2014 FACILITY ADMINSTRATORS SURVEY OF ADULT JAILS IN MONTANA

August 2015

Patrick McKay
Dusten Hollist
Gabriel Downey
Daniel Acton
Jackson Bunch
Chuck Harris

Criminology Research Group
Social Science Research Laboratory
The University of Montana, Missoula

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The researchers would like to recognize and thank all who enabled the work that this report is built upon. Funding for the project came from a Bureau of Justice Statistics, Office of Justice Programs Award (2014-BJ-CX-K002).

A debt of gratitude is extended to our research partners, Gabriel Downey, Tyson Mclean, and Don Merritt at the Montana Board of Crime Control. Tyson was the direct liaison for the project until his departure in March. Gabriel was hired as the Statistical Analysis Center, Director to replace Tyson in April. Don served as the liaison in between Tyson leaving and Gabriel coming on board. He also worked very closely with Dennis McCave to ensure that all jails and holding facilities in Montana were given the opportunity to participate in the project. A special thanks to Dennis McCave who served as a consultant on the project. Dennis was hired to serve as the liaison between the project and the jail and holding facility supervisors. He spent more than two months, meeting personally with and contacting via telephone and email, administrators who submitted the information this report is built from. His effort led to a near doubling in the number of completed surveys that had been submitted in the two months that the survey was live before he came on board. The Criminology Research Group is grateful to Deb Matteucci, Executive Director, at the Montana Board of Crime Control for her support of the project.

The support of the University of Montana, in particular, the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, the College of Humanities and Sciences, the Social Science Research Laboratory, and the Department of Sociology are recognized and appreciated.

Social Science Research Laboratory
The University of Montana, Missoula
Social Science Building, Room 259
Missoula, Montana 59812
(406) 243-5381 (Office)
(406) 243-5951 (Fax)

Executive Summary 1
Introduction 1
Methodology 1
Findings 1
Limitations 5
Conclusions 5
Introduction 7
Background 7
Purpose and Objective 8
Methodology 9
Terms and Formulas 9
Findings 11
Section 1: Supervised Population 12
Section 2: Inmate Counts and Movements of the Confined Population 13
Section 3: Population Supervised in the Community 17
Section 4: Staff Safety and Security 17
Section 5: Inmate Safety and Security 18
Section 6: Jail Booking Data Tracking System 18
Limitations 19
Conclusion 20
References 22

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

This report provides baseline data for Montana jail facilities and their populations. It provides a starting point that existing national-level data and future Montana data can be compared against. Much of the data in this report has been previously unknown. Without information about jail populations the State of Montana cannot effectively plan or develop policies and procedures to address any issues that may be present. Information gathered in this report will also inform future research in a continuous effort to address issues faced by Montana jail facilities.

The information in this report is a summary of the first year of a twenty-four month performance period. Members of the Criminology Research Group (CRG) at the University of Montana and the Montana Statistical Analysis Center (MSAC) at the Montana Board of Crime Control (MBCC) were responsible for the collection of the data in this report. The survey was initially sent out on December 8th, 2014 to facility administrators in each of the 40 Montana adult jails.

METHODOLOGY

The findings reported below are based on fully completed survey data received from 33 of the 40 (82.5%) jail facilities in Montana. Partially completed surveys were collected from an additional four facilities (10.0%). Despite multiple attempts to do so, survey data was not reported by three of the 40 facilities (7.5%). The survey was administered online via Qualtrics Online Survey Software. The survey was based on the instrument used in the Federal Annual Survey of Jails (ASJ). It was modified to include open-ended questions to solicit information about specific issues that are facing the professionals who are charged with operating and managing these facilities in Montana. All data was collected and analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

When applicable, Montana survey data was compared to findings from the ASJ which is conducted in years between the Census of Local Jails. ASJ uses a stratified probability sample of jail jurisdictions to estimate the number and characteristics of local inmates nationwide (Minton and Zeng 2015). The AJS data were last collected in 2014. Readers may need to refer to page 9 and 10 for terms and formulas used in the reporting of the findings in the executive summary.

FINDINGS

The findings presented below are organized by section in the order that the questions appeared on the survey. The survey is comprised of six sections: Section 1) Supervised Population; Section 2) Inmate Counts and Movements of the Confined Population; Section 3) Population Supervised in the Community; Section 4) Staff Safety and Security; Section 5) Inmate Safety and Security; and Section 6) Jail Booking Data Tracking System.

Section 1: Supervised Population (on December 3rd, 2014)

- Confined in Jail Facility:
    - 78.92% (1715) of the supervised population were confined in a jail facility.

        - Most facilities (72.97; 27) had a confined population of 1 to 50 inmates, two facilities (5.41%) reported having zero inmates confined and the remaining 8 facilities (21.61%) had a confined population of over 51 inmates.
    - The facility with the largest population supervised 414 inmates.
- Supervised Outside of Jail Facility:
    - 21.08% (458) of the population were supervised outside of a jail facility.
        - The majority of the respondents (83.78%; 31) did not report any persons receiving supervision outside of their facility. Five respondents (13.52%) reported to supervising 1 to 100 inmates, and one respondent (2.7%) supervised 201 or more persons outside of their facility.
- U.S. Citizenship and Weekend Program Offered:
    - 91.9% (34) of the facilities reported to supervising only U.S. citizens. Three respondents (8.1%) reported one non-U.S. citizen under supervision.
    - 43.2% (16) of the facilities offered a weekend program, with a total of 20 individuals participating in the program across Montana.

Section 2: Inmate Counts and Movement of the Confined Population (On December 3rd, 2014)

- Gender, Juveniles, and Non-Convicted Inmates:
    - Adult Males: 81.83% (85% at the National-level).
    - Adult Females: 18.17% (15% at the National-level).
    - Juveniles (under 18) 0.0% (.6% at the National-level).
    - Non-convicted confined inmates: 86.26% (60% at the National level).

- Circumstances of Confined Population in Montana Facilities:
    - 78.231% (1042) of the inmates were un-sentenced or awaiting sentencing.
    - 21.77% (290) of the inmates were sentenced.

- Circumstances of Un-Convicted Confined Population in Montana Facilities:
    - 79.63% were awaiting trial or arraignment.
    - 16.71% were awaiting a transfer or hold.
    - 3.66% were awaiting other processes.

- Race of Confined Population:
    - 69.03% were White inmates (47% at the National level).
    - 23.23% were American Indian or Alaskan Native inmates (1% at the National level).
    - 3.61% were Hispanic or Latino inmates (15% at the National-level).
    - 3.55% were Black or African American inmates (35% at the National-level).
    - The remaining .58% (9) were Asian, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, inmates who identified with two or more races, and inmates whose race is unknown.

- Inmates Held for Other Agencies:
    - Approximately, 31.61% (490) of the confined population were being held for other agencies.

- The majority of these inmates (72.24%) were being held for state prison authorities within Montana, followed by other local jail jurisdictions within Montana (14.29%), the U.S. Marshal Service (10%), state prison authorities outside of Montana (1.63%; 8), other local jail jurisdictions outside of Montana (1.43%) and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (.41%). No inmates were being held for the Federal Bureau of Prisons, or Bureau of Indian Affairs at the time the data were gathered.

- Average Daily Population (ADP) in Montana facilities:
  - On average Montana facilities had 49.84 inmates per facility with a maximum of 440 and a minimum of zero.
  - Most facilities (59.5%) had an ADP between 1 and 50 inmates, one facility had an ADP of zero, and the remaining 38.1% of the facilities had an ADP of over 51 inmates.

- Total Jail Population:
  - On an average day there were approximately 1,994 inmates in all Montana facilities.
  - Average Jail Incarceration Rate: 194.81 inmates per 100,000 Montana residents.
  - Average Jail Incarceration Rate at the National level: 234 inmates per 100,000 U.S. residents.

- Jail Crowding:
  - Montana's jails operated at about 89.1% of rated capacity on an average day and about 95% of rated capacity on the most crowded day in November 2014.
    At the National level, jails operated at about 83% of rated capacity on an average day and about 89% of rated capacity on their most crowded day in June 2014.

- New Admissions and Final Discharges: (On Nov 30th to Dec 6th, 2014)
  - New Admissions: 736
  - Final Discharges: 675
  - Length of confinement for convicted persons:
    - 7.96% were confined for less than one day.
    - 60.17% were confined between 1 and 30 days.
    - Remaining 31.8% were confined over 31 days.
  - Length of confinement for un-convicted persons:
    - 71.65% were confined for less than seven days.
    - Remaining 28.35% were confined for eight days or longer.

- Weekly Turnover Rate for Montana Facilities: (Higher percent equals more fluctuation)
  - Facilities with an average population size of 51 to 100 inmates presented the highest turnover rate at 133.45%.
  - The lowest turnover rate in Montana came from facilities with an ADP under 50 inmates (84.38%).
  - Average turnover rate for all Montana facilities: 91.73%

- Weekly Turnover Rate for Facilities Nationwide:
  - Facilities with a population of 50 to 99 had the highest turnover rate at 104.2%.

The lowest turnover rate nationally were facilities that confined an average daily population of over 1000 inmates at 48.5%.

Section 3: Population Supervised in the Community

- Gender:
  - Adult Males: 79.35%
  - Adult Females: 20.65%
  - Juveniles (Under 18): 0.0%
- Conviction Status:
  - Convicted of a Crime: 81.08% (360)
  - Not convicted (awaiting processes): 18.92% (84)
- Type of Community Supervision:
  - 52.32% participated in an alcohol or drug treatment program.
  - 22.08% participated in other programs not listed on survey.
  - 14.57% participated in day reporting.
  - 10.82% participated in other pretrial supervision programs.
  - One person participated in a community service program.
  - No facilities were using electronic monitoring, home detention without electronic monitoring, nor other alternative work programs.

Section 4: Staff Safety and Security

- Facility Staff:
  - Correctional Officers: 58.21%
    - Average: 11 correctional officers per facility.
  - Other Staff: 41.79%
    - Average: eight other staff per facility.
- Inmate Physical Assaults on Staff:
  - Correctional Officers: 12 assaults
  - Other Staff: 0 assaults
  - 0 deaths

Section 5: Inmate Safety and Security

- Inmate Physical Assaults on Inmates:
  - 114 physical assaults reported.
  - One facility reported 70 of the 114 (61.4%) physical assaults.
    - This facility also had the highest average daily population at 440.
- Inmate Sexual Assaults on Inmates:
  - 18 sexual assaults reported.
  - One facility reported 17 of the 18 (94.4%) sexual assaults.
    - This facility had the second highest average daily population at 412.

Section 6: Jail Booking Data Tracking System

- Data system used by jail facility:
  - 33.33% currently use Data Detention Information System (DDIS).
  - 15.15% use SWIFT.

    - 9.09% use Sleuth System JMS.
    - 33.33% of the facilities use a data system unique to their facility.
    - 9.09% do not use any data system.

- Willing to Use DDIS:
    - 17 of 22 (77.3%) facilities that do not currently use DDIS said they would be willing to use DDIS in the next calendar year.

- Benefits of Using DDIS:
    - Seven facilities provided feedback for the benefits of the DDIS. These facilities describe DDIS as: a good system that collects a wide range of data, allows the facility to see where additional training would be most beneficial, gives data that can be shared and compared with other facilities, and provides information that can be used as a tool for future planning for corrections in Montana.

- Suggested Improvements to DDIS:
    - Only two facilities suggested improvements to the DDIS and both suggested making other facility data available so comparison and rankings can be viewed on the computer.

- Factors that Prevent facilities from participating in DDIS:
    - Two facilities explained that cost and manpower are the main factors for not participating. One facility is already in the process of changing their software to a new system. The final facility explained that their system is a custom jail management system and they "already send data to the MBCC."

LIMITATIONS

When analyzing the survey data, several discrepancies were discovered that pointed toward inaccurate data collection. An example of these discrepancies can be found when examining the confined population. Data collected on the gender of the confined population shows a total of 1723 inmates confined. However, data collected on the race of the confined population shows a total of 1550 confined inmates. These two sample sizes should be equivalent since they are examining the same sample of inmates during the same period of time. Similar errors were discovered throughout the survey data. Looking at the raw data it is apparent that these errors are not due to missing data but due to discrepancies in the counts that were reported in the totals and then in the breakdown of those totals into smaller categories. To obtain more reliable consistent data in the future it will be beneficial to create a survey that identifies these discrepancies as the survey is being taken by the respondents. Additionally, it may be beneficial to allow respondents to describe why these discrepancies occur as they may reflect an issue with the manner in which the data are gathered and reported.

CONCLUSIONS

The findings in this report have provided baseline data for Montana jail facilities. This information is important to determine how Montana facilities compare nationally and how the facilities have

changed over time when future data is collected. Overall, Montana facilities appear to be similar to national estimates. Some notable findings are presented below.

As reported by jail administrators Montana authorities are keeping juvenile offenders (under 18) out of adult jails. No facility in Montana reported any inmate under the age of 18. Nationwide, juvenile inmates account for .6% of the jail population. This equates to an estimated to 4,200 juveniles.

Montana has a lower average jail incarceration rate estimated at 195 inmates per 100,000 Montana citizens compared to 234 inmates per 100,000 U.S. residents nationwide. The statistics for jail crowding is similar to national estimates. Montana's jails operated at about 89.1% of rated capacity on an average day and about 95% of rated capacity on the most crowded day in November 2014. Meanwhile, the nation's jails operated at about 83% of rated capacity on an average day and about 89% of rated capacity on their most crowded day in June 2014. Montana inmates fluctuate at a slightly higher rate than national estimates. The average turnover rate for Montana facilities is 91.73%. The turnover rate nationally is between a high of 104.2% to a low of 48.5%.

Inmate assaults on officers are rare. Only 12 assaults were reported in a year-long period representing .36% or 3.6 assaults per 1000 officers. No assaults on other staff were reported. Inmate on inmate assaults are slightly more common. 114 physical assaults were reported, approximately 3.45% or 34.5 assaults per 1000 inmates. 18 sexual assaults were reported representing approximately .55% or 5.5 sexual assaults per 1000 inmates. Two outlying facilities have skewed these results with one facility reporting 70 of the 114 assaults, and a separate facility reporting 17 of the 18 sexual assaults. While these two facilities account for the largest average daily population of the facilities reporting data, further inquiry may be necessary to determine strategies to decrease future assaults.

Facilities are already using or willing to adopt the Data Detention Information System (DDIS). Eleven (33.33%) of the facilities in Montana already use DDIS and out of the twenty two facilities that indicated they do not use DDIS, 17 (77.3%) reported that they would be willing to use DDIS in the next calendar year. These are promising findings which will assist in the second year of this project. Those facilities that already use DDIS described it as a good system that collects a wide range of data, allows the facility to see where additional training would be most beneficial, gives data that can be shared and compared with other facilities, and provides information that could be used as a tool for future planning for corrections in Montana. One suggested improvement that was discussed by two facilities is making other facility data available so comparisons and ranking can be viewed remotely. The second year of this project should focus on those facilities that are willing to participate in DDIS and determine if barriers can be resolved for those facilities who are not.

INTRODUCTION

This report provides baseline data for Montana jail facilities and their populations. It provides a starting point that existing national-level data and future Montana data can be compared against. Much of the data in this report has been previously unknown. Without information about jail populations the State of Montana cannot effectively plan or develop policies and procedures to address any issues that may be present. Information gathered in this report will also inform future research in a continuous effort to address issues faced by Montana jail facilities.

The information in this report is a summary of the first year of a twenty-four month performance period. Members of the Criminology Research Group (CRG) at the University of Montana and the Montana Statistical Analysis Center (MSAC) at the Montana Board of Crime Control (MBCC) were responsible for the collection of the data in this report. The survey was modeled after the Bureau of Justice Statistics Annual Survey of Jails. It was initially sent out on December 8th, 2014 to facility administrators in each of the 40 Montana adult jails.

BACKGROUND

In November 2005, the MBCC convened a detention dilemma planning meeting to develop a strategic response to perceived statewide jail overcrowding. One step of the strategic response called for the MBCC to seek out technical assistance from an independent provider. Madeline Carter and Gary Kempker of the National Institute of Corrections were identified as the technical assistance consultants. Carter and Kempker, in May and June of 2006, conducted telephone interviews and site visits to jail and detention localities across the state to assess the dimensions of the local jail population capacity issues. The key findings, as reported by Carter and Kempker, are as follows: "data is needed to better inform an analysis of the crowding problem; multiple conditions are contributing to the crowding problem; and a more strategic, cross-system collaborative approach to problem analysis is needed." The consultants offered ten recommendations and among them were to "collect and analyze offender profile data" and "to build long term data and information system capacity." With those recommendations in mind, the MSAC set out to create an adult jail based data system to meet those two specific recommendations.

The MSAC was assisted in the endeavor with grant funding from the Bureau of Justice Statistics, State Justice Statistics (SJS) grant program. Initially called the Detention Dilemma Project, the first stream of funding was awarded to the SAC in 2006 (Grant # 2006-BJ-CX-K034). It has subsequently been funded under the SJS program under grant number 2007-BJ-CX-K020. The MSAC has received a total of $101,500 of SJS program funds for the Detention Dilemma Project.

The initial purpose of the Detention Dilemma Project was to "fund the creation of reports for the records management systems of the various detention centers, to create a central repository of this detention information, and to perform analysis to determine what methods will provide the best chance of reducing the overcrowding of the detention centers and increasing the relative safety of Montanans both inside and outside of the detention centers."

The MSAC has been partially effective at meeting this broad goal. The first objective of the Detention Dilemma Project was to "create a central repository" for jail based booking information. The MSAC created the Detention Data Information System (DDIS) which currently serves as the only statewide repository in Montana for jail-based offender booking information. The first

objective has been met with the creation of the DDIS. It was created for the purpose of collecting booking information from local jails on all offenders booked into jail. In consultation with the Yellowstone County Detention facility and the creator of the Swift records management system the MBCC defined a DDIS reporting standard that guides the submission of this data. The DDIS system was designed to collect information that, in most cases, was already being entered into most detention facilities jail management systems. Furthermore, non-mandatory data elements that, in most cases, are not currently collected were also included. This was done so that future expansion of the system could be completed with minimal additional programming.

In Montana, and similar to many states, local law enforcement rely on private vendors for electronic records managements systems. These systems are typically a fully integrated package from Computer Automated Dispatch (CAD) to records management and jail management. At present, roughly eleven different companies and two custom built programs are at use in Montana's local law enforcement agencies. Because local law enforcement relies very heavily on their data management systems, the DDIS system was designed to easily accept data from these systems. In fact, it was modeled similar to the Montana Incident-Based Reporting System which conforms to the National Incident Based Reporting System standards.

With the use of SJS funds, MBCC paid for programming to ensure most of the vendors that are currently operating in Montana would be compliant with the DDIS reporting standards. This task was accomplished successfully. All but two vendors to date have been modified. MBCC plans to continue to pursue compliance with these vendors and the counties they operate in.

The second objective of the Detention Dilemma project is ongoing. Continued analysis of the data will provide invaluable information about Montana's jail inmate population and the crimes they commit. The initial 2008-2009 DDIS Report served as a baseline data analysis for more robust subsequent reports. The most recent report is the 2010-2011 DDIS report.

Law enforcement/public safety responsibilities primarily rest within the purview of local law enforcement agencies, specifically police departments and sheriff's offices. All 56 counties within the state have a sheriff's office. However, only 49 responded to Montana's Annual Law Enforcement Personnel Survey in 2012. Sheriff's departments range in size from 1 sworn officer to 51 sworn officers. Furthermore, local sheriff's offices employed anywhere from 4 to 89 detention staff in 2012. Under Montana law, the governing body of a county or two or more units of local government working together have sole authority over building and operating detention centers. In practice, the daily operations for most detention centers in Montana have been delegated to county sheriff's offices. However, not all sheriff's offices have detention facilities. In total, Montana has 40 adult jails and 12 seventy-two hour holding facilities. The three largest detention centers operated by county governments are in Yellowstone, Missoula, and Cascade counties.

PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVE

The purpose of this research is to build upon the work that has previously been done in Montana regarding the management of jail populations in the State and the collection of data from/about that population. The information presented below will provide the essential baseline data to the MSAC that is at present largely absent. Without this information, the State of Montana cannot effectively manage this population or identify and address issues within it. The funding in the second year of the project will provide for rekindling past relationships with local detention facility administrators to receive offender booking data and recruit additional detention facilities to submit

offender booking data. Costs associated with sending local booking data will be analyzed and will be requested in a future SJS grant application.

Specifically, the objective of the proposed research is to develop core-capacity capabilities that will enable the State of Montana, Montana's Association of Counties, and the local sheriff's overseeing jail operations to effectively and systematically monitor and evaluate jail population within the State and local jurisdictions. The data will provide critical information needed to implement necessary changes associated with the population of offenders in secure placement within the county jails and the practitioners who are tasked with their care. The development of a systematic data collection process will facilitate State and Federal level reporting requirements for data that are difficult to manage at the present time.

When applicable in the reporting below, Montana jail data will be compared to findings from the Annual Survey of Jails (ASJ) which is conducted in years between the Census of Local Jails. ASJ uses a stratified probability sample of jail jurisdictions to estimate the number and characteristics of local inmates nationwide (Minton and Zeng 2015).

METHODOLOGY

The findings reported below are based on fully completed survey data received from 33 of the 40 (82.5%) jail facilities in Montana. Partially completed surveys were collected from an additional four facilities (10.0%). Despite multiple attempts to do so, survey data was not reported by three of the 40 facilities (7.5%). The survey was built, pre-tested and administered using Qualtrics Online Survey Software and was based on the instrument used in the federal Annual Survey of Jails. It was modified to include open-ended questions to solicit information about specific issues that are facing the professionals who are charged with operating and managing these facilities. All data was collected and analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

TERMS AND FORMULAS

Average Daily Population (ADP): The average derived by the sum of inmates in jail each day for a year, divided by the number of days in the year (i.e., between December 1, 2013, through November 30, 2014). Equation:

$$\frac{Total\ \#\ of\ Inmates\ in\ 1\ Year}{365_{\#\ of\ days\ in\ 1\ year}}$$

Weekly Jail Turnover Rate: This rate is calculated by adding admissions and releases and dividing by the average daily population. The turnover rate takes into account jail admissions and releases and gives an indication of the fluctuation of the jail population in Montana. Higher turnover rates mean larger number of admissions and releases relative to the size of the ADP. Equation:

$$\left(\frac{Average\ \#\ of\ Admission + Average\ \#\ of\ Discharges}{ADP}\right) \times 100$$

Jail Incarceration Rate: Average number of inmates held in custody of local jails, per 100,000 Montana Residents. Equation:

$$\left(\frac{Total\ \#\ of\ Inmates\ in\ Montana\ on\ average\ day}{Montana\ Population\ estimate}\right) \times 100{,}000$$

Rated Capacity: The number of beds or inmates assigned by a rating official to a facility, excluding separate temporary holding areas.

Operational Capacity (Budget Capacity): The number of inmates that can be accommodated based on staff, existing programs, and services in institutions within their jurisdiction.

Design Capacity: The number of inmates, planners or architects, intended for all jail facilities in their jurisdiction.

Percent of Capacity Occupied: This percentage is calculated by taking the average number of inmates in Montana on an average day (ADP), dividing by the average rated capacity in Montana facilities, and multiplying by 100. Equation:

$$\left(\frac{Average\ Montana\ ADP}{Average\ Rated\ Capacity}\right) \times 100$$

Percent of Capacity Occupied is also calculated with the average number of inmates on the most crowded day in November 2014. Equation:

$$\left(\frac{Average\ Population\ on\ Most\ Crowded\ Day\ in\ Novermber}{Average\ Rated\ Capacity}\right) \times 100$$

Weighted Mean Formula: The mean of a group of means. This formula derives a mean that takes into account the population size of each group. Group percentages can be substituted in for the group means to calculate the weighted percentage for the group as is used in this report. Formula:

$$\frac{\sum(N_{group} \times \%_{group})}{N_{total}}$$

Mean Substitution: This technique is used to estimate and replace missing data in a data set. Mean substitution replaces missing data with the mean of the variable from the cases who provided data.

Confined Population: The population of confined individuals includes persons on transfer to treatment facilities but who remain under the facilities jurisdiction, persons held for jurisdictions other than the participating jurisdictions, persons in community-based programs who return to jail at night, and excludes inmates on AWOL, escape, long-term transfer to other jurisdictions, and inmates being boarded out to another county or held in another facility.

Under Jail Supervision but Not Confined: The supervised population not confined includes all persons in community-based programs run by the facility (e.g., electronic monitoring, house arrest, community service, day reporting, and work programs) and excludes persons on pretrial release who are not in a community based program run by the facility, persons under supervision of probation, parole or other agencies, inmates on weekend programs, and inmates participating in work release programs who return to jail at night.

New Admissions: New admissions include persons officially booked into and housed in the facility by formal legal document and by the authority of the courts or some other official agency. Includes

those persons serving a weekend sentence coming into the facility for the first time. New admissions exclude returns from escape, work release, medical appointment/treatment facilities, bail, and court appearances.

Discharges: Persons released after a period of confinement (e.g., sentence completion, bail or bond releases, other pretrial releases, transfers to other jurisdictions, and deaths). Discharged persons include those who have completed their weekend program and who are leaving the facility for the last time. Excluded from jail discharges are temporary discharges including work release, medical appointment or treatment center, court appearance, furlough, day reporting, and transfers to other facilities within the jail's jurisdiction.

Weekend Program: Offenders in these programs are allowed to serve their sentences of confinement only on weekends (i.e., Friday to Sunday).

Correction Officers: Deputies, monitors, and other custody staff who spend more than 50% of their time with the incarcerated population. Correction officers excludes staff paid through contractual agreements and community volunteers.

Other Staff: Administrators, clerical and maintenance staff, and other staff unspecified. Other staff excludes staff paid through contractual agreements and community volunteers.

FINDINGS

The survey asked 82 questions intended to be answered by the administrators charged with operating the jail facilities in Montana. The majority of respondents identified their position as Sheriff (31.43%; 11), followed by Undersheriff (11.43%; 4), and Detention Commander (11.43%; 4). The remaining respondent's positions are presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Respondent's Reported Title

	Freq.	%
Sheriff	11	31.43%
Undersheriff	4	11.43%
Detention Commander	4	11.43%
Chief of Police	2	5.71%
Sergeant	2	5.71%
Jail Administrator	2	5.71%
Administrative Assistant	2	5.71%
Captain	2	5.71%
Lieutenant	2	5.71%
Chief Detention Officer	1	2.86%
Deputy	1	2.86%
Jail Commander	1	2.86%
Records Clerk	1	2.86%
Total	35	100.00%
Missing	5	

The findings presented below are organized by section in the order the questions appeared on the survey. The survey is comprised of six sections: Section 1) Supervised Population; Section 2) Inmate Counts and Movements of the Confined Population; Section 3) Population Supervised in the

Community; Section 4) Staff Safety and Security; Section 5) Inmate Safety and Security; and Section 6) Jail Booking Data Tracking System.

SECTION 1: SUPERVISED POPULATION

Section 1 asked respondents about the population supervised by their facility, how many inmates were U.S. citizens, and if the facility has a weekend program. Table 2 below, describes how the supervised population is broken up between persons confined and persons supervised outside the facilities.

On December 3rd, 2014 approximately three quarters (76.71%; 1723) of the supervised population were confined in a jail facility. In Montana, the average facility had a confined population of approximately 46 inmates. The majority of the facilities (72.97%; 27) reported a confined supervised population of 1 to 50 inmates. Two facilities (5.41%) did not, at the time of the survey, supervise any inmates. Five facilities (13.51%) had a confined supervised population of 51 to 100 inmates, one facility (2.70%) has a confined population of 101 to 150 inmates, and two facilities (5.41%) had a confined population of 200 or more. The facility with the largest confined populations supervised 414 inmates.

Less than a quarter (23.29%; 523) of the inmates were supervised outside of a facility. Most of the respondents (83.78%; 31) reported their facility did not supervise any individuals outside of their facility. Three facilities (8.11%) supervised 1 to 50 individuals, two facilities (5.41%) supervised 51 to 100 individuals, no facility supervised 101 to 150 individuals, and one facility (2.70%) supervised 200 or more individuals outside of their facility.

Table 2: Supervised Population (n=40 Facilities)

Population	Confined n= 1723 (76.71%)	Non-Confined n= 523 (23.29%)
0	2 (5.41%)	31 (83.78%)
1 to 50	27 (72.97%)	3 (8.11%)
51 to 100	5 (13.51%)	2 (5.41%)
101 to 150	1 (2.70%)	0 (0.0%)
151 to 200	0(0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
201 +	2 (5.41%)	1 (2.70%)
Total	37 (100%)	37 (100%)
Missing	3	3

Thirty-four respondents (91.9%) reported that their facility's entire supervised population was comprised of U.S. citizens. The remaining three respondents (8.1%) reported their facility supervised one non-U.S. citizen. No facility in Montana reported to supervising more than one non-U.S. citizen.

Under half (43.2%; 16) of the respondents reported that their facility offered a weekend program. Out of the 16 facilities that offer a weekend program, a total of 20 individuals participated.

SECTION 2: INMATE COUNTS AND MOVEMENTS OF THE CONFINED POPULATION

Section 2 asked respondents to describe the confined population on December 3rd, 2014. These questions focused on the age, gender, and race of the inmates, if the inmates were sentenced or not, if inmates are being held for a separate agency, and what was the circumstances surrounding the population of un-convicted inmates.

Table 3 describes the gender of confined inmates. On December 3rd 2014, adult males (18 and older) make up 81.83% (1410) of the confined population in Montana with adult females accounting for 18.17% (313). The proportion of male and female estimates nationwide differ slightly. Nationwide, males account for 85% of the population and females with approximately 15%. In Montana, nine respondents reported their facilities did not hold any females and two respondents reported their facilities did not hold any males at the time the survey data was submitted. Nationwide, juveniles (under 18) represent 0.6% (approx. 4,200) of the confined population, but no juveniles were reported in any Montana facility that survey data was received from.

Table 3: Gender of Confined (n=1723 Inmates)

Adult (18 or Older)	Freq.	%
Male	1410	81.83%
Female	313	18.17%
Total	1723	100.00%

The circumstances of the confined inmates are described in Table 4. Of the confined population 78.23% (1042) were persons who were un-sentenced or awaiting trial and 20.24% (290) were sentenced inmates.

Table 4: Circumstance of Confinement

Circumstance	Freq.	%
Unsentenced Inmates or Awaiting Sentencing	1042	78.23%
Sentenced Inmates	290	21.77%
Total	1332	100.00%

Montana's un-convicted confined population was higher than national estimates at 86.26% (1149) compared to 60% nationwide. According to Table 5 below, the majority of the un-convicted confined inmates (79.63%; 915) were awaiting trial or arraignment, 16.71% (192) were awaiting transfer or hold, and the remaining 3.66% (42) were awaiting other processes.

Table 5: Circumstance of Un-Convicted Confinement

Circumstance	Freq.	%
Awaiting Trial or Arraignment	915	79.63%
Awaiting Transfer/Hold	192	16.71%
Other	42	3.66%
Total	1149	100.00%

According to Table 6 below, White inmates accounted for 69.03% (1070) of the jail population in Montana facilities. American Indian or Alaska Natives made up the largest minority population at 23.23% (360) of the total. This differs drastically from national estimates. According to the ASJ in

2014, White inmates account for only 47% of the population while American Indians account for just over 1%. In Montana, Hispanic/Latinos and Black/African Americans inmates each accounted for approximately 3.5% (55 and 56 respectively) of the population. The remaining .58% (9) of the population were comprised of Asian, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, inmates who identify with two or more races, and inmates whose race is unknown.

Table 6: Race of Confined		
Race	**Freq.**	**%**
White	1070	69.03%
American Indian or Alaska Native	360	23.23%
Hispanic or Latino	56	3.61%
Black or African American	55	3.55%
Two or More Races	4	0.26%
Asian	2	0.13%
Not Known	2	0.13%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1	0.06%
Total	1550	100.00%

Table 7 present the inmates that are being held for other agencies. On December 3rd, 2014, there were a total of 490 inmates being held for other agencies, representing approximately 31.61% of all confined inmates The majority of these inmates (72.24%; 354) were being held for state prison authorities within Montana, followed by other local jail jurisdictions within Montana (14.29%; 70), the U.S. Marshal Service (10%; 49), state prison authorities outside of Montana (1.63%; 8), other local jail jurisdictions outside of Montana (1.43%; 7) and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (.41%; 2). No inmates were being held for the Federal Bureau of Prisons, or Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Table 7: Inmates Held for Other Agencies		
Agency	**Freq.**	**%**
State Prison Authorities Within MT	354	72.24%
other Local Jail Jurisdiction Within MT	70	14.29%
U.S. Marshal Service	49	10.00%
State Prison Authorities Outside MT	8	1.63%
Other Local Jail Jurisdictions Outside MT	7	1.43%
U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement	2	0.41%
Federal Bureau of Prisons	0	0.00%
Bureau of Indian Affairs	0	0.00%
Total	490	100.00%

Respondents were asked to calculate the average daily population (ADP) in a one-year time period from December 1st, 2013 to November 30th, 2014 and to describe the rated capacity, operational capacity, and design capacity of their jail facility.

The ADP in all facilities in Montana was 49.84 inmates with a maximum of 440 and a minimum of zero. The majority (59.5%; 25) of facilities in Montana had an ADP between 1 and 50 inmates. One facility (2.4%) had an ADP of zero inmates, four facilities (9.5%) had an ADP of 51 to 100 inmates, no facility had an ADP of 101 to 150 inmates, and three facilities (7.1%) had an ADP of over 151 inmates. While facilities that hold 1 to 50 inmates represent 59.5% (25) of all facilities in Montana they accounted for only 20.5% (337) of the confined population. Similar results are found nationwide. Smaller jail facilities (under 49 inmates) are the most common in the U.S. representing 38% of all facilities while only accounting for 3% of the inmate population.

Using mean substitution to replace missing data there were approximately 1,994 inmates confined in facilities across the State on an average day. According to the U.S Census Bureau, the Montana population was estimated to be 1,023,579 residents in 2014. Together, the average jail incarceration rate in Montana is 194.81 inmates per 100,000 Montana residents.

$$\left(\frac{1{,}994\ Inmates}{1{,}023{,}579\ Montana\ Residents}\right) \times 100{,}000 = 194.81 \text{ inmates}$$

Montana's estimated jail incarceration rate is lower than the national jail incarceration rate mid-year in 2014 estimated at 234 inmates per 100,000 U.S. residents.

Table 8 presents the descriptive statistics for the greatest population in November, ADP, rated capacity, operational capacity, and design capacity of Montana facilities. Montana jail facilities had an average rated capacity of 55.94 inmates with a low of 5 and a high of 414. The average operational capacity was 58.56 inmates and the average design capacity was 54.03 inmates.

Table 8: Average Population and Capacity

Population or Capacity	n	Min	Max	Total	Mean	St. Dev
Greatest Population in November	33	1	449	1752	53.09	103.69
Average Daily Population	33	0	440	1644.76	49.84	102.99
Rated Capacity	33	5	414	1846	55.94	94.66
Operational Capacity	32	5	500	1874	58.56	106.91
Design Capacity	31	2	372	1675	54.03	83.47

Two indicators are commonly used to measure jail crowding: percent of capacity occupied and the ratio of the number of inmates on the most crowded day to rated capacity of the facility. Using these indicators, Montana's jails operated at about 89.1% of rated capacity on an average day and about 95% of rated capacity on the most crowded day in November 2014. Similar results are shown nationwide. The nation's jails operated at about 83% of rated capacity on an average day and about 89% of rated capacity on their most crowded day in June 2014.

To examine if facilities are over their capacity on an average day, each facility's average daily population was subtracted from their rated, operational, and design capacities. The results presented in Table 9 below, show the facilities that were over, equal to, or under their rated, operational, and design capacity on an average day. Overall, there were five facilities (16.93%) that exceeded all three capacities, one facility (3.23%) that exceeded two capacities, three facilities (10.0%) that exceeded one capacity, and 21 facilities (67.74%) that did not exceed any capacity on an average day. The remaining 10 facilities did not provide sufficient data to determine if they were over or under capacity on an average day.

Table 9: ADP Compared to Capacity

	Rated Capacity	Operational Capacity	Design Capacity
Over Capacity	6 (18.18%)	7 (21.88%)	7 (22.58%)
Equal to Capacity	0 (0.0%)	0 (21.88%)	1 (3.23%)
Under Capacity	27 (81.82%)	25 (78.13%)	23 (74.19%)
Total	100% (33)	100% (32)	100% (31)
Missing	5	6	7

Table 10 below describes new admissions and final discharges during the week of November 30th, 2014 to December 6th, 2014. There were 736 new admissions and 675 final discharges across 33

facilities. The average facility had 21.49 new admissions and 20.46 final discharges during this week. Convicted persons who were discharged during this time period varied in terms of their length of confinement. Inmates discharged in less than a day accounted for only 7.96% (18). The most common length of confinement was between 1 and 30 days which accounted for 60.17% of all convicted persons discharged. The remaining 31.8% were confined over 31 days. The majority of un-convicted inmates (71.65%; 364) were discharged after being detained under seven days and the remaining 28.35% (144) were discharged after being detained 8 days or longer.

Table 10: Admissions and Discharges (Nov 30th to Dec 6th, 2014)		
Type	**Freq.**	**%**
New Admissions	736	-
Final Discharges	675	-
Convicted Persons Discharged Were Confined For:	**Freq.**	**%**
Less Than 1 Day	18	7.96%
1 to 2 Days	46	20.35%
3 to 7 Days	49	21.68%
8 to 30 Days	41	18.14%
31 to 180 Days	40	17.70%
More Than 180 Days	32	14.16%
Un-convicted Persons Discharged Were Confined For:	**Freq.**	**%**
Less Than 1 Day	129	25.39%
1 to 2 Days	138	27.17%
3 to 7 Days	97	19.09%
8 to 30 Days	51	10.04%
31 to 180 Days	81	15.94%
More Than 180 Days	12	2.36%

Table 11 presents the weekly turnover rate for Montana. Weekly jail turnover rates were calculated by adding admissions and releases and then dividing this number by the ADP. Facilities with an average population size of 51 to 100 inmates presented the highest turnover rate at 133.45%. This is consistent with findings from the ASJ that also found facilities with a population of 50 to 99 to have the highest turnover rate at 104.2%. The lowest turnover rate in Montana came from facilities with an ADP under 50 inmates (84.38%). Nationally, facilities that confined an ADP of over 1000 inmates had the lowest turnover rate at 48.5%. Using the weighted mean formula (See terms and Formulas), the average turnover rate for all 32 facilities that presented data in Montana was 91.73%, which is slightly higher but in the range of national data. This means that relative to national data, on average, Montana facilities have a slightly higher fluctuation of inmates relative to their ADP.

Table 11: Weekly Turnover Rate (32 Facilities)	
Average Population Size	**Turnover Rate**
1 to 50 Inmates (25 Facilities)	84.38%
51 to 100 Inmates (4 Facilities)	133.45%
151 to 200 Inmates (1 Facility)	108.48%
200 or More Inmates (2 Facilities)	91.78%
Average Turnover Rate (weighted)	91.73%

SECTION 3: POPULATION SUPERVISED IN THE COMMUNITY

Section three asks respondents about the population of persons supervised outside of their facility. Table 12 presents the gender of persons supervised outside of the facility. Males again accounted for the greatest percentage at 79.35% (415) of the total and females made up 20.65% (108) of persons supervised in the community. No juveniles (under 18) were reported among the persons being supervised outside the facility. 81.08% (360) of the population was comprised of persons who had been convicted of a crime. The remaining 18.92% (84) were not yet convicted awaiting trial, arraignment, or other processes.

Table 12: Supervised in Community: Gender

Adult (18 or Older)	Freq.	%
Male	415	79.35%
Female	108	20.65%
Total	523	100.00%

Table 13 below describes the type of community supervision persons are receiving. The most common program used to supervise persons outside the facility was an alcohol or drug treatment program in which over half (52.32%; 237) of the population participated in. Respondents reported that 22.08% (100) of the supervised population were being supervised by other programs not listed on the survey, 14.57% (66) participated in day reporting, 10.82% (49) were in other pretrial supervision, and one person was in a community service program. No facilities were using electronic monitoring, home detention without electronic monitoring, nor other alternative work programs.

Table 13: Type of Community Supervision

Type of Supervision	Freq.	%
Alcohol Drug Treatment Program	237	52.32%
Other Programs Outside Jail Facilities	100	22.08%
Day Reporting	66	14.57%
Other Pretrial Supervision	49	10.82%
Community Service	1	0.22%
Electronic Monitoring	0	0.00%
Home Detention Without Electronic Monitoring	0	0.00%
Other Alternative Work Program	0	0.00%
Total	453	100.00%

SECTION 4: STAFF SAFETY AND SECURITY

The first question in section four asks respondents how many staff employed by their jail were correction officers or "other staff" on December 3rd 2014. Results are presented in Table 14 below. Across thirty-one facilities there were 344 correctional officers employed. This is an average of approximately eleven correctional officers per facility. The largest facility employed 55 correctional officers and one facility indicated that zero correctional officers were employed. 247 persons who were identified as "other staff" were employed in these facilities. This is an average of approximately eight non-correction officer staff per facility. The largest facility employed 46 "other staff" and one facility indicated that they did not have any non-correctional staff.

Table 14: Facility Staff				
Type of Staff	**Freq.**	**Average**	**St. Deviation**	**%**
Correctional Officers (31 Facilities)	344	11.10	13.97	58.21%
All Other Staff (33 Facilities)	247	7.48	10.18	41.79%
Total	591	-	-	100.00%

Section four also included questions about inmate-inflicted physical assault on facility staff during a year-long period from December 1st, 2013 to November 30th, 2014. Respondents were asked to report any assault that involved a weapon or serious injury requiring immediate medical attention more extensive than first aid. Six respondents reported that their facility had at least one inmate assault on a correctional officer with a total of twelve assaults. No respondent reported any inmate assault on non-correctional officer staff. There were no reported staff deaths (officers or other) during the year-long period that was examined.

Table 15: Inmate on Staff Assaults		
Type of Staff	**Freq.**	**Average**
Correctional Officers	12	0.36
All Other Staff	0	0.00
Total	12	

SECTION 5: INMATE SAFETY AND SECURITY

Section five asked respondents to report the number of physical or sexual assaults inmates inflicted on other inmates during the year-long period from December 1st, 2013 to November 30th, 2014. Similar to the questions in section four, respondents were asked to report any assault that involved a weapon or serious injury requiring immediate medical attention more extensive than first aid. Table 16 describe these assaults. Respondents reported there were a total of 114 physical assaults and 18 sexual assaults, inmates inflicted on other inmates. Interestingly, two facilities contain the bulk of physical and sexual assaults. One facility reported 70 of the 114 (61.4%) physical assaults and a separate facility reported having 17 of the 18 (94.4%) sexual assaults. However, these two facilities reported the highest ADP with 440 and 412 respectively, which partially explains their high assault frequency. No inmate deaths were reported as a result of inmate on inmate assaults during this yearlong period.

Table 16: Inmate on Inmate Assaults					
Type of Assault	**Freq.**	**Average**	**%**	**Min**	**Max**
Physical	114	3.45	86.36%	0	70
Sexual	18	0.55	13.64%	0	17
Total	132		100.00%		

SECTION 6: JAIL BOOKING DATA TRACKING SYSTEM

The final section asked respondents about the data tracking system that is currently being used in their facility. Respondents were asked whether or not their facility uses the "Detention Data Information System" (DDIS). If they do not use DDIS they were asked to list the system they use. One third (33.33%; 11) of the facilities in Montana use DDIS. Those facilities that do not use DDIS provided thirteen different data tracking systems and three facilities indicated that they do not use

any type of data system. SWIFT is the second most common system (15.15%; 5), followed by Sleuth Systems JMS (9.09%; 3). As shown in table 17 below, the remaining 11 data tracking systems are unique to the facility in which they are being used.

Table 17: Data System Used by Jail Facility

Data Tracking System	Freq.	%
DDIS	11	33.33%
SWIFT	5	15.15%
Sleuth System JMS	3	9.09%
New World	1	3.03%
AEGIS Public Safety System	1	3.03%
Citidex	1	3.03%
Custom Jail Management System	1	3.03%
IMC/Tri Tech	1	3.03%
Jail Archonix	1	3.03%
Operational Management System	1	3.03%
RIMS	1	3.03%
Securus	1	3.03%
Spillman	1	3.03%
Ultimate Database Solutions	1	3.03%
No Data Tracking System	3	9.09%
Total	33	100.00%
Missing Data	7	

The eleven facilities that use the DDIS were asked about the benefits of using this system and also what improvements they would like to see. Seven facilities provided feedback for the benefits of the DDIS. These facilities describe DDIS as: a good system that collects a wide range of data, allows the facility to see where additional training would be most beneficial, gives data that can be shared and compared with other facilities, and provides information that could be used as a tool for future planning for corrections in Montana. Only two facilities suggested improvements to the DDIS and both suggested: making other facility data available so comparison and rankings can be viewed remotely.

The remaining 22 facilities that do not currently use DDIS were asked if they would be willing to participate in DDIS for next calendar year. The majority of these facilities (77.3%; 17) said that they would be willing to participate. The remaining 22.7% (5) were asked about the factors that would prevent them from participating in a statewide jail booking tracking system. Two facilities explained that cost and manpower are the main factors for not participating. One facility is already in the process of changing their software to a new system. The final facility explained that their system is a custom jail management system and they "already send data to the MBCC."

LIMITATIONS

When analyzing the survey data, several discrepancies were discovered that pointed toward inaccurate data collection. An example of these discrepancies can be found when examining the confined population. Data collected on the gender of the confined population shows a total of 1723 inmates confined. However, data collected on the race of the confined population shows a total of 1550 confined inmates. These two sample sizes should be equivalent since they are examining the same sample of inmates during the same period of time. Similar errors were discovered throughout

the survey data. Looking at the raw data it is apparent that these errors are not due to missing data but due to discrepancies in the counts that were reported in the totals and then in the breakdown of those totals into smaller categories. To obtain more reliable consistent data in the future it will be beneficial to create a survey that identifies these discrepancies as the survey is being taken by the respondents. Additionally, it may be beneficial to allow respondents to describe why these discrepancies occur as they may reflect an issue with the manner in which the data are gathered and reported.

CONCLUSION

The findings in this report have provided baseline data for Montana jail facilities. This information is important to determine how Montana facilities compare nationally and how the facilities have changed over time when future data is collected. Overall, Montana facilities appear to be similar to national estimates. Some notable findings are presented below.

As reported by jail administrators, Montana authorities are keeping juvenile offenders (under 18) out of adult jails. No facility in Montana reported any inmate under the age of 18. Nationwide, juvenile inmates account for .6% of the jail population. This equates to an estimated 4,200 juveniles.

Montana has a lower average jail incarceration rate estimated at 195 inmates per 100,000 Montana citizens compared to 234 inmates per 100,000 U.S. residents nationwide. The statistics for jail crowding is similar to national estimates. Montana's jails operated at about 89.1% of rated capacity on an average day and about 95% of rated capacity on the most crowded day in November 2014. Meanwhile, the nation's jails operated at about 83% of rated capacity on an average day and about 89% of rated capacity on their most crowded day in June 2014. Montana inmates fluctuate at a slightly higher rate than national estimates. The average turnover rate for Montana facilities is 91.73%. The turnover rate nationally is between a high of 104.2% to a low of 48.5%.

Inmate assaults on officers are rare. Only 12 assaults were reported in a year-long period representing .36% or 3.6 assaults per 1000 officers. No assaults on other staff were reported. Inmate on inmate assaults were more common. 114 physical assaults were reported, approximately 3.45% or 34.5 assaults per 1000 inmates. 18 sexual assaults were reported representing approximately .55% or 5.5 sexual assaults per 1000 inmates. Two outlying facilities have skewed these results with one facility reporting 70 of the 114 assaults, and a separate facility reporting 17 of the 18 sexual assaults. While these two facilities account for the largest average daily population of the facilities reporting data, further inquiry may be necessary to determine strategies to decrease future assaults.

Facilities are already using or willing to adopt the Data Detention Information System (DDIS). Eleven (33.33%) of the facilities in Montana already use DDIS and out of the twenty two facilities that indicated they do not use DDIS, 17 (77.3%) reported that they would be willing to use DDIS in the next calendar year. These are promising findings which will assist in the second year of this project. Those facilities that already use DDIS described it as a good system that collects a wide range of data, allows the facility to see where additional training would be most beneficial, gives data that can be shared and compared with other facilities, and provides information that could be used as a tool for future planning for corrections in Montana. One suggested improvement that was discussed by two facilities is making other facility data available so comparisons and ranking can be

viewed remotely. The second year of this project should focus on those facilities that are willing to participate in DDIS and determine if barriers can be resolved for those facilities that are not.

REFERENCES

Minton, D., Todd and Zhen Zeng. 2015. Jail Inmates at Midyear 2014. *Bureau of Justice Statistics.*