

Annual Report of General Assembly
Approved Jail Projects
October 1, 2014

Prepared by the
Local Facilities Unit of the
Virginia Department of Corrections
The Department of Criminal Justice Services and the Department of the Treasury

Table of Contents

Page 2	Introduction
Page 3	General Assembly Approved Projects
Pages 4	Approved Funding
Pages 5-15	Chesapeake City jail
Pages 16-21	Community Corrections Required Funding
Page 22	Suggested Financing

Introduction

Chapter 2 Item 382 B. of the 2014-2016 Biennium Budget Bill requires that “The Department of Corrections shall provide an annual report on the status of jail construction and renovation projects as approved for funding by the General Assembly. The report shall be limited to those projects which increase bed capacity. The report shall include a brief summary description of each project, the total capital cost of the project and the approved state share of the capital cost, the number of beds approved, along with the net number of new beds if existing beds are to be removed, and the closure of any existing facilities, if applicable. The report shall include the six-year population forecast, as well as the double-bunking capacity compared to the rated capacity for each project listed. The report shall also include the general fund impact on community corrections programs as reported by the Department of Criminal Justice Services, and the recommended financing arrangements and estimated general fund requirements for debt service as provided by the State Treasurer. Copies of the report shall be provided by October 1 of each year to the Chairmen of the Senate Finance and House Appropriations Committees and to the Director, Department of Planning and Budget.”

For the 2014-2016 Biennium Budget the General Assembly has approved one new project, a 192-bed expansion of the Chesapeake City Jail.

Currently approved projects by the General Assembly

The following projects have been approved by the General Assembly and are either completed or under construction:

Amherst Facility of Blue Ridge Regional Jail – Has a rated capacity 380 beds –
Opened January 1, 2012

Central Virginia Regional Jail –Will add 200 new beds – Due to open January, 2016

Loudoun County Adult Detention Center – Has a rated capacity increase of 264 beds-
Opened June, 2012

Meherrin Regional Jail -Brunswick Facility- Has a rated capacity 400 beds- Opened
July 2012/ **Mecklenburg Facility** has a rated capacity 80 beds – Opened January 2013

RSW Regional Jail – rated capacity 375 beds –Date opened June 24, 2014.

Richmond City Jail – rated capacity 1032 beds- Main facility opened July 25, 2014
Renovation of Community Custody building estimated open date December 2014

Southwest Virginia Regional Jail- adding 512 new beds – Date of anticipated
completion is November 19, 2014

Chesapeake City Jail – adding 192 beds –Date of anticipated completion unknown at
this time.

Approved Funding

Funding included in the 2013-2014 Biennial Budget for the Commonwealth's reimbursement of a portion of the approved capital costs as determined by the Board of Corrections and other interest costs as provided in §§ 53.1-80 through 53.1-82.2 of the Code of Virginia, for the following:

Project	Commonwealth Share of Approved Capital Costs
Loudoun County Adult Detention Center Phase 2	\$ 8,389,677
Blue Ridge Regional Jail	\$ 31,664,995
Meherrin River Regional Jail	\$ 32,189,469
Richmond City Jail Replacement	\$ 29,702,708
Newport News Public Safety Building Life Safety Renovation	\$ 875,294
RSW Regional Jail	\$ 32,840,850
Southwest Virginia Regional Jail	\$ 16,910,186
Central Virginia Regional Jail	\$ 8,464,891
Chesapeake City Jail	\$ 5,130,673
Total Approved Capital Costs	<u>\$166,168,743</u>

Summary of the Community Based Corrections Plan submitted by the City of Chesapeake

Funding Priority

The City of Chesapeake requests the Jail be expanded on the basis of overcrowding and that the request be given preference as a priority 3. This is defined in 6VAC15-80-180 of the Virginia Administrative Code as an expansion of an existing local correctional facility experiencing overcrowding which is expected to continue based upon factors described in the Community-Based Corrections Plan. Historically the Legislature has defined overcrowding for reimbursement purposes as jail bed use at greater than 150% of its rated capacity for more than a year.

Until recently the rated capacity for the Chesapeake City Jail was 543. It has recently been re-examined and the new rated capacity is 555. This places overcrowding at 832.5 inmates of average daily population (ADP). The table below shows the jail has been above the overcrowding level for several years including when the federal inmates are subtracted from the population.

Average Daily Population	CY 2007	CY2008	CY2009	CY2010	CY2011
ADP Base	1022	1069	1005	973	1013
State Responsible	NA	NA	308	284	277
Federal inmates	50	29	45	49	29
Total Inmate Population	1073	1099	1050	1021	1043
ADP minus Federal Inmates	1023	1070	1005	972	1014

Jail History:

Located at 400 Albemarle Drive, the Chesapeake Correctional Center is centrally located within the Chesapeake Municipal Complex. The original structure opened in 1961 and has expanded several times in response to changes in the needs and increases in the population to be incarcerated. The Chesapeake Correctional Center was constructed in four phases: The original 1961 structure contains 72 single occupancy cells (linear design). In 1978 the original Work Release Facility was added, as well as the program areas for the “gym area”. In 1987, 55 double occupancy cells and 5 single occupancy cells for segregation were added (linear design); however, there was no enhancement of support space at that time. The third phase referred to as “The Tower” was completed in 1996. This six story structure contains seven 40 bed housing units (podular design) and one 20 bed unit (linear), and houses the primary jail operations. The last phase of construction was completed in 1999; provided a separate wing for the female inmate population and contains three, 30 bed open dormitory housing units.

Existing Correctional Center:

After completion of the 1996 addition, the amount of space, physical configuration, and critical adjacencies provided were adequate for the 543-bed rated capacity. As the number of inmates housed has climbed to and exceeded 1,000 inmates, almost all areas of the jail have been adversely effected. With the exception of the Entry Areas, there are no other components that are adequate for the current service load of more than 1,000 inmates.

The assessed overall rating is considered “Deficient”. Since the overall rating summary is marginal, the basic implication for long-term reuse is that a number of areas will require significant upgrade and renovation to come up to current performance demands, or to potential increased service loads. The Tower portion of the Jail is in relatively good condition. Some improvements to the HVAC system were made in 2011. On its own, the Tower portion would be considered adequate in most other aspects, with the exception that it is now 16 years old and will need overall renovation work in the not distant future. The two older portions of the jail, the Landing and **the 87**, are in significantly poorer physical condition. These two portions would likely be independently rated as deficient. In the calculation of the overall rating, the Landing and **the 87** areas reduce the Tower area to a lower overall facility rating. In the long term, more renovation work will be required in the Landing and **the 87 areas** of the facility if they are to continue in their present use, or if those areas are revised for long-term utilization. Consideration should also be given to the cost benefit of maintaining those areas versus demolition and reuse of their site area for a more efficient facility.

Addition of Temporary Space:

Facing capacity shortfalls, the City of Chesapeake developed three temporary Community-Based facilities adjacent to the existing Chesapeake Correctional Center. The City contracted for the construction of five dormitory units contained within three structures (non-permanent construction), with an estimated capacity of 266 beds. This was planned to house work release, work force, weekenders and re-entry inmates. Waiver of the construction standards and use for these temporary facilities was granted by the Board during its March 2013 meeting.

Non-confinement Alternatives

The Chesapeake Community Services Board (CCSB) is an agency of the City of Chesapeake with the mission of optimizing the quality of life by providing exceptional services to the citizens of Chesapeake, whose lives are affected by mental illness, mental retardation, substance abuse or developmental difficulties. The program is supported by local, state and federal tax dollars and by third party consumer fees. The CCSB budget does not include funds specifically earmarked for jail services; however, agency staff supports the jail as much as resources permit. A CCSB staff person provides 10-12 hours a week identifying “mental health” inmates who potentially can be placed elsewhere. In addition, it is not unusual for the agency to receive requests from the on-duty magistrate for assistance evaluating an individual brought in by a police officer.

The CCSB in cooperation with the Sheriff's Department and Police Department is applying to the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs' Bureau of Justice Assistance for a \$50,000 grant, with a \$12,500, in-kind match to come from the Community Services Board. This grant will provide for planning and technical assistance to address public safety concerns regarding citizens with mental illness involved in the criminal justice system. CCSB staff noted that misdemeanants with a mental illness on average spend eight months in jail. Often these individuals are waiting for transfer to a state facility for restoration to competency. The lack of beds in these institutions is a major problem.

Alcohol Safety Action Program: The Southeastern Virginia Alcohol Safety Action Program serves the counties of Isle of Wight and Southampton, the cities of Chesapeake, Franklin, Portsmouth and Suffolk, and the town of Smithfield. Their office is located in Portsmouth and includes 8 full time staff and 15 part time instruction staff (who do not provide treatment services). Established more than 40 years ago, the focus of the program is to improve highway safety by decreasing the incident of driving under the influence of alcohol and other drugs.

The ASAP program is a private, not-for-profit organization. ASAP programs offer four major categories of services: education, treatment, other intervention (traffic), and substance testing. Within those categories, there are several program/services provided such as:

- Education: alcohol education, drug education, intensive alcohol education, relapse prevention, and young offender (when available);
- Treatment: outpatient substance abuse treatment, intensive outpatient substance abuse treatment, and inpatient substance abuse treatment (service provider referred);
- Other intervention (Traffic): ignition interlock (Draeger, Smart Start, National ISOV), suspended operator license intervention, driver improvement class, Traffic Safety classes and victim impact panel (MADD);
- Substance Testing: alcohol breathalyzer (on sight), and drug tests (approved for authorized locations).

The City of Chesapeake is the largest contributor to this program. In 2011 the Courts referred 1,208 offenders to the program (46% of all referrals).

Agency/Program Function: The Community Corrections Agency (CCA) commenced in 1983 as the Community Diversion Incentive (CDI) Agency with the City of Chesapeake named as the Administrator and Fiscal Agent. Since 1995, CCA has been administered by the Chesapeake Sheriff's Office; however, effective July 1, 2008, the agency was reorganized under the administration of the Department of Human Services, a department within the locality. With the exception of facilities use, maintenance, and housekeeping (all provided by the City of Chesapeake), 100% of the administrative and operational costs to implement and manage services must be provided through grant funding.

Note the agency collects fees for probation supervision approximately \$20,000 annually). The agency's two components are Pretrial Services; and Local Community-based Probation Services.

Pretrial Services This CCA component provides judges with information to assist in making the best bond/release decisions for arrestees who are financially unable to make bail while awaiting trial. If released to the agency, defendants are supervised in the community to ensure compliance with the conditions of release ordered by the court and are monitored until the court return date to ensure appearance. Optional services are determined by the court and may include house arrest, electronic monitoring and/or random drug testing. Over the past few years, the agency has seen changes in staff that initially negatively impacted operations. Two investigators working in the jail were reassigned to the main office to enable them to supervise cases. As a result, no cases were investigated for much of FY2008 and FY2009. Since early 2009 the program has been able to resume their investigation process at the jail. The number of cases dropped in FY 2010, but has been rising steadily since that time. Based on July-December data, it is expected that FY2012 will reach its 2009 levels. Also, the target average length of supervision is 71 days for misdemeanants and 125 days for felons.

Investigations

In FY2009 CCA performed a total of 355 investigations. In FY2011 that number more than doubled to a total 767 screenings. However, placements declined from 359 in FY2009 to 343 in FY2011. Based on six months of data, **FY2012** is projected to end the year at approximately 338, close to the 2011 level. The impact on the jail of an additional 338 inmates placed on the program could be as high as an average daily population of 20 (calculated as 338 times 22 days (average length of stay) divided by 365 to estimate a daily count).

Placements and Caseloads

Placements have been declining since a peak of 380 in FY2010 and is projected to decrease to 338 for **FY2012**. The downward trend in placements is due in part to the lack of investigations and subsequently, a lack of recommendations. The average daily caseload ranged from a high of 112 in FY2009 to a low of 98 in FY2011. Based on the six months of data, caseloads are expected to increase again going forward.

Length of Supervision

In FY2009 the average length of supervision for misdemeanors and felons was 73 and 134 days respectively. By FY2010 the average length of supervision for misdemeanors was reduced by 11 days to 62, and by 20 days for felons reaching 114 days. However, in 2011, this decline had reversed; the average length of supervision increasing to 71 (misdemeanors) and 119 (felonies). For the first nine months of FY2012 the average length of supervision had increased further and projected to be 79 and 133 days respectively.

First Judicial Circuit Court Pretrial Service Practices

Judges in the First Judicial Circuit and District almost always require the posting of a secure bond in addition to supervision by Pretrial Services, a practice that appears contrary to the intent of the pretrial service program. In fact, the “Pretrial Services Guide” states that individuals who otherwise meet the specified criteria should not remain in jail solely due to their inability to meet the requirements of a secured bond. Between FY2009 and FY2012 the court accepted the agency’s recommendation for supervised release with no secure bond in just 33 of 291 misdemeanor situations (11%). In felony charge situations, the agency’s recommendation for supervised release with no secure bond was accepted in 97 of 1,478 instances (7%). The Sheriff’s Office staff working with CCA attempted to quantify the impact of this practice in Chesapeake. **It is estimated that 20% of arrestees, who have a secure bond as a precursor to supervised release cannot raise the secure bond and, therefore, remain in jail until the conclusion of the case.**

Local Probation The purpose of the community corrections component, or local probation, is to provide alternatives to sentencing for all courts. In lieu of jail, eligible offenders may be required to:

- Perform meaningful community service work; pay court ordered restitution and/or court costs;
- Participate in treatment for substance abuse, domestic violence counseling;
- Pursue education and/or employment while under agency supervision; submit to random unannounced drug screens; and
- Attend certain group meetings and demonstrate a positive and productive behavior.

Those not in full compliance with the program are returned to court for appropriate disposition and imposition of suspended jail sentence. Placements into the program have decreased over the past three years for misdemeanor offenders, after increasing from 623 in FY2009 to 682 in FY2010. Since the peak, misdemeanor placements are down 17%. In contrast, felony placements have increased from 19 in FY2009 to 26 in FY2011, but are projected to drop to 12 (based on the Jul-Dec 2011 data) for FY2012.

The average daily caseload has decreased following the decrease in the overall number of placements of misdemeanor and felony offenders in the program. In FY2009 and 2010 the misdemeanor caseload was 244 which dropped to 199 in FY2011 and is projected to decrease further to 195 by the end of FY2012. Felony caseloads have remained constant during the period, averaging 13 between 2009 and 2011. It is projected that the caseload number for 2012 will be 13.

State Probation: The City of Chesapeake is served by State Probation and Parole District 31. State Probation works closely with the Chesapeake Community Service Board and private vendors in the area of substance abuse treatment. State Probation handles those felons with suspended sentences to incarceration; and offenders placed on probation, parole, post-release supervision, or conditional pardon. As part of the management process, the District 31 staff conducts substance abuse screening and assessments, case supervision, surveillance, home visits, urinalysis, investigations, arrest record checks, and provides referrals to or direct provision of treatment services.

Probation District 31 utilizes the services of the Southampton Detention Center, Chesterfield Women's Diversion and Detention Center, the Stafford Diversion Center, and the White Post Diversion Center. The office has 38 full time positions. For a number of years there have been vacancies in the office, including vacancies in the investigator's section which is responsible for preparing Pre-Sentence Reports. In essence, even if there were no vacancies, the District 31's staffing has not kept pace with caseloads, at least in terms of the level of supervision that State Probation would want to provide

Since 2008, the District's total caseload has decreased by 10%, decreasing from 2,465 in CY2008 to 2,210 in CY2011. The three program elements which make up that total have also decreased at various levels: probation decreased 8%, parole down 51%, and post release down 26%.

According to the CBCP discussion with representatives from the Chesapeake Probation and Parole yielded the following:

- City of Chesapeake Judges frequently use blended sentences – a combination of bond and supervision. A relatively high number of pre-sentence individuals are placed on probation supervision.
- Parole caseload continues to go down, since it is only applicable now to individuals sentenced prior to 1995.
- The relatively new Behavioral Correctional Program established by the Commonwealth for therapeutic communities operated by Virginia DOC is a very important and viable initiative for alternative placement.
- The Compass Risk Assessment tool is used throughout the system, and provides evidence-based assessments.
- Individuals that pose the most difficult supervision are designated sex offenders, high risk/ mental health individuals, and those with violent criminal records.
- AnyTrax is used to monitor low risk offenders.
- State Probation officers do not make any arrests, those are all handled by local law enforcement.
- The Reentry focus of the current Governor should provide some beneficial impacts on the overall system

Population Forecast

Three mathematical forecast models were run and tested for statistical validity: Auto Regressive Integrated Moving Average (ARIMA), and two Exponential Smoothing models. The ARIMA model was selected on the basis of its high R-square value (adjusted R-square), low BIC1 and RMSE2. Inmate population projections are based on historic trends, with the assumption that current policy will continue. Policy decisions (e.g. bail, sentencing and arrest policies, and state ready transports) can significantly impact jail population.

Model A – Holt (Exponential Smoothing)

Holt Exponential Smoothing uses recursive equations to obtain smoothed values for model components. Non-seasonal “level” and “trend” data is linearly trended. The Holt forecast extrapolates statistical estimates at the end of the data.

Since input data was on a monthly basis, output ADP was also on a monthly basis. Standard diagnostics include an adjusted R-square value of 0.99, a BIC of 25.04, and a RMSE of 24.31. The Durbin-Watson statistic was 1.96.

Model B – Winters (Exponential Smoothing)

The Winters Exponential Smoothing model is similar to the Holt models but with an added seasonal component. The model also used a total of 174 monthly data points and when fitted to the data recognized a linear and seasonality.

Standard diagnostics for Model B provided an adjusted R-square value of 0.99, a BIC of 25.21 and a RMSE of 24.11. This model also fit the historical data well and the resulting forecasts are similar to the outcome from Model A.

Model C – ARIMA

ARIMA (Autoregressive Integrated Moving Averages) is a Time Series Analysis method. This method was applied to the historical ADP to predict future values. The time series fitted had a total of 174 monthly data points. The selected model used two parameters. The standard deviation, which measures how spread the data is, was 214.8. Model C yielded an adjusted R-square value of 0.99 and a BIC of 22.15 lower than the statistics reported for Models A and B.

Model Summary

All of the three models considered were developed using known modeling techniques. All models fit the historical data well. In 2010 the City’s estimated ADP was 973 for which all models estimated the ADP within 2 and 3. In 2011 the actual ADP was 1,013 and again models A and B estimated an ADP of 1002 (difference of 11) and model C estimated and ADP of 1,000 (difference of 13). An analysis of each of the model’s fit and statistical indicators resulted in the selection of Model C as the forecast model for Chesapeake. This Model yielded the highest adjusted R-square value, and the lowest BIC and RMSE values when comparing models A, B and C. **For the year 2021 the model forecasts an average daily population of 1,552.** By the year 2026 the number increases to 1,685 and for 2031 the forecast number is 1,891. [Note: that forecasts, by their nature, have a degree of uncertainty and the further out into the future the forecast goes, the higher the margin of error.]

Forecast Population using Model C

Model C	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2026
----------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

Arima											
Forecast	1,135	1,182	1,228	1,274	1,321	1,367	1,413	1,460	1,506	1,552	1,784

Summary

During the March 2013 Board of Correction meeting the City of Chesapeake was granted permission to use the temporary facilities that were erected without the Boards permission. The City of Chesapeake has submitted the required documents and wishes to construct a 200 bed expansion to its current facility in order to replace the temporary facilities. According to the language in the Acts of the Assembly, a state of emergency exists with regards to overcrowding. With this 200 bed expansion, the jail will be still overcrowded. However, the city feels that this is all it can afford to construct at this time. The expansion will give the jail some much needed breathing room. The City is currently working on plans for further phases to achieve the needed bed space. This includes proposed additional construction and current talks with the Hampton Roads Regional Jail about becoming a member jurisdiction.

The Community Based Corrections Plan and addendums submitted by the City of Chesapeake meets the requirements set forth in 6VAC15-80 of the Virginia Administrative Code and demonstrated a need for the 200 bed expansion.

Required Staffing for Chesapeake Jail Expansion

The staffing for the 192 bed Correctional Center expansion is summarized in the table in this section of the Plan. The expansion as programmed will require a total staffing complement of 37 FTE positions, composed of 35 security positions and 2 non-security positions. The posts/positions are listed by shift and the “relief factor” is applied to determine the number of full-time employees required. It should be noted that while the expansion will increase the official capacity of the facility, it is not expected to necessarily result in an increase in the inmate population. No assumption is made at this time either about the hiring of new staff, if any, or the utilization of existing staff to maintain security and provide services within the planned expansion. This decision will be made by local decision makers.

The existing operating capacity of the Chesapeake Correctional Center Jail is 543. The expansion will add 192 general purpose beds to the operating capacity. This staffing analysis focuses on the additional staff required for the operations of the expansion.

The expansion adds four (4) minimum security housing pods grouped around a central control room, ten (10) special purpose single cells, two (2) classroom/program spaces, a staff area, a medical examination room, and two outdoor recreation areas. The control room will require two 7 day/24 hour per week posts for the control room operations and inmate monitoring. Additionally, two 7 day /24 hour posts (rovers) should be added for the following functions:

- 1) periodic inspections/review of housing pod activities,
- 2) monitoring the classroom and medical areas,
- 3) provide for the movement of inmates from the housing units to/from the existing main complex, court, and release,
- 4) monitoring recreation and as time is available (on night shift),
- 5) perform administrative functions such as ordering/assembling canteen orders.

The staffing configuration provides for 4 correctional officers per day to provide for day shift escort to the main complex for services, court, admission/release and contact (attorney) visits.

Finally, two (2) librarian/teacher positions are included to work eight hour per day/40 hours per week within the expansion.

The Chesapeake Correctional Center utilizes 12-hours shifts for most of the security posts, and a standard 8-hour shift for those administrative and support posts that are not primarily security posts. The facility expansion, as programmed, will require a staffing addition of 19 full time employees (FTE).

Relief Factor Derivation

A *post* defines a place/function that must be manned for the specified time (12 hour post or 8 hour post) while a *position* quantifies the number of staff required to cover the position for the specified hours. For most functions, constant coverage for the entire time period is not required. However for most security posts, the “inmate supervision tasks” associated with the post requires manning the post 24 hours per day, 365 days per year (8,760 hours per year).

A security officer, working a 12 hour shift, has potentially 2,080 hours per year available for work assignments prior to any adjustments. For part of this potential work time, the officer will not be available for assignment to a post. The officer will not be available for post assignment when on leave (vacation, sick leave and holidays) and when in mandated training (both off-site and on-site). Consequently, a relief factor is applied to the “post” to determine the number of officers required to “fully staff” the post. The relief factor of 1.25 in the table above is applied to the number of posts to determine the manpower required to staff the post. For example, a control room post that is manned 24 hours per day 365 days per year by a single officer requires 5.0 FTEs.

CHESAPEAKE CITY JAIL EXPANSION -

COST ANALYSIS

8/8/2013
BY: ABB

VADOC PART I FORMULA

MEANS COSTS (2013 SF Cost Data + \$2.75 additives)		303	PER SF
MARSHAL & SWIFT MULTIPLIER (Chesapeake)	X	0.96	%
MEDIAN COST PER SQ FT	=	291	PER SF
INFLATION (3.5% Jan 2013 to Feb 2016 - 38 months)		33	PER SF
INFLATED MEDIAN COST PER SQ FT		324	PER SF
192 INMATES @ 200 SQ FT EA	X	38,400	SF
MEDIAN CONSTRUCTION COST :	=	12,436,992	

PLANNING STUDY PROJECT ESTIMATE	LOCALITY	VADOC
(EXCLUSIVE OF BONDS OR FINANCING)	REQUESTED COST	ELIGIBLE COST
PART I - PROJECT CONSTRUCTION COSTS		
BUILDING CONSTRUCTION COST	12,629,158	12,436,992
SITWORK	1,369,339	1,369,339
PART I PROJECT CONSTRUCTION COSTS SUBTOTAL:	13,998,497	13,806,331
PART II - PROJECT SPECIFIC COSTS		
PERIMETER SECURITY FENCE	254,735	254,735
COVERED WALK TO EXISTING JAIL	814,059	814,059
JUVENILE MAINTENANCE BUILDING (770 SF)	98,748	98,748
JUVENILE ACCESS & RECREATION LOCATION (30,055SF)	582,337	582,337
RELOCATE PARK ROAD & PARKING	251,713	251,713
PILES, PILE CAPS, CONC GRADE BEAMS	923,300	923,300
PART II PROJECT SPECIFIC COSTS SUBTOTAL:	2,924,892	2,924,892
PART III - OTHER PROJECT COSTS		
A/E FEES (7.5% Part I + fence, covered walk, & maint. bldg)	1,269,254	1,269,254
ADDITIONAL ENGINEERING (2% of Sitework, Access, & Relocations)	44,068	44,068

CBCP/PLANNING STUDY	447,857	151,000
VALUE ENGINEERING STUDY	70,000	70,000
FIXTURES, FURNISHINGS AND EQUIPMENT	606,000	60,600
COMMUNICATIONS/DATA EQUIPMENT	50,000	50,000
TEST BORINGS/TESTING/SPECIAL INSPECTIONS	150,000	150,000
SURVEY, TOPO,ENVIRONMENTAL & UTILITY LOCATOR	90,000	90,000
PRINTING & REPRODUCTION	50,000	50,000
PERMITS, FEES & CONNECTION CHARGES	450,000	450,000
 PART III OTHER COSTS SUBTOTAL:	 3,227,179	 2,384,922
CONTINGENCY (8%)	1,612,332	1,406,546
TOTAL PROJECT COST:	\$21,762,900	\$20,522,691
PER BED PROJECT COST @ 192 BEDS:	\$113,348	\$106,889
25 % of \$20,522,691	is	\$5,130,673

**Community Corrections Funding Required by Jail Expansion Plans
Department of Criminal Justice Services**

Pursuant to § 53.1-82.1 of the Code of Virginia, there are requirements to submit a community-based corrections plan to the Board of Corrections for approval of a jail project. Two regional jails submitted jail expansion projects, along with corresponding community-based corrections plans, to the Board of Corrections within the past year. On May 18, 2011 and July 20, 2011, the Board of Corrections approved jail expansion projects submitted by the Central Virginia Regional Jail Authority and the Southwest Virginia Regional Jail Authority. Item 377.A6 of the Appropriation Act states that:

“If the Board of Corrections approves a request, the Department of Criminal Justice Services shall submit to the Department of Planning and Budget by September 1 a summary of the alternatives to incarceration included in the community-based corrections plan approved for the project, along with a projection of the state funds needed to implement these programs.”

The following summaries, based on the two community-based corrections plans approved by the Board of Corrections, are submitted in response to the above requirement.

Southwest Virginia Regional Jail Authority

The SWVRJA is experiencing significant overcrowding within its existing regional jail system. The jail system consists of four separate jail facilities serving 10 localities. The facilities are in Abingdon, Duffield, Haysi and Tazewell. The planned expansion will take place as infill at three of the four locations and is expected to increase bed space by 512 beds. Development and expansion of Community Corrections are projected to accommodate the equivalent of a fourth additional facility.

The confinement rate for all four facilities exceeds the statewide confinement rate, suggesting there is potential for use of alternatives to incarceration. The projected jail population forecast is predicated on full implementation of pretrial investigation and supervision services and expanded Community Corrections options, along with further collaboration among local criminal justice and community stakeholders.

Existing Alternative Programming

The area is served currently by local probation, state probation, Virginia Alcohol Safety Action Program (VASAP), Home Electronic Monitoring and a small pretrial/HEM program in Tazewell. Three state probation and parole districts cover the jail catchment areas (Districts 17, 18 and 43), as do two Alcohol Safety Action Program (ASAP) agencies (Southwest Virginia ASAP and Mt. Rogers ASAP). State probation impacts the jail population primarily when offenders under state probation supervision are arrested on technical violations and returned to the jail pending and subsequent to a court hearing. VASAP provides services to offenders as provided by statute for specific violations of driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs. Electronic monitoring serves seven of the counties and is provided by four private companies who charge offenders \$11.50 - \$17.00 per day to participate. The court must approve HEM placement.

The most significant direct alternative to incarceration in the regional jail is the local probation supervision provided through the Southwest Virginia Community Corrections Agency (serving 9 localities) and the Clinch Valley Community Corrections Agency (serving Tazewell County). None of the localities has DCJS-approved pretrial services. Tazewell has a small, partial pretrial/HEM program run under agreement with the Clinch Valley Community Action Agency.

Proposed Programming

Among all four jail facilities, pretrial and locally responsible, sentenced misdemeanants are the most frequent admissions. Jail alternatives have not yet been fully developed. The SWRJA plan calls for the following:

1. Develop a sequential intercept model for diversion of mentally ill defendants. Through inter-agency training and collaboration and making more community resources available, the region will be able to more effectively identify and appropriately divert mentally ill defendants.
2. Establish DCJS-approved pretrial services for the entire region, with both pretrial investigation and supervision services available for defendants charged in all localities served by the regional jail. This would include developing pretrial services for Abingdon, Duffield and Haysi, and replacing the small program in Tazewell with an evidence-based program meeting state pretrial standards. The services will include pretrial investigations using the Virginia Pretrial Risk Assessment Instrument (VPRAI), a pretrial Home Electronic Monitoring component, drug testing and face-to-face supervision contacts. Establishing pretrial services is projected to require staffing of 4 pretrial investigators and 4 pretrial supervision officers (one of each at each facility) because of the volume and distance between each facility. Their duties will include working with defendants released on a home electronic monitoring device.
3. Expand local probation services at Southwest Virginia and Clinch Valley Community Corrections. By expanding staff and other resources at the existing two agencies providing local probation, the number of locally responsible jail inmates should decrease. Evidence-based practices will be central to service

delivery, with more structured and frequent contacts and services targeted to medium- and high-risk sentenced offenders. The services will include a Home Electronic Monitoring component, day reporting, drug testing, face-to-face supervision contacts and additional referrals to community mental health, educational and vocational resources and mentors. Expanding resource capacity for local probation services will require the addition of four probation officers for the region, whose duties will include working with sentenced offenders under electronic monitoring.

4. Create a jail reentry community phase. Two reentry coordinators will work with the Abingdon and Duffield facilities to prepare offenders for release, network extensively with local resources for transitional housing, employment and counseling assistance as appropriate.

Note: The construction of the current regional jail system 10 years ago included a plan to implement pretrial services but that component was not funded. Had it been implemented and fully utilized, the jail's current overcrowding may not been as extensive.

Projected Cost

Year 1: \$400,000 – Planning and partial staffing

Year 2: \$800,000 – Full Implementation

Central Virginia Regional Jail Authority

The CVRJ serves the counties of Fluvanna, Greene, Louisa, Madison and Orange. It plans to expand its existing facility in Orange to increase capacity by 200 beds as well as implement an aggressive community-based corrections strategy to divert an additional average daily population, eventually reaching 60 to 100 persons. The projected jail population forecast is predicated on expansion of existing pretrial investigation and supervision services and expanded community-corrections services along with further collaboration among local criminal justice and community stakeholders.

Existing Alternative Programming

The current community based services include state probation and parole, the Virginia Alcohol Safety Action Program (VASAP), local probation and pretrial services. State Probation and Parole Districts 9 and 13 provide supervision to state-responsible offenders in the jail's service area. District 9 and James River (Alcohol Safety Action Program) ASAP programs serve the regional jail localities. They provide alternatives to convictions and post-conviction punishment for persons convicted of DUI, alcohol- or drug-related driving offenses. Home Electronic Monitoring is used rarely.

Existing pretrial and local probation services are targeted to the locally responsible population and are coordinated by the OAR/Jefferson Area Community Corrections

agency. OAR is headquartered in Charlottesville, with a pretrial office in the town of Orange. While using other offices located in county courthouses, staff can access several criminal justice programs. Compared to other localities in the state, pretrial services are comparatively underutilized by the courts in the CVRJ service area. Most pretrial placements are through the magistrates with court arraignments usually on a weekly, rather than a daily basis. The weekly arraignment schedule contributes to a backlog of defendants in jail awaiting arraignment.

Proposed Programming

The CVRJ plan calls for the following:

1. Work with decision-makers to consider using “cross arraignment” procedures for first appearances in court to expedite pretrial processing.
2. Establish a full-time presence of the pretrial and local probation services in the CVRJ service area with a 6-person office in Orange.
 - a. Increase pretrial investigation and supervision staffing so all eligible defendants receive a pretrial investigation and risk assessment.
 - b. Increase local probation staffing to facilitate additional placements with appropriate supervision tied to risk based supervision plans.
3. Adopt a formal planning strategy for expanding community-based supervision services that is a collaborative effort between decision-makers at all levels of the local system.
4. Expand use of Home Electronic Monitoring for both pretrial and sentenced locally responsible populations.

Projected Cost

Year 1: \$150,000 Planning process, hiring of coordinator and investigator, establish office space and equipment.

Year 2: \$400,000 Full implementation with 6 staff and full-time office

Localities Required to Have New Pretrial and/or Community-Based Probation Services Based on Jail Projects and Community-Based Corrections Plans Previously Approved by the Legislature But Never Funded

In addition to the 15 localities projected to receive services through the two current-year jail projects, there are another 15 localities with community-based corrections plans requiring new pretrial or local probation services that were approved in prior years but not funded. Also, there are many more localities required, but not funded, to have expanded pretrial and local probation services as part of jail projects previously approved by the Board of Corrections during the past several years.

Given the lack of any pretrial services at all in 40 localities (after the addition of Southwest localities through the current project) and the state's resource limitations, the priority should be establishing at least basic pretrial investigation and supervision services to those areas that do not have services, but which are required. This is the most direct way to divert some of the locally responsible jail population using a strategic, evidence-based service. Within that group, further priority can be set by beginning with the localities where existing organizational structures and local willingness to work with neighboring agencies and jurisdictions reduce the projected cost incurred to establish the service. The following projects from this group are priority for funding:

Year 1: \$1,040,000

Localities Mandated: **Amherst County, Appomattox County**
(Lynchburg Community Corrections Agency)
Amount: \$300,000/year

Localities Mandated: **Charles City County**
(Colonial Community Corrections)
Amount: \$120,000/year

Localities Mandated: **Shenandoah County, Warren County**
(Northwest Regional Adult Detention Center)
Amount: \$260,000/year

Localities Mandated: **Culpeper County**
(Culpeper Community Corrections)
Amount: \$180,000/year

Localities Mandated: **Montgomery County**
(New River Community Corrections)
Amount: \$180,000/year

Year 2: \$1,360,000 (includes Year 1 plus additions below):

Localities Mandated: **Petersburg, Dinwiddie County**
(Petersburg Community Corrections)

Amount: \$120,000/year

Localities Mandated: **Accomack County, Northampton County**
(Community Corrections)

Amount: \$200,000/year

TOTAL FUNDING

Year 1: \$1,590,000

Year 2: \$2,560,000

Recommended financing arrangements and estimated general fund requirements for debt service as provided by the Department of Treasury.

- **Central VA Regional Jail, 200-Bed Expansion**- Based on approved costs of \$16,928,382, annual debt service for the VPBA's reimbursement of the \$8,464,191 State share would be approximately \$623,290 each year for 20 years.
- **Southwest VA Regional Jail, 512-Bed Expansion**- Based on approved costs of \$33,820,372, annual debt service for the VPBA's reimbursement of the \$16,910,186 State share would be approximately \$1,244,580 each year for 20 years.
- **RSW Regional Jail, 375-Bed Expansion**- Based on approved costs of \$65,681,700, annual debt service for the VPBA's reimbursement of the \$32,840,850 State share would be approximately \$2,429,200 each year for 20 years.
- **Richmond City Jail, 1032-Bed Expansion**- Based on approved costs of \$118,810,832, annual debt service for the VPBA's reimbursement of the \$29,702,708 State share would be approximately \$2,188,400 each year for 20 years.

All estimates were computed using a budgeted interest rate assumption of 4.00%. The actual interest rate will be based on market conditions at the time of the transaction. Also the estimates only relate to reimbursement of approved project costs and do not include reimbursement of the state's share of the regional authorities' financing (interest) costs from construction midpoint through completion, which will also be determined and at completion based on the timing and terms of their respective financings.

Since Board of Corrections approval has been obtained, the Department of Treasury will establish a file for each of these and monitor for General Assembly authorization during future sessions after which they will be added to our list of authorized jail projects.