



County of Cheshire

December 1999

TO: Representative Jack Pratt, Chairman Cheshire County Delegation
Representative Stephen G. Avery, Chairman of Executive Committee

FROM: The Cheshire County Board of Commissioners

RE: Proposal for expansion of the county jail with enhanced inmate programs

Dear Representatives Pratt and Avery:

In June of 1999, the County engaged a consulting firm to conduct a feasibility study for the Cheshire County House of Correction. The consultant team included specialized firms consisting of a criminal justice consulting firm, an architect, an engineering firm and the Institute for Crime, Justice and Corrections from the George Washington University in Washington DC, specialists in jail population projections.

The report from this team concluded the following:

1. The jail was designed for 50 inmates and presently is holding approximately 90;
2. Applying correctional standards, the jail is only suitable to hold 47 inmates;
3. The correction population could well double by the year 2010;
4. Adding new inmate programs could reduce by 20%, the expected increase in correction population;
5. To comply with minimal housing and program standards, there should be an expansion of approximately 75,000 square feet providing 160 new beds;
6. An expansion of the type recommended could cost nearly \$15 million

The County Commissioners have reviewed these recommendations and have instructed the Superintendent to develop, with the assistance of the County Administrator, a plan to reduce the scope of an expansion project. This reduced scope is based upon the following three critical elements:

1. The jail expansion should be reduced to provide housing for 64 inmates which relieves the existing overcrowding while at the same time anticipating that some increase in inmates will take place throughout the next 5-10 years and do so for a cost substantially less than \$15 million;
2. The jail expansion should provide suitable resources for inmate programs that will accomplish the task of reducing the population through community monitoring, rehabilitation programs, education and training programs and other programs designed to control the inmates in ways other than keeping them in jail; 3. The inmate program should advance with members of the delegation statutory changes necessary to better utilize electronic monitoring.

The County Commissioners have unanimously endorsed, in concept, a strong commitment to inmate programs that begin to deal with the social, political and economic impact of incarceration in our county jail. Approximately 60% of people incarcerated at the county jail have not been convicted of any crime and are awaiting disposition of their case. These people should be released to the custody and control of suitable intermediate programs rather than expensive incarceration. Cheshire County should commit the resources necessary to create and utilize these programs because they are far less expensive than the construction and operating costs associated with a full-scale expansion to the jail.

Of the 40% of incarcerated persons who have been convicted of a crime, many are viewed as suitable for participation in various inmate programs that could provide basic education and job skills. Cheshire County should commit the resources necessary to create and utilize these programs because they, too, are far less expensive than the construction and operating costs associated with a jail.

For efforts at the development of effective inmate correctional programs to be successful, it will take a commitment of all agencies involved in criminal justice to support and utilize these programs. These agencies, at a minimum, include:

The Superior Court and District Court Judges
The County Attorney and the Police Prosecutors
Probation and Parole Officers
Public Defenders

As an important backdrop, it is useful to recognize that each person incarcerated in the county jail will be returning to our neighborhoods, on average within 60 to 180 days. Regardless of the length of their sentence, these individuals will be returning to society. The County Commissioners believe that efforts to make these individuals productive members of society is of paramount importance not only for the economic impact of incarceration, but for maintaining and improving the fabric of our society.

The degree to which regional commitment is important can be seen in the history of the County-sponsored Diversion Program. While this program received 271 referrals during its initial period of operation, there were virtually no referrals as the program matured. The Diversion Program was terminated prematurely for lack of referrals by outside agencies and the courts. This was an instance where the county made a concerted effort at intermediate sentencing. However, a lack of cooperation, support or understanding on the part of other agencies resulted in the early demise of the program.

Broad-based support for inmate programs is essential. We encourage you to support the efforts of the County Commissioners at developing these programs and invite you to participate in this development.

Attached with this letter are several documents for your review.

- First is the 55-page report of the consultant team of Pulitzer-Bogard detailing the full findings and recommendations of the study.
- Second is a four-page letter dated November 16, 1999 from Pulitzer-Bogard briefly detailing the recommendations split into Phase I and Phase II.
- Third is a description of the existing inmate programs at the county jail
- Fourth is a draft of typical inmate programs that have been used successfully in other counties in the United States

By majority vote, the Commissioners are asking you to endorse Phase I of the project that would build a modest housing unit to relieve overcrowding at the jail. The preliminary cost estimates for Phase I of construction is \$7,800,179. Notwithstanding his support for a strong inmate program plan at the House of Correction, Commissioner Daschbach is not in favor of any construction project at the jail. Phase I would also include program space to accommodate the significant increase in inmate programs that are anticipated in item "Fourth", above. Phase I would also include the construction of kitchen, laundry, medical, booking, visitation, mechanical space and ancillary areas that would be needed only minor renovations should additional inmate housing units be necessary due to the failure of inmate programs to be effectively utilized.

While the Phase I expansion is expensive (\$8 million), it is one-half the cost of the full expansion. The County Commissioners believe that spending half as much as recommended will meet the needs for the county IF the agencies in the county are willing to participate in intermediate sentencing that relieves the burden on the jail by decreasing the numbers of incarcerated individuals.

This country sends far too many people to jail and spends too few resources to deal with the educational, vocational, employment, social and mental health issues confronting people who come to the attention of the criminal justice system. Simply putting these people in jail will not solve any of these problems and will do nothing to curb recidivism among this population. We hope you will support this program enhancement and expansion proposal.

Respectfully Submitted,

THE CHESHIRE COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS



ASSOCIATES, LLC

November 16, 1999

Mr. Jack Wozmak
County Administrator
Cheshire County
33 West Street Keene, NH 03431

Dear Jack:

You have asked us to develop a phased construction scenario for the Cheshire County House of Correction to meet an \$8 million initial budget. We have developed such an approach with the following caveat-this is only a *possible scenario* that must be confirmed and refined through subsequent operational/architectural programming, design studies, and cost estimating. At this point we are only offering it as an order of magnitude approach, based on very preliminary cost per square foot values and space requirements and, as such, cannot warrant that it is in fact a viable approach.

This scenario (see the attached spreadsheet) contemplates the following activity in Phase I:

1. One pod of 32 cells, accommodating 64 general population inmates.
2. A reduced full build-out of security operations (central control, command center-armory, etc.).
3. The full build out of health services.
4. The full build out of food services and laundry, with the necessary equipment to serve the initial population and possibly other county facilities.
5. Partial build-out of new administration and lobby space.
6. Partial build-out of visitation.
7. Partial build-out of staff support space (lockers, roll call, exercise space).
8. Expansion of the booking area.
9. Partial build-out of program space.
10. Partial build-out of facilities management (e.g., mechanical plant, warehouse and maintenance space)
11. Site work for the full build-out, including demolition of existing structures

The addition of 64 beds in Phase I would bring the facility's rated capacity to 175 (see page 3 of October 15, 1999 Final Report for the capacity analysis). Assuming that the County adopted none of the policy options outlined in the report, the 175 capacity would meet the forecasted bed needs until 2005-2006

**Cheshire County, New Hampshire
House Of Correction
Feasibility Study
Final Report**

October 15, 1999
Prepared By: Pulitzer/Bogard & Associates, LLC

Executive Summary

Background

In June 1999 the County selected the New York based criminal justice consulting firm of Pulitzer/Bogard & Associates, LLC (P/BA) to conduct a Feasibility Study for the Cheshire County House of Correction. The P/BA team included three specialized firms: Equus Design Group, Inc., a Massachusetts architectural firm; Louis Berger & Associates, a Manchester (NH) civil engineering firm; and the Institute for Crime, Justice and Corrections of the George Washington University, a Washington, DC based entity specializing in jail population projections.

Facility/Capacity Assessment

The P/BA team conducted a series of interviews with key Cheshire County criminal justice officials and toured the House of Correction to ascertain the current state of that facility from an operational and capacity perspective. We found a very well managed facility, with staff doing a commendable job of managing the jail population with limited physical resources. We determined that the facility's design capacity¹ is 59, its rated capacity is 47 (when judged by national standards)², and its operating capacity (including all beds added since 1996)³ is 90. By contrast, the facility's average daily inmate population is 106. Thus, the House of Correction routinely operates at approximately 100% over its design or rated capacity.

Although many beds have been added since 1996 to respond to the increasing population, this ad-hoc approach to operating capacity expansion must be viewed as a short-term response only. While extensive double-celling of cells appropriate for one inmate does add beds, it does not address the associated needs such as day space, showers, program space, dining, and facility infrastructure that are equally critical to effective inmate management and physical plant maintenance. Moreover, it also increases tension levels in a facility, compromising the safety and well being of both staff and inmates.

The table below illustrates the current capacity of the CCHOC's housing areas identifying design, operating, and rated capacity figures.

House of Correction Capacity⁴ Analysis

Housing Area	Classification	Design Capacity	Operating Capacity Including	Rated Capacity Based on Standards ⁵
--------------	----------------	-----------------	------------------------------	--

¹ Design capacity is the number of inmates for whom the original jail and subsequent additions was intended to hold

² Based on American Correctional Association Adult Local Detention Facility Standards. These are the most widely used and referenced national standards.

³ Operating capacity is a dynamic figure that is subject to change anytime a bed is added to a cell or other area of the jail.

⁴ These general population beds are supplemented by booking holding cells, observation cells, and the gymnasium (used for weekenders) that are designed to be used on a temporary basis only. In addition, approximately 10 segregation beds are not counted in this capacity, as they cannot be used for general population inmates.

⁵ Based on American Correctional Association Standards

**Cheshire County New Hampshire
Feasibility Study
House of Correction
Final Report**
Pulitzer/Bogard & Associates, LLC

West Block	Sentenced Males	24	24	4 ⁶
West Pod	Maximum-Pretrial	12	24	12
East Pod	Maximum- Pretrial Males	11	22	11
2nd Floor Work	Male Work Release	4	4	4
First Floor Work	Females-all	8	16	16 ⁷
TOTAL		59	90	47

Jail Population Forecasts

Baseline jail population forecasts indicate that the House of Correction population could well double to an average of 202 by the year 2010. When classification factors are added, i.e., accounting for population peaking, segregation needs, gender and custody stratifications, this would require a total of 220⁸ beds-an addition of approximately 160 beds based on the current design capacity of 59.

Adoption of the key population management recommendations presented in this report could potentially decrease the 2010 population projection by up to 20%. There is, however, less than universal acceptance of this notion among local criminal justice officials. As such, the County Administrator and Jail Superintendent have opted to recommend to legislative leaders that the construction be geared to the baseline forecast, while parallel efforts occur to attempt to implement suggestions for decreased bed needs. Should implementation of these population management recommendations result in reduced numbers of Cheshire County inmates, it is highly likely that the County can continue to lease excess beds to the U.S. Marshal Service. This will generate substantial revenue to the County, largely offsetting any operating cost increases associated with the larger facility and higher inmate population. At the same time, this allows the County to maintain expansion potential for its own jail population needs for the future.

Capital Plan Recommendations

This Feasibility Study recommends a 76,010 square foot expansion of the HOC. This expansion provides 160 new beds in three general population-housing units, bringing the facility's design capacity to 219.⁹ To support the significant bed increase, all non-housing areas of the facility must also be expanded to accommodate additional administration, food services, laundry, programs, visiting, storage, medical, and other support requirements. Moreover, it is cost-effective to plan facility infrastructure (utilities and central support

⁶ Cell size of 8 cells is 48 sq. ft., 25 sq. ft. of unencumbered space per occupant is required by standard American Correctional Association Standards 3-ALDF-2C-03 (Rev. 1997).

⁷ With stacked beds, the standard of 25 sq. ft. of unencumbered space per occupant could be met

⁸ This number would include all general population and segregation beds but not holding cells, observation beds, booking cells and other temporary beds that cannot routinely be used

⁹ This number would include all general population and segregation beds but not holding cells, observation beds, booking cells and other temporary beds that cannot routinely be used

**Cheshire County New Hampshire
Feasibility Study
House of Correction
Final Report**
Pulitzer/Bogard & Associates, LLC

functions) to accommodate approximately 20-25% future population growth beyond the year 2010 so that additional bed space could be built without having to also add support for those beds. In effect, the recommended expansion represents a four-five fold increase in inmate capacity, and therefore a concomitant increase in overall facility needs.

The preliminary estimated total project costs associated with this significant long-term facility expansion plan are \$14-\$15 million.^{10 11} These costs must be refined through a subsequent detailed programming and schematic design phase that will address specific facility requirements in significantly more detail than is possible via this feasibility study.

The preliminary space requirements associated with this expansion program are summarized in the following table.

This range is dependent on such factors as the degree to which the existing facility can be reused as is, or through retrofitting, the results of more detailed wastewater treatment engineering, and more detailed space programming and analysis.

Cheshire County House of Correction Preliminary Space Program¹²

Area#	Function	Gross S.F.	Components
1.000	Public Lobby/ Administration	4,000	Administration and visitor processing
2.000	Staff Support	3,000	Staff locker rooms, physical fitness area, training/roll call room and training offices
3.000	Security	2,200	Central control, key shop, armory, security administration
4.000	Visitation	3,000	Contact and non-contact visitation, attorney and other professional visits, video court
5.000	Booking/Release	6,000	Booking and release/ transfer, inmate property, open and secure holding. Provide 2400 sq. ft. vehicle sally port as a drive through garage.
6.000	Program Services	7,000	Academic education, vocational training, religious services space, library (use existing gymnasium), jail industry
7.000	Health Services	2,500	Medical clinic, dental and four patient beds

¹⁰ Costs include construction, water infrastructure enhancements, fixed furniture and equipment, programming fees, design fees, transition/activation services, contingency, and escalation assuming a calendar year 2000 inception of design work.

¹¹ This range is dependent on such factors as the degree to which the existing facility can be reused as is, or through retrofitting, the results of more detailed wastewater treatment engineering, and more detailed space programming and analysis.

¹² Square footage assumptions on this table are based on other comparable facilities that P/BA has programmed. They represent an order of magnitude estimate for a 220-250 bed jail based on national standards, sound practices, and preliminary assessments of actual Cheshire County needs. These figures are to be used only for purposes of this Feasibility Study and the preliminary cost estimate. A comprehensive programming process, including extensive interviews of facility staff and inventory of existing space utilization is required to prepare a detailed and accurate space program and this is beyond the present scope of work

**Cheshire County New Hampshire
Feasibility Study
House of Correction
Final Report**
Pulitzer/Bogard & Associates, LLC

8.000	Housing (160 new beds)	26,500	One 32 cell pod @ 7700 sq. ft.(initially single celled but expandable to 64 through double celling); two pods with double cells to house 64 inmates each @ 9400 sq. ft. Adjacent outdoor exercise yards @1500 sq. ft. for each
9.000	Food/Laundry Services	6,900	Laundry, kitchen with 3-4 days storage in kitchen, staff dining room
10.000	Facility Management	8,000	Central warehouse (dry goods, 30 day freezer/cooler storage, supplies), maintenance shops, and central
	Building Gross	6,910	Includes 10% building gross for major circulation, mechanical and electrical rooms, shafts, building skin.
	TOTAL	76,010	

The planning assumptions underlying this program are as follows:

1. The 160 new beds would be general population male beds designed around direct supervision principles.
2. The existing 59 beds (design capacity) would generally be used for segregation, special populations, work release, females and U.S. Marshal's prisoners.
3. Support services and infrastructure are planned for a total population of 250.
4. Food and laundry will be done on-site, with the assistance of inmate labor to lower current costs. These facilities could service other county agencies.
5. Existing non-housing areas are to be matched against the gross square footage in the above functional areas to identify the actual new construction required for the expansion. Actual new construction may be significantly less than the 76,010 gross square feet figure shown above, depending on the extent to which existing space can be reused or retrofitted.

Summary of Other Recommendations

Listed below is a summary of the remaining recommendations (those not set forth above). The findings and rationale for these recommendations are included in the body of the report.

Operational and Functional Assessment:

1. In light of the fact that all housing and most support areas of the existing CHOC are severely strained and very crowded, significant facility expansion is required to accommodate current and projected population levels.
2. Explore applying direct supervision management throughout the existing facility, and consider employing this approach in any new construction.
3. Implement the objective classification assessment instrument and classify inmates on the basis of their threat to the community and inside the facility and not solely on their court status.
4. Implement jail-based programming consistent with the needs outlined in the community (e.g., GED, employment and life skills).
5. Evaluate existing programs and develop future inmate programs to ensure consistency with comparable community-based programs so inmates, upon release, can continue their

treatment and skill development in the community.

6. Relocate the outdoor exercise area so it is not visible from the street.
7. House the work release inmates in the unit designed for that purpose.
8. Provide for appropriate housing for inmates with disabilities.
9. Provide two-way communication in all inmate housing and program areas or provide direct supervision by staff.
10. Ensure the facility perimeter is secure and provide interior security zones within which inmates can travel unescorted by staff.
11. Provide shower and property exchange areas adjacent to the booking area.
12. Expand the medical unit to provide for appropriate storage of pharmaceuticals and records, an examination area that ensures privacy, and a waiting area.
13. Provide food and laundry services inside the CHOC including provisions for inmate workers. Consider contracting out operation of one or both services to reduce current operating costs.
14. Provide more appropriate program space for multi-purpose rooms, classrooms, and storage.
15. Provide appropriate housing (other than the gymnasium) if weekend offenders continue to be housed at the CHOC, to ensure inmate access to exercise on a daily basis
16. Provide appropriate spaces for administration staff, support space and storage.

Population Management:

1. Criminal justice policy makers should reach a consensus that alternatives to financial release should be used whenever possible.
2. A supervised pre-trial release program should be implemented to include an assessment process, electronic monitoring, house arrest, drug testing, drug/alcohol treatment, and day reporting.
3. The supervised pre-trial release program should be operated under the aegis of the local Probation and Parole office.
4. Funding for additional staff and other resources for the pre-trial release program should be sought from the State and from the County Board of Commissioners.
5. Protective custody holds should be referred to Marathon House whenever possible. Statutory authority should be sought to allow detoxification centers to detain such persons involuntarily upon order of a bail commissioner.
6. Statutory clarification should be sought regarding the use of electronic monitoring for pre-trial supervision.
7. Criminal justice policy makers should reach a consensus that alternatives to incarceration should be used whenever possible.
8. Probation and Parole should be assigned the primary responsibility for coordinating and operating alternative sentences for both the District and Superior Courts.
9. Funding for additional staff and other resources for the Probation and Parole Office in Cheshire County should be sought from the State and from the County Board of Commissioners.
10. The Academy Program should be expanded to serve additional categories and increased numbers of defendants.

11. Work release offers the potential for a legitimate sentencing option if the HOC can acquire the necessary staff resources to ensure judges that offenders will be adequately supervised outside of the facility, and the HOC can reassign space originally designed for this purpose but presently dedicated to a small number of female offenders. This program should be operated by the HOC.
12. Weekend sentences do not represent a viable sentencing option at this time and should not be looked to in the future due to the expense of supervising and building space for this low risk population. Shock incarceration (a short jail sentence of one week or less) combined with a community sanction such as home incarceration or community service serves the same purpose and may actually be perceived to be more punitive by offenders who may become accustomed to the weekend sentences as time goes on.

Miscellaneous:

1. An existing informal group of criminal justice officials should be formalized into a "Criminal Justice Coordinating Council," with monthly meetings, a revolving chair and staff resources provided by the member agencies on a rotating basis. The Council should use this report and others that have preceded it to develop an agenda and work to develop unified policy positions and coordinated approaches to solving problems. Moreover, all criminal justice initiatives, grants, etc, should be tunneled through this entity.
2. Current efforts to develop an automated jail management information system should be fully funded through internal County budgets or via grant funding from the State.
3. The CHOC should refocus its classification system to reflect custody status more than the current pre-trial versus sentenced dichotomy.
4. The County should continue to accept Federal prisoners to offset the operating cost of the facility and to fill vacant beds (should any be available).

I Background

A. Current Status

- In April 1999 Cheshire County issued an RFP for a consultant to conduct a Feasibility Study for the County House of Correction.
- According to the RFP, the goal of the Study was to develop a plan for the short and long-term future of the House of Correction.
- In June 1999 the County selected the New York based criminal justice consulting firm of Pulitzer/Bogard & Associates, LLC (P/BA) to conduct the Feasibility Study. The P/BA team was supplemented by three specialized firms: Equus Design Group, a Massachusetts architectural firm; Louis Berger & Associates, a Manchester (NH) civil engineering firm; and the Institute for Crime, Justice and Corrections of the George Washington University, a Washington, DC based entity specializing in jail population projections.
- P/BA conducted on-site interviews with key stakeholders on June 21-22 including the County Administrator, Corrections Superintendent, judges and administrative staff of the District and

Superior Courts, representatives of the Keene Police Department and Sheriffs Department, and the County Attorney. (See Appendix "A" for a complete list of persons interviewed)

- Several members of the County's Legislative Delegation sat in on interviews on June 21.
- Tours of the House of Correction facility and site (including the water treatment plant) were conducted by members of the P/BA team in June and July (and on April 21, 1999 during the pre-proposal meeting).
- Telephone interviews were conducted with a number of key stakeholders who were not available for personal interviews on June 21-23. (See Appendix "A" for a complete list of persons interviewed)
- Data relative to the jail population projection analysis and projections was developed in concert with personnel of the House of Correction. Where available, data was obtained via the Cheshire Department of Correction's automated "Lockdown" system.
- A Draft/Preliminary Feasibility Study Report was issued to the County on August 16, 1999. Corrections and modifications were made to the text of that document, and additional information pertaining to the architectural program, design approach, and capital costs were then developed. This Final Report represents the culmination of those efforts.

II Facility Inventory

A. Overview

- The primary focus of this section is to review the extent to which the physical plant of the Cheshire County House of Correction supports or inhibits operations that are consistent with sound correctional operational standards and expectations. The assessment was conducted through on-site visits, telephone interviews and documentation obtained from the House of Correction superintendent and his staff. Photographs illustrating the physical plant (both interior and exterior) are included at the end of the report for visual reference purposes.
- Eight functional areas were reviewed including:
 - ◆ Security - How well does the facility keep inmates from escaping?
 - ◆ Safety - How well does the facility keep staff and inmates safe (e.g., emergency and routine communication between staff and inmates) ?
 - ◆ Order - Does the existing facility support staffs' efforts to maintain internal control and rule enforcement?
 - ◆ Care - How well does the existing facility support requirements related to medical, mental and dental health of inmates?
 - ◆ Activity - Does the facility have adequate and appropriate areas for staff operations and training, opportunities for inmate work, education, exercise, and worship?
 - ◆ Conditions - Are living and working conditions appropriate within the facility, e.g., crowding, density, privacy, HVAC adequacy in all areas, sanitation, plumbing to heat water in all areas, storage, and other fixtures, etc.?
 - ◆ Efficiency - Does the facility promote or support appropriate staff-to-inmate ratios; is it organized in a manner conducive to efficient circulation; does the physical relationship of the House of Correction facility to the courts or other agencies require extraordinary

transportation costs; etc?

- ◆ Relationship with other agencies - What services are exchanged with other County operations (e.g., nursing home, county farms and county facilities department).
- While the team attempted to highlight special accomplishments where they were observed, the fact remains that the focus of a functional assessment is primarily on identifying deficiencies. Unfortunately, this approach tends to overlook the many areas in which the organization is functioning consistent with professional and/or public expectations. Therefore, despite the apparent "negative" voice of this section, we are indeed impressed by the efforts of Superintendent Van Wickler and his staff to manage a crowded jail that does not offer the full range of physical resources that might otherwise be available.
- Methodology - The team reviewed information that was provided on site and toured the facility both at the initial pre-proposal facility walk-through and subsequent site visit on June 21-22, 1999. The team members spent many hours touring the House of Correction, observing operations and reviewing inspection reports and other forms of facility-based documentation of operations. Informal and formal interviews were conducted with numerous staff at all levels of the House of Correction.
- Since there are no New Hampshire State standards for jails, the team relied on its experience operating, programming, and designing similar local facilities, and on national standards.¹³ Inspections are conducted by the Cheshire County Commissioners in accordance with State regulations RSA 306:12; however the primary focus of these reports/inspections is on meeting annual goals and some operation processes (e.g., disciplinary procedures). This document refers to standards promulgated by the American Correctional Association Commission on Accreditation for Corrections (ACA). These are voluntary standards and the County is by no means obligated to meet these requirements nor must it go through the accreditation process; however, as the standards do represent the most widely respected national guidelines for facility design and operations, we have referenced them in several areas and they do represent a good approach for benchmarking purposes.
- There are two overriding operational concepts the team believes can have a significant impact on the facility operation and ultimately the functionality of the facility design. The two concepts are "direct supervision" of inmates, and "objective inmate classification." Since these concepts can impact all of the functional areas reviewed, they are discussed briefly below, but they are also addressed throughout the report where appropriate.

DIRECT SUPERVISION: Direct Supervision is a management concept that emphasizes the removal of barriers between inmates and staff so that staff can better manage the population by anticipating and solving problems before they occur. It emphasizes the assumption of rational behavior on the part of inmates, and provides for a series of steps to tighten control if inmate behavior does not meet institutional (positive) expectations.

Direct supervision management has been implemented in more than 100 jails nationwide.

¹³ Compliance with national standards, i.e., those promulgated by the American Correctional Association, is strictly voluntary. However, these standards so represent the most comprehensive statement of sound industry practice and are therefore helpful tools to rely upon

National accreditation bodies have developed standards that support the notion that facilities operate safer and in greater control with staff in direct supervision of inmates.¹⁴ With this increased supervision of inmates, facilities have experienced a reduction in weapons held by inmates; reduced vandalism in the housing units or other areas which therefore reduces the need for more costly fixtures, furnishings and equipment (often commercial grade furnishings are used); and greater control because staff, not inmates, are in control of the inmates.

The House of Correction is not presently configured to support direct supervision principles. However, the team believes there are areas where it would be appropriate and cost effective to implement direct supervision with the appropriate population of inmates and the appropriate facility design (should additional housing areas be constructed).

OBJECTIVE INMATE CLASSIFICATION: The House of Correction does have a classification instrument that assesses inmate risk and objectively assigns a custody level. This risk assessment instrument considers such factors as previous conviction, current behavior, community stability and other risk factors.

However, because of the crowding and the lack of flexible housing options, the HOC has not consistently applied the risk assessment instrument. For example, if only a few inmates score as minimum custody, one of the four housing units would have to be designated for that custody level. As a result of the limited housing options, the three primary classifications of inmates in the House of Correction are: male pretrial, male sentenced (12 months or less) male contract inmates, and females.¹⁵ All pretrial inmates are classified to maximum custody due to the unknown disposition of their sentence. However, a portion of the pretrial "maximum custody" inmates are charged with misdemeanor crimes for which they will be sentenced to a maximum of 12 months in the House of Correction, and the behavior of some of the pretrial arrestees likely does not warrant such high degrees of control.

Moreover, there is a question of whether classification by court status presents the risk that more assaultive inmates will be housed with less violent persons simply because they happen to be at the same juncture in their judicial process. Classifying inmates in this manner raises the specter of liability in the event that an inmate is victimized by another who may have presented a significantly different custody risk.

B. Operational and Functional Assessment

The P/BA team conducted a series of interviews with key Cheshire County criminal justice officials and toured the House of Correction to ascertain the current state of that facility from an operational and capacity perspective. We found a very well managed facility, with staff doing a commendable job of managing the jail population with limited physical

¹⁴ Physical plant design facilitates continuous personal contact and interaction between staff and inmates in the housing unit. Separation of supervising staff from inmates reduces interpersonal relationships and staff awareness of conditions on the housing unit.

¹⁵ All women are presently housed in the same area due to their small numbers.

**Cheshire County New Hampshire
Feasibility Study
House of Correction
Final Report**
Pulitzer/Bogard & Associates, LLC

resources. We determined that the facility's design capacity¹⁶ is 59, its rated capacity is 47 (when judged by national standards)¹⁷, and its operating capacity (including all beds added since 1996)¹⁸ is 90. However, the facility's average daily inmate population is 106. Thus, the House of Correction routinely operates at approximately 100% over its design or rated capacity.

Although many beds have been added since 1996 to respond to the increasing population, this ad-hoc approach to operating capacity expansion must be viewed as a short-term response only. While extensive double-celling of cells appropriate for one inmate does add beds, it does not address the associated needs such as day space, showers, program space, dining, and facility infrastructure that are equally critical to effective inmate management and physical plant maintenance. Moreover, it also increases tension levels in a facility, compromising the safety and well-being of both staff and inmates.

**House of Correction Capacity
General Population**

Housing Area	Classification	Design Capacity	Operating capacity including additions	Rated Capacity Based on Standards ¹⁹
West Block	Sentenced Males	24	24	4 ²⁰
West Pod	Maximum-Pretrial Males	12	24	12
East Pod	Maximum- Pretrial Males	11	22	11
2nd Floor Work	Male Work Release	4	4	4
First Floor Work	Females-all classifications	8	16	16 ²¹
TOTAL		59	90	47

These general population beds are supplemented with "classification beds" that are designed to manage a population that must be separated from the general population, and are designed to be used on a temporary basis only.

¹⁶ Design capacity is the number of inmates for whom the original jail and subsequent additions was intended to hold.

¹⁷ Based on American Correctional Association Adult Local Detention Facility Standards. These are the most widely used and referenced national standards.

¹⁸ Operating capacity is a dynamic figure that is subject to change anytime a bed is added to a cell or other area of the jail.

¹⁹ Based on American Correctional Association housing standards.

²⁰ Cell size of 8 cells is 48 sq. ft.; 25 sq. ft. of unencumbered space per occupant is required by American Correctional Association Standards 3-ALDF-2C-03 (Rev. 1997)

²¹ Cell size of 8 cells is 48 sq. ft.; 25 sq. ft. of unencumbered space per occupant is required by American Correctional Association Standards 3-ALDF-2C-03 (Rev. 1997).

**House of Correction Capacity
Special Classifications Housing**

Housing Area	Classification	Design Capacity	Operating capacity including additions	Capacity Based on Standards²²
East Block	Male	10	10	4 ²³
Gymnasium	Weekenders	0	16	0
Holding Cells	Booking	0	5	0
Observation	Suicidal Inmates	0	3	0
TOTAL		10	34	4

Therefore, the beds listed above are not included in the total bed availability. For example, a general population inmate could not be housed in a vacant holding cell or segregation cell.

1. Security

- The facility has undergone an extensive renovation as a result of security breaches reported by staff and previous escapes and attempts. Despite the number of physical plant enhancements, there continue to be requests for additional electronic and mechanical security measures.
- There is a heavy reliance on cameras. There are many in the existing facility, and based on the most recent security report (April 1999), even more cameras are requested. Cameras present only a two-dimensional view of an area and cannot detect tension in a unit. Additionally, increasing cameras for staff to monitor decreases the actual time spent viewing any one area, and staff attention can be easily diverted, especially with the current configuration of the control center being adjacent to housing units where officer attention could easily be diverted.
- The outdoor exercise area is located to the side of the House of Correction with direct visibility and direct access from the street. While staff search the area prior to inmate access, and supervise inmates during exercise periods, there is ample opportunity for persons to secrete contraband (e.g., drugs) that may go undetected by staff. Additionally, due to concerns of escape attempts from the road (e.g., driving a vehicle into the fence), Jersey barriers have been installed, but these barriers alone do not contain the institution sufficiently to guard against threats from the outside.
- A 12 feet high fence surrounds the exercise yards off the East Block stair and gymnasium with a single row of razor wire at the top and no below-grade fencing. The fences in these two areas are not built according to modern correctional standards; the threat of inmates escaping over them, either alone or with assistance from the outside is realistic.
- There are eleven doors that exit the building, including two garage doors at the vehicle sallyports. Efforts have been made to strengthen the security of these exits by adding some fence enclosures, however, the facility would be made more secure with a modern, full perimeter fencing and intrusion detection system. By expanding the secure perimeter of the building to a perimeter

²² Based on American Correctional Association housing standards.

²³ Cell size is currently 48 sq. ft.; 80 sq. ft. is required by American Correctional Association Standards 3-ALDF-2C-12

security fence system, threats of escape would be lessened considerably and the number of exits penetrating the security perimeter could be reduced to two or three (e.g., public access, vehicle sallyport for new arrestees and transports, and support services entry).

A camera monitoring the outdoor exercise area is mounted on a building across the street from the House of Correction. Though the House of Correction is located in a remote area, the position of the camera raises the potential for vandalism.

Work releasees are currently housed in a separate unit/room but in the same area as the remainder of the general population. The proximity of the work release housing generates a concern that contraband could be brought into the facility.

Designated work release housing was added with the facility expansion in 1985. This housing unit is currently being used to house females, the purpose being to maintaining appropriate sight and sound separations from the male population. This unit should be reconsidered for housing work releasees since it was specifically designed to house work releasees (e.g., dual operation door locks -which have since been disabled), and is located adjacent to the work release exit.

Central control, the hub for security operations, is a two-level area with the upper level adjacent to housing units. There are no dual control systems in central control to provide back up to door and intercom controls in the event of panel failures or preventive maintenance. One significant concern is that this critical area is accessed through a single door adjacent to the booking area; this presents an opportunity for inmates to enter the control center and assume control over the facility.

2. Safety

Inmate rooms/cells are equipped with intercoms through which staff can contact inmates. These intercoms do not currently permit two-way communication that would allow inmates to contact staff in an emergency situation, which is a critical safety issue and a requirement of national standards²⁴. An effective alternative to two-way electronic communication is to have staff posted in the housing area (i.e., direct supervision) making electronic communication unnecessary, as staff would be directly apprised of an emergency.

3. Order

- The House of Correction appears to experience limited altercations between inmates and between inmates and staff. However, with control center staff monitoring cameras, and roving staff conducting rounds, there is limited interaction with the inmates. This limited interaction greatly reduces officers' ability to proactively detect behavioral problems and conflicts between inmates.
- Staffing allows for five officers to cover the day and evening shift; four officers on the night

²⁴ See, American Correctional Association Standards 3-ALDF-3A-02.

shift. The team observed fixed posts in booking/intake and two officers in the control center. When outdoor exercise is conducted, an additional officer is assigned to a fixed post. Under this scenario, there is one remaining officer who would be responsible for conducting rounds of the entire population, located on two different floors, and providing support in the booking/intake area or other areas of the facility.

- All inmate movement out of housing units (e.g., visits, exercise, etc.) is conducted by staff escort, which is contingent upon staff availability. When all inmate movement is by escort, there are fewer officers actually monitoring other inmates in housing units and program areas. If an officer is needed for support in another area (e.g., backup for booking staff, program delays or cancellations), there may be occasions when staff are not available to respond.
- Many agencies nationally are allowing inmates of certain custody levels (particularly minimum and medium custody inmates) to move within the secure perimeter to program areas without staff escort, in many cases by pass.

4. Care

- The booking area includes the processing desk and cells; most of which contain benches and toilets. Since there are no showers in the booking area, staff must move inmates to the property room located in another area of the building for clothing exchange and showering. Access to the property room is through the dining area, which serves as a multipurpose room for programs as well. This movement raises the potential for inmates with vermin passing through the area where inmates are dining or participating in programs.
- Inmates are showered in an area that serves the dual purpose of housing inmates with disabilities. When there are inmates with disabilities housed in this area, alternate arrangements must be made.
- The medical area consists of an office area with an exam table and adjacent storage space used for inactive files, file servers, uniforms and equipment storage. Prescribed medication is dispensed by medical staff via a medication cart that is also stored in the medical area. Medical records are maintained in the exam area, which could allow inmates casual visibility to other inmate records. This area is extremely cramped and there is no seating for inmates waiting to see the nurse or the doctor.
- Medical care is available 24 hours a day under the direction of a physician; dental care is provided on an emergency basis only.
- All inmates (with the exception of Protective Custody inmates under the Public Safety and Welfare Code²⁵) are given a PPD test within 24-hours to determine if they carry the tuberculosis virus. Those who are release from the House of Correction prior to having the test read are instructed to report to the local health department for follow-up.
- Laundry services are provided by the Nursing Home, which is in close proximity to the jail. Laundry is staged in the facility and transported to the Nursing Home to be washed. This practice poses a security risk (i.e., potential to transport contraband) and it raises a concern that soiled clothing at intake may sit for up to one week until the next available day for laundry exchange.

²⁵ Public Safety and Welfare Code 172-B:3.

Additionally, there is the potential to transfer vermin or lice to the Nursing Home.

- The House of Correction accepts all prisoners brought to them regardless of their condition. While medical staff is available on-site or on an on-call basis, this practice can result in House of Correction staff spending unnecessary time and resources to secure medical attention upon prisoner arrival as opposed to requiring law enforcement personnel to seek medical attention prior to arrival.
- Strip searches of work releasees occur in the work release corridor. While this location is generally out of sight from onlookers, it does present the opportunity for observation from persons passing by.
- It is admirable that the House of Correction has attempted to ensure ADA accessible housing by adapting the cell used for showering/changing new arrivals for this purpose. However, the location of this cell makes it extremely difficult to supervise an inmate housed in this area, and the cell does not meet many national standards for cells (e.g., access to natural light) nor does it satisfy the intent of ADA which is to allow persons with disabilities to be housed in the same living environment as persons who do not possess such disabilities.²⁶

4. Activity

- Inmates may participate in programs in either the dining room or the visiting area. This clearly limits the programs that can take place, as well as the hours available to inmates for visits. Inmates are afforded approximately one and a half hours of visiting each week.
- Work programs include some in-house work opportunities, inmate farm and work release. These programs are afforded to sentenced inmates only.
- Indoor and/or outdoor exercise is afforded for one hour, five days a week. National standards require one hour of exercise daily, however due to weekend sentence inmates being housed in the indoor gymnasium, the House of Correction does not offer indoor exercise Saturday and Sunday.
- Only one of two outdoor exercise yards is used, apparently due to staffing limitations. The additional outdoor secure yard is designated for inmate evacuation holding.
- The public defender and treatment program staff have indicated a need to provide treatment programs in the jail that would serve as a springboard for subsequent community based treatment. The consultant team supports treatment programming in the House of Correction because it takes advantage of inmate idle time, and research indicates that jail treatment programs with subsequent treatment in the community does have a significant impact on recidivism. The team adds caution to this practice since expanding programs in the jail may result in widening the net of offenders who may be held in the House of Correction (e.g., offender who could have been managed in a community treatment program would now be held in the House of Correction first to take advantage of an additional level of security). Both the public defender and the treatment staff did not believe this would be a significant concern.
- Community volunteers provide General Education Development programming. A computer-based learning center, consisting of three stations, is available but is generally not used because there is no one who is proficient in its use to assist inmate users.

²⁶ See, American Correctional Standards 3-ALDF-2C-13

- The workforce needs in the community appear to be high. According to the Chamber of Commerce, some businesses are relocating out of Cheshire County because they have a low application rate and low retention rate. Many of these positions have been and can be held by persons who are hard to place (e.g., ex-offenders), however they do not possess general life skills necessary to perform satisfactorily in the workforce (e.g., accepting instructions from supervisors; money management). There apparently is little or no community resistance to employing offenders, however the offenders do not possess the necessary life skills and there is no comprehensive program plan to address the needs.

5. Conditions

- Inmate management in the House of Correction is accomplished through intermittent supervision (staff perform "rounds" in the housing units) in both traditional linear design (cells lined in a row) and podular (cells surround a dayroom). A control center is positioned so that the staff has direct observation in the podular units. Some transactions occur through a transaction window between the control center and the housing unit. The linear cells house the segregation inmates in one area, and the sentenced inmates in another area. The dayrooms that support the unit are side by side but adjacent to the housing units. The dayrooms are directly visible from the control center but the housing cells are not camera monitored or supervised directly by staff. This practice raises a concern that the segregation inmates, who typically require the greatest amount of supervision, are in fact the inmates who receive the least amount of direct supervision.
- Many spaces are not currently being used for their intended purpose. The superintendent occupies an office in the booking area, not in the administrative suite.²⁷ The administrative suite is quite crowded and includes two offices, one of which is shared by two employees, and the staff locker room. A special management cell (used for inmates from booking who are being disruptive) is located across a corridor from the booking area. Because of the difficulty inherent in supervising this area, the team would not recommend the use of this space for housing/holding special management inmates, however it does illustrate the need for appropriate space both for housing and storage.
- National standards require single cells for maximum-security inmates.²⁸ As the facility is classifying all pre-trial inmates as "maximum" security, this would appear to be a departure from this standard. Medium and minimum custody inmates may be double-celled, providing the facility uses a risk-based classification system and employs direct supervision. Thus, the current facility and operations would seem to be non-compliant with both of these requirements. With respect to segregation areas, cell sizes are approximately 48 square feet, far below the standard of 70 square feet.²⁹
- Support space in general is limited, particularly with respect to administrative support space and storage. Inmate property is stored in lockers in the corridor between the visiting area and the administration and medical areas.

²⁷ The superintendent reported that this measure was taken to afford him greater access to facility operations. See: American Correctional Association Standards 3-ALDF 2C-01 (revised).

²⁸ See American Correctional Association Standards 3-ALDF 2C-01 (revised)

²⁹ See: American Correctional Association Standards 3-ALDF 2C-12 (revised).

6. Efficiency

- When inmates participate in outdoor exercise, an officer must be detailed to that area, regardless of the number of inmates participating. A small "guard house" has been constructed for staff to step out of the elements. During the on-site visit, the team observed an officer supervising one inmate in the outdoor exercise area. While exercise, including outdoor exercise, is a critical component of effective inmate management, the current configuration is not staff efficient, as it does not allow for passive supervision of inmates within a secure perimeter.
- The location of the property room, i.e., its distance from the intake and housing areas, results in officers having to leave their post to conduct clothing exchange and/or intake processing. During this activity, inmates in other areas of the facility are not being supervised, except, perhaps via camera monitoring.
- Due to facility housing limitations, the current classification system consists primarily of separations of:
 - males and females
 - sentenced from unsentenced (males only)
 - workforce from non-workforce (males only)

Additional classifications include the protective custody of unsentenced inmates vulnerable to attack. This classification criteria does not take into account the risk factors associated with offenders' previous history, current behavior and ties to the community.

- All inmates entering the House of Correction are fully intake processed, including data entry, fingerprinting and photographing. Many offenders are also processed at the local police station upon arrest. However, the lack of an integrated Wide Area Network (for sharing appropriate data) and the lack of full service police booking equipment at some of the local police facilities, results in the House of Correction duplicating the police booking process in some cases.
- Meals are provided at a cost of \$3.24³⁰ per meal. This is substantially higher than the national average of \$1.37³¹ per meal for a medium sized facility, particularly when inmates assist in the preparation of the food.
- The current staffing plan calls for 4 staff on the night shift and 5 staff on the day and evening shifts. Using a basic shift relief factor³² (the number of staff required to operate one post - accounting for days off, training and leave) of 5.1, more than 15 officers would be required to operate the 3 fixed posts of Central Control (2 officers) and Booking. The authorized correctional shift staffing, which includes supervisory and line staff, is 25 (currently only 21 of the available positions are filled). Even when fully staffed, less than ten correctional officers are available to

³⁰ Reported by Penny Vitale, Executive Assistant, Cheshire County Department of Corrections.

³¹ Criminal Justice Institute, Inc. The Corrections Yearbook, 1998

³² A shift relief factor is analogous to a budget document; it is a plan, based on a series of assumptions and historical data, for how many personnel are required to cover the agreed upon posts in the coming year. Like a budget document, a relief factor is comprised of many individual line items (absence categories) with a bottom line figure based on the assumptions underlying each of those items. The absence categories, to note a few, may include regular days off, sick, vacation, and military leave, training, special assignments. These absence categories acknowledge that when an employee assigned to a post is absent, another employee must be assigned to that post. A standard shift relief factor of 5.1 employees for each 24-hour post was considered here; however, it would be important for the CHOC to calculate the actual shift relief factor on an annual basis.

provide supervision to over 100 inmates on a 24 hour, 7 day a week basis. On the weekends, the gymnasium must also be supervised 24 hours a day, thus reducing the availability of staff to manage inmates whose security requirements are considerably greater. The per diem cost of jail operations is \$42.32.

7. Relationship with other Agencies

- The House of Correction enjoys an excellent relationship with other agencies. Agencies are permitted access to the facility for training purposes as scheduling permits.
- The House of Correction is operated with significant consideration of its role within the community. Repeatedly the team was informed of the access afforded the public and County agencies.

• Recommendations:

1. In light of the fact that all housing and most support areas of the existing CHOC are severely strained and very crowded, significant facility expansion is required to accommodate current and projected population levels.
2. Explore applying direct supervision management throughout the existing facility, and consider employing this approach in any new construction.
3. Implement the objective classification assessment instrument and classify inmates on the basis of their threat to the community and inside the facility and not solely on their court status.
4. Implement jail-based programming consistent with the needs outlined in the community (e.g., GED, employment, life skills, jail industries).
5. Evaluate existing programs and develop future inmate programs to ensure consistency with comparable community-based programs so inmates, upon release, can continue their treatment and skill development in the community.
6. Relocate the outdoor exercise area so it is not visible from the street.
7. House the work release inmates in the unit designed for that purpose. Pursue alternative housing for female offenders that would allow for appropriate separations based on classification and custody levels.
8. Provide for appropriate housing for inmates with disabilities in the housing area.
9. Provide two-way communication in all inmate housing and program areas or provide direct supervision by staff.
10. Ensure the facility perimeter is secure and provide interior security zones within which inmates can travel unescorted by staff.
11. Provide a shower and property exchange adjacent to the booking area.
12. Expand the medical unit to provide for appropriate storage of pharmaceuticals and records. Include an examination area that ensures privacy. Provide a waiting area with seating for inmates waiting to see medical staff. Provide dental care on a non-emergency basis.
13. Provide laundry services (washers and dryers) inside the CHOC including provisions for inmate workers.
14. Provide space for a complete food service operation at the CHOC. Consider contracting the food service operation.

15. Provide more appropriate program space for multi-purpose rooms, classrooms, and storage. Work with the local adult education program to provide teachers familiar with computer based learning. Consider relocating the computer based learning terminals to an area where inmates can use the equipment without requiring staff escort.
16. Provide appropriate housing (other than the gymnasium) if weekend offenders continue to be housed at the CHOC, to ensure inmate access to exercise on a daily basis.
17. Provide appropriate spaces for administration staff, support space and storage.

B. Physical Evaluation

This section of the Study describes physical aspects of the building and site that have not been fully described in the previous section as well as an analysis of the water and wastewater service of the complex.

1. General

- The existing correctional building consists of two wings, one designed in 1974 and the other in 1986. The wings are connected to form a single two-story building.
- The building is approximately 25,380 gross square feet. It is the primary correctional building that sits among a complex of other utilitarian structures that serve the maintenance and water/wastewater needs of the building.
- The structure of the building primarily consists of non-combustible construction with load-bearing concrete masonry units (CMU), concrete floors and roof, and a CMU veneer.

2. Housing Areas

- The 1974 portion of the building consists of two linear housing areas, one on the East Side of the building and one on the West Side.
- The "East Block," currently designated for segregation-classified inmates has 10 cells measuring approximately 6 ft. wide by 8 ft. deep (48 sq. ft.), arranged with 5 cells back-to-back on a utility chase. A corridor serves each row of 5 cells and views from the cells to the outside are across that corridor. A total of 10 inmates can be housed in the East Block.
- The "West Block," currently designated for minimum/medium sentenced inmates is configured similar to the East Block except there are 12 cells, 6 back-to-back; 8 of these 12 cells are 48 sq. ft., and the remaining 4 cells are 8 ft. wide by 8 ft. deep (64 sq. ft.). The 48 sq. ft. cells each have one inmate; the 64 sq. ft. cells each have 4 inmates for a total of 24 inmates.
- A small dormitory is assigned to four male work release inmates. This area includes a shower and toilet that is separated from the living area by a curtain. The location of this small dormitory for male work release inmates is problematic, as it requires these inmates to penetrate the perimeter of the facility and therefore poses the possibility of contraband being introduced. In addition, there is no visibility into this dormitory from the second floor control center.
- The small size of the cells has already been discussed in the preceding chapter of this Study.
- There is only one shower in each corridor of cells in both the East and West Blocks serving as few as 10 inmates and as many as 12. ACA Standards call for a minimum of one shower for every

eight inmates unless inmates have unlimited access to showers throughout the day³³, which in these cases, they do not.

- The 1986 portion of the building consists of one housing pod on the first floor for currently designated for female inmates, and two housing areas on the second floor that are pods on both the East and West Side of the building.
- The West Pod, currently designated for maximum-security pretrial inmates, consists of 12 double bunked cells, each approximately 64 sq. ft., for a total of 24 inmates. A dayroom is accessed directly from the cells.
- The East Pod, currently designated for maximum security pretrial inmates and inmates "bordering on protective custody, such as sex offenders," consists of 11 cells at 64 sq. ft., each double-bunked for a total of 22 inmates. A dayroom is accessed directly from the pods.
- There appears to be only one shower in each of the East and West pods, well below ACA standards.
- The first floor pod, currently designated for women, consists of 8 cells at 70 sq. ft. each. There is an average daily population of approximately eight females housed in the unit.

3. Life Safety

- Without a substantial evaluation of the building's construction and a thorough code search, neither within the scope of this Study, it is impossible to know if the building was designed and built in accordance with the codes in effect in 1986. However, our cursory observation is that there are no obvious violations of basic life safety codes.
- The means of egress and travel distances seem to be satisfactory as designed and built.
- The sprinkler system is designed to primarily service the housing areas, in particular the cells. Additions to the facility may trigger the need to upgrade the existing facility by either providing sprinklers throughout or separating areas with fire walls. In any case, a new addition to the facility would be required to be fully sprinklered.

4. Mechanical and Electrical Systems

- The Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning system was upgraded in 1986 and is reportedly serviced regularly. The quality of the air is reported to be satisfactory. Any substantial addition to the facility would require augmentation of the existing system and, most likely, separate heating and cooling systems dedicated to the addition(s).
- The plumbing system is in working order and well maintained. As reported above, the number of shower fixtures is below standards promulgated by the ACA; consideration should be given to adding showers.
- The electrical system is adequate for the needs of the existing facility; additional service would be required for substantial additions to the facility. There is no obvious sign of faulty fixtures or wiring; the systems appear to be in good repair and well maintained.

5. Description of Existing Utilities at Cheshire County Complex

³³ See, American Correctional Standards 3-ALDF-2C-10

- The Cheshire County House of Correction, located on River Road in Westmoreland, New Hampshire, is one component of the Cheshire County Complex. The entire complex consists of:
 - The House of Correction, with more than 100 inmates;
 - A dairy barn with 60 milking stalls and milk processing machines;
 - The Maplewood Nursing Home, a 150-bed nursing home; and
 - A 20-unit assisted living residential facility, associated with the Maplewood Nursing Home, serving a population of 40 residents.
- The entire Cheshire County Complex is served with its own public drinking water supply system and wastewater treatment system. This section of the report will describe the engineering basis-of-design and the operational capacity of the existing:
 - Water supply treatment, storage and distribution system and
 - Wastewater collection and treatment system.

The purpose for this evaluation is to identify any improvements needed to the existing infrastructure at the Cheshire County Complex should the House of Correction be expanded pursuant to the recommendations contained in this Study.

6. Water Supply Treatment and Distribution System:

- Potable water for the Cheshire County Complex is supplied by an intake in the Connecticut River. The water is treated through an on-site water treatment facility across the street from the jail and then distributed to all of the components of the Cheshire County Complex. Currently, water supply demand at the entire complex is approximately 28,000 gallons per day (GPD). However, the system has a total pumping and treatment capacity of 75,000 GPD. The water supply system, therefore, is currently averaging approximately 37% of its design capacity. At present, the system supplies water at an adequate volume and pressure.
- Once treated, water is then pumped to a 236,000 gallon storage tank located approximately 250 ft above the treatment facility. The steel tank, with a fused glass lining, is 42* in diameter by 24* high, the bottom elevation is set at 490.0' and the overflow elevation is set at 512.67'. The water level of the tank is never drawn below 495.5* to maintain 50,000 gallons per NFPA code for fire storage.
- In response to demand, water drains by gravity from the storage tank at elevation 490.5' through a 6" Class 52 ductile iron pipe. While the engineering design plans specified a 10" Class 52 ductile iron pipe, discussions with the Maintenance Department staff at the Cheshire County Complex identified that a 6" pipe had been installed during construction. Because of the high head generated by the tank, Berger does not anticipate that the 6" water main will need to be upgraded for normal use. However, the 6" could impact the ability to fight a fire at the complex. From this tank, water is supplied through the distribution system to the dairy barn, the Maplewood Nursing Home, the assisted living facility and the jail. Based upon a review of water meter records provided to Berger by the Maintenance Department staff, the total complex uses approximately 28,000 GPD or approximately 10 million gallons yearly.

7. Wastewater Collection and Treatment System:

- Currently, wastewater is collected through a gravity system and discharged into an aerated lagoon system located behind the jail near the east bank of the Connecticut River. The wastewater treatment facility is comprised of two lagoons but operated as a three-cell system consisting of:
 - A primary lagoon (number one) located furthest to the north;
 - The secondary lagoon (lagoon two) with a separation baffle creating the tertiary or polishing lagoon (lagoon three)

The treatment process is a Biolac Aeration System™ in lagoons one and two. All of the wastewater generated by the Cheshire County Complex is processed through a Muffin Monster™, an in-line grinder, prior to discharge to the aerated lagoons.

- In the event of problems or maintenance of the system, the wastewater flow can be bypassed to a manually cleaned screen by raising and lowering aluminum gates. From this point, wastewater is then discharged into the lagoons for treatment. After leaving the lagoons, the wastewater is treated with an ultra-violet (UV) disinfection system (Trojan Technologies, Inc.) and then directly discharged back into the Connecticut River.
- The aerated lagoon system is permitted by the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services (NHDES) at:
 - A design capacity of 40,000 GPD;
 - 5-day biochemical oxygen demand (BOD₅) loading of 280mg/l; and,
 - A total suspended solids (TSS) of 250 mg/l.

The lagoon system is designed with a total capacity of 40,000 GPD. At the present time, the approximate daily flow is 20,000 GPD, this represents approximately 50% of the design capacity.

- Louis Berger & Associates, Inc. contacted NHDES³⁴ to ascertain the Department's experience with the operation of the aerated lagoon system at the Cheshire County Complex. Although the NHDES representative was not immediately familiar with the design capacity of the facility, he was familiar with two significant operational issues:
 - A Dissolved Oxygen (DO) problem which periodically occurs; and,
 - A Total Suspended Solids (TSS) problem during the winter.

In particular, NHDES characterized the lagoon discharge as having an ongoing problem in the winter with TSS permit violations. These violations appear to be due to a filamentous bacteria that is present in the lagoons. The problem is unusual enough that the NHDES took samples and had them analyzed by a Colorado laboratory to confirm the presence of the filamentous bacteria.

- Of all of the aerated lagoons in the State of New Hampshire regulated by the NHDES, this bacteria has only been found twice:
 - At the Cheshire County Complex and, interestingly,
 - At the Merrimack County Complex.

This leads to speculation that they may be similar operations or that similar chemicals may be used at these facilities that negatively affect the treatment process. There has been no clear resolution of the problem and the NHDES anticipates that it will return again this winter.

- An additional problem is the wash-out of solids from the first lagoon, into the second lagoon,

³⁴ Telephone conversation with Wesley Ripple on July 29, 1999.

through the baffle and into the third lagoon where they deposit around the outlet pipe. Wash-out is defined as the migration of fine suspended solids through a treatment system that leads to undesirable impacts on the effluent quality. Ideally, the majority of solids should settle in the primary lagoon, for eventual physical removal. Wash-out aggravates the TSS problem occurring at the Cheshire County Complex wastewater treatment facility and is responsible for the permit violations. Surfactants (i.e. soaps, cleaning fluids or compounds) in the wastewater may be hindering settling of the solids. To counteract the wash-out problem, polymer chemicals have been added to the wastewater to attempt to obtain better settling and, therefore, higher effluent discharge quality. However, this effort has not proved to be successful in the recent past.

- Because the first lagoon is approximately one-half the size of the second lagoon, there was initial speculation that the new Biolac Aeration System was causing the wash-out. One of the aeration headers was shut off with little impact on the TSS problem. NHDES noted that the original lagoon system was three cell and that the third (polishing) cell had filled up with solids. This history indicates a problem other than the aeration system.
- Associated with the TSS violations has been a low Dissolved Oxygen (DO) content. Profile analysis has found DO's of 5 mg/l at the surface and only 1 mg/l at the bottom of the lagoons. This is not common in aerated lagoons during winter operations. It is even more surprising in light of the new aeration system that is designed to overcome this type of problem. It is NHDES' opinion that the filamentous bacteria and the DO problems are related. However, the NHDES' Operations Division has not yet been successful in helping the County Farm to resolve the issues.
- On occasion, the wastewater treatment facility operator at the Cheshire County Complex has observed a significant drop in DO move through the system. At this time, little is known about that issue. However, high strength dairy wastes or industrial cleaners (i.e. floor strippers, etc.) can cause DO drops. This issue needs to be more fully explored in order to determine whether or not the wastewater treatment facility can be expanded to accommodate an increase in the population served by the jail.

8. Existing Utility Capacity to Serve the Cheshire County Complex

- The existing water system capacity, without any change in equipment or process technology, is 75,000 GPD; the current operating demand of the Complex is approximately 28,000 GPD. Approximately 37% of the system capacity is presently utilized. The unutilized capacity is 47,000 GPD. Assuming 120 GPD/per person, the water system can accommodate an increase in the House of Correction population of approximately 390 inmates. This is equivalent to a total inmate population of approximately 490 inmates.
- The existing wastewater treatment facility capacity without any change in equipment or process technology is 40,000 GPD. The current daily demand is approximately 20,000 GPD. Because of existing operational problems and effluent discharge violations, NHDES has stated that future expansion will be reviewed closely and, based on that review, may not be permitted until the current operational problems are resolved.
- Assuming these problems are resolved, the remaining available capacity is 20,000 GPD. This capacity can accommodate an increase in the jail population of approximately 165 inmates, or a total population of approximately 250 inmates.

9. Site

- The proximity to the Cheshire County Correctional Facility to River Road presents two problems:
 - Future expansion of the jail cannot occur to the east since the existing road is within 50' of the building;
 - Security of the inmates is compromised since traffic comes so close to the exercise yard.

To address these issues, relocation of the road east of the water treatment building may be desirable in the future. While not an immediate need, it represents a long -term improvement to the facility. The existing bridge over the adjacent stream may be approaching its design life and planned to be replaced in the future. At that time, relocation of the bridge to a more easterly alignment upstream of its present location will present an opportunity to relocate the road and improve the existing geometry along River Road.

10. Recommendations and Cost Estimate for Sewer and Water Expansion

- According to data received from the Cheshire County Farm maintenance personnel, there is adequate water treatment capacity. Therefore, no costs are anticipated to be associated with an expansion of the House of Correction.
- The wastewater treatment lagoons are designed to handle the increased flows of the jail's expansion, although there are some operational issues that need to be addressed. Since there is design capacity in the lagoons, it is possible that the expansion would not result in the need for construction of an additional lagoon. In that case, only the UV disinfection unit would have to be upgraded. It is recommended that a study to resolve the operational problems and assess the need to upgrade the lagoons be conducted. Such a study might cost approximately \$100,000.
- If the study is conducted and the only solution to the operational problems is the construction of an additional lagoon, the cost of this would likely be approximately \$500,000. This cost would include the upgrade of the UV disinfection system.

III Assessment of Population Management Utilization

Policy decisions regarding the confinement of offenders can impact the jail-bed need as much or more than increased crime rates. This section addresses jail bed needs in terms of these policy decisions (e.g., who should or should not be incarcerated and for how long?).

A. Case Processing

- The current process of having bail commissioners establish release conditions, i.e., set cash bail, personal recognizance, etc., appears to be working well with the vast majority of arrestees securing release before being booked at the CHOC or shortly thereafter.
- CHOC provides the courts with weekly and monthly lists of in-custody defendants indicating how long they have been detained awaiting trials. The County Attorney and judges and clerks of both District and Superior Courts appear to be responsive to these lists and attempt to ensure that in-custody cases do not languish.
- Representatives of the criminal justice system indicated that excessive continuances were not a

significant problem affecting the length of pre-trial detention. Although delays do sometimes occur because, for example, the Public Defender is responsible for serving three counties and occasionally is faced with schedule conflicts, this does not appear to be a significant problem.

- There are some reports that offenders sentenced to and received at the State Prison often have a considerable amount of pre-trial incarceration credit. The result is that some inmates transferred to the prison are immediately eligible for a community release program.

B. Pre-trial Detention Alternatives

- The current pre-trial detention process suffers from being overly reliant on financial-based release mechanisms i.e., bail. Not only does this traditional approach discriminate against persons who are poor; it also results in significantly higher numbers of persons being detained prior to trial than is the case when alternative systems are employed. Moreover, release on bail offers the courts and the community no control over the defendant's activities between their release and case disposition.

- The courts do attempt to supplement bail releases or personal recognizance releases with additional conditions, e.g., drug testing, curfews, check-ins with local police departments. However, there are no formalized programs for this and there is a lack of confidence in the integrity of such efforts due to the lack of a clear responsible entity to track compliance with such conditions. In addition, to the degree that such conditions are imposed on top of financial requirements, this still raises the questions associated with defendants remaining in custody simply because they are poor.

- Although it appears that judges have statutory authority to use electronic monitoring as a pre-trial release condition, they do not do so because of questions about that statutory authority and because they are not confident that the resources are available to adequately ensure compliance.

- Many key policy makers expressed a desire to have additional options available to ensure the appearance of defendants in court beyond incarceration and financial based techniques. The key barriers to these appear to be a current lack of financial resources and the absence of a single entity to coordinate such services and ensure compliance with release conditions.

- Several key members of the criminal justice system expressed strong confidence in the capabilities of the local Probation and Parole Office in their capacity of "officers of the court." Judges do occasionally request assistance from this office with respect to pre-trial supervision, but are hesitant to do so more frequently because they are aware of the office's limited resources.³⁵

- The daily cost of incarcerating a defendant on a pre-trial basis is approximately \$43.³⁶ Thus, if an individual spends four months in custody awaiting trial, the cost to the County for his/her room, board, care and custody will exceed \$5,000. Community-based pre-trial supervision certainly can be achieved at a significantly lower cost than this. For example, the daily cost of supervising

³⁵ That office currently has only two, full-time probation officers plus a supervisor who is available less than 25% of the time for local responsibilities.

³⁶ The total 1999 Cheshire County DOC budget is \$1.637 million. This equates to \$44.86 per day based on an average daily population of 100. The 10 Federal prisoners held for the Marshals result in offsetting payments of approximately \$200,000. The per diem cost excluding these prisoners is approximately \$43.75 (\$1.637 million minus \$200,000 divided by 90 inmates). Source: 1999 Cheshire County Budget.

defendants in the community-based Academy Program is \$5.75³⁷.

• **Recommendations:**

1. Criminal justice policy makers should reach a consensus that alternatives to financial release should be used whenever possible.
2. A supervised pre-trial release program should be implemented to include an assessment process, electronic monitoring, house arrest, drug testing, drug/alcohol treatment, and day reporting.
3. The supervised pre-trial release program should be operated under the aegis of the local Probation and Parole office. This office is already established to provide community supervision, has the confidence of the judiciary and local police departments, and can provide such supervision at a lower cost than if any other entity were to do so because of the economies of scale and expertise that can be realized when combined with its responsibilities to provide pre-sentence investigations and probation supervision which provides them more clear information as to the offender's stability in the community. In addition, the law enforcement authority of Probation Officers enables them to make arrests and return a defendant to jail pending a hearing in the event of a program violation.
4. Funding for additional staff and other resources for the pre-trial release program should be sought from the State and from the County Board of Commissioners.
5. Protective custody holds should be referred to Marathon House whenever possible. Statutory authority should be sought to allow detoxification centers to detain such persons involuntarily upon order of a bail commissioner.
6. Statutory clarification should be sought regarding the use of electronic monitoring for pre-trial supervision.

C. Sentencing Options

- The primary sentencing options available to the courts, beyond traditional probation supervision, are work release, weekend sentences, and the Cheshire Academy.
- The Cheshire Academy is a state funded program designed to provide treatment and supervision of non-violent offenders as they are reintegrated back into the community. The program offers such services as day reporting, drug testing and skills development in conjunction with a probation sentence. Probation officers have the authority to violate program participants who fail to comply with conditions and return them to jail pending a hearing that must occur within 10 days. This program has the confidence of the judiciary.
- The Academy is in the process of expanding the program to include misdemeanor offenders.
- Judges are not using electronic monitoring because of questions concerning statutory authority and responsibility for supervision.
- Only a small number of offenders are on work release (there are generally 2-3 work releasees on the program at any time). Judges report that they are not using this option more extensively because of concerns about logistics associated with the facility's Westmoreland location, and

³⁷ Interview with Jan Manwaring, Academy Program

because they are not confident that the resources are available to ensure program compliance when offenders are outside the facility at their work locations (i.e., are they where they are supposed to be?). In addition, there is a sensitivity that work release participants still require a bed and thus may not positively affect crowding at the facility. The amount of revenue generated through room and board costs (\$9,980 in 1998)³⁸ does not offset the cost of operating the program.

- Judges are not using community service because of concerns about compliance monitoring and supervision and lack of probation resources.
- Judges believe that alternative sentences should be proactively recommended by other criminal justice system actors including the Defense Counsel and Public Defender, Probation and Parole, and CHOC Superintendent.
- Weekend sentences, employed by District Court judges, represent a management challenge to the House of Correction as it is currently configured. This is because of the lack of appropriate bed space for this population and the insufficient staff resources to supervise these additional offenders. Moreover, these weekend sentences result in a decrease in the services and programs that could otherwise be afforded to other confined arrestees (e.g., daily exercise).
- With only two full-time Probation Officers, the resources of that agency are severely strained.
- Two programs previously operated by probation and parole have been discontinued or severely limited due to the lack of resources—"Kickstart" offers services similar to the Cheshire Academy but targets District Court sentenced offenders and, "SMILE" was a house arrest program serving both District and Superior Courts, with probation officers and local police working cooperatively to insure necessary supervision. The per diem cost of the Academy program is \$5.75 which is supported by the Probation and Parole Office which provides supervision and arrest authority for program violators.

• **Recommendations:**

1. Criminal justice policy makers should reach a consensus that alternatives to incarceration should be used whenever possible.
2. Probation and Parole should be assigned the primary responsibility for coordinating and operating alternative sentences for both the District and Superior Courts.
3. Funding for additional staff and other resources for the Probation and Parole office in Cheshire County should be sought from the State and from the County Board of Commissioners.
4. The Academy Program should be expanded to serve additional categories and increased number of defendants.
5. Statutory clarification should be sought regarding the use of electronic monitoring as an alternative sanction.
6. Work release offers the potential for a legitimate sentencing option if (1) the CHOC can acquire the necessary staff resources to ensure judges that offenders will be adequately supervised outside of the facility, and (2) the CHOC can reassign space originally designed for

³⁸ Summary of Revenue for 12 months of 1998. Dated 3/1/99.

this purpose but presently dedicated to a small number of female offenders. This program should be operated by the CHOC.

7. Weekend sentences do not represent a viable sentencing option at this time and should not be looked to in the future due to the expense of supervising and building space for this low risk population. Shock incarceration (a short jail sentence of one week or less) combined with a community sanction such as home incarceration or community service serves the same purpose and, in fact, may actually be perceived to be more punitive by offenders who may become accustomed to the weekend sentences as time goes on.

D. Miscellaneous Issues

1. Criminal Justice System Coordination and Cooperation

- The County is fortunate to have many fair minded and dedicated criminal justice officials who approach their work in an objective manner. These individuals are anxious to find solutions to criminal justice system problems and universally express a desire to have "additional tools" with which to perform their functions.
- Previous efforts to develop a coordinated strategy for making the County's criminal justice system operate in a fair, effective and efficient manner have not worked due to the lack of a formal mechanism to do so. Most efforts have been ad hoc, sparked by State grant programs, or suffered from lack of full funding to provide both supervision and treatment.
- An informal group consisting of the County Attorney, Judges, Victims/Witness representatives, District Court staff, Probation and Parole staff, and others who deal with persons in the criminal justice system, has been meeting to discuss alternative sentences and other related issues. This effort is to be commended.
- Efforts to analyze the jail population, for purposes of designing alternative programs or expediting case processing, are hampered by a lack of automated data. This proved to be a formidable obstacle to the consultants in developing population projections reflecting possible policy shifts. Current efforts to develop an automated, integrated jail management information system are commendable and will make this process far more accessible for policy makers once completed by the end of 1999.

- **Recommendations:**

1. The informal group should be formalized into a "Criminal Justice Coordinating Council," with monthly meetings, a revolving chair and staff resources provided by the member agencies on a rotating basis. The Council should use this report and others that have preceded it to develop an agenda and work to develop unified policy positions and coordinated approaches to solving problems. Moreover, all criminal justice initiatives, grants, etc., should be funneled through this entity.
2. Current efforts to develop an automated jail management information system should be fully funded through internal County budgets or via grant funding from the State.

2. Classification

- With a current rated capacity of 47, and design capacity of 59, the CHOC is presently housing in excess of 100 inmates. Despite the addition of many beds since 1996, there is widespread double-celling at the facility due to the large number of inmates and the need to assign bed space to inmates based on various classification criteria.
- Jail facilities typically cannot operate beyond 85% of capacity before crowding in certain areas occurs due to the difficulties inherent in maintaining all of the necessary classification separations. For example, an empty cell in a segregation unit cannot be filled with a general population inmate; an empty bed in a male pre-trial unit cannot be filled by a female; etc. Thus, while some units are double celled and crowded, others (e.g., the first floor female unit) are operating with several vacant cells.
- Current classifications include males and females, sentenced and pre-trial, male work release, male segregation, male pre-trial protective custody.

- **Recommendation:**

The CHOC should refocus its classification system to reflect custody status more than the current pre-trial vs. sentenced dichotomy. This would result in some additional flexibility regarding cell assignments.

3. Protective custody³⁹

- A substantial percentage (23% in 1998) of CHOC admissions are comprised of protective custody holds⁴⁰. Consistent with State law⁴¹, these persons are taken into custody by police officers due to concerns about their safety or that of others due to the degree to which they are intoxicated. Although they have not been charged with any criminal offense, and despite the fact that the law allows for them to be brought to an emergency room or detoxification facility, they are typically taken to jail where they may remain for up to 24 hours.
- Police officials report that officers typically make an effort to take the individual home when feasible, but will generally not use the emergency room option (due to the fact that the officer would be required to remain with the individual while there) or the detoxification facility option (Marathon House in Keene does not have the authority to detain anyone who attempts to leave after the officer has departed).
- Despite their relatively short stay, once in the CHOC booking area, these individuals often present a significant threat of suicide and are frequently disruptive due to their intoxicated state. CHOC staff does take an aggressive approach in attempting to make arrangements for such persons to be picked up by a family member or otherwise returned home without compromising public safety or that of the individual.

Recommendation:

1. Refer protective custody holds to Marathon House whenever possible. Statutory authority

³⁹ The average daily population of the facility in 1998 was 99.7, including 10 Federal inmates. Source: Cheshire County Department of Corrections 1998 Annual Report.

⁴⁰ Source: Cheshire County Department of Corrections 1998 Annual Report

⁴¹ New Hampshire statute 172-B: 3.

should be sought to allow detoxification centers to detain such persons involuntarily upon order of a bail commissioner.

2. Federal Prisoners

- Approximately 10% of the CHOC'S average daily population is comprised of Federal prisoners being held for the U.S. Marshals based in Concord, NH and Brattleboro, Vermont. These inmates are held pursuant to an informal arrangement whereby the Marshals pay the CHOC a daily per diem rate and the facility agrees to house the inmates if the superintendent is satisfied that the inmate does not present an unacceptable custody risk or other issues that would complicate the facility's operations.
 - The superintendent retains the right to demand that the Federal prisoners be removed should their behavior compromise the facility or in the event that an appropriate bed space is not available.
 - State law requires that the superintendent house Federal prisoners when requested to do so by Federal authorities.⁴²
 - The U.S. Marshal Service has indicated that there will continue to be a need for bed space.
 - Eliminating the Federal prisoners will not eliminate the need for an increase in the number beds projected in the future.
- **Recommendation:**
1. Continue to accept Federal prisoners to offset the operating cost of the facility to fill vacant beds.

IV Jail Bed Projections

- Jail population forecasts for the Cheshire County Department of Correction were produced using the Prophet Simulation Model. The Prophet Simulation model is an example of a stochastic entity simulation model. It is stochastic in the sense that the model is conceptually designed around the movement of individual cases (offenders) into, through, and out of correctional populations defined by the user. The model also makes use of the Monte Carlo simulation techniques by adding an element of randomness to the simulation model. Random numbers are generated and used by the simulation process to determine the offender group composition and lengths of stay associated with a system. Individual cases are processed by the model through a series of probability distribution arrays or matrices that provide computations for specific cases. When loaded with accurate data, this model will mimic the flow of offenders through a jail system and produce accurate, dependable forecasts.
- The forecasted populations are composed of (1) cases confined at the beginning of the simulation, and (2) cases admitted to the jail population at any point after the start of the simulations. The existing offender population and new offender admissions are modeled separately. By disaggregating a system in this manner, the user can adjust each of these sub-

⁴² New Hampshire statute 30-B:4

populations without altering the process of other sub-groups. This is particularly significant for completing "what-if simulations on the forecasted population.

- In order to build a prophet based simulation model, data must be collected on the system in question and a series of offender profile statistics must be generated. A data set was collected from County officials from what is referred to as the yearly "Register." This data set contained demographic and descriptive information on all offenders processed through the Cheshire County jail system from January 1-June 30,1999. It should be noted, this was the only data source available from the County and, as will be described in the recommendations, provided a very limited amount of information on which to build this forecast. Summaries of the offender population data analyzed are found in the tables that follow.

General Demographic Information

Age Group N=554		
Under 20	157	28.3%
20-25	78	14.1%
26-30	86	15.5%
31-35	68	12.3%
36-40	69	12.5%
41-45	39	7%
46 and over	57	10.3%
Employment		
Employed	329	59.4%
Unemployed	225	40.6%
Education		
High School or less	358	64.6%
College or more	109	19.7%
Missing	87	15.7%
Gender		
Male	491	88.6%
Female	63	11.4%
Marital Status		
Married	109	19.7%
Single	384	69.3%
Divorced	61	11.0%
Committing State		
New Hampshire	442	79.8%
Vermont	56	10.1%
Other	31	5.6%
Maine	25	4.5%
Top Five Committing cities		
Keene	157	28.3%

Cheshire County New Hampshire
Feasibility Study
House of Correction
Final Report
Pulitzer/Bogard & Associates, LLC

Winchester	39	7.0%
Jaffrey	29	5.0%
W. Swanzey	19	3.4%
Hinsdale	13	2.3%

Admission and Release Characteristics

Sentenced/Unsentenced Offender		N=554
Sentenced	182	32.9
Unsentenced	372	67.1
Bailed at release		
Bailed	219*	39.5
Not Bailed	335	60.5
Type of Charge/Reason for Detention		
Federal Hold	21	3.8%
Felony Charge	83	15.0%
Misdemeanor Charge	231	41.7%
Protective Custody	107	19.3%
Missing Data	112	20.2%
Most Serious Charge		
Violent	46	8.3%
Drugs	32	5.8%
Federal Hold	24	4.3%
Property	41	7.4%
Motor Vehicle Related	42	7.6%
Other nonviolent	125	22.6%
Bench Warrant	21	3.8%
Protective Custody	109	19.7%
Violation of Parole/Probation	114	20.6%

Release Reason		
Bailed	46	8.3%
Discharged	317	57.2%
Sentenced	454	81.9%
Other	55	9.9%
Missing Data	91	16.4%

Advanced Admission and Length of Stay Characteristics

Length of Stay > a day		N=554
1 day or less	265	47.8%

**Cheshire County New Hampshire
Feasibility Study
House of Correction
Final Report**
Pulitzer/Bogard & Associates, LLC

Greater than 1 day	289	52.2
Average LOS for greater than one day 22.5 days		

LOS by type of charge		
Violent		N=46
1 Day or Less	14	30.4%
Greater Than 1 Day	32	69.6%
Average LOS for Greater Than 1 Day 23.6 days		
Non-Violent		W=375
1 Day or Less	134	35.7%
Greater Than 1 Day	241	64.3%
Average LOS for Greater Than 1 Day 22.7 days		
Protective Custody		N=109
1 Day or Less	106	97.2%
Greater Than 1 Day	3	2.8%
Average LOS for Greater Than 1 Day 1.5 days		
Federal Hold		N=24
1 Day or Less	11	45.8%
Greater Than 1 Day	13	54.2%
Average LOS for Greater Than 1 Day 20.4 days		

Demographics

- As seen in the demographic characteristic table, over one half of all cases processed in the Cheshire County system are under the age of 30. An observed 28.3 percent are under the age of 20.
- Just over 40 percent of cases processed are unemployed at the time of admission. Compared to the National average rate of 50-55 percent, this would imply an overall high employment rate for Cheshire County.
- In contrast, 65 percent of all cases processed have only been educated to the high school or less level. This is fairly comparable to the National average of 70 percent.
- Approximately 11.4 percent of all cases processed are female and 88.6 percent male.
- The largest committing state, appropriately, is New Hampshire making up 79.8 percent of cases, followed by Vermont making up 10.1 percent of cases and Maine making up 4.5 percent of cases.
- The top five cities contributing the most number of cases into the system are Keene with 28.3 percent of cases, Winchester with 7.0 percent of cases, Jaffrey with 5.2 percent of cases, W Swanzey with 3.4 percent of cases and Hinsdale with 2.3 percent of cases.

Admission, Release and Length of Stay Characteristics

- As seen in the admission and release characteristics table, the majority of offenders processed through the system are unsentenced and are subsequently bailed at release, 39.5 percent. This gives evidence that the Cheshire County House of Correction is mostly

utilized for offenders awaiting bail release.

- The majority of processed offenders are also held for misdemeanor charges, 41.7 percent. Approximately 15 percent are held for felony charges and 3.8 percent are held for federal charges. Protective custody holds make up 19.3 percent of cases processed, although these cases stay less than one day. As the table shows, there is a significant number of cases missing information regarding the severity of their charges, 20.2 percent of the data set collected.
- In general, non-violent crimes make up the overwhelming majority of cases processed, 67.9 percent of admissions. Within the non-violent category, other non-violent crimes make up the largest sub-group, 30 percent of non-violent, followed by violations of parole and/or probation, 30 percent, and property crimes, 11 percent.
- Violent crimes make up only approximately 8.3 percent of admissions. This would imply the jail population within Cheshire County is made up of non-violent, lower-risk offenders.
- As seen in the length of stay table, approximately 47.8 percent of all cases processed do not stay for more than 1 day (a 24 hour clock). This would imply these cases neither leave an "intake" or "reception center" and are released immediately after being booked. The cases are most likely never assigned an official bed or cell. Approximately 40 percent of these cases are protective custody holds.
- The average length of stay for cases that stay longer than one day is an average of 22.5 days with a maximum of 159.2 days. As seen in the table, there is not a significant difference between the length of stay for violent, non-violent and federal offenders.

Baseline and Alternative Forecasts

Utilizing the data and the Prophet Simulation model, a baseline forecast and three alternative forecasts have been produced. These forecasts are presented in the table that follows. A summary of the assumptions built into each of the forecasts also follows.

Projected House of Correction Population

Calendar Year	Baseline Forecast	Scenario #1 Pre trial policy	Scenario #2 Post Conviction Policy	Scenario #3 Combined Policy
1999	106	106	106	106
2000	117	112	111	100
2001	129	110	121	104
2002	141	117	132	110
2003	152	124	154	121
2004	157	134	147	123
2005	160	137	154	131
2006	167	140	151	131
2007	172	142	162	136
2008	180	151	171	142

2009	189	166	179	153
2010	202	177	190	161

Baseline Forecast

- The baseline forecast presented assumes there will be no changes in current policy or practice within the Cheshire County system that will affect future populations.
- The average length of stay within the jail is assumed to remain constant at an average of 22.5 days. The profile of offenders processed through the system (sentenced versus unsentenced, admitting charge, etc.) will remain unchanged over the forecast period.
- An admissions assumption, the projected number of admissions that will enter the system in future years, was developed based on trends reported by Cheshire County for the period of 1994-1998.
- During this time period, the number of admissions into the jail grew from 980 cases in 1994 to 1,274 cases in 1998. This represents an average growth of 7.0 percent per year. Since 1996, however, admissions have only grown by an average of 5.353 percent per year.
- The admissions assumption built into the baseline forecast and all three alternative scenarios assume the number of cases processed by Cheshire County will increase by 7.0 percent per year through 2005 and then increase by 5.4 percent per year through the end of the forecast horizon.

Alternative Scenarios

- Scenario #1 assumes 50 percent of all misdemeanor unsentenced offenders and 50 percent of all unsentenced non-violent offenders will be released to a supervised pre-trial release program after serving 5-7 days within the jail system.
- Scenario #2 assumes 20 percent of all sentenced non-violent offenders will be diverted from serving time within the jail to alternative sentencing options. It is assumed 22 percent of these offenders will recidivate these programs and be returned to the jail to serve their sentence.
- Scenario #3 assumes the combined conditions of scenario #1 and scenario #2 for the maximum impact on the population.

V Impact of Projections/Policy Options

- Baseline jail population projections indicate that the Cheshire County House of Correction population could well double to an average of 202 by the year 2010. When classification factors are added, i.e., accounting for gender and custody stratifications, this would require the addition of approximately 160 beds based on an assessment that the design capacity of the facility is currently 59.
- Alternatively, commitment by policy makers to adopt the key population management recommendations contained in this report could decrease the 2010 population projection to 161. This suggests the need for construction of approximately 120 additional beds based on the current design capacity of 59.

- Adoption of the key population management recommendations presented in this report could potentially decrease the 2010 population projection by up to 20%. There is, however, less than universal acceptance of this notion among County officials. As such, the County Administrator and Jail Superintendent have opted to recommend to legislative leaders that the construction be geared to the baseline forecast, while parallel efforts occur to attempt to implement suggestions for decreased bed needs. Should implementation of these population management recommendations result in reduced numbers of Cheshire County inmates, it is highly likely that the County can continue to lease excess beds to the U.S. Marshal Service. This will generate substantial revenue to the County, largely offsetting any operating cost increases associated with the larger facility and higher inmate population. At the same time, this allows the County to maintain expansion potential for its own jail population needs for the future.

Capital Plan Recommendations and Preliminary Project Costs

A. Preliminary Space Requirements

- Square footage assumptions on the below table are based on other comparable facilities that P/BA has programmed. They represent an order of magnitude estimate for a 220-250 bed jail based on national standards, sound practices, and preliminary assessments of actual Cheshire County needs. These figures are to be used only for purposes of this Feasibility Study and the preliminary architectural program, design concept and cost estimate. A comprehensive programming process, including extensive interviews of facility staff and inventory of existing space utilization is required to prepare a detailed and accurate space program and this is beyond the present scope of work.
- The planning assumptions underlying this program are as follows:
 1. The 160 new beds would be general population male beds designed around direct supervision principles.
 2. The existing 59 beds (design capacity) would generally be used for segregation, special populations, work release, females and U.S. Marshal's prisoners.
 3. Support services and infrastructure are planned for a total population of 250.
 4. Food and laundry will be done on-site, with the assistance of inmate labor to lower current costs. These facilities could service other county agencies.
- Existing non-housing areas are to be matched against the gross square footage in the above functional areas to identify the actual new construction required for the expansion. Actual new construction may be significantly less than the 76,010 gross square feet figure shown above, depending on the extent to which existing space can be reused or retrofitted.

Cheshire County House of Correction Preliminary Space Program

Area#	Function	Gross S.F.	Components
1.000	Public Lobby/ Administration	4,000	Administration and visitor processing
2.000	Staff Support	3,000	Staff locker rooms, physical fitness area, training/roll call room and training offices

Cheshire County New Hampshire
Feasibility Study
House of Correction
Final Report
Pulitzer/Bogard & Associates, LLC

3.000	Security	2,200	Central control, key shop, armory, security
4.000	Visitation	3,000	Contact and non-contact visitation, attorney and other professional visits, video court.
5.000	Booking/release	6,000	Booking and release/ transfer, inmate property, open and secure holding. Provide 2400 sq. ft. vehicle sally port as a drive through garage.
6.000	Program Services	7,000	Academic education, vocational training, religious services space, library (use existing gymnasium), jail
7.000	Health Services	2,500	Medical clinic, dental and four patient beds.
8.000	Housing (160 new beds)	26,500	One 32 cell pod @ 7700 sq. ft. (initially single celled but expandable to 64 through double celling); two pods with double cells to house 64 inmates each @ 9400 sq. ft. Adjacent outdoor exercise yards @1500 sq. ft. for each pod (not included in total S.F.)
9.000	Food/Laundry Services	6,900	Laundry, kitchen with 3-4 days storage in kitchen, staff dining room.
10.000	Facility Management	8,000	Includes central warehouse (dry goods, 30 day freezer/cooler storage, supplies), maintenance shops, and central mechanical
	Building gross	6,910	Includes 10% building gross for major circulation, mechanical and electrical rooms, shafts, building skin.
	TOTAL	76,010	

B. Preliminary Design Approach

- As described above, this Feasibility Study recommends a 76,010 square foot expansion of the CHOC. This expansion provides 160 new beds in three general population housing units, bringing the facility's design capacity to 219.⁴³ To support the significant bed increase, all non-housing areas of the facility must also be expanded to accommodate additional administration, food services, laundry, programs, visiting, storage, medical, and other support requirements. Moreover, it is cost-effective to plan facility infrastructure (utilities and central support functions) to accommodate approximately 20-25% future population growth beyond the year 2010 so that additional bed space could be built without having to also add support for those beds. In effect, the recommended expansion represents a four-five fold increase in inmate capacity, and therefore a concomitant increase in overall facility needs.

- Design Guidelines should include the following:**

- Reuse of Existing Building

The existing two-story jail should remain in use and be integrated into the facility expansion. Key

⁴³ One housing area would be designed to expand from 32-64 beds through "planned" double celling. This would increase the total rated capacity to 251.

features of the building reuse should include:

- Retention of as many existing cells as possible.
- Redesign and expansion of the Booking/Release area to satisfy the full program requirement.
- Adaptive reuse of the existing dining/serving, library, and property storage areas to a single program use observable by the existing control station.
- Possible expansion of the existing gymnasium to satisfy the program requirements.

2. Location of the Expansion Facilities

The areas to the west and north of the existing jail, currently used for farming, seem to be the best locations for expansion of the existing facility. Substantial building area, security perimeter zone and parking will be required, and the areas to the east and south are constrained by the existing sewage treatment lagoons, Partridge Brook and River Road. There may need to be demolition of some existing utilitarian buildings, including a barn and garage to the north, but these seem to be underutilized and unrelated to the mission of the correctional facility.

3. Security Perimeter Zone

The new facility, including the existing jail, new expansion facilities, outdoor recreation, and service zone should be enclosed in a perimeter security zone consisting of two security fences, an electronic surveillance/intrusion detection system, and a patrol road.

4. Entrances to the Facility

The facility should have entrances limited to two locations- one for pedestrians (visitors and staff) and one for vehicles. The pedestrian entry should be located adjacent to a new parking area. The vehicular entry should be via vehicle sallyport to a new service area, preferably off River Road.

5. Parking

Parking should be designed to accommodate the maximum anticipated number of staff (including shift change staff) and visitors. The parking should be located near the main public entry to the facility, and staff parking should be separate from visitors.

6. Vehicle Service Area

A new service area should be created for all vehicles entering via the secure perimeter zone. Deliveries for the kitchen, laundry, and maintenance facilities, as well as trash trucks, emergency vehicles, and inmate escort vans, will need to access this area. Accordingly, the building functions related to these uses, such as food and laundry services, maintenance, and booking/release, should be adjacent to the service zone.

7. Housing Pods

New housing units should consist of direct supervision pods, each pod with 80 square feet cells arranged on two levels (ground floor and mezzanine) adjacent to a dayroom. Housing program rooms, showers, and outdoor recreation for each pod should be located off each pod dayroom. The plan for each pod should be organized to provide clear visibility by the pod officer of all cell fronts, the dayroom, program rooms, showers, and outdoor exercise.

The housing pods should be located on the site so that there is the least opportunity for inmates to come in contact, visually or verbally, with the public. Also, cells should be oriented so that there is the least opportunity for inmates to view each other from cell to cell.

8. Central Control

A new Central Control Room should be provided adjacent to the Public Lobby with the ability for

a control room officer to monitor visitors and staff entering the facility, as well as control essential security functions of the institution.

9. Visiting

A new visiting area will be required adjacent to the public lobby. Visitors will enter the secure area of the facility from the Public Lobby by Central Control to meet with inmates either in non-contact visitor booths or a contact visiting room.

10. Program Functions

New education, counseling, medical services, food service, commissary, and central exercise facilities should all be located separate, but convenient to, the housing units. We recommend that all these functions be interconnected by a common corridor at one level for effective surveillance of inmate movement and rapid officer response in the event of emergency.

C. Preliminary Project Costs

The preliminary estimated total project costs associated with this significant long-term facility expansion plan are \$14-\$15 million. These costs must be refined through a subsequent detailed programming and schematic design phase that will address specific facility requirements in significantly more detail than is possible via this feasibility study. This range is dependent on such factors as the degree to which the existing facility can be reused as is, or through retrofitting, the result of more detailed wastewater treatment engineering, and more detailed space programming and analysis.

Preliminary project costs have been developed with input from contractors involved in correctional construction in New Hampshire and based on the experience of Equus Design Group and P/BA.

PRELIMINARY PROJECT BUDGET

1 . Construction Cost: 76,010 g.s.f. x \$135.00/sf	=	\$10,261,250
2. Escalation: Two years at 5%/ year compounded	=	1,051,790
Sub-Total:		\$11,313,140
1 .Wastewater Treatment (Assumes study and the construction of additional lagoon)		
	=	\$ 600,000
Sub-Total:	=	\$11,913,140
Design & Construction Contingency® 10%	=	\$1,191,310
TOTAL CONSTRUCTION:		\$13,104,450
Other Project Costs		
1. A/E Fees: Includes Programming and Design at 7%		\$917,310
2. Furniture, Fixtures & Equipment (FF&E) at 5%		\$ 655,220
3. Transition/Activation Services		\$100,000
Sub-Total	=	\$1,672,350

TOTAL PROJECT BUDGET	\$14,776,980
----------------------	--------------

D. Preliminary Personnel Implications

The baseline projections would require adding 15-18 officers to ensure 24 hour a day supervision of inmate housing areas, assuming three new housing pods. The staffing figure represents the staff required to fill the new posts on a 24-hour, seven day a week basis. The figure, generally calculated at 5.1 staff to cover a post on a 24 hour basis which is figured by calculating days off, training vacations, sick leave, military leave and other days when staff are not actually working the post. This figure represents only custody staffing, and does not address future personnel requirements for expanded program, support, or administrative staff consistent with this type of increase in facility size.

Staffing requirements for all areas of the facility, as well as detailed operating cost projections, will be defined during the next phase of project development, i.e., programming.

Appendix A

Onsite Interviews

Jack Wozmak
Richard Van Wickler
Edward Burke
Thomas Powers
Gerald L. Bernier
Sheryl Trombly

County Administrator
Superintendent
County Attorney
Chief of Police Keene Police Department
Cheshire County Sheriffs Department
Cheshire County Finance Department

Telephone Interviews

Jan Peterson
Greg Crompton
Lt. Barry Hunter
Woody Vachss
David Sutherland,

Attorney Public Defender's Office
New Hampshire State Prison
Troop C New Hampshire State Police
Parole Officer New Hampshire Probation and Parole
President Keene Chamber of Commerce