

Briefing Paper: Trends in Jail Privatization
February 1992

147133

Background

The movement to involve the private sector in the operation of correctional facilities began in the early 1980s, but it gained no real momentum until the middle of the decade. A Council of State Governments report noted only a "handful of activity" by 1983. At that time, four states (Arizona, California, Colorado, and Texas) had privately-run detention facilities, all of which were under contract to the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service or the Bureau of Prisons. Tennessee was in the planning process for a facility to house local offenders.

Privatization Models

It is important to remember that the term "privatization of corrections" has several meanings. There are a variety of ways for the private sector to be involved in corrections, including the following models:

- **Private Management**—Private firms have total responsibility for the operation of a facility. This is the most common use of the term "privatization"—and the most controversial aspect of the private sector's involvement in corrections.
- **Private Sector Development**—The private sector develops, designs, and finances or arranges for the financing of facilities. This often involves owning the facility and leasing it back to the jurisdiction through a lease/purchase contract, which serves as an alternative to a public bond issue or outright tax expenditure.
- **Private Services Provision**—Jails commonly contract with private vendors to run services such as medical, food, training, and education. Services provision is the oldest and most familiar privatization model.

Continuing Arguments—Pro and Con

The debate between proponents and opponents of correctional privatization surfaced early and continues unabated today.

NCJRS

MAY 11 1993

ACQUISITIONS



National Institute of Corrections
Information Center

1790 30th Street
Suite 130
Boulder, Colorado 80301
(303) 939-8877

142133

**U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice**

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

Permission to reproduce this ~~copyrighted~~ material has been granted by

Public Domain/NIC

U.S. Department of Justice

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

Pressures for privatization come from escalating costs and crowded facilities, as well as from general dissatisfaction with government. Privatization is sometimes seen as a practical option when a jurisdiction needs to bring facilities on-line quickly in response to a court order requiring additional capacity. Advocates claim that private operators can run facilities more efficiently and cost-effectively.

Opponents dismiss cost comparisons—or disagree with them. Some insist that the fundamental point is that it is the responsibility of the government to operate corrections. In this view, corrections is, as John DiIulio put it, “a public trust to be administered on behalf of the community and in the name of civility and justice.” At stake is also the question of whether private operators might put a profit motive ahead of the interests of the public, of inmates, or the purposes of confinement. Liability issues continue to be argued, although most agree that the public sector cannot avoid all liability by contracting for the management of corrections facilities.

Professional corrections associations have addressed privatization through policy statements that range from cautious (American Corrections Association) to negative (National Sheriffs’ Association). The American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees has been opposed from the beginning, and the American Bar Association in 1989 urged a moratorium on privatization until more information was available. (See Appendix A for copies of these policy statements.)

Growth In Privatization

Between 1983 and 1990, nineteen states granted legislative authority for the private operation of adult correctional facilities, and Tennessee and Colorado authorized county-level pilot projects. By the end of 1988, there were twenty privately-operated detention facilities at the federal, state, and local levels. During the second half of the '80s, some people were predicting that the private sector would overtake the public in the operation of correctional facilities.

By the end of the decade, though, it was clear that such predictions were unlikely to come true. Thomas in 1990 made the more modest assertion that “private prisons will handle easily 5 to 10 percent of the prison population by the end of the decade.” And even that prophecy seems problematical, given the current pace.

However, significant legislative activity was evident in 1990, as at least seven state legislatures took a position on privatization; some were positive, some negative. The number of privately-operated facilities increased by fifteen that year. Nevertheless, the pace of privatization has continued to be slow and steady rather than rapid. Only seven state legislatures have specifically authorized privately-operated facilities at the county level: Alabama, California, Kentucky, New Mexico, Tennessee, and Texas. (See Appendices B and C for a summary of state legislation and a list of privately-operated facilities.)

The Picture Today

By year end 1990, 14,338 inmate beds were under private contract, and an additional 3,728 were planned for 1991. By the same date, a total of sixteen local governments had opened or planned to open private jails (Hanson).

In summarizing current trends in the privatization of corrections movement, Linda Calvert Hanson points to the following:

- There is a continuing emphasis on housing special populations, but it is changing somewhat. The first contracts for private groups to run jails were for relatively low-security facilities for special populations such as those awaiting return to custody, those being held awaiting deportation, and women. The use of private contractors to operate such facilities continues, although in some places, notably Louisiana, jurisdictions are now entering into more private contracts for housing general populations.
- The size of facilities under private contract is growing. Initial contracts were for eighty-bed detention facilities, but 500- and 600-bed facilities are becoming typical.
- The type and classification of privately-operated facilities have changed. Although most of the early facilities were for low security levels, there are now a number of facilities with medium and maximum-security levels, and several that house inmates at all security levels.
- Private contractors are becoming increasingly proactive. A new movement in the private jail business is speculative development of jails. These jails are built as "rent-a-cell" facilities with the hope that governments will pay to rent the private cells to hold inmates from overcrowded state systems. However, so far in Texas, where five such jails have been built, governments have not placed state inmates in the facilities, maintaining that they were not designed to meet court-imposed standards.

In general, it is clear that interest in the privatization of jail operations has not disappeared. But it is also clear that no strong pattern has developed to indicate that any aspect of privatization is the inevitable wave of the future. A 1990 survey of jail administrators in 280 counties across the country, for example, indicated that only 1.1 percent had privatized their entire operations. Moreover, there is no indication in the literature of any significant growth either in the private financing of facilities or in the practice of contracting out specific services, although a number of jurisdictions continue to use both these models.

Correctional privatization has seen rapid growth in some jurisdictions, but is nonexistent in others. Most still believe that more testing and experience are needed before questions about the benefits of privatization can be answered.

References

- The Council of State Governments
1985 "Private Jails: Contracting Out Public Service." *CSG Backgrounder* (March).
Lexington, Kentucky: The Council of State Governments.
- Crants, Doctor R., III
1991 "Private Prison Management: A Study in Economic Efficiency." *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 7(1) (March), pp. 49-59.
- DiIulio, John J.
1990 "The Duty to Govern: A Critical Perspective on the Private Management of Prisons and Jails." In *Private Prisons and the Public Interest*. Douglas C. McDonald, editor. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.
- Feeley, Malcolm M.
1991 "The Privatization of Prisons in Historical Perspective." *Criminal Justice Research Bulletin* 6(2).
- Hackett, Judith, Harry P. Hatry, Robert B. Levinson, et al.
1987 *Issues in Contracting for the Private Operation of Prisons and Jails*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Hanson, Linda Calvert
1991 "The Privatization of Corrections Movement: A Decade of Change." *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 7(1) (March), pp. 1-28.
- Lampkin, Linda M.
1991 "Does Crime Pay? AFSCME Reviews the Record on the Privatization of Prisons." *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 7(1) (March), pp. 41-48.
- Logan, Charles H.
1990 *Private Prisons: Cons & Pros*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- McDonald, Douglas C., editor
1990 *Private Prisons and the Public Interest*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.
- Thomas, Charles W.
1989 *The Background, Present Status, and Future Potential of Privatization in American Corrections*. Paper presented at conference, "Privatization: Promise and Pitfalls," March 30-31, 1989, Wayne State University.
- Thomas, Charles W., and Suzanna L. Foard
1991 *Private Correctional Facility Census*. Gainesville, Florida: University of Florida, Center for Studies in Criminology & Law, Private Corrections Project.

Appendix A

Policy Statements on Corrections Privatization

Appendix

Policy Statements on Correctional Privatization

**AMERICAN JAIL ASSOCIATION
RESOLUTION
PRIVATIZATION OF JAILS**

WHEREAS, Jails have traditionally been operated by city, county, or state officials.

WHEREAS, Jail officials throughout this country have become more and more professional and proficient in discharging their duties.

WHEREAS, Responsibility and personal liability of jail operations rest squarely on the shoulders of the officials in charge of jails, city, county, or state.

WHEREAS, Privatization of jails does not relieve officials of responsibility or liability of private jail operations.

WHEREAS, Cost of private jail operation in most cases has proved to be more expensive and not cost effective.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, the American Jail Association goes on record as being opposed to Privatization of Jail—city, county, or state.

**American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees'
Position on Contracting Out Correctional Facilities**

The current crisis in corrections, which has been characterized by severe overcrowding, antiquated facilities, and court orders mandating state and local governments to address their unconstitutional prison conditions, has generated interest in contracting out the management and/or ownership of entire correctional facilities to private corporations. This idea has attracted the attention of state and local governments that are finding it increasingly difficult to raise additional revenues to finance improvements in correctional facilities.

The high cost of building facilities and providing adequate services comes as no surprise to those who have worked in the field. But AFSCME does not believe that the "private ownership and operation of correctional facilities" is the answer. Here are several reasons why:

- ✓ Although a state or local government may attempt to contract out its correctional facilities, they cannot relinquish the legal responsibility or liability for the incarceration of inmates.
- ✓ Contracting out correctional facilities to private corporations creates an inherent conflict of interest between a corporation's desire to maximize profits by maintaining maximum capacities, and state or local government efforts to develop possible alternatives to incarceration for specific classifications of inmates.
- ✓ Staff salary and benefit levels make up approximately two-thirds of the cost of operating correctional facilities. Several major corporations involved in the privatization of corrections have clearly indicated that cutting salary and benefit levels is one way they plan to realize profits.
- ✓ Current salary and benefit levels for corrections staff are extremely low in relation to the responsibilities, complexities, and the unusually high levels of stress and danger which are characteristic of the occupation. Further reductions in salary and benefit levels will severely hinder the recruitment of competent and qualified professionals into the occupation.
- ✓ Current staff-to-inmate ratios in many state and local correctional facilities are too high to maintain adequate levels of security. While further reductions in staffing levels may create profits for private corporations, the security of the institution may be compromised.
- ✓ Traditionally, the deprivation of an individual's freedom has been a sanction imposed only by government. Ethical consideration must be given to the legitimacy of delegating such an awesome responsibility to a private, profit-motivated corporation.
- ✓ Although private corporations argue that they can operate correctional facilities less expensively, governments will assume costs such as the development and monitoring of contracts, the intake and classification of inmates, the risk of potential bankruptcy of the private corporation, and other hidden risks and costs that may not be immediately apparent.

tior
soc
are
ing
enc
ins
tra:
suc

juri
tion
wit

ent
for

dis:
ord
use
put

con
shc
of I
wh

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION RESOLUTION

Be It Resolved, That the American Bar Association urges that jurisdictions that are considering the privatization of prisons and jails not proceed to so contract until the complex constitutional, statutory, and contractual issues are satisfactorily developed and resolved. "Privatization" refers to contracting for total operational responsibility for a prison or jail; it does not encompass construction or leasing physical facilities or contracting for institutional services, such as food preparation, medical care, and vocational training, in full security institutions or for operation of non-secure facilities such as half-way houses.

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION CRIMINAL JUSTICE SECTION REPORT TO THE HOUSE OF DELEGATES

Recommendation

BE IT RESOLVED, That the American Bar Association urges that jurisdictions considering authorization of contracts with private corporations or other private entities for the operation of prisons or jails do so with extreme caution; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That jurisdictions contemplating entering into contracts with private corporations or other private entities for the operation of prison or jail facilities are urged to recognize that:

1. the imposition and implementation of a sentence of incarceration for a criminal offense is a core function of government;
2. there are numerous and complex legal issues involved in the delegation of incarceration functions to private entities; and
3. there is a strong public interest in having prison and jail systems in which lines of accountability are clear, which are operated in a cost-effective fashion, which provide proper care and treatment for inmates, and which meet minimum standards for the operation and maintenance of prisons and jails; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the American Bar Association disapproves of any jurisdiction undertaking a privatization program in order to avoid fundamental questions about its sentencing policies, the use of the incarceration sanction, and the conditions of confinement in publicly operated prisons and jails; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That jurisdictions seeking to contract with private entities for the operation of prison or jail facilities should do so in accordance with the "Guidelines Concerning Privatization of Prisons and Jails," dated March 29, 1989, and appended to the Report which accompanies this Recommendation.

**American Correctional Association
Public Correctional Policy
on Private Sector Involvement in Corrections**

Introduction: Although most correctional programs are operated by public agencies, there is increasing interest in the use of profit and nonprofit organizations as providers of services, facilities, and programs. Profit and nonprofit organizations have resources for the delivery of services that often are unavailable from the public correctional agency.

WHE:

Statement: Government has the ultimate authority and responsibility for corrections. For its most effective operation, corrections should use all appropriate resources, both public and private. When government considers the use of profit and nonprofit private sector correctional services, such programs must meet professional standards, provide necessary public safety, provide services equal to or better than government, and be cost-effective compared to well-managed governmental operations. While government retains the ultimate responsibility, authority, and accountability for actions of private agencies and individuals under contract, it is consistent with good correctional policy and practice to:

- A. Use in an advisory and voluntary role the expertise and resources available from profit and nonprofit organizations in the development and implementation of correctional programs and policies;
- B. Enhance service delivery systems by considering the concept of contracting with the private sector when justified in terms of cost, quality, and ability to meet program objectives;
- C. Consider use of profit and nonprofit organizations to develop, fund, build, operate, and/or provide services, programs, and facilities when such an approach is cost-effective, safe, and consistent with the public interest and sound correctional practice;
- D. Ensure the appropriate level of service delivery and compliance with recognized standards through professional contract preparation and vendor selection as well as effective evaluation and monitoring by the responsible government agency; and
- E. Indicate clearly in any contract for services, facilities, or programs the responsibilities and obligations of both government and contractor, including but not limited to liability of all parties, performance bonding, and contractual termination.

THER
does h

NATIONAL SHERIFFS' ASSOCIATION RESOLUTION

Privatization of Jails/Correctional Facilities

- WHEREAS,
1. the Sheriff is the principal administrator in the United States, responsible for the administration and operation of some 96% of all the jails; and,
 2. the Sheriff by reason of his constitutional and/or legislative mandate is charged with the operation of the county jail in a humane and effective manner for the protection of the community and those confined; and,
 3. the Sheriffs of the country have joined together over the past twenty years to develop guidelines for the administration and operation of the jail; to develop staff training programs; and, to devise systems to improve the management of the jail; and,
 4. the guidelines developed by the Sheriffs through the National Sheriffs' Association have been accepted by the corrections community to form the basis for the standards for adult local detention facilities; the training programs are currently used by local, state and federal detention/corrections agencies to train staff; and, the audit system is considered the basic management tool for operational analysis; and,
 5. now private, corporations are proposing to administer and operate local detention facilities providing the broad range of detention services; and,
 6. the constitutional questions of the delegation of the detention responsibility to the private contractor; the liability of the government and its officials for the acts of a private detention contractor; and, the methods of full accountability and assurances of the full protection of the rights of inmates have yet to be established; and,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the National Sheriffs' Association does hereby oppose the transfer of the jail function to private corporations.

Appendix B

State Legislation Concerning Corrections Privatization

Appendix A

Legislative Authority for Private Adult Detention Facilities

State	Legal Status
AL*+	None
AK*+	ALASKA STAT. section 33.30.031(b) (1989)(state-level, misdemeanants only)
AZ*+	ARIZ. REV. STAT. ANN. sections 41-1609 & 41-1609.01 (1990) (state only)
AR	ARK. STAT. ANN. section 12-50-101-110 (1989) (state and local)
CA	CAL. PENAL STAT. tit. 7, section 6256(Supp. 1990) (state level only, however A.G. construes as applicable only to community correctional centers); CAL. GOVT. CODE (1990) (local level only)
CO	COLO. REV. STAT. section 17-26-130 (1989) (local-level only for pilot in 2 counties), 17-26.5-101 (1990) (multi-jurisdictional jails)
CT+	None

Appendix A - continued

DE*	None
DC	DC CODE section 24-402 (1990) ("some suitable jail")
FL*+	FLA. STAT. ANN. sections 944.105 & 1053, 944.710-.719 (West Cum. Supp. 1990) (state only); FLA. STAT. ANN. sections 951.062, 951.0623, 951.063 (West 1989) (local only)
GA*+	The AG construes GA. CODE ANN. sections 42-2-5, 42-4-1 and 42-5-53 as prohibitory. 1973 Op. Atty. Gen. Ga. 72 (prohibits private pre-release center)
HI+	HAW. REV. STAT. section 353-3(7) (Supp. 1989) (state only)
ID*	1980 Op. Atty. Gen. Idaho 74 (prohibits privatization)
IL*	Prohibitory statute 1990 IL ALS 86-1412 (Private Correctional Facility Moratorium)
IN+	IND. CODE ANN. section 11-8-3-1, 11-10-8-4 (Burns 1988) (state only)
IA*	None
KS*	KAN. STAT. ANN. section 75-5210(i),(m) (1989); 1989 Kan. Sess. Laws 12 (2) Chp 309, sec. 84 of 1990 sess. law (state only)
KY*+	KY. REV. STAT. ANN. sections 197.500-.525 (Michie/Bobbs-Merrill 1989); Corr. Policy and Procedure (C.P.P.) 1.4 (1989) (state only)
LA*	LA. REV. STAT. ANN. sections 39:1800.1-7 (West 1989) (state and local)
ME+	1987 Me. Laws 582(A)(1)(prohibits privatization at state level); 1986 Op. Atty. Gen. Me. 22 (prohibits privatization at local level)
MD*	None
MA*+	None
MI*	1987 Op. Atty. Gen. Mich. 6474 (prohibits privatization at local level)
MN*+	MINN. STAT. ANN. section 241.021(1), 241.32(1) (West 1990) (state and local) although AG interprets as permitting only community corrections
MS	1990 Op. Atty. Gen. Miss. (July 9, 1990); 1986 Op. Atty. Gen. Miss. (June 30, 1986) (prohibits at state & local level); but see, 1986 Op. Atty. Gen. Miss. (June 13, 1986)
MO	1983 Op. Atty. Gen. Mo. 93 (prohibits privatization at state and local levels)
MT*	MONT. CODE ANN. section 53-30-106 (1989) (state only); MONT. CODE ANN. sections 7-32-2201, 2231-2234 (1989) (local only)

Appendix A - continued

NB	NEB. REV. STAT. section 83-176(2) (reissued 1987) (state only); NEB. REV. STAT. section 29-1-001 (1987); NEB. REV. STAT. section 83-170(3) (reissued 1989) (local only)
NV+	NEV. REV. STAT. section 209.141 (1986) (state only)
NH*	N.H. REV. STAT. ANN. section 21-H:8(VI) (19) (state only); 1990 NH ALS 225 (established private prison study commission)
NJ*+	1986 Op. Atty. Gen. N.J. 0155 (prohibits privatization at state and local levels)
NM*+	N.M. STAT. ANN. section 33-1-17 (repl. 1987, Supp. 1989)(Women Only) (state only); N.M. STAT. ANN. sections 33-3-1 to 33-3-28 (repl. 1987, Supp. 1989) (local only).
NY*	N.Y. Correct. Law section 72(1) McKinney 1987, Supp. 1989) N.Y. Penal Law section 70.20(1) (McKinney 1987) (both prohibit privatization at the state level only); 1980 Op. Atty. Gen. N.Y. 244 (prohibits local level privatization).
NC*	Per AG, current appropriation act prohibits privatization at the state and local levels
ND*+	N.D. CENT. CODE section 54-21-25 & 54-23.3. (Supp. 1989) (state only); N.D. CENT. CODE section 12-44.1-02 (Supp. 1989) (local only)
OH+	1985 Op. Atty. Gen. Ohio 008 (prohibits privatization at the local level only)
OK*	OKLA. STAT. ANN. tit. 57, sections 561, 563, 563.1 (West Supp. 1990) (state only); OKLA. STAT. ANN. tit. 11, sections 34-105, sections 41, 54, 68 (West Supp. 1990) (local only).
OR*+	1990 Op. Atty. Gen. Or. (July 25, 1990) (prohibits local level privatization).
PA+	None, but see PA. Stat. Ann. tit. 61 sections 1081-1085 the one- year "Private Prison Moratorium and Study Act" (Purdon -Cum. Supp. 1986) expired. The DOC notes that there is disagreement as to whether the restrictions also expired.
RI*+	None
SC+	1987 Op. Atty. Gen. S.C. (Aug. 10, 1987) (state only)
SD*	None
TN	TENN. CODE ANN. sections 41-24-101 to 115 (cum. Supp. 1989); 1985 Op. Atty. Gen. Tenn. 286 (state only); TENN. CODE ANN. sections 41-24-103(c) (only for Carter Co.) 1984 Op. Atty. Gen. Tenn. 183 (local only).

Appendix A - continued

TX*	TEX. REV. CIV. STAT. ANN. art. 6166g-2 (Vernon 19); TEX. GOV'T. CODE ANN. section 494.001 (Vernon Supp. 1990) (state only); Tex. Rev. Public Safety, tit. 11, subchapter E, sections 361.061-067 (Vernon Supp. 1990) (local only)
UT*	UTAH CODE ANN. section 64-13-26 (Supp. 1989) (state only); but see, section 64-13-1 (2) & (7); UTAH CODE ANN. sections 17-22-2 to 8 (Supp. 1989) UTAH CODE ANN. sections 17-55-88 & 10-8-58.5 (Supp. 1989) (local only)
VT	None
VA+*	1988 Op. Atty. Gen. Vir. 36. (prohibits privatization at the local level only)
WA+	None, however Wash. Rev. Code section 41.06 prohibits the contractions out of civil service (jobs traditionally held by state employees).
WV+	1990 W. Va. Acts 4559 (W. VA. CODE sections 25-5-1 to 20) (state and local)
WI+*	1985-87 Wis. Biennial session, Act 29, creating section 806d 46.03 (17) (cm) (only one state facility). 1988 Op. Atty. Gen. Wis. 20-88 (Prohibits privatization at the local level only)
WY*+	1988 Op. Atty. Gen. Wyo. 005. (Prohibits privatization at the local level only)
USMS:	18 USC 4013 (a) (3) 1988.
FBOP:	18 USC 4082 (19) Although interpreted by Gen. Counsel in 83 to be broad enough to permit ("any available, suitable & appropriate") it is not being utilized as authority

*INDICATES THE STATE DOC ATTORNEY'S WHO HAVE RESPONDED TO SURVEY.

+INDICATES THAT THE STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL HAS RESPONDED TO THE SURVEY.

Appendix C

List of Privately Operated Correctional Facilities

Appendix E

States With Private Facilities

State	Facility	Location	Contracting Agency	Capacity	Security Level	Private Contractor	Date Opened
AL	Tuscaloosa	Tuscaloosa	Tuscaloosa Co.	144	Minimum	Pricor, Inc. Metropolitan Detention Fac.	Jun-86
CO	Aurora INS Processing Center	Aurora	INS	167	Min/Med	Wackenhut Corrections Corp.	May-87
CA	Baker R-T-C Facility	Baker	California DOC	250	Minimum	Eclectic Communications Inc.	Aug-87
CA	Mesa Verde R-T-C Facility	Bakersfield	California DOC	340	Minimum	Gary White & Associates	Apr-89
CA	Eagle Mt. R-T-C Facility	Desert Center	California DOC	400	Minimum	Management & Training Inc.	Sep-88
CA	Hidden Valley Ranch	La Honda	California DOC	120	Minimum	Eclectic Communications Inc.	Jan-86

Appendix B - continued

State	Facility	Location	Contracting Agency	Capacity	Security Level	Private Contractor	Date Opened
CA	Leo Chessley Center	Live Oak	California DOC	220	Minimum	Eclectic Communications Inc.	Aug-88
CA	McFarland R-T-C Facility	McFarland	California DOC	200	Min/Med	Wackenhut Corrections Corp.	Jan-89
FL	Hernando Co. Detention Facility	Brooksville	Hernando Co & USMS	252	Min/Med/Max	Corrections Corp. of America	Oct-88
FL	Monroe County Correctional System	Key West	Monroe Co.	200	Min/Med/Max	Wackenhut Corrections Corp	Feb-90
FL	Monroe County Correctional System	Marathon	Monroe Co.	60	Min/Med/Max	Wackenhut Corrections Corp	Dec-90
FL	Monroe County Correctional System	Plantation	Monroe Co.	60	Min/Med/Max	Wackenhut Corrections Corp.	Feb-90
FL	Bay County Jail	Panama City	Bay County	204	Min/Med/Max	Corrections Corp. of America	Oct-85
FL	Bay Co. Jail & Annex	Panama City	Bay County	257	Min/Med	Corrections Corp. of America	Apr-86

Appendix B - continued

State	Facility	Location	Contracting Agency	Capacity	Security Level	Private Contractor	Date Opened
KS	Leavenworth Correctional Facility	Leavenworth	U.S. Marshal's Service	440	Med/Max	Corrections Corp. of America	Jan-92
KY	Dismas House of Portland	Louisville	Jefferson Co.	225	Minimum	Dismas House Charities, Inc.	Jan-87
KY	Dierson Correctional Center	Louisville	Kentucky DOC	80	Minimum	Dismas House Charities, Inc.	Aug-90
KY	Lee Adjustment Center	Beattyville	Kentucky DOC	500	Minimum	U.S. Corrections Corp.	Aug-90
KY	River City Correctional Center	Louisville	Jefferson Co.	350	Minimum	U.S. Corrections Corp.	Jan-90
KY	Dismas House of Owensboro	Owensboro	Kentucky DOC	100	Minimum	Dismas House Charities	Jun-90
KY	Marion Adjustment Center	St. Mary's	Kentucky DOC	500	Minimum	U.S. Corrections Corp.	Jan-86

Appendix B - continued

State	Facility	Location	Contracting Agency	Capacity	Security Level	Private Contractor	Date Opened
LA	Allen Parrish Correctional Facility	Allen	Louisiana DOC	600	Medium	Wackenhut Corrections Corp.	Dec-90
LA	Winn Parish Correctional Facility	Winnfield	Louisiana DOC	610	Medium	Corrections Corp. of America	Mar-90
NM	Estancia Regional Correctional	Estancia	U.S. Marshals Service	256	Minimum	Corrections Corp. of America	Dec-90
NM	NM Women's Correctional Facility	Grants	NM DOC	200	Min/Med/Max	Corrections Corp. of America of America	Jun-89
NM	Santa Fe County	Santa Fe	Santa Fe County Fed. BOP, USMS	201	Min/Med/Max	Corrections Corp. of America	Aug-86
NY	New York INS Processing Center	Queens	Immigration and Naturalization Service	100	Min/Med	Wackenhut Corrections Corp.	Oct-89
TN	Silverdale Unit #1, Men's	Chattanooga	Hamilton County	320	Min/Med/Max	Corrections Corp. of America	Oct-84

Appendix B - continued

State	Facility	Location	Contracting Agency	Capacity	Security Level	Private Contractor	Date Opened
TN	Silverdale Unit #2, Co. Women's	Chattanooga	Hamilton County	117	Min/Med/Max	Corrections Corp. of America	Oct-84
TN	Mason Regional Correctional Facility	Mason	U.S. Marshal's Service	256	Min/Med	Corrections Corp. of America	Oct-90
TN	Metro Davidson Co Correctional Facility	Nashville	County & state	872	Min/Med	Corrections Corp. of America	Mar-92
TX	Angelina County Detention Fac.	Diboll	Angelina County	500	Min/Med	Pricor, Inc.	Feb-91
TX	Big Spring Correctional Center	Big Spring	City of Big	350	Minimum	Mid-Tex Corrections, Inc.	Aug-89
TX	Bridgeport Pre-Release Center	Bridgeport	Texas DOC	500	Min/Med	Wackenhut Corrections Corp.	Aug-89
TX	Cleveland Pre-Release Center	Cleveland	Texas DOC	500	Minimum	Corrections Corp. of America	Sep-89

Appendix B - continued

State	Facility	Location	Contracting Agency	Capacity	Security Level	Private Contractor	Date Opened
TX	Houston Processing Center	Houston	Immigration & Naturalization Srv Tx Board of Prisons	350	Min/Med	Corrections Corp. of America	Apr-84
TX	Eden Detention Center	Eden	City of Eden	324	Min/Med	Eden Det. Center, Inc.	Oct-85
TX CLOSED	Houston Reintegration	Houston	Texas Board of Pardons & Paroles	223	Minimum	Pricor, Inc.	Jun-87
TX	Kyle Pre-Release Center	Kyle	Texas DOC	500	Min/Med	Wackenhut Corrections Corp.	Jun-89
TX	Laredo Processing Center	Laredo	U.S. Dept of Justice	208	Minimum	Corrections Corp. of America	Mar-85
TX	LaSalle County Detention Fac.	Cotulla	LaSalle County	500	Min/Med	Pricor, Inc.	Nov-90
TX	Limestone County Detention Fac.	Limestone County	Limestone County	500	Min/Med	Detention Systems, Inc.	Jan-91

Appendix B - continued

State	Facility	Location	Contracting Agency	Capacity	Security Level	Private Contractor	Date Opened
TX	Lockhart Facility	Lockhart	City of Lockhart	500	Minimum	Wackenhut Corrections Corp.	Fall-91
TX	Mineral Wells Pre-Parole	Mineral Wells	Texas Board of Pardons & Paroles	500	Minimum	Concepts Inc.	N/A
TX	Newton County	Newton County	unknown	440	Min/Med/Max	Tx Detention Mgmt, Inc.	Spr-91
TX	Reeves County Law Enforcement	Pecos	Federal BOP, U.S. Marshals Service	532	Minimum	Corrections Corp. of America	Sep-88
TX	Starr County Detention Fac.	Rio Grande City	Starr County	776	Min/Max	Pricor, Inc.	Feb-92
TX	Pecos County Detention Fac.	Ft. Stockton	Pecos County	500	Min/Med	Pricor, Inc.	Dec-90
TX	Central Tx. Parole Violator Facility	San Antonio	Texas Board of Pardons & Parole, USMS	619	Min/Med	Wackenhut Corrections Corp.	Jan-89

Appendix B - continued

State	Facility	Location	Contracting Agency	Capacity	Security Level	Private Contractor	Date Opened
TX	San Saba County Detention Fac.	San Saba	San Saba County	500	Min/Med	Pricor, Inc.	Mar-91
TX	Sweetwater Pre-Parole Center	Sweetwater	Texas Board of Pardons & Parole	210	Minimum	Pricor, Inc.	Jul-89
TX	Swisher County Detention Fac.	Tulia	no single agency	500	Min/Med	Pricor, Inc.	Jan-91
TX	Falls County Detention Fac.	Marlin	no single agency	500	Min/Med	Pricor, Inc.	Feb-91
TX	Venus Pre-Release Center	Venus	Texas DOC	500	Minimum	Corrections Corp. of America	Aug-89
TX	Zavala CLOS ^{ED} Detention Ctr	Zavala County	Zavala County	226	Min/Med	Detention Systems, Inc.	Feb-89
WA	Esmore	Seattle	Immigration & Naturalization	90	Minimum	Esmor, Inc.	Jun-89