



GYPSUM CANYON JAIL
ANALYSIS OF CRIME CONCERNS

May 31, 1988

127838

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

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

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by
Bruce Ramm (Security Design Concepts)

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

Submitted by

Security Design Concepts

1022 N. Tustin
Orange, California

92667-5103

714-997-1084

There is a concern by residents living near the proposed Gypsum Canyon Jail site of increased crime as a direct result of this facility. The assignment for Security Design Concepts was to study the issue of crime and county jails. This report will discuss the methodology used to conduct the requested research and the subsequent findings.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A computer check of prior research directly addressing the correlation of crime and county jails was conducted through the National Institute of Justice with negative results. Also, the California Board of Corrections, Jail Planning Section, was questioned if they were aware of any research, which they were not. However, there has been research on the issue of state prisons and the effect they have on the crime rate. Most notably is the study prepared by the California State Senate Office of Research (August, 1985) entitled "Cities With Prisons: Do They Have Higher Or Lower Crime Rates?" Findings from this study will be discussed in the summary section. As no studies could be located dealing directly with county jails, this assignment will involve all original research.

Reviewing crime statistics and conducting personal interviews were the two methods used to obtain information regarding the relationship of crime and location of county jails. Most of the emphasis was placed on interviews as opposed to review of crime data because more can be learned from talking to people living and working in such an environment. Interviews of law enforcement personnel were also conducted reference crime in the survey area as it relates to the jail.

Crime statistics, when available, were used to obtain an overall picture of the area surveyed. Retrieving crime data is sometimes difficult as law enforcement's method of maintaining data is often not as finite as needed for researching. Data may be computerized from reports; however, the information usually relates to type of crime, method of operation, and location. Information indicating the background of the perpetrator of a crime (i.e., recently visited an inmate) would not be in a statistical format and probably not even noted on a report. Some crime data for areas surveyed was not used for it either covered too large of a geographical area or the data was not able to be retrieved in a meaningful format.

Four branch jail sites were selected in the Southern California area which contained single family residential areas nearby the facility. Downtown main jails, which are release facilities, and branch jails considered to be housing predominately low security prisoners were not considered. In an effort to locate research sites that had medium and maximum category prisoners, along with single family homes in close proximity, the following counties were contacted: San Diego, Riverside, San Bernardino, Los Angeles, and Ventura. Based upon

information obtained from these contacts, two sites were selected in San Diego County and one site each in Riverside and Los Angeles Counties.

Residents and/or businesses within one to six blocks of the jail were surveyed, door-to-door, about the facility utilizing a questionnaire (refer to Exhibit A). The questionnaire was designed to obtain actual situations directly attributable to the jail and fear of crime because of living/working close to it. Unsolicited comments were noted if the person being surveyed offered information not asked for on the questionnaire. There were also interviews with some businesses, realtors, and apartment managers which did not necessarily follow the questionnaire, but were more general in nature.

Law enforcement officers were interviewed regarding crime which could be directly attributable to the jail. They were also asked about the habits of visitors, released inmates and escapees. As crime data lacks information regarding any relationship between an incident and a jail, the law enforcement personnel described particular instances of activity relating to the jail. Escape statistics were reviewed; however, even this data is difficult to utilize for inmates are considered to have escaped if released on a paperwork error which is known to the inmate. There are also walkaway situations involving trustees working at various government facilities or road projects. An inmate is also considered to be an escapee if they do not return to the jail from a work furlough program in the community. The "traditional" escape, climbing over a fence or going out a window to freedom, are the types of escapes addressed in this study. Interviews with law enforcement helped to sort out the "traditional" escapes from paperwork errors and walkaways.

The following sections will address specific site evaluations and then conclude with an overall summary of the findings.

SITE EVALUATIONS

1. City of Chula Vista, San Diego County
(Southwest corner of Third and "H" Streets)

The jail facility is in combination with a court house and related county services housed in a five-story building constructed in 1983. Looking at the building from the street it appears to be only three stories; however, the "basement" contains two floors of jail with windows located on two sides. This is a release facility which houses only males and is rated for 192 inmates consisting of minimum, medium and maximum levels of security. Visiting hours are from 9:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. on Saturday and Sunday.

The surrounding neighborhood is primarily residential, most of which is single family homes built in the 1950's. Apartments

have been constructed adjacent to the west side and new office buildings across the main streets (Third and "H") to the north and east. The jail is located south of the main part of downtown Chula Vista and is a fairly well kept area. (Refer to Exhibit B - photos of area.)

Personnel from the Chula Vista Police Department were interviewed regarding crime and problems associated with the jail. The six block area surrounding the jail was considered to have an average or even lower crime rate compared to overall crime in the city. Crime data for the immediate area was provided but a comparison with overall city crime was not feasible due to lack of complete information. The general consensus among police personnel interviewed, whose experience ranged from 2 to 21 years, indicated the jail was not a problem location. Visitors to the jail confine themselves to the area immediately outside of the facility and were not observed to be loitering around nearby residences or businesses.

It was interesting to note that while interviewing some of the personnel, they were not aware it was a release facility. No specific crimes could be cited as being attributed to released inmates, although it was possible one may have been responsible for stealing a car after being released.

Only one "traditional" escape occurred at this facility after it was in use for a short time. Five prisoners attempted to leave the jail at the same time via the narrow windows; however, only two were successful. Subsequently, conditions were changed within the jail operation that corrected this escape opportunity.

A door-to-door survey, in a one to three block area (refer to Exhibit C), was conducted with 71 residences completing the community questionnaire (refer to Exhibit D). Of the residents surveyed, 66% were living there before the jail was built. A majority of residents, 92%, were not afraid of the jail while 6% were and 3% never thought about it (unknown). When asked about being victimized at their home, 34% had been the victim of a crime of which 31% involved property crimes and 3% (or 2) involved an assault. None of the crimes were attributed to escapees while one was thought to have been committed by a visitor and three by released inmates. When questioned about jails attracting the criminal element, 85% indicated it did not while 8% said it did and 7% were unknown.

Regarding fear of escape, 87% did not fear escapees while 6% did and 7% were unknown. Several of the residents were aware of the one escape when the jail was first built. When questioned if they took extra security precautions because of the jail, 97% said they had not and 3% (or 2) indicated they did increase their security although neither of the two who increased security had been victims of a crime nor ever heard of a crime being committed by persons associated with the jail.

Those persons surveyed who moved into the neighborhood after the jail was constructed, 83% (or 20) indicated the jail did not influence their decision (positively or negatively) to live there, while one person said it had a negative influence on their decision. Residents living there prior to the jail being built expressed less fear of the jail (afraid: yes - 2%; no - 96%; and, escaping: yes - 2%; no - 98%) than those who moved in after it was built (afraid: yes - 13%; no - 83%; and, escaping: yes - 0%; no - 92%). The same number of people (one) for both before and after situations have taken extra security precautions. Even though the "afters" seem to have more fear, they do not feel the jail attracts the criminal element as much as do the "befores" (after: yes - 4%; no - 96%; and, before: yes - 11%; no - 79%; unknown - 11%). This answer may be related to the survey question on feeling more secure because of more police cars in the area. The "afters" feel the presence of police vehicles adds to their security (71%), while the "befores" do not feel as strongly (51%).

The residents had a very strong Neighborhood Watch Program and generally thought the jail was a good neighbor. One individual, who had been active against the jail construction, indicated there have been no problems with it and would support such a facility today. Most people interviewed indicated they never think about the jail.

2. City of Indio, Riverside County
(Southwest corner of Highway 111 and Oasis Street)

The jail, a single-story structure, is attached to the Riverside Sheriff's Indio Sub-Station which is part of a small court complex. It is a release facility, approximately thirty years old, which houses only males and is rated for 150 inmates consisting of maximum level security. Visiting hours are: Monday - Friday, 6:00 a.m. to midnight; Saturday - Sunday, 8:00 a.m. to midnight.

The jail site is adjacent to the Indio Fairgrounds on the south and west, and several blocks south of the downtown area. To the north is an older neighborhood, homes built in the 40's and 50's, and to the southeast are newer homes approximately 10 - 12 years old. The residential neighborhoods are fairly well kept, especially the newer one. The downtown area is characterized by many vacant buildings; however, according to those interviewed, the area around the jail has changed little in the last 10 to 15 years. (Refer to Exhibit E - photos of area.)

Personnel from the Indio Police Department were interviewed regarding crime and problems associated with the jail. Review of crime statistics and comments by those interviewed indicate the jail is not in a high crime area, although the area to the north does have crime problems. This is due to several problem apartment complexes and bars which are not associated with the jail. Serious crime (Part I offenses - murder, rape, robbery,

assault, burglary, theft, auto theft, arson) was analyzed for 1987 by reporting districts. Out of 9 sub-districts, for this area of town, the jail district ranked No. 5 or 8% of the total serious crimes for this section of Indio. (Refer to Exhibit F - maps and chart of crimes.)

Police personnel interviewed, which ranged from 7 to 19 years experience, indicated the jail was not a problem location. Visitors to the jail confined themselves to the waiting lobby and area just outside the lobby. They have not been observed loitering in nearby businesses or residential areas, including a school one block to the east.

There were released inmates that were responsible for some criminal activity. One specific situation involved an inmate released at night who committed several commercial burglaries. Some released persons detained for a short time (i.e., inebriates) sometimes go to the downtown bars and bus station, creating problems. This is not a frequent occurrence and not considered to be a significant problem.

There have been "traditional" escapes from this facility which can be directly related to a poorly secured exercise yard. This area has been better secured since several escapes occurred over five years ago. The exercise yard was not part of the original building plan but added on later in a delivery area. Other escapes have occurred while prisoners, usually minimum security types, are being bussed from the facility. There is no fenced loading area to prevent this type of walkaway. One of the "traditional" escapees stole a car about 5 - 10 years ago.

A survey of residences and businesses in a one to five block area (refer to Exhibit G) was conducted on a door-to-door basis. There were a total of 38 surveys completed of which 30 were for residences (refer to Exhibit H). Of the residents surveyed, 7% were living there prior to the jail and 93% moved in after it was constructed. A majority of the residents, 77%, are not afraid of the jail while 17% are afraid and 7% never thought about it (unknown). When asked about being victimized at their home, 67% had not and 33% (or 10) had been the victim of only a property crime, no assaults. One of the crimes was thought to be the responsibility of a released inmate and none attributed to escapees or visitors. A significant number of residents, 90% felt the jail does not attract the criminal element.

Regarding fear of escape, 77% did not fear it while 20% expressed fear and 3% were unknown. When questioned if they took extra security measures because of the jail, 80% said they had not and 20% indicated they had, usually extra locks. Of the 20% (or 6) that took extra precautions, only one had experienced a crime, but none had heard of a crime being committed by persons associated with the jail.

Those persons surveyed who moved into the neighborhood after the jail was constructed, 90% (or 78) indicated the jail did not influence their decision (positively or negatively) to live there, while two people said it had a positive influence on their decision. Residents living there prior to the jail being built expressed less fear of the jail (afraid: yes - 0%; no - 50%; and escaping: yes - 0%; no - 100%) than those who moved in after it was built (afraid: yes - 18%; no - 79%; and, escaping: yes - 21%; no - 75%). All of the "befores" (two of them) have taken extra security precautions as compared to 18% (or five) of the "afters". Even though the "afters" seem to have more fear, they do not necessarily feel the jail attracts the criminal element (after: yes - 11%; no - 89%; and, before: yes - 0%; no - 100%). The "afters" feel the presence of police vehicles adds to their security as do the "befores" who responded with 100% (or all two).

Businesses interviewed in the nearby area unanimously indicated they did not have any fear of the jail or fear someone might escape. All of them indicated they were not taking any extra security precautions because of the jail. They generally felt (88%) that the jail did not attract the criminal element.

A school was contacted, which is one block to the east, and asked about problems with the jail. There have been no problems of any kind with visitors or released persons.

3. City of Vista, San Diego County
(West side of Melrose Drive, south of Route 78 Freeway)

The jail is part of the San Diego Sheriff's Vista Sub-Station which is in a major court and probation department complex. It is a release facility, built in 1978, which houses only males and is rated for 246 inmates consisting of only maximum level security. Due to crowded jail conditions, only persons committing felony crimes are housed here, while other less serious offenders are released (bailed out and released on "own recognizance"). The jail is currently being expanded to add another 296 cells. This construction is very evident and can be seen from the north. Visiting hours are 8:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. and 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. on Saturday and Sunday.

The jail site is bordered by a freeway (Route 78) on the north and new office buildings on the east. There are new single-family homes and condominiums under construction and/or occupied adjacent to and south of the facility. A large apartment complex is located immediately to the west. To the southeast, up on a hill, are more established homes ranging in age from 10 to 30 years. The general area is characterized by newer buildings and construction projects (refer to Exhibit I - photos of area).

Personnel from San Diego Sheriff's Department were interviewed regarding crime and problems associated with the

jail. A review of crime statistics and comments by those interviewed indicate the jail is not in a high crime area. Serious crime (Part 1 offenses) was analyzed for 1987 by reporting districts. Out of 17 districts, the jail district ranked No. 11 or 3% of the total serious crimes for Vista (refer to Exhibit J - maps and chart of crimes).

Sheriff's personnel interviewed, whose experience ranged from one to eight years, indicated the jail was not a problem location. The only negative comment about problems was with visitors who litter the parking lot and trample the building's landscaping, although the activity is confined to the jail grounds proper. There were no known problems with visitors in the adjacent neighborhoods.

Approximately one year ago, there was a significant problem with recently released inmates which lasted for about one month. Drunks and transients from downtown San Diego were being booked into and released from this facility. When released, in great numbers, the inmates were creating nuisance problems in the surrounding neighborhood. This problem was rectified by stopping the bussing of inmates from the downtown area. Residents interviewed mentioned this particular problem, as it did upset the community.

Two specific incidents of crime were directly related to released inmates. One involved an individual stealing a car from the nearby gas station. The others involved several individuals who broke into a nearby Bob's Big Boy Restaurant and fixed themselves some coffee. No other incidents could be recalled and it was felt there was not a problem with released inmates.

There have been two "traditional" escapes from the jail, both from the exercise yard. One inmate burglarized a home to obtain clothing. These incidents occurred in 1980 and 1984; however, since then the fencing has been reinforced and procedures changed.

Residents and some businesses, in a one to five block area around the jail, were interviewed using the community questionnaire (refer to Exhibit K). A total of 31 questionnaires (28 residential and three business) were completed (refer to Exhibit L). According to the residents, 7% of whom were living there prior to the jail, 75% indicated they were not afraid of it while 21% expressed fear and 4% never thought about it (unknown). Of these residential respondents, 7% (or 2) had been the victim of a property crime while living there. No residents indicated they knew of any crimes committed by persons who were either released, escaped or visiting an inmate. When questioned about jails attracting the criminal element, 82% indicated it did not while 14% said it did and 4% answered unknown.

Regarding fear of an inmate escaping, 68% indicated they did not fear someone may escape, while 29% expressed fear and 4% were unknown. When questioned if residents took extra security precautions because of living close to the jail, 86% said they did not while 14% (or 4) indicated they had taken some (either an extra deadbolt on the door or a security system). None of those taking extra precautions had experienced a crime.

Those persons surveyed who moved into the neighborhood after the jail was constructed, 73% (or 19) indicated the jail did not influence their decision (positively or negatively) to live there, while one person said it had a positive influence and six had a negative influence on their decision. Residents living there prior to the jail being built expressed less fear of the jail (afraid: yes - 0%; no - 100%; and escaping: yes - 0%; no - 100%) than those who moved in after it was built (afraid: yes - 23%; no - 73%; and, escaping: yes - 31%; no - 65%). None of the "befores" (or two) have taken extra security precautions because of the jail while four of the "afters" have taken extra security precautions. Even though the "afters" seem to have more fear, they do not necessarily feel the jail attracts the criminal element (after: yes - 15%; no - 81%; and, before: yes - 0%; no - 100%). The "afters" feel the presence of police vehicles does not add as much to their security (73%), as the "befores" feel more strongly (100%).

The three businesses interviewed near the jail followed an interesting pattern. Two of them, both of which had been victimized by recently released persons, indicated they were not afraid of the jail and did not express fear of escapees. None of them had taken extra security precautions because of the jail and they did not feel the jail attracts the criminal element.

Persons selling single-family homes and condos were contacted to see if prospective buyers were concerned about the jail. The condos, which are directly south of the jail, attract mostly local people who are aware of the jail. Approximately 20% of the potential buyers bring up the issue of the jail; however, no one has declined to purchase because of the jail. Those looking at the new single-family homes, southwest of the jail, are potential buyers out of the immediate area. Approximately 1-2% of them inquire about the jail and one sale has been lost because of it. (Refer to Exhibit M for sales brochures on these homes.)

Contact was made with personnel at a service station on Melrose at the Freeway (Route 58). This seems to be a gathering place for recently released inmates who are seeking transportation away from the jail. These persons have bothered some customers by asking for money to either make a phone call or to pay for bus fare.

Bob's Big Boy Restaurant on Melrose, north of the freeway, indicated they rarely have problems with released inmates. If they have a problem, it is with an occasional released drunk who becomes obnoxious.

4. Wayside Honor Rancho in Los Angeles County
(South of Castaic and north of Valencia off I-5
Freeway)

This jail, which is a non-release facility, is located adjacent to the I-5 Freeway, north of Valencia (refer to Exhibit N). It houses only males and is rated for 7,694 inmates consisting of minimum, medium, and maximum levels of security. Visiting hours are Saturday, Sunday, and holidays from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. As this is not a release facility, inmates are bussed to central jail in downtown Los Angeles to be released.

The jail was constructed in the 1930's as an honor farm for minimum level security inmates. Over time, juvenile facilities were added, then after a short time, the juveniles were moved out. In the 1960's, a maximum security section was added and today another maximum addition is being built to house 2,064 inmates. Until very recently (last 10 years) there have been no homes close to it. Approximately three years ago, single family homes started being built on the west side of the I-5 Freeway, which is across the freeway from the jail (located on the east side). Major construction efforts are under way to build more homes west of the I-5 Freeway in the hills facing this facility. The jail is visible from the I-5 Freeway and homes under construction in the hills, but not from the existing tract of houses. Landscaping around the jail makes it difficult to see many of the buildings (refer to Exhibit D - photos of area).

The freeway offramp is the same for the residential area and the jail. A frontage road along the freeway, past the on/off ramps, services the homes and eventually crosses back over the freeway to the jail entrance. All visitors to the jail must use this road. Large signs along the road and approaching freeway offramps identify the jail location.

Personnel from the Los Angeles Sheriff's Santa Clarita Valley sub-station were interviewed regarding crime and problems associated with the jail. The general area (for at least a mile radius) surrounding the jail site was considered to have a much lower crime rate than the rest of the Santa Clarita Valley. Actual crime data was not reviewed as the reporting districts often cover many square miles as opposed to a few blocks at other sites researched. According to sheriff's personnel interviewed, whose experience ranged from 3 to 18 years (some of whom were also long-term residents in this area), indicated the jail is not a problem location. Except for a few "traditional" escapes, they cannot attribute criminal activity occurring in the area to the jail operation.

Visitors to the jail must park in a large parking lot at the entrance road and then are bussed into the facility. As all visitors to any jail are subject to search, sometimes there are sweeps of the parking lot where contraband (drugs and weapons) are found in visitor's cars. Also, visitors may be arrested on

outstanding warrants if they attempt to visit an inmate. Visitors are oftentimes checked for criminal records and warrants.

There have been several "traditional" escapes of medium and maximum inmates. The most noted and recent one involved seven inmates escaping from the rear of a Sheriff's transportation bus as it entered onto the freeway. One inmate was killed by a car, but the others escaped and stole a car by force from an individual. This escape, which occurred approximately 3-4 years ago, also involved a home being burglarized. Approximately 15-20 years ago, a market in Castaic was robbed by force (no weapons) when several inmates escaped. Another "traditional" escape involved an inmate who burglarized a home about three miles from the jail (direct line versus traveling over 10 miles in a vehicle to it). He was apprehended after calling for a cab. The traditional escapes have been few in number and appear to be reducing in frequency as security has been improved over the years. These noted escapes were ones that could be identified as "traditional" by those who were interviewed, which basically includes the last 18 years (deputies' experience).

Unlike the other three jail sites which were researched, this is a non-release facility and there were no residents nearby when it was built. The closest homes, across the freeway, are no more than three years old and the residents had to know about the jail before moving into the area. There is a Neighborhood Watch Program in force within this neighborhood and the Sheriff's Department has made several presentations on home security issues. Even though the residents know about the jail and have been instructed how to better secure their homes, there has been no evidence of increased neighborhood security noted by the Sheriff's Department.

According to a salesman selling new single family homes (refer to Exhibit P for brochure on homes) only one person, out of a tract of 190 homes, had their house prewired for an alarm system because of the jail. All people are told about the jail, for approximately 80% of the potential buyers are from out of the area. Approximately 6 people stopped the purchasing process because of the jail. About 50% of the people purchasing expressed a dislike of living close to a jail, but purchased anyway due to freeway access, affordability, and the fact that this is a new residential area developing in the hills.

There is a major regional recreation facility, Castaic Lake, immediately north of the jail, whose entrance is close to the next freeway offramp north of the jail's. According to authorities responsible for policing this park, there have been no known incidents involving visitors to the jail. On a rare occasion, they see a "walk-away" escapee from the jail. Magic Mountain Amusement Park is about three miles south of the jail, and there have been no incidents involving visitors to the jail at this location according to law enforcement personnel.

Based upon extensive information developed from the Sheriff's Department personnel, including feedback from residents at Neighborhood Watch meetings, input from others as previously discussed, and the fact that people knew the jail was there before purchasing a home, the community questionnaire was not administered at this site.

SUMMARY

Several observations can be made about people who live next to jails. It appears that they (81%) are not afraid of being victimized by an escapee, which is also evidenced by residents (91%) not taking any extra security precautions. They (81%) also do not consider jail sites to have more crime than areas away from the jail, which is supported by crime statistics and interviews with law enforcement. This thought is also supported by their response (85%) indicating jails do not attract the criminal element. These survey results are comparable to the findings of research published in 1985 by the California State Senate Office of Research who studied crime rates around prison sites. Their research concludes by indicating state prisons neither create an environment which encourages crime nor attracts the criminal element.

When comparing residents who were living in the area prior to the jail being built as opposed to moving in after, a similar correlation is found with all the sites. The "befores" expressed less fear (afraid: yes - 8%; no - 94%; unknown - 4%) than the "afters" (afraid: yes - 18%; no - 78%; unknown - 4%). This same correlation could be found when inquiring about fear of escapes, with "befores" showing less fear (escape: yes - 8%; no - 86%; unknown - 6%) than the "afters" (escape: yes - 18%; no - 77%; unknown - 5%). The "afters" felt a little more strongly about the jail not attracting the criminal element (88%) as compared to the "befores" (80%). The jail was not considered, either positively or negatively, by a majority (85%) of those persons moving near to such a facility.

These observations are not to imply that branch jails are not a problem. As mentioned previously, these four sites were selected on certain criteria. A brief interview was conducted with law enforcement personnel to determine an appropriate site and also determine if the jail was a problem. In the counties contacted, only one jail, City of Santee in San Diego County, was experiencing conflict with the community. This is a women's release facility which is proposed to be expanded to house male inmates. There is a significant community challenge to this expansion and it was felt an objective interview of residents could not be achieved at this time. Also, the residential area near the jail did not meet the criteria for this research project. The main issue is the releasing of inmates who sometimes beg for money (bus fare), commit prostitution, and loiter near a school (refer to Exhibit T for concerns of school). Although there are complaints from the community, the area in which it is located has the lowest crime rate (selected major crimes) in the city (refer to Exhibit U).

An analysis of all sites surveyed showed 28% of those interviewed had seen either visitors (12%) or released persons (16%) walking/driving in the area around the jail. These observations are based upon the person's "feelings" as to whom they felt fit this category of person. As these surveys were all based upon release facilities, it would seem reasonable to observe such persons near the jail. Four of the five persons responding to seeing visitors/released inmates at the Chula Vista site have a direct view of the jail facility. At the Indio location, six of the eight answering this question are in close proximity to the jail and can view its activities. The Vista survey, regarding the question of observing visitors/released persons, was somewhat tainted as people would refer to the time period when many drunks and transients were being released from the facility. Of those responding to the question, all of them indicated observing recently recent persons while 54% also reported seeing visitors to the jail.

The community questionnaire referenced six crimes, all property crimes (i.e., theft and burglary), had been committed by either recently released persons or visitors. Three of the crimes (two stolen cars and one burglary) were definitely committed by recently released persons who were apprehended. All of the victims were businesses. The other three crimes (one theft and two burglaries) involving homes, were assumed to be committed by visitors (two) or recently released persons (one). There is no positive proof who committed these crimes.

Regardless of whether it was a release or non-release facility, visitors were not identified as a problem to the area surrounding a jail. It can generally be stated that most visitors to jails are not necessarily free of criminal record. However, their habits were the same, that is, arriving during visiting hours, then leaving the jail site.

Some common traits can also be found among those who escape from jails. Almost all of the escapes are not the "traditional" type but rather walk-aways by minimum security level inmates (such as trustees) generally outside in unsecured areas. Their first objective is to get as far away from the jail as possible. Most of the time, their destination is home or to a friend's house (familiar turf). They often have transportation waiting for them (pre-planned) along with a change of clothing. Unable to obtain these two items from friends, they will seek out and steal clothing and cars. They clearly prefer not to draw attention to themselves and to avoid confrontations. Most escapees are apprehended within a relatively short period of time (minutes to 24 hours) due to their predictable nature. All of the escapees discussed in this report were recaptured. Advances in security systems and improvements in correctional facility design and procedures has enhanced security at jail facilities in very recent times.

Law enforcement personnel, at all of the counties contacted, indicated that jail overcrowding is an issue. Even though facilities have a "rating" regarding inmate populations, the locations used in this study, and others not selected, were housing inmates in significant numbers above the rated capacity. The overcrowding issue is also responsible for early releasing of inmates and not accepting minor violators for incarceration.

When interviewing law enforcement personnel, the question of services to the community as a result of jail activity was asked. They unanimously responded that the jail had not increased their calls-for-service due to the jail. No additional personnel were incorporated into the patrol force when the jails were constructed.

The presence of jails did not hinder development of adjacent residential and business properties. At these four sites, and others which were not selected, there was evidence of either recent or current construction.

Based upon information from residents, businesses, and law enforcement, the jails surveyed seem to be an accepted institution in the community and not really consciously thought about by those around them. Improvements consisting of more secure exercise areas and adequate personnel to operate a jail could have been utilized with most of these facilities. Even considering these needed improvements, crime attributed to the facilities surveyed was negligible.