

HB

105

HOUSE COMMITTEE REPORT

(9)

Date Referred: January 29, 1993

FURTHER REFERRALS:

Judiciary
Finance

Date of Committee Action: 3-26-93

The HEALTH, EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES Committee considered:

HB 105

HOUSE BILL NO. 105

BOOT CAMP FOR NONVIOLENT FIRST OFFENDERS

"An Act providing for incarceration for nonviolent, youthful first offenders in boot camps operated by the Department of Corrections; creating the Boot Camp Advisory Board in the Department of Corrections; amending Alaska Rule of Criminal Procedure 35; and providing for an effective date."

RECOMMENDATIONS:

be replaced with

CS HB 105 (HESS)

the same title

a new title

have attached amendments(s)

do pass

do not pass

no recommendations

individual recommendations

additional referral to the _____ Committee

ADOPTS: _____ letter of Intent

ATTACHES NEW FISCAL NOTE(S): (Dept)

APPROVES PREVIOUS: (Dept/Date)

fiscal impact Corrections

fiscal note(s) _____

zero fiscal note Public Safety, Courts, Admin, Law, H+SS

zero fiscal note(s) _____

SIGNING DO PASS	DP	OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS	DNP	NR	AM
<i>[Signature]</i>	X	<i>Hailey Olberg</i>		✓	
<i>[Signature]</i>	✓				
<i>[Signature]</i>	✓				
<i>[Signature]</i>	✓				
<i>[Signature]</i>	✓				
<i>[Signature]</i>	✓				

[Signature]

CHAIRMAN'S SIGNATURE



Alaska State Legislature

House of Representatives
COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION
AND SOCIAL SERVICES

DATE: MARCH 26, 1993

PLACE: Capitol Room 106

SUBJECT OF MEETING:

HB 105: BOOT CAMP FOR NON-VIOLENT 1ST O
SB 53: ANNULING ABORTION FUNDING REGU
(TELECONFERENCE ONLY)

NAME	REPRESENTING	BUSINESS/PERSONAL MAILING ADDRESS	ZIP	(H) PHONE	(W) PHONE	DO YOU WANT TO TESTIFY?		WHAT SUBJECT/ WHICH BILL?
Sherrill Gou.	Alaska Women's Lobby	P.O. Box 22156 Jno	99602		463-6744	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	SB53
✓ BILL BURK	SELF	PO BOX 240742 DANVILLE	99824	460-6019		<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	SB53
Carole Evans	Antenor AK Women's Council	1012 Seawind Lane	99709	478-5008	486-7740	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	SB53
						<input type="radio"/>	N	
NAME	REPRESENTING	BUSINESS/PERSONAL MAILING ADDRESS	ZIP	(H) PHONE	(W) PHONE	DO YOU WANT TO TESTIFY?		WHAT SUBJECT/ WHICH BILL?
✓ Leg. Middaugh	Myself	643 Sunset Drive Ketchikan	99901	225-2290		<input type="radio"/>	N	SB53
✓ Judy Jensen	"	2326 Ketchikan	99901	225-5889		<input type="radio"/>	N	SB53
✓ Rita Cook	AAUW					<input type="radio"/>	N	
						<input type="radio"/>	N	
						<input type="radio"/>	N	

3/26/93

LTH1100-R01
04/04/93

LEGISLATIVE TELECONFERENCE NETWORK

PAGE 01
15:32:26

TCN: 30415 DATE & TIME: 03/26/93 15:00 TO 17:00 STATUS:7 STATS. IN

***** ORDER SUMMARY *****

SPONSOR: HRES HOUSE HEALTH, EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVI CHAIRS. TOOHEY
PURPOSE: PUB PUBLIC HEARING BUNDE
CONTACT: LYNNE SMITH TEL#: (907)465-6825
CHAIRING SITE: JUNEAU CAPITOL CAP106

SPONSOR REMARKS(PUB): TESTIMONY:Y ALLOWED 2 MINUTE LIMIT
THIS TELECONFERENCE IS SCHEDULED PENDING REFERRAL OF SB 53 TO THE HESS
COMMITTEE. TESTIMONY IS LIMITED TO 2 MINUTES. SITKA JOINING AT 3:30.
TCN REQUESTED ON 03/26/93 AND HAS 10 UPDATES

***** AGENDA *****

1 SB 53 ANNULLING ABORTION FUNDING REGULATIONS

***** PARTICIPATING LIOS *****

ANC ANCHORAGE	3111 C STREET	LOCATION STAFF
DJT DELTA JCT.	JARVIS CTR. #210	LOCATION STAFF
FBX FAIRBANKS	119 N CUSHMAN ST	LOCATION STAFF
* JNU JUNEAU	CAPITOL CAP106	LOCATION STAFF
KOT KOTZEBUE	333 FRONT STREET	LOCATION STAFF
KTN KETCHIKAN	352 FRONT STREET	LOCATION STAFF
MAT MATSU	165 E PARKS HWY.	LOCATION STAFF
SIT SITKA	210 LAKE STREET	LOCATION STAFF
SOL KEN/SOL	34824 KALIFONSKY	LOCATION STAFF
TOK TOK LIO	MP 1314 AK. HWY	LOCATION STAFF
VAL VALDEZ	STATE BLDG. #13	LOCATION STAFF

***** VOLUNTEER & OFFNET SITES *****

VAL COR CORDOVA CITY HALL LORI DENSON (907)424-6200

PARTICIPANTS IN: ANCHORAGE

ANC

1	BONNIE JACK	TSFY. SB 53
	1063 W 20TH AVE.	ANCHORAGE AK 99503 (907)279-4836
2	ANNALEE MCCONNELL	TSFY. SB 53
	224 W. 23RD	ANCHORAGE AK 99503 (907)277-4822
3	MYRNA MAYNARD	TSFY. SB 53
	2237 FOREST PARK DR.	ANCHORAGE AK 99517 (907)272-3357
4	SHERYL JACOBSON	UBSV. SB 53
	614 FISCHER	ANCHORAGE AK 99518 (907)563-7409
5	RANDALL BURNS	TSFY. SB 53
	PO BOX 201844	ANCHORAGE AK 99520 (907)258-0044
6	BETH HARTT	UBSV. SB 53
	5800 LAKE OTIS PKWY. 329	ANCHORAGE AK 99520 (907)000-0000

PARTICIPANTS IN: DELTA JCT

DJT

1 MR.	ROY MOONEYHAM	TSFY. SB 53
	BOX 1275	DELTA JCT. AK 99737 (907)895-1978
2 MS.	BARBARA RAWALT	TSFY. SB 53
	BOX 823	DELTA JCT. AK 99737 (907)895-1946
3 MR.	MICHAEL RAWALT	TSFY. SB 53
	BOX 823	DELTA JCT. AK 99737 (907)895-1946
4 MR.	DAVID ARNEGARD	TSFY. SB 53
	BOX 138	DELTA JCT. AK 99737 (907)895-1930
5 MS.	DEBRA JOSLIN	TSFY. SB 53
	BOX 377	DELTA JCT. 99737 895-4565

PARTICIPANTS IN: DELTA JCT.			DJT	
	BOX 377		DELTA JCT.	AK 99737 (907)895-4565
6 MS.	JULIE BRENNAN			TSFY. SB 53
	BOX 1165		DELTA JCT.	AK 99737 (907)895-5153
7 MR.	TOM MCBRIDE			TSFY. SB 53
	BOX 779		DELTA JCT.	AK 99737 (907)895-4009
8 MS.	KENNA DUBOIS			TSFY. SB 53
	BOX 702		DELTA JCT.	AK 99737 (907)895-4851
9 MS.	JENNY EAST-COLE			TSFY. SB 53
	BOX 1347		DELTA JCT.	AK 99737 (907)895-4079
10 MR.	MATTHEW JUSTIN			OBVS. SB 53
	BOX 377		DELTA JCT.	AK 99737 (907)895-4565
11 MS.	ABBY BRENNAN			OBVS. SB 53
	BOX 1165		DELTA JCT.	AK 99737 (907)895-5153
12 MS.	HANNAH BRENNAN			OBVS. SB 53
	BOX 1165		DELTA JCT.	AK 99737 (907)895-5153
13 MS.	CHRISTIE DUBOIS			OBVS. SB 53
	BOX 702		DELTA JCT.	AK 99737 (907)895-4851
14 MR.	SAM COLE			OBVS. SB 53
	BOX 1347		DELTA JCT.	AK 99737 (907)895-4079
15 MS.	SELINA COLE			OBVS. SB 53
	BOX 1347		DELTA JCT.	AK 99737 (907)895-4079
16 MR.	SETH BRENNAN			OBVS. SB 53
	BOX 1165		DELTA JCT.	AK 99737 (907)895-5153

PARTICIPANTS IN: FAIRBANKS			FBX	
1 MR.	JOHN KNUTSON			TSFY. SB 53
	2010 LISGA ST.		FAIRBANKS	AK 99701 (907)452-7747
2 MS.	EVELYN FRISK		INTERIOR AWPC	TSFY. SB 53
	BOX 10465		FAIRBANKS	AK 99710 (907)457-2552
3 MS.	RUTH EWIG		NACE/CEE	TSFY. SB 53
	2325 30TH AVE.		FAIRBANKS	AK 99701 (907)452-5538
4 MS.	MEG GAYDOSIK		AAUW-AK	TSFY. SB 53
	1024 FIFTH AVE.		FAIRBANKS	AK 99701 (907)456-8389
5 MS.	KRIS GROSS		AK PTL	TSFY. SB 53
	1111 ELIZ ST.		NORTH POLE	AK 99705 (907)488-8602
6 MS.	NANCY KOHN			TSFY. SB 53
	2060 AMY-DYLAN		FAIRBANKS	AK 99712 (907)488-0329
7 MS.	LISA PENALVER		COALITION CHOICE	OBVS. SB 53
	1166 SKYLINE DR.		FAIRBANKS	AK 99712 (907)457-1458

PARTICIPANTS IN: JUNEAU			JNU	
1 REP.	CON BUNDE			TSFY. SB 53
				AK (907)000-0000
2 REP.	CYNTHIA TOOHEY			TSFY. SB 53
				AK (907)000-0000
3 REP.	HARLEY OLBERG			TSFY. SB 53
				AK (907)000-0000
4 REP.	BETTYE DAVIS			TSFY. SB 53
				AK (907)000-0000
5 REP.	IRENE NICHOLIA			TSFY. SB 53
				AK (907)000-0000
6 REP.	TOM BRICE			TSFY. SB 53
				AK (907)000-0000

TCN: 30415 DATE & TIME: 03/26/93 15:00 TO 17:00 STATUS:7 STATS. IN

PARTICIPANTS IN: JUNEAU			JNU		
7 REP.	GARY	DAVIS		AK	TSFY. SB 53 (907)000-0000
8 REP.	AL	VEZEY		AK	TSFY. SB 53 (907)000-0000
9 REP.	PETE	KOTT		AK	TSFY. SB 53 (907)000-0000
10	TESTIFIER	1		AK	TSFY. SB 53 (907)000-0000
11	TESTIFIER	2		AK	TSFY. SB 53 (907)000-0000
12	TESTIFIER	3		AK	TSFY. SB 53 (907)000-0000
13	TESTIFIER	4		AK	TSFY. SB 53 (907)000-0000
14	TESTIFIER	5		AK	TSFY. SB 53 (907)000-0000
15	TESTIFIER	6		AK	TSFY. SB 53 (907)000-0000
16	TESTIFIER	7		AK	TSFY. SB 53 (907)000-0000
17	OBSERVER	1		AK	OBSV. SB 53 (907)000-0000
18	OBSERVER	2		AK	OBSV. SB 53 (907)000-0000
19	OBSERVER	3		AK	OBSV. SB 53 (907)000-0000
20	OBSERVER	4		AK	OBSV. SB 53 (907)000-0000
21	OBSERVER	5		AK	OBSV. SB 53 (907)000-0000
22	OBSERVER	6		AK	OBSV. SB 53 (907)000-0000
23	OBSERVER	7		AK	OBSV. SB 53 (907)000-0000

PARTICIPANTS IN: KOTZEBUE			KOT		
1 MRS.	GLEND BOX 325	TABOR	SELF KOTZEBUE	AK	TSFY. SB 53 99752 (907)442-3168

PARTICIPANTS IN: KETCHIKAN			KTN		
1 MS	CONNIE BOX 7191	EMMERT	KETCHIKAN	AK	TSFY. SB 53 99901 (907)225-8811
2 MS	HEATHER BOX 6811	MUENCH	KETCHIKAN	AK	TSFY. SB 53 99901 (907)225-5372
3 MS	TERESA 1123 BLACK BEAR RD.	CREVIER	KETCHIKAN	AK	TSFY. SB 53 99901 (907)225-6588
4 MS	KAREN BOX 3013	DANGERFIELD	KETCHIKAN	AK	UNABL SB 53 99901 (907)225-7434
5 MS	MARSHA 1926 CUB COURT	GEORGE	KETCHIKAN	AK	UNABL SB 53 99901 (907)225-2490
6 MS	KATHY BOX 9060	HINSON	KETCHIKAN	AK	UNABL SB 53 99901 (907)225-9133
7 MS	MILDRED	RHODES			UNABL SB 53

PARTICIPANTS IN KETCHIKAN

KTN

	130 BRYANT ST. #115			AK 99901 (907)225-7669
8 MS.	ELINDRE JACOBSEN			UNABL SB 53
	2125 SECOND AVE.	KETCHIKAN		AK 99901 (907)225-3395
9 MS.	JANICE DAREFF			UNABL SB 53
	963A FOREST PARK	KETCHIKAN		AK 99901 (907)225-4333
10 MR.	WILLIAM FREER			UNABL SB 53
	748 MILLAR RIDGE	KETCHIKAN		AK 99901 (907)225-5071
11 MS.	DEBBI LAWE			UNABL SB 53
	BOX 1019	WARD COVE		AK 99928 (907)225-8095
12 MR.	JOHN THOMAS			OBSV. SB 53
	BOX 845	KETCHIKAN		AK 99901 (907)225-8080
13 MR.	PATRICK SINNOTT			OBSV. SB 53
	GEN. DEL.	KETCHIKAN		AK 99901 (907)000-0000

PARTICIPANTS IN MATSU

MAT

1 MR.	DICK STOFFEL			TSFY. SB 53
	1352 PIONEER DR.	WASILLA		AK 99654 (907)376-1691
2 MS.	KATIE HURLY			OBSV. SB 53
	P.O. BOX 870157	WASILLA		AK 99687 (907)376-5736
3 MR.	JOHN DAVIES			TSFY. SB 53
	P.O. BOX 870478	WASILLA		AK 99687 (907)373-2450

PARTICIPANTS IN SITKA

SIT

1 MS.	VIRGINIA PHILLIPS			TSFY. SB 53
	404 LAKE ST.	SITKA		AK 99835 (907)747-8024
2 MS.	ALICE YOUNG			TSFY. SB 53
	BOX 6161	SITKA		AK 99835 (907)747-5155
3 MR.	CHARLES HORAN			TSFY. SB 53
	403 LINCOLN ST.	SITKA		AK 99835 (907)747-6666
4 MS.	BETSY MEANS			OBSV. SB 53
	307 TLINGET WAY	SITKA		AK 99835 (907)747-6.78
5 MR.	WILLARD MEANS			OBSV. SB 53
	307 TLINGET WAY	SITKA		AK 99835 (907)747-6778

PARTICIPANTS IN KEN/SOL

SOL

1 MRS.	DEBORAH L. MORRIS		SELF	TSFY. SB 53
	304 STERLING CT.	KENAI		AK 99611 (907)283-8459
2 MRS.	JOYCE M. MOLDENHAUER		SELF	TSFY. SB 53
	BOX 595	STERLING		AK 99672 (907)262-9319
3 MS.	ANN PENCE		WRCC	TSFY. SB 53
	325 S. SPRUCE	KENAI		AK 99611 (907)283-9479
4 MS.	NANCY ROLLINS		SELF	TSFY. SB 53
	BOX 1492	SOLDOTNA		AK 99669 (907)262-4273
5 MRS.	JOAN B. SCHRADER		SELF	OBSV. SB 53
	BOX 1587	KENAI		AK 99611 (907)283-4359
6 MR.	MARK N. MOLDENHAUER		SELF	TSFY. SB 53
	BOX 595	STERLING		AK 99611 (907)262-9319

PARTICIPANTS IN TOK LIO

TOK

1 MR.	TERRY PRUETT		FAITH CHAPEL	OBSV. SB 53
	P.O. BOX 57	TOK		AK 99780 (907)883-4771
2 MS.	MELLIE TERWILLIGER			TSFY. SB 53
	P.O. BOX 206	TOK		AK 99780 (907)883-5351

LTN1100-R01
04/04/93

LEGISLATIVE TELECONFERENCE NETWORK

PAGE 05
15:32:26

TCN: 30415 DATE & TIME: 03/26/93 15:00 TO 17:00 STATUS:7 STATS. IN

PARTICIPANTS IN VALDEZ VAL
1 MR. GREG WILLIAMS KCHU OBSV. SB 53
 BOX 467 VALDEZ AK 99686 (907)835-4665

PARTICIPANTS IN CORDOVA VAL COR
1 MR. RALPH E. LOHSE TSFY. SB 53
 BOX 14 CORDOVA AK 99574 (907)424-7170

2 MS. ROSEANN CURRAN TSFY. SB 53
 BOX 42 CORDOVA AK 99574 (907)424-7642

3 MR. M. E. MCWILLIAMS OBSV. SB 53
 BOX 1901 CORDOVA AK 99574 (907)424-5317

H/HESS ROLL CALL FORM

BILL CSMB105 DATE 3/26/98
 TAPE 93-48 NUMBER 172
 SUBJECT OF VOTE to pass CSMB105 w/ IND RECS

MEMBER	YEA	NAY	ABS
46- Rep. Cynthia Toohey	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rep. Con Bunde	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rep. Gary Davis	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rep. Al Vezey	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rep. Pete Kott	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rep. Harley Olberg	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rep. Bettye Davis	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rep. Irene Nicholia	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rep. Tom Brice	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

TOTAL 6-0

PASS

+++++

BILL _____ DATE _____
 TAPE 93- _____ NUMBER _____
 SUBJECT OF VOTE _____

MEMBER	YEA	NAY	ABS
Rep. Con Bunde	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rep. Gary Davis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rep. Al Vezey	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rep. Pete Kott	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rep. Harley Olberg	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rep. Bettye Davis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rep. Irene Nicholia	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rep. Tom Brice	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rep. Cynthia Toohey	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
TOTAL	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE

COMMITTEES:

- Community and Regional Affairs
- Military and Veteran's Affairs

BUDGET SUBCOMMITTEES:

- Department of Education
- Department of Military and Veterans Affairs

CO-CHAIRMAN:

Anchorage Caucus



DURING SESSION:
STATE CAPITOL BUILDING
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99801-1182
(907) 465-2199

HOME:
17121 FOOTHILL AVENUE
EAGLE RIVER, ALASKA 99577

REPRESENTATIVE ED WILLIS

DISTRICT 25

Birchwood • Chugiak • Eagle River • Fire Lake • Peters Creek

Memorandum

TO: Rep. Con Bunde, Co-Chair
Rep. Cynthia Toohey, Co-Chair
House HESS Committee

FROM: Rep. Ed Willis *EW*

DATE: March 26, 1993

RE: House Bill 105 - Boot Camp
Proposed CS

Attached are the following:

- a. Work Draft Blank CS for HB 105 (8-LS0467\J)
- b. Memorandum to Commissioner Rupp
- c. Memorandum to Rep. Vezey
- d. Memorandum to Rep. Nicholia

The changes made in the work draft are as follows:

A. Page 1, Lines 2-3 . Title change to allow contract out option as requested by Rep. Nicholia and with suggested amendment by Rep. Vezey.

B. Page 1, Lines 9-13, and Page 2, Lines 1-4. Allows for first-time, nonviolent misdemeanor offenders with sentences over 150 days to be sentenced to the program. Change suggested by Commissioner Rupp.

C. Page 2, Line 22. Includes "personal accountability and the work ethic" in the requirements for the boot camp program. Change suggested by Commissioner Rupp.

D. Page 3, Lines 7-11. Adds the language for contracting out. Change suggested by Rep. Nicholia with incorporation of change suggested by Rep. Vezey. This provision would allow the Department to contract with profit organizations, nonprofit



printed on recycled paper

organizations, or other persons who meet the guidelines to be developed by the Department. For your information, "person" is defined in A.S. 01.10.060(8) as:

. . .includes a corporation, company, partnership, firm, association, organization, business trust, or society, as well as a natural person;

E. Page 3, Lines 12-25. Changes the reporting requirements to accommodate Commissioner Rupp's concerns about the Department's lack of a Management Information System.

F. Page 3, Lines 26-31, and Page 4, Lines 1-11. Changes made here are to conform to the change reference in "A." above. Change suggested by Commissioner Rupp.

I apologize for the delay in getting this information to you. The work draft had to be redrafted when it was not complete the first time around and I only received it last yesterday.

Thank you for your assistance regarding this matter.

Attachment

8-LS0467J-
Luckhaupt
3/25/93

CS FOR HOUSE BILL NO. 105()
IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA
EIGHTEENTH LEGISLATURE - FIRST SESSION

BY

Offered:
Referred:

Sponsor(s): REPRESENTATIVES WILLIS, Bunde

A BILL

FOR AN ACT ENTITLED

1 "An Act providing for incarceration for nonviolent, youthful first offenders in boot
2 camps operated by the Department of Corrections; allowing the Department of
3 Corrections to contract with a person for an alternative boot camp program;
4 creating the Boot Camp Advisory Board in the Department of Corrections;
5 amending Alaska Rule of Criminal Procedure 35; and providing for an effective
6 date."

7 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:

8 * Section 1. AS 12.55.015 is amended by adding a new subsection to read:

9 (g) If the defendant is ordered to serve a definite term of continuous
10 imprisonment of at least 150 days under (a) of this section, and if (1) the defendant
11 is less than 26 years of age; (2) the offense the defendant is convicted of (A) is the
12 defendant's (i) first felony conviction; or (ii) first misdemeanor conviction; and (B) is
13 not a violation of AS 11.41, AS 11.46.300, 11.46.400, AS 11.56.300, 11.56.810,

1 AS 11.61.100, 11.61.190, 11.61.195, or 11.61.240; and (3) the defendant has not
 2 previously participated in a boot camp program under AS 33.30.182, the court may
 3 recommend that the defendant be incarcerated in a boot camp program established
 4 under AS 33.30.

5 * Sec. 2. AS 33.30 is amended by adding new sections to read:

6 ARTICLE 2A. BOOT CAMP PROGRAM.

7 Sec. 33.30.182. BOOT CAMP PROGRAM. (a) The commissioner shall
 8 establish a boot camp program as a correctional facility of the state. The boot camp
 9 program is an alternative correctional facility and program for young prisoners who
 10 have been sentenced for a first felony or first misdemeanor conviction of a nonviolent
 11 nature and who have not previously participated in the boot camp program. Prisoners
 12 committed by the department to participate in the boot camp program shall be housed
 13 separately from other prisoners committed to the custody of the commissioner who are
 14 not participating in the program.

15 (b) The commissioner shall include in the boot camp program

16 (1) a militarily styled intensive physical training and discipline
 17 program;

18 (2) alcohol and drug counseling, education, and treatment as an integral
 19 part of the program;

20 (3) educational and vocational assessment and a training program
 21 emphasizing job seeking skills;

22 (4) training in personal accountability and the work ethic; and

23 (5) other educational, counseling, and treatment programs as determined
 24 by the department or as ordered by a court under AS 12.55.015.

25 (c) The commissioner shall structure the boot camp program in a manner that
 26 a prisoner entering the program may complete it in a period of time determined by the
 27 commissioner but not greater than 150 days.

28 (d) The commissioner shall notify the sentencing court when the commissioner
 29 accepts a prisoner for the boot camp program. If the prisoner successfully completes
 30 the program, as determined by the commissioner, the prisoner shall be automatically
 31 referred to the sentencing court so that the prisoner may make a motion for sentence

1 reduction and placement on supervised probation. A prisoner shall be removed from
2 the boot camp program and reassigned to another correctional facility if the prisoner
3 fails to successfully complete the program or otherwise fails to abide by the regulations
4 of the program.

5 (e) The commissioner shall adopt regulations to implement AS 33.30.182 -
6 33.30.184 and otherwise administer the boot camp program.

7 (f) Notwithstanding AS 33.30.031, the department may contract with a person
8 for an alternative boot camp program under this section. An alternative boot camp
9 program must meet all of the requirements for a boot camp under this section and
10 under the regulations adopted by the commissioner. Prisoners shall be assigned to an
11 alternative boot camp program in the manner provided under AS 33.30.183.

12 (g) The commissioner shall maintain records of the program and shall annually
13 report to the legislature not later than February 1 on the program and its effectiveness.
14 The report should include, to the extent the technological capability of the department
15 allows,

16 (1) a comparison of recidivism rates between prisoners who have
17 completed the boot camp program and

18 (A) other first offenders not eligible for the program who are
19 committed to the custody of the commissioner; and

20 (B) all other prisoners committed to the custody of the
21 commissioner;

22 (2) a comparison of costs between the boot camp program and
23 traditional incarceration programs;

24 (3) a description of the number of prisoners who have participated in,
25 completed, or failed the boot camp program.

26 Sec. 33.30.183. ELIGIBILITY FOR ASSIGNMENT TO BOOT CAMP
27 PROGRAM. (a) The commissioner may not allow a prisoner to serve time in the
28 boot camp program unless the commissioner specifically finds that the prisoner meets
29 the eligibility requirements of this section.

30 (b) To be eligible to serve time in the boot camp program, the

31 (1) prisoner

- 1 (A) must be under 26 years of age;
- 2 (B) must have been sentenced to a term of imprisonment of at
- 3 least 150 days;
- 4 (C) may not have previously participated in a boot camp
- 5 program under AS 33.30.182;
- 6 (2) offense for which the prisoner is committed
- 7 (A) must be a first felony conviction or a first misdemeanor
- 8 conviction; and
- 9 (B) may not be for a violation of AS 11.41, AS 11.46.300,
- 10 11.46.400, AS 11.56.300, 11.56.810, AS 11.61.100, 11.61.190, 11.61.195, or
- 11 11.61.240.

12 Sec. 33.30.184. ADVISORY BOARD. (a) The Boot Camp Program Advisory

13 Board is established in the department. The board shall review and provide advice to

14 the commissioner concerning the boot camp program. The members of the board are

15 appointed by the governor as follows:

- 16 (1) the commissioner or the commissioner's designee;
- 17 (2) the director of the division of institutions of the department;
- 18 (3) the director of the division of community corrections of the
- 19 department;
- 20 (4) a member of the house of representatives;
- 21 (5) a member of the senate;
- 22 (6) a superior court judge; and
- 23 (7) two public members.

24 (b) The public members of the board are entitled to per diem and travel

25 expenses authorized by law for boards and commissions under AS 39.20.180.

26 * Sec. 3. Alaska Rule of Criminal Procedure 35 is amended by adding a new subsection

27 to read:

28 (e) Notwithstanding (a) or (b) of this section, the court shall reduce a sentence,

29 by suspending the execution of any remaining term of imprisonment, even below any

30 minimum term set by law, and imposing a period of probation under conditions set by

31 the court that include a requirement for active supervision, within 180 days of the day

1 the sentence was imposed, or within 180 days of the day on which jurisdiction over
2 the case is returned to the trial court under Appellate Rule 507(b), unless the defendant
3 petitions the United States Supreme Court for certiorari, in which case the 180 days
4 commences on the day that the Alaska Supreme Court denies relief if a defendant who
5 is automatically referred to the court upon successful completion of a boot camp
6 program under AS 33.30 moves for a reduction of sentence.

7 * Sec. 4. This Act takes effect July 1, 1993.

ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE

COMMITTEES:

- Community and Regional Affairs
- Military and Veteran's Affairs

BUDGET SUBCOMMITTEES:

- Department of Education
- Department of Military and Veterans Affairs

CO-CHAIRMAN:

Anchorage Caucus



DURING SESSION:
STATE CAPITOL BUILDING
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99801-1182
(907) 465-2199

HOME:
17121 FOOTHILL AVENUE
EAGLE RIVER, ALASKA 99577

REPRESENTATIVE ED WILLIS

DISTRICT 25

Birchwood • Chugiak • Eagle River • Fire Lake • Peters Creek

SPONSOR STATEMENT FOR HOUSE BILL 105

I introduced House Bill 105, relating to boot camps for nonviolent, youthful, first-time offenders, because I feel that putting this type of offender in a prison setting is not the best way to rehabilitate this person. I believe that providing an alternative to prison time and an opportunity to learn discipline and acceptable behavior will offer these first-time offenders a chance to avoid further encounters with the law.

The bill would offer the boot camp as an alternative sentence for first-time convicted defendants under the age of 26. Defendants convicted of such crimes as homicide, assault, kidnapping, sexual offense, and offenses involving the use of a deadly weapon would not be eligible for this sentencing option. The emphasis here is on nonviolent first-time offenders.

At least 24 states currently operate boot camp programs. As can be expected, each state offers the program to different groups. For example, Virginia's program currently is limited to nonviolent, male felony offenders 24 years of age or under and does not allow felons convicted of murder, manslaughter, kidnapping, sexual assault, etc. to participate in this program. Massachusetts' program is for male offenders under the age of 40. Ohio's Cuyahoga County has a program for juveniles between the ages of 14 and 17.

My bill concentrates on persons who would be in the custody and control of the Department of Corrections, i.e., adults and juveniles who have been tried in adult courts and are no longer under the purview of the Department of Health and Social Services.

I have submitted to the committee various articles and studies concerning boot camp programs. I believe that the program outlined by the Department of Corrections in its fiscal note to this bill is feasible and will ultimately provide benefits to the state.

I believe that a boot camp program could help us address many problems from prison overcrowding to recidivism rates and the program has the potential of providing us with many long-term benefits. I would urge positive consideration of this bill.

DIVISION OF LEGAL SERVICES

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS AGENCY STATE OF ALASKA

(907) 465-3867 or 465-2450
FAX (907) 465-2029
Mail Stop 3101

130 Seward Street, Suite 409
Juneau, Alaska 99801-2105

MEMORANDUM

February 1, 1993

SUBJECT: Sectional Summary of HB 105 (Work Order No. 8-LS0467A)

TO: Representative Ed Willis
Attn: Janet Seitz

FROM: Jerry Luckhaupt *JLB*
Legislative Counsel

You have requested a sectional summary of the above-described bill. As a preliminary matter, note that a sectional summary of a bill should not be considered an authoritative interpretation of the bill - the bill itself is the best statement of its contents.

Section 1 of the bill amends AS 12.55.015 by adding a new subsection (g) that permits a sentencing court to recommend that a first-time felony offender, under the age of 26, who was not convicted of a violation of AS 11.41,^{1/} AS 11.46.300,^{2/} AS 11.46.400,^{3/} AS 11.56.300,^{4/} AS 11.56.810,^{5/} AS 11.61.100,^{6/} AS 11.61.190,^{7/} AS 11.61.195,^{8/} or AS 11.61.240.^{9/}

^{1/} Crimes against persons, including, e.g., murder, manslaughter, assault, sexual assault, and sexual abuse.

^{2/} Burglary in the first degree.

^{3/} Arson in the first degree.

^{4/} Escape in the first degree.

^{5/} Terroristic threatening.

^{6/} Riot.

^{7/} Misconduct involving weapons in the first degree.

^{8/} Misconduct involving weapons in the second degree.

^{9/} Criminal possession of explosives.

Sectional Summary

Section 2 of the bill is the statutory "meat" of the bill. It creates:

AS 33.30.182 which establishes a boot camp program as a correctional facility of the state; describes what the boot camp program involves (militarily styled discipline and physical training, counseling, training); requires the boot camp program to be designed so as to be completed within 150 days; automatically refers a prisoner who successfully completes the program to the sentencing court to file a motion for sentence reduction and for placement on supervised probation; requires prisoners who fail the program to be reassigned to other correctional institutions; requires the commissioner to adopt regulations; and requires the commissioner to report to the legislature.

AS 33.30.183 limits the prisoners eligible for assignment to the boot camp program to first felony offenders, under 26 years of age, who did not violate AS 11.41, AS 11.46.300, AS 11.46.400, AS 11.56.300, AS 11.56.810, AS 11.61.100, AS 11.61.190, AS 11.61.195, or AS 11.61.240.

AS 33.30.184 creates a boot camp advisory board.

Section 3 of the bill amends Alaska Rule of Criminal Procedure 35 by requiring a court to grant a sentence reduction imposing supervised probation on a defendant that successfully completes the boot camp program.

Section 4 of the bill provides an effective date.

GPL:lmb:gc
93-014.lmb

Alaska State Legislature

Legislative Research Agency



130 Seward Street, Suite 218
Juneau, Alaska 99801-2196

Phone: (907) 465-3991
Fax: (907) 463-3351

February 11, 1993

MEMORANDUM

TO: Representative Ed Willis

FROM: Patricia Young *P. Young*
Legislative Analyst

RE: **Boot Camps for Young Offenders**
Research Request 93.100

You asked for information about boot camps for young offenders. Specifically, you wished to know the age of participants, the type of crimes represented, the length of sentence, and the number of offenders typically in the programs. You were particularly interested in boot camp programs running in Virginia, Massachusetts, and Cuyahoga County, Ohio.

According to a *State Legislative Report*, "Prison Boot Camps: Policy Considerations and Options," (Denver: National Conference of State Legislatures, March 1991; attached) boot camps are generally military-style programs requiring team cooperation for highly disciplined drills, marching, and labor. Most such programs are designed for non-violent first-time felony offenders with relatively short sentences. Typically they are designed for young adults between the ages of 17 and 25, require a certain degree of physical and mental fitness, last from 60 to 180 days, and represent an alternative to incarceration. Although few data exist to evaluate the effectiveness of boot camp programs, particularly their long-term effectiveness, they are popular: at least 24 states currently operate such programs.

Despite their similarities, boot camp programs vary in structure and focus. A brief comparison of the programs in Virginia, Massachusetts, and Cuyahoga County, Ohio, illustrate some of the differences.

The Virginia Program

The Virginia program appears to be the most standard among the three. At its inception--mid-April of 1991--eligibility was limited to nonviolent, male felony offenders between the ages of 18 and 24 years at the time of sentencing. (Last year the age restriction was changed

"Boot Camps for Young Offenders" - Legislative Research

Representative Willis
February 11, 1993
Page 2

to 24 years or under at the time of conviction, with no minimum age limit.) Misdemeanants are ineligible, as are felons convicted of murder, manslaughter, kidnapping, sexual assault, malicious wounding, robbery, or any attempt to commit any of these crimes. Camp capacity is 100 participants, and platoons of 30 to 45 individuals enter each month. To date, 522 participants have gone through the Virginia program.

The program is voluntary, lasts 90 days, and represents a condition of supervised probation in lieu of a penitentiary sentence. The primary emphasis is on discipline. Corrections officers involved in the boot camp program receive U.S. Marine Corps training as drill officers, and an offender's sole contact for the first two weeks of the program is with the drill officer.

Following the two-week orientation come program components involving labor, general education, substance abuse education, life skills development, vocational assessment, and some social education. Although participants are not taught vocation skills as such, manual labor is believed to help them develop a work ethic. The camp is located on a 2,600-acre farm, so offenders are employed as farm laborers. Labor for community projects, such as painting schools and cleaning state parks, is also required. All participants are evaluated as to their level of education: those who test at below grade 12.9 are enrolled in the Adult Basic Education (ABE) or General Education Development (GED) program, regardless of whether they have high school diplomas; those who test at or above grade 12.9 are used as tutors. Upon completion of the entire boot camp program, participants may invite family and friends to a full graduation ceremony. Participants are on probation following graduation for at least one year, the first 90 days of which are intensive supervision.

According to Drew Malloy, program director, Virginia's boot camp program is a five-year pilot program funded by the state legislature. Results have so far been positive, with a recidivism rate of 15 percent for the first 18 months. Admittedly, however, this is a very short time to accurately gauge the effectiveness of a program, and the recidivism rate is expected to increase over time. Nevertheless, Mr. Malloy anticipates funding for the program beyond the demonstration period.

The Massachusetts Program

The Massachusetts boot camp program, which began operation in August of 1992, is for male offenders under the age of 40. Ted O'Donnell, Department of Corrections project analyst with the program, describes it as originally designed for individuals convicted of misdemeanors and less serious felonies as a short, intense alternative to jail or probation, requiring a high level of offender involvement. It is a four-month program with a capacity of 256 participants. Approximately 50 offenders have graduated from the program to date.

Representative Willis
February 11, 1993
Page 3

Eligibility criteria for the Massachusetts boot camp program include that a participant 1) must be under 40 years of age; 2) may have prior convictions if his history is non-violent; 3) must have a sentence that is for no more than 18 months; 4) must not have received a mandatory sentence for violation of a drug law; 5) must not have been convicted of a crime against a person (with the exception of assault and battery); 6) must be medically and psychologically fit to participate; 7) must have no history of escape from a secure parameter nor any escapes within the past three years; and 8) must volunteer for the program.

According to Mr. O'Donnell, because the program capacity has yet to be filled, the original criterion of "no history of escape" was relaxed to its current form. Another proposed amendment would eliminate the criterion concerning prior convictions and shift the focus more to the present conviction.

The program, described by Mr. O'Donnell as having a "marine drill camp atmosphere," includes education, work, counseling, life skills, and team building components. Following graduation, participants are in parole status for an amount of time based on the duration of the original sentence. Aftercare parole requirements may include components such as contacting parole officers, maintaining jobs, and attending counseling sessions.

The Ohio Program--Cuyahoga County

Unlike the boot camp programs in Virginia and Massachusetts, Cuyahoga County's program is for juveniles between the ages of 14 and 17 who have been convicted of felonies and sentenced to state institutions for approximately 6 to 12 months. Participants must be mentally and physically capable and have not been convicted of aggravated murder, murder, rape, manslaughter, kidnapping, sexual assault, aggravated arson, criminal enticement, or corruption of a minor.

This is a nonvoluntary, 90-day residential program followed by six to nine months of highly structured aftercare. Participants are randomly selected but generally willing to participate. Ten are admitted at the beginning of each month, and ten are released at the end of each month. The maximum capacity is 30 participants at any given time. To date, 111 youth have entered the program. Although discipline is a part of the program's structure, it is based more on the Outward Bound, challenge education model than a military one. Furthermore, the program's substance is primarily treatment for the juvenile and reunification with the family and community. Other components include substance abuse education, general education, life skills development, and basic job acquisition and retention skills.

Representative Willis

February 11, 1993


Page 4

The Ohio program began in April of 1992 with a federal grant from the U.S. Justice Department for an 18-month project to be evaluated by the National Institute of Justice. Recidivism data will not be available until 1994. According to Tim Howard, project director, the unusually strong emphasis on the aftercare component should result in low recidivism rates.

More detailed information on each of these programs is being sent and will be forwarded to you upon arrival. I hope this information is useful. If you have questions, please let me know.

Attachment

STATE LEGISLATIVE REPORT



~~PRISON BOOT CAMPS:~~ POLICY CONSIDERATIONS AND OPTIONS

by

Kae M. Warnock
Staff Assistant

and

Donna Hunzeker
Senior Policy Specialist

Vol. 16, No. 1 March 1991

GOVERNMENT
6731

An Information Service of the National Conference of State Legislatures
dway, Suite 700, Denver, Colorado 80202. William T. Pound, Executive Director

INTRODUCTION

A new breed of correctional facility has evolved out of concerns over increased drug crime and prison overcrowding, and the belief that traditional prisons often fail to rehabilitate offenders. In addition, there has been growing public sentiment that offenders be held accountable for their crimes and that serious offenders serve longer sentences. This has added to prison crowding and motivated state policymakers to search for intermediate sanctions for less-serious offenders.

Boot camps--also known as shock incarceration, special alternative incarceration or regimented inmate discipline--are military-style facilities distinguished by reveille, close-order drills, marching and demanding physical requirements. Participants are usually young adult offenders with no prior incarceration who are serving time for their first non-violent felony conviction. Offenders attend a boot camp program for a shorter duration than a standard prison sentence, 60 to 180 days depending on the state program, and then ordinarily are released on parole for an additional year or more. Boot camps are politically popular because the public sees the programs as "tough on crime." Corrections officials often like the programs because the stringent rules and schedules provide a more controlled environment for offenders than standard incarceration.

LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY

Boot camps for young adult offenders now operate in at least 23 states, and another seven states are in the process of setting up boot camp programs.

Oklahoma and Georgia opened the first boot camp programs in 1983. Most states with programs have added them just since 1987, and considerable legislative activity has occurred since 1989. Sixteen states enacted enabling legislation in the 1989 or 1990 sessions: Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Missouri, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Ohio, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Wisconsin and Wyoming. Eight states--Alabama, Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Michigan, New York and South Carolina--enacted enabling legislation between 1983 and 1989. At least five states -- Idaho, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina and Oklahoma--operate boot camps under department of corrections regulatory authority. At least one county, Los Angeles, is operating a one-year pilot project.(Figure 1)

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

Prison-bound or probation-bound offenders.

Perhaps the central policy issue to be addressed in considering or expanding boot camp programs is whether the program will be used to divert prison-bound offenders or as a more intensive, punitive form of probation.

In at least 19 states, statutes specify boot camps as an alternative for prison-bound offenders, with the intent of providing shorter more intensive terms in a boot camp for some offenders who would have served a longer prison term. In most states that statutorily divert prison-bound offenders to boot camp, the length of the original sentence is not specified by statute. In states that do designate original sentence length for program eligibility, the offender may be trading a sentence as short as three years for six months in a boot camp (New York) or a sentence as long as 15 years for 120 days in a boot camp (Alabama).(Appendix A)

In at least five states, probation-bound offenders are targeted by statute in order to provide boot camps as a sentencing option for offenders for whom straight probation was considered too lenient. Probation-bound offenders are diverted into the boot camp program by the sentencing judge. Both Connecticut and Georgia statutes allow the court to use boot camp as a condition of probation, and Arizona uses it as a condition of intensive probation.(Appendix A)

Tennessee is the only state found to have two separate statutes; one targets prison-bound offenders and the other targets probation-bound offenders. Theoretically, prison-bound and probation-bound offenders could serve side-by-side in the same boot camps. As yet, however, no probation-bound offenders have been sent to Tennessee's boot camp, according to the department of corrections.

Ten states give the court primary discretion to determine whether otherwise prison-bound or probation-bound offenders are sentenced to boot camps. Often, offenders sentenced to boot camps by a judge must also then be screened and accepted by the Department of Corrections (DOC).(Appendix A)

In about 12 states, the department of corrections has considerable discretion for diverting prison-sentenced inmates into boot camps. In six of these states, the DOC's discretion is somewhat diluted because the court maintains jurisdiction and continues to oversee and review the offender's case throughout the program.(Appendix A)

Target offenders

Most states specify that participants in boot camps be non-violent felony offenders who have never served time in a prison. A majority of the states target a specific age group either by statute or by DOC policy, the most common range being from 17 to 25 years of age. New Mexico and Wisconsin target certain drug offenders for the program. Several states statutorily exclude certain crimes such as murder, first degree rape, first degree kidnapping, first degree robbery, capital or life felonies, sex offenses, child abuse or child sexual abuse. Many state laws require that offenders be physically and mentally fit. At least five states have boot camps for women.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

The most frequently stated goals of boot camps are to reduce prison overcrowding, deter offenders from crime, rehabilitate young adult offenders and reduce corrections costs..

Reducing Prison Overcrowding

Several states have authorized boot camps, with reduction of prison overcrowding as a goal of the program. In Arkansas, offenders are evaluated according to a set of guidelines adopted by the Board of Correction, under statutory language which says the program is "designed to reduce inmate population by diverting eligible offenders from long-term incarceration." (Ark. Stat. Ann. 12-28-701 to 12-28-705 (1989)) The Florida law indicates that "Due to severe prison overcrowding, the Legislature declares the construction of a basic training program facility is necessary to aid in alleviating an emergency situation." (Fla. Stat. Ann. 958.04 (West 1990))

However, an analysis done by Abt Associates, Inc. for the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), of the U.S. Department of Justice in 1989 said that in comparing maximum annual capacity in boot camps in a number of states to total prison population, the potential effect of boot camps on prison overcrowding is small. Boot camp capacity as a percent of prison population ranged from 1.1 percent in Florida to 11.6 percent in Mississippi according to the NIJ analysis. Boot camps averaged about 4.7 percent of total prison populations in the states examined. Current selection criteria for participants would, therefore, limit the number of facilities needed to a relatively small number.(1,p.12)

Deterrence and Rehabilitation

Another commonly stated purpose of boot camps is to deter offenders from committing additional crimes by giving them a "taste" of prison. This may be particularly true where boot camps are used as a more punitive form of probation. Many boot camps operate within a conventional state prison, but participants are separated from the general population. This gives offenders a "close, sobering exposure to the realities of prison life, but without subjecting them to abuse, exploitation or corruption by hardened criminals," according to the NIJ study. (1,p.xi)

Physical exercise combined with drills and discipline is seen as having rehabilitative value by some policymakers and program managers. Shock incarceration, according to Donald J. Hengesh, director of Special Alternatives Incarceration in Michigan, teaches inmates "self-esteem, self-discipline, self-responsibility and how to work...more importantly [the program] push[es] these individuals to achieve at levels that they never knew they could achieve at before."(2,p.3)

Some programs have added confidence-building exercises, and several require participants to quit smoking. North Carolina includes a Ropes Challenge program, which works first on building group skills such as getting a team over a 12 foot wall, then on individual confidence building such as walking a balance beam suspended 30 feet in the air. In Louisiana, program participants in the Orleans Parish are able to run 12 miles upon completion of the program.(1,p.23) or

Most programs do not rely solely on military drills for their rehabilitation, many also include drug and alcohol counseling, reality therapy, individual counseling, literacy training and other pre-release programs. In New York, offenders are placed in a therapeutic community emphasizing community living and socialization skills.(1,p.5) Education also is emphasized in the New York program, with offenders required to spend 12 hours per week in classes. A 1990 report of the New York State Department of Correctional Services, Division of Program Planning, Research and Evaluation, said the academic achievement of boot camp participants is somewhat less than inmates in comparison New York facilities, but boot camp inmates both start with more skill deficiencies and spend less time in the program.(4,pp.35-36) Although many states' boot camp programs offer education, at least two states offer no adult basic education because of the difficulty in doing so in any meaningful way in the short period of time offenders are in the boot camp program.(1,p.27)

At least 10 state statutes specify that offenders receive drug and alcohol education or treatment in boot camps. As mentioned earlier, in New Mexico and Wisconsin certain drug offenders are targeted for the program. In Tennessee, however, some drug offenders are statutorily excluded.

Some states provide considerable pre-release assistance and direction. For example, in Maryland, parole agents visit the offenders before they are released, examine their home environments and make arrangements for offenders to meet with job placement assistance counselors. In at least one state, DOC officials recommend to the sentencing judge that drug offenders be required to attend out-patient drug counseling upon release, and in a few other states the statute specifies that drug offenders be sent to drug treatment or educational programs upon release. Two states--Indiana and Wisconsin--statutorily require drug treatment upon release from boot camp.

Cost Issues

Many boot camps are set up on the grounds of existing correctional facilities and share kitchen, medical and administrative services, contributing to cost-efficient start-up. However, per diem costs may be as much or more than standard prison because of higher staff to inmate ratios.(1,p.16)

The 1989 NIJ study indicated that cost savings come primarily from the shorter terms participants serve. For states to save money, the researchers conclude, they must admit inmates who otherwise would have served longer prison terms. Florida data show that time served in boot camps is about 215 days shorter than what participants would have spent in prison, suggesting savings to the state.(3,p.22) In New York, a 1990 report by the Department of Correctional Services research division estimated that despite higher per diem costs than other prison facilities, a total savings of \$55.6 million was realized for 1,158 boot camp participants. This includes an

estimated \$36.6 million saved in capital construction and \$19.0 million saved in care and custody costs, mostly because inmates were housed for a shorter time.(4,pp.33-34)

A 1990 report by the South Carolina State Reorganization Commission for the state legislature examined the criminal histories of the offenders in the boot camp program to determine how many offenders were actually being diverted from prison and whether any offenders were being diverted from probation. Of the 664 offenders who were placed in the boot camp program between July 1987 and January 1989, 244 were diverted from prison and 420 were diverted from probation. Still, the net cost savings of diverting 244 offenders from prison, after taking into account the costs added by placing 420 probation-bound offenders into boot camps, was determined to be \$1.4 million.

None of the cost analyses known have attempted to compute the return-to-crime factor into costs. Perhaps eventually, fiscal studies will combine recidivism data with cost data and analysis of who is being diverted into boot camp programs.

EVALUATIONS AND OUTCOMES

Whether or not boot camps meet the intended objective of rehabilitation of the offender is also an important policy consideration. To date, however, most outcome analyses are either anecdotal, short-term or inconclusive.

Studies by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) of the U.S. Department of Justice in 1989 and the U.S. Government Accounting Office (GAO) in 1988 concluded that available data are not sufficient to support the theory that boot camps reduce recidivism, overcrowding or prison costs.(1,p.35)(5,p.1)

The NIJ study looked at recidivism rates for graduates of boot camps in Georgia and Oklahoma and found them to be about the same as those of offenders released from prison. In fact, the Georgia DOC found that after a three year follow-up, 38.5 percent of the offenders who participated in boot camp returned to prison, compared to 38 percent recidivism of released prison inmates. Oklahoma found that almost half the boot camp graduates had returned to prison compared to 28 percent in a comparison group of prison inmates over a 29-month period.(1,p.4)

A few states also have tracked the return to crime or subsequent incarceration of boot camp participants. The Florida Department of Corrections released a study in 1989 of their program showing that boot camp graduates had a re-incarceration rate of 5.59 percent versus 7.75 percent for a comparison group; however, the study only contained data for a 13-month period.(3,p.ii)

A 1990 report of the South Carolina State Reorganization Commission showed that among 437 boot camp participants, 16 percent have had a subsequent conviction or had their probation revoked for a technical violation. Of these convictions and violations, 97 percent occurred during the first 12 months after completing boot camp. The most recent study, based on 1984 data, of recidivism for all people released (including all crimes and criminal histories) in that state showed a 16 percent recidivism rate for one year.(6,p.24)

The New York Department of Correctional Services research division report of 1990 on the state's Shock program said, "Despite being incarcerated for shorter periods of time, the Shock graduates appear to be returning at a rate similar to a selected comparable group of inmates...." But the report also notes that Shock graduates come back for offenses less serious than the comparison group, and more often for rule violations rather than for convictions on new crimes.(4,p.51-52) Georgia, Louisiana and New York are currently conducting studies and several other states have indicated they will be tracking recidivism rates as well.

Several states require the department of corrections (DOC) to report to the legislature on the progress of the boot camp programs. In Colorado, for example, the DOC is to provide a report that includes such information as: whether offenders are being diverted from probation or prison, whether bed space is being saved, and whether the recidivism rate for graduates of the program are equal to or lower than that of similar offenders committed to the DOC.

The National Institute of Justice currently is working on a multi-site survey to evaluate seven boot camp programs. The evaluation will address selection decisions, community supervision upon release, program characteristics and program location; however, the outcome of the study is not expected to be decisive. The study should be released by early next year.

The Bureau of Justice Assistance has offered funds to states for boot camp start-up and demonstration. New York and Texas have grants to implement and evaluate effectiveness of boot camps targeted for drug offenders.(7,p.47)

FEDERAL INTEREST AND INCENTIVES

Title XVIII of the federal Crime Control Act of 1990 authorizes \$220 million for "correctional options," including, "four grants in each fiscal year, in various geographical areas throughout the United States, to public agencies for correctional options (including the cost of construction) that provide alternatives to traditional modes of incarceration and offenders release programs." Programs must provide appropriate intervention for young offenders; security and discipline; services such as counseling, drug treatment, education and job training; reduction in criminal recidivism; reduction in correctional costs; and development of industrial and service skills. Also available are grants to public agencies to "establish, operate, and support boot camp prisons."

Priority is given to applicants who show potential for developing or testing innovation alternatives, as well as those that demonstrate overall quality and programming in a boot camp program. States operating over capacity in correctional facilities are also given priority. The law also identifies military facilities that may be used as sites for correctional programs funded under this chapter.

As of January 1991, funds for these grants were not yet appropriated. The Federal Crime Control Act of 1990 also authorizes the Federal Bureau of Prisons to use shock incarceration (boot camp) programs. Title XXX specifies military-style regimented training, discipline and labor, and also requires that appropriate job training, education and drug and alcohol counseling be in place. As yet there are no boot camp facilities operating for federal offenders.(8)

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), in conjunction with the Bureau of Justice Assistance, will develop and test up to three boot camps for juvenile offenders, with awards to be made in April 1991 for 18-month test sites. In addition, the National Institute of Justice will fund an independent evaluation of the OJJDP programs, also to begin in 1991.

CONCLUSION

The lofty goals of reducing prison overcrowding, controlling corrections costs and providing for criminal deterrence and rehabilitation are only marginally achievable through boot camp prison programs.

By shortening the period of incarceration for prison-bound offenders, boot camps can have a minimal effect on prison overcrowding and costs. However, cost savings tend to be elusive in programs requiring special start-up and operational costs, yet which target less than 5 percent of the prison population. It is important to note that programs which target only probation-bound offenders are not likely to realize cost savings nor do they have any effect on prison populations.

Increased justice-system costs may in fact result from sending probation-bound offenders to boot camps.

Real savings, of course, can be realized if boot camp programs are successful in reducing subsequent criminal behavior in participants. As yet, however, long-term, comprehensive recidivism evaluations are absent from an evaluation of whether boot camps are good policy. Ultimately, an objective analysis of programs' rehabilitative value compared to or in combination with drug treatment, work and education programs, likely will be key to determining success or failure.


In current practice, boot camps do respond to the need for intermediate sanctions tougher than probation and which depart significantly from traditional prison by stressing offender accountability and change. A corrections leader has said boot camps are the "first sexy idea" corrections has had in almost two decades, and therefore should be given time to develop and be refined. Others have warned that military drills without attention to the social ills of illiteracy, unemployment and drug abuse are a wasted effort.

As with most state initiatives, considerable variation is seen in how states have designed and operated boot camp programs. Their experiences, as highlighted in this document, can begin to guide policymakers' decisions on future use of boot camps as a sentencing option.

REFERENCES

- 1.) *Shock Incarceration: An Overview of Existing Programs*. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice, June 1989.
- 2.) U.S. Congress, House Committee on the Judiciary. *Shock Incarceration Act of 1990*, 101st Cong. 2d sess., 1990.
- 3.) *Boot Camp Evaluation*. Florida: Department of Corrections. March 1989.
- 4.) *The Second Annual Report to the Legislature: Shock Incarceration in New York State: The Corrections Experience*. Albany, N.Y.: Department of Corrections. January 1990.
- 5.) *Prison Boot Camps: Too Early to Measure Effectiveness*. Washington, D.C.: United States General Accounting Office. September 1988.
6. *An Evaluation of the Omnibus Criminal Justice Improvements Act of 1986*. Columbia, SC: State Reorganization Commission. March 1990.
- 7.) Doris Layton Mackenzie. "Boot Camp Prisons: Components, Evaluations and Empirical Issues." *Federal Probation*, September 1990.
- 8.) U.S. Congress, *Crime Control Act of 1990*, Chapter B, Section 515 (a) (1-3), 101st Cong. 2d sess., 1990.

Figure 1.
 Boot Camp/Shock Incarceration Facility Use in the States



Source: *Shock Incarceration: An Overview of Existing Programs* (Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice, June 1990)
 NCSL Original Research

Appendix A
State Statute Specifications for Boot Camps

State	Amount of Legislative Direction	Offender Eligibility Requirements	Prison Alternative/Enhanced Probation	Distinctive Program Features	Who Has Discretion to Select Candidates?
Alabama Ala. Code §15-18-8 (1989)	Moderate	Lists crimes not eligible, sentence of 15 years or less	PA	Unspecified	Court upon consultation with DOC, retained jurisdiction
Arizona Ariz. Rev. Stat. Ann. §13-915 (West 1989)	Moderate	Age, never been incarcerated as adult, no physical impairments, no contagious disease	EP	Academic education	Court - condition of intensive probation
Arkansas Ark. Stat. Ann. §12-28-701 to 705 (1989)	Minimal	Unspecified	PA	Unspecified	DOC
Colorado Colo. Rev. Stat. Art. 17.27.7 (1990)	Moderate	Age, nonviolent, no previous sentence in a correctional facility, free of physical & mental defects	PA	Educational & vocational assessment & training, job seeking skills, health education, drug/alcohol education & treatment.	Executive director returned to sentencing court upon completion for sentence reduction
Connecticut Conn. Gen. Stat. §18-101c (1989)	Moderate	Age, convicted of other than a class A felony, no physical or mental limitations	EP	Community work, job skills application & communication, separate from general inmate population, judge may require education, employment, restitution, approved residence upon release.	Court
Florida Fla. Stat. Ann. §956.02 (West 1990)	Moderate to Considerable	Age, crime is a felony if committed before 21st birthday, not previously classified under this statute, lists ineligible crimes, no physical limitations, not previously incarcerated.	PA	Training in decisionmaking, personal development, drug counseling, rehabilitation programs	Court commits to custody of DOC, DOC requests sentencing court approval.
Georgia Ga. Code Ann. §42-8-35.1 (1989)	Minimal	Age, no contagious disease, not physically or mentally handicapped	EP	Unspecified	Court - with DOC approval
Illinois Ill. Ann. Stat. ch. 38, §1003A-1-1 to §1003A-1-6 §1005-6-3 to 3.4 (1990)	Moderate	Age, never imprisoned as adult for felony, lists crimes not eligible, sentenced to imprisonment of 5 years or less, no mental disorder or disability, written consent.	PA	Drug counseling, mandatory supervised release	Court - upon its independent assessment
Indiana Ind. Code Ann. §11-14 (1990)	Considerable	Age, male, committed to DOC to serve max. sentence of not more than eight years, suspendable sentence, no previous conviction or incarceration, not previously in a military or correctional boot camp, not mentally impaired.	PA	Separate from general inmate population, skills for living and rehabilitation, job skills, treatment for drug/alcohol abuse & emotional or mental problems, education - remedial & GED, vocational assessment, transition program includes education, counseling, community service, drug/alcohol treatment, assisted reintegration.	Committed to DOC, DOC reports to court, court may recommend offender but still must be approved by DOC, voluntary withdrawal.
Kansas Kan. Stat. Ann. §75-52.127 (1989)	Minimal	Unspecified	Unspecified	Unspecified	Court
Louisiana La. Rev. Stat. Ann. C.Cr.P. Art. 901.1 (West 1990)	Considerable	First offender, suspended sentence of seven years or less at hard labor, has probation revoked on technical violation, otherwise eligible for parole, 1st or 2nd felony, never served time in a state prison, voluntary.	PA	Intensive parole supervision upon release	Sentenced to Dept. of Public Safety & Corrections, court recommends or Div. of Probation & Parole refers to court.

State	Amount of Legislative Direction	Offender Eligibility Requirements	Prison Alternative/Enhanced Probation	Distinctive Program Features	Who Has Discretion to Select Candidates?
Michigan Mich. Stat. Ann. §24.2356(3-5) & §28.1133(2) (Callahan 1990)	Minimal to Moderate	Age, never served sentence of imprisonment, likely to be sentenced to imprisonment, not physically or mentally handicapped.	PA	Unspecified	Court - with consent of offender
Missouri Mo. Ann. Stat. §217.378 (Vernon 1991)	Minimal to Moderate	Age, on felony probation, violated probation, no prior felony conviction.	PA	Unspecified	Court
Nevada Nev. Rev. Stat. §209.256 (1989)	Moderate	Age, male, convicted of nonviolent felony, never incarcerated for more than 6 months, otherwise eligible for probation.	EP	Training in recognition & prevention of drug/alcohol abuse, stress management, prepare for & obtain job.	Court returned to court upon completion
New Hampshire N.H. Rev. Stat. Ann. §631 (1989)	Minimal	Unspecified	PA	Intensive community supervision	Court upon recommendation of DOC
New Mexico N.M. Stat. Ann. §31-18-22 & §33-1-17 (1990)	Moderate to Considerable	Adult male & female offenders, lists ineligible crimes, DOC to adopt regulations for screening, voluntary	PA	Substance abuse counseling & treatment, GED prep, training in decisionmaking & personal development & pre-release skills.	Court upon recommendation of corrections department.
New York N.Y. Corr. Law §865-867 (McKinney 1990)	Minimal to Moderate	Age, within 3 years of parole, lists ineligible crimes, must volunteer	PA	6 months, rehabilitation therapy	Screening committee requests answer from court approving or disapproving, court must respond within 25 days or automatically approved.
Ohio 118th Gen'l Assembly §5120.031 (1990)	Considerable	Age, convicted of or pleaded guilty to 3rd or 4th degree felony, lists ineligible crimes, never sentenced to 30 days or more in reform or penal institution, nonviolent	PA	Substance abuse education, employment & social skills, psychological treatment, GED prep, 30-60 days in halfway house with self help & GED prep, intensive supervision parole for remainder of sentence.	Judge sentences to Dept. of Rehabilitation & Correction, progress reports to sentencing court.
South Carolina S.C. Code Ann. §24-21-475 (Law. Co-op 1986)	Minimal	Age, convicted of nonviolent offense for which a five years or more sentence can be imposed, not physically or mentally handicapped, no contagious diseases.	PA	Unspecified	Judge - as condition of probation
Tennessee Tenn. Code Ann. §40-20-201 to 207 & §40-28-130 (1989)	Minimal	Age, not physically or mentally handicapped, prison or probation of 6 years or less, no contagious diseases, lists ineligible crimes.	PA & EP	Treatment programs	Judge - as condition of probation
Texas Tex. Code of Crim. Proc. Ann. Art. 42.12 (Vernon 1990)	Minimal	Otherwise eligible for probation, age, not physically or mentally handicapped, never been incarcerated for felony.	PA	Unspecified	Court
Virginia Va. Code §19.2 - 316.1 & §53.1 - 67.1 (1990)	Considerable	Age, nonviolent felony, never been sentenced to incarceration as adult voluntary	PA	Counseling, remedial education, drug education, vocational assessment, upon release employment, vocational or other educational programs may be required, voluntary withdrawal.	Court orders commitment to DOC for evaluation, DOC recommends
Wisconsin Wis. Stat. Ann. §302.045 (West 1990)	Moderate	Must volunteer, age, already incarcerated, has substance abuse problem, no psychological, physical or mental limitations lists ineligible crimes	PA	Personal development counseling, substance abuse treatment & education, intensive supervision parole program for drug abusers.	DOC
Wyoming Wyo. Stat. §7-3-1003 (1989)	Minimal	Is serving sentence at state penitentiary, age, no previous incarceration, lists ineligible crimes.	PA	Separation from general inmate population	Board of Charities & Reform

BOOT CAMP PRISONS

by Kac Warnock

June 1991

No. CJ-001

NCSL Issues In Brief

Boot camp prisons are military-style facilities requiring drills, marching, and labor

Boot camps may offer education, drug/alcohol counseling, and therapy

Boot camps are usually for young adults with convictions for non-violent crimes

Boot camp prisons, also known as "shock incarceration" and "special alternative incarceration" programs, are military-style correctional facilities which provide shorter terms in a highly regimented, disciplinary setting likely to include reveille, drills and marching, physical exercise, and labor. Demanding physical drills and exercises are the most prominent and unique features of these programs. Community service labor also is required in most cases.

Boot camp correctional facilities often include drug/alcohol counseling, reality therapy, individual counseling, education, and pre-release programs. New York includes a therapeutic community that emphasizes community living and socialization skills. While some states claim success with education programs, at least two offer no adult basic education because of the difficulty in doing so during the short period of time offenders are in the program.

Most Boot camp/shock incarceration programs are designed for young, adult offenders (usually 17-25 years, although some states have no age limit) convicted of non-violent crimes.

Participants are usually first or second-time felony offenders with no prior adult incarcerations, whose current offense carries a relatively short sentence. Offenders with mental or physical impairments are excluded. At least five states have boot camp programs for women. Some states such as Louisiana, New York, and Virginia use boot camps mainly as an alternative sentence for offenders otherwise bound for prison. Other states such as Arizona, Connecticut, and Georgia structure boot camps as intensive probation programs.

Pros

Proponents hail the programs as a tough intermediate sanction that provides incapacitation and offender accountability. They say the short "shock" program aimed at young adult offenders can deter future criminal activity by instilling discipline and self control.






Cons

Detractors express concern that the boot camp programs foster physical prowess and aggression in the name of discipline and at the expense of problem solving and skill development.

Few data exist to support or disprove either of the opposing views on boot camp/shock incarceration programs. However, preliminary evaluations have been done, noted below, in Florida, Georgia, and Oklahoma.

Boot Camp/Shock Incarceration Facility Use in the States



-  Enacted enabling legislation in 1989 or 1990 (16)
-  Enabling legislation prior to 1989 (8)
-  State operating facilities under executive branch authority (5)
-  County-level program
-  Not known to have boot camp programs

Source: State Incarceration: An Overview (Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice, June 1991), 169 NCSL Original Research

STATE AND FEDERAL ACTIONS

23 states operate some type of boot camp

At least 23 states currently operate some type of boot camp facility. Oklahoma and Georgia opened the first boot camp programs in 1983. Most states with programs added them since 1987. Sixteen states enacted enabling legislation in the 1989 or 1990 sessions: Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Missouri, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Ohio, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. Eight states--Alabama, Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Michigan, New York, and South Carolina--enacted enabling legislation between 1983 and 1989. At least five states--Idaho, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, and Oklahoma--operate boot camps under department of corrections regulatory authority. At least one county, Los Angeles, is operating a one-year pilot project.

Federal assistance

The Bureau of Justice Assistance 1990 program plan offered funds to state departments of corrections for boot camp demonstration, training and technical assistance, as well as development and demonstration for juvenile offenders. Title XVIII of the federal Crime Control Act of 1990 authorizes grants to state and local governments to develop prison alternatives, including boot camp programs, although federal funds have not yet been appropriated.

The Federal Crime Control Act of 1990 also authorizes the Federal Bureau of Prisons to use shock incarceration programs. As yet there are no boot camp facilities operating for federal offenders.

Recidivism rate higher for boot camp graduates than released prison inmates in two states

A three-year follow-up study by the Georgia Department of Corrections found 38.5 percent of offenders who participated in the boot camp program returned to prison, compared to 38 percent of released prison inmates. Oklahoma found that over a 29-month period, almost half of the boot camp graduates had returned to prison compared to 28 percent in a comparison group of prison inmates.

Florida study shows boot camp graduates outperform released inmates during community supervision

A Florida evaluation of post-release outcomes showed the boot camp program graduates performed, overall, more successfully than a matched group of released prison inmates during a subsequent community supervision period. The same report showed almost 40 percent of participants entering the program did not finish it.

GAO and NIJ recommend more evaluation

A National Institute of Justice (NIJ) report issued in 1989 agreed with an earlier United States Government Accounting Office report that said more evaluation is needed to judge whether programs are operationally cost-effective and programmatically successful.

The NIJ study also indicated that cost savings result primarily from the shorter terms participants serve. For states to save money requires admitting inmates who otherwise would have served longer prison terms.

Selected References

- Boot Camp Evaluation*, Florida: Department of Corrections, March 1989.
Fla. Stat. Ann. 958.04 (West 1989), La. Rev. State Ann. Art. 961.1 & 574.4 (West 1990), N.Y. Correction Law Art. 26A (McKinney's 1990), Va. Code Ch. 13, Tit. 19.2 Art. 3 19.2-316.1 & Tit. 53.1 Art. 5 53.1-67.1 (1990)
- Prison Boot Camps: Too Early to Measure Effectiveness*, Washington, D.C.: United States General Accounting Office, September 1988.
- Shock Incarceration: An Overview of Existing Programs*, Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice, June 1989.
- The Second Annual Report to the Legislature: Shock Incarceration in New York State: The Corrections Experience*, Albany, N.Y.: Department of Corrections, January 1990.
- Virginia State Crime Commission. *Shock incarceration*. Richmond, VA, 1990.

Contacts for Further Information

The Bureau of Justice Assistance
Corrections Branch
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20531
202/724-7934

Donna Hunzeker
NCSL
301/830-2260

involuntary manslaughter had it been committed by an adult. He was sentenced to three years detention, the maximum penalty for involuntary manslaughter. On appeal, the Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit vacated the sentence, finding that had R.L.C. been an adult, the maximum sentence he could have received under the federal sentencing guidelines would have been 21 months. The Eighth Circuit said that in sentencing R.L.C. to a period of detention longer than that allowed under the guidelines, the trial court violated a federal statute providing that a juvenile may not be sentenced to a period of detention that exceeds "the maximum term of imprisonment that would be authorized if the juvenile had been tried and convicted as an adult." The U. S. Supreme Court affirmed.

Missing Children. The study of legal barriers to using schools, public service agencies and hospitals to locate missing children is one of several projects planned by the U. S. Department of Justice's Office of Juvenile and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) for its fiscal year 1992 programs to assist missing children and their families (*Federal Register*, March 18, 1992). The proposed priority programs include a variety of objectives, including using newspaper clippings to compile statistics on non-family child molestation cases; developing sentencing guidelines in parental abduction cases; and training public service workers and mental health professionals to work with families of missing children. The OJJDP will accept public comments on the priorities through May 18, 1992. The Missing and Exploited Children's Program was established by

the Congress in the 1984 Missing Children's Assistance Act as Title IV of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended. The OJJDP is responsible for administering the Missing and Exploited Children's Program. Other proposed new programs include conducting follow-up interviews with families of missing children to determine the lasting psychological effects of family and non-family abductions; studying the justice system's processing of child maltreatment cases; developing training to help law enforcement and mental health professionals assist families being reunited with their missing children; developing interviewing techniques for adolescent victims of sexual exploitation; developing a guide to victims' services and compensation for missing and exploited children and their families; a symposium on international child abductions; the development of training, technical, and product resources on the legal obstacles of returning parentally abducted children; developing a training video for investigating missing and exploited child cases; and funding for states' missing children clearinghouses. For more information, contact the Director, Missing and Exploited Children's Program, OJJDP, 633 Indiana Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20531; tel.: (202) 616-3631.

In California, A state assemblyman has introduced legislation that would make it a crime to recruit youths under the age of 18 for criminal street gangs by intimidation or coercion. The proposed bill is believed to be the first legislation in the nation to criminalize youth gang recruitment. Sacramento city officials have attributed the recent growth in the

number of gangs and gang members to successful recruitment. Sacramento Police Chief Jack Kearns, the prime sponsor of the bill, said forcing gang members to do their recruiting covertly would deter solicitation. Kearns estimated that the current number of gang members in Sacramento is 3,600, a significant increase over the 1,700 gang members in 1988. That year, a state task force on gangs and drugs found that children as young as nine-years-old were being recruited for street gangs, Kearns said. Bob Kilgore, director of the Sacramento County Probation Department, said the number of street gangs in the county has grown from approximately 35 in the 1980s to between 50 and 60 today.

California Gov. Pete Wilson on Feb. 28 signed legislation creating two military-style "boot camps" designed to deter nonviolent, youthful, first-time offenders from further criminal activity through strict discipline and hard work. The "Leadership, Esteem, Ability, and Discipline Program (LEAD)" camps would be alternatives to jails run by the California Youth Authority. The plan calls for establishing one camp in northern California and one in southern California that each will house no more than 60 youths over the age of 16. Wards at the experimental camps will be drilled in traditional military techniques, including marching, rigorous exercise, and strict room and dress inspections. Youths will be required to work 16 hours per day, six-and-one-half days per week, for four months. After release from the camps, wards will be enrolled in a six-month parole program that in-

cludes drug testing, electronic monitoring, and job placement. The program will end in mid-1997 unless it is extended by the California legislature.

In Rhode Island. Although violent juvenile crime has decreased in Rhode Island, overall juvenile criminal activity in the state has increased, according to a recent report of the Governor's Justice Commission. The report, entitled *Juveniles in Rhode Island: A Data Analysis and Statistical Study Concerning Key Information of Recent Years*, links increased levels of property crime among juveniles to increased numbers of juvenile drug abuse arrests, and attributes this relationship to juvenile substance abusers' need to steal or sell drugs to support their

drug addiction habits. In 1989, 9,261 juveniles were arrested, the second highest total of juvenile arrests since 1984, the report said. For that same year, violent juvenile crime arrests in the state decreased by 2.5 percent from 1988 totals and comprised 9.4 percent of all juvenile arrests, according to the report; property crimes made up the remaining 90.6 percent. Overall property crimes decreased 20-30 percent from 1987 to 1989. Despite a slight decrease in 1989, juvenile drug abuse arrests have remained at relatively constant levels in recent years. Juvenile arson arrests reached an all-time high of 101 in 1989, the report states, increasing nearly 100 percent over the annual average throughout the 1980s, the report said. Vandalism

and larceny arrests have remained at increased levels over recent years with larceny being the serious crime that Rhode Island juveniles commit most frequently. According to the report, juvenile recidivism rates progressively have increased since 1984, when 526 juveniles appeared twice before the court, compared to 611 in 1989. In 1984, 188 juveniles appeared three times before the court compared to 231 in 1989. The number of juveniles placed on probation has increased each year since 1984, reaching a high of 2,043 in fiscal year 1990. For more information or a copy of the report, contact the Governor's Justice Commission, Office of Substance Abuse, Statistical Analysis Center, 222 Quaker Lane, Warwick, RI 02886; tel.: (401) 277-2620.



National Criminal Justice Association
444 N. Capitol Street, N.W., Suite 618
Washington, D.C. 20001

First-Class Mail
U. S. Postage
PAID
Rockville, MD
Permit No. 4704


IE
Ms. Donna Hunzeker
Criminal Justice Program
State Legislatures
National Conference of State
Legislatures
1560 Broadway, Suite 700
Denver, CO 80202

Corrections COMPENDIUM

Volume XVI, No. 1

The National Journal for Corrections Professionals

January 1991



—Photo courtesy New York State, DOCS Today

Boot Camp Prisons Thrive

by Marjorie Marlette

THE LIFE IS RIGOROUS, the privileges few. But the rewards, for young non-violent first offenders, can be great: camp instead of prison; 90 to 180 days of concentrated effort instead of years in an in-

stitution; and a chance to detour from a future in crime.

Boot camp prisons in the United States are proliferating. Finding them acceptably

Continued on page 6

INSIDE

Legal Issues

by Richard Crane

Prison polygraphs permitted

—&—

More case reports

Page 2

Survey

Shock Incarceration

Charts

Numbers, Costs
Page 9

Program, Requirements

Page 11

New Study

U.S. Incarceration Rate Leads The World

Page 13

Inter Alia

News briefs

Page 14

Boot Camp Prisons Thrive

Continued from front page

tough and tax-dollar considerate, state legislatures and congress have established the military-like programs in 27 U. S. systems, a new survey by Corrections COMPENDIUM shows. Fourteen more are considering the option.

The programs come by many names: Special Alternative Incarceration Unit; Basic Training Program; IMPACT (Intensive Motivational Program of Alternative Correctional Treatment); RID (Regimented Inmate Discipline); Challenge Incarceration and others, as well as simply "Shock Incarceration" or "Boot Camp."

The regimen of boot camp, widely publicized by the media, is familiar: Days that start at 5—even 4—a.m. Drill and push-ups and obstacle courses. Insistent DIs (drill instructors) in constant persuasion. Harsh, summary discipline for minor infractions. Rigid dress code. Inspected living quarters that must be ship shape. Limited or no TV. Taps at 9 or 10 p.m.

But not all prison boot camps are alike. Though regimented and military inspired, they differ considerably in emphasis and the programs they offer. Almost all require some—and some many—hours of drug treatment, education and psychological counseling; others place the greatest emphasis on the heavy physical training and discipline.

One of the most crucial aspects of the programs—follow-up support in the community—also varies considerably from one system to another.

Since their start, close to 16,000 offenders have completed shock incarceration programs in the U.S.

with more than 12,000 graduating from boot camps, according to the COMPENDIUM survey.

Current programs can accommodate 4,782 inmates at a time, ranging from 20 in Wyoming to 1,500 in New York. Programs starting after Feb. 1, 1991, will add another 354 to 404 slots.

Shock camp programs are primarily designed for young, non-violent offenders, 17 to 26 years of age, who have never been incarcerated. Some allow older prisoners. And not all are limited to those committing non-violent offenses. Certain categories of prisoners,

Almost all require some—and some many—hours of drug treatment, education and psychological counseling; others place the greatest emphasis on the heavy physical training and discipline.

however—as child abusers, sex offenders, and murderers—are usually ineligible for these programs.

Drug offenders make up many of the training squads.

Eight states—Colorado, Kansas, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New York and South Carolina—include women in their programs, the COMPENDIUM survey shows. Other states and the Federal Bureau of Prisons provide programs only for men.

Courts assign defendants to the camps in 12 systems, corrections departments in 11, and both may in five. If direct from the courts,

the penalty is generally instead of a sentence to prison, with a sentence pending if training is not complete. From prison, boot camp completion shortens prison terms.

Almost all are used for offenders convicted of felony offenses carrying a sentence of one year or longer in prison.

Whether boot camps are successes depends on the definition of success. For most, it is too soon to know their long-term effect on preventing recidivism—surely the ultimate goal—but early studies indicate that they do provide as much or more deterrence in a short time as a longer time in prison does for similar offenders.

Idaho, however, with a shock program since 1974 (and some of the components of a boot camp since 1988), has had the longest—and a very positive—experience with shock incarceration.

"Without the program, we estimate our prison population would be more than double," said Deputy Warden Dean Allen at the North Idaho Correctional Institution, where the shock operation is located. (See box on page 8)

One state, Alabama, where participation in the program is mandated, reports that after two years, their recidivism rate is an astonishing 3.65 percent!

Texas, where the boot camp started two years ago, has had a success rate of 89 percent versus approximately 53 percent among regular prison parolees.

As for success in the program itself, for those who started the boot camps, the survey found completion rates ranging from 47.6 percent in Florida to 97 percent in Georgia.

The boot camps have other immediate pluses:

- The emphasis is on change. Almost all offer more counseling and education than the offenders would get in the general prison population.



—Photo courtesy New York State, DOCS Today

Inmates march sharply at Summit, New York Shock Camp.

- For young first time incarcerated, they are almost always safer than prison. There are no experienced cons to school them in crime or press them for sexual favors. There's more staff on hand, more activities, no idle time.

- The demanding exercise and regular meals improve health and stamina. The inmates learn what it's like to get up in the morning and be active all day.

- They also learn what it's like to be drug-free in an environment that demands a lot from them.

- And while the per diem cost is often the same or more than for time behind bars, the brevity of the program means less spent on the individual "recruit."

In a 25-month review of its program, the Florida Department of Corrections estimated a savings of 39,759 inmate days -- conservatively estimated at a cost savings of \$1.15 million. "The cost of Boot Camp represents perhaps its most successful aspect...the program is effectively reducing prison time," the DOC report said.

Of the 27 systems authorizing

Marjorie Marlette is editor of Corrections COMPENDIUM.

Corrections COMPENDIUM, January 1991

boot camps, eight are starting operation in 1991—Connecticut, Virginia, Wisconsin and the Federal Bureau of Prisons in January; Kansas and Nevada in

"The cost of Boot Camp represents perhaps its most successful aspect...the program is effectively reducing prison time."

February; Colorado in March and Pennsylvania later in the year. Ohio also hopes to start a camp this year.

Idaho's is the oldest shock incarceration program. Georgia's, begun in 1983, and Oklahoma's, 1984, are the oldest boot camps.

Other states with boot camps are Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Florida, Illinois, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas and Wyoming.

Iowa has a shock probation program in which the judge can remove certain inmates from prison within 90 days of confinement depending on how well they do in prison during that time. Ohio has a shock parole program.

Cost of the programs range from \$21 per diem in Alabama (compared to \$27 in regular prison), to \$67.79 in Connecticut (compared to \$56.91 in prison). Some departments gave the same costs for boot camp and prison, and many had no figures available.

Offenders participate in the camps voluntarily in 20 systems; are mandated in seven. In 15 systems, the programs are located in a separate camp or facility, while 10 systems house them in a prison. Three systems do both.

Reasons given for inmates not finishing the training include poor attitude and behavior adjustment, lack of self-discipline and motivation, and disciplinary problems. They may also be medically disqualified, or new detainees may make them ineligible.

Problems facing the individual programs include difficulties with inadequate or no funding; pressure to keep beds full that does not allow good group intake; not enough beds for the program, and lack of follow-up supervision.

One state reported a problem with corrections dislike of the program, and another said staff selection was difficult because of the need to assign only those individuals who had demonstrated leadership qualities and received favorable psychological testing.

For some, media access had to be limited for a time in order not to disrupt the program, but mostly, the interest of the press was considered a benefit.

New York, with the largest number of boot camp programs, has recently started an intensive "shock parole" program to continue support services for the graduates when they return to the streets. Two parole officers work as a team to supervise 30 parolees. In other systems, post-release supervision may be through regular or intensive probation or parole.

Much has been written about boot camps, in the scholarly as

Idaho's shock incarceration program impacts number in prison

Shock incarceration got an early start in Idaho. Authorized by the State Legislature in 1970 and implemented in 1974, the North Idaho Correctional Institution (NICI) started its short-term treatment program for offenders a decade before other states pioneered the boot camp form of shock imprisonment.

Idaho's program, modified to add boot camp drills two years ago, now has 16 years of operational experience and, says Deputy Warden Dean Allen, "we think we're having a major impact."

He estimates that the state's prison population "would be more than double" without the program.

NICI is located on an old military air force base in the rolling hills of northern Idaho. Judges send felony offenders there for evaluation and risk assessment, but retain jurisdiction for up to six months.

To be eligible, the offenders must be tried as an adult, but the age otherwise is open. The youngest has been 15, the oldest 82. Males

convicted of all felonies except Murder I are eligible, but those with previous prison time are not recommended. The length of sentence must be a minimum of 1 year.

The program lasts four months, with an additional 60 days optional.

Of those who participate, about 82 percent are then released on probation, with the other 18 percent retained in prison, Allen said.

Of those released, about 17 or 18 percent come back—11 percent on technical violations, 6 percent on new crimes.

If offenders complete both the NICI program and probation successfully, the original charges against them can be reduced to misdemeanors.

Traditionally, the courts have sent up to 50 or 51 percent of those sentenced to prison through the program. Now, 63.3 percent are coming through it, Allen said.

NICI costs less than other facilities—about \$15 to \$20 a day com-

pared to \$24 elsewhere—and "the cost savings are showing," he said.

The program ordinarily can handle 160 at one time, but has been averaging 220 the past year, Allen said. "For the short duration, people can put up with some inconveniences, can crowd a little," he noted.

By March of 1990 more than 5,000 inmates had gone through the program.

Participation is voluntary, and includes drug/alcohol treatment, literacy and GED classes, and personal counseling, with the overall emphasis on self-esteem issues.

Allen, who worked at the state's penitentiary before coming to the North Idaho institution, finds the shock approach exciting.

"Here," he said, "change not only is expected, it's demanded. It's a whole different emphasis and atmosphere than most prison settings." □

well as the popular press. Not everyone is enthusiastic about the new sanction.

Among those who urge caution in developing the programs, the concern most often heard is that they will "widen the net" to confine people who would otherwise be placed on regular probation, not just those heading for prison. (Some criminal justice officials view this as a positive, however.)

In the NIJ Reports for November/December, 1990, Doris Layton MacKenzie also notes another question raised by research as "whether the boot camp atmosphere enhances the effect of

treatment or whether an intensive treatment program alone would have the same effect."

(Dr. MacKenzie, an associate professor at the University of Maryland, is a visiting senior research associate of the National Institute of Justice (NIJ).)

Other concerns have been raised elsewhere:

- Do boot camps have a potential for deterioration of standards and abuse of offenders?
- Do they discriminate if programs are not offered for the physically handicapped offender? In those states without programs for women?

■ Could discipline without sufficient due process lead to liability questions?

The National Institute of Justice (NIJ), is planning to do a multi-site study of Shock Incarceration to be released late in 1991.

In earlier research, NIJ's intensive study of the Louisiana shock incarceration program found that shock incarceration programs by themselves may not significantly affect offender behavior or reduce recidivism. Treatment, education, and rehabilitation programs are also needed and may strengthen program impact, the study said.

Continued on page 10



SHOCK INCARCERATION PART I - NUMBERS, COSTS

SYSTEM	HAS SHOCK OR BOOT CAMP PROGRAM	LENGTH OF PROGRAM	WHEN STARTED OR WILL START	FOR MALES, FEMALES, BOTH	HOW MANY CAN PROGRAM HANDLE?	NUMBER WHO HAVE COMPLETED PROGRAM	SUCCESS RATE	PER DIEM COST FOR EACH PARTICIPANT OF	
								SHOCK PROGRAM	PRISON, IF SENT THERE INSTEAD
ALABAMA	Yes	3 mos. with extensions up to 180 days	4/7/88	Males	128	547	83%	\$21.00	\$29.00
ALASKA	No program								
ARIZONA	Yes	4 mos.	10/88	Males	150	281	86%	Unknown	
ARKANSAS	Yes	105 days	4/80	Males	60	16		Unknown	\$25.00
CALIFORNIA	No program, Los Angeles County Jail System developed plans for opening a boot camp program.								
COLORADO	Yes	3 mos.	3/91	Both	100				\$43.84
CONNECTICUT	Yes	6 mos.	1/81	Males	100			\$67.79	\$56.91
DELAWARE	No program, but interested in starting one								
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	No program, but interested in starting one								
FLORIDA	Yes	3 mos.	10/87	Males	100	429	47.6%		
GEORGIA	Yes	3 mos.	11/83	Males	250	4,180	97%	\$39.82 (average daily costs for all prisons in FY 89)	
HAWAII	No program								
IDAHO	Yes	4 mos. with option of additional 60 days	1970, authorized 1974 started	Males	160	3,745	80%	\$25.51	
ILLINOIS	Yes	4 mos.	10/15/91	Both	200	9	77.7%	Unknown	Unknown
INDIANA	No program, but interested in starting one								
IOWA	Has shock probation where the judge can remove certain inmates from prison within 90 days of confinement, depending on how well the inmate does in prison								
KANSAS	Yes	6 mos.	2/91	Both	104			\$36.88 (approx.)	
KENTUCKY	No program, but interested in starting one								
LOUISIANA	Yes	90-180 days	2/87	Both	120	470	56.9%	A little less than prison	\$24.71
MAINE	No program								
MARYLAND	Yes	6 mos.	8/6/90	Males, female program to start within 2 yrs.	288	N/A	N/A	Unknown	\$45.21
MASSACHUSETTS	No program, but under consideration at the county level.								
MICHIGAN	Yes	3 mos.	3/88	Males	120	754	59%	\$55.00	\$55.00
MINNESOTA	No program								
MISSISSIPPI	Yes	90-120 days	4/85	Both	262	1,736	91%		
MISSOURI	No program, program has been authorized but not funded or initiated.								
MONTANA	No program, but may be interested in starting one								
NEBRASKA	No program, but interested in starting one								
NEVADA	Yes		2/91	Males					
NEW HAMPSHIRE	Yes	120 days	3/5/90	Both	96	13		\$48.77	\$48.77
NEW JERSEY	No program, in early discussion stages								
NEW MEXICO	No program, likely to start 12/91								
NEW YORK	Yes (5 facilities)	6 mos.	9/87	Both	1,350 males 150 females	1,158 (as of 11/89)	68%	\$41.56-\$77.26	
NORTH CAROLINA	Yes	90-120 days	10/30/89	Males	90	158	60%		
NORTH DAKOTA	No program								
OHIO	Yes	3 mos.	Shock parole, 1983; hope to start boot camp 1991	Males	100 (projected)				\$30.96

SYSTEM	HAS SHOCK OR BOOT CAMP PROGRAM	LENGTH OF PROGRAM	WHEN STARTED OR WILL START	FOR MALES, FEMALES, BOTH	HOW MANY CAN PROGRAM HANDLE?	NUMBER WHO HAVE COMPLETED PROGRAM	SUCCESS RATE	PER DIEM COST FOR EACH PARTICIPANT OF	
								SHOCK PROGRAM	PRISON, IF SENT THERE INSTEAD
OKLAHOMA	Yes	3 mos.	1984	Males	150	Unknown	Unknown	\$64.28	\$48.79
OREGON	No program								
PENNSYLVANIA	Yes	6 mos.	1991	Males	150-200				
RHODE ISLAND	No program, but interested in starting one								
SOUTH CAROLINA	Yes	90 days	6/25/86, shock probation; 6/25/90, changed to shock incarceration; 1/81, 2nd unit started	Both	192 males, 24 females	984 males, 107 females	93% males, 83% females		
SOUTH DAKOTA	No program, currently being reviewed by legislatively established Corrections Commission								
TENNESSEE	Yes	3 mos.	12/89	Males	120	75	74%		
TEXAS	Yes	Up to 3 mos.	1/89	Males	400	1,010	89.2%	\$43.40	\$42.15
UTAH	No program, but under consideration								
VERMONT	No program								
VIRGINIA	Yes (probation)	3 mos. (followed by supervised probation)	1/91	Males	100				
WASHINGTON	No program								
WEST VIRGINIA	No program, but under consideration								
WISCONSIN	Yes	6 mos.	1/1/91	Males	60	N/A	N/A	Unknown	
WYOMING	Yes	3 mos.	2/90	Males	20	36	90%	\$41.00	\$41.00
FEDERAL BUREAU OF PRISONS	Yes	6 mos. (intensive) 1-5 mos. (community)	1/91	Males	192				

CANADIAN SYSTEMS - no shock incarceration programs reported

Boot Camp Prisons Thrive

Continued from page 8

The Corrections COMPENDIUM survey found that 26 of the boot camps include or will include drug/alcohol treatment programs, 24 offer counseling, and 23 education. All 27 also have work programs. Emphasis on the programs may vary, but once assigned, participation is mandatory.

In New York, while the recidivism rate is nearly the same for shock graduates and a comparable group released from prison, the reasons for return are different. Shock inmates come back more often for technical violations, less for crimes than those released from prison.

Also, the academic programs are

showing good results. With education classes mandatory, math and reading levels are being raised and many are passing GED (high school equivalency) exams, the New York DOC reported.

In interviews and letters to staff, some former trainees recall graduation as the high point of their lives.

They found pride and new friends in the program, they said. Though more counseling and vocational education would be a good idea, they considered boot camp a very positive experience.

Not many "graduates" would say that about their stint in traditional prison.



SHOCK INCARCERATION PART II - PROGRAM, REQUIREMENTS

SYSTEM	PARTICIPANT ASSIGNED TO PROGRAM BY		ASSIGNMENT MADE		PARTICIPATION VOLUNTARY?	PROGRAM LOCATED IN		PROGRAM INCLUDES				REQUIREMENTS FOR PARTICIPATION
	COURTS	DEPARTMENT	AS ALTERNATIVE TO PRISON	FROM PRISON		REGULAR PRISON	SEPARATE CAMP OR FACILITY	DRUG/ALCOHOL TREATMENT	EDUCATION	COUNSELING/THERAPY	WORK	
ALABAMA	X		X		No	X		X		X	X	No age limits, 1st degree crimes and enticing a child for immoral purposes are exempted, sentence of 15 yrs. or less, class 1 physical condition, and ability to follow directions
ARIZONA	X		X		Yes	X		X	X	X	X	18-25 yrs. of age, Class 2-6 non-violent offenses, specific requirements for physical and mental conditions
ARKANSAS		X		X	Yes	X		X	X	X	X	No age requirements, non-violent crimes, sentence of 10 yrs. or less, 1st time offender, physical and mental health condition must be approved
COLORADO		X		X	Yes	X	X	X	X	X	X	18-25 yrs. of age, not serving and have not served time for a violent offense, free of physical and mental defects
CONNECTICUT	X	X (oversight responsibility)	X		Yes		X	X	X	X	X	16-21 yrs. of age, non-violent, no class "A" felonies, sentenced to 1-3 yrs. (approx.), no prior sentenced or incarceration, physical and mental health must be approved
FLORIDA		X		X	Yes	X		X		X	X	24 yrs. and under in age, non-violent, no sex crimes, sentences 10 yrs. or less, 1st offense, no serious medical or mental health problems
GEORGIA	X		X		Yes	X					X	17-25 yrs. of age, no misdemeanors, sentenced to at least 1 yr., good physical and mental condition
IDAHO	X		X		Yes		X	X	X	X	X	Must be tried as an adult, felonies except murder I, sentenced to a min. of 1 yr., no prior prison time, ambulatory physical condition and not currently psychotic
ILLINOIS	X		X		Yes		X	X	X	X	X	17-29 yrs. of age, light-weight offenses including drug, robbery, theft, burglary, sentenced to 5 yrs. or less, 1st offense, good physical and mental condition
IOWA	Has shock probation where the judge can remove certain inmates from prison within 90 days of confinement depending on how well the inmate does in prison											
KANSAS	X	X	X	X	Yes		X	X	X	X	X	18-25 yrs. of age, primarily property and drug offenses, generally no prior incarcerations, must be physically and mentally capable to participate
LOUISIANA	X (recommendation)	X (final determination)	X		Yes	X		Education and awareness	X	X	X	30 yrs. of age or younger, 1st and 2nd offenders sentenced to 7 yrs. or less, parole eligible, good physical and mental health
MARYLAND		X		X	Yes		X	X	X	X	X	Under 26 yrs. of age, non-violent crimes, sentenced to 5 yrs. or less, first adult incarceration, good physical and mental condition
MICHIGAN	X		X		Yes		X	X	X	X	X	17-25 yrs. of age, excluding rape, murder, armed robbery and arson crimes, no limit on number of offenses, capable of completing the program

SHOCK INCARCERATION PART II - PROGRAM, REQUIREMENTS

SYSTEM	PARTICIPANT ASSIGNED TO PROGRAM BY		ASSIGNMENT MADE		PARTICIPATION VOLUNTARY?	PROGRAM LOCATED IN		PROGRAM INCLUDES			REQUIREMENTS FOR PARTICIPATION	
	COURTS	DEPARTMENT	AS ALTERNATIVE TO PRISON	FROM PRISON		REGULAR PRISON	SEPARATE CAMP OR FACILITY	DRUG/ALCOHOL TREATMENT	EDUCATION	COUNSELING/THERAPY		WORK
MISSISSIPPI	X		X		No, sentence imposed by court, inmate must sign agreement to participate		X	X	X	X	X	No prior adult felony confinement, white collar, property, drug and crimes of aggression that do not involve a deadly weapon and result in a life sentence, 5.2 yrs. average length of sentence, 1 1/4 average per cumulative total offenses, cannot be retarded or have a severe mental disorder
NEVADA	X		X		No		X	X	X		X	Minimum of 18 yrs., non-violent, no prior offenses
NEW HAMPSHIRE	X	X (final approval)	X	X	Yes	X		X		X	X	18-30 yrs. of age, not incarcerated for prior offenses, no crimes of violence and/or assault, must pass complete physical exam
NEW YORK		X		X	Yes		X	X	X	X	X	16-29 yrs. of age, non-violent crimes, time to parole 36 mos. or less, 1st incarceration, good physical and mental health
NORTH CAROLINA		X		X	Yes		X	X	X	X	X	17-25 yrs. of age, sentenced up to 10 yrs., good physical and mental health
OHIO	X (to shock parole)	X (to boot camp)		X	Yes	X		X	X	X	X	18-25 yrs. of age, 3rd and 4th degree crimes, only 1 offense with prison time, good physical condition, normal mental condition
OKLAHOMA		X	X		No	X		X	X		X	18-24 yrs. of age, non-violent crimes, no prior incarcerations, physically and mentally able
PENNSYLVANIA	X		X		No			X	X	X	X	18-35 yrs. of age, 1 time offense, non-violent or substance abuse crimes
SOUTH CAROLINA	X	X	X	X	Yes	X		Education	X	X	X	Less than 26 yrs. of age, non-violent offenses, sentenced not to exceed 8 yrs., must be physically able to participate
TENNESSEE		X		X	No		X	X	X	X	X	30 yrs. of age or less, non-violent crimes, sentence of 6 yrs. (longer for most drug offenders), no prior incarcerations, no disabling disabilities, no major health problems, must understand/comprehend basic instructions, no serious mental problems
TEXAS	X		X		No		X	X	Life skills	X	X	17-25 yrs. of age, sentence of less than 10 yrs., no prior offenses, no physical or mental conditions which would preclude strenuous exercise
VIRGINIA	X (referrals)				Yes		X	X	X	X	X	18-24 yrs. of age at time of the crime, non-violent felonies, 1st adult offense, no pending charges of conflicting offenses
WISCONSIN		X		X	Yes		X	X	X	X	X	24 yrs. of age, physically and mentally fit
WYOMING		X		X	Yes		X	X	X	X	X	19-25 yrs. of age, 1st incarceration
FEDERAL BUREAU OF PRISONS	X (recommended)		X		Yes		X	X	X	X	X	Adults, willing to participate, qualify for min. status

CANADIAN SYSTEMS - no shock incarceration programs reported

100-10

1991 Shock Incarceration Survey

Doris L. MacKenzie and Claire Souryal

NIJ Grant 87-IJ-CX-0020

1991 Shock Incarceration Survey + article "Boot Camp Prisons..."

TABLE 2. CHARACTERISTICS OF SHOCK INCARCERATION PROGRAMS, 1991

State	Hours/Day devoted to:					Drug Treatment or Drug Education (Hours/Week)	Release Supervision
	PT	Work	V.Ed.	Rehab.	Ed.		
BOB	2	7	.5	2	1.5	Combination (4.5)	Phased
Alabama	--	--	--	--	--	Treatment (15-21)	Intensive
Arkansas	3	4	0	2.5	1.5	Combination (12.5)	Moderate
Arizona	4	5	0	1.3 ^a	1.3 ^a	Education (3.3)	Intensive
Florida	4	4	0	1.3	0	Combination (1.3)	Moderate
Georgia	2	8	0	0	3	Education (5)	Varies
Idaho	1	*	*	*	*	Combination (--)	Varies
Illinois	5.5	5.5	1	1	1	Combination (7.5) ^b	Varies
Kansas	2	6	0	1	1	Education (5)	Varies
Louisiana	3	3.5	0	2	1.5	Education (5) ^c	Intensive
Maryland	2	8	0	2	2	Combination (215) ^d	Intensive
Michigan	2	6	0	2	1	Education (3)	Intensive
Mississippi	**	**	**	**	**	Combination (15-25)	Varies
Nevada	1.5	6 - 8	0	***		Combination (--)	Varies
New Hampshire	2	7	2	2.5	2.5	Combination (4)	Intensive
New York	3	6	0	5-6	11 ^e	Treatment (18.5) ^f	Intensive
North Carolina	1	10	0	3	3	Combination (7)	Varies
Oklahoma	1.5	4	4 ^g	2	4	Combination (76) ^d	Varies
South Carolina	1 ^h	7.5 ⁱ	0	****	4 ⁱ	Education (4) ^j	Varies
Tennessee	6	4.5	0	4	4 ^e	Combination (7)	Varies
Texas	1	7	0	2	1	Combination (8) ^b	Varies
Virginia	1-2	6	*****	****	3	Education (5)	Intensive
Wisconsin	2	7	0	2.5-3	2.5-3	Treatment (18.5-20) ^k	Intensive
Wyoming	4	3	0	3	0	Combination (21)	Varies

a = number of hours/day three times per week

b = may additionally include individual counseling on an "as needed" basis

c = 3 hours of total of 5 are not "specifically related to substance abuse"

d = total hours spent in drug treatment/education during the entire program

e = total hours per week devoted to activity

f = does not include 9-12 hours per week of therapeutic community activities

g = 8 hours/day for total of 2 weeks

h = 1 hour per day five days a week not including 2 hours/day on Saturday and Sunday

i = number of hours/day five times per week

j = 4 hours per week for total of 4 weeks/ individual psychotherapy or drug counseling offered on "as needed" basis

k = varies according to phase of the program

* = based on individual needs assessment

** = varies depending on individual needs and length of time in program

*** = rehabilitation and education combined for 2 hours/day

PT = physical training

V.Ed. = Vocational Education

Rehab. = Rehabilitation

Ed. = Education

Source: Doris L. MacKenzie & Claire Souryal
1991 Shock Incarceration Survey
NIJ Grant 87-IJ-CX-0020

**** = offered on "as needed" basis

***** = vocational education marked "tentative"

-- = No response (this section)

Boot Camp Prisons: Components, Evaluations, and Empirical Issues*

BY DORIS LAYTON MACKENZIE

Visiting Scientist, National Institute of Justice, Washington, DC

Military-style boot camps, with their rigorous regimes and austere conditions, bring a sense of order and discipline to the lives of youthful, non-violent first-time offenders, and perhaps serve as a deterrent against future crimes. . . These are the sorts of alternative sanctions that the criminal justice system must explore if it is successfully going to deter and contain drug use.

*—National Drug Control Strategy
The White House, September 1989*

IN THE past few years "boot camp" prisons, otherwise called shock incarceration programs, have proliferated throughout the nation. At the end of 1989 there were at least 21 "boot camp" prisons in 14 state correctional systems. Another 13 states were in the process of or considering developing such programs. Thus, within the next few years, over 50 percent of the state correctional jurisdictions may have boot camp prisons for adult offenders. This does not take into account the additional programs that are being considered in city and county jurisdictions or those being developed for juveniles.

Not only does it look like the number of programs will be quickly growing, but also there is interest in enlarging the purposes of these programs. There have been hearings in the U.S. House and Senate on the topic of boot camp prisons, and in the National Drug Control Strategy the President recommended that the viability of boot camps as an alternative sanction for drug offenders be examined.

Why have these programs attracted this kind of attention? Some have said that their popularity is magnified because they are "media" attractive. Drill instructors yelling in the face of offenders makes for good TV. There are other reasons given for the popularity of these programs: The offenders are receiving their "just deserts." Such programs show the public that the politicians are being tough on crime. Offenders spend only a short time in prisons, thus the programs repre-

sent a cost savings. Furthermore, according to some, such treatment addresses the major problems of young offenders—a lack of discipline and no respect for authority. The programs are rehabilitative according to some, while others argue that the programs act as a deterrent. Obviously people expect different things from the programs.

There are enthusiastic advocates of the programs and, conversely, there are equally enthusiastic opponents (Morash & Rucker, 1990; Sechrest, 1989). Some say the programs have the potential for being rehabilitative (MacKenzie, et al., 1989) others reject this possibility (Morash & Rucker, 1990). We see two factors influencing opinions about the program: (1) knowledge and (2) philosophy. Advocates and opponents frequently have a lack of knowledge about the specific components of the programs and current evaluation efforts.

Second, some issues discussed are empirical while others are philosophical. Frequently the two are not separated in debates about the shock programs (see, for instance, Morash & Rucker, 1990). Would offenders rather spend time in a shock program or in a regular prison? Are shock programs cost effective? Do shock programs widen the net? Is there a sufficient number of appropriate candidates for shock who are now incarcerated? These are examples of questions that can and should be examined with empirical research. Other criticisms are philosophical, such as whether shock programs fulfill the "real" purpose of corrections. We can discuss the purpose of corrections, but it cannot be empirically examined. Such questions cannot be addressed through research.

This article is written to describe shock incarceration programs and current evaluation efforts. An attempt is made to identify the questions that can be studied empirically and to describe the results of some preliminary research examining shock programs.

Survey of States

To learn more about shock incarceration programs, we surveyed all 50 state departments of corrections. Programs were considered to be shock incarceration only if they:

- (1) were considered an alternative to a longer

*The investigation reported in this article was supported in part by Grant #88-DD-CX-0026 from the National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice, to the Louisiana State University. The author wishes to thank all of those who have worked on the multi-site study. Opinions expressed in this article are those of the author and not necessarily those of the U.S. Department of Justice. Requests for copies should be sent to the author at the National Institute of Justice, 633 Indiana Ave, N.W., Washington, DC 20531.

- term in prison;
- (2) had a boot camp atmosphere, with strict rules and discipline;
 - (3) required offenders to participate in military drills and physical training; and,
 - (4) separated offenders in the program from other prison inmates.

Thus they were distinguished from earlier shock probation, shock parole, and split-sentence programs that did not necessarily incorporate all four of these components.

In January 1990, 14 states had one or more shock incarceration programs: Alabama, Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas. Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Indiana, Kansas, Maryland, Missouri, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, and Wyoming were either considering initiating programs or were developing programs.¹⁷

The second part of the survey was designed to elicit information about shock programs currently operating (MacKenzie & Ballow, 1989). Most of the 14 states reported that the programs were designed for young, nonviolent offenders. Most also said the majority of the participants in their programs were convicted of nonviolent crimes and were serving time on their first felony conviction. Only Michigan said participants in its program were not mostly nonviolent offenders, and Alabama, Idaho, Louisiana, and Michigan shock participants were not necessarily convicted of their first felony. As shown in table 1, the shock programs differ substantially in many other components. In particular they differ in who is responsible for placing offenders in the program, voluntary entry or dropout, location of the program, and release supervision. Ten programs were for males only, three programs included males and females (Louisiana, Mississippi, New York), and one state had separate male and female programs (South Carolina).

Programs also differ greatly in the number of hours devoted to physical training, work, education, or counseling. Programs were classified by us as high or low rehabilitation emphasis based on the proportion of each day that was spent in rehabilitation-type activities (including such activities as counseling, any type of treatment, education, and vocational training activities) versus time spent working. Here, we are distinguishing

rehabilitation activities from work and from physical training and drill.

In three state programs (Alabama, Arizona, and Mississippi) shock participants spend an amount of time in rehabilitation activities equal to or greater than the amount of time they spend working. For example, Louisiana offenders spend approximately 4.5 hours in rehabilitation activities, 4 hours working, and 4.5 hours in physical training or drill.

In the "low" rehabilitation programs the participants spend one-half to one-quarter less time in rehabilitation (e.g., in Michigan offenders spend approximately 6 hours per day working, 2.5 hours in rehabilitation activities, and 1.5 hours in physical training and drill). In comparison to offenders in other programs, Georgia participants, who receive less than ½ hour per day of rehabilitation, spend the least amount of time in rehabilitation activities. In Florida, also considered by us to be a low rehabilitation program, offenders spend 1½ hours a day in group counseling. Thus, with the possible exception of Georgia, offenders in all the shock programs spend a fairly large amount of time in rehabilitation-type activities, at least in comparison to offenders serving time in a regular prison.

Overall, the picture that arises in regard to these programs is a common core based on the military atmosphere, discipline, youthful offenders, and an alternative to long-term incarceration, but here the commonality ends. The differences that do exist in programs might be expected to contribute to differences in self-selection effects, net widening, costs, deterrence, or rehabilitation of the offenders.

Multi-Site Study

The shock incarceration programs differ dramatically. Therefore, results of an evaluation based on one shock incarceration program would not necessarily generalize to other programs. For this reason we initiated a multi-site study of shock incarceration programs. The major questions of this research are: (1) Is shock incarceration successful in fulfilling its goals, and (2) What particular components of shock programs lead to success or failure in fulfilling program goals? Evaluating programs in different states permits us to generalize findings from a program in one location to other locations which vary in numerous characteristics. Studying various programs will permit an answer to the second question by enabling the researchers to begin to identify the components of the shock programs which lead to

TABLE 1. CHARACTERISTICS OF SHOCK INCARCERATION PROGRAMS, JANUARY 1990

State	Year Program Began	Number of Programs	Number of Participants	Average Number of Days Served	Placement Authority	Voluntary Entry	Voluntary Dropout	Located in Larger Prison	Release Supervision
Alabama	1988	1	127	90	Judge	no	yes	yes	regular
Arizona	1988	1	150	120	Judge	yes	no	yes	varies
Florida	1987	1	100	90	Judge	no	no	yes	moderate
Georgia	1983	2	250	90	Judge	yes	no	yes	varies
Idaho	1989	1	154	120	Judge	no	yes	no	varies
Louisiana	1987	1	88	120	Corrections Dept./Judge	yes	yes	yes	intensive
Michigan	1988	1	120	120	Judge	yes	no	no	intensive
Mississippi	1986	2	240	110	Judge	no	yes	yes	regular
New York	1987	5	1802	180	Corrections Dept.	yes	yes	no	intensive
North Carolina	1989	1	54	93	Parole Commission	yes	yes	no	varies
Oklahoma	1984	1	150	90	Corrections Dept.	no	no	yes	varies
South Carolina	1987	2	111	90	Judge	yes	yes	yes	varies
Tennessee	1989	1	42	120	Corrections Dept.	yes	no	no	varies
Texas	1989	1	200 (capacity)	90	Corrections	no	no Dept./Judge	no	varies

FEDERAL PROBATION

September 1990

specific outcomes.

Site Selection

Seven states were asked to participate in the multi-site study: Georgia (GA), New York (NY), Oklahoma (OK), Florida (FL), Texas (TX), Louisiana (LA), and South Carolina (SC).³ The shock programs in all of these states were similar in the characteristics used to define programs as shock incarceration (see above). Programs selected to participate were similar in two other aspects: (1) the characteristics of offenders admitted to the program (most offenders were youthful, convicted of non-violent offenses, serving time on a first felony conviction), and (2) the length of the program (3 to 6 months). Since most shock programs were similar in boot camp atmosphere, offender characteristics, and program length, the selection of programs similar in these aspects was expected to maximize the generalizability of the results.

However, the shock programs participating in the multi-site evaluation varied in:

- Selection Decisions
- Community Supervision upon Release
- Program Characteristics
- Program Location

These characteristics were identified as factors that might have a major influence on the attainment of the goals of shock incarceration programs as identified by Parent (1989) in the recent National Institute of Justice Issues and Practices report. Sites were specifically selected to vary on these characteristics and they varied as shown in table 2.

Two of the states participating in the evaluation, Texas and New York, are developing programs specifically designed to target drug offenders. The Bureau of Justice Assistance, U.S. Department of Justice, is sponsoring these as innovative programs for drug offenders to begin examining whether such programs are effective methods of handling drug offenders.

For each of the four characteristics on which sites varied (see above) specific hypotheses were developed regarding program effects. Each of these is described below.

Selection Decisions. One might hypothesize that the placement authority might have a major impact on whether the program results in "net widening." Widening the net occurs, at times, when judges have a choice of placing offenders in

a program, such as shock incarceration, that is intermediate between probation and prison. If offenders who might normally be given a sentence of probation are sent to the program, more offenders serve time in prison, hence the "net" of prison is widened. In such a case the prison population will not be reduced because offenders sent to the program are drawn from the pool of probationers rather than from the prison bound offenders.

TABLE 2. CHARACTERISTICS OF SHOCK INCARCERATION PROGRAMS PARTICIPATING IN MULTI-SITE STUDY SHOWING DIFFERENCES AMONG PROGRAMS IN THE SEVEN STATES

• Entry Decisions	
Judge:	SC, GA
DOC:	OK, NY
Other:	LA, FL, TX
• Release Supervision	
Intensive:	LA, NY
Moderate or Mixed:	SC, OK, FL, GA, TX
• Rehabilitation Focus	
High:	LA, OK, NY
Low:	SC, FL, GA, TX
• Voluntary Entry	
Yes:	SC, LA, NY, GA
No:	OK, FL, TX
• Voluntary Drop Out	
Yes:	LA, SC, NY
No:	OK, FL, TX, GA
• Located in Larger Prison	
Yes:	LA, SC, OK, FL, GA, TX
No:	NY

If the department of corrections makes the placement decision rather than the judge, net widening would not be expected to be as apt to occur because in this case the participants would be chosen from the group of offenders who are already prison bound.

Whether net widening is a problem depends upon the goals of the program. If the shock incarceration program was developed to give judges a wider range of sentencing options, then net widening would not be considered a problem. The judge may want to sentence offenders to an option that is intermediate between probation and prison. On the other hand, if prison crowding is a problem and the program was developed to reduce the prison population, then net widening, by sending more offenders to prison, presents a problem.

Net widening is used here as an example to demonstrate how components of a program may

influence the effects of the program. Differences in the effect of the shock programs could be expected in other areas, based on the specific characteristics of a program (e.g., number of drop-outs, drug treatment, education or work).

Program Characteristics. Shock programs vary in whether or not there is a strong emphasis on treatment such as education, counseling, or vocational training during the time the offenders are incarcerated. If one of the goals of the programs is to change offenders, interest focuses on the importance of treatment as a component of shock programs (MacKenzie, et al., 1989). Three sites participating in the multi-site study, New York, Louisiana, and Oklahoma, require offenders to spend a large portion of each day in treatment activities (see table 2). Offenders in the other four sites spend much less time in treatment-type activities.

A second factor which may be potentially rehabilitative or have a major influence on program success is the voluntary nature of participation. Programs vary in whether offenders must initially volunteer to participate and in whether offenders can drop out once they enter the program. As shown in table 2, in three programs offenders can drop out at any time during the program, while in the other four programs the offender cannot voluntarily drop out. It is hypothesized that the offenders' ability to choose to participate or to remain in the program may influence how they behave upon release. A high drop out rate may also indicate the rigor of the program. An offender who completes a tough program may have a real sense of accomplishment in comparison to an offender who completes a relatively easy program.

Release Supervision. It has been proposed that even if the shock programs change offenders in a positive manner this change may not persist after the period of incarceration. Offenders spend only a short period of time in the programs and then are returned to their home environments. The problems and difficulties of drugs, criminal companions, lack of support groups, unemployment, etc., remain the same.

Programs such as those in Louisiana and New York, that involve a period of intensive supervision after incarceration, may be more successful in helping offenders make the transition from shock incarceration to the community. The New York Division of Parole has identified aftercare as important for shock parolees and is incorporating an intensive 6-month period of supervision and programming for shock releasees. Employment with pay, substance abuse counseling, offender support

group meetings, and urine testing are some of the components of the aftercare program.

Program Location. Another concern with shock programs has been with the staff members—their attitudes toward the work and their treatment of offenders. It was hypothesized that the location of the program might have a major impact on these factors. If a program is located within a larger facility, staff members can be transferred into or out of the programs depending upon their interest and ability. Those that burn out can be fairly easily transferred to another area of the prison. This is not as easily done when the program is located in a separate facility. In such situations staff training and selection may become important factors influencing staff and offender interactions.

Design of the Study

The participants in the multi-site study have had two conferences to plan and coordinate their research activities. At the first conference representatives from each participating state described the shock program and their evaluation efforts to date. The research for the multi-site study was planned, and it was decided to examine the programs in three areas: (1) a qualitative and descriptive analysis; (2) offender change and comparisons and, (3) system changes (including costs and benefits). The final products of the work will be written reports for each state describing the results of the evaluation and a report comparing the results among the states.

During the first conference the qualitative and descriptive analysis was planned, and the state evaluators returned to their home state to complete this portion of the study. Intensive interviews were conducted with staff, offenders serving various sentences, and, where appropriate, judges. Statistical data were collected from department records to describe the shock programs and their participants. This information was used to identify the goals of each program and the important issues related to the program and its development.

Goals of Programs

Shown in table 3 are the goals of the seven shock incarceration programs as identified from interviews and department written material. The goals can be classified into four major areas:

- System Level
- Individual Level
- Public Relations

• Prison Control/Management

TABLE 3. GOALS OF THE SEVEN SHOCK INCARCERATION PROGRAMS PARTICIPATING IN THE MULTI-SITE STUDY

System Level Goals

Reduce Crowding
 Alternative to Long-term Incarceration
 Less Cost
 Model for County Programs

Individual Level Goals

Change Offenders: Less Negative Behavior
 Less Criminal Activity

Change Offenders: More Positive Attitudes/Behavior
 Improve Confidence/Responsibility
 Discipline
 Motivation
 Positive Social Values
 Positive Social Behavior (e.g., Work Ethic)
 Reduce Drug Use
 Accountability
 Respect for Authority

Public Relations

Improve Image of Corrections
 Politically Acceptable Alternative
 Public Safety

Prison Control/Management

Clean, Healthy, Secure Environment
 Environment Promoting Rehabilitation
 Positive Offender/Staff Contact
 Offender Accountability

The most consistency in the goals across the seven states was in three system level changes: (1) a reduction in prison crowding; (2) an alternative to long-term incarceration; and (3) cost savings. Only Texas reported a system level goal of having a model program for the counties that were developing programs.

The majority of the states also reported individual level goals. For most, this meant a reduction in criminal activity and some type of positive change. Exactly what type of positive change was expected was hard to define and varied by state. In general, the changes related to increased responsibility, maturity, self control, communication/self disclosure, accountability, motivation, and improved attitudes toward authority. A reduction in drug use by the offenders was a goal of both states with shock programs for drug offenders.

Few states listed public relations as a goal. In these states there was a concern for improving the image of corrections and for public safety.

Only one state, Oklahoma, reported a goal of shock incarceration as a tool for prison control and management. The shock program was considered to be a clean, healthy, secure environment in prison, promoting counseling activities, positive

offender-staff contact, and offender accountability. Offenders in this program spend a high proportion of their time in rehabilitation activities. Thus, it was assumed that the focus on offender control was combined with the goal of developing an environment promoting positive changes in the offender rather than just managing the offenders while they are incarcerated.

Preliminary Evaluations

Five states have examined early data from the shock programs within their jurisdictions: Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, New York, and South Carolina. The number of offenders who entered the programs and how they left the program are shown in table 4. Note the differences in the programs in the proportion of offenders who graduate. In South Carolina and Georgia the proportion of those who leave the program without graduating (in comparison to all who have left the program) is low, 5.3 percent and 2.6 percent, respectively (South Carolina Department of Corrections, 1989; Georgia Department of Corrections, 1989). In contrast, in Louisiana, New York, and Florida a higher proportion of the offenders leave prior to graduation, 39.1 percent, 41.9 percent, and 40.7 percent, respectively (Aziz, 1988; Florida Department of Corrections, 1989; MacKenzie et al., 1989).

To our knowledge no state has completed an analysis examining whether the shock program(s) have had an impact on prison crowding. However, if the number graduating per year from a state program is compared to the total number of offenders in prison in the state it is obvious that the numbers graduating make up a very small proportion of the incarcerated population. Although New York with 904 graduates in 18 months may have a large enough number of graduates to have an impact on crowded prisons (table 4), this is not the case in most states.

Of course whether the programs will have an impact on prison crowding depends not only on the number of graduates but also on whether the offenders graduating from the program are drawn from the population of probationers or prisoners. Our assumption is that in states where placement is determined by the department of corrections the offenders in the program are those who would usually be incarcerated. Again this suggests that the New York program may have an impact on prison crowding.

Evaluators in both New York and Florida have completed preliminary cost analyses of their programs. In both the cost of the program was estimated to be slightly higher than the cost of reg-

TABLE 4. NUMBER OF ENTRANTS TO SHOCK INCARCERATION PROGRAMS IN FIVE STATES SHOWING HOW OFFENDERS LEFT THE PROGRAMS (GRADUATION, MEDICAL DISMISSAL, OR OTHER)

	States (months of data)				
	South Carolina (12)	Georgia (54)	Florida (12)	Louisiana (24)	New York (18)
Total Entrants	923		319	507	2299
Active	106		56	49	696
Total Leaving Program	817	3201	263	458	1604
Graduates	675	3117	143	252	904
Medical out	99		13	27	28
Left program	43	84	107	179	672

ular prison but the shorter period of incarceration resulted in an overall cost savings (Aziz, 1988; Florida Department of Corrections, 1989). In Florida this cost savings was estimated to be \$1.1 million, and in New York the estimate was \$5.1 million for the first 321 inmates. Although this does not take into consideration the additional cost of the aftercare program in New York, it does appear to represent a relatively large cost savings.

There is also some research on individual level issues. Researchers in Louisiana found graduates of the shock programs had more positive social attitudes than those who dropped out and a comparison group in a regular prison (MacKenzie & Shaw, 1990). The offenders felt positive about their experience in the program and their future. Inmates completing the shock program in New York were found to have gained more or at least as much in educational scores as comparison groups who had been in prison longer (Aziz, 1988).

The most often requested statistics are the recidivism rates of graduates of these programs. Some states have reported data on recidivism for shock graduates and comparison groups. Few of the researchers have completed statistical tests, and they caution readers about drawing definitive conclusions before more data can be tabulated. Shown in table 5 are the estimated recidivism rates of the early releasees from four shock programs. The return to prison rates for the shock offenders were higher for the shock graduates in Georgia (no significance tests), while in Florida and New York the rates are lower or approximately the same. There are no significant differences between shock graduates and a parole comparison group on rearrests or failures in Louisiana, nor between shock graduates and proba-

tioners for rearrests (MacKenzie, 1989). However, the probationers failed (absconded, jailed, or revoked) less often than the shock graduates.

To our knowledge no empirical research has yet been completed on public attitudes toward these programs. Anecdotally, from new reports and interviews there is the appearance that the public is supportive, but whether this support is because of the punishment or therapeutic nature of the programs is uncertain. Intensive interviews with those who are associated in some way with the programs have, in general, indicated positive attitudes. Reportedly employers prefer to have these offenders because they have good work skills; parents and relatives appreciate the close support and contact with parole agents; corrections officers like the discipline and close interaction with the inmates; dropouts and returnees say they would recommend that program for other offenders. There is also little research on the aspect of prison management or control. However, there is little doubt after viewing these programs that the staff members have more control of offenders in the shock programs than they do of offenders in a regular prison.

Summary

In this article the components of shock incarceration programs were described. The survey of state jurisdictions indicated that approximately 54 percent of the state jurisdictions may have shock programs in the near future. Although the programs all emphasize strict rules and discipline and require physical training and drills, they differ in other ways. These differences are expected to result in differences in the success or failure of programs in reaching their goals.

Both the advocates and opponents of shock incarceration programs are frequently uninformed

TABLE 5. ESTIMATED RECIDIVISM RATES OF EARLY RELEASEES FROM SHOCK INCARCERATION

State	Release Period*	Percent Returned		
		Shock	Parole Comparison	Probation Comparison
Georgia	1 year	27.1	22.7	
	2 "	39.5	38.3	
	3 "	46.1	44.7	
Florida	1 "	9.1	17.3	
	2 "	18.9	21.4	
New York	1 "	23.0	28.0	
	1 "	19.8 (revoked any reason)	18.5	
Louisiana	9 months	21.1 (abscond/failed/revoked)	24.7	12.8
	9 months	24.5 (arrested)	22.5	22.3
National (Young Parolees)	1 year (rearrests)		32.0	
	1 year (reincarcerated)		19.0	

*Return to prison rates unless otherwise noted.

Note: Information is taken from Georgia Department of Corrections, 1989; Florida Department of Corrections, 1989; NY Division of Parole, 1989a; NY Department of Correctional Services, 1989; MacKenzie, 1989; Beck & Shipley, 1987.

about the components of these programs. Those who view the program as a get-tough punishment frequently do not realize that many shock programs incorporate rehabilitation activities. What is surprising about these programs is the support and excitement of the staff and inmates. Even those who violate parole and are returned to prison after graduating from a program report that the experience was valuable. To our knowledge it is very unusual for releasees from regular prison to feel their time in prison has been valuable (Goodstein & Wright, 1989).

At this point there is little empirical evidence to help us make decisions about how successful these programs are in reaching the identified goals. Opponents of these programs frequently cite problems that may occur such as staff abuse of inmates or net widening. We have tried to show how such issues are being (or could be) empirically studied. It is our perspective that any prison holds the potential for abuse of inmates. Whether abuse occurs can be studied and possibly prevented.

Furthermore, can the boot camp atmosphere (the punishment) be combined with rehabilitation activities so that the result is a constructive punishment? Once the offender has received his or

her punishment (time in boot camp) will the public be more willing to fund aftercare programs that help the offender during community supervision? Whether the punishment fulfills the public's desire for retribution can be asked as an empirical question.

These issues should be separated from philosophical concerns such as whether nonviolent offenders should ever be incarcerated. One philosophical issue that should be discussed regarding these programs is whether the boot camp atmosphere of these programs is a fair and just punishment. And, is this desire for retribution a legitimate request that should be fulfilled? Or should male-oriented programs such as boot camps be replaced with more benevolent programs emphasizing more "so-called 'female traits' (e.g., sensitivity) (Morash & Rucker, 1990)" (Harris, 1989).

Should these nonviolent offenders spend longer periods of time in a regular prison where there are few constructive activities available, or would it be better to punish them for a short period of time in a boot camp prison? Can this "punishment" be combined with rehabilitation activities to create a constructive punishment? These are philosophical questions that should be discussed.

Knowledge of the components of these programs and how they operate will make the philosophical debates more meaningful.

NOTES

¹From the number of inquiries we have received about shock incarceration we anticipate that these numbers are rapidly increasing in both state and county jurisdictions.

²Cost prohibited us from including all states with programs in the multi-site study.

REFERENCES

- Aziz, D. (1988). *Shock incarceration evaluation: Preliminary data*. Albany, NY: Unpublished report to the New York Department of Correctional Services, Shock Incarceration Legislative Report.
- Beck, A.J. & Shipley, B.E. (1987). *Recidivism of young parolees*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Florida Department of Corrections. (1989). *Boot camp evaluation and boot camp recommitment rate*. Unpublished report by the Bureau of Planning, Research & Statistics.
- Georgia Department of Corrections. (1989). *Georgia's special alternative incarceration*. Unpublished report to the Shock Incarceration Conference, Washington, DC.
- Harris, K. (1989). Presentation to the American Probation and Parole Association 14th Annual Training Institute, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.
- MacKenzie, D.L. (1989). *The parole performance of offenders released from shock incarceration (boot camp prisons): A survival time analysis*. Paper presented at the American Probation and Parole Association 14th Annual Training Institute, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.
- MacKenzie, D.L. & Ballou, D.B. (1989). *Shock incarceration programs in state correctional jurisdictions—An update*. Washington, DC: NJ Reports.
- MacKenzie, D.L., Gould, L.A., Riechers, L.M., & Shaw, J.W. (1989). *Shock incarceration: Rehabilitation or retribution?* *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services & Rehabilitation*, 14(2), 25-40.
- MacKenzie, D.L., & Shaw, J.W. (1990). *Inmate adjustment and change during shock incarceration: The impact of correctional boot camp programs*. *Justice Quarterly*, 7(1), 125-150.
- Moraah, M., & Rucker, L. (1990). *A critical look at the idea of boot camp as a correctional reform*. *Crime and Delinquency*, 36(2), 204-222.
- New York State Department of Correctional Services. (1989). *Initial follow-up study of shock graduates*. Albany, NY: Unpublished report by the Division of Program Planning, Research and Evaluation.
- New York State Division of Parole. (1988). *Preliminary supervision assessment of the first six shock incarceration platoons*. Unpublished report, Shock Incarceration Legislative Report.
- New York State Division of Parole. (1989a). *Shock incarceration: One year out*. Unpublished report.
- New York State Division of Parole. (1989b). *Qualitative and descriptive analysis of shock supervision program*. Unpublished report.
- Parent, D.G. (1989). *Shock incarceration: An overview of existing programs*. Washington, DC: NIJ Issues and Practices Report, National Institute of Justice, NCJ 114902.
- Sechrest, D.K. (1989). *Prison "boot camps" do not measure up*. *Federal Probation*, 53.
- South Carolina Department of Corrections. (1989). *South Carolina shock probation unit evaluation: Qualitative and descriptive analysis*. Unpublished report to the Shock Incarceration Conference, Washington, DC.

BOOT CAMPS

Boot Camp Survey


Rehabilitation, Recidivism Reduction Outrank Punishment As Main Goals

by Doris Layton MacKenzie, Ph.D.,
and Claire C. Souryal

Boot camp prisons continue to grow in number and size. Since their inception in 1983, 34 boot camp programs have been established in 23 states, incarcerating close to 4,000 adjudicated adults. These numbers do not include adult programs operated by cities or counties, or programs developed for juveniles.

The terminology used to identify adult boot camp prisons is often confusing. While the term "boot camp prison" is synonymous with "shock incarceration," some confuse shock incarceration with shock probation or shock parole. The common thread of all three programs is that offenders spend a reduced period of time in prison. In contrast to shock probation or shock parole, however, boot camp inmates are not mixed with regular population inmates. They live in separate housing and are required to participate in military drills, physical training, work and frequently treatment-oriented activities, while this is not necessarily true for offenders in shock probation or shock parole programs.

Beyond the common core—a military atmosphere involving drills, physical training and work—boot camp prisons vary tremendously. There are differences in daily activities, the average number of days served, program size, whether participation is voluntary, release supervision and eligibility criteria. These differences may stem from the distinct correctional goals each program strives to achieve.



Courtesy New York Division of Parole

A survey of boot camps in the United States found that administrators most often named rehabilitation, recidivism reduction and drug education as their programs' main goals. Above, boot camp participants march in formation.

Program Goals

In a survey earlier this year at the University of Maryland, we asked boot camp administrators how important 11 goals were to their programs. For each goal, officials listed whether it was very important, important, somewhat important, not important or not a goal.

The goals most often judged very important included rehabilitation, recidivism reduction and drug education. Reducing crowding, developing work skills and providing a safe prison environment were generally considered important

goals. Deemed somewhat important were deterrence, education and drug treatment. Goals most often believed not important or not a goal included punishment and vocational education.

Despite the strenuous and difficult nature of boot camp prisons, many states do not consider punishment an important program goal.

It is interesting to note that despite the strenuous and difficult nature of boot camp prisons, which is often emphasized by politicians and played up by the media, many states do not consider punishment an important program goal. In fact, four states said punishment is not a goal, three states reported it is a relatively unimportant goal and six states said it is a somewhat important goal. Eight states—Georgia, Kansas, Michigan, Mississippi, New Hampshire, North Carolina, South Carolina and Virginia—did name punishment as an important goal.

Treatment and Rehabilitation


Each program's goals are clearly reflected in the daily schedule of activities. For example, education and drug education are high priority goals in South Carolina's programs. Inmates there spend four hours per day in educational programs and three hours per week in drug education. Drug treatment, in contrast, is not a high priority goal and, therefore, little time is spent in treatment.

Sixteen states consider academic education an important or very important program goal. Consequently, offenders in these programs spend one to four hours per day in academic programs. Vocational education, on the other hand, is rarely deemed an important goal. Only two states—Idaho and Illinois—consider vocational education an important goal, and neither devotes much time to it. Preliminary information from Louisiana and New York suggests shock programs positively influence offenders' attitudes and staff and inmate relationships and may influence educational achievement.

Reducing Recidivism

All but three states rate recidivism reduction as an important or very important goal. Differences in programs seem to reflect the way in which states intend to reduce recidivism. Programs that focus on rehabilitation may, for example, target educational deficits as a key problem in offenders' lives. By increasing offenders' educational levels, these programs may expect to reduce recidivism.

Continued next page



Courtesy New York Division of Parole

Women inmates at New York's Summit Shock Incarceration Facility do early-morning group exercises. New York has the largest boot camp program in the nation with about 1,500 inmates in five programs.

BOOT CAMP SURVEY

Continued

An alternate strategy is practiced by other programs, such as Georgia's. Offenders in boot camps there spend little time in educational or treatment-oriented activities. By requiring long hours of work and physical training, the state may hope to affect the recidivism rate through deterrence rather than rehabilitation. Consistent with this perspective, Georgia ranks punishment, reducing recidivism and deterrence as its most important program goals. In contrast, the goals of education, drug education and drug treatment are all deemed relatively unimportant.

At this point, no state has reported a statistically significant difference in recidivism when boot camp graduates' performance is compared to that of similar offenders serving different types of sentences. Interestingly, recent studies by the corrections departments in New York and Georgia—two states that are opposites in their emphasis on rehabilitation—conclude that boot camp releaseses do "no worse" than offenders who had served a longer period of time in prison. Although both states found slightly lower recidivism rates for boot camp participants, the differences were not statistically significant. In other words, there was little difference in recidivism despite New York's strong emphasis on education, counseling and drug treatment and Georgia's strong emphasis on work. In both states, 20 to 30 percent of boot camp graduates and comparison groups re-

turned to prison within the first year of community supervision.

All boot camp prisons report having incorporated some sort of drug treatment and education into their program plan.

The recidivism results are preliminary and should not be considered conclusive at this point. New York has identified the transition to community life as a difficult period for these offenders and has improved aftercare services during community supervision. Georgia, on the other hand, has proposed increasing the rehabilitation or educational components of its boot camp programs.

Impact on Prison Crowding

For boot camps to successfully reduce prison crowding, two conditions must be met—there must be a sufficient number of eligible offenders entering and completing the programs and offenders must be drawn from a population of prison-bound offenders, not from those who would otherwise be sentenced to probation.

Continued on page 94

BOOT CAMP SURVEY

Continued from page 92

Most programs to date do not meet the first qualification—they simply are too small to affect crowding. Only two states—New York (1,500) and Texas (400)—have more than 300 beds for boot camp programs, which nonetheless represents a small proportion of the total prison beds.

Whether states meet the second qualification may depend on who decides which offenders are placed in boot camp programs.

tional prison. In this scenario there is a higher probability that entrants are drawn from prison-bound offenders. However, the size of these programs, and therefore the impact on crowding, may be limited by restrictive eligibility requirements and high failure or dropout rates.

Types of Offenders

While the components of shock programs and the emphasis placed on treatment or rehabilitation vary substantially, the



Courtesy New York Division of Parole

Boot camps generally hold young, first-time, non-violent offenders ages 17 to 25. Rigid discipline and attention to detail are critical elements of most programs.

This differs from state to state. In Georgia and Arizona, for example, judges sentence offenders directly to boot camp programs, and if offenders are denied entry or are dismissed they

Most boot camp programs restrict participation to inmates convicted of non-violent offenses.

return to the court for resentencing. With this decision-making structure, it might be expected that a higher proportion of the boot camp entrants are selected from those who would otherwise receive probation.

In other states, such as New York, Maryland or Tennessee, offenders are sentenced to the Department of Corrections, which decides who is eligible and suitable for the program: those considered unsuitable are sent to a tradi-

types of offenders placed in the programs are very similar. Offenders sentenced to boot camp are generally young, first-time, non-violent felons. Most states, for example, restrict participation to offenders between the ages of 17 and 25, although a few have maximum age limits of between 25 and 30 years of age. Only three states allow offenders over 30 to enter boot camp prisons: Alabama has no age limit and Louisiana and Mississippi have age limits of 39 and 62, respectively.

More than half of the programs further restrict participation to offenders convicted of non-violent offenses. The remaining 10 states report that both those convicted of violent and non-violent offenses are eligible for participation. Preliminary data from the multi-site study reveals that despite violent offenders' potential eligibility, the majority of participants are convicted of non-violent offenses.

Restrictive eligibility criteria, particularly if offenders are drawn from those who are prison-bound, can severely limit the number of available entrants. In response to such problems, Louisiana made its criteria less restrictive to fill beds that initially had been empty.

Drug Offenders

The association between drugs and crime is a strong one, particularly when young offenders are involved. Not surprisingly, program evaluations reveal that many offenders in boot camps have drug problems. Officials in Mississippi, for example, have found that 90 to 95 percent of their participants are drug users. At least four states report that their programs were specifically designed for non-violent, drug-involved offenders.

For boot camps to reduce prison crowding, there must be a sufficient number of offenders completing the programs, and they must be drawn from a population of prison-bound offenders.

In response to offenders' needs, all boot camp prisons report having incorporated some sort of drug treatment and education into their program plan. In fact, in nine states drug treatment is a legal program requirement. As might be expected, the particular drug treatment/education strategy adopted by each program varies considerably.

Some programs focus solely on drug education, while others emphasize treatment. More specifically, seven programs teach only drug education, three programs emphasize treatment and 13 programs combine treatment and education in some fashion. In our survey, most respondents rated drug education as a more important goal than drug treatment.

An examination of the availability of and time spent in specific components of drug treatment and education underscores this difference in emphasis. For example, in virtually all programs inmates receive at least several hours of drug education per week. The availability of individual psychotherapy, group psychotherapy, drug counseling and relapse prevention training, however, was far more limited.

Other program differences include the number of days spent in drug treatment and education, which ranges from 12 to 180 days, whether the drug treatment and education program is administered by program staff or an outside agency and whether all inmates participate.

NIJ Study

The National Institute of Justice recently began a national boot camp study that focuses on two major questions: Are boot camps successfully fulfilling their goals, and what particular components of boot camp programs lead to success or failure? The evaluation will compare eight unique

Continued next page

FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA
1993 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO. HB 105

Revision Date: _____ Dept. Affected: Department of Corrections
 Title: "An Act providing for incarceration BRU: Institutions; Statewide Programs
for nonviolent, youthful first offenders.... Component: _____
 Sponsor: Rep. Willis
 Requestor: Rep. Willis COMPONENT SERIAL NO. 1860 1958

Expenditures/Revenues:

(Thousands of Dollars)

OPERATING	FY94	FY95	FY98	FY97	FY98	FY99
PERSONAL SERVICES	768.0	768.0	768.0	768.0	768.0	768.0
TRAVEL	24.4	24.4	24.4	24.4	24.4	24.4
CONTRACTUAL	319.0	319.0	319.0	319.0	319.0	319.0
SUPPLIES	167.0	167.0	167.0	167.0	167.0	167.0
EQUIPMENT	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0
LAND & STRUCTURES						
GRANTS, CLAIMS						
MISCELLANEOUS Prisoner gratuities	94.0	94.0	94.0	94.0	94.0	94.0
TOTAL OPERATING	1,392.4	1,392.4	1,392.4	1,392.4	1,392.4	1,392.4

CAPITAL	1,750.0	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
----------------	---------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

REVENUE FUND SOURCE:						
-----------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

FUNDING:

(Thousands of Dollars)

1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF	1,392.4	1,392.4	1,392.4	1,392.4	1,392.4	1,392.4
1005 GF/Program Receipts						
1006 GF/MHTIA						
Other						
TOTAL						

POSITIONS:

FULL-TIME	16	16	16	16	16	16
PART-TIME						
TEMPORARY						

Estimate of current year (FY93) impact: \$ -0-

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary)

Please see attached fiscal analysis

Prepared by: Dana LaTour Phone: 465-3376
 Division: Commissioner's Office Date: 2/25/93
 Approved by Commissioner: Lloyd G. Rupp Date: 2/25/93
 Agency: Department of Corrections

PREPARER TO PROVIDE ALL DISTRIBUTION COPIES TO GOVERNOR'S LEGISLATIVE OFFICE

For further distribution information call the Governor's Legislative Office

HB 105 "An Act providing for incarceration for nonviolent, youthful first offenders in boot camps operated by the Department of Corrections..."

Fiscal Analysis

Page 2

This Bill provides for the establishment of a boot camp program within the Department of Corrections. The boot camp is to serve as an alternative correctional facility for first time, youthful, nonviolent offenders. The target age of these offenders is 18 - 26.

The bill also creates a Boot Camp Advisory Board whose purpose is to review and provide advice to the Department concerning the operation of the boot camp.

The department has determined that the boot camp could be established on state owned farms in the Matanuska Valley. These farms were developed by private citizens through the use of State agricultural loans. The developers of these farms have defaulted on the loans and the ownership of the property has reverted to the State. The Department of Corrections proposes to redevelop these farms in the following steps:

- (1) Set up portable, modular units for inmate housing and support services;
- (2) Bring in 50 inmates initially, with the goal of placing 150 - 200 inmates in the boot camp in the future;
- (3) Rebuild the farm by clearing and tilling the land, repairing or upgrading the buildings and otherwise preparing the properties for turnkey operation;
- (4) Substance abuse counseling and programs will be a part of the daily routine for the inmates, in conjunction with community providers or contractors, including AA and others;
- (5) Once the farm is back in shape, the modular units are moved to the next farm and the process is repeated.

The costs of developing and operating a pilot program for 50 inmates is as follows:

Personal Services:

CO III	65.0
Probation Officer II	55.0
10 CO II's	555.0
Food Service Manager	51.0
Admin Assistant	42.0
TOTAL PERSONAL SERVICES	768.0
TOTAL TRAVEL	10.0

HB 105 "An Act providing for incarceration for nonviolent, youthful first offenders in boot camps operated by the Department of Corrections..."

Fiscal Analysis

Page 3

(Operating costs continued)

Contractual

Professional Services	203.0
Communication	4.0
Transportation	40.0
Subscriptions	1.0
Utilities	60.0
Repairs/Maint	5.0
Rentals/Leases	4.0
Other Services	2.0
TOTAL CONTRACTUAL	319.0

Commodities

Office Supplies	3.0
Food \$50 x 1800	90.0
Clothing	10.0
Non-Food Supplies	9.0
Repair/Maint Supplies	50.0
Other Commodities	5.0
TOTAL COMMODITIES	167.0

TOTAL EQUIPMENT 20.0

INMATE GRATUITIES 50 X \$7.50 Day X 250 Days 94.0

TOTAL OPERATING COSTS \$1,378.0

CAPITAL BUDGET EXPENDITURES \$1,750.0

HB 105 *"An Act providing for incarceration for nonviolent, youthful first offenders in boot camps operated by the Department of Corrections..."*

Fiscal Analysis

Page 4

Boot Camp Advisory Board

The bill provides for the establishment of an eight member advisory board whose responsibility includes providing advice and review of the boot camp program. It is assumed that the board will meet 4 times a year in the Anchorage area. It is also assumed that 4 of the 8 members will reside in the Anchorage area.

4 trips x 2 days x 4 Anchorage members x \$100 per diem	=	\$3200
4 trips x 2 days x 4 members x \$100 per diem	=	\$3200
4 trips x 4 members x \$500 airfare	=	\$8000
Total travel expenses		\$14,400

FISCAL NOTE

BILL NO. HB 105

STATE OF ALASKA
1993 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Revision Date: February 2, 1993
 Title: "...providing for incarceration for nonviolent youthful first offenders in boot camps..."
 Sponsor: Representative Willis
 Requestor: Representative Willis

Department Affected: Department of Law
 BRU: Prosecution
 Component: All
 COMPONENT SERIAL NO. 0085 through 0090

EXPENDITURES/REVENUES:

OPERATING	FY 94	FY 95	FY 96	FY 97	FY 98	FY 99
PERSONAL SERVICES						
TRAVEL						
CONTRACTUAL						
SUPPLIES						
EQUIPMENT						
LAND & STRUCTURES						
GRANTS, CLAIMS						
MISCELLANEOUS						
TOTAL OPERATING	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-

CAPITAL						
---------	--	--	--	--	--	--

REVENUE FUND SOURCE:						
----------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

FUNDING:

1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF						
1005 GF/Program Receipts						
1006 GF/MHTIA						
OTHER						
TOTAL	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-

FULL-TIME	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
PART-TIME						
TEMPORARY						

Estimate of current year (FY93) impact: -0-

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary.)

Please see the attached analysis.

Richard I. Peques

Prepared by: Richard I. Peques, Director

Division: Administrative Services Division

Richard I. Peques

Approved by Commissioner: Charles E. Cole, Attorney General

Agency: Department of Law

Phone: 465-3672

Date: February 2, 1993

Date: February 2, 1993

PREPARER TO PROVIDE ALL DISTRIBUTION COPIES TO GOVERNOR'S LEGISLATIVE OFFICE
 For further distribution information call the Governor's Legislative Office

Fiscal Note - Law

FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA
1993 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO. HB 105

ANALYSIS (Continued):

This bill amends AS 12.55 and AS 33.30 to provide for incarceration for nonviolent, youthful first offenders in boot camps operated by the Department of Corrections. This is a sentencing alternative that would be available to courts after the conviction of a defendant. Consequently, the bill will not have a fiscal impact on the Department of Law.

FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA
1993 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO. HB 105

Revision Date: _____ Dept. Affected: Health and Social Services
 Title: An Act providing for incarceration of non-violent youthful first offenders in boot camps. BRU: Alcoholism and Drug Abuse SUCS.
 Sponsor: Willis, Bunde Component: _____
 Requestor: _____ COMPONENT SERIAL NO. _____

Expenditures/Revenues: (Thousands of Dollars)

OPERATING	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	FY98	FY99
PERSONAL SERVICES	0	0	0	0	0	0
TRAVEL	0	0	0	0	0	0
CONTRACTUAL	0	0	0	0	0	0
SUPPLIES	0	0	0	0	0	0
EQUIPMENT	0	0	0	0	0	0
LAND & STRUCTURES	0	0	0	0	0	0
GRANTS, CLAIMS	0	0	0	0	0	0
MISCELLANEOUS	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL OPERATING	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

CAPITAL						
---------	--	--	--	--	--	--

REVENUE FUND SOURCE						
---------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

FUNDING: (Thousands of Dollars)

1002 Federal Receipts	0	0	0	0	0	0
1003 GF Match	0	0	0	0	0	0
1004 GF	0	0	0	0	0	0
1005 GF/Program Receipts	0	0	0	0	0	0
1006 GF/MHTIA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

POSITIONS:

FULL-TIME	0	0	0	0	0	0
PART-TIME	0	0	0	0	0	0
TEMPORARY	0	0	0	0	0	0

Estimate of current year (FY93) impact: 0

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary)

Correctional officers will provide alcohol and other drug abuse treatment education and counseling services.

The boot camps are for adult offenders who are under the age of 26 years.

There is no fiscal impact anticipated on the Department of Health and Social Services.

Prepared by: Suzanne Perry
 Division: Alcoholism and Drug Abuse

Phone: 465-2071
 Date: 2-12-93

Approved by Commissioner: Theodore A. Mala, MD, MPH
 Agency: Department of Health & Social Services

Date: 2/23/93

PREPARER TO PROVIDE ALL DISTRIBUTION COPIES TO GOVERNOR'S LEGISLATIVE OFFICE
 For further distribution information call the Governor's Legislative Office

⊗ Fiscal Note - H+SS - Alcoholism + Drug Abuse

FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA
1993 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO. HB 105

Revision Date: _____
Title: "An Act providing for incarceration for nonviolent, youthful first offenders in boot camps . . ."
Sponsor: Representatives Willis and Bunde
Requestor: (H) HES

Department Affected: Administration
BRU: Public Defender Agency
Component: Public Defender Agency
COMPONENT SERIAL NO. 1631

EXPENDITURES/REVENUES:

OPERATING	FY 94	FY 95	FY 96	FY 97	FY 98	FY 99
PERSONAL SERVICES	0	0	0	0	0	0
TRAVEL	0	0	0	0	0	0
CONTRACTUAL	0	0	0	0	0	0
SUPPLIES	0	0	0	0	0	0
EQUIPMENT	0	0	0	0	0	0
LAND & STRUCTURES	0	0	0	0	0	0
GRANTS, CLAIMS	0	0	0	0	0	0
MISCELLANEOUS	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL OPERATING	0	0	0	0	0	0

CAPITAL	0	0	0	0	0	0
---------	---	---	---	---	---	---

REVENUE FUND SOURCE:	0	0	0	0	0	0
----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---

FUNDING:

1002 Federal Receipts	0	0	0	0	0	0
1003 GF Match	0	0	0	0	0	0
1004 GF	0	0	0	0	0	0
1005 GF/Program Receipts	0	0	0	0	0	0
1006 GF/MHTIA	0	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0

POSITIONS:

FULL-TIME	0	0	0	0	0	0
PART-TIME	0	0	0	0	0	0
TEMPORARY	0	0	0	0	0	0

Estimate of current year (FY93) impact: _____

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary.)

Prepared by: John Salemi, Public Defender
Division: Public Defender Agency

Phone: 279-7541
Date: _____

Approved by Commissioner: Nancy Bear Usera
Agency: Administration

Date: 2/22/93

PREPARER TO PROVIDE ALL DISTRIBUTION COPIES TO GOVERNOR'S LEGISLATIVE OFFICE
For further distribution information call the Governor's Legislative Office

Fiscal Note - Admin - Public Defender

FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA
1993 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO. HB 105

Revision Date: _____

Title: "An Act providing for incarceration for nonviolent ..."

Sponsor: Representatives Willis, Bunde

Requestor: House HESS

Department Affected: Administration

BRU: Office of Public Advocacy

Component: Office of Public Advocacy

COMPONENT SERIAL NO. 43

EXPENDITURES/REVENUES:

OPERATING	FY 94	FY 95	FY 96	FY 97	FY 98	FY 99
PERSONAL SERVICES	0	0	0	0	0	0
TRAVEL	0	0	0	0	0	0
CONTRACTUAL	0	0	0	0	0	0
SUPPLIES	0	0	0	0	0	0
EQUIPMENT	0	0	0	0	0	0
LAND & STRUCTURES	0	0	0	0	0	0
GRANTS, CLAIMS	0	0	0	0	0	0
MISCELLANEOUS	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL OPERATING	0	0	0	0	0	0

CAPITAL	0	0	0	0	0	0
---------	---	---	---	---	---	---

REVENUE FUND SOURCE:	0	0	0	0	0	0
----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---

FUNDING:

1002 Federal Receipts	0	0	0	0	0	0
1003 GF Match	0	0	0	0	0	0
1004 GF	0	0	0	0	0	0
1005 GF/Program Receipts	0	0	0	0	0	0
1006 GF/MHTIA	0	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0

POSITIONS:

FULL-TIME	0	0	0	0	0	0
PART-TIME	0	0	0	0	0	0
TEMPORARY	0	0	0	0	0	0

Estimate of current year (FY93) impact: None.

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary.)

Prepared by: Brant McGee, Public Advocate
Division: Office of Public Advocacy

Phone: 274-1684
Date: _____

Approved by Commissioner: Nancy Bear Usura
Agency: Administration

Date: 2/22/93

PREPARER TO PROVIDE ALL DISTRIBUTION COPIES TO GOVERNOR'S LEGISLATIVE OFFICE
For further distribution information call the Governor's Legislative Office

FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA
1993 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Bill No. HB 105

Revision Date: _____ Department Affected: Alaska Court System
 Title: An Act providing for incarceration of BRU: Trial Courts
nonviolent, youthful first offenders Components: _____
 Sponsor: Willis
 Requestor: _____ COMPONENT SERIAL NO. 768

EXPENDITURES/REVENUES: (Thousands of Dollars)

OPERATING	FY 94	FY 95	FY 96	FY 97	FY 98	FY 99
PERSONAL SERVICES						
TRAVEL						
CONTRACTUAL						
SUPPLIES						
EQUIPMENT						
LAND & STRUCTURES						
GRANTS & CLAIMS						
TOTAL OPERATING	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

CAPITAL						
---------	--	--	--	--	--	--

REVENUE						
FUND SOURCE:						

FUNDING: (Thousands of Dollars)

1002 FEDERAL RECEIPTS						
1003 GF MATCH						
1004 GF	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1005 GF/PROGRAM RECEIPTS						
1006 GF/MHTIA						
OTHER						
TOTAL	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

POSITIONS:

FULL-TIME						
PART-TIME						
TEMPORARY						

Estimate of current year (FY 93) impact: None

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary)

No fiscal impact.

Prepared by: C. S. Christensen III, Staff Counsel *CS* Phone: 264-8228
 Division: Alaska Court System Date: 03/05/93
 Approved by: Arthur H. Snowden, II, Administrative Director *AS* Date: 03/05/93
 Agency: Alaska Court System

Distribution (by preparer): Legislative Finance, Legislative Sponsor, Requestor, OMB, & Impacted Agency(ies).

FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA
1993 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO: HB 105

Revision Date: _____ Dept. Affected: Public Safety
 Title: "An act providing for incarceration
for first offenders" BRU: Alaska State Troopers
 Component: Detachments
 Sponsor: Representatives Willis
 Requestor: House HESS COMPONENT SERIAL NO. 799

EXPENDITURES/REVENUES: (Thousands of Dollars) (inflation not included)

OPERATING	FY 94	FY 95	FY 96	FY 97	FY 98	FY 99
PERSONAL SERVICES						
TRAVEL						
CONTRACTUAL						
SUPPLIES						
EQUIPMENT						
LAND & STRUCTURES						
GRANTS, CLAIMS						
MISCELLANEOUS						
TOTAL OPERATING	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
CAPITAL	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
REVENUE FUND SOURCE:	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

FUNDING: (Thousands of Dollars)

1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF						
1005 GF/Program Receipts						
1006 GF/MHTIA						
Other						
TOTAL	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0


POSITIONS:

FULL-TIME	0	0	0	0	0	0
PART-TIME	0	0	0	0	0	0
TEMPORARY	0	0	0	0	0	0

Estimate of current year (FY 93) impact: \$ _____

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary.)

No fiscal impact is anticipated.

Prepared By: Francis C. Allan Phone: 269-5691
 Division: Alaska State Troopers Date: 3/23/93
 Approved by Commissioner:  Date: 3/26/93
 Agency: Richard L. Burton, Dept. of Public Safety

PREPARER TO PROVIDE ALL DISTRIBUTION COPIES TO GOVERNOR'S LEGISLATIVE OFFICE
 For further distribution information call the Governor's Legislative Office

Fiscal Note - Public Safety