

CITIZENS LEAGUE REPORT

No. 195

Minneapolis-Hennepin Co. Jails

July 1966

195

CITIZENS LEAGUE
REPORT ON
MINNEAPOLIS-HENNEPIN COUNTY JAILS

Approved
Citizens League Board of Directors
July 13, 1966

Citizens League
545 Mobil Oil Building
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
Phone: 338-0791

Citizens League
545 Mobil Oil Building
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402

July 6, 1966

TO: Citizens League Board of Directors

FROM: Minneapolis-Hennepin County Jails Committee, C. Paul Jones, Chairman

SUBJECT: Improvement in Jail Facilities and the Need for Consolidation

SUMMARY

The major recommendations in this report are as follows:

1. The Municipal Building Commission should discontinue immediately its plan for remodeling the fifth floor of the Courthouse for the Hennepin County and Minneapolis Jails. Instead the jails should be combined by act of the 1967 Legislature and the County Board of Commissioners should proceed with plans for a new building to house a combined jail.
2. The new building housing the combined jail should also include, at a minimum, other activities of a public safety nature, such as the Hennepin County Sheriff's office and the Minneapolis Police Department.
3. A new Division of Detention and Corrections should be established in County government, under the County Board, and include the combined jail, the Workhouse, the Juvenile Center and the Home Schools for Boys and Girls. Such a move, though, probably has to be part of an overall reorganization of County government. However, the need is so urgent for planning new jail facilities that the 1967 Legislature should combine the jails under the County Board as an interim step if reorganization cannot be accomplished then.
4. The 1967 Legislature should also transfer control of the Minneapolis Workhouse to the County Board, even if reorganization does not occur.
5. Adequate quarters for juveniles should be built at the Juvenile Center as part of any plan for construction of a new combined jail so that juveniles no longer will have to be housed at the jail.
6. Operating costs of the combined jail should be apportioned so that costs of keeping prisoners from Hennepin County Municipal Court will be assessed to the municipality where the violation occurred and costs of prisoners from Hennepin County District Court will be a general county obligation.

RECOMMENDATIONS, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

I. REMODELING JAIL FACILITIES VERSUS A NEW BUILDING

Recommendation:

We recommend that the Municipal Building Commission immediately discontinue its plans for remodeling the Hennepin County and Minneapolis Jails on the fifth floor of the Courthouse. Instead the Hennepin County Board of Commissioners should authorize a new building to house a combined jail. Jail facilities for both the City and the County are inadequate, but improvements can best be made--both from the standpoint of the most efficient use of the taxpayer's dollar and providing the best jail facilities--by building one new, unified jail to replace the two jails. At a minimum the new building should include the following facilities:

- (a) Adequate provision for the various categories of prisoners in Hennepin County, from misdemeanants requiring minimum security to accused murderers, requiring maximum security, from persons awaiting trial to persons awaiting sentencing or transfer to other institutions, and other categories, plus modern facilities for medical treatment, exercise and food service.*
- (b) Facilities for work-release prisoners, so they no longer have to be housed in inadequate quarters at the Workhouse.*
- (c) Enough courtrooms to handle the appearances and trials for jailed defendants.*
- (d) Other facilities of a public safety nature, such as the Hennepin County Sheriff's office, the Minneapolis Police Department, and possibly the administrative offices of the Minneapolis Fire Department.*

We further recommend that the County work closely with state and national experts on jail construction to give maximum assurance that the new jail will be built according to the most modern principles of detention and corrections.

Findings and Conclusions

1. The physical adequacy of the Hennepin County Jail

We have toured the facilities of the jail and have met with the chief jailer, the superintendent of the Municipal Building Commission, the architect for the Building Commission, and federal and state jail inspectors. We have reviewed proposed remodeling plans for the jail as submitted by the chief jailer. We have also met with the president of a consulting firm which is doing a major study of all courthouse facilities. In addition we have studied a report by the Correctional Service of Minnesota on the Hennepin County Jail. We have found unanimous agreement that the physical facilities of the Hennepin County Jail are totally inadequate for today's needs. We concur. Specifically, we find the as follows:

--The jail was built about the turn of the century. Many of its original facilities still are in use, but in dire need of replacement. The jail is not built in accord with modern principles of penology.

--Locks for the vast majority of cells are virtually worn out. It is possible for a prisoner to kick open the door of his cell, an event which happens more than once a month. Locksmiths find it extremely difficult to repair the locks because many replacement parts are not manufactured anymore. A prisoner who kicks open the door of his cell still cannot get out of his cell block without getting through another locked cell door, but it is generally accepted that the jail should have a minimum of two, and preferably three, security checks.

--Of a total of 73 cells in the Hennepin County Jail, 60 of them are two-man cells, a type of construction which violates all principles of modern penology. With two-man cells, there is little opportunity to guarantee the protection of one prisoner from another, thus exposing a prisoner to the risks of homosexual advances or other dangers. If a prisoner should be injured or die in a two-man cell, there is no witness except the other prisoner. The ideal jail construction is for one-man cells for all prisoners, such as is found at the Minneapolis Workhouse. Four-man cells are considered preferable to two-man cells because the risk of harm to a single individual by another is diminished.

--Concrete floors are cracked and porous in many places, making them hard to keep clean. Paint also will not stick to the floors properly. Further, floor drains are lacking in most parts of the jail. Toilets are flooded on the average of once a week. In the past there has been seepage of water to the fourth floor offices and courtrooms.

--It is very difficult for jailers to be aware of what is going on in the cells because most of the cells are far removed from the central headquarters. In fact, some cells are almost a city block away. Frequently a jailer must take a belligerent prisoner by himself to a cell at the far end. It would be difficult for other jailers to learn quickly if trouble arose. This problem has been alleviated somewhat in the past year with the installation of sound equipment which enables jailers at the central headquarters to hear what is going on in the various cells. It would be desirable for jailers to be able to view the cells at all times also.

--Cell blocks are very poorly constructed for any type of exercise space or general assembly area where prisoners could take part in some activity. For example, in cell blocks A and B, the largest cell blocks in the jail, with 19 two-man cells in each block, the only "exercise space" is a corridor 46 inches wide. Cell doors swing open into this space. Not only does such an area pose problems for the prisoners, it also makes it very difficult for jailers to quell any disturbances because of the cramped quarters.

--Almost all prisoners must eat in their cells. If an exercise area were available, such an area also could have tables available where meals would be served.

--Plumbing fixtures, lighting systems and other such facilities are located so close to the cells that it is possible for prisoners to have access to them and produce vandalism. In some cases it is possible for a prisoner to remove a lightbulb and bring it into his cell.

--Prisoners are kept in a block of cells with as many as 38 other prisoners. Modern penology practices generally call for cell blocks to have no more than 12 prisoners. With large cell blocks it is extremely difficult to separate different types of prisoners, such as the drunks, the deviates, the young, the old, the first offenders, the repeaters, the felons, the misdemeanants and others. Further, law enforcement officials find it difficult to separate suspects in the same crime when they are brought to jail.

--Expansion possibilities at the Hennepin County Jail are severely limited. Any expansion would have to be predicated on the removal of other fifth floor offices. Also, expansion would have to be tailored to the specific construction, and its limitations, of the present Courthouse.

--A request has been made by the superintendent of the Minneapolis Workhouse that the Hennepin County Jail become responsible for caring for the work-release prisoners who have been sentenced by the Municipal Court or District Court to serve time during their non-working hours. The jail cannot possibly handle such prisoners in the present situation.

--The jail lacks adequate facilities where prisoners can be stripped clean and inspected for contraband and for medical purposes.

2. The physical adequacy of the Minneapolis City Jail

We have met with the chief jailer of the Minneapolis City Jail, the Minneapolis Chief of Police, the State Jail Consultant, a federal jail inspector, the superintendent of the Municipal Building Commission, the architect for the Commission and we have toured the Minneapolis City Jail. As in the case of the Hennepin County Jail, we have found unanimous agreement that the physical facilities of the Minneapolis City Jail are totally inadequate. We concur. In fact, evidence we have received indicates that conditions in the Minneapolis City Jail are worse than those in the Hennepin County Jail. Specifically, we find as follows:

--Serious security problems exist in the City Jail. In the main area of cells, only a few of the cells are locked anymore. The only security is the locked door of the cell block. This means that prisoners circulate freely within a given cell block. If a guard wishes to enter the cell block for any reason, such as removing a prisoner, it is impossible to lock the prisoners in their individual cells for the protection of the guard.

--Facilities for the care of prisoners who are brought in drunk are very poor. The so-called "drunk tank", where the large number of weekend drunks are placed, is directly connected to another cell block. All persons taken to the drunk tank first must be transported through this cell block. Of course, it is not possible to lock prisoners in their cells in this cell block while prisoners are being taken to the drunk tank. Within the drunk tank itself there is no way to separate prisoners who are vomiting or otherwise unable to control themselves from other prisoners who may have been arrested, for example, for driving under the influence, but may not be in a stupor.

--The area of the City Jail known as Duffy's Flats, which is the principal security area of the City Jail, has cells which are secure, but the area

is so far removed from the rest of the jail that it is difficult for guards to maintain surveillance here. A man committed suicide in this area on April 17 of this year. Shouts by fellow prisoners failed to attract guards because of the distance involved.

--The women's section of the City Jail has security problems similar to the main jail area, with locks not working properly. Further, this area lacks proper surveillance, too. A woman committed suicide here on March 12 of this year.

--Prisoners in the City Jail do not have mattresses to sleep on, regardless of the length of stay. Mattresses need not be in cells in which drunks are placed, but it is clear that any prisoner who is kept 48 hours or more should have a mattress. Some prisoners stay two weeks or longer.

--The City purchases 10 hot meals daily from the County Jail for City Jail prisoners, regardless of the number of prisoners in jail. All other prisoners are fed cold meals.

--The physical facilities in the drunk tank are very poor, with only one toilet and wash basin for up to 40 prisoners. Also, there is no floor drain in the drunk tank, making it very difficult to clean the area.

--The City Jail lacks a central control area for locks, such as recently were installed in the County Jail.

3. The Remodeling Plan

We have reviewed the six-phase remodeling plan for the Hennepin County Jail as developed by Chief Jailer Robert McLane in cooperation with the Municipal Building Commission and its architect. In general we find that given the limitations of construction of the fifth floor of the courthouse the plan would provide an acceptable jail, if carried out to the fullest. However, our examination has revealed two major factors which led us to the conclusion that construction of new jail facilities in a new public safety building is clearly preferable.

(1) The square-foot remodeling cost would be as much as if not more, than the square-foot cost of new construction. (2) The built-in limitations of remodeling on the fifth floor of the Courthouse--such as the necessity to build around the rotunda and also to avoid construction in the attic--dictate that Hennepin County cannot possibly end up with as good a jail as would be produced in a new building. With remodeling, the plan would have to fit the layout of the building, but with new construction, the layout of the building could be made to fit the plan. Further expansion in the future would be difficult, if not impossible with a remodeled jail, because the entire floor would be used in the initial stages. Later, if additional space were needed, there would be no way to expand. Our specific findings are below:

Success of the remodeling plan is contingent upon the removal from the 5th floor of the Courthouse of some 16,000 square feet of space now used by the Minneapolis City Planning Commission, a courtroom and jury waiting rooms. These quarters, obviously, would have to be located elsewhere. We are not aware of any agreements which have been made to date to indicate that these other offices can or will be vacated.

Quite aside from our recommendations it is important for the remodeling plan to be halted to await the outcome of a study by SUA, Inc., a West Coast consulting firm, on the future building space needs of county government. Preliminary information from this firm indicates that a recommendation will be made to discontinue remodeling of the present facilities and build a new building.

We were surprised to learn that so many different cost estimates of the remodeling plan have been made. The minimum estimate is about \$1,250,000, which was made by J. Clifford Boies, superintendent of the Municipal Building Commission. (A few years ago an estimate of \$600,000 was made, but this has been discounted by all persons involved as far too low.) James Hulbert, State Jail Consultant, told us the remodeling costs would be about \$1,500,000, and R. D. Rukes, Federal Jail Inspector, with the responsibility for inspecting 103 jails in six states, has said that he was informed the remodeling cost would be \$2,250,000. Finally, figures on file with the City-County Buildings Committee of the Citizens League indicate one estimate from county officials was \$2,500,000, though this cannot be substantiated today.

There are a total of 46,815 square feet on the fifth floor of the courthouse, 14,323 for the city jail; 15,363 for the county jail; 1,051 square feet for the county jailer's residence, and 16,078 for the City Planning Commission, a District Courtroom and a jurors' room.

If the remodeling cost is \$1,250,000 the square foot remodeling cost is \$26.70 per square foot. If the cost is \$1,500,000, the square foot cost is \$32.04. If the cost is \$2,500,000, the square foot cost is \$48.06, and if the cost is \$2,500,000, the square foot cost is \$53.40.

The State Jail Consultant has informed us that latest figures on the cost of new jail construction in Minnesota are running about \$30 per square foot, excluding land.

It is clear to us from these figures that the square foot remodeling costs for the fifth floor of the Courthouse are far more than can be justified.

In addition we were told by several local, state and federal jail officials that they would "prefer" new construction if it were possible, but that the remodeling plan seemed more likely to be realized than a new building.

The jails were built around the turn of the century. It would be shortsighted to utilize the present area to plan a facility for the next 50 to 75 years when the opportunity is present to build a new structure instead. Hennepin County should plan a jail to meet modern standards of construction and penology and should not be limited by the construction on the fifth floor of the Courthouse.

The jail should be expandable, so that it can meet the needs of an expanding population. It needs to be especially flexible in connection with serving the work-release or Huber prisoners, who serve time but at the same time can continue to hold down their regular jobs.

Temporary quarters for Huber prisoners at the Minneapolis Workhouse are overtaxed. In the long run it is desirable to house work-release prisoners downtown where it is easier for them to get to and from their jobs. The demand for space for work-release prisoners will increase substantially in coming years, even to the extent that some felons and federal prisoners will be placed on work-release.

The jail needs to be in close proximity to the criminal courtrooms so that prisoners can be brought from their cells to the courtroom with a minimum--if any--amount of public contact. This is for the benefit of both the prisoners and the public. Parading prisoners through public corridors presents somewhat of a security risk. It also presents risks to the prisoners themselves to harm from individual citizens who might be enraged by a certain case. Further, the parading of handcuffed prisoners in public corridors presents an aspect of humiliation to prisoners who may or may not be convicted of crimes.

It would be possible, in remodeling the fifth floor, to construct elevators to go directly from the jail into the courtrooms. In terms of a new building--and we emphasize we are not making a specific recommendation on location pending outcome of the SUA study--the jail could be constructed across the street from the present building so that prisoners could be brought either by tunnel or by an over-the-street passageway to the courtrooms. It seems to make much more sense, though, to build the courtrooms as an integral part of the public safety building. The demand for courtrooms is expected to continue to increase in coming years, so it is not unwise to build some courtrooms in the jail building. Only a few rooms would be needed. Our examination of criminal court activity indicates that four courtrooms would be sufficient, a traffic courtroom, a police courtroom, an arraignment court for District Court cases, which also could be used for regular District Court trials, and an overflow Courtroom for District Court trials, to handle the defendants who are jailed.

We see considerable merit in the offices of the Sheriff and the Police Department being located in close proximity to the jail. Thus it seems proper to house both of these functions in a new building along with the jail and the criminal courtrooms. Administrative offices of the Minneapolis Fire Department also could be included. Conceivably, this could be a Public Safety Building. We would expect that the professional consultants hired by the Hennepin County Board of Commissioners to recommend a building plan for county government will be making some specific recommendations on what functions should be provided in the same building with the jail.

The Sheriff's office probably will retain its functions of serving warrants and making arrests, thus bringing people to the jail in the future. The Police Department no doubt will remain in close contact with prisoners it is interested in. Further the Police Department will have a close connection with the identification and record-keeping function in a new jail. Also, we do not know at this time what future changes will be made in the relationship between the Police Department and the Sheriff's office in terms of county-wide responsibilities. Housing both in a Public Safety Building with the jails means that we can prepare for such changes.

II. JUVENILE DETENTION

Recommendation:

We recommend that in planning new jail facilities the Hennepin County Board of Commissioners also plan a sufficiently large addition to the County Juvenile Center, 1000 S. 6th Street, so that juveniles no longer will have to be kept at the City-County Jail.

Findings and Conclusions

We find that the County Juvenile Center, with a capacity for 30 juveniles, is far too small to handle the juvenile population. In fact, more juveniles were

sent to the City Jail in 1965 than to the Juvenile Center. During 1965, 1,485 juveniles were admitted to the Juvenile Center and 1,696 to the City Jail.

We do not believe that the new City-County Jail should include any quarters for juveniles. Juveniles properly should be kept at the Juvenile Center, which is clearly removed from the jail.

III. CONSOLIDATION

Recommendation

We recommend that the 1967 Legislature combine the Minneapolis City Jail and the Hennepin County Jail into one Hennepin County Jail. Only then can proper planning for new jail facilities take place. Also widespread duplication of services will be eliminated.

Findings and Conclusions

We have extensively examined the administration and functioning of the two jails which are located side by side on the fifth floor of the City-County Courthouse in downtown Minneapolis. We find as follows:

1. As long as two separate jails exist we believe it is unlikely that either jail will be substantially improved. It is impossible to plan improvements sensibly without consolidation. It would be an extravagant waste of funds for both the City and the County to proceed independently with jail improvements. This was recognized by the County in its proposed remodeling plan. The final step of this plan provides for consolidation. The urgent need to provide new facilities, as we noted in our first recommendation, makes it all the more important that consolidation take place at the next session of the Legislature.

2. Extensive and unnecessary duplication of services exists which is both wasteful to the taxpayers and detrimental to welfare of prisoners in both jails. The areas of unnecessary duplication include the following:

(a) Booking and identification. Each jail operates its own booking procedures, including fingerprinting, picture-taking and social history reports. The City Jail's facilities for booking and identification are far more extensive than the County's. We have been informed that in certain cases persons who are brought directly to the County Jail are not even booked but go right through the court and are processed with the result that no positive permanent identification of these people is ever included in the records.

When a prisoner is transferred from the Minneapolis City Jail to the County Jail (this occurs when a person arrested in Minneapolis is bound over to the District Court), the identification and booking process is repeated, which seems unnecessary, but occurs because each jail operates independently.

With a consolidated jail such dual booking and identification procedures would be eliminated. Only one booking desk is needed. A prisoner need not be booked again when he is bound over to the District

Court. Only one set of fingerprints, pictures and social history is needed.

(b) Record-keeping. Each jail operates its own file of records of prisoners. The City Jail's records are far more detailed and complete than are the County Jail's records. Approximately 750,000 fingerprints and dossiers on various individuals are on file.

With two groups of records law enforcement officials have to contact both the County Jail and the City Jail records to check on an individual.

Separate record-keeping has the effect of making both the City's files and the County's files incomplete. If the records were combined, then both the City and County would have a more complete file to rely upon.

(c) Crime laboratory. Both jails have a crime lab and an evidence room for storing weapons, liquor and other items to be used during court hearings. There appears to be general agreement by jail officials on both sides that the crime labs and evidence rooms should not be part of the jails. There is a serious risk that prisoners could have access to a variety of weapons in these rooms, since the only provision of security is a wooden door with a standard lock.

(d) Women's Section. Each jail has its own section for women. The County Jail has only one matron, the wife of the chief jailer, who is responsible on a 24-hour, 7-day-a-week basis. The City Jail has a staff of six matrons, which is sufficient to guarantee that the two matrons are on duty at all times. City and County jail personnel generally agreed that the present matron staff of the city could handle the entire woman population of both jails. It is not sound, we believe, for one matron to be responsible for the women prisoners in the County Jail. It is equally unsound, though, for the County to hire enough matrons to provide service to women prisoners in the County Jail. The solution is to combine the women's sections and have only one section for women.

(e) Men's Section. Although the City Jail serves mainly prisoners accused of misdemeanors and the County Jail serves mainly prisoners accused of felonies, both jails serve a number of different types of prisoners who require various types of custody. For example, on a weekend, drunks are brought both to the County Jail and the City Jail. The City Jail has the vast majority of them but the County Jail has a few, who disrupt the nights of the other prisoners who are kept there. A properly run jail would provide an entirely separate area for the drunks so that they would not bother the other prisoners. A number of the inmates of the City Jail are non-weekenders and should be kept in areas separate from the overnight cases. Both jails have a need for some heavy security cells and some medium security cells. Neither jail, though, should have to provide the range of security on its own.

(f) Elevators. Each jail has its own separate elevator. However,

the County Jail elevator is operated only on a 40-hour-a-week basis. After regular daytime hours each day and on weekends all County Jail traffic must use the City Jail elevator, thus passing through the City Jail enroute. Only one elevator is needed.

(g) Food and meals. The City Jail does not provide hot meals for its prisoners. The City Jail purchases 10 hot meals a day from the County Jail which are given as a reward for good behavior to prisoners in the City Jail. To other prisoners the City Jail provides a roll and coffee for breakfast, a sandwich for noon lunch and another sandwich for dinner. Because of its larger, more fully-equipped food preparation area, the county provides cooked meals for all its prisoners. Our information indicates that the food preparation facility in the County Jail, with a few minor revisions, could provide well-balanced meals for every prisoner in both jails. It is our impression that certain prisoners in the City Jail, particularly the drunks, would not be in shape for a hot meal. But quite clearly, with a consolidated jail you could have one kitchen preparing adequate meals for all prisoners.

(h) Ill prisoners. Both jails have prisoners with health problems or who require special medical care. It would be desirable if such prisoners could be kept separate from the other prisoners in the jails. With a consolidated jail you could provide a special ward for such prisoners.

(i) Laundry. The City Jail now provides no laundry service for its prisoners. The County Jail has a laundry room with washing and drying facilities. From the standpoint of cleanliness, personal hygiene and general improvement of the jail program, it seems logical that a laundry service should be provided for the City Jail as well as the County, but it would not make sense for the City to provide another separate facility. Only one is needed.

(j) Library. Each jail operates its own library for inmates. One library easily could serve both jails, with probably a greater choice of material than now is available in either.

3. Both jails serve the same courts, the Hennepin County Municipal Court and the Hennepin County District Court. Minneapolis no longer has its own municipal court.

4. The administration of the Minneapolis City Jail can best be characterized as part-time. The City Jail is administered as part of the Bureau of Identification. The Head of the Bureau of Identification has said that he devotes no more than about one-third of his time to administration of the City Jail. Administration of the City Jail could be improved considerably if a person were assigned the permanent job of regular supervision. This would be possible with consolidation.

IV. ADMINISTRATION OF A CONSOLIDATED JAIL

Recommendation

We recommend that the administration of a combined jail be part of a new

Division of Detention and Corrections in County Government. The Division would be responsible for the combined jail, the Workhouse, the work-release (Huber) prisoners, the County Home School for Boys, the County Home School for Girls and the County Juvenile Center. We are aware that proposals for reorganization of County Government soon will be forthcoming from the Citizens League County Government Structure Committee and from a West Coast consulting firm hired by the Hennepin County Board of Commissioners. We would hope that recommendations made by these groups would include joint management of the above-named institutions under one division. We believe, though, that the need is so crucial for combining the jails promptly that it should not hinge an overall reorganization of County Government. We recommend that the 1967 Legislature place a combined jail under the Hennepin County Board of Commissioners. This would be the best interim step pending such reorganization. We also recommend--in line with a Citizens League report dated March 17, 1965--that the Minneapolis Workhouse be brought under the County Board at the same time the combined jail is.

Findings and Conclusions

1. It would be possible as an interim step to combine the jails under the Joint Powers Act. In 1961 the County Attorney gave an opinion to the Municipal Building Commission that the jails could be combined in this manner. Either the Minneapolis Police Department or the Sheriff could be given the responsibility for managing the jail under such an arrangement. Because of the limited nature of the Police Department's involvement in jail administration at the present time (the chief supervisor of the City Jail spends two-thirds of his time in identification work), it would appear that the Sheriff would be the only logical administrator. However, we see disadvantages in combining the jails under the Joint Powers Act even as an interim step. This is a purely voluntary arrangement which can be terminated at any time. It would not be possible to provide the proper long-range planning for new or remodeled facilities which are sorely needed by both jails. Such planning must be on a unified basis for both jails.

2. It is possible as an interim step for State Law to specify that the Sheriff be responsible for a combined jail. This would eliminate the shortcomings mentioned if the Sheriff were responsible through the Joint Powers Act. Then planning for a combined jail facilities could proceed immediately.

There are certain disadvantages, though, in such an interim step because it might not aid in accomplishing the long-term goal of bringing all the institutions of detention and corrections under one administration. We do not believe that the Sheriff should be the administrator of a Division of Detention and Corrections. This is not a criticism of the administration of the present jail. In fact, our visits with jail inspectors indicated they are quite pleased with the job of the present Chief Jailer. But we see the role of the Sheriff primarily as a service officer in the long run, not an administrator. The office of Sheriff in an urban county such as Hennepin is far different from his role in a predominantly rural county. In Hennepin County the Sheriff's office has become primarily one of providing service to the courts, performing such duties as serving warrants and other legal papers or serving as bailiff to the Courts. In a sense we see the role of the Sheriff somewhat similar to the role of the U. S. Marshal serving the Federal Courts. Also it should be noted that currently the office of Sheriff is elective. The chief administrator of the jail should not be an elective position.

3. It is possible as an interim step for the County Board of Commissioners, the chief executive arm of county government, to be given the authority by legislative act to be responsible for the combined jail. In terms of long-term considerations for a Division of Detention and Corrections, this would be the best start since we believe the long-term interests of county government will best be served by centralizing authority in the County Board.

4. The Hennepin County Department of Court Services, an arm of Hennepin County District Court, also could be given the responsibility for operating the jail as an interim step. The Department of Court Services currently is responsible for administration of the juvenile institutions, the Home Schools and the Juvenile Center, all of which we believe should be part of a Division of Detention and Corrections in the long run. One of the disadvantages of giving the Department additional administrative responsibilities under its present organization is that the Department is administered by the District Judges. While Judges have a legitimate concern for policy direction in the Department of Court Services, they should not be involved in administration. Also it is not sound to give administrative authority to one group of Judges, when another group, the Municipal Court Judges, have as much an interest in the operation of the jail as the District Judges.

On balance we conclude the preferable interim step is for the Legislature to place a combined jail under the County Board. Pending any change in the independent nature of the Sheriff's office in County Government, it would be possible for the County Board to contract with the Sheriff to operate the jail. The advantages of placing the combined jail under the County Board immediately are (1) It will enable much more orderly planning for new facilities. (2) It will place the chief governing board of Hennepin County in a more direct supervisory position over the jail, which is consistent with the general direction of county reorganization proposals.

With the jail under the County Board we see the best opportunity for our long range recommendation for an integrated Division of Detention and Corrections to be implemented. It may be that such a Division would be part of the Department of Court Services, should that Department come administratively under the County Board.

We believe also that the 1967 Legislature should go beyond consolidating the Jails. The Legislature should place the Minneapolis Workhouse under the County Board, too. The Citizens League in a report to the 1965 Legislature had urged transfer of the Workhouse to the County. Placing both the combined Jails and the Workhouse under the County Board immediately would not interfere with long range county reorganization.

V. ACCESS TO THE JAIL BY OFFICIAL PERSONNEL

Recommendation:

We recommend that any legislation or agreement in connection with a combined jail specifically provide that official personnel shall be guaranteed access to the jail 24 hours a day.

Findings and Conclusions

One of the main reasons officials of the Minneapolis Police Department have given for their reluctance to support a combined jail is that they fear they will lose the 24-hour-a-day access to the jail for official purposes. They said that currently the County Jail is closed to outsiders every day at 5 p.m. It seems to us that adequate guarantees can be provided so that police do not lose access under a combined jail.

VI. RESPONSIBILITY FOR IDENTIFICATION AND RECORDS IN A COMBINED JAIL

Recommendation:

We recommend that the large volume of identification and records which has been developed over the years by the Minneapolis Police Department be guaranteed adequate protection in a combined jail.

Findings and Conclusions

The only other reason, in addition to fear of losing full access to the jail that Minneapolis Police officials have been cool to jail consolidation has been they want to protect their large volume of records and identification.

We regard it as extremely important that a combined jail have an adequate identification and records system--at least as extensive as the one developed by the Minneapolis Police Department to date. We believe that legislation can provide that whoever maintains the identification and records system that the interests of Minneapolis will be protected. Perhaps personnel now employed by the Minneapolis Police Department could head up the identification and records section in a new jail. Or, if necessary, the County could even contract with the Police Department to carry out this function.

VII. FINANCING ARRANGEMENTS FOR A COMBINED JAIL

Recommendation:

We recommend that operating costs of a combined jail be apportioned on the following basis:

(a) The cost of keeping prisoners accused of misdemeanors and ordinance violations, whose cases will be finally disposed of in Hennepin County Municipal Court, would be assessed to the municipality where the alleged violation occurred.

(b) The cost of keeping prisoners accused of gross misdemeanors and felonies, whose cases potentially will be disposed of in Hennepin County District Court, would be a general county obligation.

Findings and Conclusions

We have concluded that in Municipal Court cases the costs of keeping prisoners should be apportioned to the municipality where the alleged violation occurred. Under present state law all fines imposed by the Municipal Court are returned to the

municipality where the violation occurred. Until or unless this is changed, the individual municipality should continue to be responsible for its own Municipal Court prisoners.

Until April 1, 1966, the County had charged suburban municipalities a per diem rate of \$4.84 for prisoners held for Municipal Court. This was eliminated because use by suburbs was so slight and because Minneapolis was not paying anything for the limited amount of use it made of the County Jail for Municipal Court cases in certain instances. Under our recommendation, a per diem would be re-established with the creation of the combined jail.

Under a combined jail, costs of keeping prisoners accused of gross misdemeanors and felonies would be assumed immediately by the county, without apportionment to the municipalities where the violations occurred. These cases are destined for District Court. Revenue from District Court fines are not returned to the municipalities but are retained by the County.

SCOPE OF THE REPORT

In the fall of 1965 the Citizens League Board of Directors authorized creation of the Jails Committee with the following assignment:

1. To review the physical adequacy of the Minneapolis and Hennepin County Jails.
2. To review the need for improved or additional facilities.
3. To review the desirability of consolidating the jails.

The establishment of this committee was an outgrowth of certain facts uncovered by another committee of the Citizens League which has been studying the building space needs of Minneapolis and Hennepin County. These facts indicated that up to \$2.5 million in remodeling was being considered for the jails.

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Twenty-two Citizens League members participated in the deliberations of the Jails Committee. The Committee was headed by C. Paul Jones, new State Public Defender. Among members were three architects, a suburban police chief and the executive director of the Correctional Service of Minnesota.

Committee members besides Jones were Russell Baumgardner, Wayne Bennett, Bruce W. Blackburn, Sam Bloom, Robert C. Burton, W. Brooks Cavin, Dr. Bernard Christensen, Ford W. Crouch, Jr., Richard W. Faunce, Murray Galinson, Lloyd Graven, Allan C. Hubanks, Roger T. Johnson, Kenneth Lee, James B. Lund, Richard Lurie, Alan C. Mingo, Mel Orenstein, Harlan E. Smith and S. L. Stolte. The committee was assisted by Paul Gilje, Citizens League Research Director.

COMMITTEE PROCEDURE

A total of 17 meetings of the committee were held between November 24, 1965, and July 6, 1966.

Committee members spent two afternoons touring the Minneapolis and Hennepin County Jails and the Minneapolis Workhouse. In addition very valuable information about the institutions was obtained from Robert McLane, chief jailer, Hennepin County Jail; Ronald Welbaum, superintendent, Bureau of Identification, Minneapolis Police Department, and Rolf W. Stageberg, superintendent of the Minneapolis Workhouse. McLane, Welbaum and Stageberg all appeared personally before the committee and also were very cooperative in providing more information in informal visits with the League staff.

Cal Hawkinson, chief of police in Minneapolis, met with the committee to discuss in detail the Police Department's feelings about jail consolidation. The committee met with J. Clifford Boies, superintendent of the Municipal Building Commission, and Al Eilers, architect for the Building Commission, on remodeling plans for the jails.

Late in 1965, the Hennepin County Board of Commissioners hired the firm of SUA (Space Utilization Analysis) Inc., Beverly Hills, California, to conduct a

study of building needs for county government. The committee met with Walter Jacobs, president of SUA, to discuss the firm's preliminary reaction to the question of remodeling the jails as against a new building.

On the question of governmental structure for a consolidated jail the committee met with Stanley Cowle, the chief administrative officer for the County Board.

The committee was very fortunate to meet with R. D. Rukes, Federal Jail Inspector with the Federal Bureau of Prisons. Mr. Rukes is responsible for inspecting some 103 jails in six states in the Upper Midwest. He was in Minneapolis for a routine inspection of the County Jail and consented to meet with us. Also the committee met with James Hulbert, State Jail Consultant with the Minnesota Department of Corrections. Hulbert discussed his recent inspections of the Minneapolis and Hennepin County Jails.

BACKGROUND

I. Detention of Prisoners in Hennepin County

Contrary to the practice in many counties throughout Minnesota and the nation neither the Minneapolis City Jail nor the Hennepin County Jail is used for sentenced prisoners--except on rare occasions.

The City Jail and County Jail can more appropriately be referred to as lockups or institutions of detention. Prisoners in these institutions may be awaiting trial, sentencing or transfer to another institution. Sentenced prisoners in Hennepin County are sent to the Minneapolis Workhouse if the term is less than a year or to the State P r i s o n or State Reformatory if the term is more than a year. On rare occasions, someone sentenced to the Workhouse may be transferred to the County Jail because of difficulty in handling him at the Workhouse.

(a) City Jail

The City Jail occupies 14,323 square feet on the fifth floor of the City-County Courthouse. The Jail has 44 cells in its main cell block. The main cell block is divided into six sections. Four sections have 8 cells each; one section has 4 cells and one section has 8 cells plus a large holding area for 30-40 persons picked up on charges of drunkenness. This holding area is known as the "bullpen" or "drunk tank". None of these cells has good security. Locks on many of the cell doors are inoperative. Only the locked door to each section keeps the prisoners secure.

At the end of a corridor which runs along the main cell block is a six-cell security area known as Duffy's Flats. This is the area where prisoners requiring the greatest security are kept.

In a separate area of the City Jail is an eight-cell section for women prisoners. There also is a five-cell area for juvenile boys; one room for five other juvenile boys and one room for four juvenile girls.

Capacity of the City Jail, exclusive of the bullpen, is about 72 prisoners. During 1965 a total of 18,068 prisoners were kept in the City Jail, an average of about 50 per day.

Prisoners accused of crimes in Minneapolis are originally brought to the City Jail. They are held here until bail can be obtained, their cases are disposed of in Hennepin County Municipal Court or until they are bound over to the District Court, in which case they are transferred down the hall to the Hennepin County Jail on the other side of the building.

The City Jail is administered by the Minneapolis Police Department. The Jail is part of the Police Department's Bureau of Identification which is located on the fifth floor also. The Bureau of Identification compiles all necessary data for an identification file on each prisoner. This includes fingerprinting, pictures and a social history report. The Bureau maintains an extensive record-keeping system, including cross-references, on all its prisoners.

The superintendent of the Bureau of Identification also serves as chief

jailer. He said that administration of the jail occupies about one-third of his time. He has said that it is difficult for him to be in charge of the jail and the Bureau of Identification and wishes that the jail could have a lieutenant or sergeant in complete charge of running the jail who would be directly responsible to him.

Other personnel in the Bureau of Identification are 5 identification officers, 13 patrolmen, 6 matrons and 3 clerk-typists. Nine of the patrolmen and all six matrons are assigned to the jail. Occasionally one of the identification officers is called to assist with the operation of the jail. The nine patrolmen who serve as jailers and the six matrons operate on a 24-hour-a-day shift basis so that two patrolmen and either one or two matrons are on duty at all times. The superintendent of the Bureau of Identification has said that occasionally he is so short of help that regular patrolmen have to be taken off their regular beats to assist in the jail. This is very difficult, he said, because such patrolmen are not experienced in working in the jail and have to be trained almost as beginning jailers. He would like three more patrolmen to be assigned full-time at the jail, one of whom could be the lieutenant or sergeant who would serve as supervisor. This would mean that at least one more man would be serving on each shift.

The Police Department's Crime Lab-Evidence Room also is included in the Bureau of Identification. The Correctional Service of Minnesota, a private organization, in a report on the City-County Jails last year said that the presence of the evidence room in the jail presents a risk because a variety of weapons, including knives, guns and other dangerous articles, in addition to various forms of intoxicating beverages, could be obtained by prisoners. The only security of the evidence room is a single wooden door with a standard lock.

Based on conversations with the superintendent of the Bureau of Identification, we estimate that approximately 58 per cent of the Bureau's budget is for the actual operation of the jail and the balance for the Bureau of Identification.

(b) Hennepin County Jail

The County Jail occupies 15,363 square feet on the fifth floor of the City-County Courthouse. The jail has a capacity for about 134 prisoners. The largest cell area is made up of Cell Blocks "A" and "B". The cell blocks are located in two tiers. Each cell block has 19 two-man cells, for a total capacity in the two cell blocks of 76 prisoners. Cell Blocks "C" and "D" are located at the end of a corridor which runs alongside Blocks "A" and "B". Blocks "C" and "D" each have 6 two-man cells. Cell Block "E", which is separated from the rest of the jail, is used for women. It has 8 cells, each with a capacity for two women.

Cell Block "F" has one one-man cell and one two-man cell. It was built in 1965 as part of the first phase remodeling of the jail. The cells are used as temporary holding quarters. Cell Block "G" has one four-man cell and four one-man cells. This cell block also was built in 1965.

Cell Block "H" has six one-man cells. This cell block is separate from the rest of the jail and usually houses certain problem prisoners, such as sexual deviates

During 1965 a total of 3,268 prisoners spent 26,259 prisoner-days at the jail. Dividing the number of prisoner-days by 365 days in a year, the result is an average of about 72 prisoners per day.

Following is a breakdown of the types of prisoners in the County Jail in 1965:

Hold for Other Jurisdictions, (U.S. Marshal, other counties, cities, states, etc.)	960
Driving Violations (includes 235 drunken (driving)	845
Check Violations	213
Burglary	187
Public Intoxication	170
Petty Larceny	142
Simple Assault	135
Violation of Probation	132
Contempt of Court	105
Aggravated Forgery	83
Robbery	73
Minor Consuming Intoxicants	65
Disorderly Conduct	60
Non-support	49
Auto Theft	42
Bench Warrants	40
Shoplifting	28
Disturbing the Peace	28
Possession of Narcotics	23
Contributing to Delinquency of a Minor	20
Indecent Assault	19
Resisting Arrest	11
Illegitimacy	11
Murder	11
Criminal Negligence	9
Manslaughter	6
Prostitution (appeals)	6
Tampering with Motor Vehicle	6
Other	<u>131</u>
Total	3,610*

* The total number of prisoner types is greater than the total number of prisoners. Some prisoners were jailed for more than one offense.

The Hennepin County Jail serves as the detention institution for suburban Hennepin prisoners awaiting trial or preliminary hearing in Hennepin County Municipal Court, for Hennepin prisoners awaiting trial in Hennepin County District Court, for prisoners under pre-sentence investigation and for prisoners being held for other jurisdictions, such as the U. S. Marshal, other counties, cities and states.

Although it is legal for the Courts to sentence someone to the County Jail, this is not done at the present time. Sentenced prisoners are sent to other institutions. However, on rare occasions a prisoner may be transferred from the Minneapolis Workhouse to the County Jail because of difficulties in handling him at the Workhouse. Also, a few work-release prisoners, who ordinarily would have been sent to the Workhouse have been kept at the jail in the last four months. The Chief Jailer said that only about two-a-day are kept at the jail. There is a possibility that facilities for additional work-release prisoners might be provided in the jail,

according to the Chief Jailer, if adequate space can be found.

The Hennepin County Sheriff, according to State Law, is in charge of the Hennepin County Jail. All employees in the jail are Sheriff's Deputies. There are 19 personnel in the County Jail, 1 chief jailer, 13 general deputies, 1 assistant jailer (sergeant), 1 identification officer, 1 bookkeeper, 1 matron and 1 cook. Based on conversations with jail officials, it appears to us that at least 80 per cent of the total budget is for direct jail operation and less than 20 per cent for identification.

(c) Other Lockups in the County

The Minneapolis Police Department, in addition to its main jail, also has cells in three of its precinct stations, the East Side, North Side and Minnehaha Stations. Personnel in the Minneapolis Police Department told us that prisoners never are kept in these cells overnight but are kept there only until they can be transferred in patrol wagons to the City Jail downtown. In fact, these lockups now are used only on busy weekend nights, police officials said. The East Side station has 8 cells; the North Side, 4; and Minnehaha, 16.

Following is a list of the lockup facilities in suburban Hennepin:

Robbinsdale. Three cells, but they are used only about once a week, and then for short periods of time, overnight or a few hours.

Osseo. Three cells, with an average use of slightly more than one detention a week. Usually overnight, but on rare occasions 48 hours. Maple Grove and Brooklyn Park also use this jail.

Hopkins. Three cells, can accommodate a maximum of five prisoners. Usually kept overnight, but on rare occasions for a weekend. Minnetonka sends prisoners here as do a few small Lake Minnetonka communities on occasions.

Edina. Three cells. Average population is one or two a day. Prisoners are kept until the next session of court, which usually is the next day. On rare occasions, prisoners are kept until Monday morning if they are picked up on, say, Friday night and cannot raise bail. Edina may take persons accused of felonies or women directly to the County Jail.

St. Louis Park. Four cells, with one available for juveniles or women, who would be kept only during the day. There are about 10 to 14 overnight prisoners per week. In the past month, two prisoners were held from Friday night to Monday morning.

Bloomington. Three double sets of single cells and a bullpen. Prisoners normally are kept only overnight until they can appear in court the next day. On occasion, a man may stay the weekend.

Crystal. Crystal has just opened its first lockup as part of the city's new Municipal Building. There are two, two-man cells, and four single cells, with two of those single cells so arranged so they could accommodate juveniles or women. Crystal now averages about four or five prisoners a week who have been housed in the County Jail.

Richfield. Three cells. Normally overnight lockup.

Suburban municipalities either will keep prisoners overnight in these lockups or will take prisoners directly to the County Jail. None of these lockups, of course, is used for sentenced prisoners.

(d) The Minneapolis Workhouse

The Minneapolis Workhouse, owned and operated by the city of Minneapolis, is the only institution in the County to which prisoners are sentenced. Prisoners at the Workhouse can serve sentences up to one year. For sentences of one year or longer, state law requires that the prisoners be sent to state institutions.

The Workhouse is located about 10 miles west of Minneapolis on the west side of Parker's Lake in Plymouth.

The city of Minneapolis charges \$5.50 a day for non-resident confinement at the Workhouse. For example, the costs of confining a person arrested for a violation in Bloomington and sentenced to the Workhouse by Hennepin County Municipal Court will be paid by the city of Bloomington. The costs of confining a person sentenced by Hennepin County District Court will be paid by the county-at-large through the Sheriff's budget.

The men's section of the Workhouse has 408 one-man cells, and the women's section has 40 one-woman cells. In addition the Workhouse has used the second floor of the administration building and the tower of the administration building for accommodating work-release prisoners. About 60 to 70 can be accommodated without crowding. However, up to 100 work-release prisoners have been kept in these quarters. Only three toilets are available for the work-release prisoners. Therefore, at times there has been a ratio of one toilet to every 33 men.

The Citizens League in a report approved March 17, 1965, urged transfer of the Minneapolis Workhouse to Hennepin County because with the establishment of one county-wide Municipal Court, Minneapolis no longer has a need for the Workhouse. The question of jail consolidation was not addressed in this report, but the League urged that the Workhouse be under the same management as the Home Schools for Boys and Girls and the County Juvenile Center and that the County Board of Commissioners be responsible for the institutions.

(e) County Juvenile Center, 1000 S. 6th St.

This institution was built in 1957. It has 30 residence rooms for juveniles. The Center is operated by the Hennepin County District Court through the Department of Court Services, an arm of the District Court.

The Juvenile Center serves as a holding institution for youths under 18 years of age for the Juvenile Center.

In 1965 a total of 1,485 youths were admitted to the Juvenile Center. The center was filled to capacity on 268 nights out of the year.

Another 1,696 juveniles were admitted to the Minneapolis City Jail, of which 955 were released to their parents within a few hours.

(f) County Home Schools for Boys and Girls

A County Home School for Boys is located at Glen Lake in suburban Hennepin

County. It is operated as an arm of the District Court through the Department of Court Services just as is the Juvenile Center. The capacity of the Home School is about 150. During 1965 the average daily population was about 117.

A County Home School for Girls is scheduled to be built soon on the same premises.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

(a) Remodeling Plan

In 1963 Robert McLane, State Jail Consultant, was hired by Sheriff Ed Ryan of Hennepin County to become chief jailer of the County Jail and to be in charge of a complete renovation of obsolete facilities which McLane had criticized in his capacity as State Jail Consultant.

McLane immediately proceeded to develop a plan for remodeling the fifth floor in cooperation with the superintendent of the Municipal Building Commission, which is responsible for all construction in connection with the City Hall-Court-house, and the architect for the Building Commission.

The following plan was proposed in October 1963:

1965 1st Phase

Install new security cell block of tool resistant steel for security risk prisoners and trustees (14 persons).

Remodel two present office rooms into four interview rooms. Convert present interview room into Central Control and Booking room. Remove present control area. Install a security cage in front of elevator and new Control Room. Remove existing grill cage in front of stairway and windows. Install security door to stairway.

1966 2nd Phase

Completely renovate existing cell block H (commonly referred to as "Detention"). Install Sally post and electric locks in Women's section.

1. Remove existing cells on all 3 levels.
2. Convert 3rd level to storage area with entrance from Tower stairs.
3. Install new cell blocks on 1st and 2nd levels including exercise space in Detention, new shower stall and sink room.
4. Install new floor tile in Laundry, Grocery, and Guards Room.

1967 3rd Phase

Install new grill type sliding doors and controls for cell block C and D, A and B and Women's section.

1968 4th Phase

Remodel Kitchen, install Dining Room, install method to move prisoners to dining room and visiting room.

1969 5th Phase

Move Crime Lab to 4th St. side of 5th floor into space presently occupied by Courtrooms, Jury Rooms, and Planning Commission. This would include the identification section of the Sheriff and City Police, the Jail Library, and would include a small Chapel. Install disciplinary cells and seclusion cells for sick and mental prisoners into space presently occupied by the Lab and identification rooms in present County Jail area.

1970 6th Phase

Expand cell block area of jail into City Identification area for about 100 prisoners. New cell block for 100 prisoners necessitated by changes in the Work Release Prisoner Law. Combine County and City Jails and provide for new receiving section in area near City Jail elevator.

Initial estimates of the cost of the plan were about \$100,000 per year, (though the first year's cost was to be \$25,000), with the money to come from the annual appropriation to the Municipal Building Commission by the city of Minneapolis and Hennepin County.

The plan got underway as scheduled in 1965. The first phase was completed but the cost was \$39,800, which does not include the plumbing, heating and electrical work done by employees of the Municipal Building Commission. We could not obtain the cost figures for this work. In addition another \$13,000 was spent on the City Jail to provide an adequate visiting room.

The 1966 phase has not gotten underway because the superintendent of the Municipal Building Commission has suspended all further work on the remodeling plan pending the outcome of an overall study of county building space needs by SUA, Inc., Beverly Hills, Calif., and the Citizens League study.

(b) Other studies

In addition to the studies by SUA, Inc., and the Citizens League, the Hennepin County Grand Jury is investigating jail conditions and management as a result of two suicides in the Minneapolis City Jail since March 12.

The Minnesota Civil Liberties Union has announced it is investigating civil liberties problems in connection with holding prisoners.

Mayor Arthur Naftalin of Minneapolis and Robert Janes, chairman of the Hennepin County Board have named a committee of professionals connected with the Jails to recommend improvements.

The Correctional Service of Minnesota last fall published a report pointing up duplication of services between the jails.

The Minnesota Council on Delinquency and Crime also is looking into jail problems.

(c) Work-release prisoners

The rapidly developing practice of sentencing persons to work-release

terms, rather than full-time commitment, is expected to have a profound effect on new construction for detention and corrections in Hennepin County.

Under the Minnesota work-release law, also known as the Huber law, the Court may sentence certain offenders to a short-term institution, such as the Minneapolis Workhouse, with the provision that the offenders can retain their regular full-time employment and spend their non-working hours at the institution.

The use of the work-release law has increased markedly in the past two years to the extent that the Minneapolis Workhouse superintendent has said he is unable to handle any more work-release prisoners without additional facilities or remodeled facilities.

In 1961 the daily average population of work-release prisoners at the Workhouse was 56.9. In 1962, the figure was 48.8; 1963, 48.5; 1964, 57.5, and in 1965, 84. The substantial increase in 1965 is holding up this year.

Work-release prisoners do not require regular Workhouse or Jail cells. Dormitory-type facilities are adequate. Work-release prisoners at the Workhouse have used old officers' quarters on the second floor of the administration building. Only three toilets are available for the work-release inmates.

Because of the inadequate crowded conditions the superintendent of the Workhouse has asked the Hennepin County Sheriff to see if he can provide for work-release prisoners in connection with the jail. The proposed remodeling plan for the fifth floor of the Jail includes provision for a 100-bed dormitory for work-release prisoners.

Information we have received indicates that the number of prisoners on work-release will continue to increase, particularly if facilities are available. There is considerable evidence to indicate that more prisoners would be sentenced under the work-release law today if additional spaces were available. Further, other developments indicate that felons and federal prison inmates may be made eligible for work-release terms in the future. It is likely that such developments will require the extensive provision for work-release quarters in Hennepin County.

DISCUSSION

The detention and correctional institutions serving the Courts of Hennepin County have evolved over the years in such a manner that today four different governmental bodies--each operating independently of each other--are responsible for some phase of the organization.

Ironically, the one body which logically would seem to be suited for most, if not all of the responsibility, today has very little, the Hennepin County Board of Commissioners.

This fragmented system of providing facilities for persons in custody, both prior to and after the determination that a violation has occurred, has been a key factor in the problems we have discovered in connection with adequate facilities for the Hennepin County Jail and the Minneapolis City Jail.

The four different governmental bodies responsible are as follows:

The Hennepin County Sheriff--for the Hennepin County Jail.

The Minneapolis Police Department--for the Minneapolis City Jail.

The Minneapolis Board of Public Welfare--for the Minneapolis Workhouse.

The Hennepin County Department of Court Services--for the Juvenile Center and the Home Schools for Boys and Girls.

Another governmental body--the Municipal Building Commission--also has some connection with the problem of providing adequate facilities, for the Commission is responsible for any remodeling of the present Courthouse for improvements in the County Jail or the City Jail. The Municipal Building Commission's responsibility is exclusively connected with the existing City Hall-Courthouse in downtown Minneapolis. The Commission has no power or responsibility for any other buildings, even those governmental offices across the street from the Courthouse.

The Hennepin County Board of Commissioners' present responsibility is to provide adequate facilities for those county institutions outside the City Hall-Courthouse, the Juvenile Center and the Home Schools. The County Board, though, does not exercise any control over the administration of any of the county institutions.

Given the present situation, therefore, it is not at all surprising that the remodeling plan for the fifth floor of the jails proceeded as it did. In fact, the Sheriff's office is to be commended for seeking to make improvements in the jails within the present governmental framework.

Unfortunately, though, implementation of the plan began in 1965 without many responsible Courthouse officials even knowing it was underway. The reason for this lack of communication is that the Municipal Building Commission operates independently. Its only connection with the County Board is that the chairman of the County Board serves as one of its four members. The other members are the Hennepin County Auditor, the mayor of Minneapolis and the City Treasurer.

The Municipal Building Commission thus approved the remodeling plan for the jails and proceeded with the first phase without general knowledge throughout the Courthouse.

An example of the lack of communication which has been present is that the president of SUA, Inc., which is conducting a study of building space needs for Hennepin County government, said he did not know that the remodeling of the jails was underway until he read minutes of the Citizens League Jails Committee.

The superintendent of the Municipal Building Commission has deferred taking any further action on the remodeling of the jails pending the results of the SUA study. However, as far as we can determine the Building Commission still has the power today to proceed with the remodeling plan as proposed, even with the SUA study underway.

The remodeling plan was not halted, though, until \$39,000 was spent installing high-security, tool-resistant steel cells for 14 prisoners in the County

Jail and a new Control Room was set up, a security cage was installed in front of the elevator, new lock mechanisms were installed in some areas and the communications network was improved. In the City Jail \$13,000 was spent on a new visiting area.

Some of these improvements may well have been needed for the interim even with construction of a new building. However, the installation of the additional cells in the County Jail definitely could have been avoided.

Another problem with planning improvements in facilities with the present structure is that there are important interrelationships between most of the institutions which need to be taken into consideration when any institution is improved. The following interrelationships are appropriate examples:

1. Currently, the Juvenile Center and the Minneapolis City Jail provide detention quarters for juveniles. A major policy decision needs to be made as to whether any juveniles at all will be housed in a remodeled jail on the fifth floor of the Courthouse or in a new jail elsewhere. If not, then additional facilities need to be provided at the Juvenile Center. We believe that juveniles should not be kept at the jail but they all should be at the Juvenile Center.

2. The question of what institution is to be responsible for work-release prisoners has not been determined to date. The superintendent of the Minneapolis Workhouse has asked that the Sheriff provide quarters at the County Jail because of lack of room at the Workhouse. Without remodeling or rebuilding the Sheriff cannot provide the space needed for work-release prisoners. Meanwhile, though, the superintendent of the Workhouse is proceeding to develop tentative plans for providing better quarters at the Workhouse for work-release prisoners.

If the same body were responsible for both the Workhouse and the County Jail, the appropriate policy decisions for both institutions could be made and adequate facilities could be provided at the proper institution.

3. We have documented extensively earlier in this report the necessity to merge the Minneapolis and Hennepin County Jails because of the close interrelationships between the two.

It seems clear to us that responsibility for planning and administration of all of the above institutions properly belongs with the chief governing body in Hennepin County Government, the County Board.

There are several other advantages of one unified system of detention and corrections. As noted in the Citizens League Workhouse report last year employees in the various institutions would have more opportunities for advancement and transfer. This would enhance recruitment possibilities and provide opportunities for in-service training on a broader base than now is possible. It would enable the hiring of a top administrative staff, well-trained in up-to-date principles of detention and corrections, to guide the various institutions in a co-ordinated manner and implement these principles.

Without a doubt, the Judges of District Court and of Municipal Court will always maintain a close interest in and concern for the administration of the institutions. Currently, Judges of District Court exercise full administrative control, through the Department of Court Services, over the juvenile institutions. Judges

do not have any control over administration of the adult institutions, the Jails and Workhouse.

We envision that Judges in all likelihood will become less and less involved with direct administration of institutions in the future. Yet they properly should still be able to exercise some control over policy, directly or indirectly. It is at this point that we defer to the other studies now underway, dealing with the overall organization of County Government in the future, to determine specific recommendations on the role of the Judges.

This is also the reason that we recognize the need for an interim step for jail consolidation, short of the establishment of one administrative control over all institutions of detention and corrections. Until the precise roles of the Judges and the Department of Court Services, which is operated under the Judges at the present, are determined, we can see some difficulty in bringing the Juvenile Center and the Home Schools for Boys and Girls under the same management with the combined jail and Workhouse. Combining the jails need not wait until overall county reorganization, though it could come at the same time. If the 1967 Legislature does not move to enact such reorganization, we believe the City and County Jails still should be combined in 1967 under the County Board and that the Workhouse be brought under the Board at the same time.

We further believe that jail consolidation should precede any further action by the Municipal Building Commission in remodeling, or as we recommend instead, building a new combined jail. Although both the City Jail and the County Jail are in serious need of improvements, these improvements can best be planned only if the jails are combined. We do not see any serious consequences if the remodeling plan for the Hennepin County Jail is delayed another year or so. The most serious deficiencies in the present jail were corrected in the past year--improving the locking mechanisms, the jail-wide communications system and the security cage around the elevator. As far as we have been able to determine the City Jail does not have a detailed remodeling plan for its jail at this time, though the County Jail's remodeling plan takes into consideration the City Jail's quarters as part of consolidation in the final stages of remodeling.

In terms of building an entirely new combined jail instead of remodeling we believe that Hennepin County not only would be choosing the wisest course from a cost standpoint (given the high costs of remodeling as presently estimated). The County also would have almost a unique opportunity to provide as modern a jail as could be constructed today.

The County need not--and should not--build an exclusively maximum security institution. Tool-resistant steel cells, such as were installed in the County Jail last year, need make up only a small portion of the entire jail. In a report of an inspection of the Hennepin County Jail dated April 9, 1962, R. W. Meier, then Warden at Sandstone Federal Prison, stated as follows: "Actually, the number of close security cells are in excess of true needs. Authorities have determined that generally in jails throughout the country, only about 20 per cent of jail prisoners need to be confined to close custody quarters. Any remodeling plans should take this and other related factors into consideration."

James V. Bennett, Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons said in 1960 in a handbook on prison and jail construction cautioned against an unnecessary amount of expensive steel installations.

We were told by R. D. Rukes, Federal Jail Inspector, that concrete construction for cells runs about less than one-half of the cost of tool-resistant steel and is adequate for most jail construction.

There is absolutely no doubt that maximum security cells are needed in the jail for some prisoners, but the same standards of security need not be applied to the hundreds of traffic and drinking violators who pass through the jail yearly as must be applied to desperate criminals. A glance at the background section of this report where the types of inmates at the County Jail are listed will indicate roughly how much maximum security seems to be needed.

In building a new structure, Hennepin County has the opportunity to experiment with new ideas in detention and corrections and need not be bound by construction traditions of the past. Federal Prison authorities encourage such experimentation.

It is somewhat ironic today that the Minneapolis and Hennepin County Jails--which serve primarily as detention institutions for persons who have not yet been found guilty or been sentenced--are in far greater need of improvement than the institutions for persons who have been found guilty and sentenced, the Workhouse, State Prison and State Reformatory. It does not necessarily follow that a person who has not yet been found guilty and sentenced is entitled to better facilities than someone who has. But at the very least the facilities should be as good.

A new jail can be built with adequate medical facilities for examining all prisoners upon admittance. Cell blocks can be so constructed to provide as much separation of prisoners as is needed, so that first offenders never have to be placed with repeaters, persons awaiting trial can be separated from persons awaiting sentencing, if necessary, misdemeanants can be separated from felons, drunks can be separated from other offenders, sex deviates can be separated from others, etc. Adequate exercise areas--in contrast with the 42-inch passageway for County Jail prisoners now--can be provided, including, perhaps, some way for prisoners to be exposed to the outdoors, by means of a courtyard or other means. A room for chapel services and other activities can be provided. Better eating areas can be made available so that prisoners no longer have to eat in their individual cells.

A new jail definitely would not include living quarters for the chief jailer, as now is provided for the chief jailer of the Hennepin County Jail. Residence of the chief jailer in the jail itself is a throwback to turn-of-the-century jail practices. Currently in the County Jail the chief jailer's wife also serves as matron; the only matron for the jail.

The Federal Bureau of Prisons has offered its offices to be consulted on whatever type of jail plan might be developed. The Bureau maintains a planning unit which keeps track of up-to-date jail construction practices. The County should take advantage of this service.