



Proceedings

62420

Proceedings

THIRD NATIONAL SYMPOSIUM

Criminal Justice Planning: Emerging Concepts and Field Experience

national clearinghouse for criminal justice planning and architecture

University of Illinois at Urbana - Champaign Department of Architecture
505 East Green, Suite 200, Champaign, Illinois 61820 Telephone (217) 333-0312

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLENARY SESSIONS

<i>Symposium Goals and Expectations</i>	Frederic D. Moyer	1
<i>The Role of LEAA</i>	Richard Velde	3
<i>Keynotes Revisited: 1972-1975</i>	Robert J. Kutak	7
<i>Evaluation and Planning: Some Directions</i>	Robert Martinson	11
<i>Research and Planning</i>	Milton Luger	16
<i>Hard Times for Criminal Justice Planning</i>	Oliver J. Keller	19

WORKSHOP SUMMARIES

<i>Planning for Law Enforcement Systems</i>	Bradley Koch Vernon Hoy	25
<i>Trends in Planning for State Court Programs and Facilities</i>	Richard Lynch Stanley Van Ness Barbara Flicker	26
<i>Overcrowding and Deficient Facilities</i>	Bruce Cook Larry Carpenter	26
<i>Metropolitan Correctional Centers</i>	William R. Nelson Robert F. Messmer	27
<i>Implementing a Local Master Plan</i>	Robert Breckenridge James Oitzinger	27
<i>Problems of Crowding: Environment - Behavior Implications</i>	Dan Stokols David D'Atri	28
<i>New Operations for New Facilities - the Staffing Problem</i>	James P. O'Neill Sierman Day	28
<i>Alternatives to Incarceration of Youth</i>	Joan Keane Stephen F. Browne Thomas S. James	29
<i>Implementing a Statewide Corrections Master Plan - Oklahoma</i>	Ned Benton David Riggs	29
<i>Special Problems of the Female Offender</i>	Laurel Rans Euphesenia Foster	30
<i>Regionalization of Law Enforcement Communications Systems</i>	Donald Meade Anthony L. Kenney	30

<i>Intake Service Centers</i>	Leo G. Plante Robin Ford	31
<i>Detention of Juveniles and Alternatives to Its Use</i>	Jim Epley John McGough George F. Klein, Jr. Dennis Rescetek Bob Nelson	31
<i>Offender Survey Techniques</i>	Ken Bishop Judy Silberstein	32
<i>Architectural Case Studies</i>	Fred Powers John McGough Roger W. Crist Helmut Jahn Sidney J. Folse Jack Shetter Thomas C. Orlowski	32
<i>Funding Alternatives for Law Enforcement and Public Safety Facilities</i>	Richard Anderson R. Douglas Taylor	33
<i>New Life for Old Courthouses</i>	Douglas C. Ikelman Edward D. Francis	
<i>Halfway Houses: The Florida Experience</i>	Harry E. Burns, Jr. Richard L. Rachin	33
<i>Criminal Justice Evaluation Techniques</i>	Barry Bollensen Peter Venezia	34
<i>Alternatives to New Construction</i>	Alan Green Edward D. Francis Steve Polson	34
<i>Application of Technology to the Courts</i>	Ernest H. Short Charles Jeske	35
<i>Impact of Community Resources in a Correctional Facility</i>	James Bergfalk John Milosovich	35
<i>The Ideal Courtroom: Myth or Reality</i>	Judge William S. Fort	36
<i>Responding to Accelerating Prison Populations</i>	Jay Friedman Allan Ault	36
<i>The Charette Process</i>	Oliver Walker Fred Parker George Thompson Morris F. X. Jeff, Jr. Judge Sara Armstrong	36
<i>Funding Strategies for Criminal Justice Facilities</i>	Tony McCann Ron Bykowski	37
<i>Part E Responsibilities and Issues</i>	Larry Carpenter Noel Bufe Steve Hesselschwerdt	37
<i>The Modern Police Facility</i>	James P. Sutherland William McClaran	38

Foreward

"Criminal Justice Planning: Emerging Concepts and Field Experience" was the title of the Third National Symposium which was held April 14-16, 1976, and sponsored by the National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice Planning and Architecture and the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the United States Department of Justice. As the title suggests, the focus of the Symposium was on bringing together recent developments in research and planning with practical experience in the field.

The symposium offered a variety of workshop topics and major addresses by prominent individuals in the criminal justice field speaking in the areas of law enforcement, courts, corrections, and juvenile justice. The symposium was attended by over 600 individuals involved in various aspects of criminal justice.

The proceedings were compiled with the intent of sharing the speaker presentations with an even wider audience, and to provide a written record of the symposium for those in attendance.

The proceedings are divided into two sections. The first section presents the full texts of the major addresses while the second section provides summaries of each workshop. Additional information on most workshops may be obtained by contacting the National Clearinghouse.

Major Addresses

Mr. Frederic D. Moyer has been the director of the National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice Planning and Architecture since its inception in 1970. Under his direction, the Clearinghouse has developed police, courts, and correctional guidelines and is presently developing guidelines in the juvenile area. Mr. Moyer has recently contributed to a book entitled Prison Architecture, compiled under the auspices of the United Nations.

Frederic Moyer:

This Third Symposium is one which the National Clearinghouse is very pleased to co-sponsor with LEAA. It follows the Second National Symposium, "New Directions in Criminal Justice Planning and Architecture," which was held in Chicago and the first Symposium, "First National Symposium on Criminal Justice Planning and Architecture," which was held in an ice storm in Urbana. We continue to find people throughout the country who recall Chamapign-Urbana and the "Winter of '72."

We are pleased to see you back again, those of you who are back, and to welcome others. It might be useful to know who is sitting next to you at this meeting. We have all fifty states represented in our audience today, and we have unofficial representation from four foreign countries. Also, the distribution of our audience is multi-disciplinary in nature. This reflects a principle goal of our symposium in that it seeks to convene those of you who either out of necessity or out of interest find yourselves in a decision-making capacity regarding criminal justice planning or the administration of criminal justice programs.

The organizations represented on our program and in our audience evidence this also. Included are the American Correctional Association, The International Association of Chiefs of Police, The National Sheriff's Association, The National Institute of Corrections, The National District Attorneys' Association, The National Association of Counties, The National Center for State Courts, The Institute for Courts Management, The Educational Facilities Laboratory, The American Institute of Architects' Committee on Architecture for Justice, The National Conference of State Planning Agency Administrators, and individual SPA's, The U.S. Bureau of Prisons, The United States Board of Parole, and LEAA Washington and Regional Offices. Other organizations or agencies have certainly been omitted in this listing, but I have given you some indication of the interests which have been brought together at one time and in one place. Accordingly, it is felt that this symposium differs from many other meetings which are convened as membership gatherings. Each of the organizations cited, for example, holds annual conventions or conferences and discusses issues similar to those which we will be discussing.

However, this symposium brings together a diverse group of professionals who are addressing criminal justice problems on a daily basis.

For those of you who are not familiar with previous symposiums which we have convened, or with the Clearinghouse itself, some background will just briefly be provided. The National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice Planning and Architecture is located at the University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana and is part of the Department of Architecture. The National Clearinghouse is sponsored by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the United States Department of Justice under an annual contract with the University of Illinois. Now entering our seventh year of operation, we are essentially in the activity of technical assistance in criminal justice planning.

We find that while our focus is long-range, involving long-term assessment of needs and planning for the allocation of resources over an extended period of time, we are called in at the moment of crisis in almost every instance. Criminal justice it seems today, as well as six years ago when we began, is plagued by crisis. It remains our endeavor, however, to seek immediate responses which have their place in the context of system planning and long-term need. The speakers featured in this symposium will seek to bring illumination to that concept.

Various publications are distributed by the Clearinghouse, and they are one of the means by which we attempt to transfer information. Certainly the Clearinghouse even with 100 staff members is small in its size and limited in its command of the expertise that is available today. While we do draw upon experienced people within our own staff to address problems which come to our attention throughout the country, we also rely upon you--those of you who are out in the field who are actively seeking to resolve these very real and important problems, and we continue to learn from you. Our technical assistance invariably brings more information back to us than we have carried out to it. One of our tasks then is to transfer that information to other jurisdictions, to other communities, or locales who may find themselves having similar problems to those which have been addressed elsewhere. So this symposium has the goal of serving that process. In addition to the Clearinghouse Transfer series, the Guidelines publications, and other means of transferring information, we feel that this meeting can be very effective in serving that same purpose.

Our expectation is not that this symposium will produce a treatise or manifesto or a standards and goals document. The interchange which this symposium allows will be its most prominent product. We do intend to produce a proceedings publication and each of you will receive it. All of the plenary sessions this morning will be recorded and transcribed. Each of the workshops will be well covered by Clearinghouse staff and the workshop sessions will be abstracted. But our goal is not to duplicate that which is done elsewhere. The work of the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals

offers excellent documents in terms of stating standards and goals statements. Many of the contributors to these standards and goals statements, in fact, appear on our program, and we do seek dialogue concerning their recommendations.

The various workshop topics themselves represent what we feel to be critical questions at this time. The panelists who have been invited have important contributions to make in addressing these questions, and we also have the expectation and goal that you will yourselves contribute in those workshops.

Mr. Richard W. Velde is the Administrator of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. "Pete" Velde has been associated with LEAA since the inception of the agency. He has been most instrumental in developing and guiding it to its present role which has nationwide impact in criminal justice. While LEAA's resources continue to be small in relationship to total expenditures in the criminal justice system, its contributions to the development of system improvements continue to be crucial. The leadership in this endeavor which is of vital national importance and interest is provided by its Administrator, Mr. Richard W. Velde.

It would not be an overstatement to suggest that Pete Velde has been important to every organization and agency represented at the Symposium. Virtually all facets of law enforcement, courts, or corrections programs have benefited from LEAA support and often catalytic participation. Despite the vast number of such programs, Pete Velde has always had the ability to maintain direct contact with the most promising and significant of these. We have found him to be in constant search for new and improved ways for LEAA to serve the criminal justice system and very quick to act on well-identified opportunities. It is a distinct honor to have LEAA represented at the opening of this symposium by its Administrator, Mr. Richard W. Velde.

Richard Velde:

I'd like to informally reflect a little bit about the past, present, and future of criminal justice planning, as viewed from the perspective of one who has had an interest in it since the subject was crystallized and formulated almost a decade ago.

Before I begin, however, I do want to note that LEAA is honored and pleased to participate in this conference. This is the kind of gathering that we like to get involved in and work with. I know, based on past experience, that there will be a set of proceedings published that will be the result and the summary of some collective best efforts at exploring what has been done and addressing some very difficult questions as to what ought to be done in the future. And, when we're looking at the subject of the improvement and operation of the criminal justice system, you just can't escape focusing on these kinds of questions.

We are now at a time of renewal and re-examination and hopefully the extension of the LEAA program. As I have already indicated, we have now had a decade of federal experience in attempting to provide assistance to state and local governments in their efforts to administer justice and to improve the justice system and to make our country a better and safer place to live.

In its decade of experience, LEAA has transmitted to the states almost five billion dollars in Federal funds. These funds have been translated into about 100,000

action projects. They range the entire gamut of criminal justice activities from juvenile delinquency prevention to community-based corrections. And no matter what your interest or perspectives or biases are in criminal justice, you'll find literally dozens, hundreds, and in some cases, thousands of projects funded with LEAA dollars that have attempted to make an impact in the improvement and operation of our justice system.

The keystone of the LEAA program has been to recognize and attempt to live with a central feature of our constitutional system, and that is that crime control and the administration of justice is the prime responsibility of state and local government, and that the federal presence in this area should be a narrowly defined and limited one. Since its inception, the LEAA program has recognized this in a number of ways.

First, the block grant concept. When the big bulk of LEAA funds are made available to the states according to an automatic formula based on population, it becomes a responsibility, under the terms of our law, to set priorities, to engage in comprehensive planning, and then to evaluate the results of these activities.

LEAA, itself, is a small agency. Currently, we have about 750 employees, roughly half of whom are located in our 10 regional offices. LEAA block grant funds support a rather unique administrative and planning machinery that has now been established in all 55 states and territories. These state agencies have, in turn, supported the development of more than 500 regional and local planning and administrative bodies. It's these state, regional, and local groups that do the bulk of administering, the bulk of planning, and the bulk of evaluating the \$5 billion worth of LEAA funds and their use.

The LEAA investments should be put into proper perspective. The LEAA participation is a very limited one as far as state and local governments are concerned. The LEAA funds currently represent less than 5% of the funds that state and local governments invest in their criminal justice systems. Indeed, the federal criminal justice system itself, the 26 federal enforcement agencies, represent only about 6% of the manpower resources of state and local criminal justice agencies. The federal courts system handles about the same volume of cases as do the criminal courts of Los Angeles, or roughly a medium-size state. The inmates in the Federal Bureau of Prisons represent about 6 or 7 percent of the inmates in state and local institutions. So, in a very real sense, not only from the standpoint of the legal framework in the constitution, the criminal justice system rests in state and local hands.

One of the hallmarks, and, I dare say, almost a unique feature of the LEAA program, is the contrast with the other 1,200 Federal aid programs, most of which place either no emphasis on comprehensive planning at all or, at best, what may be called a one-shot plan where there is a one-time requirement that a plan be developed. In stark contrast, LEAA, since its inception, has had a statutory requirement that each state wish-

ing to participate in the program must develop and submit annually to LEAA a comprehensive plan. Now our thoughts and notions as to what a comprehensive plan should be have changed somewhat since the inception of the program. Let me give you a couple of examples.

I recall very vividly the first plan submitted by the state of Pennsylvania in 1969. That plan identified 950 police agencies in the state and found that only about 150 of them had any type of communications capability other than the telephone. Now that was an interesting set of numbers. But the second plan submitted the next year by Pennsylvania somehow identified 200 additional police agencies that were not known to the state the year before. This perhaps underscored one of the characteristics of our criminal justice system: a lack of meaningful data about the dynamics of the criminal justice system.

Well, times have changed somewhat since those days. At the national level we are now accumulating a significant series of statistics about criminal justice. We know, for example, because we now have a comprehensive directory of criminal justice agencies, how many criminal justice agencies there are nationally. We know what the employment and expenditure data for these agencies is. Last year, incidentally, about \$14.5 billion was spent on almost one million employees in criminal justice agencies around the nation. We have supported some extensive organizational surveys. We know how many jail cells there are in this country, and so on. In addition, LEAA has in its fifth year of development a new series of crime indicators. We call it the National Crime Panel. It is an attempt to measure comprehensively the amount of crime actually occurring as opposed to what is reported to the police. This crime/victim survey is the world's largest poll of any kind.

Perhaps more importantly than these statistical efforts at the national level, however, is our interest and support of the development of the conceptual framework for a comprehensive set of data about criminal justice system dynamics at the state and local level -- for example, the development of OBTS (Offender-Based Transaction Statistics).

This system will be operational by the end of this year in about 10 states and for the first time in a comprehensive, reliable, timely, hopefully accurate, and more importantly, hopefully comparable basis from one jurisdiction to the next. We'll have detailed information about each individual's acquaintance with the criminal justice system from the initial point of contact to the final release. We will have the ability to track the individual through each important milestone of the criminal justice process. We'll begin to understand what happens to them, or in most cases, what does not happen. We'll begin to develop real data, hard data, about the allocation of resources, personnel, the utilization of facilities, and so on. This is the kind of data that has not been generally available so far except in a few isolated pockets.

We now have a network of state statistical centers, whose purpose is to collect, analyze, and disseminate statistics about criminal justice in their respective jurisdictions. We have seen efforts to upgrade and automate the uniform crime reporting system itself. This effort has represented a very substantial investment of LEAA funds. When you look at our investments in the state planning agencies and regional networks, you see that it is currently over \$325 million, cumulatively. If you look at our investment in criminal justice information systems, you will see that LEAA has invested over \$400 million.

Now, many of these dollars have gone for computer systems that provide for operational requirements as well as planning and other management data. Nevertheless, this is a unique investment as far as the federal government is concerned in building a sound, accurate, reliable data base. It's been a very difficult set of expenditures to justify because, in the area of criminal justice, the public concern -- politician's concern -- is in immediate results. Crime should have been reduced right now or yesterday, and there has been an impatience with what might be called red tape, or bureaucracy or overhead. Nevertheless, the hard lessons that we have learned from experiencing this comprehensive planning process is that there is no way to set milestones, no way to make lasting reforms and improvements unless you know what you are doing.

That brings me to what I would consider the significant developments in criminal justice planning that have been fostered by the LEAA experience. These developments have led to several other areas that are now very well structured and about which you will be hearing later in this conference. There is the concept of master planning pioneered by Fred Moyer and his associates at the National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice Planning and Architecture at the University of Illinois. The first comprehensive master plan, that for the State of Hawaii, was submitted almost three years ago, and already we've seen almost 20 states that either have completed or have under preparation state-wide master plans to improve corrections. And, although this was the first master planning effort, it was the beginning.

Alabama has pioneered in the development of a master plan for courts. We see master planning being developed in many other areas and disciplines of criminal justice. They include radio, telecommunications, and education and training, for example. And, although this is not universally done in all the states, it is certainly the wave of the future. We have seen the development of a bewildering array of planning technology and methodology, not the least of which is what we call crime-oriented planning that was pioneered in the framework of the national discretionary grant program now completed. We call it Impact Cities. This program began in 1972 and involved the allocation of about \$160 million over three fiscal years of LEAA discretionary funding to eight cities to develop specific programs and projects to reduce targeted crimes in those areas.

This required a whole new approach, a whole new look at criminal justice system dynamics in those eight cities. It required a degree of cooperation and coordination with governmental agencies and units having some responsibility for the control of crime in those jurisdictions. That included counties, regions, and states as well as the cities. But, based on this experience which is completed and the national evaluation efforts which are now available, we find that the hallmark was the development of crime-oriented planning techniques. I will not go into detail. You will be hearing more about them, but we do now have a very sophisticated planning technology that is available to make a difference in improving criminal justice.

When you look at your planning experience you see that perhaps there are as many techniques as there are technicians in the business, and this ranges the entire gamut from seat-of-the-pants, common-sense planning (and we've seen a lot of that) to some Pittsburgh-computerized modeling. But perhaps the most important of all has been the development of what we call a profession of criminal justice planning. In 1968, when this business was started in earnest, we found that there were two kinds of individuals who got into the criminal justice planning business. There was somebody who knew something about planning and there was somebody who knew something about criminal justice. And very seldom, if ever, did the two disciplines come together in the same individual at the same time. All that has changed, and changed very dramatically. There are formalized courses, ranging from the University of Southern California's short courses in criminal justice planning to graduate degree programs at the Ph.D. level established now in eight universities.

Throughout this experience we find literally hundreds of individuals who know something significant about planning and what its strengths and weaknesses are in the criminal justice setting. If LEAA were to be abolished tomorrow, I'm sure one of the lasting contributions of our program would be our investment in statistics and planning.

I would like to talk a little bit now about the future of planning and LEAA and then leave the program to those who have more knowledge and expertise in the areas that have brought you all together.

The current program authority for LEAA expires at the end of September 1976. The Administration has submitted to Congress a bill to extend that program for five years. It is basically a request for an extension of the status quo -- with the planning and administration machinery remaining intact; with the block grant concept remaining intact; with the emphasis on research and on statistics and on evaluation remaining intact. There are some initiatives. We have requested new authority to continue the experience in the Impact Cities program with a new high crime areas initiative. We have requested the authority to authorize states not really to waive the requirement for the annual comprehensive plan, but to reinforce it to build toward a three-year cycle of comprehensive planning. This would not mean that you would write a plan only once

every three years, but a lot of the base line data would not have to be repeated from year to year.

The Congress has now completed its hearings on our pending legislation. It turns out that one of the more controversial aspects of the proposal was the request for five-year authority. Now we have attempted to justify it on the premise that this is an absolutely essential ingredient to long-range comprehensive planning. That is, authority to engage in this process for a long enough time to make it meaningful.

There seem to be other interests at work in the Congress, however. Above all there are those who are interested in maintaining a strong posture of congressional oversight over the operations of the LEAA program. This argues for a much shorter reauthorization, so that we would have to come back to Congress at an earlier time to completely rejustify the whole program.

In a sense, our interest in comprehensive planning and our commitment to long-range efforts are on trial, and we are attempting to justify and support the need for continued emphasis in this area.

Of course, I should note that this is not the first time the Administration has requested this long-term authority. If it is granted by Congress, it will be the first time that we have received such a long-term authorization. Because, after all, LEAA is a controversial program. It's controversial in the subject matter that it deals with -- crime control. And it is controversial in its very delivery system -- the block grant concept. So, although hope springs eternal, we must face the practical reality and prospect that the reauthorization may be short.

These are all the observations that I wanted to bring to you. I want to leave you with a message -- one based on our experience: there is no more important function to be done in criminal justice than to continuously and periodically take that detached, hard-nose look at what is happening and lay the foundation for the allocation of resources, for the improvement of the system.

We've accomplished a lot. We still have a long way to go. Thank you very much.

Bob Kutak has been a very important person in many ways for criminal justice and particularly corrections over the last several years. He has had what might be called a low profile. He is a lawyer in private practice. He's not a part of the federal government nor does he occupy a public position, and yet from his position as an interested citizen, he has been instrumental in the drafting of the Part E legislation for the Omnibus Crime Control Safe Streets Act. He was instrumental to the work that even preceeded that which led to the creation of LEAA. He is chairman of the Advisory Board of the National Institute for Corrections and, importantly for us, he is chairman of the Corrections Advisory Board to the National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice Planning and Architecture. He has been the vice-chairman of the National Advisory Commission Task Force on Corrections of the President's Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. He was a key member and most vocal spokesman of the United States delegation to the Fifth United Nations Congress on Crime and the Treatment of the Criminal Justice Offenders which was held in Geneva, Switzerland in September, 1975. We are very pleased to have Bob Kutak here to present you with his keynote address.

Robert Kutak:

When I look over this audience and think back to the First Symposium, I can truly say that, in one sense, corrections has really come a long way. As Pete Velde mentioned this morning, the First Symposium sponsored by the National Clearinghouse was held on a bleak winter day in Urbana, Illinois. Many who traveled there by air didn't know if they would land, and, if they did, whether on account of the ice and snow, they were going to leave the next day.

The Second Symposium was held in summer. You can't charge the Clearinghouse with not learning from experience. The site was Chicago. The agenda of that Symposium was considerably expanded, as the Clearinghouse recognized that the issues facing the conferees were a great deal more complex and controversial than they appeared to be only two years earlier. If the change in sites and the size of the agenda are any indication of the trend of corrections, things must be looking up. Urbana in winter, Chicago in summer and now New Orleans in the springtime.

But it is not the weather, lovely as it is, that has brought so many distinguished individuals from so many distant places to this conference. Nor can it be the location, fascinating as it is, that has done so. Clearly, it is the agenda that brought you here. And what a stimulating and top-minded agenda it is. I'm pleased to see that it is related to the activities and not just the goals and standards of the Clearinghouse, so that we can establish a contact with a resource to followup the discussions of the hour. I'm also pleased to see that the agenda gets down to delicate and specific items, such as problems associated with the implementation of court orders, as

well as offering basic subjects -- all to the end that you will be better equipped when you adjourn to get a firmer handle on your own situation at home.

So, I propose we now roll up our sleeves and get to work. Fred Moyer suggested the theme and the reason for it just a few minutes ago. Perhaps to him that title is very appropriate. I might suggest, however, a different title, although basically the same theme. I would suggest the title "Heresies Revisited," and perhaps I could justify talking in such a way because probably among this distinguished audience I am really the only non-expert here.

Corrections today is experiencing much confusion, controversy, and even condemnation. When I addressed the First National Symposium four years ago, we had much the same situation, and the cause was Attica and the civil disorders in several other institutions. Currently, it is the prevailing disillusionment with the concept of rehabilitation. There are many practitioners and academicians who say that rehabilitation has not worked, or that it has not worked very well. Both the more liberal and the more conservative elements of the field seem to be converging on the conclusion that the goal of rehabilitation ought to be abandoned and that we ought to accept the reality, grim as it is, that punishment is, and ought to be, the prime purpose of the sentences of our courts.

A plan has been proposed to classify crimes and to set specific terms of punishment graduated according to the seriousness of the crimes. This would apply to all offenders, regardless of their backgrounds, and the option of parole would be removed. The plan is being debated all over the country, not just in criminal justice circles, as you are undoubtedly very much aware. To some people, this plan may seem to be a startling development. But, there is nothing new about this idea. Much of the same idea was proposed and debated among European and American criminologists early in the 19th century.

The problem of what to do with offenders has always plagued civilization, at least as far back as our written records go. It is continued throughout the present century. Seventy years ago, almost to this day, Roscoe Pound gave a speech in St. Paul, Minnesota, entitled "The Causes of Popular Dissatisfaction with the Administration of Justice." That popular dissatisfaction still exists today, although perhaps in aggravated form.

The controversy over rehabilitation versus punishment has been going on for generations. For all those generations the rehabilitative approach has been encountering the same arguments, the same opposition, the same appeals to human prejudice. Recently, a federal court declared the prisons of Alabama unconstitutional on the grounds that the conditions prevailing in those prisons did not recognize the standards of human decency. You may have read at least one very celebrated response that the federal courts are trying to make country clubs or hotels out of the prisons of this country. It is the old, almost ritualistic response about

coddling criminals. But, anyone who has visited prisons and jails of our country knows that the last term that might be used to describe them could scarcely be "coddling criminals." In all too many instances, words are inadequate to realistically describe those facilities.

I do not think we are in the position of having to choose between rehabilitation and punishment. I have no problem accepting the view that rehabilitation has not worked as well as it should, or as well as many in corrections have claimed in years past. But that is no basis for abandoning the idea. I have seen many proclaimed rehabilitation programs over the years which are said to have had considerable progress and promise. But, typically, they were indefinitely supported, they were insufficiently or, indeed, improperly staffed and forced to operate in the face of cynicism and the time-worn cliches and arguments about coddling criminals. Even in the heyday of rehabilitation, our institutions were characteristically punitive and neglectful of human rights, with rehabilitation more a matter of rhetoric than reality. Under those circumstances, we could hardly expect rehabilitation as a principle to work.

One of our speakers today, Mr. Martinson, who has done so much to challenge corrections' traditional faith in rehabilitation, has never said, if I may speak for him, that rehabilitation has never worked or that no rehabilitation program could work. If I may take the liberty of paraphrasing him rather than saying that "nothing works," it is more in order to say that nothing has truly been tried. I suggest that there is a different conclusion to be reached out of the history of controversy in corrections and today's confusion. And that is that we really don't know very much upon which to base a final judgment as to which philosophical view to take. Like much that we have heard of Mr. Martinson's findings, the matter has been over-simplified.

Although corrections has existed in this country from its beginnings, it has not changed as much as the country has. As a matter of fact, we are still using some of the jails and prisons that were built more than a century ago. This backwardness has been charged to public apathy or to legislative neglect, as well as to other causes, but we must also recognize that the acquisition of knowledge in corrections has not proceeded with the pace that it has in other disciplines. In blunt language, as far as corrections is concerned, we are still relatively uninformed.

Therefore, it is not a time to give up and to return to a primary reliance on punishment as a response to crime. It is not a time to close our minds. Rather, our decision should be to focus even more vigorously on research, to encourage more than ever before the development of innovations and new ideas, and to experiment more extensively than we have dared to do in the past. It is a time for listening. It is a time for discussion, and it is a time for an open-minded examination of ideas. It is, in a word, a time for this conference. As for rehabilitation, rather than abandon it, we should first look at the question, "Why hasn't it worked as well as it should?"

Last year, Pete Velde appointed a consultant committee to develop some recommendations as to what the priorities were in corrections and where LEAA should concentrate its resources. The report of the committee has only recently been submitted, and it is currently under study. One of its primary recommendations was that LEAA should undertake a major research effort to evaluate the various rehabilitative programs that had been in use over the years to determine how they were operated, what standards were used and where they might have gone wrong, and more importantly, where they might have done things right with good results. The report also recommended that, until those results are in, whatever funds LEAA might have for demonstration projects should be concentrated on trying out new ideas, rather than to perpetuate or proliferate traditional programs.

There, I would submit, is where the major emphasis should be in corrections over the next several years. I am confident that new ideas, new approaches, new techniques can be found. We are far from the ultimate stage of development in this field. At a very minimum, the effort should result in some insights and information that will bring about a better choice of programs and a more efficient operation of them. Certainly the public funds available for corrections will always be limited, as they have always been, and, like any good business, we should invest where we will get the maximum result. However, I recognize that whatever renewed life rehabilitation might gain from all this, the honeymoon is undoubtedly over. For rehabilitation programs to survive, they will have to produce results, and prove they can do so. They will be subjected to hard and tough scrutiny, and they should be.

I do not want to appear idealistic in wanting to preserve the objective of rehabilitation. I know there are many criminals who are poor prospects for rehabilitation. I also know that corrections, whatever its present status, is fully capable of protecting the public by keeping those clients locked up. And that is really no small task. But, in our society the way for corrections should lie in the direction of trying to salvage lives, not in writing them off. While there has been much in corrections that has been dismal and discouraging, there has been much, particularly in recent years, that is hopeful and promising. These developments are, at times, attended by contradictions of their own philosophical dilemma and operational difficulties, but that is characteristic of most human affairs.

For some years now, through LEAA, the Congress has made substantial sums available for correctional improvement. I know that promising new ideas and innovations find ready acceptance in LEAA although that may not seem so to some applicants. One of the problems has been that in the present uncertain atmosphere in corrections, new ideas and innovations have been a few in number and slow in coming. What we need is to change that atmosphere.

Another development in recent years has been the recognition of the moral and constitutional rights of prisoners. There was a time not very long ago when prisoners were thought to have no rights at all. The courts were the first to assert that they do. These rights have now come into relatively common acceptance, at first tentatively in the 1967 President's Crime Commission Report and more comprehensively in the Corrections Report of the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. Yet, this recognition of prisoners' rights has not been universal. We still hear the argument, "Why should we give prisoners rights to basic standards of housing, food, and medical care, when there are so many people on the outside who have never shared or enjoyed these same rights?" That's a difficult question, and I know many of you in this room have faced it. The answer to that, of course, is not to deny these rights to prisoners, but to elevate our standards of decency in the free community as well. The fact is that we even have a long way to go before these rights mean much to prisoners, as we know from current reports on our jail conditions.

One of the trends today that has a good deal of potential for correctional improvement is the emphasis on the adoption of standards. The American Correctional Association pioneered in this direction years ago. More recently we have had the National Advisory Commission. The American Bar Association and many other state and national groups are also working on standards. The National Sheriffs Association has developed a particularly fine set of standards for jails. The ACA has returned to its standard setting effort with the establishment of its Accreditation Commission, which is presently involved in the examination of standards developed so far by all other organizations. But, it's going to take a good deal of effort, persuasion and resolve on everyone's part if any significant number of these standards are to be implemented. Too often when we have tried to translate a standard into practice, it gets traded down through compromise or is discarded altogether. Facilities are still being built that are an affront to what we have learned in corrections, not to say a mockery of our notions of human decency. Jails and prisons are still being built that are too big, inviting excessive use. Institutional architecture is still too hard. In too many instances the new institutions fail to be much of an improvement, if any, over the supposedly outmoded institutions they were designed to replace.

One of the standards the National Clearinghouse insists upon in reviewing architectural projects is the use of single occupancy cells. And probably nowhere does it encounter more opposition. County commissioners know, of course, that it is cheaper to build tanks and multi-occupancy cells. But when planners and architects and correctional administrators acquiesce in their view, in effect the personal safety of prisoners is disregarded. It is the use of tanks and multi-occupancy cells that makes possible the brutality that is so prevalent in our jails today. Building such facilities that perpetuate these evils is a waste of time, money, talent, and opportunity.

Even where intelligent architecture and enlightened correctional administration prevails and well-designed facilities are built, (and there have been a number of such instances, I can happily report), we still have to be watchful to preserve the original philosophy upon which they are based. An escape may occur, or an unfortunate incident may happen, and the pressures begin. In yielding, the administrator piles barbed wire higher, installs new flood-lighting, adds more tons of steel bars and plates. At the same time, the operation of the jail retrogresses to traditional, more repressive practices. Even when a new facility is designed and built intelligently, the administrator or sheriff may start operating it just as he did the old facility. The end result is that with all the expenditure for construction, we are no better off than we were before.

Therefore, your responsibility, whether as architects, planners, or administrators, does not end with design and construction of a good facility. While correctional personnel have a vital role in making a new facility work as it was conceived, we have to involve the public, particularly the community leaders, in all that is done from the preliminary planning phase through to actual operation.

For those among you who are involved in planning, designing, and building a new correctional facility, it is probably a job unique in your experience. In your professional career, you may have planned many schools, hospitals or office buildings. But it is not often that a new jail or prison is built. In most jurisdictions, it may happen less frequently than once every 50 years. So the chances are that you will have only one chance to do so in your life span. That means that you have a special responsibility, a special trust, a special obligation to go to unusual lengths to understand what you should do and to pass on that understanding to your community.

There are resources, happily, which you can turn to for help. The National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice Planning and Architecture immediately comes to mind, and so do LEAA and the National Institute of Corrections. There are, of course, superb programs and facilities than can be seen and judged.

Whatever is done, however, whatever pressures you may encounter from the conflicting and contradictory philosophies now impinging upon corrections, you ought to look toward the future rather than to the past. The solution to the present day confusion does not lie in re-embracing ancient beliefs in punishment and retribution. If anything has been tried fully and has failed, it is the use of punishment. It is hardly uplifting to the people who are punished, and certainly not to those who do the punishing. The task of corrections is to bring to the offender possibilities for a meaningful life that he has never been aware of or that he may have never had available to him before. With some, there undoubtedly will be failure. But even though there is, we owe it to the kind of society we wish to have in this country to treat the offender with dignity and decency.

Therefore, on this occasion, a symposium on criminal justice planning, we need to approach the proceedings with utter candor and complete receptivity. No one here will have the solutions to all the problems. And whatever solutions are presented will not be the ultimate solutions. But, this symposium and many like it are essential steps in moving corrections away from factors that have held back its development for so long. Although corrections, as I observed at the outset, may have had an unhappy past, there is much in it upon which you can build. We may not know as much as we need to in corrections but we do know more than we did before. Personnel standards may remain low, but we do have trained planners, architects, and administrators who were not available before. Money has always been scarce and remains relatively so, but it is now more available than it ever has been.

But one thing has not changed, and there is very little prospect that it will change. It will always be an uphill fight to defend what is best in corrections. Yet, I submit it is worth it if your work in corrections is to have any lasting purpose or significance.

My parting words to you are good luck and have a great conference! You are sure to succeed, for you have the right ideas, the right people, and, from what I can see, you are on the right track.

Thank you.

Our next speaker, Mr. Bob Martinson, may already be known to many of you, and in fact, I fully expect that he is. His book which he co-authored is entitled The Effectiveness of Correctional Treatment. I promised him we'd give him a plug for his book in return for his appearance with us today. But, as a result of Bob's book and various addresses he has given in other places and articles he has written, he has acquired the reputation or at least the name of "Nothing-Works Martinson."

We have invited Bob for two reasons. One is to, of course, provide opportunity for him to correct that impression, if indeed it needs to be corrected. He will clarify that for us. Also, it is because he currently has under way a project which we think is quite important. I think you will, too. He reported work on rehabilitation in the original book entitled, The Effectiveness of Correctional Treatment, As It Could Be Determined From Research Up To 1967. Since that time people have come to him with other things that they feel he should be aware of. People feel that they are operating programs that indeed are successful, that were overlooked or at least have occurred since the time of that writing. And LEAA has funded Bob's current enterprise on the same topic. It is being conducted by the Center for Knowledge in Criminal Justice Planning which Bob Martinson directs.

Down in San Antonio last January, at the mid-winter meeting of the State Criminal Justice Planning Administrators Conference, Bob made the remark that whole sections of Canada must now be deforested in order to produce the paper for all the studies which are coming into his office. In fact, the avalanche is of such proportion that I'm not sure whether he has had time to read any of them. It is our hope that he has. We look forward to seeing the publications which will be the result of this new research effort. We are very pleased to have Mr. Robert Martinson on our program this morning.

Robert Martinson:

I see that the title of my topic today is evaluation and planning. Both of these topics are immense, and the two together are really beyond doing. Let me focus on one aspect of both -- the politics of evaluation and planning. I use the word "politics" in a very special sense to mean the process by which general ideas can initiate change in criminal justice. For long periods of time both evaluation and planning can be essentially incremental, gradual steps along a path. Assumptions are fixed; only the details are at issue. Then, suddenly, everything changes. The details become either trivial or meaningless and basic assumptions are challenged and must be modified. At such times ideas race ahead of facts. Slogans arise. "Nothing works" is certainly one of them. Challenges are issued, and the heat becomes somewhat intense. We in criminal justice are living through such a period. Those who have matured during the gradual epochs, frequently see such transitional periods as mere chaos, vulgar noise, not realizing that essential change in human affairs frequently proceeds

by jumps, by leaps, by discontinuities. In such times ideas do not merely communicate; they have a cutting, thrusting quality. They engage the attention rather than putting one to sleep. Here's a list of such ideas that I culled from the recent past:

"Crime in the Streets"

"A Moratorium on Prison Construction"

"Nothing Works"

"Standards and Goals"

"Planning (A new idea in American life) for Crime Reduction"

Most recently, "Lock 'em Up."

Now everyone of these ideas was introduced by somebody with the aim of attracting and convincing others. Planning and evaluation are not neutral bureaucratic enterprises. If they are to prosper in this country, the tendencies they favor must be sharply presented to the general public, who must seize upon them, imagine them clearly as at least one conceivable solution to a common problem. To really plan, ladies and gentlemen, one must present an idea, and that's what I intend to do today.

It's possible to reduce crime in the United States by reorganizing our existing criminal justice networks. The knowledge we have so painfully accumulated over the last several decades will help us, but the reorganization required will also demand some old fashioned American ingenuity and a complete break with the ideology of treatment, which is an intellectual dead-end but which still cripples our vision and our efforts. The plan for change which I will propose to you today is not the product of whim. It's not put forward lightly. I've come to it gradually and after many hesitations and testings. I proposed it formally for the first time on November 7th of last year before the Committee on Criminal Jurisprudence of the Texas House of Representatives meeting in Amarillo.

As a member of the LEAA Consultant Committee on Correction, I have helped recommend to the Administrator, Mr. Velde, a similar proposal for the reorganization of probation and parole which could be experimentally tested in some jurisdictions to see if it has merit. Now my statement of this idea is necessarily bold and without the detail of qualification, and it is the sole responsibility of myself, my neighbors in New York's twentieth precinct and the fifty New York taxi-cab drivers whom I consulted on the plan during the last several months. Being the world's most cynical and hard-boiled realists, these cabbies are the best antidote to foolish enthusiasm and any new-fangled nonsense, and I would propose adding one of them to any committee Mr. Velde sets up to address the crime problem.

Now, in order to win any volunteers who may be present over to the idea in the beginning, let me say that this plan has no place for volunteers. But, it does involve a very large expansion of tasks for which volunteers may be exceptionally well-qualified after several weeks of training. There is one condition however. No matter how painful it is, you must put aside the thought that the American people are going to permit you to engage

in the heartwarming task of reforming your fellow human beings. If we are to return to an American system of criminal justice, the idea of forced state treatment must be rooted out of criminal justice. The aim of criminal justice is not to turn sinners into saints, but to cope with criminal behavior. Now, the idea I proposed is laughably simple, as I think most good ideas are. I proposed to shut down nine out of every ten prisons in the United States and to provide every released criminal offender with his own personal police officer.

The process of arriving at a simple conclusion (some might say simple-minded) is always exceedingly complex. If the idea has merit, the elements for carrying it through should already be present, although in a distorted and unrecognized form. The system I will propose has been a long time in the building. It began with the rapid expansion across the U.S. of a new form of social control in the community which was given the name of probation and parole. It involved a gradual but massive shift over a century from sole reliance on the prison cage to a situation today in which two out of three convicted criminal offenders are being (you should pardon the term) supervised and treated in the community.

We awake in the Twentieth Century to discover that the prison has lost its central role as previously such punishments as execution, maiming, and the whip had lost theirs. Are we to believe that mankind has crawled and scrambled its way up the long incline of civilization only in order, at the end, to return to the bronze age? This is the essential message I hear today from Harvard Professor James Q. Wilson, who even half convinced President Ford of it. The primary reason for this backlash sentiment is the lack of a viable and workable alternative to the cage. We know in our bones that this caging of human beings as a punishment and as a restraint is on the way out, but we cannot seem to draw the necessary conclusion from this idea. We need a new and more effective form of punishment, one that is fitting to a democratic society and that will express our central concern for the value of the human being. One reason we cannot think clearly is that we have permitted the growth and entrenchment throughout criminal justice of a set of interlocking ideas and institutions and vested interests which I have called the "age of treatment." These anachronistic and backward looking interests have now lost their intellectual supremacy among us, but they are nevertheless digging in their heels and fighting desperately to maintain their hold on every nook and cranny of our system of criminal justice.

What is needed is a national, political, and judicial effort to break this death grip which is impeding efforts to reduce crime and to reorganize criminal justice to fit the Twentieth Century. For this struggle to be successful, many disparate interests must unite to run a common perspective. This is the only way to effectuate change in our democratic society. We need a banner, a central focus, an idea that is capable of expansion and that could be fitted to the many complex situation of American life. What we need, in essence, is a new form of punishment.

The term punishment will grate on your ears, since you've been brought up to believe that punishment is a crime, as Dr. Menninger has preached with so much eloquence and passion. But if punishment is a crime, then so is society, since all known human societies have made use of it. The common people use mild forms of punishment everyday to train and caution their children. It is the misuse of punishment that is a crime, not its use. If you cut off your child's hand for stealing cookies from the cupboard, that's a crime. If you ground your son on the weekend and deprive him of TV for a month, is that a crime? What Dr. Menninger expresses, of course, is what we all feel. Punishing a criminal in modern society by locking him in a pen like an ox is futile and serves no useful purpose, except to protect yourself from him while he is isolated. But to leap from this empirical observation to an indictment of each and every form of punishment is an absurdity and is meant primarily to lay the basis for a justification of Dr. Menninger's special form of punishment -- indeterminacy.

The kingpin which holds together the entire tottering structure of the age of treatment is the indeterminate sentence, that special form of human torture invented by the psychiatric and allied professions and smuggled into the institutions of criminal justice. Indeterminacy pervades the entire structure of criminal justice in the U.S. from top to bottom. The first step in any rational national strategy must be to eliminate it at the root, to ban it from the penal system. But this would have been accomplished long ago but for the lack of a viable alternative.

The central function of indeterminacy is not treatment or rehabilitation, although it was introduced under this rhetoric. The central function is control over large, unruly, difficult-to-manage bodies of convicts herded together in these corrals we call correctional institutions since we do not wish to see them for what they are. The infamous never-knowing system was an essential device to bend the convict to the will of the prison system. It is today the central key to maintaining the cage as a device for social control and punishment -- not for the Charlie Mansons and the hoodlums, but for the great run of ordinary property offenders who sit out their days in these pigpens. To strike down the indeterminate sentence is to sound the death knell of the prisons. That is why it will never come about until there is a living and effective alternative to the cage acceptable to the great majority. And that is also why, ladies and gentlemen, there is no proposal before the American people so foolish as the abolition of parole.

This proposal may go under the fancy name of the justice model or anything else you like. It may be supported by an unholy alliance of convicts and radical republicans, but for it to take root among the vast majority would mean a return to the 19th Century, with a vast reinforcement of the central role of the prison. The so-called justice model arose as an immediate response to the wave of unrest which followed Attica, and it is tainted to the core by its central aim which is to buy inmate discontent at the expense of the American people,

especially those who daily suffer the brunt of victimization by the criminal element.

Now let us zero in on these systems of field supervision which cover the United States from one end to the other. What could be done with these things to make them more useful, and let me be quite frank, more punitive? If you look too closely at the way they work now you are not going to be able to appreciate how we might change them. You probably agree with my neighbors; the way they work now is kind of an affront to your common sense, almost a standing joke. When spokesmen for these organizations speak of community treatment, my neighbors simply shake their heads sadly and go about their business which includes locking themselves in their apartments at night and avoiding hoodlums during the day. My neighbors have some sense of how these agents spend their time shuffling around these papers while the 50 to 150 persons they are supposed to supervise are running around as free as the breeze, committing burglaries, robberies, and various other kinds of mayhem. This surely is not the alternative, with or without having volunteers.

In law and in practice these field supervision networks are regarded as a mitigation of punishment, are they not, either for those who are placed on probation in lieu of prison or those who are let out early and placed on parole. This is the way the public sees it, a mitigation, partially because the public is completely unaware of the painfulness to an offender of the cat-and-mouse games which the agent can play with him while under field supervision. Now is the public aware that these revolving doors can be criminogenic beyond their obvious inability to prevent crimes from being committed by persons who, after all, are legally under state supervision, are they not?

Let me refer here to the unrecognized work of Bertram Johnson, who provided evidence that an inadequate agent who was given a small case load to supervise can actually increase the recidivism rates of those he is supervising. This is only one of the many breakthroughs which the attentive leader can find in our survey of correctional research. Another is that field supervision can have a general deterrent effect on those being supervised. That is, you can increase the success rates by varying the revocation rates across district offices or regions -- a deterrent effect.

If field supervision is to be made an acceptable punishment for crime and, at the same time a useful form of restraint to the prison cage, it must be so organized that ordinary people will be able to see immediately that they would be very uncomfortable indeed if they were subjected to it. But more than that, a convict now held in a cage should clearly envision it as a lesser but still painful experience to his sitting in one of those pens with the stainless steel toilets and the unburnable mattresses. The punishment should not be beneath the dignity of a human being, and yet it should be uncomfortable. It should be as undamaging a punishment as we can find, leaving the convict as free to take up a non-criminal existence as we can design. Unlike the

personal torture of cheek-to-jowl indeterminacy, which is meant to coerce the convict into a particular life-style, it should be aimed exclusively at criminal behavior and involve as little personal contact as possible. Unlike the unconstitutional forms of creeping slavery involved in the present probation and parole systems, it should place the released convict in no different situation in relation to his behavior and free movement as any innocent person is now placed in. Unlike the monstrous affront of indeterminacy, which aims to break the will and bend the back, this punishment must strengthen the will, be law abiding, and punish with considerable certainty and swiftness, criminal behavior and criminal behavior alone. To give a name to what is now a mere possibility, let us call this new form of punishment "determinate ambiguity."

One may search out the sources of this mode of punishment in the depths of human experience and not in the new-fangled devices of those mad technologists who hang about the criminal justice system attempting to devise obscene little instruments to place in the skulls of offenders. It is a universal fact of human life that a mere stare from another human being invades your privacy and invokes discomfort, then indignation, and finally some action to put an end to this. Let us liken this new punishment to an official stare imposed by law for a determinate period. Such a stare could easily make a person long for the quiet and solitude of a prison cell. And, for this reason it might easily be intolerable, especially for those federal offenders who now spend time comfortable in the pastel surrounding of our newest and brightest correctional facilities (as they are called) which they will soon leave so that they may better prey on the public. So, let us mitigate this official stare so as to make it impersonal, the mere possibility that one is being especially watched at times that are not stated in advance and are not revealed. This is called the state of being picked out for special surveillance -- ambiguity.

The punishment of ambiguity is similar to police surveillance, I suppose, or perhaps to having a tail placed on you by a wife searching out grounds for divorce. The difference is that the aim of these more common forms of surveillance is not punishment, and they are more successful the less you are aware of them. Determinate ambiguity would be a form of punishment lasting for a determinate period, imposed by a court on those convicted by due process of law. This punishment could only be carried out by an agent of the state and only for the period dictated by law. If the crime is burglary, you can receive, say, a sentence of three years of surveillance by a district office in which you make your residence. This differs not at all from the present probation or parole system except that you cannot be required to report to any agent, ask anybody permission to drive a car, marry, get drunk, move your residence, or do anything at all that any other citizen may refuse to do. The aim of the punishment is to permit you at all times to do anything you wish, except commit a criminal act. But the aim of the present police systems is not different, is it? They cannot interfere with anything but illegal behavior. The difference is that you

are to be assigned your own personal police officer because, and only because, you are being legally punished in retribution for a criminal act committed by you in the past.

There is an important difference between this system of retributive punishment and many others that mankind has chosen in the past. This system combines the idea of just desserts as a maximum limit to punishment, legally inflicted for crime with the idea that the person being punished may mitigate his own punishment by following a law abiding course -- mitigate, but not eliminate, since the state does not give up its right to this surveillance activity until the sentence has been served. This punishment should be quite familiar to any innocent citizen, since he walks the streets, observes policemen patrolling them, and knows what they would do if he were to commit a criminal offense. The punishment of special surveillance adds to this experience only the idea that you, because of your past illegal behavior will receive extra attention, will be picked out, so to speak, from the rest. The punishment of determinate ambiguity accomplishes for retribution what a system of penal law accomplishes for deterrence. It takes from it the irrational element of revenge, which insists beyond reason that the pound of flesh must be taken, come what may. The threat of the penal law is a marvelous device for human beings since it is present only when you need it and can otherwise be safely ignored. The punishment of determinate ambiguity is meant to provide the person being punished with an opportunity to reduce this punishment by behaving in a law abiding way. Society still exacts a kind of "revenge", if you will, but not in such a way as to defeat the social purpose of punishment, which, let me remind you, is to reduce crime.

Now all of this may seem very abstract, so to bring it into practical focus let me indicate in rough form how the present system could be reorganized so as to begin to advance in this direction. Suppose some jurisdiction in the U.S. decides that it has enough of the present irrationality, and wished to experiment with a dramatic and drastic change, so as to reduce crime within the limits of our laws and our constitutional system. The governor appoints a major task force consisting of legislators, judges, parole and probation officials, and planning administrators, especially planning administrators. The aim of the task force is to outline the steps needed to move from indeterminacy. That is where we are to a new system of social control.

The aim is to gradually shut down all the prisons but those needed to isolate the dangerous offender from society. The present convict population shall be gradually released and placed on "restraint-in-the-community," if you like. That is, as they leave their cells they will be supplied with a personal police officer who can see that they are returned to prison only if they commit a new crime and are legally convicted for it. Those now on probation and most of the present parolees shall be given a suspended sentence and sent home with no supervision and no obligations at all except that the law shall be changed so that should they commit a new crime

while in the status of a suspendee they may be punished by the court by being sentenced to restraint-in-the-community. Those who fail to respond to this restraint by committing a new crime shall be sentenced to isolation from the community, and so forth.

This system is both familiar and unfamiliar. The reason you are even considering it in your mind is that the elements for achieving it are staring you in the face. They have only to be assembled together properly and rationally, arranged and graded, and you have a new system which operates on quite different principles than the so-called correctional system of today. The essential aim of the reorganization is to maximize deterrence for those who are initially judged to be deterrable, to combine deterrence with restraint for those who are not, and to isolate from society those who are too dangerous to be permitted in this experiment. One beauty of the idea is that you don't have to wait around for years and years to see if it is able to accomplish its purpose of reducing crime. If it can do this, it can do it without any change in the nature of the convict or offender population. What is being changed, and changed radically, is the system for coping with crime. Instead of the present system of treatment, which has failed so badly and for so long a time, we shall construct a system of graded deterrence, restraint, and isolation which has as its underpinning a new mode of punishment fitting to the human being of today.

The idea of the prison was invented here in America only a century and a half ago. When it was invented, it was an important step forward for mankind since it was to replace the hideous tortures of the past, in which persons were maimed, executed, and literally torn apart. What we Americans invented, we Americans can put aside, since we are endlessly open to what is practical and what is new. It is no accident that we have developed the systems of probation and parole to their present dominance. We must now merely draw the conclusions from what we have dimly but rightly accomplished. We must seize upon these instrumentalities and make of them a new thing so as to gradually replace the prison cage with a democratic form of punishment.

The most monstrous crimes of the 20th Century were the slaughter of millions of the innocents and the helplessness in the Nazi concentration camps and the Communist Gulag Archipelagos. These slaughters were only possible because they took place within those very prison-like conditions, bureaucratic and secretive, which were introduced to mankind by the gentle Quakers of Philadelphia. The combination of fanaticism with the prison is the most dangerous and volatile instrumentality known to man, a kind of internal H-bomb which ticks and ticks and is constantly available to those who care not for the human creature. At the root of our error is the most American of failings -- the desire to save another human being from the clutches of the devil.

This fundamentally religious impulse, if you will forgive me, when combined with the fervor and inventiveness

of a democratic people has led us to the sin of pride and blinded us to the harm which can follow from good intentions. It is time now to awake from this dream of changing people against their will and against the very elements which have created them. Let us thrust this error from our midst and begin today to build an American system of criminal justice. We shall reduce crime in this country to a tolerable level only if we can put aside our religious impulses long enough to permit the New York City taxi driver a chance to get a word in edgewise.

As he and his like throughout our country maneuver their way through the jungle of our cities, they develop a philosophy of hard-boiled sentimentality toward the crime problem; they understand the need for legal codes and for the punishment of those who would terrorize us from our streets and our parks. They do not fail to note the immunity from punishment of those who commit high crimes and misdemeanors and then have the affrontery to make fortunes appearing before audiences of our young people. They are perfectly aware that our system of treatment and corrections has become a complete fraud, a device for channeling the crime in their direction, for spewing-out upon our streets persons who are trained and pushed to continue with their predatory activities.

I have a healthy respect for the power of an idea, and the simple idea I commend to your attention has this power, not because of my eloquence, but because it has the capacity to break through a dilemma at the most abstract level. This dilemma can be seen as a conflict between our republican institutions and our democratic enthusiasm. The evidence is all around us. What other country in the world could have produced a Prohibition era? Or the phenomena of the New York Mafia picketing the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

Let us pause from this folly, open our eyes and return to our senses. I have no worked-out plan here in my back pocket for you planners. And I have never considered such plans as worthy of a moment's serious consideration. I merely suggest to you a movement, a strategy, a way of thinking about this crime problem which has seized us by the throat in this our 200th year as a nation. This, too, will pass, and we can help it on its way. We shall gradually reduce the prison to a simple form of isolation for those who are too dangerous to walk among us any longer. We shall replace each prison cage by a human being who, under the authority of law, shall keep an eye upon those who have strayed from the fold and must be prevented from committing crime. We shall show our concern for the criminal offender by punishing him in a way that will harm him the least, and we shall show our concern for the victims of his crimes by not permitting him to persist in his illegal activities. If you have the general idea in mind and think it worthy of consideration, it is surely up to you to carry it forward. The people of this country are waiting patiently for you to do something.

Thank you.

It is always a fortunate combination of circumstances when good and competent people occupy positions of high responsibility and potential for influencing events. This is the case with our next speaker. We at the National Clearinghouse first met Milt Luger in 1970. We were then conducting the research which led to the Corrections Guidelines, and Milt was one of the very first people to whom we were directed. At that time, he headed the New York State Division for Youth. He already had acquired a reputation as an effective administrator. But among the very first characteristics noted in meeting Milt, in our experience, is that he is a caring person. He is very much concerned with treatment -- the one-to-one relationship between people.

Therefore, we regarded him as an important resource to our work. We were very pleased to watch his progress in New York State. Most recently we watched from the sidelines as we saw him nominated for the position of the Assistant Administrator for the Office of Juvenile Delinquency Prevention of LEAA. We looked forward to his confirmation by the Senate and then were very pleased to attend his swearing in by Attorney General Levy just a few months ago. Since that time, with the enormous responsibilities which he now carries, he has become almost inaccessible. We are very pleased that we were able to get him here today to address you. He is a person for whom we have enormous regard. I am pleased to present Milt Luger.

Milt Luger:

When Fred called me and asked about the possibility of coming down, he didn't mention that Bob Martinson was on the program as well. Bob and I are old friends. We've debated each other on this business of "Nothing works" about three or four times now, right? And we're both bloody but unbowed about our own beliefs.

I'm really glad that in some ways this is just not another debate between myself and Bob. I have not had the opportunity to see or hear the concept paper he put forth today, and so I can only respond partially. I did take him on for three hours last time in Louisville, trying to point out how, in a sense, he is being used; he knew he was being used by a lot of people who want to end up putting more and more people in cages, with the simplistic kind of notion that "Nothing Works." Bob seemed ready to buy into that kind of business to sell his books and to appear on "Sixty Minutes." In his own writings, as you analyze them very carefully -- and as he has said himself -- the very opposite could be said: "Everything works for somebody." Bob studied many sub-groups which *did* improve through some kind of treatment. I'm not a "medical model" person; I abhor it -- that kind of put-down of people with the implication that they are "sick." But so many of the sub-groups did improve! But what we do not know is really what treatment approach, what treatment track, what kind of training works for what sub-group? Bob simply says it works for nobody, and it's just not true.

But I'd like to skip that old debate, because we've gone through that a few times. I still enormously respect Bob Martinson. Few people know how committed a person Bob is to the things he believes; for example, to the civil rights movement, for which he spent time in prison because of his beliefs. There are so many other areas where he is on the right side of the issues, as I said before. The problem is he is being used by a lot of people who are just simply punitive, and he has come up with, I think, simplistic ways to handle the situation. I think he is saying that instead of giving offenders faith and hope and skills, let's give them surveillance. And I think that people, and young people especially, need a sense of adequacy and faith and hope -- more than a cop watching them 24 hours a day.

Now let me get on to just one or two other things. When Fred called me and asked me to talk about research and planning, I turned to our extensive research staff in LEAA and I said, "Would you give me a few thoughts about research and young people, and what we are doing?" They came up with some interesting findings. They said things like, they have found out after much research that insanity is hereditary, and you get it from your children.

I think, in many ways, that's the level of research and planning that has taken place, and I think Pete Velde made a very important point earlier today about the contribution that LEAA has made. One contribution LEAA has made is fostering the kind of planning that needs to be done, and should have been done so long ago. And, I would like to challenge you from a young person's perspective or point of view. I think that so much of the planning, even though we're playing catch-up in this area, has been done by people who don't listen. We come in with our MPA's and come in with our doctorates in criminal justice or sociology and we get so isolated and so aloof from the hurt and the despair that young people are feeling, and we try to impose our values that we want them to have.

I'd like to use the brief time I have with you to tell you what young people are saying, so perhaps we can listen to them before we do our planning and as we do our research. They're telling us things we should be cognizant of or sensitive to, but we go blithely on our way with our comprehensive plans. They tell us that the system itself, our juvenile justice system, doesn't give a damn about them.

You heard Fred use the word "caring." As far as I'm concerned, I'm not wishy-washy; I'm not ultra-liberal; I'm not for coddling young people. I'm for confronting them in a firm way. I recognize the fact that some of them are so dangerous you had better lock them up or they will kill you. I'm not for dumping all people in community-based programs and saying that's the only approach -- that's the latest panacea. I'm not for all of that. But I do feel very, very strongly that we've got to tune in to the fact that young people are telling us that nobody gives a damn about them. Nobody is really concerned about them. Or we are only concerned about young people simply because they are our pay-

check? That's why they believe, "Man, if you weren't paid, you wouldn't be here." The message we give them, as a state in the northeast did not too long ago, is that an entire probation staff passed a resolution that they would not work after five o'clock unless they were given time and a half. If those kinds of messages come through, then I don't know how we can even think of affecting young people and turning their attitudes and aspirations around.

And the young people tell us, too, that the system discriminates against them. It discriminates against the poor. That's an old hat kind of phrase. But it ends up in the kind of thing that Bob mentioned before -- the Atticas and people telling us that you can't touch me and don't try to work with me, because I know where you're coming from. If white kids, with all our planning, are adjudicated status offenders, while black kids are adjudicated juvenile delinquents for the same acts, I don't know what surveillance or treatment or anything else is going to do. If we keep up those kinds of games which these kids see through and recognize as rhetoric and nonsense, I don't know how we can, with all our fancy plans, hope to effect or achieve safer streets.

Young people tell me, as I talk to them, that the system itself is so mixed up that it double-talks them. It tells them that we have planned a new program for you, for example, called "diversion." That's the latest, you know -- diversion. And, if we divert you out of the system, that's a voluntary program, because, as Bob pointed out, the coercive programs are the wrong ones -- the bad ones. You can't coerce anybody. But we've got a new game for you. We've got a game called "voluntary diversion," so get into this voluntary program. But look out, kid, if you don't shape up in this voluntary program, I've got my hooks into you, and I'm going to send you on to that training school or some other place. And so he says, "What is the message? Is it voluntary? Is it coercive?" And we keep mixing our signals with him.

Youths tell me that our system (and this is the major thrust of what I want to say in my brief remarks) *our system doesn't command their respect*. They don't use those words, but that's what they mean. I think that young people learn through emulation more than they do in any fifty-minute hour with a therapist. And they're not stupid -- they read and they understand. They are sensitive to the phoniness of what we're trying to do. I read on the front page of the *New York Times* just the other day, about a politician who was indicted for fixing some tickets, traffic tickets or contracts -- I forget what it was. The charges against him were dropped simply because he wasn't brought to a speedy trial. When interviewed on the front page of the *Times*, he proudly said, "There was never a doubt in my mind that the courts would vindicate me."

Kids know that this is happening. They see that kind of leadership, and they see within us all the talk and little substance. They see the overcrowded courtrooms. They see the public defenders who have five minutes to be with them before their trial begins. They see

case loads of 250, when it should be less than that. They see a whole lot of things. They say, "You don't command respect." And this is the one point that I really want to stress. The system doesn't command respect, because it has no respect for itself. We've allowed so many other variables, so many other influences, so many other societal institutions to dump upon us, and all we've done is whine and complain and say, "Well, you know, that's the way it is." We've gotten academically retarded kids and are expected to bring them up to snuff in the six or eight months they're with us. We get juvenile murderers, who were child abuse victims themselves when they were young, yet we're supposed to deal with their hostility and turn them around to make them full of hope.

We find kids who told me when I asked them, "What are you going to do when you get out?" "Man, the first thing I'm going to get is a knife." "What do you mean, a knife? You know, I thought we had all those good sessions together, so that you know you're going to go straight." "Well, if you lived in my neighborhood, you'd get a knife, too," they answered.

We get programs that don't deal with the kid's realities at all. And yet, at the same time, we let everybody else off the hook, except the criminal justice system, which gets these rejectees. Then we have the Bob Martinsons saying, "Well, nothing works." So what is interpreted from those remarks is, "Let's lock up more and more." Why aren't the Wilsons and the Martinsons and the Vanderhaags and all the rest of them pointing their fingers at the educational systems, the teachers who leave school before kids get out to escape from the neighborhoods, the welfare systems that break up families rather than putting them together, and the slum landlords who exploit these kids and their families? Why not? Instead of saying "Nothing works in our system," I say that we allow this because we have no sense of pride in ourselves. All of our plans and all of our papers and all of our conferences are not going to achieve anything unless we start to get that sense of pride and adequacy to transmit to kids in order to turn youths around.

I could go into a lot of research that our office is doing. I could tell you a lot about the plans we have. I think it's anticlimactic, you know, after listening to Bob. Let me just sum up. I hope this is not misunderstood. But let me say this. Criminal justice is a "nigger." As long as it feels that it is, we're going nowhere. It's only when black people got a sense of pride, a feeling of what they're entitled to, and where they're going and what their potential was, that they started to get that kind of hope and drive to really achieve what they had the capacity to achieve. And as long as criminal justice feels itself a "nigger," it's going to stay that way.

Thank you.

Oliver J. Keller is a national figure in criminal justice. He, along with many of the other speakers, has been a mentor and advisor to the National Clearinghouse and has been an important influence on many others. Currently, Oliver J. Keller is the President of the American Correctional Association. This in itself should demonstrate the high regard in which he is held throughout the United States. He also is a Professor at the University of Florida in Gainesville, in the program in criminal justice studies. Prior to this, he was the Secretary for the Division of Health and Rehabilitative Services in the State of Florida, and he headed its predecessor agency with responsibility for youth services. He is a native of Illinois which gives him a special relationship to the National Clearinghouse. He has long advocated bringing the needs of corrections and criminal justice to the attention of the public in order to garner the resources and the support vitally needed to accomplish change. I am very pleased to present Oliver J. Keller.

Oliver J. Keller:

We are now in, or have just been in, what I would call the "Era of the Master Plan."

When I first became involved in Youth Services in Illinois and later in Florida, no one cared much about master plans. You simply "flew by the seat of your pants." You went in and "did your thing." But, after 1968 and the Safe Streets Act, when federal money began to be available, people said, "You know, we've got to have a plan." And so, within the last few years, people in corrections have been developing master plans.

From my point of view, this has resulted in mixed blessings. I've seen some very good master plans. On the other hand, as Jessica Mitford has pointed out, the Federal money has caused all sorts of people to get into the action. Many of the newcomers are business consultants who are quick to say, "Look, we'll work out a master plan for you." I used to be a businessman, a broadcaster for many years before moving into corrections, but some business people who say they know how to draft a master plan for corrections really don't. Although they don't know anything about corrections, they still will confidently go in and draft a master plan.

One reason they do is because of legislators in various states. Some legislators believe that if there is to be a master plan, it ought to be along the lines of a General Motors plan. "If it works for General Motors, then it will work for everything else," they say. Wasn't it Coolidge who said, "The business of America is business." At any rate, that's the thinking of a lot of legislators.

I'll sound a sour note by saying I'm not so sure we should turn to the business community to develop a master plan for corrections. We all know the United States postal service has been in trouble. We also remember that, in 1970, the Postal Reorganization Act was supposed to

put business techniques into what was a rather shoddy governmental service. If you are aware of what has been happening to your mail since 1970, you probably agree with representative Charles Wilson who said, "We were sold a bill of goods." The U.S. Postal Service is in tough straits today despite the fact it was supposed to be following "a business model."

Now I'm going to come closer to home and talk about what the planning has been in Florida. Somehow or other the Florida legislature was impressed with the idea of having business executives come in and draft a reorganization plan for the state's Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services. This is the huge, umbrella human services agency in Florida, which certainly had a lot of flaws in it. But, when their study was over, the business executives recommended the virtual abolition of the program specialists. I don't know whether this means anything to people who are specialists in business, but what it has done in Florida is do away with much effective, specialized program knowledge in such fields as mental health, vocational rehabilitation, youth services, health, retardation. It's all gone. What you have now is a state really divided into eleven large counties. Each of these counties has a district administrator, or generalist, in charge. The state actually has 67 legal counties, but, for human services, it now has eleven large counties, or districts.

What has happened is that the people who really used to know something about youth services, for example, do not have any direct say, or control over the programs they know something about. They sit off in the state capitol as policy drafters and regulation writers. If the staff in the eleven different districts don't want to pay any attention to them, they don't. The district administrators -- the eleven generalists -- now call the shots.

From my point of view, that's too bad. What I see, over time, is a youth services program, once rated pretty highly in the country, gradually going down. What sort of youth services program exists now depends on the eleven different generalists in eleven different districts. They are the ones who determine who is going to be hired and fired, and who will run the programs in their districts -- in health, mental health, retardation, and youth services. The district administrator cannot, in all fairness, be expected to know about all these matters, but that's how the model has been created.

Tomorrow, one of your speakers is an excellent man named Dick Rachin. I stole Dick from New York back in 1968, with Milton Luger's blessings. (Milt was the head of New York Division for Youth, but he was kind enough to let me recruit Dick.) We set up a program of community-based programs for delinquent kids, a variety of correctional programs to keep kids out of reform schools. Under the present model, Dick Rachin has no real control over his programs anymore. The eleven generalists in the eleven regions call the shots and are not forced by law to pay attention to Rachin, even though he is the person in our state who really knows something about community programs for

delinquent kids. So, that's the bias I have regarding master plans set up by people who really don't know about particular human service areas.

But, let's suppose -- just for the fun of it -- that we do have an excellent corrections master plan. After all, that's what we are talking about during this seminar -- the development of plans not only for correctional architecture but for correctional programs. Let's suppose we really have a good plan.

In Florida, a couple of years ago, the state hired an outfit from California that, I believe, knows something about corrections. It's called the American Justice Institute. Two men, whom some of you will know, did the study -- Howard Omart and John Galvin. They came into Florida, looked at the adult penal system, and made some good recommendations to the Florida legislature and our Governor. What they said, essentially, was: "Decentralize reception. The old idea of central reception centers is out of date; do classification at the regional level." They also said, "Develop work-release programs; develop pre-trial intervention programs; develop community correctional centers to try to keep as many offenders as possible out of the big, old-fashioned prisons." They said, "Have caseloads for probation and parole that aren't too big; try to lower caseloads to 35, so there is at least some chance that the probation or parole officer knows who is in his caseload." They said, "Close those huge, rural prisons, because you cannot get professional people to work out in the boondocks. And, if you are trying to build any kind of family relationship between a man in prison and family in Jacksonville, you've got to have the prison close enough for occasional visits. Get rid of the old-fashioned rural prisons, and build facilities closer to the metropolitan areas where most prisoners come from. And, then, as far as new prisons are concerned -- if you have to build them, build nothing bigger than for 300 or 400 inmates. As far as the institutions themselves are concerned, create none of those great, horrible cell-blocks. Instead, do what they are doing in Europe -- have small living units. The largest building would hold no more than 50 people. Then, break that down -- as they are doing in the new federal prison at Butner, North Carolina -- into units of 10 men, so that there are 5 pods of 10 men each in that building housing no more than 50 prisoners. And, instead of bars, you can have security with glass and laminated plastic. The windows look like conventional windows, but are truly secure -- as much so as the old-fashioned steel bars."

The two planners for Florida went on: "No more dormitories. They are dangerous; people get raped in dormitories, especially if you're young and weak. Again, like Western Europe, have single rooms or single cells. And, instead of those great, big dining halls, break the eating areas into small units." Omart and Galvin knew that in prison dining rooms as large as this great hall in New Orleans riots begin and the whole place goes up for grabs. So, they urge that the dining units have only 50 people, instead of 400 people, eating at one time.

All the ideas of the American Justice Institute seemed

good. They were all part of a master plan that urged getting rid of military uniforms, too. Instead of this emphasis on captain, and lieutenant, and sergeant, staff would be in civilian clothes. Omark and Galvin had created what appeared to be a great master plan. Or, at least I thought it was good. Let me tell you where that master plan is now. It is gathering dust on various shelves in Tallahassee. It is going strictly no place. And I doubt that it will ever get off those shelves in Florida for a number of reasons.

The major reason -- and this applies not only to Florida but to states all over our country -- is the recession. With the economic crunch has come a tremendous rise in prison commitments. If you have seen the new issue of *Corrections Magazine*, you'll be pleased to know we are making history in 1976. The United States prison population, both federal and state, is at an all-time high. We have 250,000 people in prisons in this country -- a quarter of a million people!

Look at the situation in Florida, which has always been a punitive state with a huge prison population. Omark and Galvin said in 1974, "If you keep sending people to prison as you have been doing, your prison population by 1980 will be 13,300." Guess what is today -- in 1976? It is now over 16,000. We are a state of 8 million people, but we are way ahead of most of you with respect to putting prisoners in prison. We even have prisoners in tents. And, frankly, if you were a prisoner in Florida, you'd probably prefer to be in our "tent city" than one of four men in a one-man cell, sleeping under the toilet.

The public in this country is terrified about crime. And some irresponsible politicians play upon the public mood. Tom Wicker of the *New York Times*, who wrote the book about Attica, *A Time to Die*, has said, "The fear of crime is the Number One political issue in America. Not crime, but the fear of crime. And the politicians are playing on that fear."

The play they are using, of course, is the "hard line" approach: "Lock 'em up. The more prisoners, the better; the bigger the prisons, the better. But lock 'em up."

Florida is now spending \$109 million a year just to incarcerate people. That figure is going up and up and up. Our Governor's budget recommended \$64 million for capital outlay for next year. At this time, the legislature has not responded.

As Wicker pointed out, some politicians play upon public anxiety and fear. They are also eager for scapegoats. Instead of making a cooperative effort with state agency heads to really address the problem, they play to their constituency by attacking "the bumbling bureaucrats." There exists an adversary situation the like of which I have never seen before in the United States. While the scapegoat technique does not describe all politicians by a long shot, there are a good number who use agency people as their "fall guys." They preach the same line: "The system isn't working because of bureaucrats."

If that's not the real answer, what is? There are situations bureaucrats can do nothing about. In many states, the prisons are so overcrowded that riot is just around the corner. Prisons are ready to blow in many states. First offenders cannot be separated from hardened ones, because all these places are so overcrowded. Some of your planners in this room have looked at antique prison buildings and urged they be taken down. They are not coming down. The famous "Rock" at Raiford in Florida has been there since the early 1920's and will remain forever, I think. What we've done is simply add more prison beds close to the Rock. The Rock remains, stuffed with prisoners.

Yes, in Florida, new prisons are being authorized, but all that planning the American Justice Institute did at state expense just two years ago, it's gone. No one is paying any attention to it. We are building 600-man prisons, and there are legislators who argue for further expansion of what now exists. The argument goes something like this: "It doesn't matter that the vocational shops and classrooms were only planned for 300. They can stay as they are; just double-deck the cells. Put two people in there; if necessary, put four people in there."

Many legislators are not thinking about treatment staff any more. The emphasis is solely on custodial personnel -- guards.

What's going on in the new prisons that are being built? Where are the cuts being made? Well, there are not going to be gymnasiums in a lot of them; there isn't going to be any air-conditioning. Can you imagine being in Texas, or Alabama, or Mississippi, or Louisiana, or Florida in the summer, and you're locked up in a cell when it's 95 to 100 degrees outside? Or, have you ever been in a men's dormitory at night when the temperature is 95 to 100? It's the setting of a riot. And yet that's where the cuts are made, because air-conditioning is too good for those prisoners.

What about probation and parole? In Florida, and I suppose it's true in other states, when positions become vacant, or when someone leaves to go elsewhere because the pay is poor, the position is held vacant. It's not filled because of the state's financial problems. That means that caseloads are rising to astronomical levels, with 120 to 130 persons assigned to the individual parole officer. Who can call that supervision?

It is not just the recession, by the way, that has put master plans on the shelf. Master plans are affected drastically by people. Suppose administrations change, and in comes a new governor. He doesn't care about a master plan developed by his predecessor and rival. He says to himself, "That was his plan. It's not mine. His people were involved with it, not mine. To hell with their master plan." With new administrations, master plans often collect dust.

And then there are the people who never cared very much for master planning in the first place, if you want to be honest about it. I am referring to the budget people in the state capital. How many of you in this room are really familiar with what goes on with state

budgets? The people who control much of state government are people the general public knows nothing about. This does not imply they are bad guys, because they are simply "doing their thing" as state employees. But, many of the people who analyze state budget requests don't really like master plans, because master plans interfere with their own power to make decisions.

I can recall taking the Omart-Galvin master plan before a legislative committee. After I had finished talking, one of the top budget spokesmen in Florida said, "Gentlemen, Mr. Keller is the fox in the henhouse. That plan he's pushing would give all those good things to offenders. If I were building those institutions, I'd make sure they have 600 men in them, and I'd have two men to a cell. We've gotta save some money."

Still another group not too inclined toward master plans consists of the personnel specialists. Let's say that the master plan calls for the administrator of a halfway house for 25 delinquent boys to receive the lofty sum of \$12,000 a year. The personnel specialist will say, "In our opinion, it's worth \$10,000. Sure, it's a tough job working with tough kids, but, if you give him \$12,000, it throws off related pay categories." The corrections administrator cannot fill the position, largely because of that lousy difference of \$2,000. That kind of money can make the difference between hiring the right men and hiring someone far less capable.

What about legislative leadership? We've mentioned what can happen to master plans when governors change. What are the effects of major changes in House and Senate leadership positions? What's happening in my state is probably true in other states as well. Here is the headline from a recent Florida paper: "Tangling with bureaucrats is popular legislative sport." That, unfortunately, is the mood today -- outright contempt for agency heads. I had one senator tell me, "You're the hired help, and we'll tell you what you're going to do." A change in legislative leaders brings in people who can care less about planning of only a year ago. With money short, positions are slashed quite arbitrarily, with little consideration of consequences. As one friend of mine said, "Legislators want a race horse; then they design a camel and tell you to ride it like that race horse." It's a mess.

And now, there's a new fly in the ointment. This fly, like the budget analyst, is unknown to the public, but the people who work in the state agencies know they exist. I refer to the staff of legislative committees. Just a week ago, the *New York Times* had a story about the growing power of the legislatures in New Jersey, Connecticut, and New York. The article says, "The New Jersey legislature now has 1975 economists, auditors, and other experts. The state of New Jersey spends \$3.5 million every two years for this legislative staff help. This is seven times the level of ten years ago. The Connecticut General Assembly has 65 full-time staff professionals. In 1969, Connecticut had fewer than a dozen legislative staff professionals." My point is that legislative committee staff comprise a fourth branch of government the public does not know about. If you don't think they have power, you haven't been

in state government. The executive, judicial, and legislative branches of government have long been on the scene, but this fourth, and virtually unknown, branch of government is growing faster than any of the rest. In fact, it's far ahead of the "bungling bureaucrats" in rate of growth.

If you are a correctional administrator and don't know how to deal with these legislative staff people, you're in trouble. Many of them are very young; many have had no experience in human service areas; many have had no particular responsibilities. They certainly have not had to make programs work. Some are highly ambitious and are on an "ego trip." If they're not in favor of the master plan, there is trouble ahead.

What sort of master plans lie ahead? You heard Robert Martinson, the research analyst, talk today. I imagine he said here what I've heard him say on other occasions: "Nothing works. My research indicates that between 1945 and 1967, there is nothing that cuts down on recidivism." My friend John Conrad of the Academy for Contemporary Problems is also equally negative. John, speaking in Tampa a couple of weeks ago, said, "It is most unlikely that any systematic application of any offender rehabilitation program will seriously reduce the recidivism of the offender population to which it may be applied." John is essentially agreeing with Martinson in saying, "I've seen it all, and it's all dismal."

My question, then, to this group is: should we, in developing master plans and planning objectives, exclude any emphasis on rehabilitation? Do we give up? Are we only to be humane -- which is where John Conrad puts the emphasis?

When John Conrad spoke in Tampa two weeks ago, he cited a number of studies. He referred to Eleanor and Sheldon Glueck's work in the 1930's. Of the 500 criminal offenders they studied over an 11-year period, half broke parole and went back in the joint. John also talked about the Special Intensive Parole Unit in California. He said it was a bust. He also mentioned California's intensive counseling program and Margaret Warren's Community Treatment program. The results of all were discouraging.

But -- in that entire gloomy picture -- John Conrad did find one bright spot. I want to call that spot the "human factor." John was talking about the Special Intensive Parole Unit in which he worked back in 1953. While he reported that, overall, the project made no difference, he also discovered the following, and I quote: "Quite early I noticed that different parole officers had different results as to the recidivism in their caseloads, which could not be accounted for by social conditions in the districts in which they worked. In Oakland, California, the SIPU agent was an irrepressible enthusiast who kept his office open until late hours at night to dispense advice and to conduct bull-sessions with any parolee who cared to happen in, as most of his caseload seemed to enjoy doing. His violation rate was extraordinarily low. Across the Bay in San Francisco, the SIPU agent was an enthusiast of a different

stripe. He liked to rise in the small hours of the morning so that he could descend on unemployed parolees and remind them that early birds get the available worms and slug-a-beds do not. And his parole violation was high.

Now, to me, Conrad is saying something important, and yet he lets it slip by. He is saying that there really can be rehabilitation if the human factor is there. When you had a parole officer who really gave a damn about the people in his caseload, recidivism went down. And, although John quotes the Gluecks, they did not paint an entirely gloomy picture. They talked about something they called "the personal touch" that seemed to change bad kids at the reformatory at Concord. We also need to remember Dan Glaser, whom many of you know personally, and who wrote *The Effectiveness of A Prison and Parole System*. Glaser pointed out it isn't the "shrink" who changes people, and it isn't the warden, and it isn't the chaplain, in most cases. The person who seemed most valuable in inmates' changing and becoming responsible citizens was the work supervisor -- if a friendship relationship had developed between that work supervisor and the prisoner.

Tom Merton, the controversial former director of the Arkansas prison system, has come out with a new book called *The Dilemma of Prison Reform*. I think he's unfair in some of the stands he takes. He takes a single work-release study from Florida to condemn the whole work-release effort. The study indicated prisoner attitudes did not improve when men were placed in work-release. Naturally, they won't improve when men were placed in work-release programs as an aftermath of "Cool Hand Luke." Some of the men now running work-release programs in Florida once ran the road-prison camps, and they haven't changed that much.

Think of all the good ideas that have been ruined by people who don't carry them out right. I remember reading a study about the East Los Angeles halfway house. The parole officers in charge of this community correctional program were described as pretty cold characters. They weren't helpers to the men. They were always on top of them, hassling them. It's no wonder the program was not successful. Yet, people will look at that one effort -- just as Merton looked at the single work-release study -- and declare, "There's a community program for you, and it doesn't work."

In Florida, the maximum security prison is a tough, mean place. Yet, in this conservative prison system, there is a middle-aged lady who is a volunteer. Financially well off, she spends her days off working with prisoners. She's a one-woman tornado, who has brought tremendous change to Florida State Prison. Her name is Lucy Batchelor. She works with some of the toughest, meanest men in the Florida penal system, the kind of men who make guards uneasy about walking alone into their cells. The kind of men whom the "goon squad" deal with. But Lucy has these men in an open program. She's doing transactional analysis, teaching them community college

courses, developing these men into teams that will help other inmates. She's going to be a star attraction at the Congress of Corrections in Denver this August. And it all started with a single good woman and her faith in people!

I admit that correctional planning looks pretty bleak, but there are many correctional planners in this room, and I address my remarks now to this group. If correctional planning is ever to get off the ground, if we are ever to overcome the changes in governors, legislative leadership, and the budget types who say, "Let's put four men in a cell because it's cheaper," we have to get the human factor involved.

What do I mean by the human factor? First of all, the plan needs to say that corrections needs certain types of people in order to help human beings. They have to be people like Lucy Batchelor. I admit it's a quality tough to define. It's not just intelligence. There are all sorts of people who are super bright and who have Ph.D.'s but some of them should not be working with people, because they don't like people. If you find the right people -- like John Conrad's parole officer who had the low recidivism rate; if you can attract more people like Lucy Batchelor, who is actually changing the tone of Florida's most dangerous prison, your correctional plan may actually work. And, if you want to keep that plan intact, the plan must call for citizen involvement and participation. If you think for one moment that so-called professionals -- in which category I group myself -- are going to change people who have been screwed up for years, you're wrong. Lay people must be informed and involved.

The tragedy revealed by a lot of these research studies is: they show that some correctional programs really aren't so bad; they reveal that offenders really begin to turn around after six months or a year in some of the programs. But, as John Conrad pointed out to the meeting in Tampa (and one reason John was so pessimistic) is they go home to nothing. They go right back to the same poor situation that got them in trouble in the first place. That doesn't mean the corrections program was a bust. What it does mean -- and Conrad makes this clear -- is that offenders go back to places where they are ostracized. Their communities don't want them. They go back to schools that kick them out. They go back to businessmen who won't employ them.

Apparently, in Europe, they do it better. The community does get involved in rehabilitation. The men in Swedish prisons belong to the unions. They actually get paid minimum wages, and they support their families and pay for their own upkeep. Do you know what happens in too many American prisons? They don't get a dime.

Correctional planning is in tough shape in many parts of our country, because of the dollar shortage. The money crunch is so tough, and people are so scared about crime, a lot of ideas like those the American Justice Institute came up with for Florida, are gathering dust. But, if we really make it clear in all of our master plans that the public has to be actively involved, it's

just possible that "people power," to use a corny phrase, will see that those plans are implemented. If we can get more people like Lucy Batchelor concerned, if we can make more people knowledgeable about corrections, maybe the general public will refuse to buy some of the simple solutions that some legislators keep coming up with -- such as sending all 15 and 16 year old delinquents to prison. If we can get the public really involved (and our plans must call for that) we might stop some of the dumb solutions to America's most difficult problem.

Workshop Summaries

SYMPOSIUM WORKSHOPS: A SUMMARY

Planning for Law Enforcement Systems

Moderator:

Bill Glover, Law Enforcement Administrator
National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice
Planning and Architecture

Speakers:

Bradley Koch, Technical Services Director
California Commission on Peace Officers'
Standards and Training (POST)
7100 Bowling Drive, Suite 250
Sacramento, California 95823

Vernon Hoy, Director
Arizona Department of Public Safety
P.O. Box 6638
Phoenix, Arizona 85005

Koch Presentation:

Mr. Koch's overview of the Peace Officers' Standards and Training (POST) program emphasized the productive relationship that can be established between state and local law enforcement agencies. All but two local California law enforcement agencies now participate in the POST program which works to upgrade standards and practices within law enforcement agencies. Different facets of the program include: the establishment of minimum standards and guidelines for the selection and training of law enforcement personnel; the provision of high quality training courses for peace officers; technical assistance in researching management problems; and direct consultative assistance to help agencies in planning for future needs.

Hoy Presentation:

The maxim repeatedly emphasized in Mr. Hoy's presentation was that without long-range planning, the practice of professional, high quality law enforcement cannot be achieved. Mr. Hoy talked about some principles necessary to good planning: (1) agency planning cannot be done in isolation from the rest of the criminal justice system; (2) planners must be aware of the activities and status of all other segments of the criminal justice system; (3) experienced practitioners, i.e., police officers, should be included in the planning process; and (4) one of the goals of planning should be to develop standards for the respective agencies.

*Trends in Planning
for State Court Programs and Facilities*

Moderator:

William Herndon
Region IV - LEAA
730 Peachtree Street, N.E., Room 984
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

Speakers:

Richard Lynch, Director
National District Attorneys Association
211 E. Chicago Ave., Suite 1515
Chicago, Illinois 60611

Stanley Van Ness
State Public Defender
520 East State St.
Trenton, New Jersey 08609

Barbara Flicker, Director
ABA Juvenile Justice Standards Project
80 50th Ave.
New York, New York 10011

Lynch Presentation:

Mr. Lynch spoke about the need for the criminal justice system to pay a great deal more attention to the problems of the victims of crime than has been done in the past. Effective programs for the victims should be initiated. If this is to be a possibility, greater funds will have to be allotted for this purpose. Planners must take a careful look at the relationship between the prosecutor's role and the criminal justice system and take this into account in their planning.

Ness Presentation:

Mr. Ness opened his talk with a series of provocative questions. For example, if we should tear down our overcrowded, inhumane prisons, what can we replace them with? Is it perhaps enough to renovate these prisons? Can architectural design improve prison conditions? He then talked about the impact new ideas and changes in the courts will have on planning. For example, what effect will it have on the system if trial must take place within ninety days? What resources would be necessary? How many courtrooms would be needed? How many judges? Decisions for change must take into account such ramifications.

Flicker Presentation:

What the court system will be like in the year 2000 will depend, in Ms. Flicker's view, upon whether or not the standards and goals as advanced by the ABA project are accepted by the court system. Ms. Flicker enumerated a number of these standards and their possible ramifications in the courts system. Among those standards that were discussed were the following: the establishment of a family division of the general trial court; the

removal of status offenders, victimless crimes, and family autonomy cases from the jurisdiction of the family court; the development of more stringent rules and criteria to be applied to judicial decisions on case dispositions; and an age limit of ten to eighteen years for cases coming under juvenile jurisdiction.

Overcrowding and Deficient Facilities

Moderator:

Fred Moyer, Director
National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice
Planning and Architecture

Speakers:

Bruce Cook
Region IV - LEAA
Corrections Specialists
730 Peachtree Street, N.E., Room 984
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

Larry Carpenter, Regional Director
U.S. Board of Parole
KCI Bank Bldg.
8800 112th St.
Kansas City, Missouri 64153

Cook Presentation:

Characterizing 1975 as the year of crisis in corrections, Mr. Cook went on to describe in illuminating detail, conditions existing in the eight southeastern states of Region 4. On the whole, prison populations in these states are 128% over design capacity. All of the states are under federal court orders for some types of reforms in their systems. A combination of factors such as higher commitment rates, longer sentences, and less use of probation and parole have produced the dramatic increase in prison populations experienced in the last year in all of these states. Court-ordered reforms have been inevitable and necessary though not necessarily the best way of solving the problems. Ultimately, the solution, in Mr. Cook's view, must come from the people who through the state legislatures ultimately control the conditions of confinement.

Carpenter Presentation:

Commenting on recent court orders, Mr. Carpenter pointed out that from his own observations of prisoners and jails all over the country, the courts have shown extreme restraint. For every jail under court order to shape up, he felt, there are probably dozens of others that ought to be under court order. In speaking to the conditions present in many jails and prisons, the court is only exercising its responsibility to protect the con-

stitutional rights of citizens, in this case citizens who are prisoners. At the same time, Mr. Carpenter placed much of the blame for current overcrowded conditions on the shoulders of the courts, saying that sentencing practices are worse and more disparate than ever before. The responsibility for improvement is up to states and local communities who must either embrace reasonable standards in sentencing or come up with the money required to build the facilities to house the growing number of prisoners.

Metropolitan Correctional Centers

Moderator:

Ken Bishop, Corrections Administrator
National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice
Planning and Architecture

Speakers:

William R. Nelson, Warden
Metropolitan Correctional Center
Chicago, Illinois

Robert F. Messmer, Chief
Office of Facilities Development
Bureau of Prisons, Justice Department
Washington, D.C.

The Federal Bureau of Prisons recently completed three Metropolitan Correctional Centers (MCC), one in New York City, Chicago, and San Diego. All three facilities serve the same purpose -- the safe and humane detention of men and women arrested and charged with committing a federal offense and awaiting or undergoing trial in the federal courts.

When planning for the first of the three MCC's (New York) began in 1971, the Bureau of Prisons became a leader in the field by incorporating advanced practices to create architectural and operational environments which are humane, decent, and safe.

Mr. Nelson described his experiences as Warden of the triangular 26-story MCC located in Chicago's "Loop." Warden Nelson stated that "one of the more intriguing observations of MCC operations is the prisoner response to the 'soft architecture' which characterizes an MCC." Vandalism, including graffiti, is virtually non-existent.

Architectural and programmatic aspects of the Chicago MCC operation were highlighted and discussed.

Implementing A Local Master Plan

Moderator:

Teri K. Martin, Planning Specialist
National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice
Planning and Architecture

Speakers:

Robert Breckenridge
Director of Correction and Detention
Harris County Sheriff's Department
Houston, Texas

James Oltzinger, Attorney
Ombudsman for Federal District Court
Houston, Texas

In 1972, the jail and rehabilitation center in Harris County, Texas had a combined average daily population of 1600 persons. The capacity of the two facilities was 933. In 1972, the American Civil Liberties Union filed suit against those responsible for the operation of the county's facilities. The suit languished in Federal District Court until 1974, when a new suit was filed seeking, among other things, relief from the overcrowded and dangerous conditions in the facilities. Also in 1974, the Harris County Sheriff requested the National Clearinghouse to provide technical assistance in developing strategies for reducing the correctional population and creating more humane conditions in the facilities. The involvement of the National Clearinghouse grew into a demonstration project under which the Harris County Corrections Plan was developed. The plan, developed with the full cooperation and support of the Harris County Sheriff, called for a number of significant reforms in court processing, police procedure, pretrial programming and facility use. The plan was presented to a wide range of citizen groups prior to its presentation to the county government. At about the same time, the Federal District Court began hearing testimony on the conditions in the county facilities and on the possible remedies for those conditions. In a series of opinions based on the testimony, the Court ordered the county to take the necessary step to assure a speed-up of court processing, reductions in the pretrial length of stay and the inmate population. The court appointed an ombudsman to oversee the county's activities and report to the Court on the progress toward compliance with the orders.

The workshop centered around events which have taken place since these court rulings and the difficulties experienced in implementation of the plan. Mr. Breckenridge spoke of the continuing dilemma faced by the detention system in Harris County. He and his staff must contend daily with the problems of the jail and rehabilitation center, must be involved in the implementation of the Plan, and must report activities to the Court. Orders from the Court which mandate action on the part of the Sheriff have also mandated the County government to provide the necessary funds to implement the orders, but the county has not responded in a timely fashion. Mr. Breckenridge pointed out that

his office substantially agrees with the Master Plan recommendations and with the court-ordered implementation, but emphasized that many of the deadlines set by the court cannot realistically be met.

Mr. Oitzinger, speaking as both the attorney for the Plaintiffs and as the court-appointed Ombudsman, stressed the difficulties that have arisen from the local response to the court's decision, as the county government is reluctant to provide the necessary means to implement the Plan. Mr. Oitzinger used the example of a bond issue, the wisdom of which was questioned by the court but which was nonetheless passed by the electorate. The court is now taking steps to ensure that the \$15,000,000 bond issue will not be used for construction until programmatic changes are made which would have an impact on architectural issues.

The Harris County Corrections Plan and its implementation presently provide a somewhat unique situation. The Federal District Court has made implementation a matter of constitutional import and has engendered, by some accounts, a defensive reaction from some local officials. The workshop speakers emphasized that the recommendations made in the Plan are being implemented as resources are made available and that work is continuing both in and out of court.

Problems of Crowding: Environment-Behavior Implications

Moderator:

Dennis Kimme, Architectural Specialist
National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice
Planning and Architecture

Speakers:

Dan Stokols
Program in Social Ecology
University of California at Irvine
Irvine, California 92664

David D'Atri
Department of Epidemiology and Public Health
Yale University, 60 College Street
New Haven, Connecticut 06510

Stokols Presentation:

Dr. Stokols examined two divergent approaches to the study of crowding. The first defined crowding as a condition of the environment, namely, high density or spatial restriction. The second conceptualized crowding as a motivational state involving the need for more space. The relative utility of these theoretical orientations for criminal justice planners concerned with the effects of crowding on behavior was examined in relation to both experimental and field research. The findings from recent investigations of crowding

conducted within correctional settings were summarized, and a theoretical model for predicting the intensity and persistence of crowding experiences was discussed.

D'Atri Presentation:

Dr. D'Atri examined the association between crowding and blood pressure. A cross-sectional study was conducted which aimed to characterize the acute, and, to some extent, long-term relationship between overcrowding, as defined by housing mode on the one hand, and blood pressure levels and pulse rate on the other. The study examined 412 male inmates and was carried out within three correctional institutions. Each of these institutions had several modes of housing inmates, including single occupancy cells and dormitories.

The major research hypothesis that there would be an association between degree of crowding and blood pressure, systolic and diastolic, and pulse rate was strongly supported. Blood pressure was found to be curvilinearly related to duration of confinement, with higher levels in the first two weeks of confinement and following the end of the first month. This curvilinear relationship between blood pressure and duration of confinement may indicate the presence of two mechanisms involved with blood pressure elevation: the first, a reaction to acute stress or fright; the second, a response due to overcrowding. In addition to these findings, preliminary data suggests that the personnel in these correctional facilities have a higher prevalence of coronary heart disease. A further investigation is being conducted to examine the precise nature of this problem. The implications for these findings for health and prison design, as well as for legislation in the correctional field appear quite challenging.

New Operations for New Facilities -- the Staffing Problem

Moderator:

Ken Bishop, Corrections Administrator
National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice
Planning and Architecture

Speakers:

James P. O'Neill, Director
National Sheriff's Institute
1250 Connecticut Avenue
Washington, D.C.

Sherman Day, Director
National Institute of Corrections
320 First Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

O'Neill Presentation:

Problems that arise in the move from an old facility to a new one were addressed by Mr. O'Neill in his talk. Pressures from the courts, the community, and, very

often, from local political interests result in the demand that a new facility be put to use nearly the moment it is completed. Steps that can be taken to overcome the difficulties often encountered in such a move were outlined. Included in these steps were: (1) the need for planning, from the inception of the project, for the move and transition into the new building; (2) principles for training veteran and new staff and familiarizing them with the concepts incorporated in the new facility and its programs; and (3) the necessity of hiring an experienced corrections person to serve as a consultant to the architect.

Day Presentation:

Prefacing his talk with a few comments, Dr. Day noted that the major hope presented by new facilities is that they offer the opportunity to break with old ways of doing things and to initiate change. The design of new facilities should be dictated by programs and not vice versa. Moving to the central theme of his talk, staff training, Dr. Day discussed such issues as who should be trained, when they should be trained, and what the context and process of training should be. And, finally, he said that though staff training is a valuable tool, it cannot replace good staff selection, redeem poor policy, cover poor administration, or replace poor planning.

Alternatives to Incarceration of Youth

Moderator:

Stephen F. Browne, Criminal Justice Statistician
Denver Anticrime Council
1313 Tremont Street
Denver, Colorado

Speakers:

Joan Keane, Juvenile Specialist
Colorado Division of Criminal Justice
1525 Sherman Street
Denver, Colorado

Stephen F. Browne (address above)

Thomas S. James, Director
Project New Pride
1808 Gaylord Street
Denver, Colorado

The planning, implementation and funding aspects of youth projects and programs in Colorado were presented.

The first section of the workshop discussed the development of Colorado's Juvenile Justice Plan, including the trials and tribulations of coordinating the efforts of criminal justice and local agencies, of collecting data, of outlining needs and problem areas, and of utilizing limited funds in accordance with the plan to achieve its objectives. Also, youth programs which offer

alternatives to criminal justice agencies for the treatment of delinquents were presented.

The second section of the workshop outlined the work efforts involved over a three-year period for the development of diversion, group home and probation projects entailing \$5.8 million. Included in this presentation was a discussion of the means by which the community was involved in defining youth project formats and of efforts to link community-based projects and local agencies. Observations resulting from intensive project evaluations conducted by the Denver Anti-Crime Council were provided, indicating the successful and unsuccessful aspects of treatment projects and program approaches.

The final presentation outlined the development of Project New Pride, a post-adjudicatory direct service diversion project.

Implementing a Statewide Corrections Master Plan -- Oklahoma

Moderator:

Mike Dane, Corrections Planning Coordinator
National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice
Planning and Architecture

Speakers:

Ned Benton, Director
Oklahoma Department of Corrections
3400 N. Eastern
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

David Riggs
State Legislator
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

The involvement of the National Clearinghouse in Oklahoma was described and emphasis was placed on the fact that the function of a master plan is to serve primarily as a starting point for implementing changes in a state's correctional system. The implementation of the Oklahoma Corrections Master Plan has provided a unique perspective since the coordinator of the planning effort is now employed as Director of the Department of Corrections and charged with translating the Plan into action.

It was felt that the major impetus for the Plan was the 1974 riot at the Oklahoma State Penitentiary at McAlester which focused public attention on corrections. A special legislative committee was formed to investigate conditions at McAlester and the prison system as a whole and to develop recommendations for change.

The Oklahoma Corrections Master Plan reinforced this committee's suggestions to develop smaller institutions nearer to the state's metropolitan areas; to expand probation, parole and other alternatives to imprison-

ment; and to provide the inmates opportunities for work with competitive wages.

Mr. Riggs presented the legislator's perspective on the Plan while Dr. Benton summarized the major recommendations of the plan and assessed the extent of its implementation.

Special Problems of the Female Offender

Moderator:

Jetta Watermann, Research Associate
National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice
Planning and Architecture

Speakers:

Laurel Rans
Entrophy, Inc.
215 Tennyson Ave.
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Euphesenia Foster
U.S. Bureau of Prisons
Department of Labor, Women's Division
Washington, D.C.

Rans Presentation:

Laurel Rans discussed some of the recent commentary on the nature and causes of female criminality. Four themes which frequently appear in the media coverage about women's crimes were discussed. These recurring themes or expectations were: the women's movement is a major cause of the rise in women's crime; women are committing more violent crimes; as more opportunities open up to women, they will commit more crime; and the crimes women are now committing are more like the crimes committed by men. A review of FBI Uniform Crime Report Statistics by Ms. Rans revealed many factors that must be considered when interpreting the escalation of women's crime. The FBI Statistics must be viewed in their proper perspective and account taken of factors not controlled for in the preparation of their tables.

The women's movement as a cause of rise in women's crime was refuted by Ms. Rans, along with the belief that women are committing more violent crime. The last two themes can be supported statistically, but Ms. Rans made the statement that statistics can be interpreted to mean whatever is needed. Forces at work on the general population affect all persons -- women are not exempt. As the number of violent crimes for men rise chances are they will rise for women and change along with the types of crimes committed.

Ms. Rans' discussion of the many factors that require consideration in thinking about women's crime and their arrest statistics was not to argue that there has been no increase in women's crime statistically and

otherwise. But a lot of people have been quick to make questionable interpretations and sensational presentations of information to the detriment of the woman offender.

Foster Presentation:

Euphesenia Foster commented on the growing awareness and concern for female offenders and the special problems that confront them in the criminal justice system. Beginning in 1970, feminist researchers in government and universities began to study women in prisons and a more accurate picture of the female offender and her position in crime and corrections is now emerging.

Ms. Foster noted that about two-thirds of women in the care of corrections departments are in the community. Many are on probation, parole or under bail bond. Others have been diverted from prison by being accepted into community-based programs during a pretrial period and still others are in halfway houses. The success ingredient in these programs is, of course, community cooperation based on a real concern and shared sense of community responsibility.

Regionalization of Law Enforcement Communications Systems

Moderator:

Skip Bennett, Law Enforcement Planning Specialist
National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice
Planning and Architecture

Speakers:

Donald Meade
Director of Communications
Adams County Communications Center
Commerce City, Colorado

Anthony L. Kenney, Chief
Muskegon Police Department
960 Jefferson Street
Muskegon, Michigan

Meade Presentation:

To avoid costly mistakes and omissions in setting up a centralized communications system, proper planning at the early stages is necessary. Mr. Meade outlined a four-phased planning process designed to aid those interested in centralized dispatching systems. Such a plan helps not only to insure the creation of a successful system but also gain widespread acceptance of the idea among a larger number of law enforcement agencies. Crucial to selling the centralized dispatch program is the involvement in the planning process of all agencies wishing to participate in the project.

Kenney Presentation:

The multiple benefits of a centralized dispatch system as typified by the one now in operation in Muskegon County (an LEAA exemplary project) were highlighted in Chief Kenney's presentation. Covered in the talk were such issues as funding possibilities, the organizational and administrative structure, the advantages of civilian versus police officer staffing, and the cost benefits of such a system. The advantages of the Muskegon project have resulted in its being well-received not only by all the law enforcement agencies involved but also by the governmental bodies and citizens in the area.

Intake Service Centers

Moderator:

Edith Flynn
Associate Professor of Criminal Justice
Northeastern University
Boston, Massachusetts

Speakers:

Leo G. Plante, Superintendent
St. Louis County Intake Service Center
7900 Carondelet Avenue
Clayton, Missouri

Robin Ford, Director
Kane County Diagnostic Center
P.O. Box 143
Geneva, Illinois

Plante Presentation:

The St. Louis County Intake Service Center -- the philosophy behind it, the services it offers, and its innovative features -- was the subject of a talk and slide show presentation by Mr. Plante. The center, staffed by non-uniformed civilians and featuring a modern, comfortable, and attractively designed interior, offers such programs as: police diversion, crisis prevention, intake assessment and classification, crisis intervention, pretrial release or conditional release, work restitution programming, supplemental supervision and assistance, work release, and educational and vocational training.

Ford Presentation:

The Kane County Intake Service Center, its characteristics and mode of development, were the subject of Mr. Ford's talk. Sensitive to the political realities of Kane County, planners for this intake center have adopted a philosophy of evolving programs as conditions allow rather than trying to introduce changes in one fell swoop. This approach, in Mr. Ford's view, has been successful in Kane County, giving the center an opportunity to prove its worth in one area and thus

be more likely to be accepted as it moves into areas where more opposition to change can be expected. With this view in mind, when the intake center began it developed first a plan for diagnosing needs and then implementing changes only in the juvenile justice system. A step-wise plan was developed with the result that juvenile services were significantly overhauled in the county. The center had the opportunity to slowly develop credibility with the local criminal justice system. Now, with one success to show, the center has been able to proceed with plans for an adult pretrial and post-release program.

Detention of Juveniles and Alternatives to Its Use

Moderator:

Dennis Kimme, Architectural Specialist
National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice
Planning and Architecture

Speakers:

Jim Epley, Director of Court Services
Umatilla County Courthouse
Pendleton, Oregon

John McGough, Managing Partner
Walker, McGough, Folse, Lyeria Architects and
Engineers
North 120 Wall Street
Spokane, Washington

George F. Klein, Jr., Vice President/Secretary
Parker Klein Associates Architects, Inc.
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Dennis Reseutek, Architect
Parker & Klein Associates
430 Oak Grove
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Bob Nelson, Program Manager
Community Corrections Department
Ramsey County Juvenile Service Center
St. Paul, Minnesota

The development and operation of two juvenile detention centers, the Northeast Oregon Regional Youth Center in Umatilla County, Oregon, and the Ramsey County Juvenile Service Center in Minnesota, was presented.

Umatilla County faced a real problem in dealing with the detention of delinquent youth and sought assistance from State and Federal levels and relied on the experiences of other agencies during the entire planning and development process. This juvenile facility in Pendleton was, from its very beginning, a joint venture and continues to be used jointly by neighboring counties.

By establishing a program idea and designing a facility around that program, Umatilla County was able to eliminate most of the problems that arise from poor facility design.

The Ramsey County project in Minnesota will start construction, if funding is approved, in the fall of 1976 and should be ready for occupancy in 15 months. The project was conceived as a "downtown" center that provides space for courts, juvenile resources, and detention.

Because Minnesota has no status offender laws, it was particularly important to allow probation, court, and social service personnel ready access to juveniles brought to detention.

By having a centralized building, juvenile offenders are afforded several opportunities to receive shelter care instead of detention.

Offender Survey Techniques

Moderator:

Mike Dane, Corrections Planning Coordinator
National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice
Planning and Architecture

Speakers:

Ken Bishop, Corrections Administrator
National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice
Planning and Architecture

Judy Silberstein, Research Associate
National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice
Planning and Architecture

The importance of data collection and proper analysis of that data was emphasized in this workshop. The planning process is a necessary prerequisite to proper facility design and the data relevant to planning permits logical and valid conclusions to be drawn. In effect, information regarding a jail or prison population is the basis for determining space needs, program and service needs and staffing patterns. The importance of adequate planning is indicated by the fact that the average cost of constructing a single cell is in the neighborhood of \$21,000. An error in planning by only 12 cells exceeds a quarter of a million dollars in cost.

Surveys developed by the National Clearinghouse to collect pertinent information needed in the planning process were presented and discussed. Survey sampling techniques for short and long-term planning also represented a major topic area.

Architectural Case Studies

Moderator:

John C. Monroe, Architect
1021 Pennsylvania
Kansas City, Missouri

Speakers:

Fred Powers, Architect
Hellmuth, Obata & Kassabaum
325 N. 9th Street
St. Louis, Missouri 6313

John McGough, Managing Partner
Walker, McGough, Folse, Lyeria Architects and
Engineers
North 120 Wall Street
Spokane, Washington 99201

Roger W. Crist, Warden
Montana Correctional Facility
Box F
Deer Lodge, Montana 59722

Helmut Jahn
C.F. Murphy Associates
224 S. Michigan Ave.
Chicago, Illinois 60604

Sidney J. Folse, Architect
Folse, Hennison, Durham, & Richardson
2440 Canal Street, Suite 2120
New Orleans, Louisiana

Jack Shetter, Senior Associate
Walker, McGough, Folse, & Lyeria Architects
and Engineers
North 120 Wall Street
Spokane, Washington 99201

Thomas C. Orlowski
Schutte - Mochan, Inc.
11121 W. Oklahoma Avenue
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53227

Architectural Case Studies was a double session highlighting many architectural aspects in the development of police, court and local and state correctional facilities.

The architects involved in the development of the various criminal justice facilities discussed their planning processes, the program components involved, and the design solutions which were developed.

Heavy emphasis was placed on the interrelationship of architectural design and desired program and service delivery.

*Funding Alternatives
for Law Enforcement and Public Safety Facilities*

Moderator:

Brian Nagle, Program Specialist
National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice
Planning and Architecture

Speakers:

Richard Anderson, Chief
Omaha Police Department
505 S. 15th Street
Omaha, Nebraska 68102

R. Douglas Taylor, Executive Director
Western Piedmont Council of Government
P.O. Box 807
Hickory, North Carolina 28601

Both speakers for this workshop covered a number of issues related to the topic of funding for law enforcement projects. Mr. Taylor concentrated on descriptions of a variety of funding sources ranging from revenue sharing, special tax levies, and general obligation bonds to federal monies available from LEAA, the Economic Development Administration, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development Community Development Act. The central theme of Mr. Anderson's talk, based on his own experience as an administrator overseeing the construction of a new police facility, was the importance of using a variety of funding methods rather than relying on only one source. In his talk, he outlined five areas for funding involved in the construction of police facilities; the land, the building, the furnishing, the police-oriented equipment, and communications. For each of these areas, he presented alternative funding methods that could be considered.

New Life for Old Courthouses

Moderator:

Dan MacGilvray, Court Projects Administrator

Speakers:

Douglas C. Ikeman.
Judicial Council of Georgia - A.O.C.
2220 Parklake Drive N.E., Suite 335
Atlanta, Georgia 30345

Edward D. Francis
William Kessler Associates
723 St. Antoine
Detroit, Michigan 48226

Ikeman Presentation:

Georgia's experience in planning for solutions to court facility problems on a statewide level was the topic of Mr. Ikeman's talk. The initial purpose of a study of Georgia court facilities, undertaken by his office, was to provide information which would help in the allocation of LEAA funds. As the study progressed, new insights into the fundamental issues facing the courts system emerged, and the planning unit found that it must provide more meaningful approaches to the solution of Georgia's problems than simply disbursing funds. Mr. Ikeman talked about the kind of information that was gathered and the knowledge that was gleaned from the Georgia experience which can be helpful to planners seeking to make long-term improvements in their court systems.

Francis Presentation:

In March 1975, William Kessler and Associates and Chambers and Chambers, Architects, were selected to conduct a feasibility study on the Livingston County Courthouse in Howell, Michigan. The purpose of the study was to ascertain what possibilities existed for preserving this building without sacrificing much-needed improvements and modernization. Mr. Francis presented the findings of this study as well as the recommendations made for restoration plans that would insure that the historic character of the main features be retained at the same time that the building would be brought into accordance with safety standards and its functional capabilities increased. It was found that the restoration and improvements could be accomplished at a cost below the average cost of new construction.

Halfway Houses: The Florida Experience

Moderator:

Richard L. Rachin, Chief
Bureau of Group Treatment
Division of Youth Services, Department of
Health and Rehabilitative Services
311 South Calhoun
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

Speakers:

Harry E. Burns, Jr. AIA
P.O. Box 2516
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

Richard L. Rachin (address above)

The major discussion concerned developments in Florida's juvenile corrections system which led to its present philosophy of deinstitutionalization and community-based corrections. The presentation included a series of slides nicely illustrating the translation of an emerging philosophy of correctional treatment in a group counsel-

ing approach and an architectural prototype for halfway houses or group homes.⁸ Various factors affecting and frequently frustrating reform were identified and examined in the context of the Florida experience. For instance, the discussion considered certain statutory, regulatory, political and economic issues that hinder the development of a system of community-based programs.

Throughout the presentation, the major advantages of halfway houses as compared to institutions were mentioned. Some of these advantages included fewer necessary fiscal resources, a greater ability to accommodate the program concepts of reality therapy, and more flexibility to locate programs near offender's home communities.

Criminal Justice Evaluation Techniques

Moderator:

Syl Zucker-Lotka, Planning Specialist
National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice
Planning and Architecture

Speakers:

Barry Bollensen, Coordinator
Probation and Court Services
Illinois Supreme Court
Committee on Criminal Justice Programs
30 North Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60602

Peter Venezia
NCCD Research Center
609 So. Second Street., Suite D
Davis, California 95616

Bollensen Presentation:

Mr. Bollensen stated that the next several years are destined to be recorded in criminal justice history as the age of evaluation. The multiplicity of competing programs, and the limit of available funds, the lack of a unified philosophy and program by criminal justice administrators and educators, and the attitude of the taxpayer/voter toward criminal offenders has set the stage for the era of evaluation. The use of program evaluation in Illinois over the past few years was described and suggestions for future program evaluation were made.

To meet the challenge of increased demand for services, the existing financial crisis and public resistance to increased taxes, the criminal justice field must use all evaluative tools available to determine which of the thousands of programs already funded by LEAA have proven sufficiently effective to warrant their continuation under selective local funding on their expansion into new communities.

Venezia Presentation:

The premise of the presentation made by Mr. Venezia is that evaluation has become a fad. It is being attempted after the programs are initiated. Program administrators, in a panic, who are facing refunding proposals and legislative committees want short-term studies which can demonstrate positive effects of their programs.

Evaluation is now being conducted as a planned failure and because of this phenomenon, we don't know what works. We haven't yet really tried to find out what works. Truly, evaluation has not yet been used by program evaluators as it should be -- as a tool for sifting successful from unsuccessful programs.

Alternatives to New Construction

Moderator:

Steve Polson, Architectural Specialist
National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice
Planning and Architecture

Speakers:

Alan Green, Architect
Educational Facilities Laboratory
850 Third Avenue
New York, New York 10022

Edward D. Francis, Chief Designer
William Kessler Associates, Inc.
733 N. Antoine Street
Detroit, Michigan 48226

Steve Polson (address above)

The workshops explored various alternatives to new construction and suggested criteria for determining whether an existing facility can be updated to meet current needs.

Green Presentation:

Mr. Green discussed the utilization of the concept of found space. The motivations behind the development of found space were discussed: historic preservation; neighborhood preservation and renewal; the opportunity to introduce an experimental program into a community without major disruption; housing experimentation; and the major motivation of putting programs where and when they are needed.

Francis Presentation:

Mr. Francis discussed, with the use of slides, recent trends in adaptive reuse, with primary focus on conservation of historic resources. Recent examples in Europe, England and the United States were presented in sketch form stating original use, present reuse and

cost implications. The basic conservation concept behind the Livingston County Courthouse was discussed in greater detail, along with the Kessler Associates, Inc., offices in Detroit, and illustration of a total renovation project for the University of Michigan, the Furstenberg Student Study Center, which was constructed in an unused sub-basement of a medical science building.

Polson Presentation:

Mr. Polson discussed the following criminal justice facility renovation/restoration projects which have utilized the found space/adaptive reuse concepts presented by the previous speakers: McDonough County Courthouse, Macomb, Illinois; Potter County Jail, Amarillo, Texas; Jackson County Jail, Kansas City, Missouri; Intake Service Center, St. Louis, Missouri; and a police facility in Toledo, Ohio.

Application of Technology to The Courts

Moderator:

Nancy Hall, Courts Specialist
National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice
Planning and Architecture

Speakers:

Ernest H. Short
Short and Associates
901 H Street, Suite 110
Sacramento, California 95814

Charles Jeske
National Center for State Courts
Lincoln Center Buildings, Suite 200
1616 Lincoln Street
Denver, Colorado 80203

The application of technology in the courts and its implications for the planning and design of court programs and facilities has recently received increasing attention from judges, attorneys, court administrators, court planners and architects. The availability and means of implementation on new court-related technology, as well as the results of several projects using advanced practices, was presented. Topics discussed include the use of computerized information and calendaring systems, videotape recordings, computer-aided transcription of court proceedings, and advanced audio-recording systems.

Mr. Short discussed the need for transfer of new technology to the courtroom. Technology is too often thrown in as an afterthought with little or no planning as it applies to existing systems and procedures. A key to the use of technology is to determine early in the planning process what equipment is needed and

plan accordingly. However, more often than not, technology is put to use without modifying existing operations -- a procedure which creates problems and obstacles rather than eliminating them.

New technological advances with regard to court reporting and videotaping were discussed. The adequate filming of court proceedings was viewed with reference to the Washington, D.C. model courtroom. Mr. Short's presentation concluded with a slide presentation of the courtroom of the future at the McGeorge School of Law, Sacramento, California.

Mr. Jeske's presentation dealt with the scope of technology in the courts. Because the courts are emerging from the "Dark Ages," the need for assistance in applying technology is evident. Lacking in-house expertise, the courts have traditionally relied on support from the equipment vendor who, very often, is not aware of the complexities of court organization and operation. Increasingly, the courts are turning to criminal justice agencies, state planning agencies, and organizations like the National Center for State Courts, for consultation.

The National Center for State Courts (NCSC) was created to assist the courts throughout the nation in areas of management, applied legal research, education and technology. NCSC also functions as a repository of information relative to new developments in the field of judicial information. Research is currently being conducted in the technological areas of audio-visual techniques, computer-aided transcription, business equipment, data processing and microfilming. A great deal more research must be made in court organization, systems methodology, technology transfer, and technology evaluation.

Impact of Community Resources in a Correctional Facility

Moderator:

Jim Taylor, Publications Administrator
National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice
Planning and Architecture

Speakers:

James Bergfalk, Director
Jackson County Department of Corrections
415 E. 12th Street
Kansas City, Missouri 64106

John Milosovich
Director of Jail Services
Jackson County Department of Corrections
415 E. 12th Street
Kansas City, Missouri 64106

Mr. Bergfalk and Mr. Milosovich related the way one county changed (in only a few years and with budgetary

increases of less than 5% since 1973) a jail system experiencing riots and large numbers of escapes, with little or no programs, and isolated from a suspicious and hostile community, into the programmatically diversified and accessible system that it is today. The key has been the extensive use of a variety of community resources to provide much-needed expertise and programs. Programs now in operation include: a modern health service unit providing diverse services, a community corrections center, small group interest and educational classes, and religious, recreational, and entertainment programs. In their presentation, the two men provided many insights into such issues as the obstacles that may be expected from the community, the kinds of services of real value to the jail system, and the effective use of volunteers in the correctional setting.

The Ideal Courtroom: Myth or Reality?

Moderator:

Dallas Reynolds, Architectural Specialist
National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice
Planning and Architecture

Speaker:

William S. Fort, Judge
Court of Appeals
Supreme Court Building
Salem, Oregon 97310

Judge William Fort, who serves as Chairman of the American Bar Association Committee on Courtroom Design and Court Facilities, gave a brief history of courtroom design and the changes that have affected the design of court facilities in the recent past. Judge Fort discussed an experimental courtroom in Eugene, Oregon, where an old courtroom was renovated, making all furnishings movable. For six months three judges tried cases in 14 separate configurations of furniture arrangement. Participant response to each configuration was elicited through a questionnaire and a circular configuration was selected.

A slide presentation of "courtrooms of the future" included the McGeorge School of Law in Sacramento, California, a design including the exhibit display in the center of the courtroom, its control room, the jury box (including monitors), the jury room and other courtroom furnishings. The District of Columbia Superior Court Model Courtroom, funded by LEAA as a prototype for 31 small courtrooms to be included in the District of Columbia Court facility presently under construction, was also discussed.

Responding to Accelerating Prison Populations

Moderator:

Joseph Maxey, Associate Director
National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice
Planning and Architecture

Speakers:

Jay Friedman
Corrections Master Plan Coordinator
Department of Institutions
142 West State Street
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

Allan Ault
Georgia Department of Corrections
1422 W. Peachtree Street
Atlanta, Georgia 30309

Friedman Presentation:

Adopting a long-term perspective, Mr. Friedman emphasized the point that corrections agencies can neither bear the whole responsibility for, nor pretend to have the capability of solving, on their own, the complex set of problems that have resulted in the current crisis of overcrowded prisons. Political, economic, social, and organizational pressures affecting the current situation were discussed. As Mr. Friedman sees it, the crisis of overcrowding can be turned to an advantage if it acts to force the long-overdue systematic changes necessary to the creation of a just criminal justice system.

Ault Presentation:

In vivid terms Dr. Ault described both the conditions and some of the actions being taken to overcome the conditions existing in the Georgia corrections system. Of special interest was Dr. Ault's description of the highly aggressive and innovative approaches being taken in Georgia with grassroots support from programs and funding proposals scheduled to come up for legislative approval. Slide presentations, television spots, and movies have all been part of extensive efforts to educate and sell ideas to the public. One film used on Georgia to win support for appropriations for Georgia prisons was shown.

The Charette Process

Moderator:

Jim Smith, Assistant Courts Project Administrator
National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice
Planning and Architecture

Speakers:

Oliver Walker, Charette Coordinator
Department of Welfare
4911 Gilbert Street
New Orleans, Louisiana 70112

Fred Parker
Curtis & Davis, Architects
111 Rue Iberville
New Orleans, Louisiana 70130

George Thompson
Department of Welfare
City Hall, Room 1W16
New Orleans, Louisiana 70112

Morris F.X. Jeff, Jr.
Director of Welfare
4911 Gilbert Street
New Orleans, Louisiana 70112

Judge Sara Armstrong
Juvenile Court Judge
New Orleans, Louisiana

The Charette Process has recently emerged as a viable technique involving local citizens in criminal justice planning. It has been used effectively by planners and architects in many communities to plan for school and public safety programs and facilities. The city of New Orleans is currently conducting a city-wide Charette which will seek community participation in examining the system of youth services. This Charette process and its implications for other areas of the country is a topic of considerable interest to persons and organizations involved in the community development of youth services, law enforcement, and corrections.

"Charette" has long been the term used by architects for brainstorming sessions in which citizens participate, and recently has been adopted as a process of community involvement in planning by social service agencies across the country. The New Orleans Milne Charette marks the first time the Charette process has been used for a child care program.

The objective of a Charette is to involve a diverse group of experts and citizens in an open, intensive, short-term (two days to two weeks) forum for the purpose of evaluating the current situation and planning for the new. The workshop discussed proposed schedules for a Charette, the techniques used in the brainstorming sessions, the benefits of such a program, the stages of implementing a Charette, and committee structure.

Funding Strategies for Criminal Justice Facilities

Moderator:

Jim Haas, Program Specialist
National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice
Planning and Architecture

Speakers:

Tony McCann
Senior Criminal Justice Specialist
National Association of Counties
1735 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Ron Bykowski
Regional Criminal Justice Planning Board
700 Cass, Suite A
Monterey, California 93940

McCann Presentation:

A general discussion of the two major sources of funding for criminal justice projects, local and federal agencies, emphasized the point that because of severe cutbacks in federal funding in recent years, local sources are the first that should be investigated and tapped. Two recent legislative bills which have received a great deal of attention in recent years were described. In addition, various aspects, specifically Title II, Title VI, and Title XX, of the 1974 Comprehensive Manpower Act were also discussed.

Bykowski Presentation:

First classifying funding sources into two general categories -- funding available from city or county sources and funds available from federal sources -- Mr. Bykowski described several types of funding alternatives within these categories. Descriptions of each source included (1) a discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of each source, (2) when relevant, time schedules that should be considered, and (3) persons or agencies to contact for further information. In summary, Mr. Bykowski suggested that the sources of funding with the highest degree of success are revenue sharing from local government sources, Part E and Part C funds from LEAA, and civil defense funds from non-LEAA, federal sources.

Part E Responsibilities and Issues

Moderator:

Ken Carpenter
Corrections Division - LEAA
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Speakers:

Larry Carpenter, Regional Director
U.S. Board of Parole
KCI Bank Building
8800 112th Street
Kansas City, Missouri 64153

Noel Bufe, Administrator
Office of Criminal Justice Planning
Lewis Cass Building, Second Floor
Lansing, Michigan 48913

Steve Hesselschwerdt, Administrator of Part E
Review
National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice
Planning and Architecture

A brief introduction was made by Ken Carpenter concerning the history of LEAA, the adoption of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, and the emergence of the Part E Amendment. The role of the National Clearinghouse was explained as a result of a contract to the University of Illinois to develop Corrections Guidelines and the need for interpretation and application of those guidelines to correctional facility projects.

Larry Carpenter discussed the statutory provisions of the Part E Amendment. These provisions emphasize the use of community-based programs over incarceration, the construction of smaller facilities than monstrosities that have been built in the past, and the upgrading of architecture, personnel standards, and correctional programs. One of the Part E provisions requiring the evaluation of correctional programs through recidivism measures is of particular importance. However, it cannot be implemented until there is developed a commonly accepted definition of "recidivism" and a common methodology.

Noel Bufe's comments were from the viewpoint of a state planning agency administrator. He stressed that philosophically he was opposed to earmarking funds for any specific problem. The effect of earmarking funds is to limit the range of alternatives within which the State Planning Agency staff has to operate, greatly diminishing the flexibility which he feels is necessary for the efficient operation of the State Planning Agency.

Steve Hesselschwerdt explained the types of services available at the National Clearinghouse and stressed the specific activities of the Office of Review. He explained how projects applying for Part E block funding and discretionary funding must be processed at the National Clearinghouse and how a certification of compliance or non-compliance is prepared for the respective State Planning Agencies and Regional LEAA offices. It was stressed that Part E is a voluntary financial assistance program implemented to encourage states and local units of government to upgrade correctional facilities. He also stressed that the National Clearinghouse does not in any way control or handle project funding. Mr. Hesselschwerdt then gave a detailed description of the review process.

The Modern Police Facility

Moderator:

Robyn Gardner, Architectural Specialist
National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice
Planning and Architecture

Speakers:

James P. Sutherland, Mayor
City of Appleton
Appleton, Wisconsin

William McClaran, Chief of Police
Portland Police Department
Portland, Maine

This workshop discussed the important role that planning and community support contribute to the development of a modern facility which not only serves the needs of the agency, but improves the law enforcement image, upgrades performance, and promotes mutual respect between the peace officers and the community being served.

Mayor Sutherland discussed the unique features of Appleton's new police building. The most prominent one is a flexible furnishing situation that allows many options for rearranging work stations. There are no conventional steel holding cells. A separate area is devoted entirely to juvenile operations. There is a staff library and a multi-purpose room for public use.

Chief McClaran placed an emphasis on crime prevention activities for the police. The bringing together of police and public is important to crime prevention programs. He believes the Portland Police have been successful largely because the design of their facility encourages interaction between the community and the police department. The Portland Police Building includes a gymnasium that operates 10 hours a day, a 110-seat auditorium, a cafeteria, and meeting rooms, all for public use. Over 50 community groups use the building for activities including athletics, music workshops, fencing classes, arts and crafts programs, and senior citizen activities.



END