

**ALASKA LEGISLATURE COMMITTEE FILES 1995-1996 8672**

**8769 HOUSE STATE AFFAIRS**

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)

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 1989)  
 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	List 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. §958.04 (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.C.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	Of Her Eligibility Requirements	Prison Alternative/ Enhanced Probation	Distinctive Program Features	Who Has Discretion to Select Candidates?
Michigan Mich. Stat. Ann. §23.2354(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. §209.356 (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. §651 (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 Genl Assembly §5120.011 (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 §40-25-130 (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 - 47.1 (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 (Walt 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

**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



Source: *Two Incarceration Alternatives* (Washington D.C.: National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice, June 1991). See NCSL Original Document.

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. 901 i & 574.4 (West 1990), N.Y. Correction Law Art. 26A (McKinney's 1990), Va. Code Ch. 18, 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  
303/830-2200

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 1964, the report said. For that same year, violent juvenile crime arrests in the state decreased by 2.6 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  
1550 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

**T**HE 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.

**B**ut 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 the 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.

**W**hether 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 55 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 \$66.91 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 230 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*

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	4/90	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.	2/91	Both	100				\$43.84
CONNECTICUT	Yes	6 mos.	1/91	Males	100			\$67.78	\$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	4,183	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.	8/5/90	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.	3/87	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	80%		
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	\$64.39	\$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; 1/91, 2nd unit started	Both	192 males, 24 females	984 males, 107 females	83% 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.

# Survey

## 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 enlisting 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 6 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	39 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 6 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, senior 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	10-25 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

# BOOT CAMPS

## Boot Camp Survey


# Rehabilitation, Recidivism Reduction Outrank Punishment As Main Goals

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

**B**oot 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. Cited 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 releases 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*

## Shock Incarceration Programs In U.S., March 1991



### BOOT CAMP SURVEY

Continued

state programs for men in Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Louisiana, Oklahoma, New York, South Carolina and Texas, and one program for women in Oklahoma.

The participating programs were selected because they varied in several ways, including selection decisions, community supervision upon release, program characteristics and program location. Researchers hope to isolate the specific components of programs that lead to the fulfillment of program goals. Each participating program is evaluating its own program and coordinating this evaluation with the other states so the methodology, data collected and data analysis can be compared across states.

While it is clear that many offenders sentenced to boot camps need drug treatment and education, it is not clear whether these programs are the most effective way to provide it. The U.S. Department of Justice's Bureau of Justice Assistance is currently funding four innovative or enhanced boot camp programs for drug offenders in Texas, New York, Illinois and Oklahoma. The sites are participating in the NIJ's study. Results from these studies should be available in 1992.

### REFERENCES

Flowers, G.T., T.S. Carr and R.B. Ruback. 1991. Special alternative incarceration evaluation. Department of Corrections, Atlanta, Ga.

New York Department of Correctional Services and Division of Parole. 1990. Shock incarceration in New York state: The corrections experience. *The Second Annual Report to the Legislature*. Albany, N.Y.

MacKenzie, D.L., and D. Parent. 1991. Shock incarceration and prison crowding in Louisiana. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 19:225-237.

MacKenzie, D.L., and J.S. Shaw. 1990. Inmate adjustment and change during shock incarceration: The impact of correctional boot camp programs. *Justice Quarterly*, 7(1):125-50.

*Doris Layton MacKenzie, Ph.D., is an associate professor at the University of Maryland's Institute of Criminal Justice and Criminology in College Park, Md. A visiting scientist at the National Institute of Justice, she is the director of the NIJ study of shock incarceration. Claire C. Souryal is a graduate student in the Institute of Criminal Justice and Criminology and is working as a research assistant on the NIJ study.*

Reprinted with permission of the American Correctional Association

1991 Shock Incarceration Survey

Doris L. MacKenzie and Claire Souryal

NIJ Grant 87-LJ-CX-0020

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.		
BOP	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 <sup>a</sup>	1.3 <sup>a</sup>	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) <sup>b</sup>	Varies
Kansas	2	6	0	1	1	Education (5)	Varies
Louisiana	3	3.5	0	2	1.5	Education (5) <sup>c</sup>	Intensive
Maryland	2	8	0	2	2	Combination (215) <sup>d</sup>	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 <sup>e</sup>	Treatment (18.5) <sup>f</sup>	Intensive
North Carolina	1	10	0	3	3	Combination (7)	Varies
Oklahoma	1.5	4	4 <sup>g</sup>	2	4	Combination (76) <sup>d</sup>	Varies
South Carolina	1 <sup>h</sup>	7.5 <sup>i</sup>	0	****	4 <sup>i</sup>	Education (4) <sup>j</sup>	Varies
Tennessee	6	4.5	0	4	4 <sup>e</sup>	Combination (7)	Varies
Texas	1	7	0	2	1	Combination (8) <sup>b</sup>	Varies
Virginia	1-2	6	*****	****	3	Education (5)	Intensive
Wisconsin	2	7	0	2.5-3	2.5-3	Treatment (18.5-20) <sup>k</sup>	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 Soury  
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*

**I**N 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-0028 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.

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 1/2 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 1 1/4 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	1985	2	240	110	Judge	no	yes	yes	regular
New York	1987	5	1602	180	Corrections Dept.	yes	yes	no	intensive
North Carolina	1989	1	54	98	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	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).<sup>3</sup> 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	468	1604
Graduates	676	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 "	39.6	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	24.6 (arrested)	22.6	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, 1969; Beck & Shipley, 1967.

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

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

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

#### REFERENCES

- Axiz, 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 recidivism 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), 125-160.
- Morash, 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: NJ Issues and Practices Report, National Institute of Justice, NCJ 114902.
- Schwert, 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 Camp Prisons in 1993

by Doris Layton MacKenzie, Ph.D.

**B**oot camp programs, frequently called shock incarceration, require offenders to serve a short term in a prison or jail in a quasi-military program similar to military boot camps or basic training. Currently 30 States, 10 local jurisdictions, and the Federal Bureau of Prisons have boot camp programs (see exhibit 1).<sup>1</sup> Another 8 programs have been designed solely for juveniles.<sup>2</sup> This report focuses on State boot camp programs for adults.

Most State programs target young adult offenders convicted of nonviolent crimes who are serving their first prison terms. Offenders accepted into the programs must serve between 90 and 180 days in the heavily regimented programs. Both the number of States with shock incarceration programs and the capacities of these programs have continued to increase during the 1990's. New York has the largest capacity with 1,500 beds, but programs in Georgia (800 beds), Oklahoma (400 beds), Michigan (600 beds), Texas (400 beds), and Maryland (440 beds) continue to grow in size (see exhibit 2).

There are currently well over 7,000 beds devoted to boot camp programs. On average, offenders spend 107 days in the programs. Thus, more than 23,000 offenders could potentially complete programs in a 1-year period.

Offenders who successfully complete shock incarceration programs are released to community supervision. Forty-two percent of the States intensively supervise offenders who

are released from boot camp; 50 percent vary the supervision depending upon evaluated risk; and the remaining 8 percent require moderate or standard supervision. In some States a fairly large percentage of the inmates are dismissed from the program for one reason or another. These offenders must serve their sentences in traditional prisons or return to court for resentencing.

Exhibit 1. Shock Incarceration Programs in the U.S., April 1993



## Research in Action

*Exhibit 2. Growth of Shock Incarceration Programs for Adults*

Date Began	State	Number of Programs in 1992 and 1993	Number of Participants/ Capacity in 1992 and 1993	Average length of stay <sup>a</sup>
1983	Georgia	5	800/800	90
	Oklahoma	4	415/438	90 <sup>b</sup>
1984				
1985	Mississippi	1	223/263	120
1986				
1987	Florida	1	93/100	90
	Louisiana	1	64/136	120
	New York	5	1500/1500	180
	South Carolina	2	198/216	90
1988	Alabama	1	140/180	90
	Arizona	1	92/150	120
	Michigan	3	160/600	90
1989	Idaho	1	236/250	120
	North Carolina	1	82/90	92
	Tennessee	1	103/150	91
	Texas	2	329/400	80
1990	Illinois	1	215/230	120
	Maryland	1	332/448	168
	New Hampshire	1	32/65	120
	Wyoming	1	23/24	95
1991	Arkansas	1	150/150	105
	BOP-male	1	192/192	190
	Colorado	1	114/100	90
	Kansas	1	66/104	180
	Nevada	1	60/60	150
	Ohio	1	76/94	90
	Virginia	1	79/100	90
	Wisconsin	1	40/40	180
1992	BOP-female	1	119/120	180
	Massachusetts	1	95/256	120
	Minnesota	1	12/36	180
	Pennsylvania	1	45/50	180
1993	California	1	48/176	180 <sup>c</sup>
Total		46	6133/7518	121

1993 Considering beginning programs: Indiana, Missouri, and Rhode Island.

<sup>a</sup> Based upon graduates of the program

<sup>b</sup> Four programs, two 90-day programs and two 45-day programs

<sup>c</sup> The first phase is 120 days with a capacity of 176 and the second phase is 60 days with a capacity of 64

### A day in boot camp

Upon arrival at the boot camp prison, male inmates have their heads shaved (females may be permitted short haircuts) and are informed of the strict program rules. At all times they are required to address staff as "Sir" or "Ma'am," must request permission to speak, and must refer to themselves as "this inmate." Punishments for even minor rule violations are summary and certain, frequently involving physical exercise such as push-ups or running in place. A major rule violation can result in dismissal from the program.

In a typical boot camp program for adult offenders, the 10- to 16-hour day begins with pre-dawn reveille. Inmates dress quickly and march to an exercise yard where they participate in an hour or two of physical training and drill. Following this they march to breakfast in a dining hall where they must stand at attention while waiting in line and move in a military manner when the line advances. Inmates are required to stand behind their chairs until commanded to sit and must eat without conversation. After breakfast they march to work sites where they participate in hard physical labor that frequently involves community service such as picking up litter in State parks or along highways. When the 6- to 8-hour work day is over, offenders return to the compound where they participate in


more exercise and drill. Dinner is followed by evening programs that include counseling, life skills training, academic education, or drug education and treatment.

As their performance and time in the program warrants, shock incarceration inmates gradually earn more privileges and responsibility. A special hat or uniform may be the outward display of their new status. Those who successfully finish the program usually attend an elaborate graduation ceremony with visitors and family invited to attend. Awards are often presented to acknowledge progress made during the program, and the inmates may perform the drill routines they have practiced throughout their time in the boot camp.

### Goals

A survey of the 26 programs in operation in early 1992 indicated that program officials considered rehabilitation and reducing recidivism as the most important goals. However, reducing crowding and providing a safe prison environment were still considered important. These results are consistent with the goals of most other intermediate sanctions—providing judges options beyond probation or prison, reducing prison crowding, and changing offenders' behavior patterns. The importance given to one goal over the other probably depends upon the individual who is doing the rating.

Exhibit 3. Importance of Shock Incarceration Goals



Judges may be particularly interested in programs that have an impact on the individual offender and that provide more control than traditional probation. In contrast, corrections administrators, seeking new programs and facing serious prison crowding, may emphasize the importance of using intermediate sanctions such as boot camp.

When different types of rehabilitation efforts were rated, the officials judged drug education and work skills as the most important rehabilitation aspects. Since "work" in most programs means hard physical labor, the work skills referred to are probably related to good work habits rather than vocational skills that might result in increased employment opportunities. Academic

### Shock Incarceration for Women

Thirteen states and the Federal Bureau of Prisons have shock incarceration programs for women. In 10 of the boot camps, males and females are combined in one program; inmates live in separate quarters but are integrated for most other activities. Other jurisdictions such as the Federal Bureau of Prisons, Mississippi, Oklahoma, and Texas have developed completely separate programs for female offenders.

In 1992 the National Institute of Justice brought together experts on female offenders, shock incarceration programs, and corrections in a focus group meeting at the University of Maryland. These experts identified issues to be considered in judging the adequacy of boot camp programs for women. The issues fell into five major categories: physical and psychological; family responsibilities; selection

and classification; facility design and staffing; and program planning.

There was some debate by focus group members about whether the programs would address the particular needs of women, unfairly exclude women from participation in a useful program, exacerbate existing prison problems, or introduce new difficulties.

The focus group agreed that more information was needed regarding the development and implementation of the programs for women, and that research should be initiated to examine the effectiveness of shock incarceration in general and its applicability for women offenders. NIJ is currently sponsoring a descriptive study of the shock incarceration programs for women. This report is expected to be completed by December 1993.

education and drug treatment were also considered by many to be important aspects of their programs. Vocational education was rated as unimportant or not a goal by most respondents.

#### Drug treatment and education

All programs operating in 1992 reported incorporating drug education or a combination of drug education and treatment in the schedule of activities, most likely

because of the large number of drug-involved offenders entering the programs. However, the amount of time devoted to drug education or treatment varies greatly among programs. Some programs have as few as 15 days of treatment; in contrast, offenders in the New York program receive drug treatment every day of the 180-day program.

Programs also differ in the way drug treatment is incorporated into the schedule of activities. New York uses a therapeutic community model for its boot camp program, and all

offenders receive the same drug treatment while they are in the program. The platoons form a small "community" and meet daily to solve problems and discuss their progress in the program. Inmates also spend time in substance abuse education classes and in group counseling. The counseling program is based on the Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) and Narcotics Anonymous (NA) model of abstinence and recovery. All inmates participate in the drug treatment programs regardless of their substance abuse history.

The Illinois program also targets substance abusers, but incorporates treatment in a very different manner from the New York model. In Illinois drug counselors evaluate offenders and match the education or treatment level to the severity of the offender's substance abuse problems. Inmates with no history of substance abuse receive only 2 weeks of drug education. Those who are identified as probable substance abusers receive 4 weeks of group counseling along with the drug education. Inmates who are classified as having drug addictions receive the drug education and 10 weeks of drug treatment.

In the Texas shock incarceration program, all participants receive approximately 5 weeks of drug education. Treatment is available after the education program ends, but offenders must volunteer for this treatment. They may also have

individual counseling if requested, and they can attend 12-step fellowship meetings.

### Development and change

Boot camp programs continue to develop and change. The first programs that were developed in Oklahoma and Georgia in 1983 emphasized the military atmosphere, physical training, and hard labor. Although these still play a significant role in shock incarceration, many boot camp programs have begun to allot an increasing amount of time to rehabilitation and education.

Also, many programs are developing innovative methods to help offenders make the transition from shock incarceration back to the community. Maryland is developing transitional housing for boot camp graduates who do not have acceptable housing available in the community. While in the boot camp program, the Maryland inmates are helping with the renovations needed for the transitional housing.

New York has an intensive "after-shock" program that incorporates work programs, employment counseling, drug counseling, and a continuation of the daily therapeutic community meetings that were part of the boot camp program.

*At Louisiana's Elayne Hunt Correctional Center, a participant stands at military attention, armed with a book and paper, weapons of rehabilitation.*



Photo by Jeff Hooper

In Illinois, offenders who graduate from the program are electronically monitored for the first 3 months of community supervision.

California's new boot camp prison at San Quentin will train convicts for 120 days. Following this, offenders will be required to live at a nearby naval air station for 60 days. During this time, they may leave the base if they are employed or work on the base while they search for a job. Upon release from the base, they are intensively supervised in the community for an additional 4 months.

There has also been some interest in applying aspects of the boot camp model to other prison populations. At the Valdosta Correctional Institution, a close custody prison, the

Georgia Department of Corrections is using a modified version of the boot camp approach in two programs for inmates who present special management problems. The Intensive Therapeutic Program for disruptive inmates, and the Mental Health Program for disruptive inmates who have been diagnosed as mentally ill.

The program for disruptive inmates involves strict discipline, regimented drills, adherence to a code of ethics, maintenance of personal living quarters, and high standards of personal hygiene. The program was designed to teach disruptive inmates acceptable ways to deal with frustration, anger, and fear and provides inmates a means of earning their way back into the general prison population.

## Research in Action



Photo by Jeff Hooper

*Military discipline is an important part of most shock incarceration programs; the photo on the left was taken of Louisiana's program*

The Mental Health Program at Valdosta is similar to the program for disruptive inmates, but was designed in consultation with mental health professionals as a treatment modality for seriously mentally ill inmates who are also disruptive. All inmates in the program are assigned to a mental health caseload after being referred by one of the diagnostic and classification centers, staff at another penal institution, or the Valdosta staff.

### The multisite study

Eight States are participating in the study of shock incarceration sponsored by the National Institute of Justice: Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Louisiana, New York, Oklahoma, South Carolina, and Texas. The programs represent very different models of the shock incarceration concept. The two most significant

differences are (1) whether the court or the department of corrections makes placement decisions; and (2) whether the program's focus is on treatment and education (New York, Illinois, Louisiana) or the military discipline, physical training, and work (Georgia, Texas).<sup>4</sup>

Intensive interviews with program staff and a thorough examination of written materials from the programs revealed that all were designed in part to address the problems of prison crowding. In some States this was expected to be accomplished because prison-bound offenders would serve less time in the boot camp than if they served a full prison sentence. In New York, Louisiana, and Illinois, the department of corrections selects candidates for the programs, and offenders can earn their way out of prison in less time than if they serve their original sentences.

In other States, offenders are sent to the boot camp by the court, which maintains full control over the offenders. Those who are dismissed prior to completion and those who successfully complete the program must return to the court for final disposition. Texas and the original programs in Georgia and South Carolina were designed this way. However, South Carolina now operates its program through the department of corrections, and Georgia operates some programs through the court and some through corrections.

There were large differences among the eight sites in the number of offenders completing the shock incarceration program in a one-year period, largely as a result of differences in the numbers of beds devoted to the program, the length of the program, and the dismissal rates. Depending upon the prison, between 8 and 50 percent of the inmates fail to complete the program. For example, in 1989 Georgia graduated more offenders (849 graduates) than New York (743 graduates), yet New York had a 1,500 bed capacity while Georgia had only 250 beds. The difference resulted from the fact that Georgia's program lasted an average of 89 days with only a 9 percent dismissal rate while New York's lasted 180 days and had a 31 percent dismissal rate. Overall, the States with the lowest dismissal rates were those in which the judge had decision-making authority.

## An Evaluation of Shock Incarceration in Louisiana

A recently released National Institute of Justice Research in Brief reports the result of an intensive evaluation of the Louisiana Department of Public Safety and Correction's boot camp prison.\* The evaluation was designed to identify the goals as defined by the jurisdiction and to examine the success or failure of the program in meeting these goals. Program implementation, changes in inmate behavior and attitudes as a result of participation, and system-level changes were examined. The results indicate that some of the desired goals are being achieved while others are not. The study identifies the difficulties of designing programs to meet these goals. The Louisiana Department of Public Safety and Correction completed multisite study of shock incarceration in eight sites.

\*MacKenzie, D.L., J.W. Shaw, and V.B. Gowdy, *An Evaluation of Shock Incarceration in Louisiana*, Research in Brief, National Institute of Justice, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, March 1993.

One phase of the multisite study was designed to examine the effect shock incarceration programs had on the attitudes of the participating offenders. Some critics of shock incarceration have argued that the programs might have a negative impact on the offenders, that offenders would leave the boot camp more alienated and antisocial than before they entered.

The programs in the multisite study differed greatly in daily schedules, the emphasis placed on therapeutic activities, the types of offenders participating, and dropout rates—all differences that would be expected to have an influence on the attitudes of the participants. In some programs most of the day was devoted to physical training, drill, and work, while others devoted a substantial amount of time to counseling, education, and treatment.


The researchers were interested in determining whether the inmates' attitudes toward their boot camp experience or their general antisocial attitudes changed as a result of the programs. Inmates' attitudes were measured once soon after they arrived and again near the end of the program. Despite the differences among the programs the results were surprisingly consistent. Boot camp inmates became more positive about their experience in the program and they became less antisocial. This was true of the programs that had a therapeutic emphasis and those that emphasized work and physical training.

The attitudes of the boot camp participants were also compared with the attitudes of similar prisoners in the general prison population and were found to be generally more positive. The general population inmates did not think their experience in prison had helped them to learn self-discipline, to learn about themselves, to change in a positive way, or to become more mature, while boot camp inmates were more apt to agree with these statements.

On the other hand, both the general population inmates and the boot camp inmates became less antisocial in their attitudes while incarcerated. They were more apt to accept responsibility for themselves and their actions instead of blaming the police or judges, they felt more positive about their relationships with others, and they held more socially acceptable opinions about behavior.

Thus, there was no evidence that shock incarceration had a negative impact on inmates' attitudes. Those nearing the end of their incarceration reported that the boot camp program had been a positive experience for them. Similar inmates in traditional prisons did not report that their experience was positive. However, both the boot camp inmates and prison comparison samples became less antisocial during their term in prison.

The researchers are now examining the performance of the offenders upon release from the shock incarceration programs in the eight sites. The positive activities and adjustment and the recidivism rates of the offenders released from boot camps will be compared to those of similar offenders who received different sentences.



*The State of New York shock incarceration program is the largest in the country with a capacity of 1,500 beds.*

These programs continue to evolve. The objective of this research is to inform program planners about the impact of the programs and to help them design programs to achieve the desired goals.

### Notes

1. For information on county boot camps see Austin, J., M. Jones and M. Bolyard. *Assessing the Impact of a County Operated Boot Camp*, 1993.
2. For information on juvenile boot camps see Toby, J. and F.S. Pearson. "Juvenile Boot Camps, 1992" in *Boot Camps for Juvenile Offenders: Constructive Intervention and Early Support-Implementation Evaluation*, final report to NIJ, 1992.
3. Quinn, Michelle, correspondent. *San Francisco Chronicle*, Tuesday, January 19, 1993.
4. As has happened throughout the U.S. these boot camp programs continue to develop and change. The descriptions of these programs are based on conditions as they were at the time of the study.

---

*Doris Layton MacKenzie is associate professor in the Institute of Criminal Justice and Criminology, University of Maryland.*

*from original for*  
Department of Health and Social Services

## **DIVISION OF YOUTH SERVICES'**

Report to Joint Committee on Finance

Residential Boot Camp and  
Wilderness Challenge Programs for  
Juvenile Offenders  
and  
Plan for Wisconsin Juvenile Boot Camp

August 31, 1994

Silvia R. Jackson, Ph.D.  
Administrator  
Division of Youth Services  
Department of Health and Social Services  
1 W. Wilson Street  
P.O. Box 8930  
Madison, WI 53708-8930  
(608) 267-3691

## Table of Contents

	<u>Page Number</u>
Preface	1
Chapter One - Evaluation of the Concept-Review of the Literature	2
Adult Boot Camps	3
Juvenile Boot Camps	4
Chapter Two - Review of Existing Juvenile Boot Camp Programs	6
Sergeant Henry Johnson, Youth Leadership Academy	8
Camp Roulston Boot Camp	10
Leon County Boot Camp	11
Manatee County Boot Camp	12
Environmental Youth Corps	13
Nokomis Challenge Center	14
SPRITE Program	15
Chapter Three - Youth Leadership Facility, Wisconsin's Proposed Juvenile Boot Camp Program	16
Wisconsin Juvenile Boot Camp, Mission Statement	16
Purpose	18
Program Goals for Participants	18
Target Group	18
Program Components	19
Program Phases	20
Camp Organization	21
Conclusion	22
Endnotes	23
Appendix A - Juvenile Boot Camp Surveys	26
Sergeant Henry Johnson, Youth Leadership Academy	27
Camp Roulston Boot Camp	33
Leon County Boot Camp	39
Manatee County Boot Camp	44
Environmental Youth Corps	50
Nokomis Challenge Program	56
SPRITE Program	62
Summary of Bed Capacity and FTE's	68
Appendix B - Activity Schedules for Youth Leadership Facility	69
Appendix C - Youth Leadership Facility Job Book	77

community--unemployment, drug use and the lack of social support--regardless of the desire of the person to change. A key finding is that "success may be contingent on the emphasis on rehabilitation--giving offenders the training, treatment and education they need to support new behaviors during incarceration and on aftercare."<sup>17</sup>

Therefore, the length and quality of aftercare appears to be critical to success. Aftercare should ideally include a highly structured transition phase, followed by an aftercare program which includes enough contacts with parole agents to ensure public safety, as well as individualized services to meet the treatment needs of the youth and keep them focused on pro-social goals.<sup>18 19</sup> For example, the aftercare program for graduates of a 90-day boot camp in Denver includes intensive education and vocational training for a year. They also receive mentoring in the community from other successful boot camp veterans.<sup>20</sup>

Michael Lucci, a retired military officer who is currently the director of a juvenile boot camp in Alabama, also feels that the key to success is the ability of the boot camp to integrate the youth back into the positive elements of the community. He pointed out that a true military boot camp is only 8 weeks in duration followed by 4 years of "aftercare" consisting of specialized education, training, employment, medical care, and room and board provided by the armed forces.<sup>21</sup> Therefore, if we expect the juvenile boot camp experience to have a lasting positive effect, we must be willing to also provide comparable support after graduation.

## ADULT BOOT CAMPS

Because the goals are similar for juvenile and adult boot camps (to reduce prison crowding, be cost/effective, reduce recidivism, and rehabilitate), the evaluation literature on adult boot camps can be informative in designing juvenile boot camps. However, because juvenile boot camps place a strong emphasis on education and rehabilitation, it is not advisable to rely too heavily on their findings.

The following has been learned regarding adult correctional boot camp programs:

Prison Crowding Reduction. Boot camps can be effective in reducing prison overcrowding only if they are used for offenders who otherwise would be sent to or remain in prison. If net widening (using the program for offenders who otherwise would not be in prison) occurs, boot camps may increase prison populations as boot camp failures are transferred to secure facilities.<sup>22</sup> This is not to say that boot camps cannot be an effective early intervention tool to prevent individuals from going to prison.

Cost Effectiveness. To the extent boot camps have been found to cost less and have the same results as prison, they can save money.<sup>23</sup> By using its boot camp program for offenders who otherwise would be sent to prison, New York estimates that it saved \$304 million over the past 6 years.<sup>24</sup> Louisiana estimates it saved \$7,838 per offender.<sup>25</sup>

**Reduce Recidivism.** Graduates of adult boot camps have about the same recidivism rates as offenders who went to prison; however, the types of offenses differ.<sup>26 27</sup> Boot camp graduates, who are often under greater scrutiny upon release, tend to return to prison for technical violations, while non-boot camp offenders tend to return to prison because they are convicted of committing new crimes.<sup>28</sup>

Key factors identified in making it through the first year after release from prison without an arrest were: 1) being employed during the first month of release; 2) scoring high on a positive adjustment index; and 3) the intensity of supervision.<sup>29</sup> Additionally, requiring boot camp graduates to participate in positive activities in the community has been found to reduce criminal activities during the community supervision phase.<sup>30</sup>

**Rehabilitation.** MacKenzie believes that rehabilitation and treatment should be the primary focus of boot camps.<sup>31</sup> According to MacKenzie, there is a movement for boot camp programs to include more effective formalized treatment programs.

## JUVENILE BOOT CAMPS

Though the primary goals of boot camps are the same for juveniles as for adult boot camps (rehabilitation, reducing recidivism, reducing institution crowding, and cost-effectiveness); juvenile boot camps place a much stronger emphasis on education and rehabilitation.

Due to the newness of juvenile boot camps, there is little information about their effectiveness.<sup>32</sup> Because of this, the U.S. Department of Justice funded a controlled evaluation of juvenile boot camps in Ohio and Alabama.<sup>33</sup> The results of this study will not be available until November 1995.

While some critics maintain that boot camps are not appropriate for juveniles, the American Correctional Association (ACA) sees merit in juvenile boot camps—provided they recognize that the needs of juveniles are different from those of young adults.<sup>34</sup> The ACA believes that a successful juvenile boot camp must have a strong academic and vocational education component; a substance abuse treatment program; and staff who care for the youth as individuals, while also disciplining and challenging them. Lloyd W. Mixdorf (former Juvenile Projects and Program Director, ACA) feels that boot camps can be effective provided they focus on education and treatment, have competent caring staff, and a comprehensive aftercare component.<sup>35</sup>

Because they are so new there is even some confusion as to what constitutes a juvenile boot camp. Some programs classified as juvenile boot camps (in a document prepared by the National Institute of Justice and the ACA) don't even consider themselves boot camps because they do not have a military component.<sup>36</sup> Most of these are experiential (adventure education) programs such as the DYS SPRITE program. Adventure education programs are sometimes confused with juvenile boot camps because they have many of the same elements as boot camps, but lack a military component. Some of the juvenile agencies which combine boot camp philosophy with "experiential" or "adventure" programming have relabeled them

9-LS0016F  
Luckhaupt  
3/16/95

CS FOR HOUSE BILL NO. 2( )  
IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA  
NINETEENTH LEGISLATURE - FIRST SESSION

BY

Offered:  
Referred:

Sponsor(s): REPRESENTATIVES WILLIS, Rokeberg

A BILL

FOR AN ACT ENTITLED

1 "An Act providing for incarceration of certain nonviolent offenders in boot camps  
2 operated by the Department of Corrections; making prisoners who complete the  
3 boot camp program eligible for discretionary parole; allowing the Department of  
4 Corrections to contract with a person for a boot camp program; creating the  
5 Boot Camp Advisory Board in the Department of Corrections; and providing for  
6 an effective date."

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

8 \* Section 1. AS 33.16.090 is amended by adding a new subsection to read:

9 (f) Notwithstanding another provision of law, a prisoner who is not otherwise  
10 eligible for discretionary parole who has successfully completed the boot camp  
11 program under AS 33.30.182 is eligible for discretionary parole.

12 \* Sec. 2. AS 33.16.100 is amended by adding a new subsection to read:

13 (e) Notwithstanding (c) and (d) of this section, a prisoner who is eligible for

1 discretionary parole under AS 33.16.090(f) may be released on parole at any time after  
2 the successful completion of the boot camp program under AS 33.30.182.

3 \* Sec. 3. AS 33.30 is amended by adding new sections to read:

4 ARTICLE 2A. BOOT CAMP PROGRAM.

5 Sec. 33.30.182. BOOT CAMP PROGRAM. (a) The commissioner shall  
6 establish a boot camp program as a correctional facility of the state. The boot camp  
7 program is an alternative correctional facility and program for youthful prisoners who  
8 have been sentenced for a conviction of a less serious nature and who have not  
9 previously participated in the boot camp program. Prisoners participating in the boot  
10 camp program shall be housed separately from other prisoners committed to the  
11 custody of the commissioner who are not participating in the program.

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

13 (1) a military style intensive physical training and discipline program;

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

16 (3) a training program emphasizing skills for reentering society;

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

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

20 (c) The commissioner shall structure the boot camp program so that a prisoner  
21 entering the program may complete it in a period of time determined by the  
22 commissioner but not greater than 150 days.

23 (d) A prisoner shall be removed from the boot camp program and reassigned  
24 to another correctional facility if the prisoner fails to successfully complete the  
25 program or otherwise fails to abide by the regulations of the program.

26 (e) The commissioner shall adopt regulations to implement AS 33.30.182 -  
27 33.30.184 and otherwise administer the boot camp program. The regulations must  
28 include provisions to require a prisoner to reimburse the department for the costs of  
29 participating in the boot camp program to the extent of the prisoner's resources.

30 (f) Notwithstanding AS 33.30.031, the department may contract with a person  
31 for operation of a boot camp program under this section. A contract boot camp

1 program must meet all of the requirements for a boot camp under this section and  
2 under the regulations adopted by the commissioner. Prisoners shall be assigned to a  
3 contract boot camp program in the manner provided under AS 33.30.183.

4 (g) The commissioner shall maintain records of the program and shall annually  
5 report to the legislature not later than February 1 on the program and its effectiveness.  
6 The report must include, to the extent the technological capability of the department  
7 allows,

8 (1) a comparison of recidivism rates between prisoners who have  
9 completed the boot camp program and other prisoners not eligible for the program who  
10 are committed to the custody of the commissioner;

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

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

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

19 (b) To be eligible to serve time in the boot camp program, the prisoner must  
20 have been selected by the commissioner and

21 (1) be under 26 years of age;

22 (2) have been sentenced to a term of imprisonment of at least 150 days;

23 (3) not have previously participated in a boot camp program under  
24 AS 33.30.182;

25 (4) not be serving a sentence for a violation of AS 11.41;  
26 AS 11.46.300, 11.46.400; AS 11.56.300, 11.56.810; AS 11.61.100, 11.61.190,  
27 11.61.195, or 11.61.240.

28 Sec. 33.30.184. ADVISORY BOARD. (a) The Boot Camp Program Advisory  
29 Board is established in the department. The board shall review and provide advice to  
30 the commissioner concerning the boot camp program. The members of the board are  
31 appointed by the governor as follows:

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10

- (1) the commissioner or the commissioner's designee;
- (2) the director of the division of institutions of the department;
- (3) the director of the division of community corrections of the department;
- (4) a member of the house of representatives;
- (5) a member of the senate; and
- (6) two public members.

(b) The public members of the board are entitled to per diem and travel expenses authorized by law for boards and commissions under AS 39.20.180.

\* Sec. 4. This Act takes effect July 1, 1995.

# ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE

## COMMITTEES:

- State Affairs
- Military and Veterans Affairs
- Economic Development

## BUDGET SUBCOMMITTEES:

- Department of Administration
- Department of Military and Veterans Affairs



DURING SESSION:  
STATE CAPITOL BUILDING  
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99801-1182  
(907) 465-2199  
Fax (907) 465-4587

EAGLE RIVER:  
11940 BUSINESS BLVD.  
EAGLE RIVER, ALASKA 99577  
(907) 694-6683  
Fax (907) 694-1015

## REPRESENTATIVE ED WILLIS

DISTRICT 25

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

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Rep. Jeannette James  
Chair, House State Affairs Committee

FROM: Rep. Ed Willis *Ed Willis*

DATE: March 20, 1995

RE: Draft CS for HB 2 (boot camps)

Thank you for your assistance regarding the scheduling of House Bill 2.

For your review, I am attaching the following:

- Draft CS for HB 2 prepared by Legal Services (9/LS0016/F)
- Chart prepared by my office to show where the changes took place in the draft CS.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me. I look forward to discussing this bill at tomorrow's committee meeting.



printed on recycled paper

## CHANGES - HB 2 (9-LS0016/A) and Draft CS HB 2 ( ) (9/LS0016/F)

From: Office of Representative Ed Willis  
March 20, 1995

### HOUSE BILL 2

Title

Section 1 & 2: allows court to impose  
boot camp as part of sentencing

Section 3: allows eligibility for  
discretionary parole after  
completion of program AS 33.16.090  
(Eligibility for Discretionary Parole)

### DRAFT CS FOR HOUSE BILL 2

Title. Some Changes:

- a. changes order of lines in title:  
former lines 4-5 become lines 1-2.
- b. deletes reference to court sentencing
- c. deletes "alternative" in front of boot  
camp

Deletes these sections.

Section 1: old section 3, no change.

## HOUSE BILL 2

Section 4: Boot camp program

## DRAFT CS FOR HOUSE BILL 2

Section 2: New Section. Allows discretionary parole after successful completion of program. AS 33.16.100 (Granting of Discretionary Parole)

Section 3: Boot camp program  
New Language. Changes:

- a: page 2, line 7: adds “youthful” before “prisoners”
- b: page 2, lines 7-9: deletes following language contained in HB 2: “ordered to successfully complete the program as a special condition of probation

## HOUSE BILL 2

## DRAFT CS FOR HOUSE BILL 2

under AS 12.55.086". This is a conforming amendment to the deletion of Sections 1 and 2 in the original bill (court sentencing to a boot camp).

c: page 2, lines 27-29: adds: "The regulations must include provisions to require a prisoner to reimburse the department for the costs of participating in the boot camp program to the extent of the prisoner's resources." Similar provision was contained in Section 1 of HB 2 and this section has been deleted in the draft CS.

d: page 2, line 31: deletes "alternative" in front of the first "boot camp" and

## HOUSE BILL 2

## DRAFT CS FOR HOUSE BILL 2

inserts “operation of a”. Deletes “alternative” in front of second “boot camp” and replaces that with “contract”.

e: page 3, line 3: deletes “alternative” in front of boot camp and replaces it with “contract”.

f: page 3, line 21: inserts “be under 26 years of age”

deletes references to sentencing by courts contained in HB 2 (“ordered to participate in the program by the court under AS 12.55.086; or” is language deleted)

**HOUSE BILL 2**

**DRAFT CS FOR HOUSE BILL 2**

g: page 4, lines 1-9. deletes reference to “a superior court judge” as member of the Boot Camp Advisory Board

Section 5. Effective Date

Section 4: Effective date - no change

# HOUSE COMMITTEE REPORT

(7)

Date Referred: January 16, 1995

FURTHER REFERRALS:

Judiciary  
Finance

Date of Committee Action: March 23, 1995

The STATE AFFAIRS Committee considered:

HB 2

HOUSE BILL NO. 2

BOOT CAMP FOR NONVIOLENT OFFENDERS

"An Act allowing courts to require certain offenders as a special condition of probation to complete a boot camp program provided by the Department of Corrections; making prisoners who complete the boot camp program eligible for discretionary parole; providing for incarceration of certain nonviolent offenders in boot camps operated by the Department of Corrections; allowing the Department of Corrections to contract with a person for an alternative boot camp program; creating the Boot Camp Advisory Board in the Department of Corrections; and providing for an effective date."

recommends it be replaced  the same title  
with the following committee substitute CS HB 2 (STA)  a new title

additional referral to \_\_\_\_\_ Committee

attached amendment(s)

ADOPTS: \_\_\_\_\_ Letter of Intent

ATTACHES NEW FISCAL NOTE(S): (Dept)

APPROVES PREVIOUS: (Dept/Date)

fiscal note(s) Corrections  fiscal note(s) \_\_\_\_\_

zero fiscal note(s) Law  zero fiscal note(s) \_\_\_\_\_

Admin, At Courts, Public Safety

SIGNING WITH RECOMMENDATIONS	DP	DNP	NR	AM
<i>Janette James</i>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<i>Brian Foster</i>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<i>[Signature]</i>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<i>[Signature]</i>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<i>Caren Robinson</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
<i>Ed Willis</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
<i>[Signature]</i>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

CHAIR'S SIGNATURE

*Janette James*

**HB**

**3**

STATE OF ALASKA  
1995 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO. HB3

Revision Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Title: Right of Step parent to have court-appointed  
 counsel at public expense in CINA proceedings.  
 Sponsor: Willis  
 Requestor: House (STA)

Dept. Affected: Health and Social Services  
 BRU: Family and Youth Services  
 Component: Southeastern Region  
 COMPONENT SERIAL NO. 258  
 See also (SN#): 254.255

Expenditures/Revenues:

(Thousands of Dollars)

OPERATING	FY96	FY97	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01
PERSONAL SERVICES						
TRAVEL						
CONTRACTUAL						
SUPPLIES						
EQUIPMENT						
LAND & STRUCTURES						
GRANTS, CLAIMS						
MISCELLANEOUS						
<b>TOTAL OPERATING</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES						
----------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

CHANGES IN REVENUES ( )						
-------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

FUND SOURCE

(Thousands of Dollars)

1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF						
1005 GF/Program Receipts						
1006 GF/MHTIA						
Other (please specify)						
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

POSITIONS:

FULL-TIME						
PART-TIME						
TEMPORARY						

Estimate of any current year (FY95) cost: \$0.0

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary)

There will be no fiscal impact to the division since the Office of Public Advocacy would be responsible to provide the legal representation.

Prepared by: Kathy Tibbles, Acting Director  
 Division: Family & Youth Services

Phone: 465-3191  
 Date: 02/09/95

Approved by Commissioner: Karen Perdue, Commissioner  
 Agency: Department of Health & Social Services

Date: 2/9/95

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

STATE OF ALASKA  
1995 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO. HB3

Revision Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Title: Right of Step parent to have court-appointed  
counsel at public expense in CINA proceedings.  
 Sponsor: Willis  
 Requestor: House (STA)

Dept. Affected: Health and Social Services  
 BRU: Family and Youth Services  
 Component: Southcentral Region  
 COMPONENT SERIAL NO. 254  
 See also (SN#): 255.258

Expenditures/Revenues:

(Thousands of Dollars)

OPERATING	FY96	FY97	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01
PERSONAL SERVICES						
TRAVEL						
CONTRACTUAL						
SUPPLIES						
EQUIPMENT						
LAND & STRUCTURES						
GRANTS, CLAIMS						
MISCELLANEOUS						
<b>TOTAL OPERATING</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES						
----------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

CHANGES IN REVENUES ( )						
-------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

FUND SOURCE

(Thousands of Dollars)

1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF						
1005 GF/Program Receipts						
1006 GF/MHTIA						
Other (please specify)						
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

POSITIONS:

FULL-TIME						
PART-TIME						
TEMPORARY						

Estimate of any current year (FY95) cost: \$0.0

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary)

There will be no fiscal impact to the division since the Office of Public Advocacy would be responsible to provide the legal representation.

Prepared by: Kathy Tibbles, Acting Director  
 Division: Family & Youth Services  
 Approved by Commissioner: Karen Perdue, Commissioner  
 Agency: Department of Health & Social Services

Phone: 465-3191  
 Date: 02/09/95  
 Date: 2/9/95

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

STATE OF ALASKA  
1995 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO. HB3

Revision Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Title: Right of Step parent to have court-appointed  
counsel at public expense in CINA proceedings.  
 Sponsor: Willis  
 Requestor: House (STA)

Dept. Affected: Health and Social Services  
 BRU: Family and Youth Services  
 Component: Northern Region  
 COMPONENT SERIAL NO. 255  
 See also (SN#): 254.258

Expenditures/Revenues:

(Thousands of Dollars)

OPERATING	FY96	FY97	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01
PERSONAL SERVICES						
TRAVEL						
CONTRACTUAL						
SUPPLIES						
EQUIPMENT						
LAND & STRUCTURES						
GRANTS, CLAIMS						
MISCELLANEOUS						
<b>TOTAL OPERATING</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES						
----------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

CHANGES IN REVENUES ( )						
-------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

FUND SOURCE

(Thousands of Dollars)

1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF						
1005 GF/Program Receipts						
1006 GF/MHTIA						
Other (please specify)						
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

POSITIONS:

FULL-TIME						
PART-TIME						
TEMPORARY						

Estimate of any current year (FY95) cost: \$0.0

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary)

There will be no fiscal impact to the division since the Office of Public Advocacy would be responsible to provide the legal representation.

Prepared by: Kathy Tibbles, Acting Director  
 Division: Family & Youth Services

Phone: 465-3191  
 Date: 02/09/95

Approved by Commissioner: Karen Perdue, Commissioner  
 Agency: Department of Health & Social Services

Date: 2/9/95

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  
1995 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO. HB 3

Revision Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Dept. Affected: Alaska Court System  
 Title: Counsel for stepparent, CINA BRU: Trial Courts  
proceedings Components: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Sponsor: Rep. Willis  
 Requestor: \_\_\_\_\_ COMPONENT SERIAL NO. 768

**EXPENDITURES/REVENUES** (Thousands of Dollars)

OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 96	FY 97	FY 98	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01
PERSONAL SERVICES						
TRAVEL						
CONTRACTUAL						
SUPPLIES						
EQUIPMENT						
LAND & STRUCTURES						
GRANTS & CLAIMS						
<b>TOTAL OPERATING</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES						
----------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

CHANGE IN REVENUES ( )						
------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

**FUND SOURCE** (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						
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

**POSITIONS**

FULL-TIME						
PART-TIME						
TEMPORARY						

Estimate of current year (FY 95) cost: \$ None

**ANALYSIS:** (Attach a separate page if necessary)

No fiscal impact.

Prepared by: C. S. Christensen III, Staff Counsel Phone: 264-8228  
 Agency: Alaska Court System Date: 02/06/95

Approved by: Arthur H. Snowden, II, Administrative Director Date: 02/06/95  
 Agency: Alaska Court System

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

**HB**

**10**

# Alaska State Legislature

While in Fairbanks  
119 N. Cushman Street Suite 207  
Fairbanks, Alaska 99701  
(907) 456-8172  
FAX (907) 451-9293



While in Session  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99801-1182  
(907) 465-4457  
FAX (907) 465-3519

## Representative John Davies District 29

### Memorandum

Date: February 15, 1995  
To: Representative Jeannette James  
Chair, State Affairs Committee  
From: Representative John Davies  
Re: Hearing for HB 10

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "John Davies".

I respectfully request a hearing for HB 10 at your earliest convenience. HB 10 is a good law and order bill, requiring DWI offenders convicted of causing motor vehicle accidents to pay for the costs of emergency services that respond to the accident.

Attached is my sponsor statement, a copy of the bill, a fiscal note from the Department of Public Safety, and information from the U.S. Department of Transportation on alcohol-related motor vehicle crashes, both rates and costs.

Thank you, please contact Shannon at my office if you have any questions concerning this bill.

# Alaska State Legislature

While in Fairbanks  
119 N. Cushman Street Suite 207  
Fairbanks, Alaska 99701  
(907) 456-8172  
FAX (907) 451-9293



While in Session  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99801-1182  
(907) 465-4457  
FAX (907) 465-3519

Representative John Davies  
District 29

## HB 10 SPONSOR STATEMENT

HB 10 is an act that requires DWI offenders convicted of causing a motor vehicle accident to pay for the costs of emergency services that respond to the accident.

The problems and associated costs of driving while intoxicated are clear. According to national statistics, approximately one-half of all fatal motor vehicle accidents involve alcohol. According to the Department of Public Safety 40% of all DWI arrests involve repeat offenders. Furthermore, alcohol related accidents nation-wide result in economic costs of \$46.1 billion per year (US Dept. of Transportation, 1990).

HB 10 attempts to address these problems in two manners. First, as a deterrent to those who drive while intoxicated by raising the financial penalty for doing so. By raising the financial burden to those breaking the law, HB 10 emphasizes the seriousness of the crime. Second, this bill shifts the financial responsibility of the emergency services that respond to alcohol-related accidents from law abiding, tax paying citizens to the convicted DWI offender.

Three states, California, Indiana, and Kansas have similar reimbursement laws.

**HOUSE BILL NO. 10**  
**IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA**  
**NINETEENTH LEGISLATURE - FIRST SESSION**

**BY REPRESENTATIVE DAVIES**

**Introduced:**

**Referred:**

**A BILL**

**FOR AN ACT ENTITLED**

1 "An Act relating to payment for emergency services responding to certain motor  
2 vehicle accidents."

3 **BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:**

4 \* Section 1. AS 28.35.030 is amended by adding a new subsection to read:

5 (n) If the act for which a person is convicted under this section contributes to a  
6 motor vehicle accident, the court shall order the person to pay the cost of any emergency  
7 services that responded to the accident. Payment required under this subsection shall be  
8 made directly to the emergency service and shall be equal to actual costs of responding  
9 to the accident or the previous year's annual average cost of responding to a motor vehicle  
10 accident, whichever is higher. In this subsection, "emergency service" includes a peace  
11 officer, fire department, ambulance service, or emergency medical technician.

1993

**Table 72**  
**Persons Killed or Injured in Alcohol-Related Crashes, by Person Type and Injury Severity**

Person Type	Persons Killed	Persons Injured by Injury Severity			Total Injured
		Incapacitating	Nonincapacitating	Other	
<b>Vehicle Occupants</b>					
Driver	10,389	48,000	68,000	88,000	180,000
Passenger	3,994	23,000	28,000	44,000	95,000
Subtotal**	14,385	69,000	95,000	111,000	275,000
<b>Nonmotorists</b>					
Pedestrian	2,738	3,000	3,000	3,000	10,000
Pedalcyclist	288	1,000	2,000	1,000	3,000
Other	34	****	1,000	****	1,000
Subtotal	3,066	4,000	6,000	5,000	14,000
<b>Total***</b>	<b>17,451</b>	<b>73,000</b>	<b>100,000</b>	<b>116,000</b>	<b>289,000</b>

\* Blood alcohol concentration (BAC) of 0.01 grams per deciliter (g/dl) or greater in the crash.  
 \*\* Police-reported alcohol involvement in the crash.  
 \*\*\* Includes 32 unknown occupants that were killed.  
 \*\*\*\* Less than 500.

USA.

Total Fatalities = 40,115  
 Fatalities in Alcohol Related Crashes = 17,461  
 Percent = 43.5 %

1. Report No. DOT HS 807 876		2. Government Accession No.		3. Recipient's Catalog No.	
4. Title and Subtitle  The Economic Cost of Motor Vehicle Crashes, 1990				5. Report Date September 1992	
				6. Performing Organization Code	
7. Author(s) Lawrence J. Blincoe and Barbara M. Faigin				8. Performing Organization Report No.	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address  Plans and Policy National Highway Traffic Safety Administration Washington, DC 20590				10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)	
				11. Contract or Grant No.	
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address  U.S. Department of Transportation National Highway Traffic Safety Administration Washington, DC 20590				13. Type of Report and Period Covered  NHTSA Technical Report	
				14. Sponsoring Agency Code	
15. Supplementary Notes We acknowledge the assistance of Linda Bernett, Office of Plans and Policy, NHTSA; Judy Hilton and other staff, National Center for Statistics and Analysis, NHTSA; and Ted R. Miller of the Urban Institute.					
16. Abstract  This report presents the results of an analysis of total motor vehicle crash costs for 1990 and the costs of alcohol-related crashes. The total economic cost of motor vehicle crashes and injuries that occurred in 1990 was \$137.5 billion. This total represents the present value of lifetime costs for 44,531 fatalities, 5.4 million non-fatal injuries, and 28 million damaged vehicles, in both police reported and unreported crashes. Property damage costs of \$45.7 billion accounted for the largest share of total motor vehicle crash costs. Lifetime losses in marketplace production due to deaths and injuries of \$39.8 billion represented the second largest portion of total cost. Medical expenses were the third highest cost category, totaling \$13.9 billion. Each fatality resulted in a discounted lifetime economic cost of \$702,000. Alcohol-related crashes resulted in economic costs of \$46.1 billion, 33.5 percent of 1990 costs. Eighty-one percent of all alcohol-related costs occurred in crashes where a driver or pedestrian was legally impaired (> = .10% BAC).					
17. Key Words Economic costs Motor vehicle crashes Motor vehicle fatalities, injuries Alcohol			18. Distribution Statement  Document is available to the U.S. public through the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, VA 22161		
19. Security Classif. (of this report)		20. Security Classif. (of this page)		21. No. of Pages	22. Price

9-LS0060F✓

Ford

3/15/95

**CS FOR HOUSE BILL NO. 10(STA)****IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA****NINETEENTH LEGISLATURE - FIRST SESSION****BY THE HOUSE STATE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

Offered:

Referred:

Sponsor(s): REPRESENTATIVE DAVIES

**A BILL****FOR AN ACT ENTITLED**

1 "An Act relating to payment for emergency services responding to certain motor  
2 vehicle accidents."

3 **BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:**

4 \* Section 1. AS 28.35.030 is amended by adding a new subsection to read:

5 (n) If the act for which a person is convicted under this section contributes to  
6 a motor vehicle accident, the court shall order the person to pay the cost of any  
7 emergency services that responded to the accident, if the convicted person or the  
8 convicted person's insurer has not already paid the cost of the emergency services. If  
9 payment is required under this subsection, the payment shall be made directly to the  
10 emergency service and shall be equal to the actual cost of responding to the accident  
11 or the previous year's annual average cost of responding to a motor vehicle accident,  
12 whichever is higher. In this subsection, "emergency service" includes a peace officer,  
13 fire department, ambulance service, or emergency medical technician.

# FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA  
1995 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO. HB 10

Revision Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Title: Payment of Costs of DWI Accidents

Department: Commerce and Economic Development  
BRU: Insurance  
Component: Operations

Sponsor: Representative Davies  
Requestor: \_\_\_\_\_

COMPONENT SERIAL NO. \_\_\_\_\_ #354

**Expenditures/Revenues**

(Thousands of Dollars)

OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 96	FY 97	FY 98	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01
PERSONAL SERVICES						
TRAVEL						
CONTRACTUAL						
SUPPLIES						
EQUIPMENT						
LAND & STRUCTURES						
GRANTS, CLAIMS						
MISCELLANEOUS						
<b>TOTAL OPERATING</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES						
----------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

CHANGE IN REVENUES						
--------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

**FUND SOURCE**

(Thousands of Dollars)

FUND SOURCE	FY 96	FY 97	FY 98	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01
1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 General Fund						
1005 GF/Program Receipts						
1006 GF/MHTIA						
Other						
<b>TOTAL</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Estimate of any current year (FY 95) cost: \$ 0.0

**POSITIONS**

POSITIONS	FY 96	FY 97	FY 98	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01
FULL-TIME	0	0	0	0	0	0
PART-TIME						
TEMPORARY						

**ANALYSIS:** (Attach a separate page if necessary)

No fiscal impact.

Prepared by: Joan Brown, Administrative Officer  
Division: Insurance  
Approved by Commissioner: William L. Hensley  
Agency: Commerce and Economic Development

Phone: 465-2597  
Date: 2/16/95  
Date: 2/23/95

**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  
1995 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO. HB 10

Revision Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Dept. Affected: Department of Law  
 Title: "An Act relating to payment for emergency services responding to certain motor vehicle accidents." BRU: Legal Services  
 Component: Operations  
 Sponsor: Representative Davies  
 Requester: Representative Davies COMPONENT SERIAL NO. 0093

**Expenditures/Revenues** (Thousands of Dollars)

OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 96	FY 97	FY 98	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01
PERSONAL SERVICES						
TRAVEL						
CONTRACTUAL						
SUPPLIES						
EQUIPMENT						
LAND & STRUCTURES						
GRANTS, CLAIMS						
MISCELLANEOUS						
<b>TOTAL OPERATING</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES						
----------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

CHANGE IN REVENUES ( )						
------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

**FUND SOURCE** (Thousands of Dollars)

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

Estimate of any current year (FY95) cost: \$ 0.0

**POSITIONS**

FULL-TIME	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
PART-TIME						
TEMPORARY						

**ANALYSIS:** (Attach a separate page if necessary)

This bill amends AS 28.35 to provide that a person convicted of driving while intoxicated, who contributes to a motor vehicle accident, be required to pay the cost of any emergency services that responded to the accident. Currently, courts have the discretionary power to order reimbursement under these circumstances, when a convicted DWI defendant is sentenced. This bill would make reimbursement of emergency responders mandatory. There will not be a fiscal impact for the Department of Law, because this is a sentencing provision that does not directly involve the department.

Prepared by: Richard I. Peques, Director  
 Division: Administrative Services Division  
 Approved by Commissioner: Bruce M. Botelho, Attorney General  
 Agency: Department of Law

Phone: 465-3672  
 Date: 2/15/95  
 Date: 2/15/95

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

BILL NO: HB 2

1995 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Revision Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Dept. Affected: Public Safety  
 Title: "An act allowing courts to require certain  
offenders...to complete a boot camp program..." Component: Alaska State Troopers  
 Sponsor: Representative Willis Detachments  
 Requestor: Representative Willis COMPONENT SERIAL NO. 0799

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

OPERATING	FY 96	FY 97	FY 98	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01
PERSONAL SERVICES						
TRAVEL						
CONTRACTUAL						
SUPPLIES						
EQUIPMENT						
LAND & STRUCTURES						
GRANTS, CLAIMS						
MISCELLANEOUS						
<b>TOTAL OPERATING</b>	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
<b>CAPITAL EXPENDITURES</b>	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
<b>CHANGE IN REVENUES ( )</b>	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
<small>Revenue Cols</small>						

**FUNDING: (Thousands of Dollars)**

1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF						
1005 GF/Program Receipts						
1006 GF/MHTIA						
Other						
<b>TOTAL</b>	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-

Estimate of current year (FY 95) impact: \$ -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

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary.)  
 No significant impact on the Alaska State Troopers.

Prepared By: Francis C. Allan Phone: 269-5691  
 Division: Alaska State Troopers Date: 01/24/95  
 Approved by Commissioner: *Ronald L. Otte* Date: 2-2-95  
 Agency: Ronald L. Otte, 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

STATE OF ALASKA  
1995 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO. HB 5

Revision Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Dept. Affected: Department of Revenue  
 Title: Eligibility for PFD and Longevity Bonus BRU: Permanent Fund Dividend Division  
 Component: Permanent Fund Dividend Division  
 Sponsor: Representative DAVIES  
 Requester: House State Affairs COMPONENT SERIAL NO. 981

**Expenditures/Revenues** (Thousands of Dollars)

OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 96	FY 97	FY 98	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01
PERSONAL SERVICES						
TRAVEL						
CONTRACTUAL						
SUPPLIES						
EQUIPMENT						
LAND & STRUCTURES						
GRANTS, CLAIMS						
MISCELLANEOUS						
<b>TOTAL OPERATING</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES						
----------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

CHANGE IN REVENUES ( )						
------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

**FUND SOURCE** (Thousands of Dollars)

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

Estimate of any current year (FY95) cost: \$ 0.0

**POSITIONS**

FULL-TIME						
PART-TIME						
TEMPORARY						

**ANALYSIS:** (Attach a separate page if necessary)

Section 1 of this legislation would add two allowable absences effective for the 1996 dividend.

If enacted, the Department would add these allowable absences to the 1996 application and instructions. The department does not anticipate any additional processing costs associated with adding these two absences.

The effect on the amount of the 1996 and subsequent dividends depends on the additional number of individuals who will qualify for a dividend as a result of these allowable absences. If the number of Alaska residents absent for these reasons is small, the effect on the dividend will be negligible.

Prepared by: Thomas C. Williams, Director Phone: 465-2323  
 Division: Permanent Fund Dividend Division Date: 2/7/95  
 Approved by Commissioner: [Signature] Date: 2/7/95  
 Agency: Department of Revenue

**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  
1995 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO. HB 6

Revision Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Dept. Affected: Department of Revenue  
Title: Eligibility for PFD BRU: Permanent Fund Dividend Division  
Component: Permanent Fund Dividend Division

Sponsor: Representative DAVIES  
Requester: House State Affairs COMPONENT SERIAL NO. 981

**Expenditures/Revenues** (Thousands of Dollars)

OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 96	FY 97	FY 98	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01
PERSONAL SERVICES						
TRAVEL						
CONTRACTUAL						
SUPPLIES						
EQUIPMENT						
LAND & STRUCTURES						
GRANTS, CLAIMS						
MISCELLANEOUS						
<b>TOTAL OPERATING</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES						
----------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

CHANGE IN REVENUES ( )						
------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

**FUND SOURCE** (Thousands of Dollars)

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

Estimate of any current year (FY95) cost: \$ 0.0

**POSITIONS**

FULL-TIME						
PART-TIME						
TEMPORARY						

**ANALYSIS:** (Attach a separate page if necessary)

Section 1 of this legislation would allow an Alaska resident as well as a resident's child who has been absent from the United States for two consecutive years during the four calendar year period immediately before the dividend year, to remain eligible for a dividend if he or she came home to Alaska during that four year period. All other residents would still be required to return home to Alaska during the two calendar years immediately before the dividend year.

If enacted, the Department would modify the 1996 application and instructions. The department does not anticipate any additional processing costs associated these amendments.

The effect on the amount of the 1996 and subsequent dividends depends on the additional number of individuals who will qualify for a dividend as a result of these amendments. If the number of affected Alaska residents is small, the effect on the dividend will be negligible.

Prepared by: Thomas C. Williams, Director Phone: 465-2323  
Division: Permanent Fund Dividend Division Date: 2/7/95

Approved by Commissioner: [Signature] Date: 2/7/95  
Agency: Department of Revenue

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

**MADD**

Mothers Against Drunk Driving

P. O. Box 71167 Fairbanks, AK 99701 (907) 456-3964

**DRUNK DRIVING IS NOT AN ACCIDENT, IT IS A VIOLENT CRIME.**

In 1993, 17,461 people were killed in the United States in alcohol-related traffic crashes. It is estimated that 950,000 people were injured in crashes where alcohol was present.

Direct costs of alcohol-related crashes are estimated to be \$44 billion yearly including \$6 billion in medical costs. An additional \$90 billion is lost in quality of life due to these crashes.

**THE MISSION OF MOTHERS AGAINST DRUNK DRIVING IS TO STOP DRUNK DRIVING AND TO SUPPORT VICTIMS OF THIS VIOLENT CRIME.**

Rep. John Davies  
Alaska State Legislature  
State Capitol  
Juneau, AK 99801-1182  
FAX (907) 465-3519


Re: HB No. 10

Dear Representative Davies,

The Fairbanks Chapter of Mothers Against Drunk Driving would like to voice it's support for HB No. 10. As I'm sure you're aware, the cost of drunk driving to the State is phenomenal. While one can never put a dollar amount on the loss of life or injury to a victim, drunk drivers must take responsibility for their actions. HB 10 will act as a deterrent to the potential drunk driver. We commend you for your efforts.

If I can provide you with further information, please contact me.

Sincerely,



Linda Ferree  
Chapter President