

# Annual Report



## MARYLAND COMMISSION ON CORRECTIONAL STANDARDS

JULY 1, 1981 to JUNE 30, 1982

90601



STATE OF MARYLAND  
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY AND CORRECTIONAL SERVICES  
MARYLAND COMMISSION ON CORRECTIONAL STANDARDS

October 15, 1982

The Honorable Harry Hughes  
Governor of the State of Maryland

and

Members of the General Assembly

and

Thomas W. Schmidt, Secretary  
Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services

I am pleased to report to you that the Maryland Commission on Correctional Standards has completed its second year of operation and has begun to substantially meet its mandate.

The Commission, its staff and the many people on our Advisory Boards have contributed considerable time and energy toward the successful completion of our initial task. That task was to develop reasonable, attainable and sound standards that address the basic life, health, safety and constitutionally mandated issues which affect all correctional agencies today.

Aware of its mandate to provide technical assistance to jurisdictions, the Commission approved a comprehensive standards manual. That manual contains the standards, auditing procedures and several other resources which will assist a jurisdiction in meeting the standards. Further, the staff conducted nine standards training sessions across the State for all correctional officials and their staffs.

During the upcoming year we will begin auditing agencies, approving compliance plans and monitoring those plans. Responses from correctional officials to our proposed procedures and plans have been most favorable and we look forward to a successful year of standards implementation.

We appreciate your continued support, and commit to faithfully exercise the responsibility you have given us.

Very truly yours,

Marie C. Henderson  
Chairperson

U.S. Department of Justice  
National Institute of Justice

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

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by  
**Maryland Dept. of Public Safety**  
**& Correctional Services**  
to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

# CONTENTS NCJRS

AUG 11 1963

PAGE

## COMMISSION ACTIVITIES

### ACQUISITIONS

Standards Development.....	1
Progress of Advisory Boards.....	2
Standards Manual.....	3
Auditing Activities.....	4
Technical Assistance.....	6
STANDARDS ACT.....	8
MEETINGS OF THE COMMISSION.....	9
COMMISSION MEMBERS.....	10
ADVISORY BOARDS.....	11
BUDGET.....	13
AUDIT SCHEDULE.....	14
JAIL STATISTICS.....	15

# COMMISSION ACTIVITIES

## STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT

In February 1981, the Commission directed the staff to develop a Work Plan. A major objective was to draft and recommend standards for all adult places of correctional confinement to the Secretary of the Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services. These initial standards were to address basic life, health, safety and constitutional issues.

In April, the staff presented the Commission with a list of concepts or issues from which standards would eventually be developed. These concepts or issues were the result of research of case law, national standards, local and State codes, and standards of other states. The intent was to ensure reasonable compatibility with national standards, adherence to court decisions, and conformity with accepted corrections practices. The Commission approved the Work Plan and directed that it be presented to the legislatively mandated Advisory Boards for review and comment.

In May, the Advisory Boards met to discuss the Work Plan. Their comments were considered by the Commission at its June meeting. The Commission approved the revised Work Plan and directed staff to begin standards development.

The staff spent the next three months researching and drafting specific standards for review by the Commission at its monthly meetings. The draft standards underwent many revisions during this time. In addition, the Advisory Boards met again in July and September to present further comments and suggestions. The staff then considered the following issues before presentation to the Commission for final approval: proper wording and content; jurisdictional applicability; proper sequence or order; identification of management versus facility standards; cost implications; identification of terms to be defined; and, need for documentation.

The approved standards were submitted to the Secretary at the October Commission meeting. The Secretary thoroughly evaluated the standards during the next six weeks. In December, he presented comments and suggestions to the Commission for their remarks. Based on the Secretary's suggestions and staff remarks, the Commission resubmitted its comments in early January 1982 to the Secretary. The Secretary then officially adopted the standards for adult local detention centers, community correctional facilities, and correctional institutions in January. The standards were then proposed in the February 5 edition of the Maryland Register. After the period for Public Comment, some minor changes were recommended by staff. The Commission and

the Secretary approved the changes in April, permitting the publication of the standards for Final Action in the April 16 edition of the Maryland Register.

## PROGRESS OF ADVISORY BOARDS

The Standards Commission Act mandates that the Commission establish Advisory Boards to assist it in the development of standards. Each Board must be chaired by a Commission member. Board members are appointed by the Chairman with the approval of the Commission. In May 1981, three Boards were appointed. They are:

Advisory Board for Adult Detention Centers  
Advisory Board for Adult Correctional Institutions  
Advisory Board for Adult Community Correctional Facilities

Since the Commission has a technical assistance mandate the Commission appointed a Technical Assistance Committee which would assist the Boards in areas such as fire, health, safety and nutrition. This Committee also serves as a continuing resource to the staff. Advisory Board membership includes citizens, legislators, county government officials, sheriffs, State and local correctional administrators and employees, regulatory officials and others.

Before the Commission appointed the Boards, it spent considerable time in defining their role which is to provide information and advice on issues sent to them by the Commission. The Commission is convinced of the value of the involvement of the Boards in its work. However, it stressed to the Boards that it will retain the authority in policy making, and developing and recommending standards to the Secretary.

The first time the Boards convened was in May when they were asked to review the Commission approved set of concepts or issues which would be the basis for initial standards development. While the Boards met at the same location, they considered the concepts or issues in separate rooms. After approximately three hours the Boards came together and gave a report on their findings. The result of the full day's activity was a wealth of ideas and information which was presented to the Commission at its next meeting.

After considering the comments of the Boards, the Commission directed the staff to draft standards based upon the issues it approved. After approving those drafts the Commission sent them to the Boards which were convened again in July.

During this meeting each Board caucused and discussed each standard. This activity took most of the day, thus there was no opportunity for a large group session where each Board reported its findings. The Advisory Boards for Adult Correctional Institutions and Adult Community Correctional Facilities presented their recommendations to the staff. The Advisory Board

for Adult Detention Centers, unable to complete its task that day, met again in September. The recommendations of the Boards were considered at two Commission meetings after which the staff was directed to develop a final draft of standards.

The next meeting of the Advisory Boards took place in March 1982 for purposes of reviewing and commenting on a proposed auditing process and "Commentaries", which are clarifying statements on each standard. The Board members were briefed on the Commission's activities since the last meeting, the status of the standards, and some of the anticipated activities in the near future.

Each Advisory Board then met separately to review and discuss the Commentaries with particular attention to be paid to the following questions: Are they factually correct? Do they clarify the spirit and intent of the standard? Do they give a clear picture of what to do to achieve compliance? Do they go beyond the scope of the standard?

Overall, members felt the Commentaries were well written and beneficial, but there were several suggestions with regard to format. The Board members felt that a "disclaimer" should be included with the Commentaries to further clarify the fact that they are to be considered simply as instructional and educative rather than regulatory in nature. In addition, the members believed that the Commentaries should be placed in a separate section of a proposed manual.

There are no plans at this time to reconvene the Boards in the near future. However, if the Commission should request advice and guidance on any issue, the Advisory Boards might be convened on short notice.

The original composition of the Boards has remained rather constant. However, due to transfers, resignations, and retirements, some changes have occurred. Regardless of the composition, the Board members, who are unpaid volunteers, have enthusiastically and unselfishly given of their time and energies. Their input has proved to be invaluable to the work of the Commission.

## STANDARDS MANUAL

While the standards were being developed, the staff inspected all jails using the 1972 Minimum Jail Standards. This was helpful because it allowed the staff to assess the jails' problems and gain an understanding of what system changes could be effected through implementing the new jail standards.

One apparent problem with the old jail inspection program was that most administrators did not have the standards at hand, nor was the annual inspection something for which they prepared. In other words, the inspection process was a passive one to which they reacted, instead of one for which they prepared. To overcome this problem, the Commission directed staff to develop a manual which would allow people to prepare for audits and to work for compliance with standards at all times.

The manual was approved by the Commission at its April 1982 meeting and contains information to assist the administrator in meeting the standards.

The actual standards comprise one section of the manual. In another section, written Commentaries explain and discuss each standard. The Commentaries are intended to aid in understanding the intent of the standards and to suggest methods to meet them. The Commentaries may also be used as a guide for writing policy and procedure statements.

The audit process is described in detail. It orients the administrator on his role in the audit process and specifies the requirements necessary to verify compliance with the standards. It also discusses the opportunities available to the administrator to comment on audit findings prior to final publication of an audit report, and describes the appeals process to the Commission.

The manual contains a section on how to develop policies and procedures to meet the standards. Written policies and procedures are of primary importance in complying with the standards, as well as being crucial to the maintenance of good correctional management practices. They also provide guidance for staff, promote consistency of practices, assist in staff training, can provide a basis for promotional exams, and serve as a defense against liability in court. In this same section, suggested examples of written policies and procedures are included.

Finally, a resource section is included with a directory of inspection agencies to be consulted for their services. Recommended references are also included to serve as guidelines in developing and implementing good policies and procedures.

The manual is bound in a bright yellow 3-ring binder with block lettering for easy reference. It is assembled and paged in such a fashion that changes can be made easily by notifying all manual holders.

## AUDITING ACTIVITIES

The standards manual was completed in April 1982, and the Commission was ready to begin auditing State and local facilities in June. Before that activity began the staff conducted a "mock" audit of one local facility and a series of one-day training sessions for correctional officials and their staff, who would be responsible for monitoring the standards on a day-to-day basis.

The mock audit proved to be most helpful as a test of the auditing procedures since the staff was able to apply the standards to an actual situation. As a result of the mock audit some planned procedures were changed. This was most helpful in the subsequent training sessions because questions about what the staff would be looking at to determine compliance were addressed realistically.

The training sessions were conducted geographically so that the training was convenient to all jurisdictions. Also, the sessions were conducted for local agencies first and later for State agencies. There were nine sessions scheduled in May at the following locations:

### Local Agencies

May 4	Salisbury	May 12	Ellicott City
May 6	Denton	May 14	Hagerstown
May 10	Upper Marlboro		

### State Institutions

May 18	Jessup	May 25	Hagerstown
May 19	Baltimore	May 28	Jessup

The all day sessions included the following topics:

- Briefing on Commission Activities
- Standards - Why Have Standards?
- How Were They Developed?
- The Standards Manual: How to Use It
- The Audit Process
- Policies and Procedures Development
- Technical Assistance Resources

The session's activities also included time for people to review the standards and get clarification as to their intent. Typically the kinds of questions raised related to medical requirements, emergency plans and programs, food, housing and sanitation issues, and legal requirements regarding inmate rights.

Most people agreed that the training sessions were most helpful and that the audit procedures were reasonable. The manual received the highest praise since people felt that they had all that was needed to meet the standards.

The final activity of the session was for the agency to indicate when they would be ready for their initial audit.

Prior to conducting the training, the staff had decided to begin auditing facilities after June 1, 1982 and complete the first round of audits by June 30, 1983. After that date, audits would be on a Fiscal Year basis. The staff felt that the initial audits would take at least thirteen months to complete because the standards were new, and there were over fifty agencies to be audited. Further, while the staff had experience auditing local jails, it had never audited State facilities and it was felt that audits of these large facilities could take three to four days each. The Audit Schedule can be found on page 14.



## TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

The Standards Act calls for the Commission to provide technical assistance to agencies to assist in meeting standards. Technical assistance can take many forms including staff training, referral to other agencies which are meeting standards, and assistance given by staff or other correctional professionals. The Commission plans to use all of these strategies to assist agencies in meeting the standards.

After the Commission staff came on board in January 1981, it began inspection jails under the 1972 State standards in addition to developing new standards. It was found that many deficiencies in the jails could be corrected at little or no cost by altering or instituting new practices. The Commission staff provided technical assistance by suggesting methods to solve the problems, and provided technical information. The staff also met with County Commissioners to explain the deficiencies in the jails and was invited to testify on jail budgets in at least two counties. In addition, two counties requested a technical assistance report, over and above the inspection, which addressed security and housing problems in their rather old and antiquated facilities.

While the Commission does not have authority to review new jail plans, the staff has worked closely with the Division of Correction providing information about local jail conditions. Further, the staff has provided assistance to some counties which are undergoing lesser renovation in their jails in such areas as control centers, medical facilities, food service areas and exercise yards. The staff has received countless requests for assistance or information from local jurisdictions on problems which face correctional administrators on a day-to-day basis. Finally, the staff has developed an excellent relationship with other organizations which impact on the jails' operations including the State Fire Marshal, Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, and the Maryland Medical Faculty.

Most of the Commission's activities have been with local jails since it had the 1972 standards to enforce. There was little activity with State institutions since no such standards existed. However, State agencies were kept informed of the Commission's activities in the standards development area, and some technical assistance was provided.

The Commission expects its technical assistance function to increase dramatically once inspections under the new standards begin.

Where many agencies are in non-compliance with one or more standards, the problem may be a need for staff training. The Commission staff will assess that need and coordinate with the Correctional Training Commission to assist in the development of training programs to solve the problem. Another excellent training source which offers special interest training programs for correctional personnel is the National Corrections Academy of the National Institute of Corrections.

In some instances, an agency may have a problem with a standard and need referral to another agency which is meeting the standard. Examples where this may apply include contingency plans, evacuation plans, medical services, etc. The staff has established contacts for this type of referral using resources such as the Technical Assistance Committee of the Maryland Community Correctional Administrators Association, the Maryland State Sheriffs' Association, the National Institute of Corrections Jail Resource Center in Rockville, the Maryland Medical Faculty, the Maryland Occupational Safety and Health Administration, the Department of Health, etc.

The Commission is a resource for technical assistance especially in the area of policy and procedure development. The Commission library has sample policies and procedures from other states and national associations, as well as those from State and local correctional facilities, which are available to all agencies. Further, the Commission will train people in the development of policies and procedures.

# STANDARDS ACT

The Act creating the Commission on Correctional Standards was passed during the 1980 Session of the General Assembly. It is codified as Article 41, Section 70C, in the Annotated Code of Maryland. Its salient Provisions are found below.

1. To advise the Secretary of the Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services regarding standards for State and local correctional facilities.
2. To provide technical assistance to jurisdictions to aid in their effort to meet standards.
3. To inspect facilities to determine compliance with standards.
4. To determine schedules for remedial action when jurisdictions are in non-compliance with certain standards.
5. To hold public hearings in regard to possible closing of a correctional facility or one of its elements for failure to meet certain standards.
6. To issue orders to cease operations of correctional procedures or functions found in violation of certain standards.
7. To review and act on appeals of staff inspection reports.
8. To consult and coordinate with national bodies promulgating correctional standards to ensure a reasonable compatibility between State standards and nationally established standards.
9. To consult and cooperate with other State agencies and local jurisdictions concerning standards development and enforcement.
10. To establish advisory boards to assist the Commission in the development of standards.

The Commission consists of three ex-officio members: the Attorney General, the Secretary of State Planning, and the Secretary of General Services; and, eight members appointed by the Governor for terms of three years. The appointed members include two citizens-at-large, two State Correctional Officials, two local Correctional Officials, one representative of a national correctional accrediting body, and a locally elected official.

The Standards Act was amended during the 1982 Session of the General Assembly. The amendment allows ex-officio members to designate representatives.

# MEETINGS OF THE COMMISSION

The Commission met on ten occasions during this reporting period. The Commission meets generally in different locations and often at a correctional facility where a tour is held after the meeting.

10th Meeting	July 21, 1981	Baltimore County Office Building
11th Meeting	August 20, 1981	Baltimore City Jail
12th Meeting	September 17, 1981	Maryland Reception, Diagnostic and Classification Center
13th Meeting	October 29, 1981	Office of the Secretary, Department of Public Safety & Correctional Services
14th Meeting	December 17, 1981	Commission on Accreditation for Corrections, Rockville
15th Meeting	February 3, 1982	Patuxent Institution
16th Meeting	March 18, 1982	Baltimore County Detention Center
17th Meeting	April 22, 1982	Staff Offices
18th Meeting	May 27, 1982	Maryland Correctional Institution-Women
19th Meeting	June 17, 1982	Brockbridge Correctional Unit



## COMMISSION MEMBERS

Marie C. Henderson  
Chairman  
Citizen Member

Robert H. Fosen, Ph.D.  
Executive Director  
Commission on Accreditation  
for Corrections

J. Brown Hardy, Deputy Secretary  
for Correctional Services  
Department of Public Safety  
and Correctional Services

Ralph W. Packard, Superintendent  
Patuxent Institution  
(Mr. Packard was appointed  
June 30, 1982 to fill Mr.  
Hardy's unexpired term)

Louis Hyatt  
Citizen Member

Sarah Ada Koonce, Councilwoman  
Prince George's County

Constance Lieder, Secretary  
Department of State Planning

David M. Doxzen  
Vice Chairman  
Administrator  
Frederick County Jail

Calvin A. Lightfoot, Warden  
Baltimore City Jail

Paul J. Davis, Warden  
Baltimore City Jail  
(Mr. Davis was appointed  
June 30, 1982 to fill Mr.  
Lightfoot's unexpired term)

J. Max Millstone, Secretary  
Department of General Services

Patricia L. Quann, Superintendent  
Maryland Reception, Diagnostic  
and Classification Center

Elmanus Herndon  
Deputy Commissioner  
Division of Correction  
(Mr. Herndon was appointed  
November 2, 1981 to fill Ms.  
Quann's unexpired term)

Stephen H. Sachs  
Attorney General of Maryland

### STAFF

Thomas A. Rosazza  
Executive Director

Regina A. Crawford  
Secretary

Paul S. Hastmann  
Assistant Executive Director

Francis L. Manear  
Correctional Program Specialist

### OFFICES

One Investment Place, Suite 700  
Towson, Maryland 21204  
(301)-321-3273

## ADVISORY BOARDS

### DETENTION CENTERS

David M. Doxzen, Chairman  
Administrator, Frederick County Jail

Robert C. Adams, President  
Cecil County Board of Commissioners  
(Representing Maryland Association  
of Counties)

Louis C. Andrew, Sheriff  
Caroline County  
(Representing Maryland State  
Sheriffs' Association)

Gary R. Blake, Director  
Montgomery County Department of  
Correction and Rehabilitation

Arnett W. Gaston, Ph.D., Director  
Prince George's County Department  
of Corrections

Charles H. Hickey, Jr., Sheriff  
Baltimore County

Judith Johnson, Executive Director  
National Coalition for Jail Reform

Clinton E. Mowen, Chief  
Hagerstown Police Department

Joseph L. Somerville, Sheriff  
St. Mary's County

### ADULT CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Robert H. Fosen, Ph.D., Chairman  
Executive Director  
Commission on Accreditation for Corrections

Jerilyn Ayers, Director of  
Adult Corrections  
Maryland League of Women Voters

Lowry Coe, Citizen  
Montgomery County

Lawrence Coshnear, Director  
Prisoner Assistance Project  
Legal Aid Bureau, Inc.

Sally Familton, Director of Planning  
Maryland Criminal Justice Coordi-  
nating Council

Jon P. Galley, Commissioner  
Division of Correction

Norma B. Gluckstern, Ed.D., Director  
Patuxent Institution

Sgt. Harold Henry  
Maryland Reception, Diagnostic  
and Classification Center

Howard N. Lyles, Warden  
Maryland House of Correction

Honorable Patrick T. Welsh  
State Senate

## COMMUNITY CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

Elmanus Herndon, Chairman  
Deputy Commissioner  
Division of Correction

Lehrman W. Dotson, Assistant Director  
Baltimore City Pre-Release Unit

Honorable Carter M. Hickman  
House of Delegates

H. David Jenkins, President  
Maryland Probation, Parole and  
Correction Association

Kent W. Mason, Director  
Montgomery County Pre-Release Center

Fr. Joseph R. Wenderoth, Director  
Dismas House, Inc.

Ernest Zaccanelli, Citizen  
Prince George's County

## TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE

Thomas A. Rosazza, Chairman  
Executive Director

Clare Forbes, R.D.  
Chief of Nutritional Services  
Department of Health & Mental Hygiene

Louis T. Hofferbert, Administrator  
Division of Labor and Industry  
Department of Licensing and Regulation

William Koffel  
Fire Protection Engineer  
State Fire Marshal's Office

John Linton, Director  
Correctional Education Program  
Maryland State Department of Education

Michael A. Murray  
Assistant Executive Director  
Medical and Chirurgical Faculty  
of Maryland

Theodore E. Shea, III  
Administrative Assistant  
Wicomico County Board of Commissioners

## BUDGET

	FY 82 <sup>1</sup> ACTUAL	FY 83 APPROPRIATION
.01 Salaries and Wages	121,216	111,424
.02 Technical and Special Fees	-	-
.03 Communication	3,900	4,095
.04 Travel	2,000	2,200
.05 Food	0	-
.06 Fuel and Utilities	0	-
.07 Motor Vehicle Operation and Maintenance	2,355	1,762
.08 Contractual Services	1,972	2,110
.09 Supplies and Materials	400	436
.10 Equipment Replacement	-	-
.11 Equipment Additional	-	-
.12 Grants, Subsidies and Contributions	-	-
.13 Fixed Charges	4,457	5,558
Total	136,300	127,585

NOTE <sup>1</sup> The FY 82 Budget consisted of \$55,598 appropriated funds for the Jail Inspection Program. The remaining funds were received through Budget Amendment.

# AUDIT SCHEDULE

LOCAL DETENTION CENTERS	6/82	7/82	8/82	9/82	10/82	11/82	12/82	1/83	2/83	3/83	4/83	5/83	6/83
Allegany County						X							
Anne Arundel County											X		
Baltimore County					X								
Baltimore City									X	X			
Calvert County									X				
Caroline County		X							X				
Carroll County							X						
Cecil County													
Charles County		X											
Dorchester County			X										
Frederick County												X	
Garrett County											X		
Harford County			X										
Howard County							X				X		
Kent County													
Montgomery County				X									
Prince George's County								X					
Queen Anne's County				X									
St. Mary's County													X
Somerset County	X												
Talbot County							X						
Washington County											X		
Wicomico County					X								
Worcester County	X												
LOCAL COMMUNITY CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES													
Balto. City Work Rel.										X			
Balto. County Work Rel.			X										
Charles County Work Rel.							X						
Dismas House East						X							
Dismas House West						X							
Montgomery County													
Pre-Release										X			
Threshold, Inc.								X					
STATE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS													
Md. Reception, Diagnostic and Classification Cnt.								X					
Md. Penitentiary										X			
Md. Correctional Training Center				X									
Md. Correctional Inst.-Hagerstown						X							
Patuxent Institution					X								
Md. Correctional Institution-Women													X
Md. House of Correction												X	
Md. Correctional Institution-Jessup									X				
PRE-RELEASE SYSTEM													
Brockbridge Corr. Unit									X				
Balto. City PRU					X								
Central Laundry PRU							X						
Eastern PRU						X							
Jessup PRU								X					
Poplar Hill PRU				X									
Pre-Release-Women		X											
Southern Md. PRU			X										

# JAIL STATISTICS

The Commission staff compiles monthly jail statistics and reports them monthly and annually. The information is used by State and local agencies to identify trends and to attempt to predict future jail populations.

Maryland and its subdivisions effectively make use of these jail statistics. The local jurisdictions serve as the conduit of all inmates that enter into the State correctional system. Statistics such as the number of persons awaiting trial, the court of jurisdiction (district or circuit), total time held awaiting trial, length of time spent in confinement, and pre-sentence or sentencing status, can assist the State in determining the number of persons that will be entering the Division of Correction. It greatly aids the Departments of State Planning, General Services, and Public Safety and Correctional Services in planning and determining priorities in the financing of construction, expansion or renovation of jails and prisons.

Local jurisdictions need this information to determine their future housing needs, especially if a new or expanded jail is being considered. Local jurisdictions also need comparative information in order to analyze their current and future budgetary, staffing and programmatic needs. Further, the Commission utilizes this information to provide technical assistance to the local authorities.

EXISTING AND PROJECTED LOCAL JAIL CAPACITIES IN MARYLAND

COUNTY	EXISTING <sup>1</sup> CAPACITY			FUTURE CAPACITY <sup>2</sup> COMPLETION DATE			DIFFERENCE IN BEDS	COMMENTS
	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	1982	1983	1984-85		
ALLEGANY	73	65	8					No construction currently planned. A new jail was constructed in 1969.
ANNE ARUNDEL	220	201	19		241		+21	A new work release unit was completed in 3/82. Renovations are planned.
BALTIMORE CITY <sup>3</sup>	1409	1317	92			1609	+200	A new housing unit with an educational/vocational unit is planned.
BALTIMORE <sup>3</sup>	392	372	20					A new jail was completed in 12/81. Old jail is used as a work release center.
CALVERT	92	72	20					New jail was constructed in 1979. Expansion is being considered.
CAROLINE	61	57	4					A new jail was completed in 12/81.
CARROLL	48	48	-		90		+42	Renovations and expansion of the present jail are planned.
CECIL	70	64	6		106		+36	A new jail and CARC unit are under construction.
CHARLES <sup>3</sup>	136	119	17					A new jail opened in 6/81. The old jail is to be renovated.
DORCHESTER	54	48	6					No construction currently planned.
FREDERICK	85	83	2			108	+39	A new jail is being planned. Construction will begin in 1982.
GARRETT	24	20	4					A new jail was completed in 1979.
HARFORD	180	164	16			214	+30	This jail opened in 1973. Possible renovations are being considered.
HOWARD	82	82	-	108			+26	A new jail is currently under construction. Completion date is 1983.

KENT	20	20	-					No construction currently planned.
MONTGOMERY <sup>3</sup>	420	376	44			564	+144	New housing units are planned for the detention and work release centers.
PRINCE GEORGE'S <sup>3</sup>	312	296	16	412		777	+465	Temporary housing is under construction. A new jail is being planned.
QUEEN ANNE'S	18	18	-					No construction currently planned.
ST. MARY'S	33	31	2					Minor renovations are planned.
SOMERSET	26	24	2					Construction of a new jail is currently being studied.
TALBOT	60	56	4					No construction is currently planned.
WASHINGTON	107	101	6			148	+41	A new jail is being planned. Construction may begin in 1982.
WICOMICO	82	74	8			150	+68	A new jail is being planned. Construction may begin in 1983.
WORCESTER	98	92	6				+41	A new jail was completed in 1982.
TOTALS	4102	3800	302	4228	4349	5202	+1112	

NOTES:

<sup>1</sup> This total capacity may include special purpose cells. The existing capacity is defined as the maximum normal number of beds in designated housing areas.

<sup>2</sup> Actual future beds in some unstarted projects may differ from these totals.

<sup>3</sup> Includes separate work release centers.

FY 82 JAIL STATISTICS

COUNTY	POPULATION			WORK RELEASE	INTAKE	AVERAGE DAILY STATUS <sup>2</sup>				
	HIGH POP.	LOW POP.	AVG. POP.			AWAIT TRIAL	LOCAL SENT.	D.O.C. SENT.	PSI	OTHER <sup>1</sup>
ALLEGANY	79	32	46	5	4	19	10	13	3	1
ANNE ARUNDEL	253	152	211	15	9	128	73	3	8	2
BALTIMORE CITY	1862	1358	1695	34	48	1284	271	-	96	62
BALTIMORE	367	260	299	46	8	160	106	2	30	5
CALVERT	81	43	66	9	3	15	24	10	3	13
CAROLINE	42	0	30	1	2	12	14	2	1	*
CARROLL	50	22	38	5	2	19	13	2	3	*
CECIL	126	75	101	24	5	31	53	2	11	*
CHARLES	93	42	62	9	7	28	27	3	1	1
DORCHESTER	62	25	42		3	12	25	2	1	*
FREDERICK	97	55	78	14	4	24	44	3	7	1
GARRETT	31	14	22	3	2	4	12	4	*	1
HARFORD	141	91	116	5	5	48	52	3	4	7
HOWARD	88	39	66	5	6	39	21	1	2	*
KENT	39	10	21	3	1	4	11	2	2	2
MONTGOMERY	569	408	480	80	12	231	212	30	-	7
PRINCE GEORGE'S	626	393	515	16	37	374	80	31	23	8
QUEEN ANNE'S	22	8	15	1	1	6	7	1	-	*
ST. MARY'S	60	26	39	3	4	16	13	9	1	*
SOMERSET	30	11	22	4	1	10	8	*	1	*
TALBOT	60	26	40	1	3	21	15	4	-	*
WASHINGTON	141	95	115	13	5	35	62	2	11	2
WICOMICO	96	53	73	3	4	39	23	4	4	2
WORCESTER	88	26	52	13	2	31	17	*	3	1
STATE TOTALS <sup>3</sup>			4241	315	176	2587	1186	130	215	114

\*Less than one rounded.

<sup>1</sup>Awaiting Commissioner, Federal Prisoners, Held for other jurisdictions, etc.

<sup>2</sup>Average daily status was computed on last day populations and may not add up to average populations.

<sup>3</sup>County totals may not add up to State totals due to rounding.



**END**