencies.

PLANNED INDUSTRY INITIATIVES

Eight sites reported plans to initiate industry programs in the foreseeable future. In many respects the planned programs looked similar to those already in existence. For example, of the eight industry programs planned, five are manufacture-based, two are farm operations, and one is a service-type industry. Furthermore, potential markets and customers represent a mix between public and private sector agencies as described for those industries currently in operation. Planners of one industry are seeking a relationship with the schools/university market that offers great potential. None of the existing industries has tapped this market. Three of the sites have undergone feasibility studies funded by the National Institute of Corrections to develop their industry programs.

Several differences do emerge, however, regarding those sites with planned industries. For example, five of the eight sites have new facilities that provide the space necessary to incorporate an industry program. Administrators of one of the remaining sites are planning their industry program to operate off the jail premises with minimum-custody inmates. six of the eight jails with planned industries operate under a maximum one-year sentence requirement. Only two of the eight jails planning industries currently pay their inmates for work programs. This would indicate that compensating inmates for work programs, while desirable from a management incentive standpoint, is not necessarily a prerequisite for establishing an industry.

One jail in the process of planning an industry has a population of less than 100 inmates, which has implications for small and medium-sized jails--a group not emphasized in this survey. This same site, Strafford County, New Hampshire, already pays its inmates for public works projects performed under contract with the state. Table 5 describes the jail industry planning activities of those sites polled.

Table 5
PLANNED INDUSTRY PROGRAMS

Site	Present Programs	Planned Industries	Market Objective
Orange County, CA	Vocational furniture refinishing	Inmate clothing Furniture/sign manufacture	Public Private
Cook County, IL	Vocational auto program	Soap production	Public County facilities
Fayette County, KY	None	Vehicle wash center	County government agencies County employees
Baltimore, Maryland	Public works Work release	Trash bag production Small engine repair Furniture repair	City government agencies
Salt Lake County, UT	Public works	Farm operation	Public Private
Fairfax County, VA	Work release Public works Vocational program	Farm operation	County correc-tional agencies
Hampden County, MA	Work release Vocational welding machine shop	Computer furniture, chair, and pedestal table manufacture	Schools Local government Hospitals Private
Strafford County, NH	Work release	Shoe shop	Private

DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL FOR JAIL INDUSTRIES

This survey, with its findings of significant industry activity as well as a surprising number of industries in the planning stages, illustrates that real potential exists for further expansion of such programs. The response to the developmental questions substantiates this assertion.

The analysis in this section concentrates on the 51 sites in the sample that are not presently operating or planning industry programs. A brief look at this group of jails illustrates some interesting points. While most jails conduct an assessment of inmate work skills at intake or classification, only

four jail administrators reported any formal testing of work ability.[11] Fewer than half the jails had a job placement component, and only two jails in this group had any contact with the state Department of Corrections.

The issue of jail industry had already been discussed in 23 or nearly half of the cases. Administrators of 21 jails expressed interest in the idea of establishing a jail industry program. However, only a subset of these, or 9, thought initiating a jail industry would be feasible. With one exception, the respondents in this group all agreed that their present vocational training programs could be modified to develop an industries component. Five of the nine jail administrators raised problem issues or obstacles that would have to be addressed before establishing an industry. The primary concerns were political opposition and, in one case, the problem of turnover. Eight of the 9 sites currently assess inmate work skills and 5 of the jails have job placement programs. It would appear that these 9 sites identified by the survey could be considered serious candidates for further exploration and development of jail industries. Two of them already perform service work for their counties but do not presently charge for these services.

In the remaining 42 sites, 30 jail administrators responded that they simply were not interested in pursuing the question any further because they believed the feasibility issues were too great. This group is approximately 42 percent of the total jail sample surveyed.

It should be noted, however, that the sites in this group included two industry-type programs, in St. Louis City and Los Angeles County, that are operated more akin to large vocational training programs in which no financial transaction occurs. In addition, two Texas sites said that, although they were not interested and did not think the jail industry concept was feasible in the present climate, such a program is possible as a long-term future strategy. From a feasibility standpoint, 13 of these jail administrators responded that it was possible to modify their vocational programs to develop an industry component.

Twelve jail administrators said they were interested in jail industries but that it was not possible to start them for a variety of reasons including political problems, lack of space, lack of resources, high turnover, and legal constraints. While political and legal factors may be difficult to overcome, resource shortage and high turnover may not be insurmountable. As described earlier, one of the jails operating an industry houses only 20 percent sentenced inmates with a maximum six month sentence. Furthermore, even legal constraints can be modified. Historically, legal issues have included marketing restrictions and other operational limits. In many cases a program such as a jail industry may not be expressly prohibited by statute; rather, no such program has ever been tried. The entire legal issue needs to be explored further since there appeared to be substantial ambiguity on the part of several respondents as to precisely what legal restrictions may apply.

Political constraints, on the other hand, are obstacles that in most cases can represent real problems. For purposes of the survey grouping,

political issues were defined to include administrative opposition by the county board to the idea of a jail industry and union pressures that could arise- These types of issues can sometimes only be resolved with changes over time. Several of the sites that recently established industry programs and those with industries planned will provide good case studies of strategies that were undertaken to garner political support for their industry.

Notably, lack of space or economic resources were identified in half of those cases in which jail administrators said they were uninterested or that an industry was infeasible. Those jails most interested in developing industry programs were also likely to have space available. This perhaps illustrates the problem of jail crowding and would suggest that the most opportune time to develop an industry that fits into the overall jail design may be while planning for a new facility.

CONCLUSION

In sum, it is clear that real potential for development of jail industries exists. One of the glaring deficiencies made apparent by this survey was the lack of knowledge that existed among jails about what programs currently exist and what possibilities there are for further development. The survey demonstrated the widespread interest among jail administrators in pursuing the question of jail industries further. Numerous respondents expressed interest in what their counterparts were doing in this area. The overwhelming response rate to the survey further solidifies the point. This study and publication are attempts at bridging this gap.

FOOTNOTES

1. Wingspread Conferences on "Factories With Fences," Racine, Wisconsin, January 1984 and January 1985.

2. See, for example, Robert C. Grieser et al., Guidelines for Prison Industries (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections, 1984); Neal Miller et al., "Prison Industries in Transition: Private Sector or Multistate Involvements," Federal Probation (Washington, D.C.: Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, December 1983); Gail S. Funke et al., Assets and Liabilities of Correctional Industries (Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books, 1981); Special Issue Seminars for Prison Industry Directors, Boulder, Colorado, National Academy of Corrections, 1982-83; Neal Miller and Robert C. Grieser, "The Evolution of Prison Industries," (unpublished paper written under subcontract for the National Institute of Corrections, U.S. Department of Justice, May 1984).

3. U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin, Prisoners at Midyear 1983 (Washington, D.C., October 1983)

4. U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin, Jail Inmates 1982 (Washington, D.C., February 1983)

5. George Washington University Conference on "Factories With Fences," Washington, D.C., June 1984.

6. U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin, Jail Inmates 1982 (Washington, D.C., February 1983).

7. Ibid.

8. Deputy administrators and other senior jail personnel were interviewed whenever the jail administrator was unavailable.

9. In 6 of the 26 jails that pay their inmates for work, the funding source comes from outside the jail budget.

10. Data unavailable due to lack of knowledge about fiscal matters by some survey respondents.

11. The lack of formal testing in jails is an issue raised while developing this survey in discussion with Don Murray, Director of the Criminal Justice Program of the National Association of Counties. The survey data would substantiate that testing inadequacies are a deficiency in many jails.

Appendix A

PARTICIPATING SITES

Maricopa County, AZ
Alameda County, CA
Contra Costa County, CA
Fresno County, CA
Kern County, CA
Los Angeles County, CA
Orange County, CA
Riverside County, CA
Sacramento County, CA
San Bernardino County, CA
San Diego County, CA
San Francisco, CA
Santa Clara County, CA
Ventura County, CA
Denver County, CO
Dade County, FL
Duval County, FL
Hillsborough County, FL
Volusia County, FL
De Kalb County, GA
Fulton County, GA
Cook County, IL
Marion County, IN
Fayette County, KY
Jefferson County, KY
Caddo Parish, LA
Jefferson Parish, LA
Orleans Parish, LA
East Baton Rouge Parish, LA
Baltimore, MD
Montgomery County, MD
Prince Georges County, MD
Hampden County, MA
Middlesex County, MA
Kent County, MI
Oakland County, MI
Wayne County, MI
Hennepin County, MN
Jackson County, MO
St. Louis, MO
St. Louis County, MO
Strafford County, NH
Bergen County, NJ
Essex County, NJ
Hudson County, NJ
Middlesex County, NJ
Monmouth County, NJ
Passaic County, NJ
Erie County, NY
Nassau County, NY
Suffolk County, NY
New York City, NY
Cuyahoga County, OH
Franklin County, OH
Hamilton County, OH
Allegheny County, PA
Chester County, PA
Delaware County, PA
Philadelphia, PA
Shelby County, TN
Bexar County, TX
Dallas County, TX
El Paso County, TX
Harris County, TX
Jefferson County, TX
Tarrant County, TX
Salt Lake County, UT
Fairfax County, VA
Norfolk, VA
Richmond, VA
King County, WA
Milwaukee County, WI

Appendix B

JAIL INDUSTRY SURVEY

The Institute for Economic and Policy Studies is conducting a survey for the National Institute of Corrections Jail Center on the existence and potential development of industries in local jails. We would like your help in answering a few questions on the subject of jail industries.

Section I: Background Data (screen questions)

1. County _____ State _____

   Name _____ Phone Number _____

   Title _____ Date _____

2. Countywide:
   Number of facilities _____

   Total jail population _____

   Facility Specific:
   Name _____

   Population _____

   Percent sentenced _____

   Maximum sentence length _____

3. Do you operate an industry program in your county jail? _____

4. What other work programs exist in the jail?
   ___ Work release
   ___ Public works
   ___ Vocational training
   ___ Farm operation
   ___ Other (specify) _____

5. Do any of these programs produce goods or services for use outside of the jail? _____
   Which ones? _____

6. Are inmates paid for work performed in any of these programs? _____

   Which ones? _____

   If yes, are other inmates also paid? _____

   What is the source of these funds? _____

   (Note: If inmate work performed outside the jail is compensated from county or other outside funding source, this should be pursued as an industry-like program.)

7. Do either of the following conditions apply to these programs?

___ Goods or services produced are sold or the jail account is credited for work performed

___ Primary emphasis is on production, e.g., a formal written contract exists to provide a good or service on a regular schedule

Which programs? _____

_____

If either condition is true, go to Section III.
If neither exists, go to Section II.

Section II: Developmental

1. Has the issue of industries ever arisen in your jail? Explain.

_____

_____

_____

2. Do you have any interest in developing such a program? Do you think a jail industry is feasible?

_____

_____

_____

3. Are you aware of any legal restrictions which may exist to hamper such efforts?

_____

_____

_____

4. Are inmate work skills currently assessed at intake? Does this occur at any other point?

_____

_____

5. If a vocational or other work program exists, could it be modified to develop an industries component?

_____

_____

_____

6. If other work programs exist, is there a job placement component for inmates in these programs?

_____

_____

_____

7. If other work programs exist, is there any linkage between the jail programs and the DOC's industry program?

_____

_____

_____

8. If plans for an industry program exist, can you send us any planning documents you may have?

Section III: Jail Industry Program

1. Organizational Structure
   Who is in charge of this program?_____

   To whom do they report?_____

2. Products/Market
   What products or services does your industry manaufacture or provide?

   _____

   Who are its clients/customers?_____

   _____

   Do you sell to counties other than your own or to the state?

   _____

3. Historical Development

How did you get started? _____

_____

_____

How long have you been in existence? _____

_____

4. Inmate Workforce

Number of inmates employed as of 11/1/84 _____

Average number of work hours per day _____

Average daily wage; hi/lo (range) _____

Do inmates receive any extra good time for industry work? _____

What are the criteria for eligibility/assignment? _____

_____

_____

Are the same inmates assigned on a regular basis? _____

_____

What is the average length of stay for an inmate in the program?

_____

Are there any women or pretrial inmates working in the program?

_____

5. Personnel

Number of employees _____

Number of civilians _____

Number of security staff assigned to industries _____

Do you employ staff with specialized skills in sales, marketing or production?

_____

6. Budget

Is budget and accounting for the program handled separately from other jail finances? _____

Amount? _____

Does the program pay for itself? _____

What was the total volume of sales last year? _____

If profit is made, where does it go? _____

_____

How is the acquisition of capital equipment handled? _____

_____

_____

7. Legal/Policy Issues

Does any special legal authority exist for this program?

_____

_____

Have there been any court suits related to industry in the jail?

_____

_____

8. Linkages

Is there any relation to the state correctional industry program?

_____

Does the jail do any job placement for industry inmates?

_____

Is there any link with the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation or other community agency?

_____

_____

9. What have been the general problems/advantages of having an industry program in the jail?

Impact on jail _____

_____

_____

Community reaction _____

_____

_____

10. Can you send us any catalogs, annual reports, or other documents you may have regarding this program?

_____

Section IV: Network

1. Do you know anyone else who has a jail industry operation? _____

_____

_____

Thank you for your assistance.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CORRECTIONS ADVISORY BOARD

Benjamin F. Baer
Chairman
U.S. Parole Commission
Bethesda, Maryland

Frank D. Brost
Attorney
Presho, South Dakota

Norman A. Carlson
Director
Federal Bureau of Prisons
Washington, D.C.

John E. Clark
Attorney
San Antonio, Texas

Dorcas Hardy
Assistant Secretary for Development
Department of Health and Human Services
Washington, D.C.

Lois Herrington
Assistant Attorney General
Office of Justice Programs
Washington, D.C.

Stephen Horn
President
California State University at Long Beach
Long Beach, California

A. Leo Levin
Director
Federal Judicial Center
Washington, D.C.

Jacqueline McMickens
Commissioner
Department of Corrections
New York, New York

W. Walter Menninger
Chief of Staff
The Menninger Foundation
Topeka, Kansas

Richard H. Mills
Judge
Appellate Court of Illinois
Virginia, Illinois

Norval Morris
Professor
University of Chicago Law School
Chicago, Illinois

Richard K. Rainey
Sheriff
Contra Costa County
Martinez, California

Marcella C. Rapp
Justice Consultant
Lakewood, Colorado

Alfred S. Regnery
Administrator
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
Washington, D.C.

James H. Turner, III
Sheriff
Henrico County
Richmond, Virginia