
Table of Contents

Volume One

List of Contributors	<i>v</i>
About the Editor	<i>vii</i>
Foreword	<i>ix</i> <i>Norval Morris</i>
Foreword to the Original Edition	<i>xi</i> <i>Morris E. Lasker</i>
Preface	<i>xv</i>

SECTION I **An Overview of Prison Law**

CHAPTER 1 **Introduction**

Reflections of a Federal Judge	<i>Frank A. Kaufman</i>	<i>1-3</i>
Notes		<i>1-8</i>

Resolving Prisoners' Grievances Out of Court: 42 U.S.C. § 1997e		
<i>Harvard Law Review</i>		
Introduction		<i>1-11</i>
Recommendations of the Federal Courts Study Committee		<i>1-12</i>
Elements of a Fair and Effective Prisoner Grievance System		<i>1-17</i>
Conclusion		<i>1-21</i>
Notes		<i>1-22</i>
Appendix		<i>1-31</i>

The Prisoners' Mail Box and the Evolution of Federal Inmate Rights		
<i>Ira P. Robbins</i>		
Introduction		<i>1-33</i>
Federal Prisoners Before the Federal Prison System: 1789-1891		<i>1-34</i>

The Three Prisons Act and Its Immediate Aftermath	1-35
The Early Days of the Federal Prison System	1-36
Early Procedures for Prisoner Complaints	1-38
The Prisoners' Mail Box and the Evolution of Inmate Rights	1-40
Expanding Scope/Expanding Concerns	1-45
Transition to the Future	1-53
Conclusion	1-54
Notes	1-56

The Trauma of the Incarceration Experience *Mika'il DeVeaux*

Introduction	1-80
I. Psychological Effects of Incarceration	1-81
A. Trauma	1-84
B. A Concern Related to Public Safety	1-86
II. The Incarceration Experience	1-88
A. Sing Sing Prison	1-91
B. Clinton Dannamora	1-94
C. Special Housing Units	1-95
D. Happy Nap	1-97
III. Conclusion	1-99

CHAPTER 1A

Correctional Developments

The State of Corrections Today: A Triumph of Pluralistic Ignorance

Allen F. Breed

Introduction	1A-3
Public Attitudes Over Time	1A-4
The Emergence of Crime and Corrections as Major Issues	1A-6
The Politicization of Crime and Corrections	1A-8
The Public Attitude Today	1A-9
The Lessons Learned	1A-10

The Use of Incarceration in the United States: A Look at the Present and the Future *Lynn Sanders Branham*

Preface and Summary of Recommendations	1A-13
General Recommendations	1A-14
Recommendations to State and Local Bar Associations	1A-16
Introduction	1A-16
The Use of Incarceration—Where We Are Today	1A-18
How Many People Are Incarcerated in Prisons and Jails?	1A-18
Who Is Incarcerated in Prisons and Jails?	1A-20
How Long Are People Incarcerated in Prisons and Jails?	1A-26

What Happens During Incarceration in Prison or Jail?	1A-29
Why Are So Many More People Incarcerated in Prisons and Jails?	1A-32
More Prison and Jail Sentences	1A-36
Longer Sentences	1A-37
More Restrictive Parole and Other Release Policies	1A-37
Increased Probation and Parole Revocations	1A-38
Demographic Factors	1A-38
What Are the Costs, Benefits, and Efficacy of Present Incarceration Policies?	1A-39
Financial Costs	1A-39
Opportunity Costs	1A-40
Other Costs of Incarceration	1A-41
Crime-Control Benefits and Efficacy	1A-41
Recommendations for the Future	1A-46
The Role of State and Local Bar Associations in Sentencing and Corrections Reform	1A-66
Corrections and Sentencing Committees in Each State Bar Association	1A-67
Appointment of a Liaison to the American Bar Association Criminal Justice Section's Corrections and Sentencing Committee	1A-67
Working with Other Organizations	1A-67
Training	1A-68
Public Education	1A-69
Monitoring	1A-70
Conclusion	1A-71
Notes	1A-72
Appendix: Model Adult Community Corrections Act	1A-82

The Return of the Chain Gang *Harvard Law Review*

Introduction	1A-101
Problems with the Concept	1A-101
Conclusion	1A-104
Notes	1A-104

Designing a Prisoner Reentry System Hardwired to Manage Disputes *Harvard Law Review*

Introduction: The Reentry Problem	1A-110
I. Three Principles for an Effective Reentry System	1A-111
II. Past Solutions: Parole and the Rehabilitative Ideal	1A-113
A. The Rehabilitative Ideal Failed to Follow Three Principles of DSD	1A-114
B. Resulting Critiques of the Rehabilitative Ideal	1A-115
C. The Fall of the Rehabilitative Ideal	1A-118

III. The Status Quo: Supervised Release and the Rise of the Reentry Court Model	<i>IA-120</i>
A. Supervised Release	<i>IA-120</i>
B. The Rise of Reentry Courts	<i>IA-121</i>
IV. Improving on the Status Quo: Designing a Sustainable System to Manage Reentry Disputes	<i>IA-124</i>
A. Involving Stakeholders in the Design and Implementation of the System	<i>IA-124</i>
B. Timing: Approaching a Mutually Hurting Stalemate	<i>IA-128</i>
C. Sustainability: Revisiting and Reevaluating the System	<i>IA-130</i>
Conclusion	<i>IA-131</i>

Second Looks & Second Chances *Shon Hopwood*

Introduction	<i>IA-134</i>
I. Second Looks Have a Long Historical Pedigree and are a Worthwhile Policy Goal	<i>IA-139</i>
A. There is a Long History of Second Look Provisions in the Federal Justice System	<i>IA-139</i>
B. Providing a Second Chance to Those Who are Deserving Comes with a Number of Benefits	<i>IA-141</i>
II. Federal Judges Can Reduce Sentences for People Whose Cases Present “Extraordinary or Compelling Reasons” Under the Compassionate Release Statute in 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A)(I)	<i>IA-147</i>
A. The History of Second Look Compassionate Release and Its Expanding Development	<i>IA-147</i>
C. Circumstances Presenting “Extraordinary and Compelling Reasons” for a Sentence Reduction	<i>IA-155</i>
III. Congress Should Create a True Second Look Provision, Requiring a Federal Judge to Reevaluate a Sentence after a Prisoner has Served Ten Years	<i>IA-157</i>
IV. U.S. Attorneys Can Dismiss Charges Under Holloway Relief for Deserving Prisoners who were Over-Sentenced	<i>IA-158</i>
V. The President Should Commute the Sentences of Those Who Were Unable to Seek Relief Through the Judicial System, But Who Have a Demonstrated Record of Rehabilitation and Who Have Been Sentenced Too Harshly	<i>IA-161</i>
Conclusion	<i>IA-164</i>

The Prisoner Trade *Emma Kaufman*

Introduction	<i>IA-166</i>
I. Building the American Penal Estate	<i>IA-171</i>
A. The Rise of Regional Prison Governance	<i>IA-171</i>
B. The Law of Prison Transfers	<i>IA-179</i>
II. The Prison Network	<i>IA-187</i>
A. State Sunshine Statutes	<i>IA-188</i>
B. Interstate Prison Pathways	<i>IA-191</i>

C. Rationales for Prisoner Transportation	1A-197
III. Regulating the Prisoner Trade	1A-204
A. The Harms	1A-205
B. The Benefits	1A-215
C. Outsourcing the Power to Punish	1A-218
D. Consent as a Cure	1A-222
Conclusion	1A-227
Appendix	1A-228

But Who Oversees the Overseers?: The Status of Prison and Jail Oversight in the United States *Michele Deitch*

Introduction	1A-234
I. The Value of Independent Correctional Oversight	1A-240
A. What is Oversight?	1A-240
B. Why is Oversight Important	1A-242
1. Benefits to Incarcerated People	1A-243
2. Benefits to Correctional Administrators	1A-243
3. Benefits to Judges, Prosecutors, Defense Lawyers, and Policymakers	1A-245
4. Benefits to the Media and the General Public	1A-246
C. The United States is an Anomaly on the World Stage	1A-247
II. America's Overreliance on Court Oversight and its Now-Diminished Role	1A-250
III. Increasing Calls for Independent Oversight	1A-254
IV. The Current Research Project: Assessing the State of Prison and Jail Oversight in the United States	1A-265
A. Project Purpose	1A-265
B. Research Methodology	1A-266
C. Defining the Criteria for Inclusion	1A-267
1. Independence	1A-267
2. Function	1A-268
3. Access	1A-269
D. Research Findings	1A-270
(a) Prison Oversight	1A-282
(b) Statewide Jail Oversight	1A-285
(c) Local Jail Oversight	1A-289
(1) Insufficient staffing and funding	1A-289
(2) Political pressures	1A-293
(3) Lack of unfettered access to correctional facilities	1A-294
Conclusion: Two Steps Forward, One Step Back	1A-295

Climate Change and the Threat to U.S. Jails and Prisons *IA-299*

<i>Laurie Levinson</i>	
I. Introduction	1A-300

II. The Tragedy in Surfside	<i>1A-304</i>
III. Climate Change and Its Impact on Correctional Facilities	<i>1A-308</i>
A. Step #1: Recognize There Is a Problem with U.S. Jails and Prisons	<i>1A-313</i>
B. Step #2: Conduct a Comprehensive Study of the Physical Condition of U.S. Jails and Prisons	<i>1A-314</i>
C. Step #3: Prepare a Climate Change Impact Report for Vulnerable Institutions	<i>1A-315</i>
D. Step #4: Assess and Allocate Money for Rebuilding Prisons	<i>1A-316</i>
E. Step #5: Address Political Resistance to Rebuilding Prisons	<i>1A-317</i>
F. Step #6: Create a Transparent Process for Groups to Monitor Prison Conditions	<i>1A-317</i>
G. Step #7: Let Science Guide the Design	<i>1A-318</i>
H. Step #8: Collaborate with International Efforts	<i>1A-319</i>
I. Step #9: Engage Detainees in Efforts to Protect Prisons and Prisoners	<i>1A-321</i>
J. Step #10: Address How Mass Incarceration Contributes to Climate Change	<i>1A-322</i>
IV. Ten Steps for Coping with Climate Change and Its Impact on Correctional Institutions	<i>1A-311</i>
V. Add Repair and Reconstruction of Correctional Facilities to Subsequent Infrastructure Bills	<i>1A-324</i>
VI. Conclusion	<i>1A-326</i>
Appendix	<i>1A-329</i>

CHAPTER 1B

Overview of the Law of Prisoners' Rights and Remedies

Prisoners' Rights and Procedural Means of Enforcement Under 42 U.S.C. § 1983	<i>Georgetown Law Journal</i>
Introduction	<i>1B-4</i>
Prisoners' Rights	<i>1B-4</i>
Right of Access to Courts	<i>1B-7</i>
Freedoms of Speech, Association, and Religion	<i>1B-15</i>
Rights Related to Searches, Seizures, and Personal Privacy	<i>1B-23</i>
Rights Related to Conditions of Confinement and The Use of Force Against Prisoners	<i>1B-26</i>
Rights to Procedural Due Process	<i>1B-39</i>
Right to Equal Treatment	<i>1B-50</i>
Right to Assistance of Counsel	<i>1B-55</i>
Rights of Pretrial Detainees	<i>1B-56</i>
Procedural Means of Enforcement Under 42 U.S.C. § 1983	<i>1B-64</i>
Scope of § 1983	<i>1B-64</i>

Available Remedies Under § 1983	1B-77
Filing a § 1983 Action Pro Se and Proceeding In Forma Pauperis	1B-86
Other Restrictions Imposed by the PLRA	1B-91
Persons Liable Under § 1983	1B-96
Absolute and Qualified Immunity from Suit Under § 1983	1B-102
Other Affirmative Defenses	1B-114
Appointment of Counsel	1B-118
Other Procedural Issues Governing § 1983 Actions	1B-119

CHAPTER 2
Legal Developments

**The Legacy of *Wolfish* and *Chapman*: Some Thoughts About “Big
Prison Case” Litigation in the 1980s** *David J. Gottlieb*

Introduction	2-3
Conditions Litigation Prior to <i>Wolfish</i>	2-4
The Rise and Fall of the “Hands Off” Doctrine	2-4
Early Prison-Conditions Litigation	2-5
Early Jail-Conditions Litigation	2-6
The Road to <i>Wolfish</i>	2-8
<i>Bell v. Wolfish</i>	2-9
Post- <i>Wolfish</i> Litigation	2-11
<i>Rhodes v. Chapman</i>	2-15
Post- <i>Chapman</i> Litigation	2-17
Totality of Conditions vs. Core Conditions	2-17
Experts and Proof	2-19
Equitable Relief	2-21
Conclusion	2-24
Notes	2-25

***Wilson v. Seiter*: Less Than Meets the Eye** *David J. Gottlieb*

Introduction	2-33
<i>Wilson v. Seiter</i>	2-34
The Relevance of Intent	2-36
The Meaning of Deliberate Indifference	2-39
<i>Estelle v. Gamble</i>	2-39
Deliberate Indifference in Class-Action Cases	2-41
Deliberate Indifference in Prison-Conditions Cases	2-42
The Question of Cost	2-42
Litigation After <i>Wilson</i>	2-44
Conclusion	2-46
Notes	2-47

Modification of Consent Decrees *Harvard Law Review*

Introduction	2-53
<i>Rufo v. Inmates of Suffolk County Jail</i>	2-53
Analysis	2-55
Conclusion	2-58
Notes	2-59

Farmer v. Brennan: A Subjective Standard for Deliberate Indifference *Harvard Law Review*

Introduction	2-63
<i>Farmer v. Brennan</i>	2-63
Analysis	2-66
Conclusion	2-68
Notes	2-69

Symbolic Statutes and Real Laws: The Pathologies of the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act and the Prison Litigation Reform Act *Mark Tushnet and Larry Yackle*

Introduction	2-75
The AEDPA and the PLRA: Studies in Interpretation	2-76
General Background	2-77
Habeas Corpus: Reform Proposals	2-77
Prisoner Litigation: Developments and Reform Proposals	2-82
Limiting Relief to Identifiable Violations	2-83
Limiting "Micromanagement"	2-84
Easing Standards for Modifying and Lifting Decrees	2-84
Adoption of the Proposals	2-87
The Habeas Corpus Revisions in the AEDPA	2-87
<i>Felker v. Turpin</i>	2-87
Revising Habeas Corpus: Some Case Studies	2-89
Delays and Timetables	2-90
Filing Deadlines for Prisoners	2-90
Timetables for Federal Court Action	2-94
Procedural Bar Rules	2-95
Default in Successive Petition Cases	2-95
Default with Respect to Fact Development	2-96
Default in Death Penalty Cases	2-99
Previous State Court Judgments on the Merits	2-99
The Prison Litigation Reform Act	2-102
Restricting Institutional Litigation: The Statute	2-103
Introduction	2-103
General Considerations	2-103
Prospective Relief Generally, Including Modification	2-105
Modifying Decrees Now in Force	2-109

Limiting Frivolous Litigation	2-111
The AEDPA and the PLRA as Case Studies in Legislative and Judicial Process	2-115
Accounting for the Judicial Responses	2-115
Two Positive Accounts	2-115
Methods of Interpreting the Statutes as Stabilizers of the Law	2-116
The “Constitutional” Lens	2-116
The “Administrative” Lens	2-116
The “Policy” Lens	2-117
The “Realistic” Lens	2-117
Instrumental, Expressive, and Symbolic Statutes	2-117
First-Order Instrumental Statutes	2-118
Direct Effects on Incentives	2-118
Indirect Effects on Incentives: Reconstitutive Law	2-119
Expressive or Second-Order Instrumental Statutes	2-120
Searching for “Loopholes” in the Details	2-121
Obscuring the Message Through the Details	2-121
Symbolic Statutes	2-122
Conclusion	2-122
Notes	2-123

The PLRA and AEDPA: Implications for Federal District Judges

<i>Harvard Law Review</i>	2-149
Introduction	2-149
Historical Background	2-150
The Warren Court	2-150
The Expansion of Rights for Prisoners and Criminal Defendants	2-151
The Rehnquist Court	2-152
The Statutes	2-153
The Prison Litigation Reform Act	2-153
Legislative History	2-153
Provisions	2-155
Prospective Relief Restrictions	2-155
Three-Judge Court Requirement for Population Caps	2-155
Termination of Prospective Relief	2-156
The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act	2-157
Legislative History	2-157
Provisions	2-158
“Clearly established law”	2-158
Circuit Court Certification Requirement	2-159
The Importance of Federal District Judges	2-159
The Impact of the PLRA’s and AEDPA’s Procedural Changes on Prisoners’ Rights	2-160

The Virtues of Federal, Rather Than State, Courts	2-160
The Virtues of Trial, Rather Than Appellate, Federal Courts	2-160
Implications That Should Concern Even Those Who Do Not Support Prisoners' Rights	2-161
Conclusion	2-162
Notes	2-162

**The Essential but Inherently Limited Role of the Courts in Prison
Reform** *Erwin Chemerinsky* 2-173

Introduction	2-174
I. The Crisis	2-175
II. The Causes of the Crisis	2-176
III. The Courts' Essential but Limited Role	2-178
Conclusion	2-183

Prisoners' Rights Strategies for Preserving the Role of the Courts

<i>Margo Schlanger</i>	2-185
I. Introduction	2-186
II. Trends in Prisoner Litigation	2-188
III. Entry of Relief, Including Settlement	2-192
A. What the PLRA Requires	2-192
B. How Parties Continue to Settle Cases	2-194
1. Acceptable Stipulations	2-194
2. Conditional Dismissal	2-200
3. State-Court Enforcement	2-205
IV. Termination of Prospective Relief	2-207
A. What the PLRA Requires	2-207
B. How the Prisoners' Rights Bar has Responded, and Should Respond	2-209
1. Lengthening the Remedial Period	2-210
2. Gathering Information	2-212
V. Conclusion	2-216
Appendix	2-218
A. Federal Court Filings (Table 1 & Figure A)	2-218
B. Prison Population (Table 1 & Figure A)	2-219
C. Jail Population (Table 1 & Figure A)	2-220
D. Prison Censuses (Table 2)	2-222
E. Jail Censuses (Table 2)	2-222

**“When Mercy Seasons Justice”: Interstate Recognition of
Ex-Offender Rights** *Wayne A. Logan* 2-225

Introduction	2-226
I. Restoration and Recognition	2-232
A. Restoration	2-233

B. Recognition	2-238
1. Statute or Regulation	2-238
2. Caselaw	2-240
II. Potential Constitutional Arguments	2-244
A. Full Faith and Credit	2-244
B. Privileges and Immunities	2-251
C. Right to Travel	2-255
D. Equal Protection	2-258
III. Legislative Options	2-262
A. States	2-262
1. The Case for Recognition	2-262
2. The Case Against Recognition	2-265
3. The Case for a More Conditional Approach	2-267
B. Congress	2-271
1. Interstate Compact	2-271
2. Spending Clause	2-273
3. Commerce Clause	2-275
4. Effects Clause	2-277
<i>Wayne A. Logan</i>	2-225
Conclusion	2-279

The Constitutional Law of Incarceration, Reconfigured	<i>Margo</i>
<i>Schlanger</i>	2-281
Introduction	2-282
I. Constitutional Regulation of Jail and Prison Conditions: Doctrinal Developments	2-286
A. Stage 1: Before the 1970s	2-289
B. Stage 2: <i>Estelle</i> Through <i>Rhodes</i> , 1976-1981	2-293
C. Stage 3: <i>Whitley</i> Through <i>Farmer</i> , 1986-1994	2-301
D. The Problem with "Punishment"	2-309
II. The Normative Case for a Constitutional Ban on Objectively Unreasonable Force	2-312
A. Officers Sometimes Inflict Obvious Summary Corporal Punishment	2-313
B. Officers Sometimes Escalate a Situation that Could Reasonably Be Managed with Minor Force, to Cover Summary Corporal Punishment	2-316
C. Officers Sometimes Use Excessive Force to Accomplish Legitimate Purposes, Indifferent to the Pain or Injury the Force Inflicts	2-317
D. Officers Sometimes Use Force that Is Unreasonable Under the Circumstances	2-323
III. <i>Kingsley v. Hendrickson</i>	2-326
A. The <i>Kingsley</i> Majority	2-327

B. The <i>Kingsley</i> Dissent	2-333
C. <i>Kingsley</i> Requires an Objective Reasonableness	
Conditions-of-Confinement Standard, Too	2-334
IV. The Organizational Normative Case for a Constitutional Ban on	
Objectively Unreasonable Force or Conditions	2-341
A. Solving the Problem of Culpable Ignorance	2-342
B. Solving the Problem of a Cost Defense	2-346
V. The Eighth Amendment "Malicious and Sadistic" and Deliberate	
Indifference Standards are Wrong, Too	2-349
Conclusion	2-357

150% Wrong: The Prison Litigation Reform Act and Attorney's Fees *Eleanor Umphres* 2-361

Introduction	2-362
A. Attorney's Fees in America	2-363
B. The Prison Litigation Reform Act: 42 U.S.C. § 1997e	2-365
I. The Statute: 42 U.S.C. § 1997e	2-366
A. Legislative Purpose and History	2-366
B. The Text in Question: 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(d)—Attorney's Fees	2-369
II. How 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(d)(2) Has Been Interpreted	2-371
A. The Prevailing Interpretation	2-371
B. The Problem with the Prevailing Interpretation	2-374
1. Fallacy of the Inverse	2-374
2. Unnecessarily Absurd Results That Deter Meritorious Litigation	2-375
C. Why Such a Bad Interpretation Has Persisted	2-377
D. "The Reminder Theory"	2-380
III. How 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(d) Should Be Interpreted	2-381
A. Section 1988-Authorized Attorney's Fees in Non-Prisoner Suits	2-381
B. Section 1988-Authorized Attorney's Fees Under the PLRA: A Reasonable Interpretation	2-382
C. "Proportionately Related"	2-384
IV. Benefits of a Correct Reading	2-388
Conclusion	2-393

Completely Exhausted: Evaluating the Impact of *Woodford v. Ngo* on Prisoner Litigation in Federal Courts *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*

Introduction	2-396
I. <i>Woodford v. Ngo</i> : A Primer	2-397
A. The Administrative Law Exhaustion Doctrine	2-397
B. The PLRA: The End of Prisoner Litigation in Federal Court?	2-398

C. <i>Woodford v. Ngo</i> : Parsing the Opinion	2-401
D. Post- <i>Woodford</i> Developments	2-405
II. "Proper" Exhaustion and Prisoner Litigation: What Result?	2-405
A. Methodology	2-406
B. Summary: Key Findings	2-412
III. Analyzing Trends: <i>Woodford's</i> Failure to Block Prisoners' Unexhausted Civil Claims from Entering Federal Court	2-413
A. Explaining the Outliers	2-413
B. Outliers vs. The Median	2-417
C. Knowledge Gaps: Setting Prisoners up to Fail	2-418
D. Longer Sentences, More Time to File	2-420
E. <i>Woodford's</i> Impact on the Courts and on Court Proceedings	2-421
IV. Recommendations	2-422
Conclusion	2-425
Appendix	2-426

SECTION II

Litigating and Enforcing the Rights of Prisoners

CHAPTER 3

The First Amendment**Prisons as Censors** *Clair A. Cripe and Ira Kirschbaum*

Introduction	3-3
The Constitutional Context	3-4
The Need for Professional Decisionmaking Deference	3-6
Publications That Pose a Definite Threat	3-9
To Reject or Not to Reject Other Publications: It Depends on the Particular Situation	3-10
Sexually Explicit Material	3-13
What Process Is Due?	3-15
Conclusion	3-19
Notes	3-19

Prisoners' Religious Free Exercise Rights *American University Law Review*

Introduction	3-25
Background	3-26
Prisoners' First Amendment Rights	3-26
Federal Appellate Court Decisions	3-29
<i>Shabazz v. O'Lone</i> : Facts and Procedural History	3-31
The District Court's Analysis	3-31

The Third Circuit's Analysis	3-32
The Supreme Court's Analysis	3-32
Analysis	3-33
Conclusion	3-37
Notes	3-37

Restrictions on Prisoners' Rights to Receive Publications*Harvard Law Review*

Introduction	3-59
<i>Thornburgh v. Abbott</i>	3-59
Analysis	3-62
Conclusion	3-65
Notes	3-65

In the Belly of the Whale: Religious Practice in Prison*Harvard Law Review*

Introduction	3-71
The Legal Standard for Inmate Religious Claims	3-72
Correctional Approaches to Religious Accommodation	3-73
Religious Accommodations in Practice	3-75
Classification	3-75
Worship and Pastoral Services	3-77
Diet	3-78
Grooming	3-80
Personal Property	3-81
Conclusion	3-82
Notes	3-83

The Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act of 2000*Harvard Law Review* 3-95**Inmate Access to Print Media***Harvard Law Review* 3-107**Gods Behind Bars: Prison Gangs, Due Process, and the First Amendment***Brooklyn Law Review*

Introduction	3-120
I. Due Process: Prisoners' Claims of Deprivation of Constitutional Rights	3-125
A. The Turner Test	3-125
B. Turner and Security Threat Group Designation	3-128
C. Other Legal Approaches to STGs	3-130
II. First Amendment	3-132

A. Five Percenters	3-132
1. Background	3-132
2. Legal Analysis	3-134
B. Black Guerilla Family	3-139
1. Background	3-139
2. Legal Analysis	3-142
III. Consequences of STG Designation	3-145
A. Lost Privileges	3-147
B. Segregation	3-148
C. Reporting to Local Law Enforcement on Release	3-150
D. "Debriefing"	3-150
IV. Proposals for Change	3-152
A. The Future of Turner	3-152
B. Proposed Approaches	3-155
Conclusion	3-157

Ineffective Assistance of Library: The Failings and the Future of Prison Law Libraries

Jonathan Abel

Introduction	3-160
I. The History of Prison Law Libraries	3-166
A. Prison Law Libraries: 1900 to 1960	3-166
1. General-Interest Libraries in Prisons	3-166
2. Law Libraries in Prisons: The Early History	3-168
3. Propagating the Prison Law Library Myth	3-171
B. Prison Law Libraries in the 1960s	3-172
1. The Courts' Views on Prison Law Libraries	3-173
2. Prison Officials' Views on Prison Law Libraries	3-174
II. The Wobbly Path to a Law Library Doctrine	3-178
A. Nonlibrary Access-to-Courts Cases: <i>Ex Parte Hull and Johnson v. Avery</i>	3-179
B. <i>Younger v. Gilmore</i> : The First Law Library Case	3-180
C. <i>Bounds v. Smith</i> : The Second Law Library Case	3-183
D. The Law Library Debate Flipped on its Head	3-185
1. Inmate Advocates Opposed Law Libraries Insofar as Libraries Became an Impediment to a Postconviction Right to Counsel	3-185
2. The States' Noninterference Principle	3-190
III. The Internal Contradictions of the Law Library Doctrine	3-193
A. <i>Lewis v. Casey</i> : The Standing Paradox and the Absence of a Right to "Discover" Claims or to "Litigate Effectively"	3-193
B. The Mysterious Origins of the Constitutional Right	3-194
C. The Correct Amount of Access: Which Claims? What Resources? How Effective?	3-196
D. Circuit Split: Do Pretrial, Pro Se Inmates have a Law Library Right?	3-197

A Concluding Note: Technological Changes to the Prison Law
Library 3-198

Holding Federal Prison Officials Accountable: The Case for Recognizing a Damages Remedy for Federal Prisoners' Free Exercise Claims

Nicole B. Godfrey

I. Introduction	3-204
II. Development of Damages Remedy Against Government Officials for Constitutional Violations	3-209
A. Damages Against State and Local Officials Under 42 U.S.C. § 1983	3-210
B. Damages Against Federal Officials Under <i>Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics</i>	3-211
C. The Future of <i>Bivens</i>	3-218
III. Extending <i>Bivens</i> to Free Exercise Claims Brought by Federal Prisoners	3-226
A. Is a <i>Bivens</i> Remedy for Free Exercise Claims Truly an Extension of <i>Bivens</i> ?	3-227
B. Do Special Factors Exist that Would Counsel Hesitation in Expanding the Availability of a <i>Bivens</i> Remedy for Free Exercise Claims Brought by Federal Prisoners?	3-231
C. Has Congress Created an Adequate Alternative Remedy to Address the Violation of Federal Prisoners' Free Exercise Rights?	3-235
IV. Importance of a Damages Remedy for Substantial Burdens on the Free Exercise of Religion in Prisons	3-244
A. The Stanford Prison Experiment and the "Lucifer Effect": How Prisons Create an Environment Ripe for Abuse	3-245
B. The Importance of Religious Rights in Prison	3-248
C. The Historical Purpose of Punitive Damages	3-250
V. Conclusion	3-251

Reading the Prisoner's Letter: Attorney-Client Confidentiality in Inmate Correspondence *Gregory Sisk, Michelle King, Joy Nissen Beitzel,*

Bridget Duffus, and Katherine Koehler

Introduction	3-258
I. Confidentiality in Attorney-Client Correspondence with Prisoners	3-262
A. Attorney-Client Confidentiality in General	3-263
B. Attorney-Client Confidentiality and the Inmate	3-265
1. The Prisoner's Need for Confidentiality in Legal Communications	3-265
2. The Impact of Invasive Prison Legal Mail Rules on the Availability of Legal Counsel for Prisoners	3-269
C. The Vital Importance of Legal Mail to the Attorney-Client Relationship	3-271

II. A Survey of Prison Policies on Legal Mail	3-274
A. Prison Regulations on Incoming Attorney Mail to Prisoners	3-275
B. Prison Regulations on Outgoing Prisoner Mail to Attorneys	3-276
III. Constitutional Protection for Prisoner-Attorney Correspondence	3-277
A. Prisoner Free Speech and Access to Court Rights to Confidentiality in Attorney Correspondence	3-280
1. Supreme Court Precedent	3-280
2. Circuit Precedent (Majority)	3-281
3. Circuit Precedent (Minority)	3-283
4. Whether Prison Intrusion Occurs Inside or Outside Presence of Prisoner as Being Irrelevant to Prohibition on Reading	3-284
B. Prisoner Right to Assistance of Counsel in Criminal Matters and Confidentiality in Attorney Correspondence	3-286
C. Protecting a Prison's Legitimate Penological Interests	3-288
1. Protecting Against Introduction of Contraband	3-289
2. Interrupting Illegal Communications	3-290
3. Upholding the Critical Need for Attorney-Client Confidentiality	3-292
D. Reading Versus Inspection Versus Scanning	3-293
1. Impermissibility of Reading Attorney-Client Letters	3-293
2. The Danger of Allowing Even Limited Access to the Substantive Contents of Attorney-Client Mail	3-296
a. Skimming of Legal Mail is a Form of Reading That Would Eviscerate Confidentiality	3-297
b. The Rare Prospect of the Rogue Lawyer Engaging in Criminal Misconduct	3-298
c. Nordstrom v. Ryan: Rejecting Skimming and Highlighting Absence of Evidence of Lawyer Abuse of Legal Mail	3-301
IV. Procedures for Asserting Right to Confidentiality in Prisoner Legal Mail	3-306
A. Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies: The Prison Grievance Process and Legal Mail Cases	3-307
B. Liberal Construction of Pro Se Prisoner Complaints in Legal Mail Cases	3-311
C. Standing for Legal Mail Claims	3-313
1. Proving a Practice or a Policy of Reading or Opening Attorney-Client Mail	3-313
2. Standing for First Amendment Free Speech Claim	3-314
3. Standing for Sixth Amendment Right to Counsel Claim	3-316
a. Showing of Prejudice When Seeking Retrospective Relief	3-316

b. No Need to Show Past Prejudice When Seeking Prospective Relief	3-318
c. The Potential Problem of Mootness	3-320
4. Standing for Right-of-Access-to-the-Courts Claim	3-322
D. Retrospective and Prospective Relief in Legal Mail Cases	3-324
E. Qualified Immunity for Prison Officers in Legal Mail Cases	3-327
Conclusion	3-329

CHAPTER 4

Fourth Amendment, Privacy, and Possessory Rights**Fourth Amendment, Privacy and Possessory Rights of Detainees and Prisoners: Recent Supreme Court Decisions** *Harvard Law**Review*

Introduction	4-3
<i>Block v. Rutherford</i>	4-3
<i>Hudson v. Palmer</i>	4-5
Analysis of the Decisions	4-7
Conclusion	4-10
Notes	4-10

CHAPTER 5

Procedural Due Process Rights**Prisoners and Due Process Litigation: An Invitation to the State Courts** *Susan N. Herman*

Introduction	5-3
Due Process Claims	5-4
Federal Due Process Claims	5-4
State Constitutions: The New Frontier	5-6
Perceived Flaws or Eccentricities in the Federal Doctrine	5-7
Institutional Differences Between State and Federal Courts	5-9
Distinctive State-Specific Factors	5-10
Alternative Approaches	5-11
Conclusion	5-12
Notes	5-13

The Supreme Court's Due Process Cases of the 1985 Term*Harvard Law Review*

Introduction	5-19
<i>Daniels v. Williams</i> and <i>Davidson v. Cannon</i>	5-19
Analysis of the Decisions	5-21

Conclusion	5-24
Notes	5-25

Procedural Due Process of Incarcerated Parents in Termination of Parental Rights Proceedings: A Fifty State Analysis *Philip M. Genty*

Introduction	5-29
Constitutional Requirements in the Determination of Parental Fitness	5-33
When a Hearing Is Something Less: Streamlined Hearing Procedures	5-37
Physical Presence at Hearings	5-38
Disposition of Proceeding Through Summary Judgment	5-39
Right to Counsel	5-40
Conclusion	5-40
Termination of Parental Rights on the Basis of Past Unfitness: "Backward-Looking" Statutes and Cases	5-41
Rehabilitation of Parents	5-42
Repeated Criminal Activity or Other Detrimental Conduct	5-43
Nature of the Parent's Crime	5-44
Conclusions	5-46
Termination of Parental Rights on the Basis of Length of Prison Sentence: "Forward-Looking" Statutes and Cases	5-47
Statutes	5-48
Cases	5-49
Conclusions	5-52
Protecting the Procedural Due Process Rights of Incarcerated Parents: Toward a Constitutionally Acceptable Framework for Termination of Parental Rights	5-53
Illustrative State Systems	5-54
Model for Termination of Parental Rights Proceedings Involving Incarcerated Parents	5-61
Hearing Procedures	5-61
Duties of Childcare Agency	5-61
Requirements for Judicial Inquiry Into Parental Fitness	5-62
Conclusions	5-63
Notes	5-64

Due Process and Punishments Imposed by Administrative Proceedings *Harvard Law Review*

Introduction	5-109
<i>Sandin v. Conner</i>	5-110
Analysis	5-112
Conclusion	5-114
Notes	5-115

CHAPTER 6
Overcrowding**Prison Overcrowding: The Threat of the 1980s** *Robert B. McKay*

Introduction	6-3
Extent of Prison Overcrowding	6-5
Prison Population Trends from 1960 to 1983	6-6
Jail Inmates	6-6
Probation and Parole	6-7
Rates of Crime	6-7
Causes of Prison Overcrowding	6-9
Demographic Factors	6-9
Legislative Responsibility	6-9
Judicial Responsibility	6-9
Parole Officials' Responsibility	6-10
Consequences of Prison Overcrowding	6-10
Remedies for Prison Overcrowding	6-12
New Construction or Conversion of Facilities	6-13
Decriminalization	6-14
Reducing Mandatory Sentences	6-14
Alternative Sanctions	6-15
Restitution	6-15
Fines	6-15
Community Service	6-16
Presumptive Parole	6-16
Emergency Standby Release Power	6-16
Conclusion	6-17
Notes	6-17

Table of Contents

Volume Two

SECTION II

Litigating and Enforcing the Rights of Prisoners (continued)

CHAPTER 7

The Eighth Amendment

The Defense Perspective on Prison-Conditions Cases

William C. Collins

Introduction	7-3
The Role of the Judiciary	7-4
The Status of the Totality-of-Conditions Standard	7-5
The Impact of <i>Bell v. Wolfish</i> and <i>Rhodes v. Chapman</i>	7-5
The Lower Federal Cases	7-6
Effects of the <i>Chapman</i> Trend	7-7
Relief as a Separate Issue	7-7
Development of the Law	7-7
The Relevance of Cost	7-9
The Precedents Reconsidered	7-10
Continuing Jurisdiction	7-11
Relief and the Contempt Power: An Old Idea Revisited	7-12
Conclusion	7-14
Notes	7-15

Excessive Force Against Prisoners *Harvard Law Review*

Introduction	7-19
<i>Hudson v. McMillian</i>	7-19

Analysis	7-22
Conclusion	7-24
Notes	7-25

Secondhand Smoke Signals from Prison

Michigan Law Review

Introduction	7-29
The Serious Risk Posed By Secondhand Smoke	7-33
Secondhand Smoke and the Eighth Amendment	7-36
The <i>Helling v. McKinney</i> Standard	7-36
Societal Intolerance Toward Significant Exposure	7-38
The Deliberate Indifference Inquiry	7-42
Remedying the Eighth Amendment Violation	7-46
Conclusion	7-52

Confronting the Helms Amendment *Elizabeth R. Alexander*

Introduction	7-73
The Helms Amendment Does Not Require Proof of Any Element Not Previously Required to Show an Eighth Amendment Violation Regarding Overcrowding	7-74
The Helms Amendment Should Not Be Construed as an Attempt to Alter the Eighth Amendment Standard Applicable to Overcrowding	7-76
The Helms Amendment Does Not Restrict the Equitable Discretion of the Federal Courts to Issue an Injunction Against Overcrowding	7-78
The Amendment Does Not Preclude Class Action Certification for Prison Overcrowding Cases	7-79
Section 2 Places No New Restrictions on Federal Court Remedial Powers in Overcrowding Cases	7-81
Section (b)(1) Does Not Interfere with the Ability of a Federal Court to Place a Ceiling on Overcrowding by Approving a Consent Decree	7-81
Application of the Helms Amendment to Require Modification of Existing Consent Decrees May Violate the Principles of Separation of Powers and Due Process	7-84
Section (c) of the Helms Amendment Does Not Change the Standard for Modification	7-85
Conclusion: What Was Congress Doing in Enacting the Helms Amendment?	7-85
Notes	7-86
Appendix	7-91

Restrictions on Prisoners' Religious Freedom as Unconstitutional Conditions of Confinement: An Eighth Amendment Argument

Duke Law Journal

Introduction	7-93
The Importance of Protecting the Religious Freedom of Prisoners	7-94

The Religious Freedom of Prisoners is Poorly Protected	7-95
The Eighth Amendment May Protect the Religious Freedom of	
Prisoners	7-96
Background	7-97
Applying the <i>Wilson</i> Test to Religious Deprivations	7-98
The Subjective Prong	7-98
The Objective Prong	7-98
Objections and Replies	7-102
Religious Freedom and (Physical?) Pain	7-102
Pain and the Eighth Amendment	7-102
The Prison Litigation Reform Act	7-103
Isn't the First Amendment the Right Way to Protect Free	
Exercise?	7-104
Conclusion	7-104
Notes	7-105

Managed Health Care in Prisons as Cruel and Unusual Punishment

Ira P. Robbins

Introduction	7-117
Managed Health Care in Prisons	7-118
Managed Care	7-118
Managed Health Care in Prisons	7-119
The Different Companies	7-120
Contracts for Services	7-120
Accreditation Standards	7-120
The “Deliberate Indifference” Standard	7-121
History of the Standard	7-121
Liability of Institutional Defendants	7-123
Liability of Private Health Care Providers	7-123
Municipal Liability Based on Acquiescence in Acts of Private Health Care	
Providers	7-124
Financial Considerations as Deliberate Indifference	7-125
Institutional Liability of Private Health Care Providers	7-126
Challenges Under the Standard	7-126
Can the Use of Managed Care Constitute “Deliberate	
Indifference”?	7-128
<i>Per Se</i> Deliberate Indifference	7-129
Rebuttable Presumptions of Deliberate Indifference	7-129
Treatment-Based Controversies	7-131
Treatment Denied	7-132
Inefficacious Treatment	7-132
Treatment Delayed	7-132
Inadequate Staffing	7-133
Conclusion	7-134
Notes	7-134

Racial Segregation in Prisons *Harvard Law Review* 7-151**The Deaths in Custody Reporting Act: Status and Recommendations** *Ira P. Robbins*

Introduction	7-163
The Unmet Goals of DICRA	7-165
The Effectiveness of Reporting Acts	7-167
The Utility and Limitations of Reporting Statutes	
Generally	7-167
California as a Microcosm: The Need for More than Data	
Collection	7-168
Why Congress Should Enact Additional Legislation to Supplement	
DICRA	7-170
Blueprint for Complementary DICRA Legislation	7-171
Legislative Tools for Creating Accountability	7-171
Reporting	7-171
Investigations and Inspection	7-172
National Standards	7-173
Training	7-176
Conclusion	7-180
Notes	7-180

Lessons From Hurricane Katrina: Prison Emergency Preparedness as a Constitutional Imperative *Ira P. Robbins*

Introduction	7-200
I. Preparing for Hurricane Katrina	7-205
A. "There was No Plan for this Situation"	7-205
B. Point of Comparison: The Nebraska Emergency System	7-210
II. Emergency Preparation and Response in Prisons Generally	7-211
A. Emergency Training	7-212
B. Emergency Drills and Exercises	7-214
C. Planning for Terrorism	7-216
III. Legal and Moral Issues in Prison Emergency Preparedness	7-218
A. Emergency Preparedness and the Eighth Amendment	7-218
1. The Components of an Eighth Amendment Claim	7-220
2. Applying the Deliberate Indifference Standard to the Orleans	
Parish Prison	7-223
a. Officials' Awareness of Serious Risks to Inmates	7-226
b. OPP Officials Were Deliberately Indifferent by Failing to	
Take Reasonable Steps to Abate the Risks to	
Prisoners	7-231
3. The Defense of Qualified Immunity	7-236
B. Emergency Preparedness and the Sixth Amendment	7-238
1. The Rights to Speedy Trial and Counsel: Legal	
Background	7-239

2. Hurricane Katrina, the Rights to Speedy Trial and Counsel, and Emergency Planning	7-243
a. The Right to Speedy Trial	7-243
b. The Right to Counsel	7-248
3. What Could Have Been Done Differently?	7-249
C. Emergency Preparedness and Human Rights Concerns	7-250
IV. Recommendations	7-255
A. Reform Through Prisoners' Rights Litigation	7-256
B. Reform Through Legislation	7-258
C. Comparing Litigation with Legislation	7-262
1. Advantages of Litigation	7-262
2. Advantages of Legislation	7-263
D. Speedy Trial Recommendations	7-264
Conclusion	7-266

Qualified Immunity: Order of Analysis

Harvard Law Review 7-269

The Psychology of Cruelty Recognizing Grave Mental Harm in American Prisons

Harvard Law Review

Introduction	7-282
I. Applying Psychological and Neuroscientific Research to the Eighth Amendment Inquiries	7-285
A. Unconstitutional Punishments: The Proportionality Inquiry	7-285
B. Unconstitutional Conditions of Confinement	7-289
II. Using Psychological and Neuroscientific Research as a Basis for Recognizing Grave Mental Harm	7-295
A. Juvenile Brain Research and the Proportionality Inquiry	7-296
B. Social Isolation Research and the Conditions of Confinement Inquiry	7-297
III. Justifying Judicial Action	7-299
A. Overcoming Institutional Biases: Why the Courts are the Correct Entity to Identify Mental Needs	7-299
B. Why Courts are Capable of Identifying Grave Mental Harm	7-302
IV. Conclusion	7-302

Cruel and Unusual Construction: The Eighth Amendment as a Limit on Building Prisons on Toxic Waste Sites

University of Pennsylvania Law Review

Introduction	7-306
I. The Problem: Prisons in Unsafe Locations	7-309
A. The State Correctional Institution at Fayette (SCI Fayette), LaBelle, Pennsylvania	7-311

B. Forthcoming: United States Penitentiary Letcher (USP Letcher), (Roxana, Kentucky)	7-311
II. Cruel and Unusual Prison Conditions: The Case Law	7-313
A. Development of the Objective and Subjective Requirements	7-315
B. Future Harm and Deliberate Indifference	7-318
1. <i>Helling</i> : Exposure to Unsafe Conditions	7-318
2. <i>Farmer</i> : Reconciling <i>Wilson</i> with <i>Hutto</i> and <i>Rhodes</i>	7-319
C. <i>Brown v. Plata</i> : System-Wide Violations	7-321
III. Applying the Legal Framework	7-325
A. Objective Requirement: The Evidence	7-327
1. SCI Fayette	7-327
2. Letcher County	7-330
B. Subjective Test: Deliberately Indifferent Design	7-332
1. SCI Fayette	7-332
2. Letcher County	7-333
3. Subjectivity and Prospective Relief: An Uneasy Fit	7-334
IV. Limitations and Solutions	7-336
A. Federal Courts: The PLRA and Justiciability	7-336
1. Standing and Ripeness: Limits on Entry	7-336
2. The PLRA: Limits on Remedies	7-340
B. State Courts: A Solution Through Subsidiarity	7-342
Conclusion	7-345

Promise Amid Peril: PREA's Efforts to Regulate An End to Prison Rape *Brenda V. Smith*

Introduction	7-348
Background	7-349
I. The Development of PREA Provided Greater Discover Tools for Prisoners and Their Counsel	7-352
A. Shining a Light on Agency Practices in the Standards Development Process	7-353
B. PREA Discovery in Litigation	7-354
C. Notice and Comment as Admissions	7-357
II. New Articulations for the Standard of Care in Preventing, Investigating, and Punishing Sexual Abuse in Custody	7-359
III. Lowering Barriers and Giving New Life to Existing Constitutional and State Law Claims	7-364
A. Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies	7-366
B. Frivolous Claims	7-367
C. Physical Injury	7-369
IV. Litigation Interpreting PREA	7-371
A. Cases Attempting to Use PREA as a Separate Cause of Action Have Not Succeeded	7-371
B. PREA's Contribution to the Eighth Amendment Analysis	7-372

V. Extending Civil Rights and Services to Incarcerated Persons	7-374
A. Sexual Assault Services for People in Custody	7-374
B. Limits on Cross-Gender Supervision	7-377
C. Providing Protections for LGBTQI Persons in Custody	7-380
Conclusion	7-383

Excessive Force in Prison *Sharon Dolovich*

Introduction	7-386
I. Institutional Realities	7-394
A. Mechanisms of Moral Engagement in the Modern American Prison	7-394
B. The Moral Psychology of Excessive Force	7-404
C. The Psychology of Excessive Force in Action: The Case of <i>Kingsley</i>	7-408
D. Why Individual Liability	7-413
II. Constitutional Standards	7-420
A. Governing Doctrine	7-420
B. The Problem with <i>Whitley</i>	7-432
C. <i>Kingsley v. Hendrickson</i> : A Step in the Right Direction	7-432
D. Objectively Unreasonable Physical Force: Cruel and Unusual Punishment?	7-436
E. Reasonableness as a Moral Concept	7-436
F. <i>Kingsley</i> and the Limits of Reasonableness	7-453
G. Reasonableness Force and the Police	7-460
III. Normative Limits	7-464
A. The State's Carceral Burden and Cos' Duty to Protect	7-464
B. Necessity and Governing Values	7-471
C. <i>Whitley, Kingsley</i> , and the (Flawed) Grounds for Force	7-482
D. Putting It All Together	7-487
Conclusion	7-491

CHAPTER 8

Death-Row Conditions

Litigating Death-Row Conditions: The Case for Reform

Robert Johnson and John L. Carroll

Introduction	8-3
Death-Row Confinement Conditions	8-4
Nature of Conditions	8-4
Psychological Harms Produced by Death-Row Conditions	8-7
Attacking Death-Row Conditions: A Litigational History	8-8
The Nineteenth-Century Experience	8-8
Death-Row Litigation Before <i>Gregg</i> and <i>Furman</i>	8-9
Modern Theories for Enforcing the Rights of Death-Row Inmates	8-10

Cruel and Unusual Punishment: Totality of Conditions	8-11
The Due Process Clause: Arbitrary and Capricious Treatment and the Substantive Right Not to Be Confined to Death Row	8-13
Death Row as Punishment Without Penological Justification: Another Eighth Amendment Approach	8-16
Core Issues: Out-of-Cell Time and Contact Visitation	8-17
Out-of-Cell Time	8-17
Contact Visitation	8-19
The Texas Success	8-21
Conclusion	8-22
Notes	8-23
Appendix: Stipulations and Orders Regarding Death-Row Conditions, <i>Ruiz v. McKaskle</i>	8-27

CHAPTER 9

Supervisory Liability**Legal Liabilities and Responsibilities of Corrections Agency Supervisors** *Rolando v. del Carmen*

Introduction	9-3
Supervisor Lawsuits Categorized	9-4
Direct Liability	9-5
To Clients	9-5
State Law	9-5
Federal Law	9-6
To Subordinates	9-6
State Law	9-6
Federal Law	9-8
Vicarious Liability	9-8
To Clients	9-9
State Law	9-9
Respondeat Superior	9-9
Policy or Custom	9-9
Negligence of Supervisors	9-10
Federal Law	9-17
To Subordinates	9-20
Agency Representation and Liability for Acts of Supervisors	9-20
Conclusion	9-22
Notes	9-23

CHAPTER 9A

Overview of the Law of Probation, Supervised Release, Restitution, and Parole**Probation, Supervised Release, Restitution, and Parole***Georgetown Law Journal*

Probation	9A-4
Imposition of Probation	9A-5
Duration of Probation	9A-7
Conditions of Probation	9A-8
Revocation	9A-14
Supervised Release	9A-23
Restitution	9A-31
Parole	9A-40
Parole Release from Incarceration	9A-40
Parole Revocation	9A-45

CHAPTER 10

Parole**The Rights of Parolees** *Oliver J. Keller, Jr.*

Introduction	10-3
The Federal Parole System	10-4
A Brief History of Parole	10-5
Parole Becomes a Target	10-5
Judicial Intervention	10-6
<i>Morrissey v. Brewer</i> : Revoking Parole	10-6
<i>Gagnon v. Scarpelli</i> : Legal Assistance	10-8
<i>Moody v. Daggett</i> : No Immediate Hearing Required for Parole	
Violators	10-8
<i>Wolff v. McDonnell</i> : Loss of Good Time Requires a Prison	
Hearing	10-10
<i>Jago v. Van Curen</i> : Rescission Proceedings	10-11
<i>Greenholtz v. Nebraska Penal Inmates</i> : No Constitutional Right to	
Parole	10-12
Birth of Parole Guidelines	10-14
The Presentence-Investigation Report: A Crucial Document	10-15
Important Improvements to Presentence-Investigation Reports Under Rule	
32	10-17
Youth Corrections Act vs. Parole Commission and Reorganization	
Act	10-19
The Guidelines and the Salient-Factor Score	10-20
Criticisms of the Guidelines	10-21
Nonadjudicated Offenses	10-22

Resentencing	10-23
Judicial Expectations	10-24
Inadequate Reasons	10-26
Double-Counting	10-26
Failure to Consider Rehabilitation	10-27
Mechanical Use of Guidelines	10-27
Ex Post Facto Violation	10-28
Separation of Powers	10-30
Prisoners Not Adequately Informed	10-31
Final Observations	10-31
Notes	10-34
Appendix A: Guidelines for Decision-Making	10-43
Appendix B: Salient Factor Score	10-44

The Fourth Amendment Exclusionary Rule in Parole Revocation Hearings *Harvard Law Review*

Introduction	10-45
<i>Pennsylvania Board of Probation & Parole v. Scott</i>	10-45
Analysis	10-48
Conclusion	10-49
Notes	10-51

CHAPTER 10A

Pardon and Clemency

The Quality of Mercy Strained: Wrestling the Pardoning Power from the King	<i>Daniel T. Kobil</i>
Introduction	10A-3
The Nature and Origins of Clemency: What's Justice Got to Do With It?	10A-6
Defining Clemency, and Its Relationship to Notions of Justice	10A-6
Early Origins of the Clemency Power	10A-10
The Development of the Clemency Power in England	10A-11
The Clemency Power in the United States	10A-13
Federal Clemency Power	10A-13
The Clemency Power in the States	10A-21
A Proposal for Bifurcation of the Clemency Power: Replacing Politics with Justice	10A-25
Limitations on the Exercise of Executive Clemency Power	10A-27
The Legislature	10A-27
The Judiciary	10A-27
The People	10A-31
The Executive	10A-31

Proposed Clemency Commission	<i>10A-32</i>
Proposed Clemency Standards	<i>10A-33</i>
Substantial Doubt of Guilt	<i>10A-33</i>
Diminished Mental Capacity, Retardation, Intoxication, or Minority	<i>10A-34</i>
Disparate Sentencing: Proportionality	<i>10A-34</i>
Disparate Sentencing: Special Circumstances	<i>10A-35</i>
Sentencing That Is Unrelated to Deserts	<i>10A-36</i>
Crimes Committed Out of Necessity, Coercion, or Adherence to Moral Principles	<i>10A-36</i>
Crimes in Which the Offender Has Suffered Enough	<i>10A-37</i>
Proposed Clemency Procedures	<i>10A-38</i>
Justice-Neutral Exercise of the Clemency Power by the Executive: What Remains?	<i>10A-39</i>
Conclusion	<i>10A-41</i>
Notes	<i>10A-42</i>
Appendix	<i>10A-70</i>

Clemency and Presidential Administration of Criminal Law

Rachel E. Barkow

Introduction	<i>10A-72</i>
I. The Constitutional Pardon Power	<i>10A-78</i>
A. The Use of the Clemency Power	<i>10A-82</i>
B. Analyzing the Decline	<i>10A-87</i>
1. Politics	<i>10A-88</i>
2. Structural Bias at DOJ	<i>10A-93</i>
II. Clemency, the Unitary Executive, and Presidential Administration	<i>10A-98</i>
A. Clemency's Structural Function	<i>10A-98</i>
B. Clemency's Relationship to Unitary Executive and Presidential Administration Theories	<i>10A-109</i>
III. The Modern Relevance of Clemency	<i>10A-120</i>
A. Fewer Mechanisms for Controlling Prosecutors	<i>10A-120</i>
B. Increasing Danger of Overreach	<i>10A-125</i>
C. The Need for Relief from Collateral Consequences	<i>10A-135</i>
Conclusion	<i>10A-138</i>

SECTION III

Procedural Aspects of Prisoner Litigation

CHAPTER 11

Magistrate Judges**The Role of the United States Magistrate Judge in Prisoner Litigation** *Frederic N. Smalkin and Nancy K. Oliver*

Introduction	11-3
The Office of United States Magistrate Judge	11-3
Jurisdiction of Magistrate Judges	11-4
Nonconsensual References	11-4
Consent Trials	11-8
Additional Duties	11-10
Conclusion	11-11
Notes	11-11
Appendix: 28 U.S.C. § 636(a)-(c) (1988 & Supp. IV 1992)	11-19

CHAPTER 11A

The Provision of Counsel**Rethinking Prisoner Civil Rights Cases and the Provision of Counsel** *Howard B. Eisenberg*

Introduction	11A-3
The History of Prisoner Civil Rights Litigation	11A-4
Stemming the Tide of Prisoner Litigation	11A-6
Medical Care	11A-7
Prisoner Overcrowding, Conditions of Confinement, and Protection of Inmates	11A-8
Failure to Protect	11A-9
First Amendment Rights	11A-10
Privacy and Fourth Amendment Rights	11A-11
Use of Force	11A-11
Right to Due Process	11A-11
The Issues to Be Litigated Under Present Prison Cases	11A-12
Volume and Frivolity—The Twin Devils of Prisoner Civil Rights Litigation	11A-12
Volume of Prisoner Cases	11A-12
Frigidity of Prisoner Cases	11A-13
Defining “Frigid”	11A-14
The Therapeutic Value of Prisoner Litigation	11A-15
Prisoners’ Ability to Draft a Viable Complaint	11A-16
Frigidity and the “Jailhouse Lawyer”	11A-18

Remedies for High Volume and Perceived Frivolity	11A-19
The Provision of Counsel in Prisoner Civil Rights Cases	11A-19
Legal Authority for the Provision of Counsel in Prisoner Civil Rights Cases	11A-19
Constitutional Right	11A-19
Statutory Right	11A-20
Inherent Authority of the Court	11A-20
Criteria for Provision of Counsel in Prisoner Civil Rights Cases	11A-21
Factors Relating to the Nature of the Claim	11A-22
Factors Relating to the Nature of the Plaintiff	11A-22
Factors Relating to the Plaintiff's Efforts to Obtain Counsel	11A-23
Providing Reasons for Denying the Appointment of Counsel	11A-23
Results of File Review in Three Federal Districts	11A-24
Who Provides Legal Representation to Prisoners in Civil Cases?	11A-26
Reducing the Volume of Prison Civil Rights Litigation	11A-30
Requiring Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies	11A-31
Expediting Department of Justice Certification of State Grievance Systems	11A-31
Requiring Partial Payment of Filing Fees	11A-32
Modification of Existing Form Complaints	11A-33
Mandatory Post-Filing Review	11A-33
Mandatory Document Submission	11A-34
Second Screening by the Court	11A-34
The Need for Counsel	11A-35
Leave to Appeal	11A-35
Providing Counsel in Prisoner Cases	11A-36
Amending 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d) to Cure <i>Mallard</i> Problem	11A-36
Paying for Counsel	11A-36
The Most Obvious Ways of Providing Counsel Are Politically Unrealistic	11A-37
The Judiciary Could Simply Order the Funding of Attorneys to Represent Prisoners	11A-37
Using Segregated Funds (Filing Fees, Court Costs, and Attorneys' Fees) to Fund Counsel in Prisoner Cases	11A-38
Interest on Prisoner Trust Accounts	11A-39
Selecting Counsel	11A-40
The Role of Counsel	11A-43
Establishing Rapport with the Client	11A-43
Amending the Complaint, Discovery, and Settlement	11A-44
Conclusion	11A-44
Notes	11A-45

CHAPTER 11B

Pro Se Litigation**Ghostwriting: Filling in the Gaps of Pro Se Prisoners' Access to the Courts***Ira P. Robbins*

Introduction	11B-4
I. Background	11B-6
A. The Need in Prisons	11B-8
B. Trends in the Response to Ghostwriting	11B-16
II. The Important Role of Ghostwriting	11B-22
III. Do Attorneys Have an Ethical or Legal Duty to Disclose Drafting Assistance?	11B-27
A. Ethical Duty to Disclose	11B-27
B. Legal Duty to Disclose	11B-30
IV. Does Undisclosed Ghostwriting Implicate the Attorney's Duty to Provide Competent Representation?	11B-34
A. Competent Representation	11B-35
B. Benevolent Reading	11B-38
V. Does Undisclosed Ghostwriting Encourage the Unauthorized Practice of Law?	11B-44
A. Does Ghostwriting Constitute the "Practice of Law"?	11B-44
B. Does Ghostwriting by Non-Lawyers Constitute the <i>Unauthorized Practice of Law</i> ?	11B-46
C. Should Non-Lawyer Ghostwriting be Authorized in Certain Circumstances?	11B-47
Conclusion	11B-51

CHAPTER 12

Obtaining Witnesses**Obtaining Witnesses in Prisoner Cases** *Kent Sinclair, Jr. and Debra**Ruth Wolin*

Introduction	12-3
Attendance of Witnesses	12-3
Plaintiff's Own Presence at Trial	12-3
Subpoena Power for Witnesses	12-5
Transportation	12-6
Use of Depositions	12-7
Waiver of Witness Fees	12-7
Relevant Caselaw	12-7
Statutory Analysis and Legislative History	12-11
Can the Government Be Required to Bear the Expense?	12-14
Conclusion	12-16

Notes	<i>12-16</i>
Appendix: Sample Orders Writ of Habeas Corpus Ad Testificandum	<i>12-23</i>
Order for Service of Subpoena, with Government to Advance Fees	<i>12-24</i>
Order for Service of Subpoena, Without Prepayment of Fees	<i>12-25</i>

CHAPTER 13

Challenges to the Duration of Confinement**Habeas Corpus and the Burger Court** *Theodore McMillian*

Introduction	<i>13-3</i>
Background	<i>13-3</i>
Recent Cases	<i>13-4</i>
Conclusion	<i>13-6</i>
Notes	<i>13-7</i>

The Habeas Corpus Certificate of Probable Cause *Ira P. Robbins*

Introduction	<i>13-9</i>
The Stevens-Rehnquist Debate	<i>13-10</i>
Congressional Intent and the History of the Certificate	<i>13-12</i>
Problems with Certificate Practice	<i>13-14</i>
The Standard for Issuance of the Certificate	<i>13-14</i>
Limited Certificates	<i>13-16</i>
The State and the Certificate	<i>13-18</i>
Procedure	<i>13-20</i>
Current Legislative Reform of the Certificate Requirement	<i>13-22</i>
Conclusion and Recommendations	<i>13-24</i>
Notes	<i>13-26</i>

The Jurisprudence of Detention: An Analysis of the Politics of Federal Habeas Corpus Relitigation *Gary Peller*

Introduction	<i>13-43</i>
The Classical Liberal Justification of the Substantive Criminal Law	<i>13-44</i>
The Instrumentalist and Process-Oriented Approaches to Legitimizing Detention	<i>13-47</i>
The Burger Court Restrictions	<i>13-48</i>
An Evaluation of the Restriction of Collateral Habeas Corpus Review	<i>13-51</i>
Interpretation of the Habeas Corpus Act of 1867: Reconsidering the Relevant History	<i>13-52</i>
Habeas Law Prior to the Habeas Corpus Act of 1867	<i>13-52</i>
Passage of the Habeas Corpus Act of 1867	<i>13-54</i>

Federal Habeas Corpus Review Prior to 1915	13-54
Federal Habeas Corpus Review Between 1867 and 1886	13-55
Supreme Court Habeas Cases Involving Due Process Claims: 1886-1915	13-56
Exhaustion and Habeas Review: 1886-1915	13-58
Federal Habeas Corpus Review for State Prisoners from <i>Frank v. Mangum</i> to <i>Brown v. Allen</i>	13-59
The Contraction and Expansion of Due Process Requirements Under the Fourteenth Amendment	13-60
Exhaustion, Relitigation, and the Adequacy of the State's Corrective Process	13-61
Effect of the Denial of Certiorari Review	13-62
Summary	13-62
A Critique of Process Orientation in the Habeas Corpus Relitigation	
Debate	13-63
The External Critique	13-65
The Internal Critique	13-68
Conclusion	13-71
Notes	13-73

Whither (or Wither) Habeas Corpus?: Observations on the Supreme Court's 1985 Term *Ira P. Robbins*

Introduction	13-83
Statistics	13-84
Supreme Court Cases of the 1985 Term	13-84
<i>Vasquez v. Hillery</i> and <i>Kuhlmann v. Wilson</i>	13-84
<i>Miller v. Fenton</i>	13-87
<i>Murray v. Carrier</i> and <i>Smith v. Murray</i>	13-90
<i>Kimmelman v. Morrison</i>	13-95
The Next Generation of Habeas Corpus Analysis	13-100
Conclusion	13-103
Notes	13-104

Habeas Corpus and Retroactivity *Harvard Law Review*

Introduction	13-119
<i>Teague v. Lane</i>	13-119
Analysis	13-122
Conclusion	13-125
Notes	13-125

Habeas Corpus and Retroactivity: The Supreme Court's 1989 Term

Harvard Law Review

Introduction	13-131
<i>Butler v. McKellar</i> , <i>Saffle v. Parks</i> , and <i>Sawyer v. Smith</i>	13-132

Analysis	13-135
Conclusion	13-138
Notes	13-139

Habeas Corpus and State Procedural Default *Harvard Law Review*

Introduction	13-143
<i>Coleman v. Thompson</i>	13-143
Analysis	13-146
Conclusion	13-147
Notes	13-149

Habeas Corpus and Abuse of the Writ *Harvard Law Review*

Introduction	13-155
<i>McCleskey v. Zant</i>	13-155
Analysis	13-158
Conclusion	13-160
Notes	13-161

Habeas Corpus and Evidentiary Hearings *Harvard Law Review*

Introduction	13-167
<i>Keeney v. Tamayo-Reyes</i>	13-167
Analysis	13-169
Conclusion	13-171
Notes	13-172

Habeas Corpus and Actual Innocence *Harvard Law Review*

Introduction	13-177
<i>Herrera v. Collins</i>	13-177
Analysis	13-180
Conclusion	13-182
Notes	13-183

Habeas Corpus and *Miranda* Claims *Harvard Law Review*

Introduction	13-187
<i>Withrow v. Williams</i>	13-187
Analysis	13-190
Conclusion	13-193
Notes	13-193

Harmless Error in Federal Habeas Corpus After *Brechit v. Abrahamson* *John H. Blume and Stephen P. Garvey*

Introduction	13-197
The Structure of the <i>Brechit-Kotteakos</i> Rule	13-198

Allocation of the Burden of Proof	13-199
Burden of Proof	13-200
Standard of Prejudice	13-201
Burden on the State	13-201
Burden on the Defendant	13-202
Approach of the Reviewing Court	13-204
Exceptions to the <i>Brecht-Kotteakos</i> Rule	13-206
The <i>Orndorff</i> Exception	13-207
Trial Error and Structural Error	13-208
Prosecutorial Misconduct and Cumulative Error	13-209
The <i>Richmond</i> Principle	13-210
Conclusion	13-213
Notes	13-214

Habeas Corpus, Death Penalty, and Actual Innocence Claims*Harvard Law Review*

Introduction	13-223
<i>Schlup v. Delo</i>	13-223
Analysis	13-225
Conclusion	13-228
Notes	13-228

Habeas Corpus and Retroactivity: *Schrivo v. Summerlin**Harvard Law Review*

Introduction	13-235
<i>Schrivo v. Summerlin</i>	13-235
Analysis	13-238
Conclusion	13-240
Notes	13-240

Habeas Corpus and Military Detention: Alien Detainees*Harvard Law Review*

Introduction	13-245
<i>Rasul v. Bush</i>	13-245
Analysis	13-248
Conclusion	13-251
Notes	13-251

Habeas Corpus and Military Detention: Enemy Combatants*Harvard Law Review*

Introduction	13-257
<i>Hamdi v. Rumsfeld</i>	13-257
Analysis	13-261
Conclusion	13-263

Notes	13-264
-------	--------

Habeas Corpus Jurisdiction and Venue: *Rumsfeld v. Padilla**Harvard Law Review*

Introduction	13-269
<i>Rumsfeld v. Padilla</i>	13-269
Analysis	13-272
Conclusion	13-274
Notes	13-275

The Vienna Convention and Procedural Default*Harvard Law Review*

13-281

Postconviction Access to DNA Evidence*Harvard Law**Review*

13-291

Excuse of State Procedural Default: *Martinez v. Ryan**Harvard Law**Review*

13-303

Habeas Corpus Petitions in Federal and Tribal Court: A Search for Individualized Justice*Carrie E. Garrow*

Introduction	13-316
I. The Indian Civil Rights Act and Federal Indian Law's Limitations on Tribal Criminal Jurisdiction	13-320
II. Habeas Corpus	13-324
III. Federal Courts and ICRA Habeas Corpus Petitions	13-326
A. The Exhaustion Requirement	13-327
B. Non-Indian Defendants—No Exhaustion Required	13-329
C. Tribal Court Remedies Exhausted and Habeas Corpus Granted	13-332
D. Tribal Court Remedies Exhausted and Habeas Corpus Denied	13-336
E. Federal Habeas Petitions by State Detainees	13-337
F. Implications from the Survey	13-338
IV. Individualized Justice and a Case Study of the Navajo Nation Supreme Court and Habeas Corpus	13-339
A. Individualized Justice	13-339
B. The Navajo Nation Courts	13-341
C. The Navajo Nation Habeas Corpus Process	13-342
D. Individualized Justice—A Balancing of Rights	13-348
E. Exhaustion of Tribal Remedies	13-349
F. Navajo Due Process	13-350
G. Mr. Haungooah's Quest for Individualized Justice	13-354
H. Implications from the Navajo Nation Case Study	13-356

Conclusion 13-357

Habeas Corpus Retroactivity in Florida *Harvard Law Review* 13-359

Procedural Default: A Structural Approach to Adequacy Doctrine
Eve Brensike Primus

Introduction	13-371
I. State Procedural Rules as Obstacles to the Adjudication of Criminal Defendants' Federal Claims	13-379
II. Structural Adequacy Doctrine as a Potential Solution	13-390
A. The Origin and Purpose of Procedural Adequacy Doctrine	13-391
B. A Structural Approach to Procedural Adequacy	13-398
III. Structural Adequacy Doctrine Falls Dormant: How the Federal Courts Shifted to a Cause and Prejudice Analysis	13-400
IV. Why Structural Adequacy is Better Than Cause and Prejudice	13-406
A. Different Orientations: The Prisoner Versus the System	13-406
B. Different Relief	13-407
C. Different Obstacles to Review	13-411
D. Doctrinal Coherence and Original Purposes	13-413
Conclusion	13-416

Equitable Gateways: Toward Expanded Federal Habeas Corpus Review of State-Court Criminal Convictions *Eve Brensike Primus*

Introduction	13-420
I. An Overview of the Obstacles to Federal Habeas Review	13-425
A. Procedural Obstacles to Review	13-426
1. Statute of Limitations	13-427
2. Exhaustion Requirement	13-428
3. Procedural Default Doctrine	13-428
4. Successive Petition Barrier	13-429
B. Substantive Obstacles to Review	13-429
1. Limits on Cognizable Claims	13-430
2. Evidentiary Hearings	13-430
3. Presumption of Correctness with Respect to State Factual Findings	13-431
4. Deferential Standards of Review	13-431
II. Fair Consideration Doctrine's Equitable Gateways	13-432
A. Bypassing Procedural Obstacles to Review	13-433
1. Statute of Limitations	13-433
2. Exhaustion Requirement	13-435
3. Procedural Default Doctrine	13-437
4. Successive Petition Barrier	13-438

B. Obtaining More Rigorous and Less Deferential Merits	
Review	13-440
1. Expansion in Cognizable Claims	13-440
2. Evidentiary Hearings	13-441
3. Deferential Standards of Review and the Presumption of Correctness	13-442
III. Expanding Equitable Gateways	13-445
Conclusion	13-450

Habeas Corpus and Retroactivity: *Edwards v. Vannoy* *Harvard Law Review* 13-453

CHAPTER 13A
Death Penalty Review

Toward a More Just and Effective System of Review in State Death Penalty Cases: Report and Recommendations of the American Bar Association Task Force on Death Penalty Habeas Corpus

Ira P. Robbins

Task Force Members	13A-5
Executive Summary	13A-6
Introduction	13A-11
The Provision of Competent Counsel	13A-15
Special Demands of Representation in a Capital Case	13A-16
The Problem at Trial and on Appeal	13A-16
Post-Conviction Representation	13A-19
The Causes of the Problem	13A-20
Compensation for Counsel and Other Services	13A-21
The Right to Post-Conviction Counsel	13A-22
Task Force Recommendations	13A-28
Commentary	13A-30
State Procedural Default Rules	13A-37
Background	13A-37
Does <i>Wainwright v. Sykes</i> Overrule <i>Fay v. Noia</i> ?	13A-39
Miscarriages of Justice and Innocence	13A-40
Role of Procedural Default Rules in Death Penalty Cases	13A-42
Task Force Recommendations	13A-48
Commentary	13A-49
Exhaustion of State Judicial Remedies	13A-52
Background	13A-52
The Mixed-Petition Issue	13A-53
Application to Death Penalty Cases	13A-55
Task Force Recommendations	13A-56
Commentary	13A-57

Stays of Execution, Certificates of Probable Cause, and “Chaotic”	
Litigation	<i>13A-59</i>
Background	<i>13A-59</i>
28 U.S.C. §§ 2251 and 2253	<i>13A-62</i>
<i>Barefoot v. Estelle</i>	<i>13A-63</i>
The Aftermath of <i>Barefoot v. Estelle</i>	<i>13A-67</i>
Task Force Recommendations	<i>13A-68</i>
Commentary	<i>13A-70</i>
Delay, Time Limitations, Successive Petitions, and Abuse of the	
Writ	<i>13A-72</i>
Delay	<i>13A-72</i>
Time Limitations	<i>13A-77</i>
Successive Petitions and Abuse of the Writ	<i>13A-80</i>
<i>Teague v. Lane</i>	<i>13A-86</i>
Task Force Recommendations	<i>13A-89</i>
Commentary	<i>13A-92</i>
Notes	<i>13A-98</i>
Selected Bibliography	<i>13A-184</i>
List of Witnesses	<i>13A-188</i>
Separate Statements of Task Force Members	<i>13A-197</i>

Table of Contents

Volume Three

SECTION III: PROCEDURAL ASPECTS OF PRISONER LITIGATION
(Continued)

CHAPTER 13B

Challenges to the Duration of Confinement for Federal Prisoners

Habeas Corpus Relief for Federal Prisoners	<i>Georgetown Law Journal</i>
28 U.S.C. § 2255 Relief for Federal Prisoners	<i>13B-4</i>
Cognizable Claims	<i>13B-4</i>
§ 2255 Motions Distinguished from § 2241 Petitions	<i>13B-8</i>
Custody Requirements and Venue	<i>13B-9</i>
Filing Deadlines	<i>13B-11</i>
Procedural Bar	<i>13B-13</i>
Right to Legal Assistance	<i>13B-18</i>
Disposition of Motions	<i>13B-20</i>
Successive Motions	<i>13B-25</i>
Remedies and Appeals	<i>13B-28</i>

CHAPTER 13C

The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996

Supreme Court Jurisdiction to Review Second or Successive Habeas Corpus Petitions	<i>Harvard Law Review</i>
Introduction	<i>13C-3</i>
<i>Felker v. Turpin</i>	<i>13C-4</i>
Analysis	<i>13C-6</i>

Conclusion	13C-9
Notes	13C-9

Rewriting the Great Writ: Standards of Review for Habeas Corpus Under the New 28 U.S.C. § 2254 *Harvard Law Review*

Introduction	13C-15
Federal Habeas Corpus Review Prior to the AEDPA	13C-16
Standards of Review	13C-16
Nonretroactivity and “New Law”	13C-16
Interpretive Approaches to the Amendments to § 2254	13C-17
Approaches to Review of Legal and Mixed Question Determinations	13C-18
Approaches to Review of Factual Determinations	13C-19
Policy, Precedent, and Their Implications for the Interpretation of the New § 2254	13C-20
Consonance with the Objectives of Habeas and Deferential Review	13C-21
Interaction with Pre-AEDPA Case Law	13C-24
Conclusion	13C-26
Notes	13C-27

Standard of Review for the Recall of Mandates by Courts of Appeals *Harvard Law Review*

Introduction	13C-35
<i>Calderon v. Thompson</i>	13C-35
Analysis	13C-38
Conclusion	13C-40
Notes	13C-41

Deference to State Court Determinations of Law *Harvard Law Review*

Introduction	13C-47
<i>Williams v. Taylor</i>	13C-47
Analysis	13C-50
Conclusion	13C-52
Notes	13C-53

Habeas Corpus and the Suspension Clause *Harvard Law Review*

Introduction	13C-59
<i>INS v. St. Cyr</i>	13C-60
Analysis	13C-62
Conclusion	13C-64
Notes	13C-65

Standard for Obtaining Certificates of Appealability *Harvard Law Review*

Introduction	13C-69
<i>Miller-El v. Cockrell</i>	13C-69
Analysis	13C-72
Conclusion	13C-74
Notes	13C-75

“Clearly Established Law” in Habeas Review *Harvard Law Review*

<i>Review</i>	13C-81
---------------	--------

Actual Innocence Gateway: *McQuiggin v. Perkins*

<i>Harvard Law Review</i>	13C-93
---------------------------	--------

The Demise of Habeas Corpus and the Rise of Qualified Immunity

<i>Stephen R. Reinhardt</i>	
-----------------------------	--

Introduction	13C-106
I. The Demise of Habeas Corpus	13C-110
A. The Evolution from Independent Review to Near-Total Deference to State Courts	13C-111
B. Respect for State Courts at the Expense of Constitutional Rights	13C-116
C. The Lack of “Clearly Established Federal Law”	13C-119
D. Pinholster and the Court’s Barriers to Establishing Factual Cause for Relief	13C-124
E. The Court’s Exceptional Treatment of Habeas Law	13C-127
F. How Far We Have Strayed	13C-130
II. The Rise of Qualified Immunity	13C-131
III. Particularly Unfortunate Consequences	13C-137
Conclusion	13C-140
CODA	13C-141

Certificates of Appealability, Rule 60(b) Motions, and Race: *Buck v. Davis*

<i>Harvard Law Review</i>	13C-143
---------------------------	---------

AEDPA as Forum Allocation: The Textual and Structural Case for Overruling *Williams v. Taylor*

<i>Carlos M. Vázquez</i>	
--------------------------	--

Introduction	13C-156
I. The Historical Forum-Allocation Function of Habeas	13C-160
A. The 1789-1916 Period	13C-161
B. The 1916-1953 Period	13C-162
C. The 1953-1996 Period	13C-164
II. <i>Williams</i> and the Standard of Review	13C-166
A. The <i>Williams</i> Majority’s Basis for its Interpretation	13C-166

1. AEDPA's Text	<i>13C-167</i>
2. AEDPA's Purpose	<i>13C-172</i>
B. Congress's Actual Intent	<i>13C-174</i>
III. AEDPA's Forum-Allocation Function	<i>13C-184</i>
A. The Constitutionality of the <i>Williams</i> Construction of § 2254(d)(1)	<i>13C-184</i>
B. The Dysfunctional Nature of AEDPA's Allocation of Jurisdiction	<i>13C-187</i>
C. Alternative Interpretations?	<i>13C-191</i>
D. Implementing the Forum-Allocation Interpretation	<i>13C-195</i>
IV. Reconsidering <i>Williams</i>	<i>13C-201</i>
A. The Court's Freer Hand in Interpreting Jurisdictional Statutes	<i>13C-202</i>
1. The Court's Common Law Approach to the Interpretation of Jurisdictional Statutes	<i>13C-202</i>
2. Supreme Court Resistance of Severe Misallocations of Jurisdiction	<i>13C-206</i>
a. <i>Martin v. Hunter's Lessee</i>	<i>13C-207</i>
b. <i>Murdock v. City of Memphis</i>	<i>13C-209</i>
B. In Defense of Resistance of Jurisdictional Misallocations	<i>13C-212</i>
1. The Complexity of the Law of Federal Jurisdiction	<i>13C-213</i>
2. The Propriety of Resistance	<i>13C-214</i>
Conclusion	<i>13C-216</i>

Ineffective Assistance of Counsel and Procedural Default: *Shinn v. Ramirez* *13C-219 Harvard Law Review*

AEDPA Repeal *Cornell Law Review*

Introduction	<i>13C-233</i>
I. AEDPA and Federal Habeas Corpus	<i>13C-240</i>
A. Statutory Background	<i>13C-242</i>
B. Pre-AEDPA Caselaw Regulating Federal Habeas Corpus	<i>13C-245</i>
C. The Impact of AEDPA	<i>13C-249</i>
1. AEDPA Statute of Limitations	<i>13C-250</i>
2. AEDPA and State Court Fact Finding	<i>13C-252</i>
3. AEDPA's Limitation on Merits Relief	<i>13C-249</i>
II. AEDPA Amendment and Repeal	<i>13C-257</i>
A. Remove or Amend the 28 U.S.C. Section 2254(d) Relitigation Bar	<i>13C-258</i>
B. Codify Teague to Preserve Mixed Question Review	<i>13C-260</i>
1. 28 U.S.C. Section 2254(b): Second or Successive Petitions	<i>13C-261</i>

2. 28 U.S.C. Section 2254(d): Statute of Limitations	<i>13C-263</i>
3. 28 U.S.C. Section 2254(b)-(c): Exhaustion	<i>13C-265</i>
4. 28 U.S.C. Section 2254(e): Evidentiary Hearings	<i>13C-266</i>
5. Include Adequate Funding for Federal Representation	<i>13C-268</i>
C. Revise AEDPA's Procedural Restrictions	<i>13C-270</i>
B. Civil Rights Models	<i>13C-271</i>
C. A Consequentialist Case for Federal Habeas Reform	<i>13C-272</i>
Conclusion	<i>13C-274</i>

The Interplay Between 28 U.S.C. § 2241 and 28 U.S.C. § 2255: *Jones v. Hendrix* *Harvard Law Review*
 Introduction *13C-292*

SECTION IV
Special Issues and Problems

CHAPTER 14
The Rights of Gay Prisoners

Prisons Within Prisons: Gay Prisoners and Protective Custody	
<i>Joan W. Howarth</i>	
Introduction	<i>14-3</i>
Segregation in Prisons	<i>14-4</i>
Segregation: A Method of Control	<i>14-4</i>
Segregation of Gay Prisoners	<i>14-5</i>
The Judicial Response: Confused	<i>14-8</i>
Reform of Criteria and Procedures for Protective-Custody Assignment	<i>14-11</i>
Staying Out: Procedural Due Process	<i>14-11</i>
Staying Out: Substantive Due Process	<i>14-14</i>
Getting In: The Right to Reasonable Protection	<i>14-14</i>
Getting In: Procedural Due Process	<i>14-15</i>
Reform of Conditions in Protective Custody	<i>14-16</i>
Protective-Punitive Distinction	<i>14-16</i>
Nonwaiver of Constitutional Rights	<i>14-17</i>
Equal Protection	<i>14-18</i>
Cruel and Unusual Punishment	<i>14-19</i>
Penal-Policy Considerations	<i>14-21</i>
Conclusion	<i>14-22</i>
Notes	<i>14-23</i>

CHAPTER 14A

AIDS**AIDS in Prisons and Jails: Issues and Options** *National Institute of Justice, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction	14A-3
Cause and Transmission of AIDS	14A-4
AIDS in the Correctional Population	14A-5
Correctional Policy Issues and Options	14A-5
Education and Training	14A-6
HTLV-III Antibody Testing	14A-6
Correctional Policies on HTLV-III Antibody Testing	14A-6
Mass Screening: The Debate	14A-7
Implementation Issues	14A-9
Medical, Correctional Management, and Legal Issues	14A-9
Medical Issues	14A-9
Correctional Management Issues	14A-10
Housing Policies	14A-10
Precautionary Measures	14A-11
Notification and Confidentiality	14A-11
Costs of Care and Associated Services	14A-13
Legal Issues	14A-13
Conclusion	14A-14
Notes	14A-19

Opening the Bloodgates: The Blood Testing of Prisoners for the AIDS Virus *Lynn Sanders Branham*

Introduction	14A-21
Mandatory Blood Testing of Prisoners for the AIDS Virus—Constitutionally Permissible?	14A-22
The Fourth Amendment: An Unreasonable Search or Seizure?	14A-22
<i>Hudson v. Palmer</i> and <i>Bell v. Wolfish</i> : A Framework for Analysis	14A-22
Involuntary Blood Taking: A Search or Seizure?	14A-24
The Reasonableness of AIDS-Virus Blood Testing	14A-28
The Intrusiveness of AIDS-Virus Blood Testing	14A-28
The Need for AIDS-Virus Blood Testing	14A-30
The Latency of AIDS	14A-31
Intravenous Drug Users and Sex in Prisons	14A-31
Lack of Behavior-Monitoring Resources	14A-32
Negative Effects of Intense Supervision	14A-32
Disadvantages of Increased Confinement of Prisoners in Cells	14A-33
Limits on the Efficaciousness of Education	14A-33

Seropositivity Rates in Prisons	14A-34
The Failure to Adopt Testing in “Other”	
Jurisdictions	14A-35
Protection of the Public	14A-36
Preservation of Life: A Fundamental Interest	
Case Law on the Constitutionality of Public Health	
Measures	14A-37
The Right to Privacy	14A-38
The Requirement of a Rational Relationship	14A-40
Other Means of Exercising the Right to Privacy	14A-41
Less Restrictive Means	14A-42
Adverse Effects of Accommodation	14A-42
Due Process	14A-43
Blood Testing of Prisoners for the AIDS Virus—Constitutionally	
Required?	14A-46
Requiring Blood Testing to Prevent the Spread of AIDS	
Due Process	14A-47
Cruel and Unusual Punishment	14A-48
Requiring Blood Testing for Medical Treatment Purposes	
Conclusion	14A-51
Notes	14A-52

Update on AIDS in Prisons and Jails *National Institute of Justice, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction	14A-61
Essential Medical Information	14A-62
HIV Infection and AIDS in the Correctional Population	14A-63
Correctional Policy Issues and Options	14A-65
Education and Training	14A-65
HIV-Antibody Screening and Testing	14A-66
Correctional Policies on HIV-Antibody Testing	14A-67
Medical Care, Psychosocial Services, Housing, and Correctional	
Management Issues	14A-68
Medical Care	14A-68
Psychosocial Services	14A-68
Housing and Programming Policies	14A-69
Precautionary and Preventive Measures	14A-70
Legal Issues	14A-71
Notes	14A-79

Prisons, Law and Public Health: The Case for a Coordinated Response to Epidemic Disease Behind Bars *Scott Burris*

Introduction	14A-81
Prisoners and Epidemic Disease	14A-83

The Demographics of HIV, TB, Drug Use, and Incarceration	14A-83
Who Is Ill?	14A-83
Who Is Ill in Prison?	14A-84
The Public Health Responses	14A-86
A Model Response	14A-87
HIV	14A-87
TB	14A-88
Prison Practices	14A-90
The Role of Litigation	14A-91
Court Decisions	14A-91
Basic Medical Care for HIV	14A-91
HIV Testing and Counseling	14A-91
Medical Care After Identification	14A-92
HIV Prevention Education	14A-94
Social Conditions for People with HIV	14A-95
TB Prevention and Treatment	14A-98
Barriers to Effective Litigation	14A-99
The Constitutional Right to Medical Treatment Is Narrowly Applied	14A-99
Poor Facts	14A-102
Poor Lawyering	14A-102
Wrong Parties, Wrong Place	14A-104
Prison Organization, Change, and the Courts	14A-104
The Coordinated Public Health Strategy	14A-106
Conclusion	14A-109
Notes	14A-110

1998 AIDS in Prison Bibliography *National Prison Project*

Preface	14A-121
Introduction	14A-121
Legal Articles	14A-122
Law Review Articles	14A-122
Clinical Trials	14A-122
Confidentiality	14A-122
Conjugal Visits	14A-122
HIV/AIDS Policy	14A-122
Segregation	14A-124
Sentencing	14A-124
HIV Seroprevalence Rates & HIV Testing	14A-124
Transmission in Prison	14A-125
Women Prisoners	14A-125
Legal News Articles	14A-125
Compassionate Release	14A-125
Confidentiality	14A-126

HIV/AIDS Policy	<i>14A-126</i>
HIV Seroprevalence Rates & HIV Testing	<i>14A-128</i>
HIV Transmission in Prison	<i>14A-129</i>
Legislation & Jurisprudence	<i>14A-130</i>
Segregation	<i>14A-130</i>
Sentencing	<i>14A-130</i>
Articles and Abstracts on AIDS/HIV in Corrections	<i>14A-130</i>
Criminal Justice Articles	<i>14A-130</i>
Articles	<i>14A-130</i>
Clinical Trials	<i>14A-130</i>
Conjugal Visits	<i>14A-130</i>
HIV/AIDS Education & Prevention	<i>14A-131</i>
HIV/AIDS Epidemiology & Medical Care	<i>14A-132</i>
HIV/AIDS Policy	<i>14A-133</i>
HIV Seroprevalence Rates & HIV Testing	<i>14A-136</i>
Legislation & Jurisprudence	<i>14A-136</i>
Probation & Parole	<i>14A-138</i>
Substance Abuse Prevention & Control	<i>14A-138</i>
Women Prisoners	<i>14A-138</i>
Reports & Books	<i>14A-139</i>
Surveys on HIV/AIDS in Prisons and Jails	<i>14A-139</i>
Books on HIV/AIDS in Prisons and Jails	<i>14A-140</i>
Manuals & Handbooks	<i>14A-140</i>
Training Manuals & Guidelines for Correctional & Probation Staff	<i>14A-140</i>
Training Manuals & Guidelines for Criminal Justice Staff	<i>14A-141</i>
HIV/AIDS Policies in Corrections	<i>14A-141</i>
HIV/AIDS Policies in Criminal Justice Agencies	<i>14A-142</i>
International Conference on HIV/AIDS Abstracts	<i>14A-142</i>
Clinical Trials	<i>14A-142</i>
Compassionate Release	<i>14A-143</i>
Discharge Planning	<i>14A-143</i>
Incarcerated Youth	<i>14A-143</i>
HIV/AIDS Education & Prevention	<i>14A-144</i>
HIV/AIDS Epidemiology & Medical Care	<i>14A-148</i>
HIV/AIDS Policy & Legal Issues	<i>14A-149</i>
HIV/AIDS Preventive Measures	<i>14A-151</i>
HIV/AIDS Psychology	<i>14A-151</i>
HIV Seroprevalence Rates & HIV Testing	<i>14A-152</i>
HIV Transmission in Prison	<i>14A-154</i>
Substance Abuse Prevention & Control	<i>14A-155</i>
Tuberculosis Epidemiology	<i>14A-156</i>
Women Prisoners	<i>14A-157</i>
Medical Articles	<i>14A-158</i>

Clinical Trials	<i>14A-158</i>
Discharge Planning	<i>14A-158</i>
Incarcerated Youth	<i>14A-158</i>
HIV/AIDS Education & Prevention	<i>14A-160</i>
HIV/AIDS Epidemiology & Medical Care	<i>14A-162</i>
HIV/AIDS Psychology	<i>14A-164</i>
HIV/AIDS Policy	<i>14A-166</i>
HIV Seroprevalence Rates & HIV Testing	<i>14A-168</i>
HIV Transmission in Prison	<i>14A-173</i>
Substance Abuse Prevention & Control	<i>14A-175</i>
Tuberculosis Epidemiology	<i>14A-177</i>
Women Prisoners	<i>14A-179</i>
National Prison Project Journal Articles	<i>14A-180</i>
Policies on AIDS/HIV & Corrections	<i>14A-183</i>
Federal Policies	<i>14A-183</i>
Federal Bureau of Prisons	<i>14A-183</i>
Department of the Army	<i>14A-183</i>
State Correctional Policies	<i>14A-183</i>
Organizational Policies on AIDS/HIV in Prison	<i>14A-190</i>
AIDS/HIV Educational Materials	<i>14A-191</i>
Correctional Education Materials	<i>14A-191</i>
Canadian Publications	<i>14A-192</i>
General Educational Materials	<i>14A-192</i>
Local & National Organizations	<i>14A-192</i>
African-American Community	<i>14A-192</i>
Asian Community	<i>14A-194</i>
Latino Community	<i>14A-195</i>
Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual/Transgender Community	<i>14A-196</i>
Native American Community	<i>14A-198</i>
People of Color Communities	<i>14A-199</i>
Women	<i>14A-199</i>
People Living with HIV/AIDS	<i>14A-201</i>
Commercial Organizations	<i>14A-202</i>
Federal Government Agencies	<i>14A-203</i>
Audiovisual Materials	<i>14A-204</i>
Resource Listings	<i>14A-208</i>
Publications	<i>14A-208</i>
Legal/Correctional Newsletters	<i>14A-209</i>
Service Providers and Advocacy Organizations	<i>14A-211</i>
Canadian Organizations	<i>14A-222</i>

CHAPTER 14B
Compassionate Release

Compassionate Release of Terminally Ill Prisoners	<i>Working Group</i>
<i>on Compassionate Release</i>	
Introduction	14B-3
Justifications and Compatibility with Sentencing Laws	14B-5
Compassionate Release Programs in the Federal System and the States	14B-7
An Overview of Compassionate Release Programs	14B-8
Types of Programs	14B-8
Eligibility and Release Criteria	14B-8
Application Process and Review	14B-9
Release Conditions; Revocation	14B-10
Data on Compassionate Release	14B-10
Issues in Implementing Compassionate Release	14B-11
Eligibility and Standard for Release	14B-11
Release Procedure	14B-13
A Special Mechanism for Terminally Ill Prisoners?	14B-13
Paradigms for Special Mechanisms	14B-13
Administrative Agency as Decisionmaker	14B-13
Court as Decisionmaker	14B-14
Hybrid System	14B-14
General Considerations	14B-15
Procedural Issues	14B-15
The Application	14B-15
Time Frames for Decisionmaking	14B-16
Hearing Requirement	14B-16
Legal Representation	14B-16
Evidentiary Issues	14B-16
Administrative or Judicial Review	14B-16
Revocation of Release	14B-17
Reporting of Data	14B-18
Relationship Between the Department of Corrections and the Maker of the Release Decision	14B-18
Need for Uniform System?	14B-18
Conclusion	14B-19
Notes	14B-20
Appendix: Draft Language for Compassionate Release Legislation—Administrative Model	14B-24
Draft Language for Compassionate Release Legislation—Judicial Model	14B-27

Quelling the Silver Tsunami: Compassionate Release of Elderly Offenders	<i>Jalila Jefferson-Bullock</i>
I. Introduction	<i>14B-30</i>
II. Which Elderly Offenders Should Be Compassionately Released?	<i>14B-35</i>
III. Aging in America	<i>14B-39</i>
A. Physical Deterioration of the Elderly	<i>14B-40</i>
B. Mental Decline of the Elderly	<i>14B-42</i>
C. The Elderly Population Requires "Tender Loving Care"	<i>14B-45</i>
IV. The Undignified Prisoner	<i>14B-46</i>
A. Prison Life, Generally	<i>14B-50</i>
B. Prison Life for the Elderly	<i>14B-53</i>
V. The Problem with Compassionate Release	<i>14B-59</i>
VI. Incarceration of Category Four Elderly Offenders Does Not Fulfill Any Goal of Criminal Punishment	<i>14B-63</i>
A. The Problem with Deterrence	<i>14B-63</i>
B. Aging Out of Crime	<i>14B-64</i>
C. The Problem with Retribution	<i>14B-67</i>
D. Retribution and Quantitative Proportionality	<i>14B-69</i>
E. Retribution, the Eighth Amendment, and Qualitative Proportionality	<i>14B-70</i>
VII. Incarceration of the Elderly is Cost-Prohibitive	<i>14B-72</i>
VIII. Remedies	<i>14B-74</i>
A. Compassionate Release Procedures Must Clearly Define and Reform Eligibility Criteria	<i>14B-78</i>
B. Eligibility Determination Should Be Placed Squarely in the Hands of Judges	<i>14B-79</i>
IX. Conclusion	<i>14B-80</i>

CHAPTER 15
Prison Riots

Legal Aspects of Prison Riots	<i>Ira P. Robbins</i>
Introduction	<i>15-3</i>
Prison Riots and the Attorney	<i>15-4</i>
Practical Limitations on the Attorney's Involvement in a Prison Riot	<i>15-5</i>
Ethical and Legal Limitations on the Attorney's Involvement in a Prison Riot	<i>15-6</i>
Illegal or Improper Conduct	<i>15-6</i>
Withdrawal of the Attorney-Client Privilege and the Duty to Disclose	<i>15-7</i>
Potential Conflicts of Interest	<i>15-8</i>
Summary	<i>15-9</i>

Prison Riots and the Inmates	15-9
Tort Recovery	15-10
State Law	15-10
Federal Law	15-12
Constitutional Causes of Action	15-13
Criminal Sanctions for Prison Riots	15-15
Federal Law	15-15
State Law	15-16
Issues Common to Federal and State Criminal Cases	15-16
Amnesty and Negotiations	15-17
First Amendment Implications	15-19
Prison Riots and the Guards	15-21
Recovery Under Federal Law	15-21
Recovery Under State Law	15-22
Conclusion	15-22
Notes	15-23

How Can We Sleep When the Beds Are Burning? The Tumultuous Prison Culture of Attica Flourishes in American Prisons Twenty-Five Years Later *Justin Brooks*

Introduction	15-35
What Is a Prison Culture? What Makes Prison Cultures Unique?	15-37
The Cultures of Attica and Lucasville	15-38
Attica: The Punitive Culture	15-38
Lucasville: The Custodial Culture	15-40
Reforming Prison Cultures Over the Last Twenty-Five Years	15-41
Shortcomings of Reforming Prison Cultures Through Litigation	15-41
Reforming Prison Cultures Has Been Contrary to Political Agendas	15-43
Other Factors Aggravating Cultural Reform	15-45
Overcrowding	15-45
Health Issues	15-46
The Changing Characteristics of Inmates	15-47
How Do We Change Prison Cultures?	15-47
Alter Our Correctional Philosophy	15-47
Change the Relationship Between Staff and Inmates	15-48
Break Down Total Institutions	15-48
Decrease the Number of Prisoners	15-49
Improve Prisoner Health Care	15-50
Conclusion	15-50
Notes	15-51

CHAPTER 16

Inmate Welfare Funds**Inmate Welfare Funds: Reassessing Prisoner Assessments** *Eric Neisser*

Introduction	16-3
Nature and Operation of Inmate Welfare Funds	16-6
Overview	16-6
California	16-6
Survey of Other States	16-10
Legal Authority	16-10
Administration	16-10
Methods of Assessment	16-11
Expenditures	16-11
Constitutional Limitations on Financial Assessments of Inmates	16-12
The Constitutional Framework for Punishment	16-12
Involuntary Servitude	16-13
Fines	16-14
Liberty vs. Property Punishments	16-17
Other Sources and Limits	16-17
The Eighth Amendment Perspective	16-18
The Fiscal Implications of Constitutional Imperatives	16-19
The Meaning of Cruel and Unusual Punishment	16-20
The Application to Monetary Impositions	16-21
The Equal Protection Perspective	16-23
Indigency	16-23
Public vs. Individual Benefit: Who Pays When All Gain?	16-25
The Federal Approach	16-26
The California Analysis	16-27
Applying the California Analysis	16-30
Limits on Particular Methods of Assessment	16-35
Assessment of Interest on Inmate Savings	16-35
Surcharges on Inmate Purchases	16-36
Surcharges on Inmate Sales	16-37
Disclosure Requirements	16-38
The Correctional Perspective: The Purposes of Punishment	16-39
Retribution	16-39
Incapacitation	16-40
Deterrence	16-40
Rehabilitation	16-42
The Economic Perspective: User Fees in Prison	16-43
Conclusion	16-50
Notes	16-51
Appendix: San Quentin Inmate Welfare Fund Statement of Operations, 1980 & 1981	16-85

CHAPTER 17
Jail Litigation

A Primer for Jail Litigators: Some Practical Suggestions for Surviving and Prevailing in Your Lawsuit	<i>Edward I. Koren, John Boston, Elizabeth R. Alexander, and Daniel E. Manville</i>
Introduction	17-4
The Legal Context	17-4
The Importance of Remedy	17-6
Political Realities	17-6
Your Clients	17-8
Threshold Decisions	17-9
Choice of Forum	17-9
Factors That Influence the Choice of Forum	17-10
Choosing the Appropriate Judge	17-10
The Substantive Law	17-10
State Procedural Law	17-11
State Remedial Options	17-11
Enforcing State Law in Federal Court and Vice Versa	17-11
Remedial Options: Injunctions and Damages	17-12
Injunctive Relief	17-13
Damages	17-13
Preliminary Relief	17-15
Naming the Proper Defendants	17-17
Respondeat Superior vs. Personal Responsibility	17-17
Monell Actions: Direct Liability of Local Government	17-18
Individual and Official Capacity	17-18
Non-Jail Defendants	17-19
Preliminary Planning and Research	17-20
Initial Contact with Plaintiffs	17-20
Gathering Documents	17-21
Other Sources of Information and Assistance	17-21
Preliminary Tour	17-21
Resources and Money	17-22
Experts	17-23
Types of Experts	17-23
Corrections and Security	17-23
Medical Care	17-23
Mental Health	17-23
Environmental Health	17-24
Structure	17-24
Use of Experts	17-24
Legal Limitations	17-24
What to Do with Your Expert	17-25
The Expert Tour	17-25

Finding and Selecting Experts	17-26
Drafting the Complaint	17-27
Class Actions	17-28
Preparation for Filing	17-29
Requirements for Certification	17-29
Numerosity and Impracticability of Joinder	17-30
Commonality	17-30
Typicality	17-31
Adequate Representation	17-32
Injunctive Relief	17-32
The “Lack of Necessity” Argument	17-33
If Certification Is Denied	17-33
Notice	17-35
Settlement or Dismissal	17-36
Discovery	17-37
Defenses in Jail Cases	17-40
Lack-of-Funding Defense	17-41
Improved-Conditions Defense	17-41
Future-Improvements Defense	17-41
Damage-Case Defenses	17-43
Proving the Case	17-44
Making It Real	17-44
Making Sense Out of It	17-46
Fitting the Facts to the Law	17-49
Deference	17-49
Length of Stay	17-50
Medical Care	17-50
Protection from Inmate Assault	17-51
Access to the Courts	17-52
Enforcing and Defending a Judgment	17-53
Writing an Enforceable Judgment	17-53
Enforcing an Injunction	17-56
Modification of Judgments	17-57
Attorneys’ Fees	17-58
Recordkeeping	17-58
Prevailing-Party Status	17-59
Interim Awards	17-59
Awards to Public-Interest Lawyers	17-59
Prevailing Under a Consent Decree	17-60
Prevailing as a Catalyst for Relief	17-60
Prevailing on Non-Section 1983 Claims	17-61
Recovering Experts’ Costs and Other Litigation Expenses	17-61
Recovering Fees Against the Governmental Unit	17-61
Compliance Work	17-61
Getting Paid	17-62

Conclusion	17-62
Notes	17-62
Appendix A: Leading Post- <i>Wolfish</i> and Post- <i>Chapman</i> Federal Decisions	17-89
Appendix B: List of Correctional and Other Relevant Standards (and Where to Obtain Them)	17-92

CHAPTER 17A

Disenfranchisement**The Disenfranchisement of Ex-Felons: Citizenship, Criminality, and “The Purity of the Ballot Box”** *Harvard Law Review*

Introduction	17A-3
Policy Justifications	17A-4
Theoretical Justification	17A-5
The Social Contract	17A-5
Moral Competence	17A-7
Building Fences	17A-8
Disenfranchisement as Symbolic Action	17A-8
Building an Inclusive Community	17A-11
Conclusion	17A-12
Notes	17A-12

CHAPTER 17B

The Rights of Deaf Prisoners**Deaf Prison Inmates: Time to Be Heard** *Bonnie P. Tucker*

Introduction	17B-3
Anti-Discrimination and Equal Protection Principles	17B-10
Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act	17B-12
Requirement That the Prison Be a Recipient of Federal Financial Assistance	17B-12
Requirement That the Deaf Prisoner Be an Otherwise Qualified Handicapped Individual	17B-14
The “Program or Activity” Requirement	17B-14
Discrimination Under Section 504	17B-18
Reasonable Accommodations	17B-19
Constitutional Rights	17B-20
Equal Protection	17B-21
The Eighth Amendment	17B-26
Rights of Convicted Deaf Prisoners	17B-26
Due Process Rights of Pretrial Detainees	17B-31
Summary	17B-33

Broadening State Interpreter Statutes: A Partial Solution	17B-33
Conclusion	17B-36
Appendix	17B-37
Notes	17B-42

CHAPTER 17C

The Rights of Women Prisoners**Pregnant Prisoners** *Ellen M. Barry*

Preface	17C-3
Pregnant Prisoners: The Overall Picture	17C-3
The Development of an Adequate Medical Care Standard in Correctional Institutions	17C-4
Pregnancy Medical Care Litigation in California State Prisons and County Jails	17C-6
<i>Harris v. McCarthy</i>	17C-6
<i>Jones v. Dyer</i>	17C-8
<i>Yeager v. Smith</i>	17C-9
Analysis of Litigation for Pregnant Prisoners	17C-9
Conclusion	17C-11
Notes	17C-12

Women in Prison Bibliography

Introduction	17C-17
Amnesty International/International Human Rights	17C-17
Battered Women: Abuse, Domestic Violence, and Crime	17C-19
Bibliographies About Women in the Criminal Justice System	17C-21
Book Reviews/Book Notes	17C-22
Capital Punishment	17C-24
Education/Programs/Training	17C-28
Employment/Labor	17C-29
Health Care/Mental Illness	17C-29
HIV/AIDS	17C-31
HIV+ Women	17C-35
Juvenile Girls in the Criminal Justice System	17C-39
Motherhood/Family in Prison: Children of Incarcerated Mothers	17C-40
Pregnancy/Reproductive Rights/Prenatal Care	17C-44
Pregnancy and Substance Abuse	17C-48
Race and the Criminal Justice System	17C-53
Rape, Sexual Assault, Cross-Gender Searches	17C-55
Sex/Gender Issues In Constitutional Law and Criminal Sentencing	17C-60
Statistics About Women in Jail/Prison	17C-68

Substance Abuse and Women	17C-69
Additional Resources	17C-71

Gender and Sexuality in the ABA Standards on the Treatment of Prisoners *Margaret Colgate Love and Giovanna Shay*

I. Development of the ABA Standards on the Treatment of Prisoners	17C-76
II. Updated Provisions Affecting Women Prisoners	17C-80
A. Screening and Classification	17C-81
B. Pregnancy and Childbirth	17C-83
C. Co-Corrections and Equal Protection	17C-85
III. New Provisions Addressing Sexual Abuse, Privacy, and LGBT Prisoners	17C-86
A. Custodial Sexual Abuse and Prison Sexual Violence	17C-86
B. Searches and Cross-Gender Supervision	17C-88
C. Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Prisoners	17C-92
D. Provisions Affecting Transgender Prisoners	17C-94
IV. Conclusion	17C-97

Parental Prisoners: The Incarcerated Mother's Constitutional Right to Parent *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*

Introduction	17C-100
I. Why and How Women End Up Incarcerated	17C-106
II. Existing Programs	17C-109
A. Prison Nurseries	17C-109
B. Community-Based Residential Parenting Programs	17C-110
III. Parental Rights Upon Incarceration	17C-111
IV. Fourteenth Amendment Right to Parent	17C-113
V. The Logic of <i>Turner</i> Grants Incarcerated Mothers the Right to Parent	17C-117
VI. Policy Justifications	17C-121
A. Well-Being of the Children	17C-121
B. Benefits for the Mothers	17C-123
C. Common Arguments Against Parental Rights for Incarcerated Mothers	17C-124
D. Contested Methods	17C-125
VII. Additional Barrier: Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997	17C-125
Conclusion	17C-126

CHAPTER 17D

The Rights of Native American Prisoners

Sweat Lodges and Headbands: An Introduction to the Rights of Native American Prisoners *Louis M. Holscher*

Introduction	17D-3
A Brief History of Prison Litigation	17D-4

Long Hair and Headbands	17D-7
Medicine Men and Sweat Lodges	17D-12
Recommendations and Conclusion	17D-16
Notes	17D-18

CHAPTER 17E

The Rights of Disabled Prisoners**George Bush's America Meets Dante's Inferno: The Americans with Disabilities Act in Prison** *Ira P. Robbins*

Introduction	17E-3
Specific Disabled Prison Populations	17E-7
Disabled Prisoners	17E-7
Elderly	17E-7
Mentally Disabled	17E-8
HIV- and AIDS-Infected	17E-9
Hearing Impaired	17E-10
Disabled Pretrial Detainees	17E-10
Disabled Death-Row Inmates	17E-11
Status of Disabled Prisoners Prior to the ADA	17E-12
Constitutional Standards for Prison Litigation	17E-13
Statutory Civil Rights for the Disabled: The Rehabilitation Act of 1973	17E-14
The Americans with Disabilities Act	17E-15
Background: The Interrelationship of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the ADA	17E-15
Summary of ADA Requirements	17E-16
Title II: Public Services—Prohibition Against Discrimination and Other Generally Applicable Provisions	17E-17
Other Relevant Provisions	17E-18
Accessibility Guidelines and Their Limitations	17E-20
General Applicability to Prisoners	17E-21
Legal Aspects and Implications of ADA's Title II	17E-22
Liability of State Governments and Individual Officials	17E-23
Remedies	17E-23
Diminished or Disappearing Intent Requirement	17E-24
Objective Standards	17E-25
Judicial Constraints	17E-26
The Class: Disabled Individuals and Levels of Judicial Review	17E-26
The Context: Prisons and Appropriate Levels of Judicial Deference	17E-26
ADA-Based Prisoner Litigation to Date	17E-28
Strategic Possibilities	17E-33

Conclusion	17E-35
Postscript	17E-37
Notes	17E-38

CHAPTER 17F
Experimentation on Prisoners

Prisoners as Human Subjects: A Closer Look at the Institute of Medicine's Recommendations to Loosen Current Restrictions on Using Prisoners in Scientific Research *Osagie K. Obasogie*

Introduction	17F-4
I. The Institute of Medicine: Organization, Structure, and Influence	17F-7
II. The Institute of Medicine and its Recommendation to Loosen Current Restrictions on Prison Research	17F-10
A. Background to the Current Regulatory Restrictions: Past Abuses with Using Prisoners as Human Subjects	17F-11
B. Mounting Concerns and Current Regulatory Framework	17F-15
C. The 2006 IOM Report and Its "Evolved" Ethical Framework for Evaluating Prison Research	17F-19
III. Beyond Consequences: A Critique of the Institute of Medicine's Recommendations	17F-22
A. Existing Commentaries on the IOM Report	17F-22
B. Three Critiques of the IOM's Updated Ethical Framework	17F-24
1. Methodological Critique	17F-24
2. Contextual Critique	17F-33
3. Substantive Critique	17F-39
Conclusion	17F-43

CHAPTER 17G
Children of Incarcerated Parents

Children of Incarcerated Parents: The Child's Constitutional Right to the Family Relationship *Chesa Boudin*

I. Introduction	17G-4
II. The Population Impacted by Parental Incarceration and the Issues at Stake	17G-8
III. The Rights of the Child: Lessons from International Law	17G-10
A. The Convention on the Rights of the Child	17G-10
B. The African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child	17G-13
C. European Law	17G-15

D. Other International Law	<i>17G-17</i>
IV. Sentencing and Visiting: Is There a Role for the Child?	<i>17G-18</i>
A. Sentencing Procedures Fail to Recognize Children's Rights	<i>17G-19</i>
B. Visitation Policies and Children with Incarcerated Parents	<i>17G-25</i>
V. Constitutional Rights of Children with Incarcerated Parents	<i>17G-31</i>
A. First Amendment	<i>17G-32</i>
B. Due Process	<i>17G-36</i>
C. Engaging Counter-Arguments	<i>17G-39</i>
D. Prudential Considerations	<i>17G-41</i>
VI. Conclusion	<i>17G-44</i>

CHAPTER 17H

Prison Visitation

Prison Visitation Policies: A Fifty-State Survey	<i>Chesa Boudin, Trevor Stutz, and Aaron Littman</i>
Introduction	<i>17H-4</i>
I. Methodology	<i>17H-10</i>
A. Background	<i>17H-10</i>
B. Sources of Data	<i>17H-11</i>
II. Key Findings	<i>17H-14</i>
A. Overview of Key Findings	<i>17H-14</i>
1. Institutional Authority over Visitation	<i>17H-14</i>
2. Number and Duration of Visits	<i>17H-14</i>
3. Inmate Eligibility for Visits	<i>17H-15</i>
4. Approval of Visitors	<i>17H-17</i>
5. Exclusion of Visitors	<i>17H-19</i>
6. Searches of Visitors	<i>17H-20</i>
7. Dress and Behavior of Visitors	<i>17H-21</i>
8. Children Visiting	<i>17H-22</i>
9. Extended Visits	<i>17H-23</i>
10. Virtual Visits	<i>17H-25</i>
B. Similarities and Differences Across the Fifty States	<i>17H-26</i>
C. Recent Policy Reforms	<i>17H-27</i>
III. Overnight Family Visits and Virtual Visitation	<i>17H-28</i>
A. Overnight Family Visits	<i>17H-29</i>
B. Virtual Visitation	<i>17H-33</i>
Conclusion	<i>17H-41</i>

CHAPTER 17I
Prison Banking

Prison Banking	<i>Anna VanCleave</i>
Introduction	<i>17I-4</i>
I. What are Inmate Trust Accounts	<i>17I-11</i>
A. How Inmate Trust Accounts Operate	<i>17I-11</i>
B. Descriptions, Justifications, and Purposes of Inmate Trust Accounts	<i>17I-16</i>
1. Prison Accounts as Ledgers to Track Wages and Debts	<i>17I-16</i>
2. Prison Accounts as Simple Government Budget Line Items to Track Property	<i>17I-18</i>
3. Prison Accounts for Purposes of Setting up an Efficient and Well-monitored Commissary System	<i>17I-19</i>
4. Prison Accounts as a Means of Maintaining Security and Control	<i>17I-21</i>
5. Prison Accounts as Pooled Assets for the General Welfare	<i>17I-24</i>
6. Prison Accounts as Tools for Teaching Financial Responsibility	<i>17I-26</i>
C. The Legal Status of Inmate Trust Accounts	<i>17I-28</i>
D. Statutory and Regulatory Frameworks and Failures	<i>17I-34</i>
II. Problems with the Current System: Legal and Illegal Abuses	<i>17I-42</i>
A. Prison Banking and Its Historical Contexts	<i>17I-42</i>
B. Inmate Trust Accounts Today: Forms of Asset Seizure	<i>17I-49</i>
1. Unilaterally Establishing Prison Costs for Goods and Services and Deducting These Costs from Individual Accounts	<i>17I-50</i>
2. Collecting Interest	<i>17I-54</i>
3. Charging Money for Prison Disciplinary Infractions and Restitution	<i>17I-55</i>
4. Diverting Funds to Pay Court Fines and Fees	<i>17I-56</i>
5. Imposing Per Diem Costs of Incarceration	<i>17I-58</i>
6. Embezzlement and Error	<i>17I-61</i>
C. Impacts of Asset Seizures	<i>17I-62</i>
D. Problematic Features of Prison Banking Systems	<i>17I-64</i>
1. Conflicts of Interest	<i>17I-64</i>
2. Low Transparency and Oversight	<i>17I-65</i>
3. Minimal Regulation	<i>17I-66</i>
4. Lack of Judicial Recourse	<i>17I-67</i>
5. Low Transaction Costs	<i>17I-72</i>
E. Change Resistance	<i>17I-73</i>
III. The Paths Forward	<i>17I-74</i>
A. Increasing Regulation, Oversight, and Transparency	<i>17I-74</i>
B. Abolition	<i>17I-79</i>
Conclusion	<i>17I-82</i>

CHAPTER 18

The Accreditation Debate**The Case Against Correctional Accreditation** *David L. Bazelon*

Introduction	18-3
The Promise of Accreditation	18-4
The Reality of the Accreditation Process	18-5
The Commission Has Repeatedly Refused to Open Up the Accreditation Process to Public Scrutiny and Participation	18-5
The Commission's Audit Techniques and Deliberative Procedures Are Inherently Unreliable	18-8
The Commission Is Unwilling to Accommodate Constructive Criticism and the Possibility of Meaningful Change	18-10
The Commission's Priorities Are Fundamentally Flawed	18-10
The Commission Has Pervasive Conflicts of Interest with the Facilities It Is Charged with Monitoring	18-11
The Commission Has Permitted the Accreditation Movement to Be Transformed into a Propaganda Vehicle for Corrections Authorities	18-12
Conclusion	18-13
Notes	18-13

The Case for Correctional Accreditation *B. James George, Jr.*

Introduction	18-19
Standards Development	18-20
Accreditation Procedures	18-21
Statistics on Accreditation	18-21
Correspondent Status	18-21
Candidate Status	18-22
Accreditation Hearing	18-23
Accredited Status	18-24
Reaccreditation	18-26
Criticisms of the Accreditation Process	18-27
The Benefits of Accreditation	18-35
Conclusion	18-36
Notes	18-37

Accreditation: Making a Good Process Better*Lynn Sanders Branham*

Introduction	18-41
Ensuring That Accredited Facilities Meet Constitutional Standards	18-42
Ensuring That the Information Provided by the Auditors to the Commission Is Accurate and Complete	18-46

Ensuring That the Decisions of the Commission Are Accurate and Reliable	18-48
Establishing a Multitiered Accreditation System	18-50
Conclusion	18-50
Notes	18-51

CHAPTER 19
The Future of Prisons

Let's Nationalize the State Prisons	<i>David Fogel</i>	19-3
Notes	19-7	

CHAPTER 20
Restitution

A Proposal for a New Correctional System: Correction by Restitution	<i>Don J. Young</i>	
Prologue	20-3	
Introduction	20-4	
The Proposal	20-5	
Problems to Be Considered	20-5	
How This Proposal Would Work in Practice	20-7	
The Mechanics of Translating the Program into Reality	20-9	
The First Stage	20-9	
The Second Stage	20-10	
Conclusion	20-10	
Epilogue	20-10	
Notes	20-13	

CHAPTER 21
Prison Industries

Factories with Fences: The Prison-Industries Approach to Correctional Dilemmas	<i>Warren E. Burger</i>	21-3
Notes	21-8	

Freeing Prisoners' Labor	<i>Stephen P. Garvey</i>	21-9
Introduction	21-9	
Closing the Market	21-11	
Organizational Forms of Prison Labor	21-11	
The Rise of Prison Labor, 1790-1870	21-12	

Prison Labor in the North	21-12
Labor in the “Cradle of the Penitentiary”	21-12
Labor in the Auburn-Cherry Hill Rivalry	21-13
Prison Labor in the South	21-15
The Fall of Prison Labor, 1870–1935	21-17
The Fall of the Contract	21-17
The Fall of the Lease	21-20
Federal Intervention	21-22
Prison Labor Today	21-24
Reopening the Market	21-26
The Morality of the Market	21-27
Potential Benefits	21-27
Social Welfare	21-27
Prison Order	21-28
Inmate Reform and Rehabilitation	21-29
Risks	21-31
Abuse, Coercion, and Exploitation	21-31
Racial Stereotyping	21-33
Less Eligibility	21-34
The Politics of the Market	21-35
Three Ways to Open the Market	21-36
Unions	21-36
The State	21-36
Victims	21-37
Punishment and Profit	21-38
Conclusion	21-40
Notes	21-40

Table of Contents

Volume Four

SECTION V **The Future of Prison Reform**

CHAPTER 22 **Privatization of Corrections**

Privatization of Corrections: Defining the Issues *Ira P. Robbins*

Introduction	22-3
Advantages and Criticisms	22-4
Constitutional Issues	22-6
State Action	22-6
Public-Function Test	22-7
Close-Nexus Test	22-8
State-Compulsion Test	22-9
Delegation	22-10
Other Important Questions	22-11
Symbolism: The Hidden Issue	22-12
Conclusion	22-13
Notes	22-13

Contracting for the Operation of Prisons and Jails *National Institute of Justice, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction	22-17
Legal Issues	22-18
Labor Relations	22-18

Liability	22-19
Use of Force	22-19
Inmate Rights	22-19
Before Deciding to Contract	22-20
Public Relations	22-20
What Kind of Facility?	22-20
Selection of Inmates	22-20
Inmate Discipline	22-21
RFP and Contract Issues	22-21
Appraisal Criteria	22-21
Contract Pricing	22-22
Interruptions in Service	22-23
Performance Standards	22-23
Duration and Renewal	22-23
Provisions for Monitoring	22-23
Present Employees	22-24
Monitoring and Evaluation	22-24
How to Monitor and How Much	22-24
Evaluation Issues	22-25
What Results to Expect	22-27
Official Perceptions	22-27
Speed and Quality	22-27
Cost Considerations	22-27
Public Perceptions	22-28
Avoiding Future Problems	22-28
Prison Contracting: The Issues	22-29
Legal Issues	22-29
Policy and Program Issues Before Deciding to Contract	22-29
RFP and Contract Issues	22-29
Monitoring and Evaluation	22-30
Trends in Private Operation of Correctional Facilities	22-30

The Legal Dimensions of Private Incarceration *Ira P. Robbins*

Preface	22-36
Advisory Board	22-39
Executive Summary	22-40
I. Introduction	22-40
II. Constitutional Dimensions	22-43
A. The Delegation Doctrine	22-43
1. Introduction	22-43
2. Federal Delegation	22-44
a. Brief History	22-44
(1) Delegation to Public Bodies	22-45
(2) Delegation to Private Parties	22-46
b. Current Federal Law	22-47

(1) The <i>Todd</i> Test	22-48
(2) Possible Inapplicability of the <i>Todd</i> Test	22-49
c. Possible Trend to Revive the Delegation Doctrine	22-49
3. State Delegation	22-51
a. Delegation of Management Functions	22-52
b. Delegation of Rule-Making Authority	22-54
c. Delegation of Adjudicative Powers	22-57
d. Application of State Law to Private Incarceration	22-60
4. Conclusion	22-60
B. The State-Action Requirement of the Fourteenth Amendment and 42 U.S.C. § 1983	22-62
1. Introduction	22-62
2. Overview of State-Action Doctrine	22-63
a. Historical Approaches to State Action: Four Traditional Tests	22-64
b. The 1982 Trilogy: An Attempt at Clarification	22-64
3. Development of the State-Action Doctrine: The Application to Prison and Jail Privatization	22-65
a. Public-Function Test	22-65
b. Close-Nexus Test	22-69
c. State-Compulsion Test	22-72
d. Multi-Characterization Analysis	22-73
4. The Latest Word: <i>West v. Atkins</i>	22-75
5. Conclusion	22-76
C. The Thirteenth Amendment	22-77
1. Introduction	22-77
2. Analysis	22-77
3. Conclusion	22-79
III. Contractual Dimensions	22-80
A. Model Contract and Commentary	22-82
Section 1: Policy Statement—Goals and Responsibilities of the Parties	22-82
Section 2: Private Financing and Physical Plant	22-86
Section 2(A): Private Financing	22-86
(1) Private Financing Generally	22-86
(a) Advantages and Disadvantages	22-86
(b) Tax Aspects	22-87
(2) Types of Private Financing	22-87
(a) Straight Lease	22-88
(b) Leasing as Part of Contract for Operation and Management of a Correctional or Detention Facility	22-89
(c) Sale/Leaseback	22-90
(3) Other Types of Financing for Incarceration Facilities	22-91
(4) Conclusion	22-93

Section 2(B): Physical Plant	22-94
Section 3: General Contract Terms	22-95
Section 3(A): Term	22-95
Section 3(B): Renewal	22-97
Section 3(C): Compensation	22-99
Section 3(D): Performance Bond	22-101
Section 3(E): Indemnification, Immunity, and Insurance	22-102
(1) Indemnification and Immunity	22-102
(a) The Eleventh Amendment, Sovereign Immunity, and Federal/State Tort-Claims Acts	22-103
(b) 42 U.S.C. § 1983	22-104
(c) Available Immunities	22-105
(d) Immunity for Private-Incarceration Contractors	22-105
(2) Insurance	22-112
Section 3(F): Operating Standards and Accreditation	22-119
(1) Operating Standards	22-119
(2) Accreditation	22-121
Section 3(G): Subcontracts and Assignments	22-122
Section 3(H): Independent-Contractor Status	22-124
Section 4: Employee Issues	22-124
Section 4(A): Hiring Criteria	22-124
(1) Employment Discrimination	22-124
(2) Employment Options for Correctional and Detention Employees at Existing Facilities	22-126
(3) Employee Background Investigations	22-127
Section 4(B): Employee Training Requirements	22-128
Section 4(C): Personnel Policy	22-130
Section 4(D): Staff Ratio	22-131
Section 4(E): Labor Disputes/Right to Strike	22-132
(1) Federal Facilities	22-132
(2) State Facilities	22-133
(3) Private Facilities	22-134
(a) The National Labor Relations Act	22-134
(b) The Applicability of the National Labor Relations Act to Private Prison and Jail Employees	22-134
(4) Recommendations	22-137
Section 5: Inmate Issues	22-138
Section 5(A): Inmate Management	22-138
(1) Classification	22-138
(2) Transfer	22-139
(3) Discipline	22-139
(4) Parole	22-141
Section 5(B): Use of Force	22-142
Section 5(C): Inmate Transportation	22-145

Section 5(D): Inmate Labor	22-146
Section 6: Monitoring	22-147
Section 7: Termination	22-150
Section 8: Miscellaneous Provisions	22-154
Section 8(A): Entire Agreement	22-154
Section 8(B): Amendment	22-154
Section 8(C): Severability	22-155
Section 8(D): Venue and Choice of Law	22-155
Section 8(E): Alternative Dispute Resolution	22-156
B. Summary of Model Contract Provisions	22-157
IV. Statutory Dimensions	22-176
A. Federal Statutory Authorization to Designate Privately Operated Places of Confinement	22-176
1. Introduction	22-176
2. 18 U.S.C. § 4082(b)	22-177
a. Legislative Intent of 18 U.S.C. § 4082(b)	22-178
b. 18 U.S.C. § 4002's Restrictions on 18 U.S.C. § 4082(b)	22-179
c. 1965 Amendment to Section 4082(b) Expanding Scope of Attorney General's Authority to Designate Places of Confinement	22-180
3. Conclusion	22-180
B. Model Statute and Commentary	22-181
Section 1: Enabling Legislation	22-183
Section 2: Site Selection	22-185
Section 3: Contract Term and Renewal	22-187
Section 4: Standards of Operation	22-188
Section 5: Use of Force	22-189
Section 6: Employee Training Requirements	22-190
Section 7: Monitoring	22-191
Section 8: Liability and Sovereign Immunity	22-192
Section 9: Insurance	22-193
Section 10: Termination of Contract and Resumption of Government Control	22-194
Section 11: Nondelegability of Contracting Agency's Authority	22-195
Section 12: Conflict of Interest	22-195
C. Summary of Model Statutory Provisions	22-197
V. Conclusion	22-202
VI. Notes	22-203
VII. Selected Bibliography	22-282

No Qualified Immunity for Private Prison Guards

Harvard Law Review

Introduction	22-335
<i>Richardson v. McKnight</i>	22-336

Analysis	22-338
Conclusion	22-340
Notes	22-341

Prison Accountability and Performance Measures

Alexander Volokh

Introduction	22-349
I. The Failure of Comparative Effectiveness Studies	22-354
A. Which Sector Costs Less?	22-354
1. Difficulties in Calculating Costs	22-354
2. Competing Cost Estimates	22-357
a. Texas	22-357
b. Florida	22-358
c. Taft	22-358
B. Which Sector Provides Higher Quality?	22-360
1. Difficulties in Figuring Out Quality	22-360
2. Which Sector Leads to Less Recidivism?	22-364
C. The Limits of Comparative Effectiveness	22-368
II. Why Use Performance Measures?	22-371
A. The Puzzle of Prisons?	22-371
B. Accountability, Neutrality, and Goal Setting	22-376
1. To Know What Works	22-376
2. To Implement Competitive Neutrality	22-377
3. To Express What We Want	22-380
C. For Performance-Based Contracting	22-380
1. Limited Current Efforts	22-380
2. The Range of Possible Contracts	22-382
a. General Considerations	22-382
b. Rewards or Penalties	22-384
c. Controlling for Baselines	22-385
d. Discrete vs. Continuous Measures	22-389
3. The Feasibility of Merit Pay in the Public Sector	22-391
D. What Measures to Choose	22-392
III. Concerns and Critiques	22-400
A. What Prices to Set	22-400
B. Effects on Market Structure	22-403
1. Public-Interestedness	22-403
2. Risk and Capital Requirements	22-404
a. The Risk Is in the Slope	22-404
b. Financing Nonprofits: Social Impact Bonds	22-408
C. Undesirable Strategic Behavior	22-410
1. Manipulating the Goals	22-410
2. Distortion Across Dimensions of Performance	22-413
3. Distortion Across Types of Inmates	22-417
4. Falsifying Performance Measures	22-419

Conclusion	22-422
------------	--------

APPENDIX A
Prisoners' Assistance Directory

Introduction	<i>App. A-3</i>
National and Regional Organizations	<i>App. A-4</i>
Corrections/Criminal Justice/Legal	<i>App. A-4</i>
AIDS/Hepatitis	<i>App. A-13</i>
Book Programs/Pen Pals	<i>App. A-15</i>
Death Penalty	<i>App. A-17</i>
Drug Law Reform	<i>App. A-18</i>
Families/Visitation	<i>App. A-18</i>
Gays/Lesbians	<i>App. A-21</i>
Immigrants Rights	<i>App. A-23</i>
Juveniles	<i>App. A-23</i>
Mental Health	<i>App. A-24</i>
Religious	<i>App. A-25</i>
Technology	<i>App. A-26</i>
Veterans/Military	<i>App. A-27</i>
Voting Rights	<i>App. A-27</i>
Women	<i>App. A-28</i>
State and Local Organizations	<i>App. A-29</i>
International Organizations	<i>App. A-132</i>
Publications	<i>App. A-135</i>
Books, Reports, Etc.	<i>App. A-135</i>
Newsletters	<i>App. A-143</i>
Miscellaneous	<i>App. A-147</i>
Duplicating Services	<i>App. A-147</i>
Educational Opportunities	<i>App. A-147</i>

APPENDIX B
American Bar Association Criminal Justice Standards

**ABA Criminal Justice Standards on the Treatment of Prisoners
 (Approved by the ABA House of Delegates, February 2010)**

Definitions	<i>App. B-7</i>
General Principles	<i>App. B-9</i>
Intake and Classification	<i>App. B-11</i>
Conditions of Confinement	<i>App. B-18</i>
Rules of Conduct and Discipline	<i>App. B-24</i>
Personal Security	<i>App. B-27</i>
Health Care	<i>App. B-36</i>
Personal Dignity	<i>App. B-46</i>

Rehabilitation and Reintegration	<i>App. B-54</i>
Grievances and Access to Courts	<i>App. B-62</i>
Administration and Staffing	<i>App. B-68</i>
Accountability and Oversight	<i>App. B-73</i>

APPENDIX C
Prisoner Statistics

Time Served in Prison and on Parole 1984 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction	<i>App. C-87</i>
Prison Releases, 1984	<i>App. C-88</i>
Offender Characteristics	<i>App. C-88</i>
Type of Prison Release	<i>App. C-89</i>
Time Served in Prison	<i>App. C-89</i>
Time Served in Local Jails	<i>App. C-90</i>
Sex	<i>App. C-90</i>
Race	<i>App. C-91</i>
Prior Felony Incarceration	<i>App. C-91</i>
Minimum Time to Be Served	<i>App. C-92</i>
Parolees Discharged in 1984	<i>App. C-92</i>
Total Time Under Supervision	<i>App. C-93</i>
Time to Failure	<i>App. C-93</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-94</i>
Reporting Criteria	<i>App. C-94</i>
Offenses	<i>App. C-94</i>
Sentences	<i>App. C-95</i>
Time Served	<i>App. C-95</i>
Median and Mean	<i>App. C-96</i>
Year-to-Year Comparisons	<i>App. C-96</i>

Historical Statistics on Prisoners in State and Federal Institutions, Yearend 1925-86 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction	<i>App. C-153</i>
National Trends, 1925-86	<i>App. C-154</i>
Record High Number of Prisoners	<i>App. C-154</i>
Record Year-to-Year Numerical Increase	<i>App. C-154</i>
Record Year-to-Year Percentage Increase	<i>App. C-154</i>
Record Year-to-Year Percentage Decrease	<i>App. C-154</i>
Regional Trends, 1925-86	<i>App. C-154</i>
Record Year-to-Year Percentage Increase	<i>App. C-154</i>
Individual State Trends, 1925-86	<i>App. C-155</i>
Record Year-to-Year Percentage Increase	<i>App. C-155</i>

Trends in the Size of the Federal Prison Population as a Percentage of the Total Prison Population	<i>App. C-156</i>
Record High Percentage of Federal Prisoners	<i>App. C-156</i>
Record Low Percentage of Federal Prisoners	<i>App. C-156</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-156</i>
Tables	<i>App. C-157</i>
Sources	<i>App. C-170</i>

Prison Rule Violators *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction	<i>App. C-175</i>
Rule Violators: Definition, Classification, and Disposition	<i>App. C-176</i>
Rule Violations in State Prisons	<i>App. C-177</i>
Demographic Characteristics of Rule Violators	<i>App. C-177</i>
Drug-Use History of Rule Violators	<i>App. C-178</i>
Frequency of Violations	<i>App. C-178</i>
Average Annual Number of Violations	<i>App. C-179</i>
Facility Characteristics Relating to Rule Violators	<i>App. C-179</i>
Punishments for Rule Violations	<i>App. C-180</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-181</i>
Questions Asked State Prison Inmates About Their Prison Rule Infractions	<i>App. C-182</i>
Notes	<i>App. C-196</i>

Women in Prison *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction	<i>App. C-241</i>
Surveys of State Prison Inmates	<i>App. C-242</i>
Female Prisoner Characteristics	<i>App. C-243</i>
Commitment Offense	<i>App. C-243</i>
Violent Female Offenders and Their Victims	<i>App. C-243</i>
Criminal History	<i>App. C-244</i>
Sentence Length and Time Served	<i>App. C-244</i>
Drugs and Crime	<i>App. C-245</i>
Drug Use by Women Prior to Imprisonment	<i>App. C-246</i>
Physical and Sexual Abuse	<i>App. C-246</i>
Mothers in Prison	<i>App. C-247</i>
Recent Growth in the Female Offender Population	<i>App. C-248</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-249</i>
Notes	<i>App. C-258</i>

Race of Prisoners Admitted to State and Federal Institutions, 1926-86 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction	<i>App. C-259</i>
National Prisoner Statistics	<i>App. C-259</i>

Statistics on Race from the Admission Series	<i>App. C-260</i>
Definitions Used in the Admission Series	<i>App. C-261</i>
Gaps in the Admission Series	<i>App. C-262</i>
Number of States Submitting Admission Records	<i>App. C-263</i>
Relative Number of Admission Records Submitted	<i>App. C-263</i>
Long-Term Growth of the Black Prison Population in the United States	<i>App. C-264</i>
Growth in Per Capita Rates of Black Imprisonment	<i>App. C-265</i>
Increase in the Number of Blacks in State Versus Federal Prisons	<i>App. C-265</i>
Comparing the Growth in the Prison Population of Blacks and of Asians, Alaska Natives, American Indians, and Pacific Islanders	<i>App. C-265</i>
Regional Variation in the Growth of the Black Prison Population	<i>App. C-266</i>
Recent Trends in the Racial Composition of Persons Admitted to State Prisons	<i>App. C-266</i>
State-by-State Statistics and Federal Statistics on Prison Admissions, by Race, 1926-86	<i>App. C-266</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-267</i>
Estimation Procedures	<i>App. C-267</i>
Missing States, 1926	<i>App. C-267</i>
Missing States, 1986	<i>App. C-267</i>
Missing Records, 1926 and 1986	<i>App. C-268</i>
Incomplete Records, 1926 and 1986	<i>App. C-268</i>
Tables	<i>App. C-268</i>
Appendix: Sources on Table 1	<i>App. C-309</i>
Sources for Total Admissions from Courts	<i>App. C-309</i>
Sources for State and Federal Prison Admissions	<i>App. C-310</i>
Notes	<i>App. C-315</i>

Drug Enforcement and Treatment in Prisons, 1990	<i>Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice</i>
Overview	<i>App. C-341</i>
Introduction	<i>App. C-342</i>
Interdiction Activities	<i>App. C-343</i>
Most Prison Facilities Patted Down Inmates and Required Them to Exchange Clothes upon Admission or Any Reentry	<i>App. C-343</i>
Most Facilities Searched the Belongings of Visitors	<i>App. C-343</i>
Staff Were Also Subject to Drug Interdiction Activities	<i>App. C-344</i>
Maximum Security Facilities Took More Stringent Drug Interdiction Measures Than Other Facilities	<i>App. C-344</i>
Testing Urine for Drug Use	<i>App. C-344</i>
Most Correctional Facilities Tested Some Inmates for Illegal Drug Use	<i>App. C-344</i>
Most Large State Confinement Facilities Tested for Drugs	<i>App. C-345</i>

Almost All Work Release Facilities Tested for Drugs	<i>App. C-346</i>
For All Inmates Tested, State Prisons Reported Higher Positive Rates	
Than Federal Prisons	<i>App. C-346</i>
Same Percentage of State and Federal Facilities Reported Positive Drug	
Tests	<i>App. C-346</i>
Community-Based Facilities Found Higher Rates of Drug Use Than	
Confinement Facilities	<i>App. C-346</i>
Among State Confinement Facilities, Positive Test Results Were Highest	
in Those Testing on Suspicion Only	<i>App. C-347</i>
The Percentages of Positive Tests Were Higher in Large Facilities	
<i>App. C-347</i>	
Positive Results from Drug Tests Varied Among Facilities Performing	
Different Functions	<i>App. C-347</i>
Positive Drug Tests Were Linked to Interdiction Activities	
<i>App. C-348</i>	
Drug Testing of Staff Was Highest in Federal Facilities	<i>App. C-348</i>
A Positive Test Was Grounds for Dismissal in over a Third of Facilities	
That Tested Staff for Drugs	<i>App. C-349</i>
Drug Treatment/Intervention on June 29, 1990	<i>App. C-349</i>
Prisons Could Treat an Estimated 131,900 Inmates for Drug	
Addiction	<i>App. C-350</i>
Prisons Were Treating Approximately 100,200 Inmates	
<i>App. C-350</i>	
Enrollment in Drug Treatment Was Below Capacity	<i>App. C-351</i>
Prisons Offered a Variety of Programs	<i>App. C-351</i>
Interpreting Measures of Drug Testing	<i>App. C-352</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-353</i>
Census Universe	<i>App. C-353</i>
Questionnaire Administration	<i>App. C-353</i>
Definitions of Community-Based and Confinement Facilities	
<i>App. C-354</i>	
Drug Addendum	<i>App. C-354</i>
Estimation Procedures	<i>App. C-354</i>
Notes	<i>App. C-369</i>

HIV in U.S. Prisons and Jails *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States*

Department of Justice

Introduction	<i>App. C-391</i>
Data Sources	<i>App. C-392</i>
Prevalence of HIV Infection in U.S. Prisons	<i>App. C-392</i>
Prison Policies for Testing for HIV	<i>App. C-393</i>
Deaths in Prison	<i>App. C-393</i>
AIDS-Related Deaths	<i>App. C-393</i>
Extent of HIV Testing of State Prison Inmates	<i>App. C-394</i>
HIV Test Results, By Inmate Characteristics	<i>App. C-394</i>
HIV Test Results, By Drug and Needle Use	<i>App. C-395</i>

HIV Test Results, By Type of Prison	<i>App. C-395</i>
HIV Testing Policies in the Largest Jail Jurisdictions	<i>App. C-395</i>
Deaths in 503 Large Jail Jurisdictions	<i>App. C-396</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-396</i>
Data Sources	<i>App. C-396</i>
Accuracy of the Estimates	<i>App. C-397</i>

Women in Prison, 1994 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction	<i>App. C-433</i>
Current Offenses	<i>App. C-433</i>
Criminal Histories	<i>App. C-433</i>
Victims of Violent Inmates	<i>App. C-434</i>
Family Characteristics	<i>App. C-434</i>
Drug and Alcohol Use	<i>App. C-434</i>
Survey of Inmates of State Correctional Facilities, 1991	<i>App. C-434</i>
Increase in Number of Women in Prison	<i>App. C-435</i>
Characteristics of Women in Prison	<i>App. C-435</i>
Current Offense	<i>App. C-436</i>
Violent Female Inmates and Their Victims	<i>App. C-436</i>
Criminal History	<i>App. C-437</i>
Sentence Length	<i>App. C-437</i>
Family Background	<i>App. C-438</i>
Physical and Sexual Abuse of Prisoners	<i>App. C-439</i>
Mothers in Prison	<i>App. C-441</i>
Drug Use History	<i>App. C-442</i>
HIV and AIDS	<i>App. C-444</i>
Alcohol Use	<i>App. C-445</i>
Prison Health Care for Women	<i>App. C-445</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-445</i>
Sample Design	<i>App. C-446</i>
Accuracy of the Estimates	<i>App. C-446</i>

Comparing Federal and State Prison Inmates, 1991 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Foreword	<i>App. C-463</i>
Summary	<i>App. C-464</i>
Current Offense	<i>App. C-464</i>
Sentence Length and Time to Be Served	<i>App. C-464</i>
Criminal History	<i>App. C-465</i>
Drug and Alcohol Use	<i>App. C-465</i>
Weapons	<i>App. C-465</i>
Personal and Family Characteristics	<i>App. C-465</i>
HIV	<i>App. C-466</i>

Activities Since Admission	<i>App. C-466</i>
Inmate Characteristics	<i>App. C-466</i>
The Data	<i>App. C-466</i>
Characteristics of Sentenced Federal and State Prison Inmates	<i>App. C-467</i>
Current Offenses	<i>App. C-467</i>
Current Offenses of Men and Women	<i>App. C-468</i>
Current Offenses of Whites, Blacks, and Hispanics	<i>App. C-468</i>
Current Offenses of Citizens and Noncitizens	<i>App. C-469</i>
Sentence Length and Time to Be Served	<i>App. C-469</i>
Recidivism	<i>App. C-470</i>
Prior Sentences to Probation and Incarceration	<i>App. C-470</i>
Criminal Histories	<i>App. C-471</i>
Characteristics of Prior Sentences	<i>App. C-471</i>
Criminal Histories of Men and Women	<i>App. C-471</i>
Criminal Histories of White, Black, and Hispanic Inmates	<i>App. C-471</i>
Criminal History and Current Offense	<i>App. C-472</i>
Drug Use	<i>App. C-472</i>
Drug Use of Men and Women	<i>App. C-473</i>
Drug Use of White, Black, and Hispanic Inmates	<i>App. C-473</i>
Drug Use of Age Groups	<i>App. C-473</i>
Drug Use of Citizens and Noncitizens	<i>App. C-474</i>
Drug Use, by Current Offense	<i>App. C-474</i>
Drug Treatment Programs	<i>App. C-474</i>
Type of Drug Treatment Program	<i>App. C-474</i>
Status of Drug Treatment	<i>App. C-475</i>
Characteristics of Drug Treatment Participants	<i>App. C-475</i>
Alcohol and Drug Use at the Time of the Offense	<i>App. C-475</i>
Federal Inmates Serving Time for a Drug Offense—Other Than Possession Only—Organizations and Activities	<i>App. C-476</i>
Amount of Drugs Involved in the Current Offense for Federal Inmates	<i>App. C-477</i>
Firearms	<i>App. C-478</i>
Firearm Use by Violent and Nonviolent Offenders	<i>App. C-478</i>
Type of Firearm	<i>App. C-479</i>
Firearm Use, by Offense	<i>App. C-479</i>
Stealing and Selling Firearms	<i>App. C-479</i>
Family Background	<i>App. C-479</i>
Parental Drug and Alcohol Abuse	<i>App. C-480</i>
Family Members Incarcerated	<i>App. C-480</i>
Physical or Sexual Abuse	<i>App. C-480</i>
Prisoners with Children	<i>App. C-481</i>
Women in Federal and State Prisons	<i>App. C-481</i>
Highlighting Women in Federal and State Prisons: An Index to Tables	<i>App. C-482</i>

Activities in Prison	<i>App. C-483</i>
Furloughs	<i>App. C-483</i>
HIV Infection	<i>App. C-484</i>
Conditions of Confinement in Federal Prisons	<i>App. C-486</i>
Federal Inmates' Opinions of Confinement Conditions	<i>App. C-486</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-487</i>
Sample Design	<i>App. C-487</i>
Accuracy of the Estimates	<i>App. C-488</i>

Lifetime Likelihood of Going to State or Federal Prison *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction	<i>App. C-659</i>
Highlights	<i>App. C-659</i>
The Chances of Going to Prison, by Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin	<i>App. C-660</i>
The Likelihood of Going to Prison, by Age	<i>App. C-661</i>
The Chances of Going to Prison Decline with Advancing Age	<i>App. C-661</i>
The Number of First Admissions by Age, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin	<i>App. C-662</i>
Characteristics of First Admissions	<i>App. C-663</i>
Steady Chances of Going to Prison Since 1991	<i>App. C-664</i>
Comparing Lifetime Rates to Other Types of Incarceration Rates	<i>App. C-665</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-666</i>
Life Table Techniques	<i>App. C-666</i>
Age-Specific Mortality Rates	<i>App. C-667</i>
Estimating the Number of Persons at Risk to First Incarceration	<i>App. C-667</i>
Estimating the Number of First Admissions to Prison	<i>App. C-667</i>
Calculating the Lifetime Chances of Going to Prison	<i>App. C-669</i>
Limitations of the Life Table Estimates	<i>App. C-670</i>

Prisoner Petitions in the Federal Courts, 1980-96 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Highlights	<i>App. C-741</i>
Petitions by State Inmates	<i>App. C-741</i>
Petitions by Federal Inmates	<i>App. C-741</i>
Introduction	<i>App. C-742</i>
Overview	<i>App. C-742</i>
Tracking Prisoner Petitions Through the Federal Courts	<i>App. C-742</i>
Petitions Dismissed	<i>App. C-743</i>
Petitions Adjudicated	<i>App. C-743</i>
Petitions Pending	<i>App. C-743</i>

Legal Representation of Federal and State Inmates	<i>App. C-743</i>
Prisoner Petitions in U.S. District Courts	<i>App. C-744</i>
Prisoner Petitions Filed	<i>App. C-744</i>
Trends in Prisoner Petitions Filed	<i>App. C-745</i>
Cases Filed	<i>App. C-745</i>
Filing Rate	<i>App. C-746</i>
Prisoner Petitions Adjudicated in U.S. District Court	<i>App. C-747</i>
Mode of Disposition	<i>App. C-747</i>
Disposition	<i>App. C-747</i>
Case Processing Time	<i>App. C-748</i>
Habeas Corpus Petitions by Death Row Inmates in State Prisons	
<i>App. C-749</i>	
Mode of Adjudication	<i>App. C-750</i>
Case Processing Time	<i>App. C-750</i>
Appeals	<i>App. C-750</i>
Prisoner Petitions in U.S. Courts of Appeal	<i>App. C-751</i>
Prisoner Petitions Filed	<i>App. C-751</i>
Trends, 1980-1995	<i>App. C-752</i>
Appeals Filed	<i>App. C-752</i>
Filing Rate	<i>App. C-752</i>
Prisoner Petitions Adjudicated in U.S. Courts of Appeal	
<i>App. C-753</i>	
Mode of Disposition	<i>App. C-753</i>
Disposition	<i>App. C-753</i>
Case Processing Time	<i>App. C-754</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-754</i>
Notes	<i>App. C-754.1</i>

Truth in Sentencing in State Prisons	<i>Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice</i>
Introduction	<i>App. C-859</i>
Highlights	<i>App. C-860</i>
Three Decades of Sentencing Reform—1970's Through 1990's	
<i>App. C-860</i>	
Discrepancy Between Sentence and Time Served	<i>App. C-860</i>
Data Were Compiled From Multiple Sources	<i>App. C-860</i>
Sentencing Reforms Parallel "Get Tough on Crime" Attitude	
<i>App. C-861</i>	
Washington State Enacted the First Truth-in-Sentencing Law in 1984	
<i>App. C-862</i>	
Most Truth-in-Sentencing States Require Offenders to Serve 85% of the Prison Sentence	<i>App. C-862</i>
14 States Have Abolished Parole Board Release for All Offenders	
<i>App. C-863</i>	
Between 1990 and 1997 the Number of Offenders in State Prison Increased 7% Annually	<i>App. C-864</i>

State Prison Admission Rates Have Dropped *App. C-864*
Over a Third of Prison Admissions in 1997 Were Parole Violators
App. C-864
The Commitment Rate for Murder Rose From 460 per 1,000 Arrests in
1990 to 613 per 1,000 in 1996 *App. C-866*
Nearly 40% of All Female, Black, and Hispanic Prison Admissions Were
Drug Offenders *App. C-867*
Nearly 7 in 10 Violent Offenders Are in a State that Requires 85% of the
Sentence Be Served *App. C-868*
Offenders Admitted to Prison in 1996 for Robbery Were Expected to Serve 7
Months Longer Than in 1990 *App. C-869*
Violent Offenders Admitted to Prison in 1996 Were Expected to Serve
About Half of Their Sentence *App. C-870*
Truth-in-Sentencing Laws Would Increase the Minimum Prison Term by 15
Months for Violent Offenders *App. C-870*
Violent Offenders Would Serve About 10 Months Less Under a
75%-Requirement Than an 85%-Requirement *App. C-871*
For Releases, Average Time Served in Prison Increased From 22 Months in
1990 to 25 Months in 1996 *App. C-871*
Time Served by Released Part 1 Violent Offenders Increased in 38 States
Between 1993 and 1997 *App. C-872*
Part 1 Violent Offenders Released in 1997 Served Between 25% and 87% of
Their Sentence *App. C-872*
Black Offenders Released in 1996 Served 2 Months Longer Than White
Offenders *App. C-873*
Prisoners Released in 4 States Served Over 70% of the Sentence
App. C-874
Nearly 18% of Released Offenders Served Their Entire Prison Sentence
App. C-875
Time Served Increased for Parole Board Releases Between 1990 and
1996 *App. C-875*
Violent Offenders Released by Parole Boards Served 4 Months Longer Than
Other Conditional Releases *App. C-875*
Parole Board Releases Served 29% of the Sentence, and Other Conditional
Releases, 47% *App. C-876*
Prisoners Are Serving More Time Than Release Data Indicate
App. C-876
State Prison Population Growth Is Linked to Increasing Time Served
App. C-876
The Sentences of Released Offenders Decreased Between 1990 and
1996 *App. C-877*
The Release Rate for Rape Offenders Dropped From 24 per 100 to 15 per
100 State Prison Inmates *App. C-877*
Few Offenders Admitted Under Truth-in-Sentencing Laws Are Being
Released From Prison *App. C-878*
Six States Projected an Average 10-Year Prison Term Under Truth in
Sentencing *App. C-878*

Seven States Reported an Average Percent of Sentence Served Above 85% <i>App. C-878</i>	
Methodology <i>App. C-879</i>	
NCRP Participating States <i>App. C-879</i>	
Estimating the Admission and Release Rates by Offense <i>App. C-880</i>	
Truth-in-Sentencing Reform <i>App. C-880</i>	
Definition of Terms <i>App. C-880</i>	
 Prior Abuse Reported by Inmates and Probationers <i>Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice</i>	
Introduction <i>App. C-897</i>	
Highlights <i>App. C-898</i>	
For Women, Abuse as Children More Likely in Correctional Than General Population <i>App. C-899</i>	
Abused Males Reported Being Mistreated as Children, But Females, as Both Children and Adults <i>App. C-899</i>	
Abuse of Men Was by Family Members, But Abuse of Women by Family Members and Intimates <i>App. C-899</i>	
Prisoners' Prior Abuse Related to Their Family Background <i>App. C-899</i>	
Reported Past Abuse Associated With Violent Crime <i>App. C-900</i>	
The Reported Use of Illegal Drugs and Alcohol Higher Among Abused Inmates <i>App. C-901</i>	
Inmates and Probationers Answered Surveys About Their Abuse <i>App. C-901</i>	
Question Wording and Respondent Sensitivity Affect Level of Reported Abuse <i>App. C-902</i>	
 Substance Abuse and Treatment, State and Federal Prisoners, 1997 <i>Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice</i>	
Introduction <i>App. C-907</i>	
Highlights <i>App. C-908</i>	
Half of State Inmates and a Third of Federal Prisoners Reported Committing Their Current Offense Under the Influence of Alcohol or Drugs <i>App. C-908</i>	
Since Admission 1 in 8 State Prisoners Were Treated for Substance Abuse, and 1 in 4 Had Participated in Other Alcohol or Drug Abuse Programs <i>App. C-909</i>	
Drug Offenders Accounted for Over 250,000 Prisoners; 21% of State, Over 60% of Federal Prisoners in 1997 <i>App. C-910</i>	
Half of All Prisoners Were Under the Influence of Alcohol or Drugs at the Time of Their Offense <i>App. C-911</i>	
Assault, Murder, and Sexual Assault Most Closely Tied to Alcohol Use at the Time of Offense <i>App. C-912</i>	

A Third of State and a Fifth of Federal Prisoners Said They Used Drugs at the Time of Offense *App. C-912*
Prior Drug Use by State Prisoners Remained Stable Since 1991, Except for Marijuana Use *App. C-912*
Nearly Three-Quarters of Federal Prisoners Had Used Drugs in the Past—Up From 60% in 1991 *App. C-913*
Over 40% of Federal Prisoners Used Drugs in the Month Before the Offense; 20% Used Cocaine or Crack *App. C-913*
Past Experiences of Alcohol Abuse, by Number of Positive CAGE Responses of State Prisoners, 1997 *App. C-914*
About 1 in 6 Prisoners Said They Committed Their Offense to Get Money for Drugs *App. C-915*
Responses From a Quarter of State, a Sixth of Federal Prisoners Indicated Past Alcohol Abuse or Dependence *App. C-915*
Over 60% of All Prisoners Had Driven While Under the Influence of Alcohol or Drugs *App. C-916*
Prisoners Were as Likely to Experience Problems With Alcohol as With Drugs *App. C-916*
Female State Prisoners Reported Higher Levels of Past Drug Use; Levels Higher for Male Federal Prisoners *App. C-916*
Prior Drug Use of State Prisoners Varies Little by Race; Hispanics Report Lowest Levels in Federal Prisons *App. C-917*
Prisoners Aged 44 and Younger Report More Prior Drug Abuse Than Older Prisoners *App. C-917*
Alcohol Abuse More Prevalent Among Whites, Male Prisoners *App. C-917*
Three-Quarters of All Prisoners Can Be Characterized as Alcohol- or Drug-Involved Offenders *App. C-918*
A Third of State, a Quarter of Federal Prisoners Said They Had Ever Been Treated for Substance Abuse *App. C-919*
Treatment Tied to Past Use, Time Remaining Until Expected Release *App. C-919*
Prisoners' Participation in Drug Treatment Dropped Since 1991; Other Drug Programs Grew *App. C-920*
1 in 4 Prisoners Participated in Either Drug Treatment or Other Drug Abuse Programs Since Admission *App. C-921*
Among Prisoners With Past Drug Abuse, Treatment Provided Less Commonly Than Other Programs *App. C-921*
A Quarter of State and a Fifth of Federal Prisoners Received Alcohol Treatment Since Admission *App. C-922*
Less Than a Fifth of Alcohol-Abusing Prisoners Received Treatment; About a Third Enrolled in Other Programs *App. C-923*
Women, Whites More Likely to Receive Substance Abuse Treatment Since Admission to State Prison *App. C-923*
Substance Abuse Treatment of Federal Prisoners Shows Little Variation by Sex or Age *App. C-924*
Methodology *App. C-924*

Sample Design	<i>App. C-924</i>
Estimates of Prisoner Counts	<i>App. C-926</i>
Accuracy of the Estimates	<i>App. C-926</i>

Time Served in Prison by Federal Offenders, 1986-97 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction	<i>App. C-947</i>
Highlights	<i>App. C-948</i>
Sentences Imposed	<i>App. C-948</i>
Time to Be Served, 1986 and 1997	<i>App. C-948</i>
Time Served to First Release	<i>App. C-949</i>
Differences Between Entry and Release Cohorts	<i>App. C-949</i>
Measuring Length of Stay for Entering Cohorts of Federal Prisoners	<i>App. C-950</i>
Time to Be Served by Federal Offenders, 1986-97	<i>App. C-950</i>
Offenders Entering Federal Prison	<i>App. C-950</i>
Offense of Conviction	<i>App. C-951</i>
Offenders Released from Federal Prison	<i>App. C-952</i>
Offense of Conviction	<i>App. C-953</i>
Time to Be Served	<i>App. C-953</i>
Prison Population	<i>App. C-954</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-955</i>
Data Sources	<i>App. C-955</i>
Measuring Time Served and Time to Be Served	<i>App. C-956</i>
Prison Term in Effect	<i>App. C-956</i>
Time Served	<i>App. C-956</i>
Proportion of Time Served	<i>App. C-957</i>
Estimated Number of Suspects in Criminal Matters in 1986	<i>App. C-958</i>

Mental Health and Treatment of Inmates and Probationers

Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice

Introduction	<i>App. C-1017</i>
Highlights	<i>App. C-1018</i>
Over a Quarter Million Mentally Ill Incarcerated in Prison or Jail	<i>App. C-1018</i>
Mentally Ill Inmates Were More Likely Than Others to Be in Prison for a Violent Offense	<i>App. C-1018</i>
Nearly 6 in 10 Mentally Ill Offenders Reported They Were Under the Influence of Alcohol or Drugs at the Time of Their Current Offense	<i>App. C-1019</i>
Prevalence of Mental Illness Among Correctional Populations Based on Offender Self Reports	<i>App. C-1019</i>
16% of State Prisoners Identified As Mentally Ill	<i>App. C-1020</i>

283,800 Mentally Ill in Prison or Jail; 547,800 on Probation
App. C-1020

White Inmates More Likely Than Blacks or Hispanics to Report a Mental Illness
App. C-1021

Offender Mental Illness Highest Among the Middle-Aged
App. C-1021

Mentally Ill More Likely Than Other Offenders to Have Committed a Violent Offense
App. C-1022

6 in 10 Violent Mentally Ill State Prisoners Knew Their Victim
App. C-1022

Half of Mentally Ill Inmates Reported 3 or More Prior Sentences
App. C-1023

Mentally Ill More Likely Than Other Inmates to Be Violent Recidivists
App. C-1024

Homelessness More Prevalent Among Mentally Ill Offenders
App. C-1024

About 4 in 10 Inmates with a Mental Condition Unemployed Before Arrest
App. C-1025

Family History of Incarceration and Alcohol or Drug Use Prevalent Among Mentally Ill
App. C-1025

Mentally Ill Report High Rates of Past Physical and Sexual Abuse
App. C-1026

6 in 10 Mentally Ill State Inmates Under the Influence of Alcohol or Drugs at Time of Offense
App. C-1026

A Third of Mentally Ill Offenders Alcohol Dependent
App. C-1027

Mentally Ill Offenders Report Negative Life Experiences Related to Drinking
App. C-1027

Mentally Ill Expected to Serve 15 Months Longer Than Other Inmates in Prison
App. C-1028

Disciplinary Problems Common Among Mentally Ill Inmates
App. C-1028

6 in 10 Mentally Ill Received Treatment While Incarcerated
App. C-1029

Female Mentally Ill More Likely Than Males to Report Treatment
App. C-1029

Methodology
App. C-1030

Accuracy of the Estimates
App. C-1031

Estimating the Number of Mentally Ill Offenders Under Correctional Supervision
App. C-1031

Women Offenders *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction
App. C-1073

Highlights
App. C-1074

Violent Victimizers
App. C-1075

Characteristics of Violent Female Offenders
App. C-1075

Characteristics of Victims of Female Violent Offenders	<i>App. C-1076</i>
Where Offenders Committed Violence and Use of Drugs or Alcohol	
<i>App. C-1076</i>	
Consequences of Female Violence	<i>App. C-1077</i>
Women Who Murder	<i>App. C-1077</i>
Parents Who Kill	<i>App. C-1079</i>
Arrests	<i>App. C-1079</i>
Female Defendants in State Courts	<i>App. C-1080</i>
Female Corrections Populations	<i>App. C-1081</i>
Characteristics of Women Serving a Sentence	<i>App. C-1081</i>
Race and Hispanic Origin	<i>App. C-1081</i>
Age	<i>App. C-1082</i>
Marital Status	<i>App. C-1082</i>
Education	<i>App. C-1082</i>
Inmates' Children	<i>App. C-1082</i>
Economic Circumstances	<i>App. C-1083</i>
Health Issues	<i>App. C-1083</i>
Alcohol and Drug Use	<i>App. C-1083</i>
Criminal History	<i>App. C-1084</i>
State and Federal Prisoners	<i>App. C-1085</i>
Sentences to Prison	<i>App. C-1085</i>
Prison Admissions	<i>App. C-1085</i>
Prison Releases	<i>App. C-1086</i>
Death Sentences	<i>App. C-1086</i>
Recidivism	<i>App. C-1087</i>
The Prevalence of Imprisonment Among Women	<i>App. C-1087</i>
Basic Sources for Statistics Describing Women Offenders	
<i>App. C-1088</i>	
National Crime Victimization Survey	<i>App. C-1088</i>
Uniform Crime Reporting Program	<i>App. C-1089</i>
Supplementary Homicide Reports	<i>App. C-1089</i>
State Court Processing Statistics	<i>App. C-1089</i>
National Judicial Reporting Program	<i>App. C-1090</i>
National Prisoner Statistics	<i>App. C-1090</i>
National Corrections Reporting Program	<i>App. C-1090</i>
Surveys of Probationers and Jail and Prison Inmates	<i>App. C-1091</i>

Profile of State Prisoners Under Age 18, 1985-97 *Bureau of Justice*

Statistics, United States Department of Justice

Introduction	<i>App. C-1139</i>
Highlights	<i>App. C-1140</i>
States Utilize Three General Types of Transfer Mechanisms	
<i>App. C-1141</i>	
States Using Blended Sentences Link Adult and Juvenile Systems	
<i>App. C-1142</i>	

States Vary in Their Correctional Responses for Persons Under 18 Sentenced as Adults *App. C-1142*

Half of 1% of State Inmates Were Under Age 18 at Yearend 1997
App. C-1142

Prison Admissions Rose 7% Per Year Among Persons Under Age 18
App. C-1143

The Number of Persons Under Age 18 Admitted for Violent Offenses Nearly Tripled in 13 Years *App. C-1143*

In 1996, 9,160 Persons Under 18 Were Convicted of Violent Felonies; Nearly 4,200 Were Sent to Prison *App. C-1144*

State Prison Admissions Grew Faster Than Arrests *App. C-1144*

Prison Admissions More Than Doubled Among Male Offenders Under Age 18 *App. C-1145*

Nearly 6 Out of 10 Offenders Admitted to State Prison Under Age 18 Were Black *App. C-1145*

Maximum Sentences for Violent Offenders Under Age 18 Were Shorter on Average in 1997 *App. C-1146*

A Growing Number of Inmates Released From Prison Had Been Admitted Under Age 18 *App. C-1147*

Among Persons Admitted Under 18, An Increasing Percentage Are Released From Prison Unconditionally *App. C-1147*

Nearly Half of Prisoners Released in 1997 Were Sentenced to Prison for a Violent Crime *App. C-1147*

Released Violent Offenders Admitted Under 18 Had Served 53% of Their Sentences in 1997 and 46% in 1985 *App. C-1148*

Methodology *App. C-1148*

Data Sources *App. C-1148*

National Corrections Reporting Program *App. C-1148*

National Prisoner Statistics *App. C-1149*

Survey of Inmates in State Correctional Facilities *App. C-1149*

Annual Survey of Jails *App. C-1149*

National Judicial Reporting Program *App. C-1149*

Estimation Procedures *App. C-1149*

Estimating State Prison Admissions and Releases *App. C-1149*

Estimating Persons Under 18 in State Prison *App. C-1150*

Estimating Arrests of Persons Ages 13 to 17 From the FBI's Uniform Crime Reports *App. C-1150*

Estimating State Court Conviction Offenses for Persons Under Age 18 *App. C-1150*

Veterans in Prison or Jail *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States*

Department of Justice

Introduction *App. C-1169*

Highlights *App. C-1170*

Nearly 60% of Incarcerated Veterans Had Served in the Army
App. C-1171

1 in 5 Incarcerated Veterans Saw Combat Duty During Their Service <i>App. C-1172</i>	
A Majority of Veterans in State Prison, But Less Than a Third of Nonveteran Inmates, Were White <i>App. C-1172</i>	
Among State Prisoners, the Median Age of Veterans Was 10 Years Higher Than That of Nonveterans <i>App. C-1173</i>	
Veteran Inmates Were More Likely to be Violent Offenders, Less Likely to be Drug Offenders <i>App. C-1174</i>	
Among Violent State Prisoners, Over Two-Thirds of Veterans Knew Their Victims <i>App. C-1174</i>	
Combat Veterans in Prison Were No More Likely to be Violent Offenders Than Other Veterans <i>App. C-1175</i>	
Among State Prisoners, Veterans Had Less Extensive Criminal Histories Than Nonveterans <i>App. C-1175</i>	
Criminal Histories of Combat Veterans Were Less Serious Than Other Veterans in Prison <i>App. C-1176</i>	
Veterans' Sentences Averaged 3 Years Longer Than Other State Prisoners <i>App. C-1176</i>	
Veterans Were Less Likely Than Other Inmates to Report Using Drugs in the Month Before Their Current Offense <i>App. C-1177</i>	
Less Than a Third of Incarcerated Combat Veterans Used Drugs in the Month Before Their Offense <i>App. C-1178</i>	
Reports of Prior Alcohol Abuse and Dependence Were Higher Among Veteran Inmates <i>App. C-1179</i>	
Incarcerated Veterans and Nonveterans Reported Equal Participation in Substance Abuse Treatment <i>App. C-1180</i>	
Incarcerated Veterans Were More Likely to Report a Mental Illness <i>App. C-1180</i>	
Reported Levels of Employment and Income Were Higher Among Veteran Inmates <i>App. C-1181</i>	
Incarcerated Veterans Were as Likely as Nonveterans to Have Been Homeless When Arrested <i>App. C-1181</i>	
Methodology <i>App. C-1182</i>	
Accuracy of the Estimates <i>App. C-1182</i>	
Estimates of the Veteran Population <i>App. C-1183</i>	
Historical Statistics on Active Duty Military Personnel <i>App. C-1183</i>	
Military Prison Statistics <i>App. C-1183</i>	
CAGE Diagnostic Instrument for Alcohol Dependence <i>App. C-1183</i>	

Offenders Returning to Federal Prison, 1986-97 *Bureau of Justice*

Statistics, United States Department of Justice

Introduction <i>App. C-1247</i>	
Highlights <i>App. C-1248</i>	
Violent Offenders Returned to Federal Prison at Higher Rates Than Other Offenders <i>App. C-1249</i>	

Men, Blacks, and Younger Adults Returned to Federal Prison at Higher Rates Than Other Offenders; Hispanics at Lower Rates *App. C-1249*

Noncitizens, More Than a Third of Offenders Released From Federal Prison, Returned to Prison at a Lower Rate Than Citizens *App. C-1250*

Several Factors Account for Noncitizens' Lower Rate of Return *App. C-1250*

Return Rates for Technical Violations of Post-Release Supervision Exceeded the Return Rates for New Crimes *App. C-1251*

As Length of Time Served in Prison Increased, So Did the Rate of Return to Prison *App. C-1251*

Offenders Released to Supervision Remained Free Longer Than Other Offenders *App. C-1252*

Offenders Returning to Prison Following Revocation Served an Additional 16 Months in Federal Prison *App. C-1252*

Methodology *App. C-1254*

Data Sources *App. C-1254*

Scope of the Analysis *App. C-1254*

Identifying and Counting "First Returns" to Prison *App. C-1254*

Unit of Analysis *App. C-1255*

Measuring Time Served Upon Return *App. C-1255*

Comparing Returns to Prisons With Unsuccessful Terminations of Supervision *App. C-1256*

Definitions of Concepts *App. C-1257*

Incarcerated Parents and Their Children *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction *App. C-1271*

Highlights *App. C-1272*

In 1999 an Estimated 721,500 State and Federal Prisoners Were Parents to 1,498,800 Children Under Age 18 *App. C-1272*

Prior to Admission, Less Than Half of the Parents in State Prison Reported Living With Their Children—44% of Fathers, 64% of Mothers *App. C-1272*

Nearly 2 in 3 State Prisoners Reported at Least Monthly Contact With Their Children by Phone, Mail, or Personal Visits *App. C-1273*

Over Half of Both State and Federal Prisoners Reported Having a Child Under Age 18 *App. C-1273*

State and Federal Prisons Held an Estimated 721,500 Parents of Minor Children in 1999 *App. C-1274*

1.5 Million Children in the U.S. Had a Parent in Prison in 1999—Up by More than 500,000 Since 1991 *App. C-1274*

Nearly Half of All Imprisoned Parents Were Black; About a Quarter Were White *App. C-1275*

Half of the Parents in State Prison Were Never Married *App. C-1276*

Fewer Than Half of the Parents in State Prison Lived With Their Minor Children Prior to Incarceration *App. C-1276*

Fathers Cite Child's Mother as the Current Caregiver; Mothers Cite Child's Grandparents, Other Relatives	<i>App. C-1277</i>
One-Third of Mothers in Prison Had Been Living Alone With Their Children in the Month Before Arrest	<i>App. C-1278</i>
40% of Fathers and 60% of Mothers in State Prison Had at Least Weekly Contact With Their Children	<i>App. C-1278</i>
Over 60% of Parents in State Prison Were Held More Than 100 Miles From Their Last Place of Residence	<i>App. C-1279</i>
A Majority of Parents in Prison Were Violent Offenders or Drug Traffickers	<i>App. C-1279</i>
On Average, Parents Expected to Serve 80 Months in State Prison and 103 Months in Federal Prison	<i>App. C-1280</i>
Over 75% of Parents in State Prison Reported a Prior Conviction; 56% Had Been Incarcerated	<i>App. C-1281</i>
A Majority of Parents in State Prison Used Drugs in the Month Before Their Offense	<i>App. C-1282</i>
1 in 3 Mothers in State Prison Committed Their Crime to Get Drugs or Money for Drugs	<i>App. C-1282</i>
Over a Third of Parents in State Prison Committed Their Offense While Under the Influence of Alcohol	<i>App. C-1283</i>
About 1 in 7 Parents in State Prison Reported Indications of a Mental Illness	<i>App. C-1284</i>
Nearly 20% of Mothers in State Prison Had Been Homeless in the Year Prior to Admission	<i>App. C-1284</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-1285</i>
Accuracy of the Estimates	<i>App. C-1285</i>
CAGE Diagnostic Instrument for Alcohol Dependence	<i>App. C-1286</i>

Medical Problems of Inmates, 1997	<i>Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice</i>
Introduction	<i>App. C-1333</i>
Highlights	<i>App. C-1334</i>
Nearly a Third of State Inmates and a Quarter of Federal Inmates Reported Having Some Physical Impairment or Mental Condition	<i>App. C-1334</i>
More Than 1 in 4 State and Federal Inmates Had Been Injured After Admission to Prison	<i>App. C-1334</i>
Injuries and Other Medical Problems Increase With Time in Prison	<i>App. C-1335</i>
Medical Problems and Other Conditions More Common Among Older Inmates	<i>App. C-1335</i>
State and Federal Inmates Asked to Report on Physical Impairments, Injuries, and Other Medical Problems	<i>App. C-1335</i>
Nearly a Third of State Inmates and a Quarter of Federal Inmates Reported a Physical Impairment or Mental Condition	<i>App. C-1336</i>

Rates of Speech and Vision Impairment Higher Among Inmates Than in the General Population *App. C-1337*
Older Inmates More Likely to Report Physical Impairments or a Mental Condition *App. C-1338*
More Than 1 in 10 State Inmates Reported Multiple Impairments
App. C-1338
Over a Quarter of State and Federal Inmates Reported Being Injured Since Admission to Prison *App. C-1339*
Likelihood of Injury Increases With Time Served in Prison
App. C-1339
Inmates With a Physical Impairment or Mental Condition Were Also More Likely to Report an Injury *App. C-1340*
Violent Offenders More Commonly Reported Being Injured in a Fight Since Admission
App. C-1341
About 22% of State Inmates Will Be Injured While in Prison
App. C-1341
More Than 1 in 5 Inmates in State and Federal Prisons Reported a Medical Problem Excluding Injury Since Admission *App. C-1342*
Reported Medical Problems Highest Among Older, Female Inmates
App. C-1343
About 1 in 6 State and Federal Inmates Reported a Medical Problem Other Than a Cold, Injury, or Surgery *App. C-1343*
Medical Problems More Prevalent Among Inmates Who Had Been Homeless or Unemployed *App. C-1344*
Medical Problems More Common Among Inmates Who Had Used a Needle to Inject Drugs and Those Who Were Alcohol Dependent
App. C-1344
Methodology *App. C-1345*
Survey of Inmates in State and Federal Correctional Facilities, 1997
App. C-1345
Accuracy of the survey estimates *App. C-1345*
National Adult Literacy Survey, 1992 *App. C-1346*
National Health Interview Survey, 1996 *App. C-1346*
Estimating the Likelihood That an Inmate Will Be Injured or Will Require Surgery at Some Time While in Prison *App. C-1347*

Prisoners in 2000 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction *App. C-1369*
More Than 1.9 Million in Prisons and Local Jails *App. C-1370*
U.S. Prison Population Rose 1.3% During 2000—The Smallest Annual Growth Rate Since 1972 *App. C-1370*
In the Last 6 Months of 2000, the State Prison Population Declined About 6,200 Inmates *App. C-1370*
Sentenced Federal Inmate Population Rose 9.4% During the Last 12 Months *App. C-1371*

Prison Incarceration Rates Have Risen Sharply Since 1990 <i>App. C-1371</i>	
Five States Reported Increases of at Least 10% During 2000; 13 States Reported Decreases <i>App. C-1372</i>	
Among States, Louisiana had the Highest Incarceration Rate; Minnesota, the Lowest <i>App. C-1372</i>	
Female Prisoner Population More Than Doubled Since 1990 <i>App. C-1372</i>	
Privately Operated Prisons Held Over 87,000 State and Federal Inmates in 2000 <i>App. C-1373</i>	
Local Jails Held More Than 63,000 State Prisoners <i>App. C-1374</i>	
Prison Capacity Measures Vary <i>App. C-1374</i>	
Twenty-Two States and Federal System Operating at or Above Capacity <i>App. C-1375</i>	
States Added 351 Adult Correctional Facilities and More Than 528,000 Prison Beds During the Decade <i>App. C-1375</i>	
At Yearend 2000 U.S. Military Authorities Held 2,420 Prisoners in 62 Facilities <i>App. C-1376</i>	
U.S. Territories Held 16,130 Inmates in 2000 <i>App. C-1376</i>	
More Black Males Than White Males Among State and Federal Inmates at Yearend 2000 <i>App. C-1377</i>	
Nearly 10% of Black Males, Age 25-29, in Prison in 2000 <i>App. C-1377</i>	
Growth Linked to Increasing Number of Inmates in State Prison for Violent and Drug Offenses <i>App. C-1378</i>	
Sources of Growth Differ Among Men and Women and Among White, Black, and Hispanic Inmates <i>App. C-1378</i>	
Changing Federal Prison Population Related to Drugs, Weapons, and Immigration Violations <i>App. C-1379</i>	
Methodology <i>App. C-1379</i>	
National Prisoner Statistics <i>App. C-1379</i>	
2000 Census of State and Federal Adult Correctional Facilities <i>App. C-1380</i>	
Military Corrections Statistics <i>App. C-1380</i>	
Estimating Age-Specific Incarceration Rates <i>App. C-1380</i>	
NPS Jurisdiction Notes <i>App. C-1381</i>	

Mental Health Treatment in State Prisons, 2000	<i>Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice</i>
Introduction <i>App. C-1407</i>	
Inmates Screened at Admission and Placed in General Confinement or Specialized Facilities <i>App. C-1407</i>	
Mental Health Services Most Commonly Provided in Maximum/High-Security Confinement Facilities <i>App. C-1408</i>	
Based on Inmate Self-Reports, at Midyear 2000 State Prisons Held 191,000 Mentally Ill Inmates <i>App. C-1409</i>	

13% of State Inmates Were Receiving Mental Health Therapy; 10% Were Receiving Psychotropic Medications *App. C-1409*
 General Confinement Facilities Provided Most Mental Health Treatment *App. C-1409*
 In 5 States Nearly 20% of Inmates Receiving Psychotropic Medications *App. C-1410*
 Methodology *App. C-1410*

Firearm Use by Offenders *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States*

Department of Justice

Introduction *App. C-1443*
 Almost a Fifth of Prison Inmates Carried a Gun During Their Crime *App. C-1444*
 Less Than 2% of Prison Inmates Reported Carrying an Assault Gun *App. C-1444*
 Of Inmates Who Carried a Firearm During Their Offense, 8 in 10 Had a Handgun *App. C-1445*
 Firearm Use During Crimes Increased From 1991 to 1997 *App. C-1445*
 8% of Drug Offenders and 3% of Property Offenders Armed While Committing Their Crimes *App. C-1446*
 Male Inmates and Young Inmates Carried Firearms *App. C-1446*
 Background Characteristics Account for Relatively Small Differences in Firearm Use *App. C-1446*
 Violent Recidivists Were as Likely as First Time Violent Offenders to Have Carried a Gun *App. C-1447*
 Inmates' Retail Purchase of Firearms Fell Between 1991 and 1997 *App. C-1448*
 Recidivists Less Likely Than First Timers to Buy Their Gun From a Retail Establishment *App. C-1448*
 1 in 5 Assault Guns Bought From Retail Store *App. C-1449*
 Young Offenders Less Likely Than Older Ones to Have Bought a Firearm From a Retail Source *App. C-1449*
 Federal Law May Have Disqualified Over 8 in 10 Inmates From Buying a Firearm *App. C-1449*
 9% of All State Prison Inmates and 2% of All Federal Inmates Shot a Gun While Committing Their Current Offense *App. C-1450*
 About Half of Inmates Carrying a Gun During Their Offense Fired it and Half of Those Injured or Killed Someone *App. C-1450*
 Possession of a Firearm During an Offense Increased Sentences and Expected Time Served of Inmates *App. C-1451*
 Methodology *App. C-1451*
 Sample Design *App. C-1452*
 Estimates of Prisoner Counts *App. C-1453*
 Accuracy of the Estimates *App. C-1453*
 Definitions *App. C-1454*

**Prisoner Petitions Filed in U.S. District Courts, 2000, with Trends
1980-2000** *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction	<i>App. C-1519</i>
Petitions Filed During 2000	<i>App. C-1519</i>
Petitions by State Inmates	<i>App. C-1520</i>
Petitions by Federal Inmates	<i>App. C-1520</i>
Legislative Initiatives to Reduce Prisoner Litigation	<i>App. C-1521</i>
Civil Rights Petitions	<i>App. C-1522</i>
Habeas Corpus Petitions	<i>App. C-1522</i>
Measuring the Impact of Legislation	<i>App. C-1523</i>
Civil Rights Petitions	<i>App. C-1524</i>
Habeas Corpus Petitions	<i>App. C-1524</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-1525</i>
Data Sources	<i>App. C-1525</i>

HIV in Prisons, 2000 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction	<i>App. C-1579</i>
Number of HIV-Infected Prison Inmates at Yearend 2000 Down From 1999	<i>App. C-1579</i>
Inmates in the Northeast Had the Highest Rates of HIV Infection	<i>App. C-1580</i>
A Greater Percent of Females Than Males With HIV Infection	<i>App. C-1580</i>
Number of HIV-Positive Female Inmates Rose During 2000	<i>App. C-1581</i>
The Number of Confirmed AIDS Cases in U.S. Prisons Decreased During 2000	<i>App. C-1582</i>
Rate of Confirmed AIDS Higher Among Prison Inmates Than U.S. General Population	<i>App. C-1583</i>
About a Third of Prisoners With Confirmed AIDS Were Held in 25 Facilities	<i>App. C-1584</i>
Nearly a Quarter of HIV-Positive Prisoners Were Housed in Medical Treatment Facilities	<i>App. C-1584</i>
AIDS-Related Deaths in State Prisons Have Dropped by More Than 80% Since 1995	<i>App. C-1585</i>
Fewer Deaths Reported in All Jurisdictions in 2000 Compared to 1995	<i>App. C-1586</i>
AIDS Deaths as a Percent of All Deaths in State Prison More Than Two and a Half That in the General Population	<i>App. C-1586</i>
AIDS Death Rate Lower for State Prisoners Than for Comparable General Population	<i>App. C-1587</i>
20 States and the Federal Bureau of Prisons Test All Inmates for HIV at Admission or While in Prison	<i>App. C-1587</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-1588</i>

National Prisoner Statistics	<i>App. C-1588</i>
Census of State and Federal Adult Correctional Facilities	<i>App. C-1588</i>
AIDS in the U.S. Resident Population	<i>App. C-1589</i>
AIDS-Related Deaths in the United States	<i>App. C-1589</i>

**Immigration Offenders in the Federal Criminal Justice System,
2000** *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction	<i>App. C-1643</i>
Nationality of Persons Investigated	<i>App. C-1644</i>
Geographical Distribution of Immigration Suspects	<i>App. C-1644</i>
Suspects in Matters Concluded by U.S. Attorneys	<i>App. C-1645</i>
Characteristics of Defendants Charged	<i>App. C-1645</i>
Demographic Characteristics	<i>App. C-1645</i>
Criminal History	<i>App. C-1645</i>
Trends in Prosecution of Immigration Offenses, 1985-2000	<i>App. C-1646</i>
Defendants Adjudicated in the Federal Courts	<i>App. C-1648</i>
Offenders Under Federal Correctional Supervision	<i>App. C-1648</i>
Incarcerated	<i>App. C-1648</i>
Community Supervision	<i>App. C-1648</i>
Immigration Offenders Returning to Federal Prison	<i>App. C-1648</i>

Education and Correctional Populations *Bureau of Justice Statistics,
United States Department of Justice*

Introduction	<i>App. C-1713</i>
Correctional Populations Less Educated Than the General Population	<i>App. C-1714</i>
Numbers of Prison Inmates Without a High School Education Increased From 1991 to 1997	<i>App. C-1715</i>
Three-Quarters of State Prison Inmates Did Not Earn a High School Diploma	<i>App. C-1715</i>
Jail Inmates and the General Population Reported Why They Dropped Out of School	<i>App. C-1715</i>
9 in 10 State Prisons Offer Educational Programs	<i>App. C-1716</i>
Over Half of Inmates Reported Taking an Educational Program Since Their Most Recent Prison Admission	<i>App. C-1717</i>
State Prisoners Without a High School Diploma Were More Likely to Have Taken Classes Since Admission	<i>App. C-1717</i>
Women in State Prison Were Better Educated Than Men	<i>App. C-1718</i>
Minority State Prison Inmates Were Less Likely Than Whites to Have a High School Diploma or GED	<i>App. C-1718</i>
Young Inmates Were Less Well Educated Than Older Inmates	<i>App. C-1718</i>

Inmates With Military Service Were Better Educated Than Those Who Had Not Served	<i>App. C-1719</i>
61% of Noncitizens Had Not Completed High School or a GED	<i>App. C-1719</i>
Inmates Raised Without Two Parents Less Likely to Have a High School Diploma or a GED	<i>App. C-1720</i>
66% of State Prison Inmates With Learning Disabilities Did Not Complete High School or a GED	<i>App. C-1720</i>
47% of Drug Offenders Did Not Have a High School Diploma or a GED	<i>App. C-1721</i>
Inmate Unemployment Before Admission Varied With Education	<i>App. C-1721</i>
Less Educated Inmates More Likely Than More Educated to Be Recidivists	<i>App. C-1721</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-1723</i>
Bureau of Justice Statistics Surveys	<i>App. C-1723</i>

Prevalence of Imprisonment in the U.S. Population, 1974-2001

Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice

Introduction	<i>App. C-1777</i>
4.3 Million U.S. Residents in 2001 Were Former Prisoners	<i>App. C-1778</i>
More Than Two-Thirds of Former Prisoners No Longer Under Correctional Supervision	<i>App. C-1778</i>
1 in 37 Adult U.S. Residents in 2001 Had Ever Served Time in Prison	<i>App. C-1779</i>
Two-Thirds of the Increase in Number Ever Incarcerated Due to Rise in First Incarceration Rates	<i>App. C-1779</i>
In 2001, 3 Out of 10 Adults Ever Incarcerated Were Age 35 to 44	<i>App. C-1780</i>
Prevalence Rates Up Sharply Among Persons Under Age 50	<i>App. C-1780</i>
More Males Than Females and More Blacks and Hispanics Than Whites Had Ever Served Time in Prison	<i>App. C-1781</i>
Nearly 17% of Adult Black Males Had Ever Served Time in Prison	<i>App. C-1781</i>
Regardless of Gender, Race or Hispanic Origin, Prevalence Rates Highest Among Persons Age 35 to 44	<i>App. C-1782</i>
Impact of Rising First Incarceration Rate Varies by Birth Cohort	<i>App. C-1782</i>
3.4% of Adults Projected to Have Served Time in Prison by 2010	<i>App. C-1783</i>
6.6% of Persons Born in 2001 Will Go to Prison, If Current Rates of First Incarceration Remain Unchanged	<i>App. C-1784</i>
6 Times Higher Lifetime Chance of Going to Prison in 2001 for Men Than for Women	<i>App. C-1784</i>

Methodology	<i>App. C-1785</i>
Life Table Techniques	<i>App. C-1785</i>
Estimating Prevalence of Imprisonment in the United States	<i>App. C-1786</i>
Limitations	<i>App. C-1787</i>

Hepatitis Testing and Treatment in State Prisons *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction	<i>App. C-1861</i>
Nearly 8 in 10 State Prison Facilities Reported Testing Inmates for Hepatitis C	<i>App. C-1861</i>
Nearly a Third of Hepatitis C Tests Confirmed Positive	<i>App. C-1862</i>
Hepatitis C Tests Concentrated in 23 States	<i>App. C-1862</i>
More Than 6,000 Inmates in State Prisons Treated for Hepatitis C in the 12-Month Period Before the Census	<i>App. C-1863</i>
Two-Thirds of Facilities Had a Policy to Vaccinate Inmates for Hepatitis B	<i>App. C-1863</i>
In the 12 Months Before the Census, 13,655 Inmates Completed a 3-Dose Series Vaccination for Hepatitis B	<i>App. C-1863</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-1864</i>

Profile of Nonviolent Offenders Exiting State Prisons *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction	<i>App. C-1901</i>
Offense Characteristics of Nonviolent Prison Releasees	<i>App. C-1901</i>
Demographic Characteristics of Nonviolent Prison Releasees	<i>App. C-1902</i>
Criminal History Characteristics of Nonviolent Prison Releasees	<i>App. C-1902</i>
Recidivism of Nonviolent Prison Releasees	<i>App. C-1903</i>

Table of Contents

Volume Five

APPENDIX C

Prisoner Statistics (continued)

Suicide and Homicide in State Prisons and Local Jails	<i>Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice</i>
Introduction	<i>App. C-2027</i>
Nationwide, 337 State Prisoners Committed Suicide During 2001-02	<i>App. C-2028</i>
87 State Prisoners Became Victims of Homicide Over 2 Years	<i>App. C-2028</i>
Suicide Rate in the Nation's 50 Largest Jail Jurisdictions Half That of All Other Jails	<i>App. C-2028</i>
During 2002 The Nation's Smallest Jails Had a Suicide Rate 5 Times That of the Largest Jails	<i>App. C-2029</i>
Jail Suicide Rates Drop by Over 90% When Based on "At-Risk" Population	<i>App. C-2030</i>
Males and White Inmates Had the Highest Rates of Suicide in Jails	<i>App. C-2030</i>
White Jail Inmates 6 Times More Likely to Commit Suicide Than Black Inmates and 3 Times More Likely Than Hispanic Inmates	<i>App. C-2031</i>
State Prisoners Age 45 or Older Made Up 17% of Inmates but 66% of Deaths	<i>App. C-2031</i>
Black Inmates Had the Lowest Suicide and Homicide Rates in State Prisons	<i>App. C-2032</i>
Violent Offenders Committed Suicide At Nearly Triple the Rate of Nonviolent Offenders in Jails	<i>App. C-2033</i>

Local Jails Had An Average of Fewer Than 20 Inmate Homicides Each Year *App. C-2033*

Drug Offenders Had the Lowest Suicide and Homicide Rates of All State Prisoners *App. C-2034*

Nearly Half of Jail Suicides Occurred in the First Week of Custody *App. C-2034*

7% of State Prison Suicides Took Place During the First Month *App. C-2035*

At Least 80% of Suicides in Prison and Jail Occurred in the Inmate's Cell; Time of Day Not a Factor *App. C-2036*

Most Jail Homicides Occurred At Least 2 Weeks After Admission *App. C-2037*

Two-Thirds of Homicide Victims in State Prison Had Served At Least 2 Years in Prison; Nearly 40% Had Served 5 Years or More *App. C-2037*

Homicide Rate of U.S. Residents, When Standardized, 10 Times the Rate of Jail Inmates in 2002 *App. C-2038*

Methodology *App. C-2039*

Standardized U.S. Resident Death Rates *App. C-2040*

Population Bases for Mortality Rates *App. C-2040*

Sexual Violence Reported by Correctional Authorities, 2004

Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice

Introduction *App. C-2053*

BJS Conducts the First Annual Administrative Records Collection *App. C-2053*

Survey Covers More Than 2,700 Adult and Juvenile Correctional Facilities *App. C-2054*

Two-Thirds or More of Systems and Facilities Able to Fully Report the Most Serious Forms of Sexual Violence *App. C-2055*

Caution Needed When Interpreting the 2004 Survey Results *App. C-2056*

More Than 5,500 Allegations of Sexual Violence Reported In Survey *App. C-2056*

Juvenile Facilities Reported the Highest Rates of Alleged Sexual Violence *App. C-2057*

External Authorities Often Involved in Investigating Allegations *App. C-2058*

In State Prisons Fewer Than 20% of Allegations Of Nonconsensual Sexual Acts Were Substantiated *App. C-2058*

In Juvenile Facilities a Third of the Alleged Nonconsensual Sexual Acts Were Substantiated *App. C-2059*

During 2004 Correctional Authorities Substantiated Nearly 2,100 Incidents of Sexual Violence *App. C-2059*

Males Comprised 90% of Victims and Perpetrators of Nonconsensual Sexual Acts in Prison And Jail *App. C-2060*

Female Staff Implicated in Staff Sexual Misconduct in Prisons; Male Staff in Local Jails	<i>App. C-2061</i>
Most Prisons and Jails Imposed Legal Sanctions on Perpetrators of Inmate-on-Inmate Sexual Violence	<i>App. C-2061</i>
90% of Perpetrators of Staff Sexual Misconduct Discharged or Referred for Prosecution	<i>App. C-2062</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-2062</i>
Sampling Design	<i>App. C-2062</i>
Comparing Systems and Facilities	<i>App. C-2064</i>
 Mental Health Problems of Prison and Jail Inmates <i>Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice</i>	
Introduction	<i>App. C-2167</i>
A Quarter of State Prisoners had a History of Mental Health Problems	<i>App. C-2168</i>
Symptoms of Mental Disorder Highest Among Jail Inmates	<i>App. C-2168</i>
High Proportion of Inmates had Symptoms of a Mental Health Disorder Without a History	<i>App. C-2169</i>
Mental Health Problems More Common Among Female, White, and Young Inmates	<i>App. C-2169</i>
Homelessness, Foster Care More Common Among Inmates Who had Mental Health Problems	<i>App. C-2170</i>
Low Rates of Employment, High Rates of Illegal Income Among Inmates Who had Mental Problems	<i>App. C-2170</i>
Past Physical or Sexual Abuse More Prevalent Among Inmates Who had Mental Health Problems	<i>App. C-2171</i>
Family Members of Inmates with Mental Problems had High Rates of Substance Use and Incarceration	<i>App. C-2171</i>
Inmates Who had Mental Health Problems had High Rates of Substance Dependence or Abuse	<i>App. C-2172</i>
Over a Third of Inmates Who had Mental Health Problems had Used Drugs at the Time of the Offense	<i>App. C-2173</i>
Binge Drinking Prevalent Among Inmates Who had Mental Problems	<i>App. C-2173</i>
Violent Offenses Common Among State Prisoners Who had a Mental Health Problem	<i>App. C-2173</i>
Use of a Weapon Did Not Vary by Mental Health Status	<i>App. C-2174</i>
Violent Criminal Record More Prevalent Among Inmates Who had a Mental Health Problem	<i>App. C-2174</i>
State Prisoners Who had Mental Health Problems had Longer Sentences Than Prisoners Without	<i>App. C-2175</i>
State Prisoners Who had a Mental Health Problem Expected to Serve 4 Months Longer Than Those Without	<i>App. C-2175</i>
A Third of State Prisoners Who had Mental Health Problems had Received Treatment Since Admission	<i>App. C-2176</i>

Use of Medication for a Mental Health Problem By State Prisoners Rose
Between 1997 and 2004 *App. C-2176*
Rule Violations and Injuries from a Fight More Common Among Inmates
Who had a Mental Health Problem *App. C-2177*
Methodology *App. C-2178*
Survey of Inmates in State and Federal Correctional Facilities, 2004
App. C-2178
Survey of Inmates in Local Jails, 2002 *App. C-2178*
Accuracy of Survey Estimates *App. C-2178*
Measures of Mental Health Problems in the General Population
App. C-2179

Drug Use and Dependence, State and Federal Prisoners, 2004*Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction *App. C-2201*
Overall Drug Use By State Prisoners Unchanged from 1997;
Methamphetamine Use Rose *App. C-2201*
Overall Drug Use By Federal Prisoners Rose; Cocaine/Crack Use
Declined *App. C-2202*
Women in Federal Prison Report Sharp Increase in Prior Drug Use
App. C-2202
Prior Drug Use Grew Most Quickly Among Middle-Aged Inmates
App. C-2203
1 in 4 Violent Offenders in Prison Committed Their Offenses Under the
Influence of Drugs *App. C-2203*
1 in 3 Property Offenders in State Prisons Report Drug Money As a Motive
in Their Crimes *App. C-2204*
53% of State and 45% of Federal Prisoners Met Criteria for Drug
Dependence or Abuse *App. C-2205*
In State Prisons, Violent Offenders were Least Likely to Meet Criteria for
Drug Dependence or Abuse *App. C-2205*
Half of Drug Dependent or Abusing Inmates in State Prisons Reported
Three or More Prior Sentences *App. C-2206*
1 in 7 Drug Dependent or Abusing Inmates in State Prison Were Homeless
in Year Before Admission *App. C-2206*
Participation in Drug Abuse Programs Rose in Both State and Federal Prison
Since 1997 *App. C-2207*
Number of Federal Prisoners Taking Part in Drug Abuse Programs Up 90%
Between 1997 and 2004 *App. C-2207*
Over 250,000 Dependent/Abusing State Inmates Took Part in Drug Abuse
Programs Since Admission *App. C-2208*
Methodology *App. C-2208*
Survey of Inmates in State and Federal Correctional Facilities, 2004
App. C-2209
Accuracy of Survey Estimates *App. C-2209*
Measures of Drug Dependence and Abuse in the General
Population *App. C-2210*

Sexual Violence Reported by Correctional Authorities, 2005	
<i>Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice</i>	
Introduction	<i>App. C-2229</i>
Second Administrative Records Collection Conducted for 2005	
<i>App. C-2229</i>	
2005 Survey Covered 1,866 Adult Correctional Facilities	<i>App. C-2230</i>
State Prison Reporting Capabilities Improve During 2005	
<i>App. C-2231</i>	
Sexual Violence Allegations Increased	<i>App. C-2232</i>
Approximately 15% of Allegations of Nonconsensual Sexual Acts in 2005	
were Substantiated	<i>App. C-2233</i>
During 2005 Correctional Authorities Substantiated 885 Incidents of Sexual	
Violence	<i>App. C-2234</i>
Correctional Authorities Provided Detail on 82% of Substantiated	
Incidents	<i>App. C-2234</i>
Physical Force or Threat of Force was Used in 51% of Inmate-On-Inmate	
Sexual Violence	<i>App. C-2235</i>
Victims Received Physical Injuries in 15% of Substantiated Incidents of	
Inmate-On-Inmate Sexual Violence	<i>App. C-2236</i>
Half of Victims of Nonconsensual Sexual Acts were Placed in Protective	
Custody or Administrative Segregation	<i>App. C-2236</i>
Most Inmate Perpetrators Received Legal Sanctions or Solitary Confinement	
<i>App. C-2237</i>	
Two-Thirds of Incidents of Staff Sexual Misconduct with Inmates were	
Reported to Be Romantic	<i>App. C-2237</i>
Female Staff Implicated in Staff Sexual Misconduct in Prisons; Males in	
Local Jails	<i>App. C-2238</i>
Over Two-Thirds of Perpetrators of Staff Sexual Misconduct or Harassment	
were Correctional Officers	<i>App. C-2238</i>
Inmates Involved in Staff Sexual Misconduct Often Transferred or Placed in	
Segregation	<i>App. C-2239</i>
Nearly 90% of Perpetrators of Staff Misconduct Arrested, Referred for	
Prosecution, or Discharged	<i>App. C-2239</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-2239</i>
Prisoners in 2005	
<i>Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of</i>	
<i>Justice</i>	
Introduction	<i>App. C-2279</i>
Nearly 2.2 Million Persons in Prison or Jail at Yearend 2005	
<i>App. C-2280</i>	
U.S. Prison Population Rose 1.9% During 2005	<i>App. C-2280</i>
14 States Reported Increases of at Least 5% During 2005; 11 States Had	
Decreases	<i>App. C-2280</i>
Prison Incarceration Rate Reached 491 Per 100,000 Residents in 2005, Up	
from 411 in 1995	<i>App. C-2281</i>

Female Prisoners Increased 2.6% During 2005; Male Prisoners, 1.9%
App. C-2281

Over a Third of Female Prisoners Held in the 3 Largest Jurisdictions
App. C-2281

Privately Operated Prisons Held 7.0% of State and Federal Inmates in 2005
App. C-2282

In 2005 Local Jails Held almost 5% of State and Federal Prisoners
App. C-2282

23 States and the Federal System Operated at or Above Highest Capacity
App. C-2283

60% of State and Federal Inmates Black or Hispanic at Yearend 2005
App. C-2284

An Estimated 8% of Black Males, Age 25 to 29 in Prison in 2005
App. C-2284

Half of State Prisoners Were Violent Offenders
App. C-2285

Offenses of State Prisoners Varied by Gender, Race, and Hispanic Origin
App. C-2285

Changing Federal Prison Population Related to Drug and Immigration Offenses
App. C-2286

Methodology
App. C-2286

- National Prisoner Statistics
App. C-2286
- Military Corrections Statistics
App. C-2287
- Other Inmate Counts
App. C-2287
- Estimating Age-Specific Incarceration Rates
App. C-2287

NPS Jurisdiction Notes
App. C-2287

Medical Causes of Death in State Prisons, 2001-2004 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction
App. C-2309

Heart Diseases and Cancer Accounted for Half of All State Prison Deaths
App. C-2310

Death Rates Higher Among Men Than Women in 9 of the 10 Leading Causes of Death
App. C-2310

Black and Hispanic Inmate Mortality Rates Identical; White Inmates 67% Higher
App. C-2310

Two-Thirds of State Prison Deaths Involved Inmates Age 45 or Older
App. C-2310

Among Deaths of Elderly State Prisoners, 85% Were 45 or Older When Admitted
App. C-2311

Death from Illness Increased with Time Served in Prison
App. C-2311

Time Served in Prison Played Little Role in the Death Rate Due to Communicable Diseases
App. C-2312

Two-Thirds of Illness Deaths Resulted from Pre-Existing Conditions—Including 94% of AIDS Deaths
App. C-2312

In 93% of Deaths from Illness, Medical Staff Had Provided Medications for the Fatal Condition
App. C-2312

Over 40% of Prisoner Deaths Took Place in 5 States; Mortality Rates Varied Widely Across States	<i>App. C-2313</i>
Mortality Rate in State Prisons Nearly 20% Lower Than in U.S. Resident Population	<i>App. C-2313</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-2313</i>

Veterans in State and Federal Prison, 2004 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction	<i>App. C-2331</i>
After Rising for Two Decades, Number of Veterans Dropped Since 2000	<i>App. C-2332</i>
Male Veterans Were Half as Likely as Other Men to be Held in Prison; the Gap Increasing Since the 1980s	<i>App. C-2333</i>
U.S. Army Accounted for 46% of Veterans Living in the U.S., But 56% of Veterans in State Prison in 2004	<i>App. C-2334</i>
Half of Incarcerated Veterans Performed Wartime Military Service; 1 in 5 Reported Combat Duty	<i>App. C-2334</i>
Veterans Were Older, Better Educated Than Other State and Federal Prison Inmates	<i>App. C-2335</i>
Nearly 1 in 4 Veterans in State Prison Were Sex Offenders, Compared to 1 in 10 Nonveterans	<i>App. C-2335</i>
Veterans Were More Likely Than Other Violent Offenders in State Prison to Have Victimized Females and Minors	<i>App. C-2336</i>
Veterans Had Shorter Criminal Histories Than Nonveterans In State Prison	<i>App. C-2336</i>
More Than a Third of Veterans in State Prison Had Maximum Sentences of at Least 20 Years, Life, or Death	<i>App. C-2337</i>
Veterans Reported Longer Average Sentences Than Nonveterans, Regardless of Offense Type	<i>App. C-2337</i>
Veterans Were Less Likely Than Nonveteran Prisoners to Have Used Drugs	<i>App. C-2338</i>
No Relationship Between Veteran Status and Alcohol Dependence or Abuse	<i>App. C-2338</i>
Veteran Status Unrelated to Inmate Reports of Mental Health Problems	<i>App. C-2339</i>
Combat Service Not Related to Prevalence of Recent Mental Health Problems	<i>App. C-2339</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-2340</i>
Estimates of the Veteran Population in the United States	<i>App. C-2340</i>
Military Prison Statistics	<i>App. C-2341</i>

HIV in Prisons, 2005 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction	<i>App. C-2407</i>
--------------	--------------------

HIV/AIDS Cases in State and Federal Prisons Steadily Declining Since 1999 *App. C-2408*
New York Accounted for More Than Three-Quarters of the Decline in HIV/AIDS Cases Between 1999 and 2005 *App. C-2408*
Number of Confirmed AIDS Cases Fluctuated Between 1999 and 2005 *App. C-2409*
Difference Between the Rate of Confirmed AIDS Cases in Prisons and the General Population Shrinking *App. C-2409*
HIV/AIDS Cases Among Both Male and Female State Inmates Declining, But at a Faster Rate for Females *App. C-2409*
Number of AIDS-Related Deaths Declined Dramatically Between 1995 and 2000 *App. C-2410*
Almost All of the Decrease in AIDS-Related Deaths Attributed to Male Inmates *App. C-2410*
AIDS-Related Deaths As a Percent of All Deaths Decreasing More Rapidly in State Prison Than in the General Population *App. C-2411*
Rate of AIDS-Related Deaths Declining in Prisons, Stabilizing in the General Population *App. C-2411*
Older Persons in State Prisons Had a Higher Rate of AIDS-Related Deaths Than Those in the General Population *App. C-2411*
Methodology *App. C-2411*
 National Prisoner Statistics *App. C-2411*
 Surveys of Inmates in State Correctional Facilities *App. C-2412*
 Accuracy of the Survey Estimates *App. C-2412*
 Deaths in Custody Reporting Program *App. C-2412*
 Estimation of HIV/AIDS Cases in New York State *App. C-2413*
 AIDS in the U.S. Resident Population *App. C-2413*
 AIDS-Related Deaths in the United States *App. C-2413*

Sexual Violence Reported by Correctional Authorities, 2006

Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice

 Introduction *App. C-2435*
 Allegations of Sexual Violence Rose During 2006 *App. C-2436*
 Upon Investigation, Most Allegations Were Unsubstantiated or Unfounded *App. C-2437*
 Surveys Reveal Consistent Patterns of Sexual Violence in Correctional Facilities *App. C-2438*
 Most Incidents of Sexual Violence Among Inmates Involve Force or Threat of Force and Occur in the Victim's Cell, in the Evening *App. C-2439*
 Most Victims Experienced a Change in Their Housing; Most Inmate Perpetrators Received Solitary Confinement *App. C-2439*
 The Sexual Relationship "Appeared to Be Willing" in 57% of Incidents of Staff Sexual Misconduct and Harassment *App. C-2440*
 Female Staff More Frequently Implicated in Sexual Misconduct in Prisons; Male Staff in Local Jails *App. C-2441*

Three-Quarters of Staff Perpetrators in 2006 Lost Their Jobs; 56% Were Arrested or Referred for Prosecution	<i>App. C-2442</i>
Half of Inmates Involved in Staff Sexual Misconduct Were Transferred or Placed in Segregation	<i>App. C-2442</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-2443</i>
Measures of Sexual Violence	<i>App. C-2443</i>
Sampling Procedures	<i>App. C-2444</i>
National Estimates and Accuracy	<i>App. C-2445</i>
Detail on Substantiated Incidents	<i>App. C-2446</i>

Sexual Victimization in State and Federal Prisoners Reported by Inmates, 2007 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction	<i>App. C-2537</i>
Inmate Self-Reports Provide a Basis for Comparing and Ranking Facilities	<i>App. C-2538</i>
An Estimated 60,500 Inmates Experienced One or More Incidents of Sexual Victimization	<i>App. C-2538</i>
10 Facilities Had Prevalence Rates of 9.3% or Greater; 6 Facilities Had No Reported Incidents	<i>App. C-2539</i>
Identification of the 3 Facilities With the Highest Rates of Sexual Victimization Depends on Non-Statistical Judgments	<i>App. C-2540</i>
Inmates Reported an Estimated 165,400 Incidents of Nonconsensual Sexual Acts With Other Inmates or Staff	<i>App. C-2541</i>
11 Facilities had Nonconsensual Sex Rates of 300 or More Incidents Per 1,000 Inmates	<i>App. C-2542</i>
Further Analyses of Sexual Victimization and Facility Variations Underway	<i>App. C-2542</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-2543</i>
Selection of State and Federal Prisons	<i>App. C-2543</i>
Selection of Inmates	<i>App. C-2545</i>
Weighting and Non-Response Adjustments	<i>App. C-2545</i>
Survey Estimates and Accuracy	<i>App. C-2546</i>
Exposure Period	<i>App. C-2546</i>
Measuring Sexual Victimization	<i>App. C-2547</i>
Definition of Terms	<i>App. C-2548</i>

Prison Inmates at Midyear 2007 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction	<i>App. C-2595</i>
Growth in the Prison Population Slowed Slightly During the First Six Months of 2007	<i>App. C-2595</i>
Growth During the First Half of the Year Generally Outpaced Growth During the Second Half	<i>App. C-2596</i>
Growth During the First Half of 2007 Slowed in States With the Largest Prison Populations	<i>App. C-2596</i>

Six-Month Growth Rates in States Ranged From Increases of More Than 8% to Decreases of 3% *App. C-2597*
Growth in Sentenced Prisoners Mirrored Growth in All Prisoners Under Jurisdiction *App. C-2597*
Prison Admissions Growth Outpaced Growth in Releases *App. C-2598*
State Admissions for Parole Violations Grew More Rapidly Than New Court Commitments *App. C-2598*
Use of Private Facilities and Local Jails By Federal Correctional Authorities Increased 12% *App. C-2598*
Inmates Held in State or Federal Prison or in Local Jails Increased to Nearly 2.3 Million *App. C-2599*
Black Males Ages 30 to 34 Had the Highest Custody Incarceration Rate of Any Race, Age, or Gender Group *App. C-2599*
Hispanic and White Men Accounted for More Than Half of the Increase to the Custody Population *App. C-2600*
Estimated Number of Non-U.S. Citizens and Juveniles in State Custody Increased *App. C-2601*
Methodology *App. C-2601*
National Prisoner Statistics *App. C-2601*
Other Inmate Counts *App. C-2602*
Estimating Age-Specific Incarceration Rates *App. C-2603*
NPS Jurisdiction Notes *App. C-2604*

Parents in Prison and Their Children *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction *App. C-2637*
Parents of Minor Children Held in the Nation's Prisons Increased by 79% Between 1991 and Midyear 2007 *App. C-2638*
The Number of Children Under Age 18 with a Mother in Prison More Than Doubled Since 1991 *App. C-2638*
More Than 4 in 10 Fathers in State or Federal Prisons Were Black; Almost 5 in 10 Mothers Were White *App. C-2638*
The Majority of Prisoners Reported Having a Minor Child, a Quarter of Which Were Age 4 or Younger *App. C-2639*
More Than a Third of Minor Children Will Reach Age 18 While Their Parent is Incarcerated *App. C-2639*
Incarcerated Parents of Minor Children Most Likely to be Age 25 to 34 *App. C-2640*
Drug and Public-Order Offenders in State and Federal Prisons Were More Likely Than Violent Offenders to Have Children *App. C-2640*
Inmates in State and Federal Prisons With a Criminal History Were More Likely to be Parents of Minor Children Than Those With No Criminal History *App. C-2641*
Fewer Than Half of Parents in State Prison Lived With Their Minor Children Either in the Month Before Arrest or Just Prior to Incarceration *App. C-2641*

More Than 4 in 10 Mothers in State Prison Who Had Minor Children Were Living in Single-Parent Households in the Month Before Arrest	<i>App. C-2642</i>
Fathers Living With Their Minor Child Relied Heavily on Someone to Provide Daily Care	<i>App. C-2642</i>
Fathers Most Commonly Reported the Child's Mother as Current Caregiver of Their Children, While Mothers Most Commonly Reported the Child's Grandparents	<i>App. C-2642</i>
About Half of Parents in State Prison Provided the Primary Financial Support for Their Minor Children	<i>App. C-2643</i>
More Than Three-Quarters of State Prison Inmates Who Were Parents of Minor Children Reported That They Had Some Contact With Their Children Since Admission	<i>App. C-2644</i>
Half of Parents in State Prison Reported That They Had a Family Member Who Had Been Incarcerated	<i>App. C-2644</i>
Mothers in State Prison More Likely Than Fathers to Report Homelessness, Past Physical or Sexual Abuse, and Medical and Mental Health Problems	<i>App. C-2645</i>
More Than 4 in 10 Parents in the Nation's Prisons Who Met the Criteria for Substance Dependence or Abuse Had Received Treatment Since Admission	<i>App. C-2646</i>
Among Parents in State Prison, Two-Thirds Reported They Had a Work Assignment; Over Half Had Attended Self-Help or Improvement Classes Since Admissions	<i>App. C-2646</i>
Mothers in Prison Had Served Less Time at Time of Interview and Expected to Be Released in a Shorter Amount of Time Than Fathers	<i>App. C-2647</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-2648</i>
Survey of Inmates in State and Federal Correctional Facilities	<i>App. C-2648</i>
Accuracy of the Estimates	<i>App. C-2648</i>
Number of Parents in Prison Who Had Minor Children	<i>App. C-2649</i>
Number of Minor Children of Parents in Prison	<i>App. C-2649</i>

Prison Inmates at Midyear 2008 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States*

Department of Justice

Methodology	<i>App. C-2729</i>
National Prisoner Statistics	<i>App. C-2729</i>
Other Inmate Counts	<i>App. C-2730</i>
Estimating Age-Specific Incarceration Rates	<i>App. C-2730</i>
NPS Jurisdiction Notes	<i>App. C-2731</i>

Prison Inmates at Midyear 2009 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States*

Department of Justice

Highlights	<i>App. C-2847</i>
------------	--------------------

Selected Characteristics of Prisoners Under State or Federal Jurisdiction	
<i>App. C-2847</i>	
Selected Characteristics of Inmates Held in Custody in State or Federal	
Prisons or in Local Jails	<i>App. C-2848</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-2848</i>
National Prisoner Statistics	<i>App. C-2848</i>
Other Inmate Counts	<i>App. C-2849</i>
Estimating Age-Specific Incarceration Rates	<i>App. C-2850</i>
Definitions	<i>App. C-2850</i>
NPS Jurisdiction Notes	<i>App. C-2851</i>

Sexual Victimization in Prisons and Jails Reported by Inmates, 2008-09 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction	<i>App. C-2879</i>
Incidents of Sexual Victimization	<i>App. C-2880</i>
4.4% of Prison Inmates and 3.1% of Jail Inmates Reported One or More	
Incidents of Sexual Victimization	<i>App. C-2880</i>
Facility Level Rates	<i>App. C-2881</i>
NIS-2 Provides a Basis for Identifying High Rate and Low Rate	
Facilities	<i>App. C-2881</i>
Eight Male Prisons, 2 Female Prisons, and 6 Jails Were Identified as	
Having High Rates of Inmate-On-Inmate Sexual Victimization	
<i>App. C-2882</i>	
Four Male Prisons, 2 Female Prisons, and 5 Jails Were Identified as	
Having High Rates of Staff Sexual Misconduct	<i>App. C-2883</i>
Seven Male Prisons, 4 Female Prisons, and 9 Jails Were Identified as “Low	
Rate” for Sexual Victimization Overall	<i>App. C-2883</i>
Low Rates of Sexual Victimization Were Reported in Military, Indian	
Country, and ICE Facilities	<i>App. C-2884</i>
Demographic Characteristics	<i>App. C-2885</i>
Rates of Reported Sexual Victimization Varied Across Demographic	
Categories of Prison and Jail Inmates	<i>App. C-2885</i>
Sexual History and Orientation	<i>App. C-2886</i>
Large Differences in Sexual Victimization Were Found Among Inmates	
Based on Their Sexual Orientation and Past Sexual Experiences	
<i>App. C-2886</i>	
Criminal Justice Status	<i>App. C-2887</i>
Inmates Held for a Violent Sexual Offense Reported Higher Rates of	
Inmate-On-Inmate Sexual Victimization Than Inmates Held for Other	
Offenses	<i>App. C-2887</i>
Rates of Staff Sexual Misconduct Also Varied Among Inmates Based on	
Their Criminal Justice Status and History	<i>App. C-2887</i>
Predicted Victimization Rates	<i>App. C-2888</i>
Sexual Victimization Among High Rate Facilities Only Partially	
Explained by Variations in Risk Among Inmates Held	
<i>App. C-2888</i>	

Inmate-On-Inmate Victimization	<i>App. C-2890</i>
Reports of Inmate-On-Inmate Sexual Victimization Differed Among Males and Females by Type of Facility	<i>App. C-2890</i>
Inmate-On-Inmate Victimization Occurred Most Often in the Victim's Cell Between 6 pm and Midnight	<i>App. C-2890</i>
Staff Sexual Misconduct	<i>App. C-2891</i>
Most Victims of Staff Sexual Misconduct in Prisons and Jails Reported at Least One Incident That Involved Pressure, Force, or Threat of Force	<i>App. C-2891</i>
Most Victims and Perpetrators of Staff Sexual Misconduct Were of the Opposite Sex	<i>App. C-2892</i>
Reports of Staff Sexual Misconduct Were Linked to Strip Searches and Pat Downs	<i>App. C-2892</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-2892</i>
Selection of State and Federal Prisons	<i>App. C-2893</i>
Selection of Inmates Within Prisons	<i>App. C-2894</i>
Selection of Jail Facilities	<i>App. C-2895</i>
Selection of Inmates Within Jails	<i>App. C-2896</i>
Selection of Special Confinement Facilities	<i>App. C-2897</i>
Selection of Inmates in Special Confinement Facilities	<i>App. C-2898</i>
Weighting and Non-Response Adjustments	<i>App. C-2898</i>
Standard Errors and Tests of Significance	<i>App. C-2899</i>
Exposure Period	<i>App. C-2900</i>
Measurement of Sexual Victimization	<i>App. C-2900</i>
Interviews Checked for Inconsistent Response Patterns	<i>App. C-2901</i>
Definition of Terms	<i>App. C-2902</i>
Logistic Regression Models	<i>App. C-2902</i>
Predicting Facility-Level Rates of Sexual Victimization	<i>App. C-2903</i>

**Sexual Victimization Reported by Adult Correctional Authorities,
2007-2008** *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction	<i>App. C-3045</i>
Detail on Substantiated Incidents	<i>App. C-3046</i>
Summary Findings	<i>App. C-3047</i>
Allegations of Sexual Victimization	<i>App. C-3047</i>
The Rate of Sexual Victimization Reported by Correctional Administrators Increased from 3.33 Incidents Per 1,000 Inmates in 2005 to 3.82 in 2008.	<i>App. C-3047</i>
Allegations of Inmate-on-Inmate Abusive Sexual Contacts Account for Two-Thirds of the Total Increase in Reported Allegations of Sexual Victimization Between 2005 and 2008.	<i>App. C-3047</i>
Substantiated Incidents of Sexual Victimization	<i>App. C-3047</i>

State Prison Administrators Reported an Increase of 130 Substantiated Incidents Between 2005 and 2008. *App. C-3047*

Substantiated Incidents of Inmate-on-Inmate Abusive Sexual Contacts and Staff Sexual Harassment Increased Significantly Between 2005 and 2008. *App. C-3048*

A Greater Percentage of Allegations of Abusive Sexual Contacts and Incidents of Staff Sexual Misconduct were Substantiated in Local Jails than in Prisons. *App. C-3048*

Incident-Level Findings *App. C-3048*

Inmate-on-Inmate Sexual Victimization *App. C-3049*

Females were Disproportionately Victimized by Inmates in State and Federal Prisons and Local Jails. *App. C-3049*

Victims and Perpetrators of Nonconsensual Acts were More Likely to be Younger than 25, Compared to Victims and Perpetrators of Abusive Sexual Contacts. *App. C-3049*

About 1 in 9 Substantiated Incidents of Inmate-on-Inmate Sexual Victimization were Committed by More than one Perpetrator. *App. C-3049*

About 1 in 5 Incidents of Inmate-on-Inmate Sexual Victimization Resulted in a Victim Injury. *App. C-3049*

Nonconsensual Sexual Acts were More Likely than Abusive Sexual Contacts to Occur in the Early Morning Hours (Midnight to 6 A.M.). Abusive Sexual Contacts Occurred More Often During the Day (6 A.M. to 6 P.M.) than Nonconsensual Sexual Acts. *App. C-3050*

Solitary Confinement was Used Most Often as a Sanction Against Perpetrators of Inmate-on-Inmate Sexual Victimization. *App. C-3050*

Sanctions were More Severe for Nonconsensual Sexual Acts than for Abusive Sexual Contacts. *App. C-3050*

Staff-on-Inmate Sexual Victimization *App. C-3051*

Females were Disproportionately Victimized by Staff in State and Federal Prisons and Local Jails. *App. C-3051*

Females Perpetrated the Majority of Incidents of Staff Sexual Misconduct, While Males Perpetrated the Majority of Incidents of Staff Sexual Harassment. *App. C-3051*

Over Half of Incidents of Staff Sexual Harassment were Reported by the Victim. *App. C-3051*

About 2 in 5 Incidents of Staff-on-Inmate Sexual Victimization Occurred in a Program Service Area. *App. C-3051*

More Incidents of Staff Sexual Victimization Occurred During Daytime Hours (6 A.M. to 6 P.M.) in Federal and State Prisons than in Jails. *App. C-3052*

Methodology *App. C-3052*

Prisoners in 2010 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction *App. C-3137*

The Imprisonment Rate Declined in 2010 *App. C-3138*

Releases from Prison Exceeded Admissions; However, Both Declined During 2010	<i>App. C-3139</i>
Decline in State Prison Admissions was led by a Decrease in Parole Violators Admitted in California	<i>App. C-3139</i>
The Decrease in Releases from State Prisons was Divided Between Conditional and Unconditional Releases	<i>App. C-3140</i>
Decline in Admissions Accounted for Decrease in State Prison Population, as Time Served by State Prisoners Remained Relatively Unchanged	<i>App. C-3140</i>
Other Selected Findings	<i>App. C-3141</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-3142</i>
Definition of Terms	<i>App. C-3145</i>
NPS Jurisdiction Notes	<i>App. C-3147</i>

Correctional Populations in the United States, 2010 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction	<i>App. C-3193</i>
Community Supervision and Incarcerated Populations Declined for the Second Consecutive Year	<i>App. C-3194</i>
Probation Population Accounted for Three-Quarters of the Decline in the Correctional Population During 2010	<i>App. C-3194</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-3194</i>

Prison and Jail Deaths in Custody, 2000-2009 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction	<i>App. C-3211</i>
Summary Findings: Jails	<i>App. C-3212</i>
Cause of Death	<i>App. C-3212</i>
Decedent Characteristics	<i>App. C-3212</i>
State-Level Jail Populations	<i>App. C-3213</i>
Cause of Death by Decedent Characteristics	<i>App. C-3213</i>
Summary Findings: Prisons	<i>App. C-3213</i>
Cause of Death	<i>App. C-3213</i>
Decedent Characteristics	<i>App. C-3214</i>
State-Level Prison Populations	<i>App. C-3214</i>
Cause of Death by Decedent Characteristics	<i>App. C-3214</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-3215</i>

Sexual Victimization Reported by Former State Prisoners, 2008

Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice

Introduction	<i>App. C-3253</i>
Highlights	<i>App. C-3254</i>
Prevalence of Sexual Victimization	<i>App. C-3254</i>
Coercion and Physical Injury	<i>App. C-3254</i>
Individual Risk Factors	<i>App. C-3255</i>

Facility Characteristics *App. C-3255*
Sexual Victimization and Its Consequences *App. C-3256*
Incidents of Sexual Victimization *App. C-3257*
9.6% of Former State Prisoners Reported One or More Incidents of Sexual Victimization During the Most Recent Period of Incarceration in Jail, Prison, or a Post-Release Community-Treatment Facility *App. C-3257*
5.4% of Former Inmates Reported an Incident with Another Inmate; 5.3% Reported an Incident with Staff *App. C-3257*
Few Former Inmates Reported Experiencing Sexual Victimization While in a Community-Based Correctional Facility *App. C-3258*
Sexual Victimization Rates Differed from Those Previously Reported in the NIS-1 and NIS-2 *App. C-3259*
Criminal History and Supervision Profile of Former Inmates *App. C-3259*
Type of Coercion and Physical Injury *App. C-3260*
Among Victims of Inmate-on-Inmate Sexual Violence, a Quarter Had Been Physically Held Down or Restrained and a Quarter Had Been Physically Harmed or Injured *App. C-3260*
Half of Victims of Staff Sexual Misconduct Said They Had Been Offered Favors or Special Privileges; A Third Had Been Persuaded or Talked Into It; A Quarter Had Been Bribed or Blackmailed *App. C-3261*
Four Percent of Victims of Staff Sexual Misconduct Reported that They Were Physically Injured *App. C-3261*
Circumstances Surrounding Victimization *App. C-3262*
Inmate-on-Inmate Victimization Occurred Most Often in the Victim's Cell; Staff-on-Inmate Victimization Occurred Most Often in a Closet, Office, or Other Locked Room *App. C-3262*
Most Victims (86%) of Staff Sexual Misconduct Reported More than One Incident; 47% Reported More than One Perpetrator *App. C-3262*
Variations by Sex of Former Inmates *App. C-3263*
The Rate of Inmate-on-Inmate Sexual Victimization Among Former State Prisoners Was 3 Times Higher Among Females (13.7%) than Males (4.2%) *App. C-3263*
The Rate of "Willing" Sexual Activity with Staff Was Higher Among Males (4.8%) than Females (2.6%), and the Rate of Unwilling Sexual Activity Was Higher Among Females (2.5%) than Males (1.1%) *App. C-3263*
Variations by Other Individual-Level Characteristics *App. C-3263*
Large Differences in Sexual Victimization Were Found Among Former Inmates Based on Their Sexual Orientation *App. C-3263*
Violent, Male Sex Offenders Reported High Rates of Inmate-on-Inmate Sexual Victimization (13.7%) *App. C-3264*
Rates of Sexual Victimization Increased with the Length of Time that Former Inmates Had Served *App. C-3265*

Former State Prisoners Who Had Served Time in 5 or More Facilities During Their Most Recent Confinement Reported the Highest Rates of Staff Sexual Misconduct	<i>App. C-3265</i>
Difference in Findings After BJS Performed Multivariate Logistic Regressions	<i>App. C-3266</i>
Variations By Selected Facility-Level Characteristics	<i>App. C-3266</i>
Three-Quarters of Former Inmates Had Served Time in More than One Prison Facility; Nearly 1 in 8 Had Served Time in 5 or More Prison Facilities Before Their Release	<i>App. C-3267</i>
Nearly 44% of Male Victims and 74% of Female Victims Reported that Sexual Victimization Had Occurred in the First Prison Facility They Had Entered	<i>App. C-3267</i>
Reports of Sexual Violence Did Not Vary by Size of Facility, Facility Age, Crowding, Inmate-to-Staff Ratios, or Sex Composition of Staff	<i>App. C-3268</i>
Sexual Victimization Rates Varied by Type and Primary Function of the Facility and by Indicators of Facility Disorder	<i>App. C-3268</i>
Prison Placements and Individual-Level Risk Factors	<i>App. C-3269</i>
An Incident of Sexual Victimization Was Reported in 4.0% of Prison Placements	<i>App. C-3270</i>
Independent Contributions of Individual-Level and Facility-Level Factors to Victimization	<i>App. C-3271</i>
Variations in Sexual Victimization Rates Were Strongly Related to Sexual Orientation After Controlling for Other Factors	<i>App. C-3271</i>
Facility-Level Factors Remained Significant After Controlling for Inmate Characteristics	<i>App. C-3272</i>
Reporting Of Sexual Victimization	<i>App. C-3273</i>
Two-Thirds of Victims of Inmate-on-Inmate Sexual Victimization Said They Reported at least One Incident to Facility Staff or Someone Else	<i>App. C-3273</i>
22% of Unwilling Victims of Sexual Activity with Staff, Compared to 3% of "Willing" Victims, Said They Had Reported an Incident to Facility Staff or Someone Else	<i>App. C-3273</i>
Most Common Reasons for Not Reporting Sexual Victimization by Other Inmates Linked to Embarrassment, Shame, and Not Wanting Others to Know	<i>App. C-3274</i>
37% of Victims Who Reported Being Victimized by Other Inmates Said Facility Staff Did Not Respond	<i>App. C-3274</i>
Post-Release Responses To Victimization	<i>App. C-3274</i>
HIV Testing and Results	<i>App. C-3275</i>
Current Employment, Housing, and Living Arrangements of Former Inmates	<i>App. C-3276</i>
Following Their Release from Prison, Victims and Nonvictims Did Not Differ in Their Employment and Housing Arrangements, but Victims Were More Likely than Nonvictims to Be Living Alone	<i>App. C-3276</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-3276</i>

HIV in Prisons, 2001-2010 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States**Department of Justice*

- Introduction *App. C-3323*
- Rates of HIV/AIDS and AIDS-Related Deaths in Prisons have Declined
 - Steadily Since 2001 *App. C-3324*
- Rates of HIV/AIDS Cases and AIDS-Related Deaths Declined Across all Sizes of Prison Populations *App. C-3324*
- The Rate of AIDS-Related Deaths for State Prison Inmates Dropped Below the Rate for the U.S. General Population *App. C-3325*
- Methodology *App. C-3325*

Sexual Victimization in Prisons and Jails Reported by Inmates, 2011-12 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

- Introduction *App. C-3455*
- Highlights *App. C-3456*
 - Prevalence of Sexual Victimization *App. C-3456*
 - Facility Rankings *App. C-3456*
 - Variations in Victimization Rates *App. C-3457*
 - Special Inmate Populations *App. C-3457*
 - Incidents of Sexual Victimization *App. C-3459*
 - In 2011-12, 4.0% of Prison Inmates and 3.2% of Jail Inmates Reported Experiencing One or More Incidents of Sexual Victimization *App. C-3459*
 - Facility-Level Rates *App. C-3460*
 - The NIS-3 Provides a Basis for Identifying High Rate and Low Rate Facilities *App. C-3460*
 - 11 Male Prisons, 1 Female Prison, and 9 Jails Were Identified as Having High Rates of Inmate-on-Inmate Sexual Victimization in 2011-12 *App. C-3461*
 - 8 Male Prisons, 4 Female Prisons, and 12 Jails Were Identified as Having High Rates of Staff Sexual Misconduct *App. C-3462*
 - 7 Male Prisons, 6 Female Prisons, and 4 Jails Were Identified as Low-Rate Facilities for Sexual Victimization Overall *App. C-3463*
 - In 2011-12, Two Military Facilities and One Indian Country Jail Had High Rates of Staff Sexual Misconduct *App. C-3463*
 - Demographic and Other Characteristics *App. C-3464*
 - Overweight and Obese Prison Inmates Had Lower Rates of Inmate-on-Inmate Sexual Victimization and Staff Misconduct Than Inmates Who Were at or Below a Normal Weight *App. C-3464*
 - Large Differences in Sexual Victimization Were Found Among Inmates Based on Their Sexual Orientation and Past Sexual Experiences *App. C-3465*
 - In 2011-12, Inmates Held for a Violent Sexual Offense Reported Higher Rates of Inmate-on-Inmate Sexual Victimization Than Inmates Held for Other Offenses *App. C-3466*

Rates of Staff Sexual Misconduct Varied Among Inmates Based on Their Criminal Justice Status and History	<i>App. C-3467</i>
Special Inmate Populations—Inmates Ages 16 to 17	<i>App. C-3467</i>
In 2011-12, Juvenile Inmates Ages 16 to 17 Held in Adult Facilities Reported Rates of Sexual Victimization Similar to Those of Adult Inmates	<i>App. C-3467</i>
Among Juveniles and Young Adult Inmates in 2011-12, Patterns of Sexual Victimization Across Demographic Subgroups Showed Little Variation	<i>App. C-3468</i>
Among Juveniles Victimized by Other Inmates in 2011-12, More Than Three-Quarters Experienced Force or Threat of Force, and a Quarter Were Injured	<i>App. C-3469</i>
Special Inmate Populations—Inmates with Mental Health Problems	<i>App. C-3469</i>
A High Percentage of Inmates Had a History of Problems with Their Emotions, Nerves, or Mental Health	<i>App. C-3470</i>
Inmates with a History of Mental Health Problems Had Higher Rates of Sexual Victimization Than Other Inmates	<i>App. C-3470</i>
In 2011-12, Nearly 15% of State and Federal Prisoners and 26% of Jail Inmates Had Symptoms of Serious Psychological Distress	<i>App. C-3471</i>
Inmates with SPD or Anxiety-Mood Disorders Reported High Overall Rates of Sexual Victimization in 2011-12	<i>App. C-3472</i>
Inmates with Mental Illness Reported Higher Rates of Sexual Victimization Than Inmates Without Mental Health Problems Across Subgroups	<i>App. C-3473</i>
Reports of Sexual Victimization Differed Among Inmates with SPD and Other Inmates	<i>App. C-3473</i>
Special Inmate Populations—Inmates with a Non-Heterosexual Sexual Orientation	<i>App. C-3474</i>
Across Subgroups, Inmate-on-Inmate Victimization Rates Were Higher for Non-Heterosexual Inmates Than Heterosexual Inmates	<i>App. C-3474</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-3475</i>

Prisoners in 2012: Trends in Admissions and Releases, 1991-2012

Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice

Introduction	<i>App. C-3647</i>
The Drop in State Prison Admissions Drove the Overall Decline in U.S. Prison Admissions in 2012	<i>App. C-3648</i>
Releases from State Prison in 2012 Exceeded Admissions for the Fourth Consecutive Year, Contributing to the Decline in the Total Prison Population	<i>App. C-3649</i>
Violent Offenders Accounted for a Larger Proportion of the State Prison Population Between 1991 and 2011	<i>App. C-3649</i>
Between 1991 and 2011, Changes in State Prison Admission Types Were Associated with Changes in the Offense Distributions	<i>App. C-3650</i>

The Number of Females Admitted on New Court Commitments for Violent Offenses in 2011 Increased by 2% from 2006 and by 83% from 1991 *App. C-3651*

Among New Court Commitments to State Prison, More than a Third Each of Black and Hispanic Offenders, and a Quarter of White Offenders Were Convicted of a Violent Offense *App. C-3651*

Since 1991, the Proportion of Newly Admitted Violent Offenders Receiving Prison Sentences of Less than 5 Years has Increased *App. C-3652*

Violent Offenders' Longer Sentences Contribute to Their Increased Proportion in the Yearend Prison Population *App. C-3653*

State Prisons Released Almost 24,900 More Inmates than They Admitted in 2011 *App. C-3654*

The 2012 Yearend U.S. Sentenced Prison Population Declined 1.8%, Driven by a Decrease in the Number of State Prisoners *App. C-3654*

Imprisonment Rates Continued to Decline for Most Race, Ethnicity, Sex, and Age Groups *App. C-3654*

Other Select Findings *App. C-3655*

National Prisoner Statistics Program Jurisdiction Notes *App. C-3656*

Terms and Definitions *App. C-3664*

Methodology *App. C-3665*

Medical Problems of State and Federal Prisoners and Jail Inmates, 2011-12

Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice

Introduction *App. C-3979*

Prisoners and Jail Inmates were More Likely than the General Population to Report Ever Having a Chronic Condition or an Infectious Disease *App. C-3980*

High Blood Pressure was the Most Commonly Reported Chronic Condition Among Prisoners and Jail Inmates *App. C-3980*

Chronic Conditions were more Commonly Reported by Female Inmates Both in Prisons and Jails *App. C-3981*

Older Prisoners were About 3 Times more Likely than Younger Persons to Report Ever Having a Chronic Condition or Infectious Disease *App. C-3981*

24% of Prisoners and Jail Inmates Reported at Least Two Chronic Conditions *App. C-3981*

Most Prisoners and Jail Inmates Received Medical Assessments or Exams Since Admission *App. C-3982*

Among Prisoners and Jail Inmates Who Reported Ever Having a Chronic Condition, About Three-Quarters Reported Having a Chronic Condition at Admission *App. C-3982*

66% of Prisoners and 40% of Jail Inmates with a Current Chronic Condition Reported Taking Prescription Medication *App. C-3983*

More than Half of Prisoners and Jail Inmates Reported Being Somewhat or Very Satisfied with Health Care Services Received Since Admission *App. C-3983*

Methodology *App. C-3984*

Multistate Criminal History Patterns of Prisoners Released in 30 States *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction *App. C-4129*
 Older Inmates Were More Likely Than Younger Inmates to Have Prior Out-of-State Arrests *App. C-4130*
 Prior to Release, the Majority of Multistate Offenders Had Arrest Records in Two States *App. C-4131*
 Inmates with Prior Out-of-State Arrests Were More Likely Than Other Inmates to Have an Out-of-State Arrest Following Release *App. C-4131*
 Recidivism Patterns Based on National Criminal History Records Differed from Those Limited to Criminal History Records Within the State of Release *App. C-4132*
 For Most States, Their Released Prisoners Had Arrest Histories in About 50 States *App. C-4133*
 Methodology *App. C-4134*

Use of Restrictive Housing in U.S. Prisons and Jails, 2011-12

Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice

Introduction *App. C-4163*
 Individual-Level Rates *App. C-4164*
 On an Average Day in 2011-12, Up to 4.4% of State and Federal Prisoners and 2.7% of Jail Inmates Were Held in Administrative Segregation or Solitary Confinement *App. C-4164*
 Nearly 20% of Prison Inmates and 18% of Jail Inmates Had Spent Time in Restrictive Housing in the Past 12 Months or Since Coming to the Facility, If Shorter *App. C-4164*
 Time in Restrictive Housing Varied Among Inmate Demographic Groups *App. C-4165*
 Time in Restrictive Housing Units Linked to Current Offense and Past Criminal Justice Contacts *App. C-4166*
 Use of Restrictive Housing Linked to Inmate Mental Health Problems *App. C-4166*
 A High Percentage of Inmates with Current Symptoms of Serious Psychological Distress Had Spent Time in Restrictive Housing Units *App. C-4167*
 More than Three-Quarters of Inmates Written Up for Assaulting Other Inmates or Staff Had Spent Time in Restrictive Housing *App. C-4168*
 Facility-Level Rates *App. C-4169*
 Use of Restrictive Housing Associated with Indicators of Facility Disorder *App. C-4169*
 Facility-Level Rates of Restrictive Housing Associated with Characteristics of Inmates Housed *App. C-4170*

Lack of Inmate Trust and Confidence in Staff Linked to Greater Use of
Restrictive Housing *App. C-4171*
Methodology *App. C-4173*

Veterans in Prison and Jail, 2011-12 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction *App. C-4201*
Veterans in Prison and Jail Have Decreased Since 1998 *App. C-4202*
On Average, Veterans in Prison and Jail Were Older Than Nonveterans
App. C-4202
Incarcerated Veterans Were More Likely to be Convicted On a Violent
Sexual Offense and Have Fewer Priors Than Nonveterans
App. C-4203
The Majority of Incarcerated Veterans Did Not Experience Combat During
Their Military Service *App. C-4204*
Veterans in Prison and Jail Were Likely to Report Having Been Told They
Had Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder *App. C-4205*
Veterans in Prison and Jail Were More Likely Than Nonveterans to Report a
Hearing or Vision Disability *App. C-4205*
Methodology *App. C-4205*

Disabilities Among Prison and Jail Inmates, 2011-12

Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice

Introduction *App. C-4263*
Inmates Were More Likely than Persons in the General Population to Report
Having a Disability *App. C-4264*
Cognitive Disability was the Most Commonly Reported Disability Among
Inmates *App. C-4264*
About 13% of Prisoners and 16% of Jail Inmates Reported Having Multiple
Disabilities *App. C-4264*
Female Inmates Were More Likely than Male Inmates to Report Having a
Disability *App. C-4264*
Non-Hispanic Black and Hispanic Inmates Were Less Likely than
Non-Hispanic Whites to Report a Disability *App. C-4265*
Older Inmates Were More Likely to Report *App. C-4265*
More than Half of Inmates with a Disability Reported a Chronic
Condition *App. C-4265*
Methodology *App. C-4266*

Prisoners in 2015 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction *App. C-4291*
Total Prison Population *App. C-4291*
Sentenced Prison Population *App. C-4292*
State and Federal Prisoners Sentenced to More than 1 Year Declined for
the Second Consecutive Year *App. C-4293*

Blacks and Hispanics Sentenced to More than 1 Year in State or Federal Prison Declined in 2015	<i>App. C-4293</i>
Imprisonment Rate	<i>App. C-4293</i>
At Yearend 2015, the Imprisonment Rate for Sentenced Prisoners of All Ages Was the Lowest Since 1997	<i>App. C-4293</i>
The Imprisonment Rates Decreased for All Races from 2014 to 2015	<i>App. C-4294</i>
Prison Admissions And Releases	<i>App. C-4294</i>
State and Federal Correctional Authorities Admitted 17,800 Fewer Prisoners in 2015 than in 2014	<i>App. C-4294</i>
Correctional Authorities Released 4,700 More Prisoners from State and Federal Prisons in 2015 than in 2014	<i>App. C-4295</i>
Demographic and Offense Characteristics of State and Federal Prisoners	<i>App. C-4295</i>
A Tenth (11%) of Prisoners Sentenced to More than 1 Year in State or Federal Prison at Yearend 2015 Were Age 55 or Older	<i>App. C-4295</i>
Fifty-Three Percent of State Prisoners Were Serving Time for Violent Offenses	<i>App. C-4296</i>
Nearly Half of Federal Prisoners in 2015 Were Serving Sentences for Drug Offenses	<i>App. C-4296</i>
Other Selected Findings	<i>App. C-4297</i>
Prison Capacity	<i>App. C-4297</i>
Private Prisons	<i>App. C-4297</i>
Prisoners Held in Local Jails	<i>App. C-4297</i>
U.S. Military and Territories	<i>App. C-4298</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-4298</i>
National Prisoner Statistics (NPS) Program Jurisdiction Notes	<i>App. C-4302</i>

Correctional Populations in the United States, 2015	<i>Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice</i>
Introduction	<i>App. C-4341</i>
Community Supervision and Incarcerated Populations Declined to Lowest Levels in More than a Decade	<i>App. C-4341</i>
Drop in the Number of Probationers Accounted for Most of the Decrease in the Correctional Population During 2015	<i>App. C-4342</i>
By Yearend 2015, the Correctional Supervision Rate Dropped to the Lowest Rate Since 1994	<i>App. C-4343</i>
Terms and Definitions	<i>App. C-4343</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-4345</i>

Aging of the State Prison Population, 1993-2013	<i>Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice</i>
Introduction	<i>App. C-4403</i>
Growth of the State Prison Population	<i>App. C-4404</i>

The Number of State Prisoners Age 55 or Older Doubled Each Decade
Between 1993 and 2013 *App. C-4404*

Persons Age 55 or Older Made Up a Larger Percentage of the U.S.
Resident Population than the State Prison Population
App. C-4404

Characteristics of the Aging State Prison Population *App. C-4405*
Between 1993 and 2003, Both Males and Females Ages 40 to 54
Increased by More than 100% *App. C-4405*

Black State Prisoners Age 55 or Older Increased More than 150%
Between 2003 and 2013 *App. C-4406*

State Prison Inmates Age 55 or Older Had a Higher Percentage of Violent
Offenders than All Other Age Groups *App. C-4406*

Sources of Growth in the Older Prison Population *App. C-4407*

Admissions of State Prisoners Increased Most Among 45 to 49 Years Old
Between 1993 and 2003, and Among Ages 55 or Older After
2003 *App. C-4407*

Type of admission *App. C-4408*
Rate of admission *App. C-4408*
Admitting offense *App. C-4408*

Likelihood of admission to prison after an arrest
App. C-4409

Inmates Age 55 or Older Admitted to State Prison Were Sentenced
to—and Were Expected to Serve—More Time on Average than
Younger Inmates *App. C-4410*

Sentence length *App. C-4410*
Time served in prison *App. C-4411*

The Percentage of Older Prisoners Released After Serving at Least 10
Years More than Doubled Between 1993 and 2013
App. C-4412

By 2013, 40% of Persons Age 55 or Older in Prison at Yearend Had
Served 10 Years or More, Compared to 9% in 1993
App. C-4413

Over Time, Admissions Contributed a Smaller Proportion of State Prison
Inmates Age 55 or Older Relative to Prisoners Who Turned 55 While
in Prison *App. C-4413*

Conclusion *App. C-4414*

Longer Sentences, More Time Served, and Increased Admissions Among
Older Offenders Led to Aging in the State Prison Population
App. C-4414

Methodology *App. C-4415*

HIV in Prisons, 2015

Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice

Introduction *App. C-4473*

HIV Among State and Federal Prisoners *App. C-4474*

HIV Among State and Federal Prisoners by Sex *App. C-4474*

AIDS-Related Deaths Among State and Federal Prisoners	
<i>App. C-4475</i>	
AIDS-Related Deaths of State Prisoners by Sex, Race, Hispanic Origin, and	
Age <i>App. C-4475</i>	
Sex <i>App. C-4475</i>	
Race and Hispanic Origin <i>App. C-4475</i>	
Age <i>App. C-4476</i>	
HIV Testing Practices in State and Federal Prison Systems	
<i>App. C-4476</i>	
During Intake Process <i>App. C-4476</i>	
While in Custody <i>App. C-4476</i>	
During Discharge Process <i>App. C-4477</i>	
Methodology <i>App. C-4477</i>	

Indicators of Mental Health Problems Reported by Prisoners and Jail Inmates, 2011-12

<i>Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice</i>	
Introduction <i>App. C-4499</i>	
Prisoners and Jail Inmates Were More Likely to Have Ever Been Told They	
Had a Major Depressive Disorder than Other Mental Disorders	
<i>App. C-4500</i>	
Prisoners and Jail Inmates Were Three to Five Times as Likely to Have Met	
the Threshold for SPD as Adults in the General U.S. Population	
<i>App. C-4500</i>	
Female Prisoners and Jail Inmates Were More Likely to Have Met the	
Threshold for SPD than Males <i>App. C-4501</i>	
Prisoners Age 65 or Older Were Less Likely to Have a Mental Health	
Indicator, Compared to Other Age Groups <i>App. C-4501</i>	
Prisoners Who Were Married Were Less Likely to Have Met the Threshold	
for SPD than Prisoners with Other Marital Statuses <i>App. C-4502</i>	
Prisoners and Jail Inmates with a College Degree Were More Likely than	
High School Graduates to Have a History of a Mental Health	
Problem <i>App. C-4502</i>	
The Percentage of Prisoners Incarcerated for a Violent Offense Who Met the	
Threshold for SPD was Similar to Those Incarcerated for a Property	
Offense Who Met the Threshold for SPD <i>App. C-4502</i>	
The Percentage of Prisoners Who Met the Threshold for SPD Did Not	
Differ by Sentence Length <i>App. C-4503</i>	
The Percentage of Inmates Who Had Ever Been Told They Had a Mental	
Disorder Did Not Differ by Time Served Since Admission	
<i>App. C-4503</i>	
A Larger Percentage of Prisoners and Jail Inmates with More than One Arrest	
than Those with One Arrest Had Been Told They Had a Mental	
Disorder <i>App. C-4504</i>	
Prisoners Who Spent 5 Years or More Previously Incarcerated Were More	
Likely to Have Met the Threshold for SPD than Those with No Prior	
Time Served <i>App. C-4504</i>	

Almost Three-Quarters of Inmates Who Met the Threshold for SPD Had Received Mental Health Treatment in Their Lifetime *App. C-4505*
 Prisoners Who Had a Mental Health Indicator Were More Likely than Similar Jail Inmates to Have Received Treatment Since Admission to Their Current Facility *App. C-4505*
 About a Third of Inmates With a Mental Health Indicator Were Currently Receiving Treatment *App. C-4505*
 Prisoners and Jail Inmates Who Met the Threshold for SPD Were More Likely than Those Without SPD to be Written Up or Charged with an Assault While Incarcerated *App. C-4506*
 Methodology *App. C-4506*

Drug Use, Dependence, and Abuse Among State Prisoners and Jail Inmates, 2007-2009

Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice

Introduction *App. C-4535*
 Drug Dependence and Abuse *App. C-4536*
 During 2007-09, More than Half of State Prisoners and Two-Thirds of Sentenced Jail Inmates Met the DSM-IV Criteria for Drug Dependence or Abuse *App. C-4536*
 Female Inmates Were More Likely than Male Inmates to Have Met the DSM-IV Criteria for Drug Dependence or Abuse *App. C-4536*
 Inmates Incarcerated for a Property Offense Were More Likely to Have Met the Criteria for Dependence or Abuse than Inmates Incarcerated for Other Offenses *App. C-4536*
 State Prisoners Were 12 Times More Likely than Adults in the General Population to Have Met the Criteria for Dependence or Abuse *App. C-4537*
 Jail Inmates Were More Likely to Have Met the Criteria for Dependence or Abuse than Those in the General Population Who Had Been Arrested *App. C-4537*
 Trends in Lifetime and Regular Use of Drugs by State Prisoners and Jail Inmates *App. C-4538*
 Overall Drug Use Reported by Inmates was Unchanged from Past Surveys *App. C-4538*
 More State Prisoners and Jail Inmates Reported They Had Ever Used Marijuana/Hashish than Any Other Drug *App. C-4538*
 Patterns of Drug Use at Time of the Offense *App. C-4539*
 4 in 10 Prisoners and Jail Inmates Used Drugs at the Time of the Offense for Which They Were Currently Incarcerated *App. C-4539*
 About 4 in 10 State Prisoners and Sentenced Jail Inmates Who Were Incarcerated for Property Offenses Committed the Crime to Get Money for Drugs or to Obtain Drugs *App. C-4539*
 Drug Use by Demographics and Offense *App. C-4539*
 Among State Prisoners, Females, Whites, and Those Age 54 or Younger Were More Likely than Other Persons to Have Used Drugs in the Month Before the Offense *App. C-4539*

State Prisoners Incarcerated for Property or Drug Offenses Were More Likely to Have Used Drugs than Those Who Committed Violent Offenses	<i>App. C-4540</i>
Female Jail Inmates Were More Likely than Male Inmates to Have Used Drugs in the Month Before the Offense or at the Time of the Offense	<i>App. C-4540</i>
More than Half of Sentenced Jail Inmates Incarcerated for a Drug Crime Used Drugs at the Time of the Offense	<i>App. C-4540</i>
Regular Use of Cocaine/Crack, Methamphetamine, or Heroin/Opiates by Demographics	<i>App. C-4541</i>
Cocaine/Crack	<i>App. C-4541</i>
During 2007-09, Regular Use of Cocaine/Crack was Highest Among Females, Whites, Inmates Ages 35 to 44, and Property Offenders	<i>App. C-4541</i>
Methamphetamine	<i>App. C-4541</i>
Female Inmates Were More Likely than Male Inmates to Have Regularly Used Methamphetamine During 2007-09	<i>App. C-4541</i>
Heroin/Opiates	<i>App. C-4542</i>
Regular Use of Heroin/Opiates was Lowest Among Black Prisoners and Jail Inmates During 2007-09	<i>App. C-4542</i>
Estimates of Lifetime and Regular Use of Drugs Among Adults in the General Population	<i>App. C-4542</i>
Little to No Change Occurred in the Percentage of Adults in the General Population Who Had Ever Used or Regularly Used Drugs Between 2002-04 and 2007-09	<i>App. C-4542</i>
Month-Before Drug Use Among Prisoners was Three Times Higher than the General Population	<i>App. C-4543</i>
Among Prisoners and Adults in the General Population, Marijuana/Hashish was Reported as the Most Used Drug in the Month Before the Arrest or Interview	<i>App. C-4543</i>
Sentenced Jail Inmates Were More Likely than the General Population to Have Used Drugs in the Prior Month	<i>App. C-4543</i>
Participation in Drug Treatment Programs	<i>App. C-4544</i>
Fewer than a Third of Inmates Who Met the Criteria for Drug Dependence or Abuse Received Drug Treatment or Participated in a Program	<i>App. C-4544</i>
Prisoner and Jail Inmate Participation in a Drug Treatment Program Did Not Differ by Time Since Arrival to the Current Facility or Time Until Release	<i>App. C-4544</i>
More Inmates Who Met the Criteria for Dependence or Abuse Participated in a Drug Treatment Program than Adults in the General Population	<i>App. C-4544</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-4545</i>

Table of Contents

Volume Six

APPENDIX C

Prisoner Statistics (continued)

2018 Update on Prisoner Recidivism: a 9-Year Follow-up Period (2005-2014)

Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice

Introduction *App. C-4675*

About 1 in 4 State Prisoners Released in the 30 States in 2005 Were in Prison for a Violent Offense *App. C-4676*

Extending the Follow-up Period from 3 to 9 Years Increased Recidivism of Prisoners by 15 Percentage Points *App. C-4676*

Longer Follow-up Periods Show Substantial Declines in Apparent Desistance *App. C-4677*

After Year-1 the Annual Percentages of Males and Females Arrested for the First Time were Similar *App. C-4677*

Prisoners Released in 30 States in 2005 were Arrested Nearly 2 Million Times During the 9 Years Following Release *App. C-4678*

Male and Younger Prisoners were More Likely to be Arrested Each Year than Female and Older Prisoners *App. C-4678*

During the 9 Years After Release, Prisoners Released for a Property Offense were Most Likely to be Arrested *App. C-4678*

By the Sixth Year After Release, Prisoners Released for a Violent or Property Crime were Similarly Likely to be Arrested for a Violent Crime *App. C-4679*

Among Prisoners Arrested Following Release, the Percentage of Arrests in Another State Increased Each Year After Release *App. C-4679*

Five Percent of Prisoners Were Arrested During Year-1 Following Release and Not Arrested Again During Years 2 Through 9 *App. C-4680*

Forty-Four Percent of Released Prisoners were Not Arrested After
 Year-5 *App. C-4680*
 Methodology *App. C-4680*

Time Served in State Prison, 2016

Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice
 Introduction *App. C-4757*
 Violent Offenders Served 4.7 Years in State Prison on Average, Compared to
 Less than 2 Years for Other Offenders *App. C-4758*
 More than 7 in 10 Violent Offenders Released in 2016 Served Less than Five
 Years in State Prison *App. C-4758*
 Persons Released After Serving Time for Rape or Sexual Assault (62%)
 Served the Highest Percentage of Their Sentence *App. C-4758*
 Persons Sentenced for Murder or Rape/Sexual Assault Made Up About Half
 (49%) of All Deaths in State Prisons in 2016 *App. C-4759*
 Methodology *App. C-4759*

Source and Use of Firearms Involved in Crimes: Survey of Prison Inmates, 2016

Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice
 Introduction *App. C-4827*
 Controlling-Offense Characteristics *App. C-4828*
 Extent of Firearm Use Among Prisoners During the Crime
 App. C-4828
 Type of Firearm Possessed By Prisoners During Offense *App. C-4829*
 Demographic Characteristics *App. C-4829*
 Method, Source, and Process Used to Obtain the Firearm
 App. C-4830
 Use and Source of Firearms Among All State and Federal Prisoners
 App. C-4830
 Methodology *App. C-4830*

Recidivism of Sex Offenders Released from State Prison: a 9-Year Follow-Up (2005-14)

Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice
 Introduction *App. C-4855*
 Sex Offenders were more Likely than Other Released Prisoners to Receive
 Longer Sentences and to be Granted Unconditional Releases
 App. C-4856
 The Median Age at Release for Sex Offenders was 38 *App. C-4857*
 About Half of Sex Offenders had 5 or more Prior Arrests and about a Third
 had at Least 1 Prior Drug Arrest *App. C-4857*
 Sex Offenders were Less Likely than Other Released Prisoners to be Arrested
 During the 9 Years Following Release *App. C-4857*
 Sex Offenders were Three Times as Likely as Other Offenders to be Arrested

for Rape or Sexual Assault During the 9 Years Following Release <i>App. C-4858</i>	
18% of Sex Offenders were Arrested for the First Time During Years 4 Through 9 After Release <i>App. C-4858</i>	4
Half of Prisoners Released After Serving Time for Rape or Sexual Assault had an Arrest Within 9 Years that Led to a Conviction <i>App. C-4859</i>	
Younger Sex Offenders were more Likely than Older Sex Offenders to be Arrested for Another Sex Offense Post-Release <i>App. C-4859</i>	
11% of Prisoners Released After Serving Time for Rape or Sexual Assault were Arrested at Least Once Outside the State that Released Them <i>App. C-4860</i>	
Annual Arrest Percentages Among Sex Offenders Declined During the 9 Years Following Their Release <i>App. C-4860</i>	
Prisoners Released after Serving Time for Rape or Sexual Assault Accounted for 16% of Arrests for Rape or Sexual Assault During the Follow-Up Period <i>App. C-4861</i>	
Almost 6% of Male Prisoners Released in 30 States in 2005 were Serving Time for Rape or Sexual Assault <i>App. C-4861</i>	
Fewer than 1% of Female Prisoners Released in 30 States in 2005 were Serving Time for Rape or Sexual Assault <i>App. C-4862</i>	
67% of Male Prisoners Released After Serving Time for Rape or Sexual Assault were Arrested Within 9 Years <i>App. C-4862</i>	
Methodology <i>App. C-4862</i>	

Time Served in State Prison, 2018 <i>Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice</i>	
Introduction <i>App. C-5161</i>	
Violent Offenders Served More than Twice as Long in State Prison on Average as Other Offenders <i>App. C-5161</i>	
More than 75% of Offenders Released in 2018 Served Less than 3 Years in State Prison <i>App. C-5162</i>	
Offenders Released After Serving Time for Rape Served the Highest Percentage of Their Sentence <i>App. C-5162</i>	
Violent Offenders Made Up More than 70% of All Deaths in State Prisons in 2018 <i>App. C-5163</i>	
Methodology <i>App. C-5163</i>	

Parents in Prison and Their Minor Children, 2016 <i>Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice</i>	
Introduction <i>App. C-5173</i>	
Highlights <i>App. C-5173</i>	
Other Key Findings <i>App. C-5174</i>	
Methodology <i>App. C-5174</i>	

Veterans in Prison, 2016 <i>Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice</i>	
Introduction <i>App. C-5185</i>	
Highlights <i>App. C-5185</i>	

Other Key Findings *App. C-5186*
Methodology *App. C-5187*

Disabilities Reported by Prisoners, 2016

United States Department of Justice *Bureau of Justice Statistics,*
Introduction *App. C-5197*
Highlights *App. C-5197*
Other Key Findings *App. C-5198*
Methodology *App. C-5198*

Federal Prisoner Statistics Collected Under the First Step Act, 2020

Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice
Introduction *App. C-5213*
Key Findings *App. C-5213*
Methodology *App. C-5214*

Medical Problems Reported by Prisoners, 2016

Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice
Introduction *App. C-5309*
Other Key Findings *App. C-5309*
Methodology *App. C-5310*

Alcohol and Drug Use and Treatment Reported by Prisoners, 2016

Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice
Introduction *App. C-5325*
Other Key Findings *App. C-5325*
Alcohol and Drug Use *App. C-5325*
Alcohol and Drug Use, by Prisoner Characteristics *App. C-5326*
Alcohol, Drug, and Substance Use Disorder *App. C-5327*
Alcohol or Drug Use Treatment *App. C-5327*
Methodology *App. C-5327*

Indicators of Mental Health Problems Reported by Prisoners, 2016

Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice
Introduction *App. C-5349*
Other Key Findings *App. C-5349*
Methodology *App. C-5350*

Indicators of Mental Health Problems Reported by Prisoners, 2016

Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice
Introduction *App. C-5365*
Allegations of Sexual Victimization *App. C-5366*
Over Half of All Fully Investigated Allegations of Sexual Victimization
in 2018 were Unsubstantiated *App. C-5366*

Outcomes of Sexual Victimization Investigations	<i>App. C-5366</i>
8% of Inmate-on-Inmate and 5% of Staff-on-Inmate Allegations were Substantiated During 2016-18	<i>App. C-5367</i>
In 2018, There Were 1,673 Substantiated Incidents of Sexual Victimization in Adult Correctional Facilities	<i>App. C-5367</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-5367</i>

Suicide in Local Jails and Federal Prisons, 2000-2019

Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice

Introduction	<i>App. C-5407</i>
Suicides in Local Jails	<i>App. C-5408</i>
Demographic Characteristics of Local Jail Inmates Who Died by Suicide	<i>App. C-5408</i>
Criminal Justice Characteristics of Local Jail Inmates Who Died by Suicide	<i>App. C-5409</i>
Circumstances of Suicide Deaths in Local Jails	<i>App. C-5409</i>
Characteristics of Jail Facilities with Suicides in 2019	<i>App. C-5409</i>
Suicides in State Prisons	<i>App. C-5410</i>
Demographic Characteristics of State Prisoners who Died by Suicide	<i>App. C-5410</i>
Circumstances of Suicide Deaths in State Prisons	<i>App. C-5411</i>
Suicides in Federal Prisons	<i>App. C-5411</i>
Demographic and criminal Justice Characteristics of Federal Prisoners who Died by Suicide	<i>App. C-5411</i>
Characteristics of State and Federal Prison Facilities with Suicides in 2019	<i>App. C-5412</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-5412</i>

Prisoners in 2020 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction	<i>App. C-5453</i>
Total Prison Population	<i>App. C-5454</i>
State-Level Total Prison Populations	<i>App. C-5454</i>
Population of Sentenced Prisoners	<i>App. C-5454</i>
State-Specific Sentenced Prison Populations	<i>App. C-5455</i>
Imprisonment Rates	<i>App. C-5455</i>
State-Specific Imprisonment Rates	<i>App. C-5456</i>
Prison Admissions	<i>App. C-5456</i>
Prison Releases	<i>App. C-5456</i>
Age, Sex, and Race or Ethnicity of Sentenced Prisoners	<i>App. C-5457</i>
Imprisonment Rates of Sentenced Males By Age and Race or Ethnicity	<i>App. C-5457</i>
Imprisonment Rates of Sentenced Females By Age and Race or Ethnicity	<i>App. C-5457</i>
Prisoners Held in Privately Operated Prisons	<i>App. C-5458</i>

Prisoners Held in Local Jails	<i>App. C-5458</i>
Prisoners Age 17 or Younger	<i>App. C-5458</i>
Offense Characteristics of State Prisoners	<i>App. C-5459</i>
State-Specific Offense Distributions	<i>App. C-5459</i>
Offense Characteristics of Federal Prisoners	<i>App. C-5459</i>
Prison Capacity	<i>App. C-5460</i>
Non-U.S. Citizens in State and Federal Prisons	<i>App. C-5460</i>
Persons Held Under U.S. Military Jurisdiction	<i>App. C-5460</i>
Offense Characteristics of Persons Held Under U.S. Military Jurisdiction	<i>App. C-5461</i>
Persons Held in the Custody of U.S. Territories	<i>App. C-5461</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-5461</i>

Recidivism of Prisoners Released in 24 States in 2008: a 10-Year Follow-Up Period (2008-2018) *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States*

Department of Justice

Introduction	<i>App. C-5533</i>
The Median Age of State Prisoners Released in 2008 was 34	<i>App. C-5533</i>
About 1 in 4 State Prisoners Released in 2008 Were Serving Time for a Violent Offense	<i>App. C-5534</i>
82% of Released State Prisoners Were Arrested Within 10 Years	<i>App. C-5534</i>
Nearly 8 in 10 Violent Offenders Were Arrested for any Crime Within 10 Years of Release From State Prison	<i>App. C-5535</i>
Nearly 9 in 10 State Prisoners With 10 or More Prior Arrests Were Arrested Within 10 Years of Release	<i>App. C-5535</i>
Nearly 7 in 10 State Prisoners Released Across 22 States Had an Arrest Within 10 Years That Led to a Conviction	<i>App. C-5536</i>
About 6 in 10 Released Prisoners Across 18 States Returned to Prison Within 10 Years	<i>App. C-5536</i>
The Total Number of Arrests Among Former Prisoners Released in 2008 Declined From Year 1 to Year 10	<i>App. C-5536</i>
Nearly Half of State Prisoners Released in 2008 Were Arrested for a Drug Offense Within 10 Years	<i>App. C-5537</i>
More Than 4 in 10 Prisoners Released After Serving Time For a Violent Offense Were Arrested For a Violent Offense Within 10 Years	<i>App. C-5537</i>
Prisoners Released After Serving Time For a Violent Offense Were More Likely to Be Arrested For a Public Order Offense Than Other Offenses	<i>App. C-5537</i>
About 3 in 4 Prisoners Released After Serving Time For a Drug Offense Were Arrested For a Nondrug Offense Within 10 Years	<i>App. C-5537</i>
More Than 8 in 10 Prisoners Released After Serving Time For a Property Offense Were Arrested For a Crime Other Than a Property Offense Within 10 Years	<i>App. C-5538</i>

Persons in Prison For a Violent Offense Served Longer Sentences Than Other Released Prisoners	<i>App. C-5538</i>
Released Prisoners Who Served Less Time Had Higher Arrest Rates Than Those Who Served More	<i>App. C-5538</i>
About 1 in 6 Released State Prisoners Were Arrested in Another State Within 10 Years	<i>App. C-5539</i>
About Half as Many State Prisoners Were Arrested in Year 10 as in Year 1	<i>App. C-5539</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-5539</i>

Profile of Prison Inmates, 2016 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States
Department of Justice*

Introduction	<i>App. C-5609</i>
Demographic Characteristics	<i>App. C-5609</i>
Sex and Age	<i>App. C-5609</i>
Race and Ethnicity	<i>App. C-5610</i>
Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity	<i>App. C-5610</i>
Education	<i>App. C-5610</i>
Marital Status, Military Service, and Citizenship	<i>App. C-5611</i>
Offense Characteristics of State and Federal Prisoners	<i>App. C-5611</i>
Criminal Histories of State and Federal Prisoners	<i>App. C-5612</i>
Criminal Justice Status	<i>App. C-5612</i>
Lifetime Arrests	<i>App. C-5613</i>
Prior Incarcerations	<i>App. C-5612</i>
Sentence Length and Time Served	<i>App. C-5614</i>
Sentence Length	<i>App. C-5614</i>
Time Served Since Admission	<i>App. C-5614</i>
Total Time Expected to Serve	<i>App. C-5614</i>
Special Conditions of Sentences	<i>App. C-5615</i>
Time to Expected Release	<i>App. C-5615</i>
Housing Characteristics Prior to Arrest	<i>App. C-5615</i>
Family Background While Growing Up	<i>App. C-5616</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-5617</i>

Mortality in State and Federal Prisons, 2001-2019 *Bureau of Justice
Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction	<i>App. C-5653</i>
Total Prison Deaths, 2001-2019	<i>App. C-5654</i>
Cause of Deaths in State Prison	<i>App. C-5654</i>
State Prison Mortality Rates in 2019	<i>App. C-5654</i>
Comparing Mortality in State Prisons and the U.S. Population	<i>App. C-5655</i>
Demographic Characteristics of State Prison Decedents	<i>App. C-5655</i>
Deaths in Federal Prisons	<i>App. C-5655</i>
Jurisdiction-Level Prison Mortality	<i>App. C-5656</i>

Methodology *App. C-5656*

Employment of Persons Released from Federal Prison in 2010

Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice

Introduction *App. C-5701*

Persons Released From Federal Prison in 2010 *App. C-5702*

Pre-Prison Employment *App. C-5702*

Percent of Persons Employed Prior to Imprisonment *App. C-5702*

Quarterly Earnings Prior to Imprisonment *App. C-5703*

Post-Prison Employment *App. C-5704*

Overall Employment Measures for Persons Released From Federal Prison *App. C-5704*

Quarterly Employment After Release From Federal Prison *App. C-5705*

Quarterly Earnings After Release From Federal Prison *App. C-5706*

Sectors of Employment *App. C-5707*

Methodology *App. C-5708*

Correctional Populations in the United States, 2020

Statistics, United States Department of Justice

Introduction *App. C-5741*

Methodology *App. C-5741*

HIV in Prisons, 2020

Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice

Introduction *App. C-5757*

Key Findings *App. C-5758*

HIV Among State and Federal Prisoners *App. C-5758*

AIDS-Related Deaths Among State and Federal Prisoners *App. C-5758*

AIDS-Related Deaths Among State and Federal Prisoners by Demographic Characteristics *App. C-*

HIV Testing Practices in State and Federal Prison Systems *App. C-5759*

Methodology *App. C-5760*

Federal Deaths in Custody and During Arrest, 2020

Statistics, United States Department of Justice

Introduction *App. C-5795*

Methodology *App. C-5795*

Impact of COVID-19 on State and Federal Prisons, March

2020–February 2021 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of*

Justice

Introduction *App. C-5815*

The Number of Prisoners in Custody Declined in All States During the Study Period *App. C-5816*

Admissions to Prison Decreased 66% During the Pandemic from March 2020 to April 2020	<i>App. C-5816</i>
Fewer than 10% of Releases from Prison During the COVID-19 Study Period were Earlier than Originally Scheduled	<i>App. C-5817</i>
State and Federal Prisons Administered 4.8 Million Viral COVID-19 Tests to Prisoners Over the Study Period	<i>App. C-5818</i>
The Majority of States Suspended Prisoners' Family Visitation and Educational Programming at Some Point in the COVID-19 Study Period to Mitigate Transmission	<i>App. C-5819</i>
The Infection Rate for State Prisoners was 219 Per 1,000 Prisoners at Risk of Exposure to COVID-19	<i>App. C-5819</i>
White and Black Prisoners Accounted for Two-Thirds of all COVID-19 Infections	<i>App. C-5820</i>
The Crude Mortality Rate for COVID-19 was 1.5 Deaths Per 1,000 Prisoners	<i>App. C-5820</i>
Less than 10% of COVID-19-Related Deaths Occurred in Prisoners Less than 44 Years of Age	<i>App. C-5821</i>
Jurisdictions Vaccinated 119,000 Staff and 126,000 Prisoners from December 2020 to February 2021	<i>App. C-5821</i>
Almost 200 Prison Staff Died as a Result of Covid-19 Over the Study Period	<i>App. C-5822</i>
Jurisdiction Notes	<i>App. C-5822</i>

Work Assignments Reported by Prisoners, 2016	<i>Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice</i>
Introduction	<i>App. C-6071</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-6072</i>

Recidivism of Females Released from State Prison, 2012-2017	<i>Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice</i>
Introduction	<i>App. C-6083</i>
Key Findings	<i>App. C-6083</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-6084</i>

Prisoners in 2022	<i>Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice</i>
Introduction	<i>App. C-6089</i>
Total Prison Population	<i>App. C-6089</i>
Jurisdiction-Level Total Prison Populations	<i>App. C-6090</i>
Population of Sentenced Prisoners	<i>App. C-6090</i>
Jurisdiction-Specific Sentenced Prison Populations	<i>App. C-6091</i>
Imprisonment Rates	<i>App. C-6091</i>
Jurisdiction-Specific Imprisonment Rates	<i>App. C-6092</i>
Prison Admissions	<i>App. C-6092</i>
Prison Releases	<i>App. C-6092</i>

Age, Sex, and Race or Hispanic Origin of Sentenced Prisoners	
<i>App. C-6093</i>	
Imprisonment Rates of U.S. Residents, by Sex, Age, and Race or Hispanic	
Origin <i>App. C-6093</i>	
Prisoners Held in Privately Operated Prison Facilities and Local Jails	
<i>App. C-6093</i>	
Prisoners Age 17 or Younger <i>App. C-6094</i>	
Offense Characteristics of State Prisoners <i>App. C-6094</i>	
Offense Characteristics of Federal Prisoners <i>App. C-6094</i>	
Prison Capacity <i>App. C-6095</i>	
Non-U.S. Citizens in State and Federal Prisons <i>App. C-6095</i>	
Persons Held Under U.S. Military Jurisdiction <i>App. C-6095</i>	
Persons Held in the Custody of U.S. Territories <i>App. C-6095</i>	
Methodology <i>App. C-6095</i>	

Arrest History of Persons Admitted to State Prison in 2009 and 2014 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction	<i>App. C-6165</i>
Characteristics of Persons Admitted to State Prison	<i>App. C-6166</i>
About Half of All Persons Entering Prison in 2014 Were Ages 25 to 39	<i>App. C-6166</i>
About 4 in 5 Persons Admitted to Prison in 2014 Entered on A New Court Commitment	<i>App. C-6166</i>
Persons Age 24 or Younger Made Up 1 in 4 of Those Admitted in 2014 on A New Court Commitment	<i>App. C-6167</i>
Arrest History of Persons Admitted to State Prison	<i>App. C-6167</i>
About 9 in 10 Persons Admitted in 2014 Were First Arrested at Age 24 or Younger	<i>App. C-6167</i>
2% of persons admitted in 2009 or 2014 were first arrested at age 40 or older	<i>App. C-6167</i>
Persons Admitted to Prison in 2009 or 2014 Had a Median of Nine Prior Arrests	<i>App. C-6168</i>
For 5% of Persons Admitted in 2014, the Arrest that Led to Their Imprisonment Was Their Only Arrest	<i>App. C-6168</i>
About 3 in 10 Persons Admitted to Prison in 2014 Had Prior Arrests in More Than One State	<i>App. C-6169</i>
The Percentage of Persons Admitted to Prison with an Out-of-State Arrest Increased from 2009 to 2014	<i>App. C-6169</i>
About 8 in 10 Persons Admitted to Prison in 2014 Had a Prior Arrest for a Property Offense	<i>App. C-6169</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-6170</i>

Correctional Populations in the United States, 2022 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction	<i>App. C-6257</i>
Total Correctional Population	<i>App. C-6257</i>

Composition of the Correctional Population	<i>App. C-6258</i>
Correctional Supervision Rates	<i>App. C-6258</i>
Males and Females Under Correctional Supervision	<i>App. C-6258</i>
Correctional Supervision by Race or Hispanic Origin	<i>App. C-6259</i>
Incarcerated Persons	<i>App. C-6260</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-6260</i>

Federal Deaths in Custody and During Arrest, 2022 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction	<i>App. C-6285</i>
Highlights	<i>App. C-6285</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-6286</i>

Sexual Victimization Reported by Adult Correctional Authorities, 2019-2020 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction	<i>App. C-6301</i>
BJS Changes to Reporting of Sexual Victimization	<i>App. C-6302</i>
Section 1: Summary of Allegations and Substantiated Incidents in Adult Correctional Facilities, 2013-2020	<i>App. C-6302</i>
Key Findings	<i>App. C-6302</i>
Section 2. Characteristics of Substantiated Incidents of Sexual Victimization, 2019-20	<i>App. C-6303</i>
Key Findings	<i>App. C-6303</i>
Inmate-on-Inmate Incidents	<i>App. C-6303</i>
Victim and Perpetrator Characteristics	<i>App. C-6303</i>
Outcomes	<i>App. C-6303</i>
Staff-on-Inmate Incidents	<i>App. C-6304</i>
Victim and Perpetrator Characteristics	<i>App. C-6304</i>
Outcomes	<i>App. C-6304</i>
Section 3. Allegations and Substantiated Incidents in Federal and State Prisons, 2019 and 2020	<i>App. C-6304</i>
Key Findings	<i>App. C-6305</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-6305</i>

Federal Prisoner Statistics Collected Under the First Step Act, 2024 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction	<i>App. C-6357</i>
Key Findings	<i>App. C-6357</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-6359</i>

Maternal Healthcare and Pregnancy Prevalence and Outcomes in Prisons, 2023 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction	<i>App. C-6385</i>
--------------	--------------------

Pregnancy Testing and Positive Tests Among Female Admissions	
<i>App. C-6385</i>	
Pregnancy Prevalence in Custody and Outcomes of Pregnancies by	
Type	<i>App. C-6386</i>
Pregnancy-Related Training for Staff, Emergency Transportation Protocols,	
and Medical Services	<i>App. C-6386</i>
Accommodations and Support Services for Pregnant and Postpartum	
Women in Custody	<i>App. C-6386</i>
Residential Units for Mothers and Babies	<i>App. C-6387</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-6387</i>

HIV in Prisons, 2023 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction	<i>App. C-6399</i>
Highlights	<i>App. C-6399</i>
About this Report	<i>App. C-6400</i>
HIV Among Persons in State and Federal Prison	<i>App. C-6400</i>
HIV Testing During Intake Process	<i>App. C-6400</i>
HIV Testing While in Custody	<i>App. C-6400</i>
HIV Testing During Discharge Planning	<i>App. C-6401</i>
Data Tables	<i>App. C-6401</i>
Methodology	<i>App. C-6401</i>

APPENDIX D

Jail Inmate Statistics

Census of Local Jails 1988 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction	<i>App. D-57</i>
The 1988 Census of Local Jails	<i>App. D-58</i>
Jails Require a Greater Reserve of Bed Space Than Prisons	<i>App. D-59</i>
The South Led the Increase in Local Jail Population	<i>App. D-59</i>
Percentage of Women in Jail Increased	<i>App. D-59</i>
Percentage of Juveniles in Adult Jails Declined	<i>App. D-60</i>
Average Daily Jail Population Rose Markedly	<i>App. D-60</i>
White Inmates Outnumbered Blacks by a Small Margin	<i>App. D-60</i>
Percentages of Unconvicted and Convicted Inmates Were Unchanged	
<i>App. D-60</i>	
Admissions and Releases Increased	<i>App. D-61</i>
Most Jail Detentions Lasted a Few Days	<i>App. D-61</i>
The Number of Jail Deaths Relative to Releases Was Unchanged from	
1983	<i>App. D-61</i>
The Number of Facilities Decreased Slightly	<i>App. D-62</i>
Most Jails Were Small	<i>App. D-62</i>

A Majority of Inmates Were Held in Medium or Large Capacity Jails	
<i>App. D-62</i>	
Nearly Two of Every Five Bed Spaces Were Added Between 1978 and	
1988	<i>App. D-63</i>
Occupancy Exceeded Rated Capacity	<i>App. D-63</i>
One in Every Eight Inmates Were Being Held for Other Correctional	
Authorities	<i>App. D-63</i>
Most Jails Charged Fees to Hold Inmates for Other Authorities	
<i>App. D-64</i>	
Courts Had Ordered One of Every Eight Jails to Limit Population or	
Improve Conditions	<i>App. D-64</i>
Staff Growth Kept Pace with Inmate Increase	<i>App. D-64</i>
Sex and Race/Ethnicity Representation of Staff Differed from That of	
Inmates	<i>App. D-65</i>
Inmate-to-Staff Ratio Rose Among All Occupational Groups Except	
Correctional Officers	<i>App. D-65</i>
Annual Jail Spending Exceeded \$4.5 Billion in 1988	<i>App. D-65</i>
Methodology	<i>App. D-66</i>
Notes	<i>App. D-85</i>

Population Density in Local Jails, 1988 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction	<i>App. D-87</i>
The 1988 Census of Local Jails	<i>App. D-88</i>
Inmates, Housing, and Staff in Local Jails	<i>App. D-89</i>
Population Density in Local Jails	<i>App. D-90</i>
Spatial and Social Density in Local Jails	<i>App. D-92</i>
Spatial Density Categories	<i>App. D-93</i>
Social Density Categories	<i>App. D-93</i>
Jail Size and Density Measures	<i>App. D-93</i>
Spatial Density and Occupancy	<i>App. D-94</i>
Jail Suicides and Population Density	<i>App. D-94</i>
Spatial Density and Jail Size	<i>App. D-94</i>
Social Density and Jail Size	<i>App. D-94</i>
Methodology	<i>App. D-95</i>
Notes	<i>App. D-108</i>

Profile of Jail Inmates, 1989 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction	<i>App. D-123</i>
Local Jails	<i>App. D-125</i>
Detention Status	<i>App. D-125</i>
Characteristics of Jail Inmates	<i>App. D-125</i>
Current Offenses	<i>App. D-126</i>
Criminal Justice Status at Arrest	<i>App. D-127</i>

Prior Sentences and Criminal Histories	<i>App. D-128</i>
Sentence Length	<i>App. D-129</i>
Time Served	<i>App. D-129</i>
Drug and Alcohol Use	<i>App. D-130</i>
Treatment for Drug and Alcohol Abuse	<i>App. D-131</i>
Family Background	<i>App. D-131</i>
Physical and Sexual Abuse	<i>App. D-132</i>
Mental Health Problems	<i>App. D-132</i>
Methodology	<i>App. D-132</i>
Sample Design	<i>App. D-132</i>
Accuracy of the Estimates	<i>App. D-133</i>
Self-Reported Information	<i>App. D-134</i>

Jail Inmates 1990 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction	<i>App. D-151</i>
One-Day Counts	<i>App. D-152</i>
Average Daily Population	<i>App. D-152</i>
Adult Conviction Status	<i>App. D-152</i>
Demographic Characteristics	<i>App. D-153</i>
Population Movement	<i>App. D-153</i>
Occupancy	<i>App. D-153</i>
Characteristics of Jurisdictions with Large Jail Populations	<i>App. D-153</i>
Twenty-Five Largest Jail Jurisdictions	<i>App. D-154</i>
Inmate Deaths	<i>App. D-154</i>
Methodology	<i>App. D-155</i>
Sampling Error	<i>App. D-156</i>
Measures of Population	<i>App. D-156</i>
Juveniles	<i>App. D-156</i>

Drugs and Jail Inmates, 1989 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction	<i>App. D-165</i>
The 1989 Survey of Inmates in Local Jails	<i>App. D-166</i>
Inmates in Jail with Drug Charges	<i>App. D-166</i>
Characteristics of Inmates Charged with Drug Offenses	<i>App. D-167</i>
Sentences	<i>App. D-168</i>
Criminal Histories	<i>App. D-169</i>
Prior Drug Use by Jail Inmates	<i>App. D-169</i>
Characteristics of Drug Users	<i>App. D-170</i>
Parental Abuse of Drugs and Alcohol	<i>App. D-171</i>
First Use of Drugs and First Arrest	<i>App. D-171</i>
Drug Use and Family Background	<i>App. D-172</i>

Drug Use by Inmates Who Had Been Physically or Sexually Abused	
<i>App. D-172</i>	
Drug-Related Crime	<i>App. D-172</i>
Drug Use at the Time of the Offense	<i>App. D-173</i>
Alcohol and Drugs	<i>App. D-173</i>
Current Offense and Drug Use	<i>App. D-173</i>
Participation in Drug Treatment Programs	<i>App. D-174</i>
Jail Inmates Who Had Used Cocaine or Crack, 1989	<i>App. D-174</i>
How Many Jail Inmates Used Cocaine or Crack in the Month Before Their Arrest?	<i>App. D-174</i>
What Are the Characteristics of Inmates Who Used Cocaine or Crack in the Month Before Their Offense?	<i>App. D-175</i>
Methodology	<i>App. D-177</i>
Sample Design	<i>App. D-177</i>
Accuracy of the Estimates	<i>App. D-177</i>
Self-Reported Information	<i>App. D-178</i>
Notes	<i>App. D-193</i>

Women in Jail 1989 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of
Justice*

Introduction	<i>App. D-211</i>
Growth in the Female Jail Population	<i>App. D-212</i>
Characteristics of Female Inmates	<i>App. D-213</i>
Current Offense	<i>App. D-214</i>
Detention Status	<i>App. D-215</i>
Sentence Length	<i>App. D-215</i>
Criminal Justice Status at Arrest	<i>App. D-216</i>
Criminal History	<i>App. D-216</i>
Violent Female Inmates and Their Victims	<i>App. D-217</i>
Drug Use	<i>App. D-217</i>
Alcohol Abuse and Treatment	<i>App. D-218</i>
Mothers in Jail	<i>App. D-219</i>
Family Background	<i>App. D-219</i>
Physical and Sexual Abuse	<i>App. D-220</i>
How Sentenced Jail Inmates Used Their Time, 1989	<i>App. D-220</i>
Characteristics of Jails Holding Female Inmates, 1988 Census of Local Jails	<i>App. D-222</i>
Methodology	<i>App. D-224</i>
Sample Design	<i>App. D-225</i>
Accuracy of the Estimates	<i>App. D-225</i>
Self-Reported Information	<i>App. D-226</i>

Profile of Jail Inmates 1996 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States
Department of Justice*

Introduction	<i>App. D-305</i>
Highlights	<i>App. D-305</i>

The Survey of Inmates in Local Jails, 1996 *App. D-306*
Two-Thirds of Jail Inmates Were Convicted on Their Arrest Offense or Still
Serving a Prior Sentence *App. D-307*
Jails Held 12% of Inmates for Other Authorities *App. D-307*
An Increasing Percentage of the Jail Population Was Female
App. D-307
6 in 10 Jail Inmates Were Racial or Ethnic Minorities *App. D-307*
Middle-Aged Inmates Comprised a Growing Part of the Jail Population
App. D-307
1 in 3 Jail Inmates Were Not Working Before Their Arrest
App. D-308
1 in 5 Jail Inmates Received Government Payments *App. D-309*
Unchanged From 1989, 22% Were in Jail for Drug Offense
App. D-309
Unconvicted Inmates Were More Likely Than Convicted Inmates to be in
Jail for Serious Offenses *App. D-310*
Offenses Vary Among Men and Women; Blacks, Whites, and Hispanics; and
by Age Group *App. D-310*
54% of Jail Inmates Already Had a Criminal Justice Status When
Arrested *App. D-311*
Three-Quarters of Jail Inmates Had Served Prior Sentences
App. D-311
44% of Inmates Had Current or Past Violent Offenses; 14% Had Only
Drug Offenses *App. D-312*
Criminal Histories Differ Among Inmate Groups *App. D-312*
Among Sentenced Jail Inmates—Half Would Serve Less Than 6 Months
From Admission *App. D-313*
Reported Drug Use Rose Between 1989 and 1996 *App. D-313*
62% of Convicted Jail Inmates Reported They Consumed Alcohol
Regularly *App. D-314*
6 in 10 Convicted Jail Inmates Were Using Alcohol or Drugs at the Time of
the Offense *App. D-315*
Nearly Two-Thirds of Jail Inmates Said They Had Driven After Consuming
Alcohol or Drugs *App. D-316*
After Entering Jail, 1 in 6 of the Active Drug Users Had Participated in
Treatment or Self-Help Program *App. D-316*
6 in 10 Inmates Grew Up Living in Homes Without Both Parents
App. D-317
Nearly Half of all Female Inmates Reported Past Physical or Sexual
Abuse *App. D-317*
Over a Third of Jail Inmates Reported a Physical or Mental Disability
App. D-318
Almost Half of Jail Inmates Had Received a Medical Examination After
Admission *App. D-318*
A Quarter of Inmates Had Received Treatment for a Mental or Emotional
Problem *App. D-318*
1 in 4 Jail Inmates Had a Work Assignment *App. D-319*

14% of Inmates Had Been in a Fight, Hit, or Punched Since Entering Jail	<i>App. D-319</i>
Methodology	<i>App. D-319</i>
Sample Design	<i>App. D-320</i>
Accuracy of the Survey Estimates	<i>App. D-320</i>
Information From Inmate Interviews	<i>App. D-321</i>
Measurement	<i>App. D-322</i>
Blood Alcohol Concentration	<i>App. D-322</i>
 Federal Pretrial Release and Detention, 1996 <i>Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice</i>	
Highlights	<i>App. D-347</i>
Introduction	<i>App. D-348</i>
Recommendations to the Court	<i>App. D-348</i>
Federal Pretrial Release and Detention Practices	<i>App. D-349</i>
Decisions to Release or Detain Pending Trial	<i>App. D-349</i>
Pretrial Practices Across Federal Judicial Districts	<i>App. D-350</i>
Characteristics of Defendants Detained Following a Federal Detention Hearing	<i>App. D-350</i>
Statutorily Prescribed Factors	<i>App. D-351</i>
Offense Charged	<i>App. D-351</i>
Defendant Characteristics	<i>App. D-352</i>
Criminal History	<i>App. D-352</i>
History of Pretrial Misconduct	<i>App. D-353</i>
Community Ties	<i>App. D-353</i>
Threat to the Community	<i>App. D-354</i>
Demographic Characteristics	<i>App. D-355</i>
Methodology	<i>App. D-356</i>
Data Sources	<i>App. D-356</i>
Notes	<i>App. D-357</i>
 DWI Offenders Under Correctional Supervision <i>Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice</i>	
Introduction	<i>App. D-385</i>
Highlights	<i>App. D-386</i>
Arrests for Driving Under the Influence of Alcohol or Drugs (DUI) Have Been Generally Declining Since 1986	<i>App. D-387</i>
Most States Report a Decline in DUI Arrest Rates	<i>App. D-388</i>
Average DUI Arrest Rate Higher in States with a .08 g/dl Legal Blood Alcohol Concentration (BAC) Limit Than in States with a .10 g/dl Limit	<i>App. D-389</i>
The Number of DWI Offenders Under Correctional Supervision Nearly Doubled Between 1986 and 1997	<i>App. D-389</i>
DWI Offenders Serving Time in Jail Had an Average Sentence of 11 Months	<i>App. D-390</i>

Nearly a Third of DWI Offenders on Probation Had Served Time in Jail or in Prison for Their Current DWI Offense *App. D-390*

All DWI Offenders on Probation Had at Least One Condition to Their Sentence *App. D-391*

A Third of DWI Offenders on Probation and Nearly Two-Thirds of Those Incarcerated Reported Prior DWI Sentences *App. D-391*

Over Half of DWI Offenders in Jail Were on Probation, Parole, or Pretrial Release at Time of New Offense *App. D-392*

DWI Offenders Were Older, Better Educated, and More Commonly White and Male *App. D-393*

Females Account for a Growing Number of DWI Offenders in Jails *App. D-393*

Over a Third of Convicted DWI Offenders in Jail Consumed 7 or More Ounces of Ethanol Prior to Their Arrest *App. D-394*

About Half of the DWI Offenders Who Reported Drinking Prior to Arrest Consumed Beer Only *App. D-395*

DWI Offenders on Probation Drank for Fewer Hours and Consumed Less Ethanol Than Those in Jail *App. D-395*

BAC Levels Were Higher Among DWI Offenders in Jail Than Among Those on Probation *App. D-396*

Nearly 1 in 3 DWI Offenders on Probation and 2 in 5 in Jail Reported Drinking Daily *App. D-396*

Over a Third of DWI Offenders on Probation and Nearly Half in Jail Exhibited Signs of Past Alcohol Dependence *App. D-397*

DWI Offenders Reported More Alcohol-Related Troubles Than Other Offenders *App. D-397*

DWI Offenders Who Consumed Greater Amounts of Ethanol Reported More Signs of Alcohol Dependence *App. D-397*

High Levels of Past Drug Use Reported by DWI Offenders *App. D-398*

About Two-Thirds of DWI Probationers and Jail Inmates Had Ever Received Any Alcohol/Drug Treatment *App. D-398*

DWI Offenders Who Exhibited the Greatest Need More Frequently Reported Receiving Treatment *App. D-399*

About 1 in 7 DWI Offenders on Probation and 1 in 5 in Jail Reported Ever Receiving Mental Health Treatment *App. D-400*

Methodology *App. D-401*

Data Sources *App. D-401*

Accuracy of the Estimates *App. D-401*

Estimating the Number of DWI Offenders Under Correctional Supervision *App. D-402*

Measuring Sentence Length *App. D-402*

Estimating Ounces of Ethanol Consumed *App. D-402*

Calculating BAC Levels *App. D-403*

Drug Use, Testing and Treatment in Jails	<i>Bureau of Justice Statistics,</i>
<i>United States Department of Justice</i>	
Introduction	<i>App. D-429</i>
Highlights	<i>App. D-431</i>
Jail Inmates Reported High Levels of Drug Involvement	<i>App. D-432</i>
Actively Drug-Involved Jail Inmates Younger and More Likely to Be Black Than Other Inmates	<i>App. D-432</i>
Jails Emphasized Testing to Control Drug Use	<i>App. D-433</i>
Half of All Inmates Were in Jails That Tested for Drug Use	<i>App. D-433</i>
69% of Jurisdictions Test Inmates Mainly on Indication of Use	<i>App. D-434</i>
Over Two-Thirds of the Jails That Tested Inmates Had at Least One Positive Test	<i>App. D-434</i>
10% of Tests Conducted in June 1998 Were Positive for One or More Drugs	<i>App. D-434</i>
Most Jurisdictions Take Away Inmate Privileges for a Positive Test Result	<i>App. D-435</i>
70% of Jail Jurisdictions Tested All Staff; 20%, New Employees Only	<i>App. D-436</i>
Most Jail Employees Are Tested at Random	<i>App. D-437</i>
In 7 in 10 Jail Jurisdictions a Positive Test Was Grounds for Dismissal	<i>App. D-437</i>
Self-Help Programs Like Alcoholics Anonymous or Narcotics Anonymous Common in Jails	<i>App. D-438</i>
Large Jails Had Three-Quarters of the Total Capacity for Substance Abuse Treatment	<i>App. D-438</i>
92,600 Inmates Participated in Drug or Alcohol Programs or Treatment	<i>App. D-438</i>
61% of Inmates Who Had Used Drugs at the Time of the Offense Had Received Treatment in the Past	<i>App. D-439</i>
Methodology	<i>App. D-439</i>
Survey of Inmates in Local Jails	<i>App. D-439</i>
Annual Survey of Jails	<i>App. D-440</i>

Jails in Indian Country, 2000	<i>Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States</i>
<i>Department of Justice</i>	
Introduction	<i>App. D-483</i>
Tribes Retain Jurisdiction Over Many Crimes by American Indians and Alaska Natives in Indian Country	<i>App. D-483</i>
On June 30, 2000, Jails in Indian Country Supervised 1,799 Persons	<i>App. D-485</i>
Juveniles Accounted for Nearly 16% of Inmates in Custody	<i>App. D-485</i>
90% of Confined Inmates Held For Misdemeanors; 15% for DWI/DUI	<i>App. D-485</i>

From 1999 to 2000, Admissions Declined 12%, and Discharges, 7%
App. D-485

On June 30, 2000, 24 Persons Under Community Supervision, Down From
72 the Previous Year *App. D-486*

The 10 Largest Jails Housed 45% of Inmates in Indian Country
App. D-486

Indian Country Jails Operated at 118% of Capacity on Peak Day in June
2000, Up From 111% in 1999 *App. D-487*

Medium-Sized Facilities Reported the Highest Occupancy Rates on Their
Peak Day in June 2000 *App. D-487*

11 Jail Facilities in Indian Country Under a Court Order or Consent Decree
on June 30, 2000 *App. D-488*

Methodology *App. D-488*

**Substance Dependence, Abuse, and Treatment of Jail Inmates,
2002** *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction *App. D-587*

68% of Jail Inmates Met Substance Dependence or Abuse Criteria
App. D-587

Over Half of All Female Jail Inmates Reported Substance Dependence
App. D-588

White and Middle Age Inmates Had Relatively Higher Rates of Substance
Dependence or Abuse *App. D-588*

Substance Dependence or Abuse More Prevalent Among Drug or Property
Offenders *App. D-589*

Half of Inmates Who Met Criteria of Dependence or Abuse Had a Family
Member Who Had Served Time *App. D-589*

Prior Criminal Record Linked to Substance Dependence or Abuse
App. D-590

Alcohol Use at Offense Declined Between 1996 and 2002 *App. D-590*

Regular Drug Use Rose Between 1996 and 2002; Use at Offense
Declined *App. D-591*

Women and White Inmates More Likely to Have Used Drugs at
Offense *App. D-591*

Younger Inmates Had Higher Rates of Dependence or Abuse of Drugs;
Middle-Age Inmates, of Alcohol *App. D-592*

Over Half of Inmates Convicted of Robbery, Burglary, or Drug Offenses
Were Under the Influence At Offense *App. D-593*

16% of Convicted Jail Inmates Committed the Offense to Get Money for
Drugs *App. D-593*

Three-Quarters of Inmates in Jail For Drug Or Property Offenses Met
Dependence or Abuse Criteria *App. D-594*

6 in 10 Substance Dependent or Abusing Inmates Had Participated in
Substance Treatment or Programs *App. D-594*

Participation in Substance Treatment or Programs Linked to
Dependence *App. D-595*

Participation in Treatment or Other Programs While Under Correctional Supervision Rose Between 1996 and 2002	<i>App. D-595</i>
1 in 6 Inmates Using Alcohol at the Time of the Offense Participated in Treatment/Programs After Admission	<i>App. D-596</i>
1 in 5 Inmates Who Used Drugs at Time of the Offense Participated in Treatment or Programs After Admission	<i>App. D-596</i>
Substance Dependent or Abusing Women, Whites More Likely to Participate in Treatment or Programs	<i>App. D-597</i>
Methodology	<i>App. D-597</i>

Medical Problems of Jail Inmates *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction	<i>App. D-617</i>
22% of Jail Inmates Reported One Medical Problem; 14%, Two or More	<i>App. D-618</i>
Medical Problems were Highest Among Female and Older Inmates	<i>App. D-618</i>
About 1 in 8 Jail Inmates Reported Currently Having Arthritis	<i>App. D-618</i>
Women Most Likely to Report Cervical Cancer, Men Skin Cancer	<i>App. D-618</i>
Heart Valve Damage was the Most Commonly Reported Heart Problem	<i>App. D-619</i>
Prevalence of a Medical Problem Did Not Change with Time Served	<i>App. D-620</i>
More Than a Third of Jail Inmates Reported an Impairment	<i>App. D-620</i>
Females Most Likely to Report a Physical or Mental Impairment, Males a Learning Impairment	<i>App. D-620</i>
More Than 40% of Inmates Age 45 or Older Reported an Impairment	<i>App. D-621</i>
15% of Jail Inmates had 2 or More Impairments	<i>App. D-621</i>
Around 1 in 8 Jail Inmates Reported Being Injured Since Admission to Jail	<i>App. D-621</i>
Injuries Highest Among Male and Younger Inmates	<i>App. D-621</i>
Violent Offenders had Higher Rates of Fight-Related Injuries	<i>App. D-622</i>
Inmates with an Impairment had Higher Rates of Injuries	<i>App. D-622</i>
Likelihood of Injury Increased with Time Served in Jail	<i>App. D-623</i>
Health-Related Problems More Common Among Homeless or Unemployed Inmates	<i>App. D-624</i>
Medical Problems Common Among Inmates with a History of Drug Use or Dependence	<i>App. D-624</i>
Methodology	<i>App. D-625</i>

Jail Inmates at Midyear 2010 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States**Department of Justice*Introduction *App. D-915*Population Decline was Mostly Concentrated in Large Jails
*App. D-915*Six Jail Jurisdictions Account for Nearly Half of the Decline in Jail
Population *App. D-916*Capacity to Hold Inmates Continues to Increase at Slower Rate
*App. D-916*Local Jails Admitted Almost 13 Million Persons During the 12 Months
Ending June 30, 2010 *App. D-917*Methodology *App. D-917***Jails in Indian Country, 2010** *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States**Department of Justice*Introduction *App. D-937*The Number of Operating Jails in Indian Country Increased Between 2004
and 2010 *App. D-937*On an Average Day in June, the Percentage of Occupied Bed Space
Decreased from 71% to 67% *App. D-938*Fourteen Jails Held More than Half of all Inmates *App. D-938*Jails Holding 50 or More Inmates Reported Stability in Their Use of Jail
Space in June 2010 *App. D-939*Fifteen Jails were Operating at More than 50% Over Capacity on Their
Most Crowded Day in June 2010 *App. D-940*Jail Admissions Increased in Indian Country Jails *App. D-940*Attempted Suicides in Indian Country Jails Declined *App. D-941*The Share of Inmates Held for a Violent Offense Declined
*App. D-941*The Number of Jail Operations Staff Increased *App. D-942*Methodology *App. D-942*

Table of Contents

Volume Seven

APPENDIX D

Jail Inmate Statistics (continued)

Jails in Indian Country, 2015	<i>Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice</i>
Introduction	<i>App. D-1157</i>
Jails Operating in Indian Country Increased from 68 Facilities in 2004 to 76 in 2015	<i>App. D-1157</i>
Occupied Bed Space Declined from 86% of Rated Capacity in 2000 to 66% in 2015	<i>App. D-1158</i>
The Largest Jails Accounted for 26% of All Facilities and Held Nearly 60% of All Inmates in Indian Country Jails	<i>App. D-1158</i>
The Expected Average Length of Stay in Indian Country Jails Increased By a Day	<i>App. D-1158</i>
An Estimated 30% of Inmates Were Held for a Violent Offense Each Year in the Previous 5 Years	<i>App. D-1159</i>
The Number of Correctional Staff Increased Since 2010	<i>App. D-1159</i>
Two Reported Deaths Occurred in Indian Country Jails in the 12-Month Period Ending June 30, 2015	<i>App. D-1160</i>
Methodology	<i>App. D-1160</i>

Jail Inmates in 2015	<i>Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice</i>
Introduction	<i>App. D-1187</i>
Juvenile Population in Adult Jails Continued to Decline	<i>App. D-1187</i>
Nearly 7 in 10 Inmates Were Held in Jail for a Felony Offense	<i>App. D-1188</i>

Jail Jurisdictions with 2,500 or more Inmates Held 21% of the Population in 2015, Down from 25% in 2014 *App. D-1188*
 Bed Space Increased Between 2008 and 2015, While Jail Population Decreased *App. D-1188*
 The Smallest Jail Jurisdictions Turn Over Inmates Three Times Faster Than the Largest Jails *App. D-1189*
 Jail Staff Supervised an Additional 57,100 Persons in Various Community Programs Outside of Jail *App. D-1189*
 Methodology *App. D-1190*

American Indian and Alaska Natives in Local Jails, 1999-2014

Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice

Introduction *App. D-1255*
 The Number of AIANs Held in Local Jails Nearly Doubled from 1999 to 2014 *App. D-1255*
 The Majority of AIAN Jail Inmates Were Held in the Midwest and West *App. D-1256*
 About 22% of Jails Held at Least One AIAN Inmate *App. D-1256*
 A Small Number of Inmates Were Held for Tribal Authorities *App. D-1257*
 The AIAN Jail Incarceration Rate Continued to Increase *App. D-1257*
 An Estimated 71% of Adult AIAN Jail Inmates Were Age 39 or Younger in 2011 *App. D-1258*
 The Number of Jail Inmates Reporting Partial AIAN Race was Six Times Greater than Persons Reporting Sole AIAN Race *App. D-1258*
 Methodology *App. D-1259*

Mortality in Local Jails, 2000-2019

Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice

Introduction *App. D-1541*
 Cause of Death in Jail Inmates in 2019 *App. D-1542*
 Mortality Rates in 2019 *App. D-1542*
 Demographic and Criminal Justice Characteristics of Jail Decedents *App. D-1543*
 Local Jail Mortality Rates by Demographic and Criminal Justice Characteristics *App. D-1543*
 Total Deaths in Local Jails, 2000-19 *App. D-1543*
 Average Annual Mortality Rates, 2000-19 *App. D-1543*
 Time Between Jail Admission and Death *App. D-1544*
 Location of Jail Deaths *App. D-1544*
 Jail Deaths by Hold-Status and Jurisdiction Size *App. D-1544*
 Jurisdictions With and Without Jail Deaths *App. D-1545*
 Methodology *App. D-1545*

Census of Jails, 2005-2019

Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice

Introduction *App. D-1625*
 Key Findings *App. D-1626*

Distribution of Local Jail Populations	<i>App. D-1626</i>
Demographic Characteristics of Local Jail Inmates	<i>App. D-1626</i>
Conviction Status and Offense Seriousness of Local Jail Inmates	<i>App. D-1626</i>
Probation and Parole Violations of Local Jail Inmates	<i>App. D-1627</i>
Jail Inmates Held for Federal, State, and Tribal Correctional Authorities	<i>App. D-1627</i>
Admissions and Average Time in Jail	<i>App. D-1627</i>
Capacity of Local Jails	<i>App. D-1628</i>
Functions of Local Jails	<i>App. D-1628</i>
Correctional Officers Employed in Local Jails	<i>App. D-1628</i>
Characteristics of the Federal Bureau of Prisons' Detention Facilities and Inmates	<i>App. D-1628</i>
Methodology	<i>App. D-1629</i>

Jails in Indian Country, 2021, and the Impact of COVID-19, July-December 2020

Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice

Introduction	<i>App. D-1677</i>
The Largest Facilities Experienced the Greatest Increase in Their Midyear Populations from 2020 to 2021	<i>App. D-1677</i>
Admissions to Indian Country Jails Increased 8% from June 2020 to June 2021	<i>App. D-1678</i>
About Half of Jail Beds in Indian Country were Occupied at Midyear 2021	<i>App. D-1678</i>
More Inmates were Held for Violent (up 6%) and Nonviolent (up 10%) Offenses at Midyear 2021 than at Midyear 2020	<i>App. D-1678</i>
Indian Country Jails Reported One Death During the 12 Months Ending June 30, 2021	<i>App. D-1679</i>
About 6% of COVID-19 Tests Conducted on Inmates from July to December 2020 Were Positive	<i>App. D-1680</i>
From July to December 2020, About 1 in 5 Inmates Received Expedited Release in Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic	<i>App. D-1680</i>
The Number of Staff in Indian Country Jails Continued to Decline	<i>App. D-1680</i>
Nearly 1 in 5 Jail Staff Tested Positive for COVID-19 from July To December 2020	<i>App. D-1680</i>
Methodology	<i>App. D-1681</i>

Jails in Indian Country, 2023

Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice

Introduction	<i>App. D-1797</i>
The Monthly Inmate Population Fluctuated Between June 2022 and June 2023	<i>App. D-1797</i>
The Largest Jails Accounted for Nearly 4 in 10 Jails and 7 in 10 Inmates	<i>App. D-1798</i>

- June Admissions to Indian Country Jails Fell by Nearly Half From 2013 to 2023 *App. D-1798*
- The Largest Jails Accounted for Over Half of All Admissions in June 2023 *App. D-1798*
- Nearly 6 in 10 Jail Beds in Indian Country Were Occupied at Midyear 2023 *App. D-1798*
- Persons Held for Violent Offenses Increased 24% from Midyear 2013 to Midyear 2023 *App. D-1799*
- About 4 in 10 Inmates Were Held for Violent Offenses at Midyear 2023, Up from About 3 in 10 at Midyear 2013 *App. D-1799*
- The Share of Inmates Not Convicted Rose From 44% at Midyear 2013 to 54% at Midyear 2023 *App. D-1800*
- The Share of Female Inmates Increased from 24% at Midyear 2013 to 27% at Midyear 2023 *App. D-1800*
- Indian Country Jails Reported Nine Deaths in Custody During the 12 Months Ending on June 30, 2023 *App. D-1801*
- The Number of Staff in Indian Country Jails Continued to Decline *App. D-1801*
- Methodology *App. D-1801*

Jail Inmates in 2023

Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice

- Introduction *App. D-1821*
- Highlights *App. D-1821*
- About this Report *App. D-1822*
- Demographic Characteristics of Inmates *App. D-1822*
- Jail Incarceration Rates *App. D-1822*
- Conviction Status and Offense Characteristics *App. D-1823*
- Persons Held for Federal, State, or Tribal Authorities *App. D-1823*
- Average Daily Population, Admissions, and Average Time in Jail *App. D-1823*
- Capacity and Staffing *App. D-1824*
- Persons Supervised Outside Jail and Those Serving Weekend Sentences *App. D-1824*
- Data Tables *App. D-1824*
- Terms and Definitions *App. D-1825*
- Methodology *App. D-1826*

APPENDIX E

Probation and Parole Statistics

Probation and Parole 1985 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

- Introduction *App. E-17*
- Probation *App. E-17*

Parole	<i>App. E-18</i>
Adults Under Correctional Supervision	<i>App. E-18</i>
Probation Notes	<i>App. E-18</i>
Parole Notes	<i>App. E-19</i>
 Recidivism of Felons on Probation, 1986-89 <i>Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice</i>	
Preface	<i>App. E-83</i>
Introduction	<i>App. E-84</i>
Probation Defined	<i>App. E-84</i>
Types of Probation Sentences	<i>App. E-85</i>
Eligibility for Probation	<i>App. E-86</i>
State Probation Sentences Nationwide, 1986	<i>App. E-86</i>
The Probation Department's Role in Deciding Who Gets Probation	<i>App. E-87</i>
Probation Conditions Imposed	<i>App. E-88</i>
Financial Penalties Imposed	<i>App. E-88</i>
Felony Arrests and Disciplinary Hearings for Probationers	<i>App. E-89</i>
Felony Arrest Offenses	<i>App. E-91</i>
Compliance with the Conditions of Supervision	<i>App. E-92</i>
The Effect of Drug Testing and Treatment in Reducing New Arrests	<i>App. E-93</i>
The Effect of Intensive Supervision in Reducing New Arrests	<i>App. E-94</i>
What Happened to Probationers After Felony Arrest	<i>App. E-95</i>
Probation Status 3 Years Later	<i>App. E-95</i>
Methodology	<i>App. E-96</i>
Data Sources	<i>App. E-96</i>
Sampling Design	<i>App. E-97</i>
Sampling Error	<i>App. E-97</i>
Period of Follow-up	<i>App. E-97</i>
Missing Data	<i>App. E-98</i>
Notes	<i>App. E-106</i>
 Probation and Parole Violators in State Prison, 1991 <i>Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice</i>	
Introduction	<i>App. E-107</i>
Highlights	<i>App. E-107</i>
Criminal Justice Status Defined	<i>App. E-108</i>
Reason for Imprisonment: New Conviction or Technical Violation	<i>App. E-110</i>
Trends in Probation and Parole Violators in State Prisons	<i>App. E-111</i>
Reasons for Imprisoning Technical Violators	<i>App. E-111</i>
Current Commitment Offense	<i>App. E-113</i>
Demographic Characteristics	<i>App. E-113</i>

Criminal History	<i>App. E-114</i>
Time Periods Served Defined	<i>App. E-115</i>
Prior Conviction Offense That Resulted in Probation or Parole	<i>App. E-115</i>
Time on Probation or Parole Prior to Being Sent to Prison	<i>App. E-115</i>
Expected Time to Serve in Prison	<i>App. E-116</i>
Current Conviction Offense Versus Prior Conviction Offense That Resulted in Probation or Parole	<i>App. E-116</i>
Criminal Justice Status at Time of Offense	<i>App. E-117</i>
Characteristics of Offenses Committed While on Probation or Parole	<i>App. E-119</i>
Drug and Alcohol Use	<i>App. E-120</i>
Weapons	<i>App. E-121</i>
Methodology	<i>App. E-121</i>
Sample Design	<i>App. E-122</i>
Accuracy of the Estimates	<i>App. E-122</i>
Self-Reported Information	<i>App. E-123</i>
Notes	<i>App. E-142</i>

Characteristics of Adults on Probation, 1995	<i>Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice</i>
Introduction	<i>App. E-143</i>
Highlights	<i>App. E-143</i>
Survey of Adults on Probation, 1995	<i>App. E-145</i>
Nearly 2 of 5 Probationers Convicted of a Violent or Drug Offense	<i>App. E-146</i>
Felons More Than Half of All Adults on Probation	<i>App. E-146</i>
Women and Non-Hispanic Whites Make Up Comparatively High Percentages of Adult Probationers	<i>App. E-147</i>
Types of Offenses Vary Among Men and Women and Blacks, Whites, and Hispanics on Probation	<i>App. E-147</i>
DWI Accounts for More Than a Quarter of Probationers Over Age 44	<i>App. E-148</i>
Half of All Probationers Have at Least One Prior Sentence	<i>App. E-148</i>
Violent Offenders On Probation the Least Likely To Have a Prior Sentence	<i>App. E-148</i>
Presentence Investigations Focus on the Most Serious Offenders	<i>App. E-149</i>
4 Out of 5 Probationers with a PSI Recommended for Probation	<i>App. E-149</i>
Half of Sentences Split Between Incarceration and Supervision	<i>App. E-149</i>
Repeat Offenders More Likely To Be Incarcerated	<i>App. E-150</i>
More Than a Third of Probationers Also Serve Jail or Prison Time	<i>App. E-150</i>

82% of Probationers Given 3 or More Conditions on Sentence <i>App. E-151</i>
Majority Pay Supervision Fees <i>App. E-151</i>
More Than 2 of 5 Adults on Probation Required To Receive Treatment for Alcohol or Drug Abuse <i>App. E-151</i>
Nearly Three-Quarters Contacted by a Probation Officer in Last 30 Days <i>App. E-152</i>
More Than a Third of Probationers in Alcohol/Drug Treatment Program <i>App. E-152</i>
18% Faced a Disciplinary Hearing After Entering Probation <i>App. E-153</i>
Disciplinary Hearings More Common Among Unemployed and Those With Prior sentences <i>App. E-154</i>
Failure To Maintain Contact the Most Frequent Reason for Hearing <i>App. E-155</i>
Over 40% Receive New Conditions of Supervision; 29% Incarcerated <i>App. E-155</i>
Methodology <i>App. E-156</i>
Sample Design <i>App. E-156</i>
Accuracy of the Estimates <i>App. E-157</i>
Data on Prior Sentences <i>App. E-157</i>
Sentence Lengths <i>App. E-159</i>

Substances Abuse and Treatment of Adults on Probation, 1995*Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction <i>App. E-177</i>
Highlights <i>App. E-178</i>
Half of Probationers Were Under the Influence of Alcohol or Drugs at the Time of the Offense for Which They Were Convicted <i>App. E-178</i>
While on Probation, 32% Were Treated for Alcohol, 17% for Drugs <i>App. E-178</i>
Probationers Over Half of the Nation's Correctional Population <i>App. E-178</i>
The Survey of Adults on Probation, 1995, the First of Its Kind <i>App. E-179</i>
Almost Half of Probationers Were Under the Influence of Alcohol or Drugs at the Time of Their Offense <i>App. E-180</i>
Over Two-Thirds of Probationers Said They Used Drugs in the Past <i>App. E-181</i>
Responses From a Quarter of Adults on Probation Indicated Past Alcohol Abuse or Dependence <i>App. E-182</i>
Nearly Two-Thirds of Probationers Said They Had Driven While Under the Influence of Drugs or Alcohol <i>App. E-182</i>
Hispanic Probationers Reported the Lowest Levels of Prior Drug Use <i>App. E-183</i>

Prior Drug Use Dropped Dramatically Among Probationers Over Age 45	<i>App. E-183</i>
Over 80% of Probationers with a GED Reported Past Drug Use	<i>App. E-184</i>
Two-Thirds of Probationers Can Be Characterized as Alcohol- or Drug-Involved Offenders	<i>App. E-184</i>
While on Probation, Half of Probationers Tested—But Less Than a Fifth Treated—for Drug Abuse	<i>App. E-185</i>
Types of Drug Treatment Varied Little Among Probationers with Differing Severity of Past Drug Use	<i>App. E-186</i>
A Third of All Probationers Received Alcohol Treatment During Probation	<i>App. E-187</i>
Over 80% of Current Drug Users Had Personal Contact with Their Probation Officer in the Past 30 Days	<i>App. E-188</i>
Fewer Than 1 in 7 Current Drug Users on Probation Reported a Prior Drug Offense Sentence	<i>App. E-188</i>
Half of Alcohol- or Drug-Involved Probationers Received Treatment on Their Current Probation Sentence	<i>App. E-189</i>
Methodology	<i>App. E-189</i>

Federal Offenders Under Community Supervision, 1987-96

Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice

Introduction	<i>App. E-215</i>
Highlights	<i>App. E-216</i>
Offenders Supervised	<i>App. E-216</i>
Probation	<i>App. E-217</i>
Post-Incarceration Supervision	<i>App. E-218</i>
Parole	<i>App. E-218</i>
Supervised Release	<i>App. E-218</i>
Special Conditions of Supervision Imposed by the Courts	<i>App. E-218</i>
Community Confinement	<i>App. E-219</i>
Drug Abuse Treatment and Monitoring	<i>App. E-219</i>
Termination of Supervision	<i>App. E-220</i>
Successful Completion of Supervision	<i>App. E-220</i>
Reasons for Unsuccessful Termination of Active Supervision	<i>App. E-220</i>
Length of Revocation Period	<i>App. E-221</i>
Revocation Sentences Imposed	<i>App. E-221</i>
Time Served	<i>App. E-221</i>
Methodology	<i>App. E-222</i>
Data Sources	<i>App. E-222</i>
Notes	<i>App. E-223</i>

Trends in State Parole, 1990-2000

States Department of Justice

Introduction	<i>App. E-257</i>
States Have Reduced the Discretion of Parole Boards in Determining Prison Release	<i>App. E-258</i>

Four States Accounted for Nearly Two-Thirds of the Growth in Parole During the 1990's	<i>App. E-260</i>
Since 1990 Discretionary Releases Have Declined; Mandatory Parole and Expiration of Sentence Releases Have Increased	<i>App. E-260</i>
Growth in Prison Releases Linked to Drug Offenders	<i>App. E-260</i>
Prison Releases Have Served More Time and a Greater Portion of Their Sentence Before Release	<i>App. E-261</i>
Time Served by Released Part 1 Violent Offenders Increased in 33 States Between 1993 and 1999	<i>App. E-262</i>
Inmates Released by Parole Boards Served Longer Than Those Released by Mandatory Parole	<i>App. E-262</i>
Among Discretionary and Mandatory Parole Releases, Black Offenders Served Longer Than Whites	<i>App. E-263</i>
Over Half of Prison Releases had a Prior Incarceration; More Than a Quarter Were Parole Violators	<i>App. E-263</i>
State Parole Entries and Discharges Rose During the 1990's	<i>App. E-264</i>
Re-Releases an Increasing Portion of State Parole Entries	<i>App. E-264</i>
State Parole Entries Older in 1999 Than in 1990	<i>App. E-264</i>
Female Entries to Parole Increased During the 1990's	<i>App. E-265</i>
Parole Success Rates Unchanged Since 1990	<i>App. E-265</i>
Success Rates Highest Among First Releases and Discretionary Parole Releases	<i>App. E-266</i>
Among Parole Discharges, Success Rates Rose for Blacks and Hispanics; Dropped for Whites	<i>App. E-266</i>
Success Rates Highest Among First Releases Serving Less Than 12 Months in Prison	<i>App. E-267</i>
In 1999 Parole Discharges Served an Average of 26 Months Under Supervision, Up From 23 Months in 1990	<i>App. E-267</i>
Number of Parole Violators Returned to Prison Continued to Rise During the 1990's	<i>App. E-267</i>
Nearly a Quarter of State Prisoners in 1997 Were Parole Violators	<i>App. E-268</i>
70% of Parole Violators in Prison in 1997 Returned for a New Offense	<i>App. E-268</i>
Half of Parole Violators Incarcerated in 3 States	<i>App. E-269</i>
Characteristics of Parole Violators Varied Among the 3 Largest States	<i>App. E-269</i>
Methodology	<i>App. E-269</i>
National Corrections Reporting Program	<i>App. E-269</i>
Annual Parole Survey	<i>App. E-270</i>
National Prisoners Statistics	<i>App. E-270</i>
Surveys of Inmates in State and Federal Correctional Facilities, 1991 and 1997	<i>App. E-271</i>

Probation and Parole in the United States, 2000 *Bureau of Justice**Statistics, United States Department of Justice*Summary *App. E-301*National Correctional Population Reaches New High—Grows by
126,400 During 2000 to Total 6.5 Million Adults *App. E-301***Probation and Parole in the United States, 2005** *Bureau of Justice**Statistics, United States Department of Justice*Introduction *App. E-391*Nearly 5 Million Persons on Probation or Parole *App. E-391*Probationers Accounted for Half the Growth in the Correctional Population
Since 1990 *App. E-392*Community Supervision Declined as a Percentage of the Correctional
Population *App. E-392*Correctional Supervision Rate Rose Sharply from 1980 to 2005
*App. E-393*6 of the 10 States with Largest Probation Populations Also Had Large Parole
Populations *App. E-393*9 States Reported an Increase of 5% or More in Their Probation
Population *App. E-394*19,070 Probationers Added in 2005 *App. E-394*Small Growth in Probation Population During 2005 *App. E-394*Growth in Probation Since 1990 Linked to Entries *App. E-395*5 States Accounted for Nearly a Third of the Growth in Probation from
1995 to 2005 *App. E-395*At Yearend 2005 Almost 1 in 4 Probationers Were Female; More Than 1 in
2 Were White *App. E-396*Direct Sentences More Common in 2005 Than 1995 *App. E-396*Half of All Probationers Convicted of a Felony *App. E-396*Success Rates Have Remained Stable Since 1995 *App. E-397*Parole Population Grew by 12,556 During 2005 *App. E-397*Parole Populations Increased in 33 States *App. E-397*State Parole Population Increasing After Stability During the 1990s
*App. E-397*Growth in State Parole Linked to Entries *App. E-398*Discretionary Releases to Parole Supervision Continued to Decline
*App. E-398*Proportion of Females on Parole Increased Between 1995 and 2005
*App. E-399*More Than 8 in 10 Parolees Were Under Active Supervision
*App. E-399*About 4 in 10 Parolees Served a Sentence for a Drug Offense
*App. E-399*Rates of Success for Parolees Have Remained Stable Since 1995
App. E-400

Methodology	<i>App. E-401</i>
Probation	<i>App. E-401</i>
Parole	<i>App. E-401</i>

Characteristics of State Parole Supervising Agencies, 2006

Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice

Overview	<i>App. E-437</i>
Combined Parole and Probation Agencies Supervised 4 Times as Many Offenders on Probation as on Parole	<i>App. E-437</i>
Five Agencies Supervised Half of the Parole Population	<i>App. E-438</i>
State Parole Supervising Agencies Employed Nearly 65,000 Full-Time and 2,900 Part-Time Workers	<i>App. E-438</i>
Average Caseload Was 38 Active Parolees for Each FTE Devoted to Supervision	<i>App. E-439</i>
Two-Thirds of Paroled Offenders Were Required to Meet With a Parole Officer at Least Once a Month	<i>App. E-439</i>
Half of Parole Supervising Agencies Had a Role in Releasing Prisoners to Parole, Setting the Conditions of Supervision, or Conducting Revocation Hearings	<i>App. E-440</i>
Up to 16% of At-Risk Parolees in Some Agencies Were Re-Incarcerated for a Failed Drug Test	<i>App. E-441</i>
Nearly All Agencies Report Use of Drug, Sex Offender, or Mental Health Treatment Programs	<i>App. E-441</i>
2 in 5 Parole Supervising Agencies Operated or Contracted a Housing Service For Paroled Offenders	<i>App. E-442</i>
Half of Parole Supervising Agencies Offered Some Type of Formal Employment Assistance	<i>App. E-442</i>
Methodology	<i>App. E-442</i>

Probation and Parole in the United States, 2010

Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice

Introduction	<i>App. E-627</i>
Community Supervision Population Dropped to the 2004 Level	<i>App. E-628</i>
Rate of Offenders Under Community Supervision at Yearend 2010 Dropped Below the 2000 Level	<i>App. E-629</i>
Five States Accounted for more than Half of the Decline in the Probation Population	<i>App. E-629</i>
Entries onto Probation Were Down for the Third Consecutive Year; Exits Declined for the First Time Since 2006	<i>App. E-630</i>
Offenders on Probation Completed Their Supervision Terms at About the Same Rate in 2010 as in 2009	<i>App. E-630</i>
Rate of Incarceration Among Probationers Remained Steady During the Last Year	<i>App. E-631</i>
Most Characteristics of Probationers Were Unchanged During 2010	<i>App. E-631</i>

U.S. Parole Population Rose During 2010; State Parole Population Dropped for the Second Consecutive Year *App. E-632*

Entries to Parole Exceeded Exits During 2010 as Exits Dropped at a Greater Rate Than Entries *App. E-632*

Mandatory Releases from Prison Were a Smaller Portion of Entries to Parole in 2010 Compared to 2009 *App. E-632*

Parole Completion Rate Increased During 2010, Continuing a Trend Observed Since 2006 *App. E-633*

Rate of Reincarceration Among Parolees Declined During 2010 *App. E-633*

Most Characteristics of Parolees Were Unchanged During 2010 *App. E-634*

Methodology *App. E-634*

Probation: Explanatory Notes *App. E-645*

Parole: Explanatory Notes *App. E-653*

Probation and Parole in the United States, 2015 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction *App. E-745*

The Decline in Community Supervision was Primarily Due to a Decline in the Probation Population *App. E-745*

The Rate of Adults Under Community Supervision Fell to 1,886 Per 100,000 U.S. Adult Residents *App. E-746*

Probation Entries and Exits Each Decreased by More Than 4% in 2015 *App. E-746*

The Exit Rate for Probationers was Consistent with Rates Observed in 2005 *App. E-746*

Probation Population Characteristics Remained Relatively Unchanged During the Last Decade *App. E-747*

U.S. Parole Population Increased 1.5% in 2015 *App. E-747*

The Parole Exit Rate Increased After Five Consecutive Annual Decreases *App. E-747*

Parolees Being Supervised for Drug Offenses Decreased 6 Percentage Points Since 2005 *App. E-747*

Methodology *App. E-748*

Probation: Explanatory Notes *App. E-753*

Parole: Explanatory Notes *App. E-755*

Probation and Parole in the United States, 2022 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction *App. E-931*

Population of Adults on Parole Decreased 6.2% During 2022 *App. E-932*

Probation Population Increased in 28 States and the District of Columbia During 2022 *App. E-932*

During 2022, the Parole Population Decreased in 37 Jurisdictions	
<i>App. E-932</i>	
The Rate of Adults Supervised in the Community Fell for the 15th	
Consecutive Year in 2022	<i>App. E-932</i>
During 2022, Entries to Probation Rose 10.7%	<i>App. E-933</i>
Exits from Parole Exceeded Entries by 46,500 During 2022	
<i>App. E-933</i>	
Percent of Adults on Probation for a Felony Offense Increased from 2012 to	
2022	<i>App. E-933</i>
Methodology	<i>App. E-934</i>

APPENDIX F

Correctional and Detention Facility Statistics

1984 Census of State Adult Correctional Facilities	<i>Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice</i>
Preface	<i>App. F-3</i>
Overview	<i>App. F-4</i>
Confinement Facilities (Prisons)	<i>App. F-4</i>
Security Level	<i>App. F-4</i>
Size of Facility	<i>App. F-5</i>
Sex of Inmates Housed	<i>App. F-5</i>
Facilities and Inmates by Region and State	<i>App. F-6</i>
Occupancy	<i>App. F-6</i>
Court Orders or Consent Decrees	<i>App. F-6</i>
Years Since Original Construction	<i>App. F-6</i>
Inmates	<i>App. F-7</i>
Employees	<i>App. F-7</i>
Expenditures	<i>App. F-8</i>
Methodology	<i>App. F-8</i>
Tables	<i>App. F-9</i>

Census of Local Jails, 1983	<i>Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice</i>
Preface	<i>App. F-63</i>
Selected Findings	<i>App. F-64</i>
Number of Jails and Number of Jail Inmates	<i>App. F-64</i>
Jails Under Court Order	<i>App. F-64</i>
Inmate Deaths	<i>App. F-65</i>
Confinement Unit Use	<i>App. F-65</i>
Planned Changes in Jails	<i>App. F-65</i>
Expenditures	<i>App. F-66</i>
Jail Employees	<i>App. F-66</i>
Inmate Programs	<i>App. F-66</i>

Juveniles	<i>App. F-67</i>
Methodology	<i>App. F-67</i>
Text Tables	<i>App. F-68</i>
Summary Tables by Region and State	<i>App. F-68</i>
Text Tables	<i>App. F-70</i>
Summary Tables	<i>App. F-76</i>

Census of Local Jails, 1988 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States*

Department of Justice

Preface	<i>App. F-115</i>
Selected Findings	<i>App. F-116</i>
Number of Jails and Jail Inmates	<i>App. F-116</i>
Jail Capacity and Court Orders	<i>App. F-117</i>
Inmate Deaths	<i>App. F-118</i>
Confinement Unit Use	<i>App. F-118</i>
Planned Changes in Jails	<i>App. F-119</i>
Expenditures	<i>App. F-119</i>
Jail Employees	<i>App. F-120</i>
Inmate Programs	<i>App. F-120</i>
Juveniles	<i>App. F-121</i>
Methodology	<i>App. F-121</i>
Contents of Text Tables	<i>App. F-122</i>
Contents of Summary Tables	<i>App. F-123</i>
Text Tables	<i>App. F-125</i>
Summary Tables	<i>App. F-132</i>

State Prison Expenditures, 1996 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States*

Department of Justice

Highlights	<i>App. F-259</i>
Introduction	<i>App. F-261</i>
Total Expenditure, 1985-96	<i>App. F-263</i>
State Correctional Costs More Than Doubled Between 1985 and 1996	<i>App. F-263</i>
State Costs Per Resident for Corrections Increased Faster Than Costs for Education, Health, and Natural Resources	<i>App. F-263</i>
Expenditures, Fiscal Year 1996	<i>App. F-264</i>
States Spent \$22.0 Billion on Prisons in FY 1996	<i>App. F-264</i>
States Spent Approximately \$94 of Every \$100 on Current Operations	<i>App. F-264</i>
Capital Expenditures	<i>App. F-265</i>
Most States Spent About \$6 Out of Every \$100 on Prison Capital Projects	<i>App. F-265</i>
Operating Expenditures	<i>App. F-266</i>
About Two-Thirds of Operating Costs Went for Prison Employee Salaries, Wages, and Benefits	<i>App. F-266</i>

Five Core Expenditures	<i>App. F-267</i>
Five Core Expenditures Provide a Prison Cost Profile	<i>App. F-267</i>
Medical Care	<i>App. F-267</i>
Food Service	<i>App. F-267</i>
Inmate Programs	<i>App. F-268</i>
Utilities	<i>App. F-268</i>
Transportation	<i>App. F-268</i>
Differences in Prison Costs	<i>App. F-269</i>
Numerous Factors Associated With State-by-State Differences in Prison Costs	<i>App. F-269</i>
Inmate-to-Staff Ratios	<i>App. F-269</i>
Average Number of Inmates Per Facility	<i>App. F-270</i>
Transfer Payments	<i>App. F-271</i>
Facility Security Level	<i>App. F-272</i>
Community Corrections	<i>App. F-272</i>
Methodology	<i>App. F-273</i>
Data Limitations	<i>App. F-274</i>
Adjusting for Inflation	<i>App. F-274</i>
Underreporting	<i>App. F-275</i>
Estimating Average Daily Population	<i>App. F-275</i>
U.S. Resident Population	<i>App. F-275</i>

Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, 2000	<i>Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice</i>
Highlights	<i>App. F-363</i>
Number of Facilities	<i>App. F-363</i>
Capacity	<i>App. F-364</i>
Facility Characteristics	<i>App. F-364</i>
Characteristics of Inmates	<i>App. F-365</i>
Number of Correctional Employees	<i>App. F-365</i>
Characteristics of Correctional Staff	<i>App. F-366</i>
Prisoner Assaults	<i>App. F-366</i>
The 2000 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities Counted 1,668 Facilities in Operation on June 30, 2000	<i>App. F-366</i>
Number of Facilities	<i>App. F-366</i>
Population	<i>App. F-367</i>
Type of Facility	<i>App. F-367</i>
More Than Three-Quarters of Facilities Operated by State Authorities	<i>App. F-367</i>
Facilities	<i>App. F-367</i>
Prisoners	<i>App. F-367</i>
Facility and Inmate Growth Highest Among Private Facilities	<i>App. F-367</i>
Jurisdictions	<i>App. F-367</i>
Regions	<i>App. F-368</i>

Black and Hispanic Inmates in the Majority *App. F-368*
 Federal *App. F-368*
 State *App. F-368*
 Private *App. F-368*

Average Daily Population in Prison Reached Nearly 1.3 Million—Up 30%
 From 5 Years Earlier *App. F-368*
 Jurisdiction *App. F-368*
 Region *App. F-369*

Prison Facilities Operated at 2% Above Rated Capacity in 2000
 App. F-369
 Federal Facilities *App. F-369*
 State Facilities *App. F-369*
 Private Facilities *App. F-369*

A Quarter of All Prison Facilities Held Between 750 and 1,499 Inmates
 App. F-369
 Jurisdiction *App. F-370*
 Region *App. F-370*
 Confinement Facilities *App. F-370*
 Community-Based Facilities *App. F-370*

More Than a Quarter of Correctional Facilities Less Than 10 Years Old
 App. F-371
 Facilities *App. F-371*
 Inmates *App. F-371*

More Than a Quarter of All Confinement Facilities Maximum Security
 Prisons *App. F-371*
 Gender of Inmates Housed *App. F-371*
 Function *App. F-371*
 Age *App. F-372*
 Size *App. F-372*

More Than a Third of Confined Inmates in Maximum Security
 Facilities *App. F-372*
 Gender of Inmates Housed *App. F-372*
 Age of Facility *App. F-372*
 Size of Facility *App. F-372*

State Inmates Nearly Twice as Likely as Federal Inmates to Be Rated at the
 Maximum Custody Level *App. F-372*
 Confinement *App. F-373*
 Community *App. F-373*

3,175 Inmates Died in Federal, State, and Private Prisons Between July 1,
 1999, and June 30, 2000 *App. F-373*

The Number of Noncitizen Inmates Nearly Doubled From 1995 to
 2000 *App. F-373*

4,095 Prisoners Under Age 18 in 2000, Down From 5,309 in 1995
 App. F-374

About 1 in 5 Correctional Facilities Operated Under a Court Order or
 Consent Decree *App. F-374*

State	<i>App. F-374</i>
Private	<i>App. F-374</i>
More Inmate Assaults on Other Inmates and Staff in 2000 Than in 1995	
More Than 90% of Facilities Had Work Programs	
Work Programs	<i>App. F-375</i>
Education Programs	<i>App. F-376</i>
Counseling	<i>App. F-376</i>
Work Release Programs	<i>App. F-376</i>
95 Facilities Operated Boot Camps in 2000, Up From 65 in 1995	
<i>App. F-377</i>	
Correctional Staff Exceeded 430,000 in 2000, an Increase of 24% Since 1995	
<i>App. F-377</i>	
Correctional Officers Comprised 63% of Facility Employees in 2000	
<i>App. F-378</i>	
Growing Percentages of Facility Staff Female, Black, or Hispanic	
<i>App. F-378</i>	
Community-Based Facilities Had the Highest Number of Inmates Per Employee in 2000	
<i>App. F-379</i>	
The Number of Inmates Per Employee Highest in Private Confinement Facilities	
<i>App. F-379</i>	
Private Facilities Increased in Number and in Size of Their Inmate Population During the 1990's	
Facilities	<i>App. F-380</i>
Inmates	<i>App. F-380</i>
Less Than Half of 1% of Inmates in State and Private Facilities Under Age 18	
<i>App. F-380</i>	
Rated Capacity of Prisons Operating Under State Authority Expanded	
Nearly 84% From 1990 to 2000	
<i>App. F-381</i>	
Methodology	
<i>App. F-381</i>	

State Prison Expenditures, 2001	<i>Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States</i>
<i>Department of Justice</i>	
Introduction	
<i>App. F-415</i>	
The Increase in Cost of Corrections Outpaced the Cost of Health, Education, or Natural Resources	
<i>App. F-415</i>	
States Spent \$29.5 Billion on Prisons in Fiscal 2001	
<i>App. F-416</i>	
Operating Costs Averaged \$22,650 Per Inmate in Fiscal Year 2001	
<i>App. F-417</i>	
Compared to 1996, Prison Spending in 2001 Revealed a Greater Emphasis on Facility Operation	
<i>App. F-418</i>	
A Majority of States Spent 4% or Less of Prison Expenditures on Capital Projects	
<i>App. F-418</i>	
Spending on State Prison Capital Projects Decreased 25% From 1996 to 2001	
<i>App. F-419</i>	
Over a Quarter of Prison Operating Costs for Basic Living Expenses	
<i>App. F-419</i>	

40 State Correctional Systems Paid Others to House Some Prisoners	
<i>App. F-420</i>	
Methodology	<i>App. F-421</i>
Underreporting	<i>App. F-421</i>
Data Limitations	<i>App. F-422</i>
Adjusting for Inflation	<i>App. F-422</i>

Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, 2005 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction	<i>App. F-431</i>
Selected Findings from the Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, 2005	<i>App. F-432</i>
Facility Characteristics	<i>App. F-433</i>
Facility Size and Rated Capacity	<i>App. F-433</i>
Facility Security Level	<i>App. F-434</i>
Court Orders and Consent Decrees	<i>App. F-434</i>
Private Facilities	<i>App. F-435</i>
Inmates	<i>App. F-435</i>
Facility Security Level	<i>App. F-436</i>
Staff	<i>App. F-436</i>
Inmate-To-Staff Ratios	<i>App. F-437</i>
Facility Programs	<i>App. F-437</i>
Institutional Work Programs and Work Release	<i>App. F-438</i>
Educational Programs	<i>App. F-438</i>
Counseling Programs	<i>App. F-439</i>
Methodology	<i>App. F-439</i>
Scope	<i>App. F-439</i>
Data Reporting and Estimation	<i>App. F-440</i>
Definitions	<i>App. F-441</i>

State Corrections Expenditures, FY 1982-2010 *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction	<i>App. F-497</i>
States Spent About Three-Quarters of the Corrections Budget on Correctional Institutions	<i>App. F-497</i>
Direct Expenditures on Institutions Were Divided Between Capital Outlay and Operations	<i>App. F-498</i>
Operational Expenditures, as a Share of Total Expenditures, Grew From 1982 to 2010	<i>App. F-498</i>
Changes in State Operations Expenditures From 1999 to 2010	<i>App. F-499</i>
Medical Care Expenditures Increased for Correctional Institutions in Most States	<i>App. F-500</i>
Methodology	<i>App. F-500</i>

Local Government Corrections Expenditures, FY 2005-2011*Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction	<i>App. F-519</i>
Local Governments Spent 1.6% of Total Expenditures on Corrections	<i>App. F-519</i>
Local Governments Spent More than 80% of Total Corrections	
Expenditures on Correctional Institutions	<i>App. F-520</i>
Methodology	<i>App. F-520</i>

Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, 2019*Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction	<i>App. F-531</i>
Key Findings	<i>App. F-532</i>
Adult Correctional Facilities by Type and Operator	<i>App. F-532</i>
Characteristics of Adult Correctional Facilities	<i>App. F-5880</i>
Prisoners by Characteristic of Adult Correctional Facilities	<i>App. F-532</i>
Demographic Characteristics of Prisoners in Adult Corrections Facilities	<i>App. F-532</i>
Selected Characteristics of Prisoners in Adult Correctional Facilities	<i>App. F-533</i>
Prisoners Held in State and Private Facilities for Federal, State, and Local Authorities	<i>App. F-533</i>
Security Incidents in Adult Correctional Facilities	<i>App. F-5882</i>
Security Staff Employed in Adult Correctional Facilities	<i>App. F-534</i>
Work Programs in Adult Correctional Facilities	<i>App. F-534</i>
Education Programs in Adult Correctional Facilities	<i>App. F-534</i>
Special Programs in Adult Correctional Facilities	<i>App. F-535</i>
Methodology	<i>App. F-535</i>

APPENDIX G**International Statistics****Imprisonment in Four Countries***Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Introduction	<i>App. G-3</i>
Findings	<i>App. G-3</i>
Background	<i>App. G-5</i>
Using Arrest Data	<i>App. G-5</i>
Selection of Crimes	<i>App. G-6</i>
Assumptions and Adjustments to the Data	<i>App. G-6</i>
Excluding Juveniles	<i>App. G-7</i>
The Jail Correction	<i>App. G-7</i>

The Charge Reduction Correction	<i>App. G-8</i>
Limitations in Comparing Imprisonment Rates	<i>App. G-8</i>
Notes	<i>App. G-11</i>

**Profile of Inmates in the United States and in England and Wales,
1991** *Bureau of Justice Statistics, United States Department of Justice*

Overview	<i>App. G-13</i>
The United States and England and Wales Administer Corrections in Distinctive Types of Systems	<i>App. G-15</i>
In Both the United States and England and Wales About Four-Fifths of the Inmates Were Serving a Sentence	<i>App. G-16</i>
For Certain Offense Categories, the Distributions of Inmates in the Two Countries Were Similar	<i>App. G-16</i>
A Majority of Convicted Inmates in Both Populations Had Served a Prior Sentence to Adult Custody	<i>App. G-18</i>
About 1 in 3 Convicted Inmates in Both Countries Had Family Members Who Had Also Served a Sentence to Incarceration	<i>App. G-18</i>
U.S. Inmates, on Average, Received Longer Sentences for Comparable Offenses Than Inmates in England and Wales	<i>App. G-19</i>
Inmates in England and Wales and in the United States Differ from Their General Population	<i>App. G-20</i>
Men Formed the Overwhelming Majority of Inmates in Both Systems	<i>App. G-20</i>
Inmates on the Whole in England and Wales Were Younger Than Those in the United States	<i>App. G-20</i>
Racial or Ethnic Minorities Were Overrepresented in the Incarcerated Populations in Both Countries	<i>App. G-21</i>
A Larger Percentage of U.S. Inmates, Compared to Their British Counterparts, Had Married at Some Time	<i>App. G-21</i>
From a Third to a Half of Inmates, Depending on the Country, Were Unemployed Around the Time of Their Arrest	<i>App. G-22</i>
About the Same Proportion of Inmates in Both Systems Reported Having Prison Jobs	<i>App. G-22</i>
The Educational Level of Inmates in Each Country Was Generally Lower Than That of the Respective General Adult Population	<i>App. G-23</i>
In Both Countries About a Third of the Inmates Were Living with Dependent Children Before Incarceration	<i>App. G-23</i>
Growing Up in a One-Parent Family Was More Than Twice As Likely for U.S. as for British Inmates	<i>App. G-24</i>
Methodology	<i>App. G-25</i>
Sample Design	<i>App. G-25</i>
Comparability of Survey Methods	<i>App. G-27</i>
Accuracy of the Estimates	<i>App. G-27</i>
Comparability Issues	<i>App. G-28</i>
Appendix	<i>App. G-29</i>
Notes	<i>App. G-48</i>

World Prison Population List *International Centre For Prison Studies*

Introduction *App. G-49*
Key Points *App. G-50*

World Female Imprisonment List *International Centre For Prison Studies*

Introduction *App. G-57*
Key Points *App. G-58*

World Prison Population List *International Centre for Prison Studies*

Introduction *App. G-65*
Key Points *App. G-66*

World Pre-Trial Remand Imprisonment List *International Centre For Prison Studies*

Introduction *App. G-73*
Key Points *App. G-74*

World Prison Population List *International Centre for Prison Studies*

Introduction *App. G-81*
Key Points *App. G-82*

World Prison Population List *International Centre for Prison Studies*

Introduction *App. G-89*
Key Points *App. G-90*

World Female Imprisonment List *International Centre for Prison Studies*

Introduction *App. G-97*
Key Points *App. G-98*

World Prison Population List *International Centre for Prison Studies*

Introduction *App. G-105*
Key Points *App. G-106*

World Pre-Trial Remand Imprisonment List *International Centre For Prison Studies*

Introduction *App. G-113*
Key Points *App. G-114*

World Female Imprisonment List *Institute for Criminal Policy Research*

Introduction *App. G-121*
Key Points *App. G-122*

World Prison Population List *Institute for Criminal Policy Research*

Introduction *App. G-135*
Key Points *App. G-136*

World Female Imprisonment List *Institute for Criminal Policy Research*

Introduction *App. G-151*
Key Points *App. G-152*

World Pre-trial/Remand Imprisonment List *Institute for Criminal Policy Research*

Introduction *App. G-167*
Key Points *App. G-168*

World Prison Population List *Institute for Crime & Justice Policy Research*

Introduction *App. G-183*
Key Points *App. G-184*

World Pre-trial/Remand Imprisonment List *Institute for Crime & Justice Policy Research*

Introduction *App. G-205*
Key Points *App. G-206*

World Female Imprisonment List *Institute for Crime & Justice Policy Research*

Introduction *App. G-225*
Key Points *App. G-226*

World Prison Population List *Institute for Crime & Justice Policy Research*

Introduction *App. G-245*
Key Points *App. G-246*

World Female Imprisonment List *Institute for Crime & Justice Policy Research*

Introduction *App. G-265*
Key Points *App. G-266*

Index *Ind.-1*