

GAO

Report to the Chairman, Subcommittee
on Crime and Criminal Justice,
Committee on the Judiciary, House of
Representatives

June 1993

INTENSIVE PROBATION
SUPERVISION

Cost-Savings Relative
to Incarceration





United States
General Accounting Office
Washington, D.C. 20548

**Program Evaluation and
Methodology Division**

B-239626

June 4, 1993

The Honorable Charles E. Schumer
Chairman, Subcommittee on Crime and Criminal Justice
Committee on the Judiciary
House of Representatives

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Since 1980, the number of offenders incarcerated in the United States has doubled. Along with this enormous increase in prison population has come a corresponding increase in the cost of incarcerating these offenders. The high cost of imprisonment is one factor that has led to the proliferation of intermediate sanction programs.

In order to achieve a more specific understanding of the role that intensive supervision programs—the most prevalent form of intermediate sanctions—can play in future corrections policy, we undertook the evaluation of one state's intensive supervision program. Our evaluation focused on the extent to which intensive supervision was effective in controlling criminal behavior and whether intensive supervision was a cost-saving alternative to incarceration. This report, the second in a series, presents our findings on the the cost of intensive supervision as an alternative to incarceration.

As agreed with your office, unless you publicly announce its contents earlier, we plan no further distribution of this report until 30 days from its date of issue. We will then make copies available to interested organizations, as appropriate, and to others upon request.

If you have any questions or would like additional information, please call me at (202) 512-2900 or Mr. Robert L. York, Director of Program Evaluation in Human Services Areas, at (202) 512-5885. Major contributors to this report are listed in appendix IX.

Sincerely yours,

Eleanor Chelimsky
Assistant Comptroller General

Executive Summary

Purpose

The increasing prison population and the high cost of incarcerating these offenders have led to the growing use of intermediate sanctions as alternatives to incarceration. GAO undertook an evaluation of the most prevalent form of intermediate sanction, intensive supervision. This evaluation of an intensive supervision program in a single state—the Arizona Intensive Probation Supervision (IPS) program—focused on two broad objectives—crime control and cost. The crime control objective is addressed in a separate report. The present report focuses on the extent to which the IPS program can be a cost-saving alternative to incarceration.

In this study, GAO compares the direct operating cost of an IPS sentence to that of the alternative prison sentence. GAO used two different methods for estimating the cost of a sentence. The first cost estimate was based on the direct cost of supervising an offender for the duration of the sentence, under the assumption that all offenders completed their full sentences. The direct cost of an IPS sentence, then, was the cost of both the IPS portion and the subsequent period of standard probation supervision. The direct cost of a prison sentence included the cost of both incarceration and subsequent parole supervision. The second cost estimate was based on the expected cost of supervision under the assumption that a certain proportion of the offenders “failed” and were revoked to prison.

Background

With more and more criminal offenders being incarcerated in state and federal prisons, the expanding prison population is placing considerable demands on already burdened municipal, state, and federal budgets. In response, states around the country have initiated a variety of programs aimed at serving as alternatives to incarceration. These programs are known collectively as “intermediate sanctions” because they offer a level of sanction between incarceration and traditional probation.

There has been, however, little solid evidence concerning the effectiveness of intensive supervision with regard to controlling criminal behavior or providing a cost-saving alternative to incarceration. GAO thus undertook this evaluation of Arizona’s IPS program to increase the general understanding of intensive supervision’s potential for controlling crime relative to other sanctions and for reducing cost relative to incarceration.

The IPS program in Arizona was initiated in 1985 to provide a cost-saving alternative to incarceration. The aim of the program was to supervise, under house arrest, adult offenders who normally would have been incarcerated. Through multiple contacts with the offender, contacts with

the offender's employer, and arrest checks conducted on a weekly basis, the program provided a more intensive level of supervision than was found in standard probation. GAO's evaluation focuses on the two largest counties in the state (Maricopa and Pima), whose IPS programs accounted for about 80 percent of the IPS offenders statewide.

Results in Brief

For the two counties studied, GAO found that the IPS sentences were cost-saving alternatives to the prison sentences, with the single exception of offenders convicted of the least serious felony in the larger county. In that one case, IPS was the more expensive sentencing option.

GAO found that revocations reduced cost-savings substantially. In the larger county, Maricopa, the projected cost of an IPS sentence doubled when revocations were taken into consideration. The impact of revocations was less in Pima County, where the projected cost of an IPS sentence increased by 30 to 40 percent. Nonetheless, the extent of the cost-savings realized from supervising offenders who had committed more serious offenses was such that, despite high revocation costs, IPS remained a cost-saving alternative in the two Arizona counties. The savings realized from supervising offenders convicted of the more serious offenses were nearly \$4,000 per capita in both counties.

GAO Analysis

For any given offense, the cost of a sentence depends on the daily per capita cost, the sentence length, and the change in the mode of supervision—from IPS to standard probation or from incarceration to parole. The estimated daily per capita costs for the two Arizona counties were lowest for parole supervision (\$2.77) and highest for incarceration (\$34.47). The costs for standard probation and intensive supervision differed by county. In Maricopa County, the daily per capita costs were \$3.25 for standard probation supervision and \$12.00 for intensive supervision. The costs for Pima County were \$4.96 and \$11.42 for standard probation and intensive supervision, respectively. Due to the relative difference in the daily per capita costs between standard probation and intensive supervision, the duration of IPS supervision had a greater effect on the overall cost of an IPS sentence than did sentence length. Similarly, the duration of incarceration had a greater effect on the overall cost of a prison sentence than did the length of the sentence. As a consequence, Arizona's IPS program realized greater cost-savings when it was supervising offenders who would have been incarcerated for a longer duration—that is, those who were convicted of more serious offenses.

Revocations increase the overall cost of a sentence because the cost of supervising an offender who is subsequently revoked to prison includes both the cost of the supervision prior to revocation and the cost of incarceration after revocation. In Arizona, offenders revoked from intensive supervision were generally sentenced to the presumptive prison term of the offense for which they were convicted, while offenders revoked from parole were returned to prison for the remainder of their sentence. Thus, revocation costs for IPS offenders who were convicted of more serious offenses were greater, due to the longer period of incarceration that followed revocation. IPS revocation costs were also greater than parole revocation costs because the duration of the subsequent incarceration was longer for IPS offenders. The higher the revocation rates, the greater the revocation costs to the IPS program as a whole.

In Maricopa County, the revocation costs increased the per capita IPS costs by \$11,306 for an offender convicted of a more serious felony and \$5,232 for one convicted of the least serious felony. For Pima County, IPS costs increased by \$8,032 for an offender convicted of a more serious felony and \$3,912 for one convicted of the least serious felony. The increases in prison costs due to parole revocation were much lower—approximately \$2,500 for an offender convicted of a more serious felony and \$900 for one convicted of the least serious felony.

To obtain the most conservative view of IPS cost-savings, GAO compared the cost of an IPS sentence that included revocation costs with the lowest estimated cost of a prison sentence that excluded parole revocation costs. Even then, GAO found that the cost-saving yield from supervising the more serious offenders was able to offset revocation costs. The only exception to the cost-saving benefits of the program was for offenders convicted of the least serious felony in Maricopa County.

The projected cost saving in Maricopa County for sentencing an offender convicted of a more serious felony to IPS instead of prison was \$3,941, while sentencing an offender convicted of the least serious felony to IPS instead of prison incurred a cost of \$350. In Pima County, sentencing an offender convicted of a more serious felony to IPS produced a cost saving of \$3,951, while sentencing an offender convicted of the least serious felony to IPS produced a projected saving of only \$71.

One lesson from the Arizona program likely to be useful for other intensive supervision programs is that greater cost-savings can be realized

by targeting particular offenders and by having a short-term program with selected program components. Greater savings can be obtained through supervising offenders who would otherwise have been sentenced to prison for longer periods (that is, those convicted of more serious offenses). Cost-savings can also be improved through supervising offenders who are less likely to be revoked to prison. In terms of program characteristics, one that supervises offenders for a shorter duration, then “graduates” them to a less expensive mode of supervision—that is, standard probation—can also realize increased cost-savings. If additional program components that enhance control over the offender—for example, mandatory jail incarceration—are added, however, the cost of the program can exceed that of incarceration.

Recommendations

This report contains no recommendations.

Agency Comments

Comments were obtained from IPS officials throughout the course of our data collection. These comments were incorporated in the report as GAO deemed appropriate.

Contents

Executive Summary		2
Chapter 1		10
Objectives, Scope, and Methodology	Introduction	10
	Objectives	12
	Scope	13
	Methodology	14
	Report Overview	18
Chapter 2		19
Cost of a Sentence Assuming Completion	Introduction	19
	Sentence Length by Offense Class	19
	Changes in Supervision During the Sentence	20
	Estimated Sentence Length and Duration of Supervision	21
	Estimated Cost of a Sentence	24
	Conclusion	25
Chapter 3		27
Cost of a Sentence Including Revocation Costs	Introduction	27
	The Cost of Revocation	27
	Estimated Cost Including the Cost of Revocation	29
	Conclusions	32
Chapter 4		34
Conclusions and Implications		
Appendixes	Appendix I: State IPS Statutes and Policy Common to Arizona's County Programs	38
	Appendix II: Data Collection and Data Sources	40
	Appendix III: Cost Estimates for Offenders Reinstated to IPS	44
	Appendix IV: Costs for Two Institutions With Comparable Numbers of Inmates	45
	Appendix V: Costs of Standard Probation and Intensive Supervision for Maricopa and Pima Counties	46
	Appendix VI: Estimated Costs of an IPS and a Prison Sentence	47
	Appendix VII: Projected Costs of IPS and Prison Sentences Including Revocation Costs	49
	Appendix VIII: Estimated Cost for Jail Incarceration	64

	Appendix IX: Major Contributors to This Report	65
--	--	----

Tables

Table 2.1: Sentence Lengths for First Offense, by Offense Class	20
Table 2.2: Estimated IPS and Prison Sentence Length and Duration of Supervision, by County and Penal Mode	23
Table 2.3: Daily Per Capita Cost, by Mode of Supervision	24
Table 2.4: Estimated Per Capita Cost of an IPS Versus a Prison Sentence	25
Table 3.1: Estimated per Capita Costs of a Sentence Including Revocation Costs, and of a Sentence Assuming No Revocation Costs	30
Table 3.2: Estimated per Capita Costs for IPS Including Revocation Costs and Estimated per Capita Costs for Prison Assuming No Revocations	31
Table IV.1: Costs for Two Arizona Minimum Security Facilities	45
Table VI.1: Cost of an IPS Sentence, by Offense Class, Maricopa County	47
Table VI.2: Cost of an IPS Sentence, by Offense Class, Pima County	47
Table VI.3: Cost of a Prison Sentence, by Offense Class, Maricopa County	48
Table VI.4: Cost of a Prison Sentence, by Offense Class, Pima County	48
Table VII.1: Per Capita Cost of IPS Supervision at 3-Month Intervals, Maricopa County	50
Table VII.2: Projected Costs Including Revocations at 3-Month Intervals for Class 4 Offenders Sentenced to IPS, Maricopa County	51
Table VII.3: Projected Costs Including Revocations at 3-Month Intervals for Class 5 Offenders Sentenced to IPS, Maricopa County	52
Table VII.4: Projected Costs Including Revocations at 3-Month Intervals for Class 6 Offenders Sentenced to IPS, Maricopa County	53
Table VII.5: Projected Costs Including Revocations at 3-Month Intervals for Class 4 Offenders Sentenced to Prison, Maricopa County	54
Table VII.6: Projected Costs Including Revocations at 3-Month Intervals for Class 5 Offender Sentenced to Prison, Maricopa County	55

Table VII.7: Projected Costs Including Revocations at 3-Month Intervals for Class 6 Offenders Sentenced to Prison, Maricopa County	56
Table VII.8: Per Capita Cost of IPS Supervision at 3-Month Intervals, Pima County	57
Table VII.9: Projected Costs Including Revocations at 3-Month Intervals for Class 4 Offenders Sentenced to IPS, Pima County	58
Table VII.10: Projected Costs Including Revocations at 3-Month Intervals for Class 5 Offenders Sentenced to IPS, Pima County	59
Table VII.11: Projected Costs Including Revocations at 3-Month Intervals for Class 6 Offenders Sentenced to IPS, Pima County	60
Table VII.12: Projected Costs Including Revocations at 3-Month Intervals for Class 4 Offenders Sentenced to Prison, Pima County	61
Table VII.13: Projected Costs Including Revocations at 3-Month Intervals for Class 5 Offenders Sentenced to Prison, Pima County	62
Table VII.14: Projected Costs Including Revocations at 3-Month Intervals for Class 6 Offenders Sentenced to Prison, Pima County	63

Abbreviations

AOC	Administrative Office of the Courts
GAO	General Accounting Office
IPS	Intensive probation supervision

Objectives, Scope, and Methodology

Introduction

Many states, faced with a rapidly expanding offender population and unable to afford the high cost of constructing new prisons, have turned to intermediate sanctions in the hope of keeping correctional system costs down. The term “intermediate sanction” refers to a wide range of sanctions (including house arrest, electronic monitoring, shock incarceration, and so forth), of which the most prevalent is intensive supervision. However, whether intermediate sanctions are, in fact, cost-saving alternatives to incarceration has never been established.¹ This report is the second in a series of three reports that present the results of an in-depth study of one state’s experience in intensive supervision: Arizona’s Intensive Probation Supervision (IPS) program.² The other reports in the series discuss, respectively, how effective that program was in controlling criminal behavior and the implications of our findings on both crime and cost.³ The focus of the present report is on the extent to which the Arizona program was a cost-saving alternative to traditional incarceration.

Arizona’s IPS Program

Intensive probation supervision in Arizona is essentially a house arrest program that was started in 1985 by state legislation. That legislation, together with administrative policy, specifies elements that are common to the program throughout the state. Included among these elements are requirements that the offender be fully employed or a full-time student, perform community service, and provide IPS officers control over any wages earned. By specifying offender eligibility, the state targeted offenders for the program who would otherwise have been incarcerated. A more intensive level of supervision than found in standard probation is provided by means of multiple contacts with the offender, contact with the offender’s employer, and arrest checks on a weekly basis.⁴ Despite these and other common elements, however, IPS in Arizona is a program that

¹See *Intermediate Sanctions: Their Impacts on Prison Crowding, Costs, and Recidivism Are Still Unclear*, GAO/PEMD-90-21 (Washington, D.C.: September 7, 1990).

²Intensive supervision is variously called “intensive supervision program” (ISP), “intensive supervision probation” (ISP), and “intensive probation supervision” (IPS). In this report, we use IPS to refer to Arizona’s Intensive Probation Supervision program. We also restrict our discussion to intensive supervision for probation, although some intensive supervision programs supervise parolees while others supervise both probationers and parolees.

³See *Intensive Probation Supervision: Mixed Effectiveness in Controlling Crime*, GAO/PEMD-93-4 (Washington, D.C.: June 1993), and *Intensive Probation Supervision: Crime-Control and Cost-Saving Effectiveness*, GAO/PEMD-93-23 (Washington, D.C.: June 1993).

⁴Appendix I contains a description of the state statutes and administrative policies governing IPS programs in Arizona.

varies so considerably between counties that the program in each county is best viewed as a distinct entity.⁵

Effectiveness of the Program for Crime Control

To evaluate the effectiveness of IPS for controlling criminal behavior, we examined the program as it operated in Arizona's two largest counties—Maricopa and Pima.⁶ These counties accounted for 80 percent of the IPS offenders statewide. We found that the IPS program supervised a distinct group of offenders who, on the whole, appeared riskier—that is, were more likely to be arrested for a new crime—than those under standard probation. The IPS offenders also appeared as risky as our sample of offenders sentenced to prison.⁷

Both IPS programs were able to effectively control the criminal behavior of offenders under their supervision. Nonetheless, IPS sentences—that is, the period of time spent first under IPS and then under standard probation supervision—resulted in an increase in criminal activity in the community beyond that exhibited by offenders sentenced to standard probation. Specifically, IPS was able to supervise a group of riskier offenders and ensure that the percentage of such offenders arrested was at or below that of offenders sentenced to standard probation. However, as soon as these IPS offenders completed the program and custody was transferred to standard probation, the percentage arrested increased rapidly.

Similarly, prison sentences resulted in effective crime control while offenders were actually incarcerated, followed by a rapid increase in criminal activity after offenders were released from prison to parole supervision. By the end of our observation period, despite their period of incarceration, the percentage of such offenders arrested for new offenses in Maricopa County approximated that for IPS offenders who had been in the community—and thus at risk—for a much longer period. In Pima County, however, the percentage of offenders released from prison who were subsequently arrested was lower than that for IPS offenders.

⁵See appendix III in *Intensive Probation Supervision: Mixed Effectiveness in Controlling Crime*, GAO/PEMD-93-4 (Washington, D.C.: June 1993).

⁶See *Intensive Probation Supervision: Mixed Effectiveness in Controlling Crime*, GAO/PEMD-93-4 (Washington, D.C.: June 1993).

⁷This was not surprising since our prison samples consisted of offenders sentenced during the same period in 1987 and released by March 1990—which means that the samples consisted of those offenders sentenced to shorter prison terms (6 years or less). See appendix II for details concerning data collection and data sources.

We found that IPS reduced the percentage of its arrested offenders partially through a high revocation rate. Offenders revoked to prison were no longer in the community and thus not available for arrest. In both county programs, more than half of the offenders directly sentenced to IPS were revoked.⁸ Since the cost of supervising an offender who was subsequently revoked was the cost of the initial supervision plus the cost of incarceration after revocation, revocations constituted “add-on costs.” This raised the question of whether IPS actually was a less expensive sentencing option. Did the add-on costs due to revocations render an IPS sentence more expensive than the alternative prison sentence? We address that question in this report. In the next section, we present our specific objectives, followed by the scope and methodology of this portion of the study.

Objectives

Our general objective for this study was to determine whether IPS was a cost-saving alternative to incarceration. Traditionally, research on costs has attempted to determine whether a particular program saved money. Relying only on daily per capita cost, past studies showed that parole and probation were the least expensive sanctions, followed by intensive supervision, and then prison. However, whether a program is a less expensive alternative to incarceration depends on whether it supervises offenders who would otherwise have been incarcerated. Therefore, researchers attempted to determine whether the program studied supervised offenders who would otherwise have been incarcerated or those who would normally have been sentenced to standard probation.⁹ But since it did not appear possible to establish reliably whether any specific offender sentenced to IPS would have been sentenced either to prison or probation had the IPS program not been in existence, we framed our inquiry in terms of the potential of IPS as a cost-saving alternative to incarceration—that is, what was the cost of sentencing an offender to IPS and, alternatively, the cost of sentencing that same offender to prison? In turn, this led us to address three specific questions:

- What was the relative cost of sentencing an offender to IPS or prison?

⁸Three years after sentencing, 74 percent of offenders directly sentenced to IPS in Maricopa County had been revoked. Revocations were 57 percent for Pima County. The percentages for offenders reinstated to IPS were lower—66 and 38 percent for Maricopa and Pima County, respectively.

⁹See Intermediate Sanctions: Their Impacts on Prison Crowding, Costs, and Recidivism Are Still Unclear, GAO/PEMD-90-21 (Washington, D.C.: September 7, 1990). Standard probation is a sentencing option traditionally used as an alternative to sending an offender to prison. Parole is a community-based sanction granted to an inmate who is conditionally released from prison; it is not a sentencing option.

- What was the relative cost of sentencing an offender when the fact that a certain proportion of offenders would be revoked to prison was taken into consideration?
- Was IPS a cost-saving alternative given the high rate of revocations?

The cost of a sentence entails the cost of supervising the offender for the duration of the sentence, including any change in the mode of supervision during the course of that sentence. An IPS sentence in Arizona generally involved IPS supervision followed by standard probation supervision, while a prison sentence generally consisted of incarceration followed by parole supervision.¹⁰ For any given offense, both factors—sentence length and change in mode of supervision—differed for the two sentencing options.

In this report, we do not compare the cost of sentencing an offender to IPS with the cost of sentencing that offender to probation because the Arizona program was designed to be a cost-saving way of supervising offenders who would otherwise be sentenced to prison. Arizona's IPS provided a more intensive level of supervision than that provided by standard probation through a low officer-to-offender ratio, specific program components, and specific supervision requirements. This greater intensity of supervision was expected to be achieved through the provision of enhanced resources.

Scope

The focus of this evaluation is on a single form of intermediate sanction—intensive supervision—in a single state, Arizona. We compare the projected cost of an IPS sentence in the two Arizona counties—Maricopa and Pima—with the projected cost of a prison sentence for those same counties. Together, these counties account for 80 percent of IPS offenders statewide. Since Arizona's IPS program is county-based, our evaluation reports on two different IPS programs.

In this study, we define cost simply as those direct operating expenses that are reflected in the budgets of the respective agencies—IPS, probation, prison, and parole. Costs that result from sentencing an offender to IPS but were reflected in the budgets of other agencies—such as law enforcement agencies, county jails, or the courts—were outside the scope of this work.

¹⁰Most prisoners were conditionally released to some form of community supervision—over 90 percent of our 1987 sample. In this report, we refer to all such forms of community supervision as “parole.”

We also restricted our analysis of IPS costs to offenders directly sentenced to IPS—that is, we excluded the costs for offenders reinstated to IPS.¹¹ This second mode of entry into IPS accounted for a good proportion of the offenders in the program—60 percent in Maricopa and 40 percent in Pima. However, it was not clear that offenders reinstated to IPS would otherwise have been revoked to prison. Moreover, there was some indication that some offenders might not have been brought before the court for probation violation in the absence of the IPS program.

Methodology

The methodology used in this report exclusively involves the estimation of direct operating costs for offenders sentenced to IPS, as well as for those sentenced to prison, in the two counties.

Cost Estimates

We used two methods to derive the cost of an IPS sentence and the cost of a prison sentence. The first method estimated the direct cost of supervising an offender for the duration of the sentence, assuming that all offenders completed their sentences. The second method estimated the expected cost of supervision under the assumption that a certain proportion of offenders failed and were revoked to prison.

In our previous research on intermediate sanctions, we concluded that, although the direct daily per capita costs of intensive supervision were less than those of incarceration, the overall costs of the program could exceed those of incarceration.¹² Three factors contribute to increasing the overall cost of a program—sentence length, changes in the mode of supervision, and revocation rates. Our first cost estimate incorporates sentence length and changes in the mode of supervision for each of the two options; our second cost estimate adds revocation rates to the other two factors.

Sentence Length

For any given offense, the alternative IPS sentence was not necessarily of the same length as the prison sentence.¹³ For example, according to Arizona's sentencing guidelines, an offender convicted of petty theft could

¹¹See appendix III for a discussion on estimating the cost of reinstating offenders to IPS.

¹²See Intermediate Sanctions: Their Impacts on Prison Crowding, Costs, and Recidivism Are Still Unclear, GAO/PEMD-90-21 (Washington, D.C.: September 7, 1990).

¹³In the case of multiple offenses, we consider only the most serious offense. That is, we assume that the sentences imposed would be served concurrently and that the most serious offense would have the longest sentence imposed.

be sentenced to 3 years of IPS; alternatively, that offender could be sentenced to one and a half years of prison. Prison sentence lengths tended to be shorter than the alternative IPS sentences, particularly for less severe offenses.

Mode of Supervision

Changes in the mode of supervision—from IPS to standard probation or from prison to parole—affect the relative duration of supervision under the different modes. As we mentioned previously, probation and parole supervision are less expensive than either IPS or incarceration.¹⁴ Thus, the relative proportions of time an offender was supervised under IPS and standard probation affected the cost of the IPS sentence. Similarly, the amount of time the offender was actually incarcerated affected the cost of the prison sentence.

While the daily per capita operating costs of IPS may have been less than those of incarceration, the longer duration of intensive supervision may have resulted in an IPS sentence's being more expensive than the alternative prison sentence. This is especially true if the offender would have been incarcerated for a relatively short time. For example, the cost of supervising our illustrative offender, convicted of petty theft, for 2 years under IPS and the final year under standard probation could have exceeded the cost of incarcerating that offender for 6 months of the one and a half year prison sentence.¹⁵

Revocation

As noted previously, offenders who failed IPS and were eventually revoked to prison contributed add-on costs to the program.¹⁶ That is, the cost for supervising such offenders included the cost of the initial supervision plus the cost of incarceration after revocation. The greater the number of offenders revoked from the program, the greater the add-on costs for the program as a whole. Similarly, offenders conditionally released and

¹⁴We assume the cost of community supervision following incarceration to be equivalent to parole cost.

¹⁵The 6 months duration is not unlikely if we assume early release for "good behavior" and 3 months credit for presentence time served in jail.

¹⁶Revocation is only one of the possible dispositions for violations, which include arrest for a new offense. For example, offenders can be found in violation but reinstated to IPS or parole. Charges can also be dismissed. The costs of an arrest, jail incarceration, and processing of the violation are costs that are not reflected in our direct operating costs. The cost of violations that do not result in revocations, then, are not included in our estimates. Three years after sentencing, 80 percent of offenders directly sentenced to IPS in Maricopa County had incurred petitions for probation violation, and of those, 74 percent were revoked. In Pima County, 67 percent had incurred petitions for probation violation, 57 percent of whom were revoked.

subsequently returned to prison for violating the conditions of their release contributed to an increase in the overall cost of sentencing offenders to prison.

Strengths and Limitations

Restricting our definition of cost to direct operating costs enabled us to easily determine expenditures from county probation, IPS, and department of corrections budgets. The limitation of this approach was that not all costs were included. There are many different ways to assess the cost of a program: for example, direct costs, indirect costs, hidden costs, social costs, psychological costs.¹⁷ Even if we had restricted the definition of cost to financial or monetary costs, as opposed to social or psychological costs (for example, the public's fear of crime or victimization), there were still many different ways of determining that cost. By restricting our definition of cost to direct operating costs that were reflected in the budgets of the respective agencies, we underestimated the overall costs of both IPS and prison sentences.

Data Requirements

To calculate our two cost estimates, we needed estimates of the daily per capita operating costs, sentence length, duration of supervision, and revocations for two sets of offenders—those sentenced to IPS and those sentenced to prison. Estimates of daily operating costs were derived from fiscal 1990 annual expenditures and the number of offenders supervised that year for each option. Estimates of sentence length, duration of both IPS and probation supervision, duration of incarceration, and revocations were all derived from a sample of offenders sentenced in the summer of 1987 and tracked through December 1990. All Maricopa County offenders sentenced to IPS from July through September 1987 and all Pima County offenders sentenced to IPS from July through October 1987 were included in our IPS samples. The prison samples consisted of all offenders sentenced to prison during those same periods for no more than 6 years

¹⁷See Douglas C. McDonald, "The Cost of Corrections: In Search of the Bottom Line," Research in Corrections, 2:1 (February 1989).

and released by March 15, 1990.¹⁸ Our estimated duration of parole supervision was derived from existing data for Arizona.¹⁹

Our cost estimates for incarceration are based on incarceration in an Arizona minimum security facility. Offenders who were prospective candidates for intensive supervision were lower risk offenders likely to be incarcerated in a minimum, rather than a medium or maximum, security facility. Although the costs of incarceration differed according to the intensity of supervision—that is, minimum, medium, or maximum security—the same was not true for the cost of IPS. All IPS offenders were initially supervised at the most intensive level, then moved progressively to less intensive levels.²⁰ However, progress within IPS did not affect IPS costs, even though the differential levels of supervision required differential levels of effort on the part of the IPS officers. The maximum number of offenders an IPS officer was allowed to supervise is specified by statute, regardless of the intensity of supervision.

Throughout this report, we use a base figure of 400 offenders. This base was selected because it was the projected growth for IPS in 1991. Thus, we decided on a minimum security facility supervising approximately 400 offenders to derive our cost of incarceration.²¹ We also used this base figure of 400 offenders to project the per capita cost of supervising a single offender, under the assumption that a certain proportion of those 400 offenders would be revoked.

Our work was conducted in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards.

¹⁸We used estimates derived from our 1987 samples in conjunction with fiscal 1990 data to compute cost estimates, and thus did not take into account inflationary costs. However, since inflationary costs were likely to be consistent for both options, they did not represent a problem in calculating the relative costs of the two sentencing options.

¹⁹According to the U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics, 96.4 percent of Arizona's parolees were supervised for a year or more in 1987. Using national data on the amount of time under parole supervision by offense type—person offense, 24 months; property offense, 16 months; drug offense, 18 months; public order offense, 14 months—the estimated duration of parole supervision was 16 months for Maricopa County and 17.4 months for Pima County. This method of estimation was likely to underestimate the duration for class 4 offenders and, at the same time, overestimate the duration for class 6 offenders. To ensure that our cost estimates would not be biased in favor of IPS, we used the conservative 1-year duration for these estimates.

²⁰Different supervision requirements—for example, the number of required contacts per week—were specified for different levels. See appendix I.

²¹See appendix IV for a comparison of costs for two Arizona minimum security facilities—one with an average daily population of 591 offenders and another with 425 offenders.

Report Overview

In chapter 2, we estimate sentence length and duration of supervision, then calculate the per capita costs for the two sentencing options—IPS and prison. Cost estimates are provided for the three felony offense classes eligible for direct sentencing to IPS in 1987—classes 4, 5, and 6. (Offense class indicates the severity of the offense, where class 1 is the most severe and class 6 the least.)²² We incorporate our data on revocation rates into the cost of the respective sentences in the following chapter. In the final chapter, we provide our conclusions and implications for the intensive supervision program.

²²The 1988 change in statute allows for direct sentencing of class 2 and 3 felony offenders to IPS. Offenders committing a class 1 offense (for example, murder) are ineligible for IPS. Although misdemeanants are also eligible for IPS, very few misdemeanants have been supervised by IPS. Misdemeanors and traffic offenses are generally handled by the lower courts.

Cost of a Sentence Assuming Completion

Introduction

Many of those who call for intermediate sanctions as alternatives to incarceration argue that such sanctions can save money. Generally, the daily per capita costs of supervising an offender under intensive supervision were lower than those for supervising that offender in prison. Nonetheless, because of a number of factors discussed in chapter 1, the costs of an IPS sentence may not necessarily have been less than those of the alternative prison sentence. In this chapter, we compare the costs of an IPS sentence with those of a prison sentence for offenders of the three offense classes eligible for sentencing to IPS in 1987.¹

The comparison of costs between an IPS sentence and a prison sentence was made using an estimate of cost that reflects two facts: (1) sentence lengths varied depending on the sentencing options; and (2) for each option, the mode of supervision changed during the course of a typical sentence. That is, an offender convicted of a particular offense might have been sentenced to 3 years of IPS or, alternatively, to one and a half years of prison. Further, during the sentence, the offender in IPS “graduated” to standard probation supervision at some point, and the offender in prison was usually conditionally released to parole supervision before the sentence expired.

The chapter begins with a discussion of the variation in sentence lengths by offense class for both IPS and prison. This is followed by a discussion of changes in the mode of supervision during the course of a sentence—that is, from IPS to probation or from prison to parole. We then present average sentence lengths and durations of supervision within different modes—IPS, probation, prison, and parole. Finally, using these averages in conjunction with the daily operating costs, we calculate the cost of an IPS sentence and that of a prison sentence. Since only class 4, 5, and 6 offenders were eligible for direct sentencing to IPS in 1987, we compare the costs for these three offense classes only.

Sentence Length by Offense Class

The difference between the cost of an IPS sentence and the alternative cost of a prison sentence varied according to differences in sentence length. In general, sentence length was determined both by the severity of the offense and the offender’s criminal history. The more severe the offense, the longer the sentence; the more extensive the offender’s criminal history, the longer the sentence.

¹Again, offense class indicates the severity of the offense, class 1 being the most severe felony and class 6 the least.

For prison sentences, Arizona used a sentencing guideline that provided the maximum, minimum, and presumptive sentence lengths for each offense class. The actual sentence imposed depended on the circumstances under which the crime was committed. The sentencing guideline also specified different sentence lengths according to whether the offense was the first, second, third, or higher-number conviction for the offender.

For intensive supervision sentences, the Arizona criminal codes specified only a maximum sentence length for each offense class.² Unlike in the case of prison sentences, there was no distinction in IPS sentence lengths based on the number of prior offenses. To illustrate the differences in sentence lengths by offense class and by sentencing option, table 2.1 provides the minimum, presumptive, and maximum prison sentence lengths for an offender with no prior convictions, along with the maximum probation sentence length.

Table 2.1: Sentence Lengths for First Offense, by Offense Class

Offense class	Years in prison			Maximum years on probation
	Minimum	Presumptive	Maximum	
Class 4	2.00	4.0	5.00	4
Class 5	1.00	2.0	2.50	3
Class 6	0.75	1.5	1.87	3

Source: Arizona State Supreme Court, Administrative Office of the Courts, "Criminal Code Sentencing Options" (1988).

As indicated in table 2.1, the more severe the offense, the longer the sentence—for both sentencing options. At the same time, the IPS sentence was likely to be longer than the prison sentence for less severe offenses.

Changes in Supervision During the Sentence

The difference in the costs of the two sentencing options—IPS or prison—also varied according to changes in the mode of supervision. As previously noted, offenders generally did not remain under intensive supervision for the entire length of their sentence; rather, they progressed from intensive supervision to standard probation supervision. The average duration of IPS supervision differed by county. Maricopa County IPS structured supervision around systematic 90-day reviews, and tended to

²Since intensive supervision was a type of probation, the guidelines for probation sentences applied to IPS.

move offenders through the program in 9 to 12 months.³ Pima County IPS, in contrast, allowed its officers greater discretion in moving the offender through the program and supervised its offenders for a longer period.⁴ Thus, the cost of an IPS sentence—that is, the cost of the intensive supervision plus the cost of the subsequent standard probation supervision—differed in the two counties due to differences in both sentence length and proportion of the sentence spent under IPS supervision.

Similarly, offenders sentenced to prison were not incarcerated for their entire sentences, but were generally conditionally released to parole at some point prior to the expiration of the sentence. The cost of a prison sentence, then, was the cost of incarceration plus the cost of parole supervision. The cost of supervising an offender in prison did not differ by county. Offenders sentenced to prison were all under the jurisdiction of the Arizona Department of Corrections. Offenders who were conditionally released remained under the jurisdiction of the Department of Corrections. The costs of a prison sentence for the two counties, then, differed to the extent that sentence lengths differed in the two counties. Since the duration of incarceration was based on sentence length, there were county differences in the duration of incarceration.

In the following section, we provide average sentence lengths and durations of supervision by the different modes, based on our 1987 samples for both Maricopa and Pima counties.

Estimated Sentence Length and Duration of Supervision

The average sentence lengths and durations of supervision by offense class are provided in table 2.2.⁵ The estimated IPS sentence length was the average observed for each offense class in our 1987 samples. Progress through the program was not related to offense class; thus, we used the average duration of IPS supervision for each offense class—13.8 months for

³Although offenders progressed through the Maricopa County IPS program in 90-day intervals, we used the average duration of IPS supervision to estimate the cost of IPS for Maricopa County. This 13.8 month average was the result of a few offenders being supervised for more than 20 months.

⁴Pima County IPS instituted 120-day reviews in 1990.

⁵Although we used averages in months for our estimated sentence length, sentence length was actually a discrete variable rather than a continuous variable. That is, sentence lengths were for 1 year, 2 years, or 3 years, as opposed to 12 months, 13 months, or 14 months. This fact is reflected in the large standard deviations in table 2.2.

Maricopa County and 18.7 months for Pima County.⁶ The duration of standard probation supervision was the remainder of the initial sentence after “graduation” from IPS. Consequently, the duration of standard probation also varied by offense class. In addition, both the prison sentence length and the duration of incarceration varied by offense class. Unlike probation, the duration of parole supervision was not the remainder of the sentence length following incarceration; thus, the period of incarceration plus the time under parole supervision did not always equal the sentence length.⁷

⁶Offense class was associated with neither the likelihood of probation violation nor the likelihood of revocation. Logistic regression analyses indicated that for Maricopa County, age, Arizona’s IPS risk score, the number of prior arrests, and whether the offender was in IPS as opposed to probation predicted the likelihood of being revoked. In Pima County, only age and whether the offender was in IPS as opposed to probation were associated with revocations, although they were not very good predictors. That is, the Pima County model was not statistically significant.

⁷As stated in chapter 1, we used 1 year as our conservative estimate of the duration of parole supervision.

Chapter 2
Cost of a Sentence Assuming Completion

Table 2.2: Estimated IPS and Prison Sentence Length and Duration of Supervision, by County and Penal Mode^a

Penal mode by county	Offense class		
	Class 4	Class 5	Class 6
Maricopa			
IPS sentence ^b	42.6	37.5	36.5
IPS supervision	13.8	13.8	13.8
Probation supervision	28.8	23.7	22.7
Prison sentence ^c	37.3	26.6	16.8
Incarceration	21.3	15.4	10.7
Parole supervision	12.0	12.0	12.0
Pima			
IPS sentence ^d	45.0	36.5	35.5
IPS supervision	18.7	18.7	18.7
Probation supervision	26.3	17.8	16.8
Prison sentence ^e	43.2	24.3	20.8
Incarceration	20.6	15.1	11.5
Parole supervision	12.0	12.0	12.0

^aIn months, for 1987

^bFor class 4 offenders sentenced to IPS, number = 20 and the standard deviation = 11.5; for class 5, number = 13 and the standard deviation = 7.8; for class 6, number = 10 and the standard deviation = 0.

^cFor class 4 offenders sentenced to prison, number = 32 and the standard deviation = 15.7; for class 5, number = 62 and the standard deviation = 10.5; for class 6, number = 45 and the standard deviation = 7.7.

^dFor class 4 offenders sentenced to IPS, number = 33 and the standard deviation = 5.6; for class 5, number = 4 and the standard deviation = 0; for class 6, number = 12 and the standard deviation = 3.5.

^eFor class 4 offenders sentenced to prison, number = 19 and the standard deviation = 12.6; for class 5, number = 19 and the standard deviation = 9.3; for class 6, number = 31 and the standard deviation = 7.8.

As table 2.2 indicates, there was approximately one month's difference in IPS sentence length between Maricopa and Pima counties. However, the difference in the actual duration of intensive supervision was greater; specifically, Pima County IPS supervision was longer by almost 5 months.

⁶Offense class was associated with neither the likelihood of probation violation nor the likelihood of revocation. Logistic regression analyses indicated that for Maricopa County, age, Arizona's IPS risk score, the number of prior arrests, and whether the offender was in IPS as opposed to probation predicted the likelihood of being revoked. In Pima County, only age and whether the offender was in IPS as opposed to probation were associated with revocations, although they were not very good predictors. That is, the Pima County model was not statistically significant.

⁷As stated in chapter 1, we used 1 year as our conservative estimate of the duration of parole supervision.

The difference in prison sentence lengths ranged from 2 to 6 months, while the difference in the amount of time incarcerated was less than a month. With these estimates of sentence length and duration of supervision in mind, we now turn to an estimation of the costs of an IPS sentence and the alternative prison sentence.

Estimated Cost of a Sentence

To derive the cost of a sentence, we needed the daily per capita operating costs for each mode of supervision—IPS, standard probation, prison, and parole. We derived these costs by taking the total operating costs for the year and dividing by the total number of offenders supervised during that year. Specifically, for both Maricopa and Pima County, we took the annual expenditures for fiscal year 1990 and divided by the number of offenders supervised for that year. (See appendix V for standard probation and intensive supervision costs for both Maricopa and Pima County.) To determine the cost of incarcerating an offender, we took the daily operating costs of an Arizona minimum security facility and divided by the average daily offender population. (See appendix IV for incarceration costs.)

The estimated daily per capita costs for IPS and prison, as well as for probation and parole, are provided in table 2.3.

Table 2.3: Daily Per Capita Cost, by Mode of Supervision

Mode of supervision	Maricopa County	Pima County
Prison	\$34.47	\$34.47
IPS	12.00	11.42
Probation	3.25	4.96
Parole ^a	2.77	2.77

^aUnlike the costs for probation, IPS, and prison, which were derived from fiscal year 1990 data, the parole cost was based on 1986 data; thus, it is likely to be underestimated due to inflation. The extent of this underestimation is unknown.

Our estimates of daily operating costs were lowest for parole, followed by standard probation, then IPS, and lastly prison. The daily per capita cost of IPS was slightly lower in Pima County (by 58 cents) than in Maricopa County; the probation cost was higher (by \$11.71). Both prison and parole supervision were under the jurisdiction of the Arizona Department of Corrections, and their costs did not vary by county.

The substantial differences in cost between IPS and standard probation and between incarceration and parole indicate that the change in the mode of supervision caused a substantial reduction in the cost of supervising the offender. The duration of supervision under the more costly modes—IPS and incarceration—clearly had a greater effect in increasing the cost of a sentence.

Using the estimated daily per capita costs (table 2.3) in combination with the estimated sentence lengths and durations of supervision (table 2.2), we derived the mean estimated costs of a sentence to either IPS or prison by offense class. For example, the cost for an IPS sentence was the daily cost of intensive supervision multiplied by its duration, plus the daily costs of standard probation supervision multiplied by its duration. The costs of a sentence to either IPS or prison for each of class 4, 5, and 6 felony offenders are provided in table 2.4. (See appendix VI for details on calculations.)

Table 2.4: Estimated Per Capita Cost of an IPS Versus a Prison Sentence

	Offense class		
	Class 4	Class 5	Class 6
Maricopa County			
IPS	\$ 7,776	\$ 7,279	\$ 7,181
Prison	23,023	16,922	12,062
Difference	15,247	9,643	4,881
Pima County			
IPS	10,317	9,055	8,906
Prison	22,300	16,612	12,889
Difference	11,983	7,557	3,983

Conclusion

Assuming offenders successfully completed their sentences, we projected the costs of the two sentences and found that, despite the longer IPS sentences, prison sentences were more expensive than IPS sentences for all offense classes. The difference in cost was greater for class 4 than for class 6 offenders in both counties. That is, the cost-savings of the IPS program were greater for more severe offense classes.

By examining county differences, we illustrated the effects of daily per capita cost and sentence length, as well as the duration of supervision, on the cost of a sentence. Since the daily per capita cost of supervising an offender in IPS was almost four times as great as the cost of supervising the

offender in standard probation, the duration of IPS supervision had a greater impact than sentence length on the cost of an IPS sentence. Similarly, the duration of incarceration had a greater effect than sentence length on the cost of a prison sentence.

While the duration of IPS supervision did not differ by offense class, the duration of incarceration did. The projected difference between the costs of an IPS sentence for a class 4 and a class 6 offender was \$595 in Maricopa and \$1,411 in Pima County. Since the cost of the IPS supervision was the same for all offense classes, these county differences in IPS cost were due to differences in IPS sentence length.

In contrast, the differences in the costs of a prison sentence across offense classes were due to differences in the amount of time the offender was incarcerated. The cost of parole supervision remained constant. A class 4 offender was incarcerated for almost twice as long as a class 6 offender. This difference in the amount of time a class 4 and class 6 offender were incarcerated was reflected in the difference in the cost between the two offense classes. The difference between the projected costs of a prison sentence for a class 4 and a class 6 offender was \$10,961 in Maricopa and \$9,411 in Pima County. Thus, the greatest savings credited to the IPS program were produced through supervising offenders who normally would have been incarcerated for the longest duration—that is, class 4 offenders.

Cost of a Sentence Including Revocation Costs

Introduction

In this chapter, we compare the cost of an IPS sentence with that of a prison sentence, under the assumption that a certain proportion of the IPS offenders failed and were revoked to prison. In chapter 2, we found that, despite their greater lengths, IPS sentences were less expensive than the alternative prison sentences. However, in both Maricopa and Pima County, a considerable percentage of the offenders sentenced to intensive supervision were revoked. A high revocation rate could potentially increase the overall cost of an IPS program to such an extent as to render it more expensive than incarceration. This chapter, then, focuses on whether the Arizona IPS program would be a cost-saving alternative to incarceration, once high revocation rates are taken into account.

We begin with a discussion of the revocation costs, followed by a description of how we incorporated them into our estimated cost of a sentence. We conclude the section with a comparison of the cost of a sentence that included the revocation costs with one that assumed no revocation costs. Next, we deal with why a simple comparison of the cost of an IPS and a prison sentence, using this second estimate of cost, is not appropriate. We then provide an alternative comparison—one biased against the IPS program. That is, we compare the cost of the IPS sentence that included revocation costs with the cost of a prison sentence that assumed no revocation costs.

The Cost of Revocation

The cost for an IPS offender who was subsequently revoked to prison can be thought of as the cost of the initial intensive supervision plus the cost of the prison sentence after the revocation. The length of time the offender was supervised in the community before revocation did not affect the subsequent prison sentence length. Offenders who were revoked were generally sentenced for the presumptive prison term of their instant offense—that is, the offense for which they were initially convicted. Consequently, the cost of the period of supervision before revocation became an “add-on” to the cost of the presumptive prison sentence after the revocation. Had the offender been initially sentenced to prison, that offender would only have incurred the cost of the presumptive prison sentence. The longer the offender was supervised under intensive supervision before revocation, the greater the add-on cost of intensive supervision.¹

¹As our concern here is the direct operating cost—excluding the cost of crime commission and those costs charged to other agencies—we do not distinguish between revocations for technical (or administrative) violations and for new crimes. In terms of direct operating costs, IPS became an add-on cost when the offender was revoked for whatever reason.

Revocation resulted in an add-on cost even after the offender “graduated” from intensive supervision to standard probation. Moreover, such an offender incurred a greater add-on cost because the offender was supervised for a longer duration before revocation. The cost of supervising such an offender was the cost of intensive supervision, plus the cost of standard probation, plus the cost of the prison sentence after revocation. Consequently, to determine the real direct cost of an IPS sentence, revocations that occurred before the expiration of the sentence, even if they occurred after the offender progressed to standard probation, must be taken into consideration.

Prisoners conditionally released to parole could also be revoked for violating the terms of their release. The costs of parole supervision for those offenders also became add-on costs. As with IPS, the longer the offender was supervised in the community before the revocation, the greater the add-on cost of parole supervision. However, unlike IPS offenders who were revoked, offenders on parole were returned to prison for the remainder of their sentence. The duration of incarceration after revocation, therefore, was generally shorter for prisoners conditionally released from prison than for IPS offenders. Consequently, the cost of parole revocations was lower than that for IPS revocations.

Incorporating revocation costs into the estimates, however, is not easily accomplished. As noted previously, the cost of a revocation varied according to the amount of time the offender was supervised under the different modes before the revocation, in addition to how long the offender was incarcerated after the revocation. Estimating the duration of incarceration after the revocation was less problematic than estimating the duration of supervision prior to revocation. For IPS revocations, the resulting duration of incarceration depended on the instant offense and differed by offense class. Offenders convicted of a more severe offense were revoked to longer prison terms. For parole revocations, the duration of incarceration after revocation was the remainder of the prison sentence.² Thus, we estimated revocation costs by offense class.

We assumed that the revocation rates for IPS offenders were the same for all offense classes. Similarly, we assumed that the revocation rates for prisoners conditionally released to parole were the same for all offense classes. Using the costs of supervision in conjunction with actual revocation rates, we projected the costs of supervising 400 offenders

²We assumed that the offender completed the remainder of the sentence in prison and was not released to parole a second time. There were only two cases in our two samples in which an offender was released to parole a second time.

where a certain proportion of them were revoked at each successive 3-month interval. We describe this calculation in further detail in the next section. (See appendix VII for the actual projections.)

Estimated Cost Including the Cost of Revocation

First, we calculated the cost of supervising an offender for successive 3-month intervals—that is, for 3 months, 6 months, 9 months, and so forth. (See table VII.1 for Maricopa County estimates and table VII.8 for Pima County estimates.) Then, using the revocation rates observed for our 1987 samples, we calculated the costs of supervising 400 offenders under the assumption that a similar proportion of them were revoked for each successive 3-month interval.³ The per capita costs were derived by dividing the total costs of supervision, including the cost of revocations, by the 400 offenders. We estimated costs for class 4, 5, and 6 offenders. (See tables VII.2-VII.4 for Maricopa County IPS cost estimates and tables VII.9-VII.11 for Pima County.)

We estimated the costs of a prison sentence in a similar way—under the assumption that a certain proportion of offenders on parole were eventually revoked. That is, we calculated the cost of parole supervision for successive 3-month intervals. The costs of incarceration after revocation was added to derive the costs of supervising an offender who was eventually returned to prison. Since the length of the incarceration after revocation was the remainder of the initial sentence, and the initial sentence was determined by the offense class, these estimates for prison also differed by offense class. (See tables VII.5-VII.7 for Maricopa County prison cost estimates and tables VII.12-VII.14 for Pima County.) Table 3.1 provides the summary of these cost estimates, along with the cost of sentences assuming no revocation cost.

³Offenders are assumed here to have been revoked at the end of the 3-month intervals, although they could actually have been revoked at any point within each of the 3-month intervals. Consequently, this method of determining the cost of supervising an offender who was eventually revoked overestimates the actual costs.

Chapter 3
Cost of a Sentence Including Revocation
Costs

Table 3.1: Estimated Per Capita Costs of a Sentence Including Revocation Costs, and of a Sentence Assuming No Revocation Costs

	Offense class		
	Class 4	Class 5	Class 6
Maricopa County			
IPS with revocation	\$19,082	\$15,301	\$12,413
IPS with no revocation	7,776	7,279	7,181
Difference	11,306	8,022	5,232
Prison with revocation	25,523	18,659	12,922
Prison with no revocation	23,023	16,922	12,062
Difference	2,500	1,737	860
Pima County			
IPS with revocation	18,349	14,808	12,818
IPS with no revocation	10,317	9,055	8,906
Difference	8,032	5,753	3,912
Prison with revocation	25,182	17,735	14,025
Prison with no revocation	22,300	16,612	12,889
Difference	2,882	1,123	1,136

As expected, revocations had a greater impact on the costs for IPS sentences than for prison sentences. For example, in Maricopa County, the revocation costs increased the average per capita IPS cost by as much as \$11,306 for a class 4 offender. In contrast, the per capita prison cost for a class 4 offender increased by \$2,500. This was due to the higher IPS revocation rates, in addition to the higher incarceration costs that followed revocation.

Cost of an IPS Sentence Including Revocation Costs Compared With the Cost of a Prison Sentence With No Revocation Costs

The IPS and parole revocation rates were generated by two different groups of offenders—those sentenced to IPS and those sentenced to prison. More importantly, the two groups differed in offender characteristics traditionally associated with the likelihood of committing a crime, thus we cannot assume that they are comparable.⁴ If offenders in our IPS sample were sentenced to prison, they might not have been revoked at the same rates as the 1987 prison sample; similarly, if offenders in our prison sample were sentenced to IPS, they might not have been revoked from IPS at the same rates as the 1987 IPS sample. Thus, we cannot use cost estimates based on these observed revocation rates to compare the alternative costs of sentencing any given offender to the two sentencing options.

⁴See Intensive Probation Supervision: Mixed Effectiveness In Controlling Crime, GAO/PEMD-93-4 (Washington, D.C.: June 1993) for a comparison of the IPS and prison samples.

We can, however, make a different comparison. We can examine whether IPS was a cost-saving alternative, given its high revocation rates, by comparing its cost with the lowest estimated cost of a prison sentence. To make this comparison, we assumed that the IPS offenders were revoked in the same proportion as our 1987 samples and, alternatively, if these offenders were sentenced to prison, that they were incarcerated for a portion of that sentence, were released to parole supervision, and successfully completed parole supervision.

Accordingly, we compared the costs of IPS including revocation costs with the costs of prison assuming no parole revocation costs. These comparisons are provided in table 3.2.

Table 3.2: Estimated Per Capita Costs for IPS Including Revocation Costs and Estimated Per Capita Costs for Prison Assuming No Revocations

	Offense class		
	Class 4	Class 5	Class 6
Maricopa County			
IPS	\$19,082	\$15,301	\$12,412
Prison	23,023	16,922	12,062
Difference	3,941	1,621	-350
Pima County			
IPS	18,349	14,808	12,818
Prison	22,300	16,612	12,889
Difference	3,951	1,804	71

As indicated in table 3.2, despite its high revocation rates, IPS was the less expensive alternative for all three classes of offenders in Pima County and was more expensive only in the case of offenders convicted of the least severe (class 6) offenses in Maricopa County.

Additional Costs and Savings

As noted in chapter 1, we defined cost as direct cost, and by thus restricting our definition, we may have either underestimated or overestimated the relative costs of the sentencing options. However, there were two sources of revenue and expenditure that bear mentioning since they were statutorily specified components of the Arizona IPS program. In the revenue category was the collection of monies from the offender, while an indirect cost excluded from our projections was the cost of jail incarceration. Some cost-savings were realized through the collection of

probation fees, victim restitution, and the like.⁵ The extent to which such collections offset costs is not known, however. At the same time, additional program components (for example, mandatory jail time) involved additional costs.⁶

We used jail incarceration to illustrate the effect of such an additional component on the cost of a program. From our 1987 data, we obtained the average length of jail incarceration for our IPS samples. We then estimated the cost of jail incarceration—\$2,970 for Maricopa County IPS and \$3,213 for Pima County IPS. Adding these estimates of jail costs to the cost of an IPS sentence rendered IPS sentences more expensive than the alternative prison sentences for all except the most serious (class 4) offenses.⁷

Conclusions

We calculated the costs of IPS and of prison sentences that incorporated revocation costs. The direct cost of revocations had a substantial effect on the average cost of an IPS sentence due to both the high revocation rate and the cost of incarceration after revocation. In contrast, parole revocation cost had a smaller effect on the cost of a prison sentence. This was due to both a lower parole revocation rate and a lower total cost of incarceration after parole revocation.

By examining county differences, we can see the effect of a higher revocation rate on the cost of an IPS sentence. (Maricopa County had a higher IPS revocation rate than Pima County.) We can also see the effect of the cost of the subsequent incarceration by examining the differences between class 4 and class 6 offenders. For example, the difference in the costs of an IPS sentence for a class 4 offender was \$11,306 in Maricopa County and \$8,032 in Pima County when revocation costs were included. The difference for a class 6 offender when revocation costs were included was \$5,232 in Maricopa and \$3,912 in Pima County.

It is clear that, when revocation costs were included, the cost-savings of the IPS program were greatly diminished. But, when we compared that IPS

⁵Concerning cost savings derived from collections, see Arizona Criminal Justice Commission, "Adult Intensive Probation Supervision Program: Evaluation Report," 1987, and "Intensive Probation Supervision: Annual Report, Fiscal Year 1988."

⁶In 1990, Pima County began using electronic monitoring. Although electronic monitoring was not a program component of IPS and was available to both standard probation and intensive supervision, it was yet another example of additional costs that would not be reflected in an analysis of direct operating cost of an intensive supervision program.

⁷A 1989 change in statute eliminated the mandatory 45-day minimum jail time as a condition of IPS. Nonetheless, a substantial percentage of IPS offenders were still sentenced to some jail time after that change. See appendix VIII concerning jail time and for our estimation of jail incarceration costs.

cost with the lowest estimated cost of a prison sentence (that is, not including revocation costs for prison sentences while including them for IPS), IPS remained less expensive than incarceration for all offense classes in Pima County. In Maricopa County, IPS was cost-saving for more serious offenses; it was more expensive for the least severe (class 6) offenses.

For class 6 offenders in Maricopa County, the prison sentence was less expensive than an IPS sentence because it entailed a shorter period of incarceration. Although the shorter presumptive sentence and corresponding period of incarceration for a class 6 offender also implied that the cost of the subsequent incarceration following revocation for an IPS offender was not as high, the high revocation rate caused the cost of an IPS sentence to exceed the cost of a prison sentence.

Conclusions and Implications

The Intensive Probation Supervision (IPS) program in Arizona was implemented to provide a cost-saving alternative to incarceration. In this report, we examined the cost of IPS as an alternative by comparing the direct costs of the two sentencing options—IPS and prison. We used two methods for deriving our cost estimates. First, we estimated the direct operating cost of a sentence, assuming that all offenders completed their sentences. Second, we took into consideration that a high percentage of the IPS offenders failed and were revoked to prison.

Differences in sentence length and duration of supervision by the different modalities—IPS, probation, prison, and parole—contributed to differences in the costs of the two sentencing options. We found that, despite its lengthier sentences, IPS was the less expensive alternative if all offenders completed their sentences successfully. The difference in cost was due to substantial differences in operating costs of the various modalities. The duration of supervision under the more costly modality—IPS as opposed to probation, and prison as opposed to parole—had a greater effect than sentence length on the overall cost of the sentence.

Our second estimate of cost is illustrative of the enormous impact of revocations on the cost of a sentencing option. For both sentencing options, the revocation costs for offenders who had committed more serious offenses were higher than for those who had committed less serious offenses. Moreover, the costs for IPS revocations were greater than those for parole revocations. This was due to differences in the duration of the incarcerations that followed revocations.

The cost of an IPS sentence when revocation costs were included increased by 46 to 60 percent in Maricopa County, while the cost for Pima County increased by 32 to 43 percent. The lower parole revocation rates also produced a smaller effect on the cost of a prison sentence. Parole revocation costs increased the cost of a prison sentence by 3 to 12 percent in both counties.

Because our IPS and parole revocation rates were not comparable, and to ensure a conservative comparison (that is, one favoring prison), we compared the cost of an IPS sentence that incorporated revocation costs with the cost of a prison sentence assuming no parole revocations. We found that, despite IPS revocation rates of more than 50 percent, with one exception, the IPS sentence still remained less expensive than the prison sentence. Only offenders who committed the least serious class of offense in Maricopa County were more expensive to supervise under IPS. Due to

the lower cost-savings realized for offenders who committed less serious offenses, a high revocation rate caused the IPS sentence to be more expensive than the prison sentence for such offenders.

Throughout this report, we have presented estimates for the cost of a sentence to either IPS or prison for an offender of a particular offense class. The IPS program, however, supervised offenders of all three classes. The majority of the offenders directly sentenced to IPS in both counties were class 4 offenders.¹ As the cost-savings realized were greater for offenders who committed more serious offenses, the IPS programs in both counties were able to supervise offenders at a lower cost than that for incarceration, despite high revocations.²

In conclusion, it is clear that, in the two counties of Arizona that we examined, intensive supervision was a cost-saving alternative to incarceration with respect to direct operating costs for offenders directly sentenced to the program. Assuming that all offenders, those sentenced to IPS as well as those sentenced to prison, completed their sentences, intensive supervision was the less costly sentencing option. When taking into consideration that a certain proportion of the offenders in each of the sentencing options were revoked, the IPS sentence was still less expensive than the prison sentence. When the comparison was between the cost of an IPS sentence that included revocation cost and the cost of a prison sentence that assumed no revocation cost, IPS was more expensive in only one instance—that of offenders convicted of the least serious class of felony in Maricopa County. Thus, given the mix of offenders sentenced to the IPS program in the two counties, the program was a cost-saving alternative in terms of direct operating cost. However, we also saw that these savings could be offset by additional program components, such as jail incarceration.

Our data also show that cost-savings could be maximized by tailoring intensive supervision programs like those of Maricopa and Pima counties. In terms of the offenders supervised, the greatest cost-savings could be realized by supervising offenders who would normally be incarcerated for

¹Class 4 offenders directly sentenced to IPS in 1987 constituted 46 percent of the Maricopa County and 58 percent of the Pima County IPS program population. Class 6 offenders constituted 24 and 21 percent of the offenders directly sentenced to IPS in Maricopa and Pima County, respectively. See *Intensive Probation Supervision: Mixed Effectiveness In Controlling Crime*, GAO/PEMD-93-4 (Washington, D.C.: June 1993) for offender characteristics of the prison and IPS samples.

²Statutory changes in 1988 allowed the direct sentencing of class 2 and 3 offenders to IPS. If class 2 and 3 offenders were no more likely to be revoked, the cost-savings derived from supervising these offenders would be greater yet.

the longest duration. Targeting offenders who are least likely to be revoked to prison would also maximize cost-savings. In terms of the program, cost-savings could be realized by having a short-term program that “graduates” offenders to a less costly mode of supervision—standard probation.

State IPS Statutes and Policy Common to Arizona's County Programs

In this appendix, we briefly describe the Arizona Intensive Probation Supervision (IPS) program as it is specified by state statute and administrative policy. The state, by specifying program components, supervision requirements, and offender eligibility, defines aspects of the IPS program that are common throughout the state.

Offenders under the IPS program are required to

- be fully employed, full-time students, or seeking employment and community service work;
- remain under house arrest, except for reasons of employment, school, community service, or as allowed by the IPS officers;
- submit to drug and alcohol testing;
- perform at least 40 hours of community service per month, except for full-time students who may be required to do less;
- pay restitution and fees; and
- comply with other court-ordered conditions.

Minimum supervision requirements as specified by statute include four visual contacts (as opposed to phone contacts) with the offender each week, as well as weekly contacts with the offender's employer. IPS officers are also required to make weekly checks for new arrests. These supervision requirements were further delineated by state policy, which created three levels of supervision with decreasing minimum requirements. Under this policy, the number of required visual contacts is gradually reduced from four times, to twice, and finally once a week; employer contacts are reduced from once a week to once every 2 weeks.¹

Control over the offender's finances is maintained through the collection of the offender's wages; IPS officers deduct the appropriate amount for probation fees and other court-ordered restitution before—the practice in some counties—returning the balance to the offender.

To ensure that the intensity of IPS supervision is maintained, the state mandated a maximum officer-to-offender ratio. A two-person IPS team, consisting of a probation officer and a surveillance officer, is allowed to supervise no more than 25 offenders.² Exceptions are made for small counties with few offenders, where a single IPS probation officer can

¹Under standard probation, the minimum requirements for offenders on the maximum level of supervision are two visual contacts monthly.

²The average number of offenders supervised by a single probation officer in Arizona ranges between 60 and 80 offenders.

supervise, at most, 15 IPS offenders. The supervision requirements for the single IPS officer are also revised accordingly. Statutory changes in mid-1988 permit an alternative three-person IPS team, consisting of a single probation officer and two surveillance officers, to supervise, at most, 40 IPS offenders.

Offender eligibility requirements differ according to the mode of program entry. Offenders enter the program through either direct sentencing or reinstatement for violation of conditions of standard probation—both of which are judicial decisions. In 1987, only offenders convicted of class 4, 5, and 6 felonies were eligible for direct sentencing to IPS. A 1988 change in the statute allowed for the direct sentencing of class 2 and 3 felons who are “probation bound” to the program. A subsequent statutory change in 1989 allowed for the direct sentencing to IPS of any “probation eligible” class 2 and 3 felon.

Probation violators who commit a technical violation (that is, a violation of conditions of probation but not a new crime) are eligible for reinstatement to IPS. This means that any offender under standard probation supervision, regardless of the class of the original conviction, is eligible for intensive supervision. Only class 1 offenders (for example, those convicted of murder) are not eligible for probation. Consequently, although class 2 and 3 felons were not eligible for direct sentencing to IPS prior to the 1988 statutory changes, such offenders nevertheless entered the program by way of the probation-violation route. State policy also attempted to restrict the program to “prison-bound” offenders—that is, those who otherwise would have been sentenced to prison.

Beyond state legislation and administrative policies, counties had a great deal of discretion in defining the actual programs. Each county determined the specific structure of its IPS teams, the supervision provided, as well as the type of offenders supervised. County differences in the size of the program, offender population, employment and community service opportunities, and treatment resources, all contributed to differences in county programs. At another level, IPS officers exercised discretion in carrying out these state mandates and policies. Individual IPS officers determined what supervision actually entailed, what was permissible behavior, how to respond to violations, and perhaps most importantly, when to take offenders off the streets by revoking them to prison.

Data Collection and Data Sources

We found in our prior work on intermediate sanctions that almost every program was unique and most involved multiple components.¹ This argued for a closer examination of programs as the optimal method for learning not only about the actual supervision they provided but also about their effects. Alternative approaches, which compared offenders in a program with those sentenced to probation or prison without regard to exactly how the program operated, were open to misinterpretation. Accordingly, we selected the most prevalent form of intermediate sanction—intensive supervision—and evaluated it in a single state.

We spent about 5 months conducting field research in four counties—Cochise, Coconino, Maricopa, and Pima—learning how offenders entered IPS, how they were supervised while in the program, and how they exited the program. In addition, we studied incentive structures for the IPS staff, their backgrounds and experience, and officer safety and weapons policies in each of the counties.

Data Requirements: the Effectiveness of IPS for Controlling Crime

To answer the question concerning the ability of IPS to control crime, we selected our samples from the two largest counties—Maricopa and Pima—which together accounted for 80 percent of the IPS offenders statewide. We selected samples of offenders sentenced to probation, intensive supervision, and prison, as well as offenders reinstated to IPS in the summer of 1987. Because IPS had been implemented 2 years previously (in July 1985), we worked with data that were not complicated by program implementation problems. At the same time, our use of 1987 data enabled us to track arrests and revocations for as long as our study's time frame allowed.

In 1987, IPS supervised 5 percent of Arizona's adult offender population convicted under the superior courts; of the rest, 32 percent were incarcerated in prisons, and 63 percent were under standard probation.² The Maricopa County IPS supervised over half (53 percent) of the IPS offenders in the state. The Pima County IPS, which was approximately half the size of Maricopa's, supervised 26 percent of the IPS offenders statewide.³

¹See *Intermediate Sanctions: Their Impacts on Prison Crowding, Costs, and Recidivism Are Still Unclear*, GAO/PEMD-90-21 (Washington, D.C.: September 7, 1990).

²Most offenders charged with a felony are under the jurisdiction of the county superior courts. Offenders charged with lesser offenses—misdemeanors, traffic offenses—are usually under the jurisdiction of lower courts—specifically, the justice of the peace courts and the municipal courts.

³Cochise and Coconino counties each supervised approximately 3 percent of the IPS offenders.

**Maricopa County Samples:
July-September 1987**

The three Maricopa samples were drawn from two magnetic tapes provided by the Maricopa County Adult Probation Department. Offenders sentenced to either probation, IPS, or prison during the months of July through September 1987, as well as offenders reinstated to IPS for probation violation during this period, were selected. The Maricopa County probation sample consisted of a random sample of 108 offenders selected from approximately 6,360 offenders sentenced to probation for a felony in 1987. This probation sample was selected using a randomization process available in a commercial statistical package.⁴ Dropping cases for which relevant data were missing resulted in a sample size of 95.

All offenders entering Maricopa County IPS during these same 3 months were selected for the IPS sample. Of the 116 offenders entering IPS, 40 percent were directly sentenced to IPS, and 60 percent were reinstated to IPS as a result of probation violation. (In 1987, a total of 542 offenders entered Maricopa County IPS.)

The resulting list of all offenders entering IPS during the 3-month period was not consistent with data provided by Arizona's Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC). Offenders who, according to AOC data, entered Maricopa County IPS during the July-September 1987 period, but were missing from the list, were subsequently included in the sample. (According to AOC data, an additional 45 offenders entered Maricopa County IPS during this time period. However, of these 45 offenders, some were subsequently dropped from the sample because they had been sentenced in other counties and then sent to Maricopa County for "courtesy" supervision.) Our resulting samples consisted of 70 offenders reinstated and 46 directly sentenced to IPS.

For the prison sample, the intent was to select all offenders who were sentenced to prison in the July-September 1987 period and subsequently released by March 15, 1990. Our method for doing this was initially to select all offenders who were sentenced to prison for 6 years or less during the 3-month period in 1987 and then draw our sample of offenders released by March 15, 1990, from this pool. (We assumed that offenders sentenced to more than 6 years of prison had not been released by March 1990—after less than 3 years of incarceration.) We obtained a list of 234 offenders sentenced to prison for 6 years or less during the July-September 1987 period. Of these 234 offenders, 160 had been released by March 15, 1990. (During the whole of 1987, 859 offenders were sentenced to prison for a felony.)

⁴See SPSS, Inc., *SPSSX User's Guide* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1986).

However, the list of 234 offenders consisted of offenders who were recommended for a prison term of 6 years or less, rather than those actually sentenced to 6 years or less.⁵ Offenders recommended for prison terms of more than 6 years but actually sentenced to shorter terms and subsequently released by March 1990, were missing from the sample.⁶ That is, our prison sample consisted of offenders who were considered by both a probation officer—the person recommending the sentence—and a judge to be appropriate candidates for a shorter prison term.

Offenders who were released to a detainer—that is, released to the custody of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, another state agency, or the Immigration and Naturalization Service—to treatment facilities, or to the work furlough program, were dropped from the prison sample. The resulting Maricopa prison sample consisted of 154 offenders.

**Pima County Samples:
July-October 1987**

The Pima County samples were drawn from 4 months—July through October 1987—because fewer offenders were sentenced in Pima County. Offenders were selected from court dockets of all offenders sentenced during this 4-month period. A list of all offenders reinstated to IPS during this same period was provided by the Pima County IPS program.

The Pima County probation sample consisted of a random sample of the 398 offenders sentenced to probation during the 4-month period. Every fourth offender of each month was selected. Of this group, only offenders sentenced to standard probation supervision for a felony offense were retained. Excluding cases for which relevant information was missing yielded a sample of 89 probationers. All offenders directly sentenced to Pima County IPS during this 4-month period, as well as those reinstated to Pima County IPS through probation violation, were included in the sample, yielding a total of 100 IPS offenders. In Pima County, about 60 percent of the IPS offenders were directly sentenced to IPS, while about 40 percent were reinstated. Of the 151 offenders sentenced to prison for 6 years or less in Pima County during this period, 108 had been released by March 15, 1990. As with the Maricopa prison sample, offenders released to detainees, treatment facilities, and work furlough, as well as those for which relevant information was missing, were dropped from the sample—yielding a sample size of 85 offenders.

⁵Some of the offenders on the list were actually sentenced to terms of more than 6 years.

⁶There were 86 offenders sentenced to 6 years of prison or less during the 3-month period in 1987 who were not included in the list. It is unknown how many of these offenders were released from prison by March 15, 1990.

Sources of Data

We obtained the data for our outcome measures—arrests and revocations—from three sources. The Arizona Department of Public Safety—the state law enforcement agency that maintains arrest records for the state—provided arrest data, including arrests by Arizona state, county, and city law enforcement agencies. We also used probation violation data obtained from the respective county probation data bases. Data concerning release from prison, as well as that on subsequent returns-to-prison due to parole violations, were provided by the Arizona Department of Corrections.

We used the same 1987 samples from Maricopa and Pima counties to answer the question of whether IPS is a cost-saving alternative to incarceration. The IPS and prison samples were used to estimate sentence lengths, durations of supervision by different modes, and revocation rates. Annual expenditures for fiscal year 1990, as well as the number of offenders supervised during that year, were obtained from Arizona's Administrative Office of the Courts and the Department of Corrections. The cost of parole and duration of parole supervision were obtained from existing literature.

Cost Estimates for Offenders Reinstated to IPS

Offenders reinstated to Arizona's Intensive Probation Supervision (IPS) program constituted a large proportion of offenders supervised by the program, and thus had a significant effect on determining the type of offenders in the program and its costs. In Maricopa, offenders reinstated to IPS constituted 74 percent of IPS offenders; in Pima, 42 percent. To determine whether IPS was a cost-saving alternative for offenders who violated probation requires a comparison of the cost of supervising that offender under intensive supervision for the remainder of the probation sentence with the alternative cost of revoking the sentence and sending the offender to prison.¹

Determining the cost of supervising an offender reinstated to IPS is more complex. The daily per capita cost of supervising an IPS offender was the same whether the offender was directly sentenced to IPS or was reinstated to IPS through probation violation. The cost of the reinstatement to IPS, like that of a direct sentence to IPS, depended on three factors—sentence length, duration of supervision, and revocation. Since offenders directly sentenced and those reinstated to IPS differed on all three factors, the cost estimates differed for the two groups.

Sentence length for offenders reinstated to IPS equalled the remainder of the initial probation sentence at the time of the reinstatement. Offenders reinstated to IPS were initially sentenced to standard probation. As a result of probation violation, the conditions of their probation sentence were modified to intensive supervision. Such offenders did not receive a new probation sentence. That is, the probation violation did not increase the length of the initial sentence.

When an offender who was reinstated to IPS subsequently progressed to standard probation, the cost of IPS as an alternative to incarceration included both intensive and standard probation supervision. The cost of reinstatement to IPS—assuming that a proportion of such offenders were subsequently revoked—can also be calculated. However, the revocation rates for offenders directly sentenced and those reinstated to IPS differed.

¹For more details concerning differences in offender characteristics between offenders directly sentenced to IPS and those reinstated to IPS, as well as differences in their revocation rates, see *Intensive Probation Supervision: Mixed Effectiveness in Controlling Crime*, GAO/PEMD-93-4 (Washington, D.C.: June 1993).

Cost for Two Institutions With Comparable Numbers of Inmates

Table IV.1 is a comparison of fiscal year 1990 expenditures for two Arizona minimum security facilities. The Arizona State Prison at Safford housed approximately 400 offenders and its daily per capita costs were used for our estimate of the daily per capita operating costs for incarceration. This estimated per capita operating cost for incarceration—\$34.47—is lower than incarceration estimates reported in other sources—\$44.30¹ and \$41.93.² The lower estimate may have resulted from restricting the cost to a minimum security facility. The Fort Grant facility, which housed almost 600 inmates, cost \$2.47 more per capita per day than Safford. The cost for this facility is also below the estimates reported in other sources.

Table IV.1: Costs for Two Arizona Minimum Security Facilities^a

Budget category	Expenditures	
	Fort Grant	Safford
Personal services	\$4,005,000	\$2,595,300
Employee-related	1,211,800	788,400
Outside professional	695,500	434,100
Out-of-state travel	22,400	10,600
Other	1,277,500	1,014,100
Food	586,600	381,100
Work-function pay plan	160,400	115,600
Discharge expense	10,000	7,200
Total	\$7,969,200	\$5,346,400
Daily per capita cost	\$36.94	\$34.47
Average daily population	591	425
Staffing level ^b	194	122

^aFiscal year 1990

^bFull-time equivalents

¹Dennis J. Palumbo, "Home Arrest in Arizona," Report to the State Legislature, Arizona Department of Corrections, January 1990.

²Richard M. Ortiz, Member, Arizona Board of Pardons and Paroles, "Intensive Parole in Arizona?", NIC Information Center, 1986.

Costs of Standard Probation and Intensive Supervision for Maricopa and Pima Counties

Budget category	Expenditures ^a	
	Maricopa County	Pima County
Intensive probation services	\$3,187,644	\$174,784
State aid enhancement	5,283,091	1,036,571
Community Punishment Program	844,423	613,899
Drug Enforcement grant	149,106	118,406
Adult probation (standard)	5,836,758	3,150,429
Fees	1,662,291	467,446
Free enterprise	636,458	0
Total	\$17,599,771	\$7,128,535
Population supervised		
Standard probation	12,156	2,975
Intensive probation	728	418
Total	12,884	3,393
Daily costs		
Standard probation	\$3.25	\$4.96
Intensive probation	\$12.00	\$11.42

^aFiscal year 1990

Estimated Costs of an IPS and a Prison Sentence

The cost estimates presented in tables VI.1-VI.4 were calculated from the daily per capita costs (table 2.3) and the duration of supervision by different modes—probation, intensive supervision, prison, and parole (table 2.2). Estimates are provided for both Maricopa and Pima County class 4, 5, and 6 offenses.

We first determined the monthly per capita cost (using a 30-day month), then multiplied that figure by the average IPS duration to yield an IPS supervision cost. The IPS duration was the same for each offense class. For the probation supervision cost, we again determined the monthly per capita cost and multiplied that figure by the duration of probation supervision. The duration of probation supervision was obtained by subtracting the average IPS duration from the estimated sentence length for each offense class. The cost of an IPS sentence was the total cost for both IPS and probation supervision.

The cost of a prison sentence was similarly obtained. We estimated the cost of supervising an offender in prison by multiplying the monthly per capita cost by the duration of incarceration. We then obtained a parole supervision cost and added the two supervision costs, which yielded the cost of a prison sentence.

Table VI.1: Cost of an IPS Sentence, by Offense Class, Maricopa County

Offense class	IPS			Probation			Cost of sentence
	Monthly cost	Duration ^a	Supervision cost	Monthly cost	Duration ^a	Supervision cost	
Class 4	\$360	13.8	\$4,968	\$97.50	28.8	\$2,808	\$7,776
Class 5	360	13.8	4,968	97.50	23.7	2,311	7,279
Class 6	360	13.8	4,968	97.50	22.7	2,213	7,181

^aIn months

Table VI.2: Cost of an IPS Sentence, by Offense Class, Pima County

Offense class	IPS			Probation			Cost of sentence
	Monthly cost	Duration ^a	Supervision cost	Monthly cost	Duration ^a	Supervision cost	
Class 4	\$342.60	18.7	\$6,407	\$148.80	26.28	\$3,910	\$10,317
Class 5	342.60	18.7	6,407	148.80	17.80	2,649	9,055
Class 6	342.60	18.7	6,407	148.80	16.80	2,500	8,906

^aIn months

**Appendix VI
Estimated Costs of an IPS and a Prison
Sentence**

Table VI.3: Cost of a Prison Sentence, by Offense Class, Maricopa County

Offense class	Prison			Parole			Cost of sentence
	Monthly cost	Duration ^a	Supervision cost	Monthly cost	Duration ^a	Supervision cost	
Class 4	\$1034.10	21.3	\$22,026	\$83.10	12	\$997	\$23,023
Class 5	1034.10	15.4	15,925	83.10	12	997	16,922
Class 6	1034.10	10.7	11,065	83.10	12	997	12,062

^aIn months

Table VI.4: Cost of a Prison Sentence, by Offense Class, Pima County

Offense class	Prison			Parole			Cost of sentence
	Monthly cost	Duration ^a	Supervision cost	Monthly cost	Duration ^a	Supervision cost	
Class 4	\$1034.10	20.6	\$21,302	\$83.10	12	\$997	\$22,300
Class 5	1034.10	15.1	15,615	83.10	12	997	16,612
Class 6	1034.10	11.5	11,892	83.10	12	997	12,889

^aIn months

Projected Costs of IPS and Prison Sentences Including Revocation Costs

In this appendix, we provide the projected costs of two sentencing options—IPS and prison—including revocations costs. The cost estimates, based on 400 offenders, are provided for class 4, 5, and 6 felony offenses for both Maricopa and Pima County. We first present the IPS costs for successive 3-month intervals; then we project the costs of supervising 400 offenders under the assumption that a certain proportion were revoked at successive 3-month intervals. The per capita cost was derived by dividing the total cost by 400. Estimates for class 4, 5 and 6 offenders are provided separately. The prison costs are similarly derived for each class. That is, we use a base of 400 offenders to derive the cost of a prison sentence under the assumption that a certain proportion of the 400 offenders were revoked at successive 3-month intervals.

In Maricopa County, for example, the cost of supervising an IPS offender for 3 months was \$1,080. (See table VII.1.) The cost of a prison sentence for a class 4 offender—assuming that all offenders successfully completed the subsequent parole supervision—was \$23,023. (See table VI.3.) Thus, the cost of revoking a class 4 offender after 3 months equalled the cost of the 3 months of IPS supervision plus the cost of the subsequent prison sentence, or \$24,103.

Within the first 3 months, 2.2 percent of Maricopa County IPS offenders were revoked. Assuming 2.2 percent of the 400 IPS offenders were revoked yielded revocations for 8.8 offenders within the first 3 months. The total sentence cost for supervising these offenders was \$212,106. (See table VII.2.) The costs for each successive 3-month interval can be determined similarly. Adding the revocation costs for each successive 3-month interval to the cost of supervising the 41.4 percent of offenders who are not revoked (165.6 offenders) yielded a total cost of \$7,632,743 for supervising 400 class 4 offenders sentenced to IPS. Dividing the total cost of IPS by the 400 offenders yielded the per capita cost of an IPS sentence for a class 4 offender, including the costs of revocation. In this case, the per capita cost of supervising a class 4 offender, including the per capita cost of supervising a certain proportion of offenders who were eventually revoked to prison (at different points in time), was \$19,082.

**Appendix VII
 Projected Costs of IPS and Prison Sentences
 Including Revocation Costs**

**Table VII.1: Per Capita Cost of IPS
 Supervision at 3-Month Intervals,
 Maricopa County**

3-month Intervals	IPS		Probation		Total ^b
	Monthly cost	Duration ^a	Monthly cost	Duration ^a	
3	\$360	3.0	\$97.50	0	\$1,080
6	360	6.0	97.50	0	2,160
9	360	9.0	97.50	0	3,240
12	360	12.0	97.50	0	4,320
15	360	13.8	97.50	1.2	5,085
18	360	13.8	97.50	4.2	5,378
21	360	13.8	97.50	7.2	5,670
24	360	13.8	97.50	10.2	5,963
27	360	13.8	97.50	13.2	6,255
30	360	13.8	97.50	16.2	6,548
33	360	13.8	97.50	19.2	6,840
36	360	13.8	97.50	22.2	7,133
39	360	13.8	97.50	25.2	7,425
42	360	13.8	97.50	28.2	7,718
45	360	13.8	97.50	31.2	8,010

^aIn months. IPS duration plus probation duration equal duration under supervision (lefthand column).

^bTotals have been rounded to nearest dollar.

**Appendix VII
 Projected Costs of IPS and Prison Sentences
 Including Revocation Costs**

Table VII.2: Projected Costs Including Revocations at 3-Month Intervals for Class 4 Offenders Sentenced to IPS, Maricopa County^a

3-month intervals	Supervision cost^b	Projected number revoked^c	Projected cost^d
3	\$24,103	8.8	\$212,106
6	25,183	60.8	1,531,126
9	26,263	17.2	451,724
12	27,343	34.8	951,536
15	28,108	60.8	1,708,966
18	28,401	17.2	488,489
21	28,693	26.0	746,018
24	28,986	8.8	255,072
27	29,278	0	0
30	29,571	0	0
33	29,863	0	0
36	30,156	0	0
Success ^e	7,776	165.6	1,287,706
Total IPS cost or 400 c offenders	lass 4		\$7,632,743
Per capita IPS cost for class 4 offender			\$19,082

^aCosts were projected for 400 offenders and rounded to nearest dollar.

^bCost of initial supervision (IPS and probation) plus cost of prison sentence subsequent to revocation. See table VII.1 for cost of initial supervision. Prison cost was constant at \$23,023.

^cBased on revocation rate projected for 400 offenders.

^dProjected cost for number of offenders revoked at 3-month intervals.

^eCost for and number of offenders who successfully completed IPS sentence.

**Appendix VII
 Projected Costs of IPS and Prison Sentences
 Including Revocation Costs**

Table VII.3: Projected Costs Including Revocations at 3-Month Intervals for Class 5 Offenders Sentenced to IPS, Maricopa County^a

3-month intervals	Supervision cost^b	Projected number revoked^c	Projected cost^d
3	\$18,002	8.8	\$158,418
6	19,082	60.8	1,160,186
9	20,162	17.2	346,786
12	21,242	34.8	739,222
15	22,007	60.8	1,338,026
18	22,300	17.2	383,551
21	22,592	26.0	587,392
24	22,885	8.8	201,384
27	23,177	0	0
30	23,470	0	0
33	23,762	0	0
36	24,055	0	0
Success ^e	7,279	165.6	1,205,402
Total IPS cost for 400 class 5 offenders			\$6,120,367
Per capita IPS cost for class 5 offender			\$15,301

^aCosts were projected for 400 offenders and rounded to nearest dollar.

^bCost of initial supervision (IPS and probation) plus cost of prison sentence subsequent to revocation. See table VII.1 for cost of initial supervision. Prison cost was constant at \$16,922.

^cBased on revocation rate projected for 400 offenders.

^dProjected cost for number of offenders revoked at 3-month intervals.

^eCost for and number of offenders who successfully completed IPS sentence.

**Appendix VII
 Projected Costs of IPS and Prison Sentences
 Including Revocation Costs**

Table VII.4: Projected Costs Including Revocations at 3-Month Intervals for Class 6 Offenders Sentenced to IPS, Maricopa County^a

3-month intervals	Supervision cost^b	Projected number revoked^c	Projected cost^d
3	\$13,142	8.8	\$115,650
6	14,222	60.8	864,698
9	15,302	17.2	263,194
12	16,382	34.8	570,094
15	17,147	60.8	1,042,538
18	17,440	17.2	299,959
21	17,732	26.0	461,032
24	18,025	8.8	158,616
27	18,317	0	0
30	18,610	0	0
33	18,902	0	0
36	19,195	0	0
Success ^e	7,181	165.6	1,189,174
Total IPS cost for 400 class 6 offenders			\$4,964,953
Per capita IPS cost for class 6 offender			\$12,412

^aCosts were projected for 400 offenders and rounded to nearest dollar.

^bCost of initial supervision (IPS and probation) plus cost of prison sentence subsequent to revocation. See table VII.1 for cost of initial supervision. Prison cost was constant at \$12,062.

^cBased on revocation rate projected for 400 offenders.

^dProjected cost for number of offenders revoked at 3-month intervals.

^eCost for and number of offenders who successfully completed IPS sentence.

**Appendix VII
 Projected Costs of IPS and Prison Sentences
 Including Revocation Costs**

Table VII.5: Projected Costs Including Revocations at 3-Month Intervals for Class 4 Offenders Sentenced to Prison, Maricopa County^a

3-month intervals	Cost		Projected number revoked ^d	Projected cost ^e
	Parole ^b	Prison + parole + return to prison ^c		
3	\$249	\$38,821	37.6	\$1,459,678
6	499	39,071	22.0	859,552
9	748	39,320	0	0
12	997	39,569	3.2	126,621
Success ^f	997	23,024	337.2	7,763,534
Total prison cost for 400 class 4 offenders				\$10,209,385
Per capita prison cost for class 4 offender				\$25,523

^aCosts were projected for 400 offenders and rounded to nearest dollar.

^bMonthly parole cost was \$83.10.

^cInitial prison cost was \$22,026 (\$1,034 monthly for 21.3 months); return to prison cost was \$16,546 (\$1,034 monthly for 16 months).

^dBased on revocation rate projected for 400 offenders.

^eProjected cost for number of offenders revoked at 3-month intervals.

^fCost for and number of offenders who successfully completed prison sentence.

**Appendix VII
 Projected Costs of IPS and Prison Sentences
 Including Revocation Costs**

Table VII.6: Projected Costs Including Revocations at 3-Month Intervals for Class 5 Offender Sentenced to Prison, Maricopa County^a

3-month intervals	Cost		Projected number revoked ^d	Projected cost ^a
	Parole ^b	Prison + parole + return to prison ^c		
3	\$249	27,860	37.6	\$1,047,527
6	499	28,109	22.0	618,400
9	748	28,358	0	0
12	997	28,608	3.2	91,545
Success ^f	997	16,922	337.2	5,706,213
Total prison cost for 400 class 5 offenders				\$7,463,685
Per capita cost for class 5 offender				\$18,659

^aCosts were projected for 400 offenders and rounded to nearest dollar.

^bMonthly parole cost was \$83.10.

^cInitial prison cost was \$22,026 (\$1,034 monthly for 15.4 months); return to prison cost was \$11,685 (\$1,034 monthly for 11.3 months).

^dBased on revocation rate projected for 400 offenders.

^eProjected cost for number of offenders revoked at 3-month intervals.

^fCost for and number of offenders who successfully completed prison sentence.

**Appendix VII
 Projected Costs of IPS and Prison Sentences
 Including Revocation Costs**

Table VII.7: Projected Costs Including Revocations at 3-Month Intervals for Class 6 Offenders Sentenced to Prison, Maricopa County^a

3-month intervals	Cost		Projected number revoked ^d	Projected cost ^e
	Parole ^b	Prison + parole + return to prison ^c		
3	\$249	\$17,415	37.6	\$654,818
6	499	17,665	22.0	388,623
9	748	17,914	0	0
12	997	18,163	3.2	58,122
Success ^f	997	12,062	337.2	4,067,330
Total prison cost for 400 class 6 offenders				\$5,168,893
Per capita prison cost for class 6 offender				\$12,922

^aCosts were projected for 400 offenders and rounded to nearest dollar.

^bMonthly parole cost was \$83.10.

^cInitial prison cost was \$11,065 (\$1,034 monthly for 10.7 months); return to prison cost was \$6,101 (\$1,034 monthly for 5.9 months).

^dBased on revocation rate projected for 400 offenders.

^eProjected cost for number of offenders revoked at 3-month intervals.

^fCost for and number of offenders who successfully completed prison sentence.

**Appendix VII
 Projected Costs of IPS and Prison Sentences
 Including Revocation Costs**

**Table VII.8: Per Capita Cost of IPS
 Supervision at 3-Month Intervals, Pima
 County**

3-month intervals	IPS		Probation		Total ^b
	Cost	Duration ^a	Cost	Duration ^a	
3	\$343.00	3.0	\$148.80	0	\$1,029
6	343.00	6.0	148.80	0	2,058
9	343.00	9.0	148.80	0	3,087
12	343.00	12.0	148.80	0	4,116
15	343.00	15.0	148.80	0	5,145
18	343.00	18.0	148.80	0	6,174
21	343.00	18.7	148.80	2.3	6,756
24	343.00	18.7	148.80	5.3	7,203
27	343.00	18.7	148.80	8.3	7,649
30	343.00	18.7	148.80	11.3	8,096
33	343.00	18.7	148.80	14.3	8,542
36	343.00	18.7	148.80	17.3	8,988
39	343.00	18.7	148.80	20.3	9,435
42	343.00	18.7	148.80	23.3	9,881
45	343.00	18.7	148.80	26.3	10,328

^aIn months. IPS duration plus probation duration equal duration under supervision (lefthand column).

^btotals are rounded to nearest dollar.

**Appendix VII
 Projected Costs of IPS and Prison Sentences
 Including Revocation Costs**

Table VII.9: Projected Costs Including Revocations at 3-Month Intervals for Class 4 Offenders Sentenced to IPS, Pima County^a

3-month intervals	Supervision cost^b	Projected number revoked^c	Projected cost^d
3	\$23,329	34.4	\$ 802,518
6	24,358	41.2	1,003,550
9	25,387	48.0	1,218,576
12	26,416	27.6	729,082
15	27,445	6.8	186,626
18	28,474	20.8	592,259
21	29,056	13.6	395,162
24	29,503	6.8	200,620
27	29,949	0	0
30	30,396	0	0
33	30,842	6.8	209,726
36	31,288	0	0
Success ^e	10,317	194	2,001,498
Total IPS cost for 400 class 4 offenders			\$7,339,617
Per capita IPS cost for class 4 offender			\$18,349

^aCosts were projected for 400 offenders and rounded to nearest dollar.

^bCosts of initial supervision (IPS and probation) plus cost of prison sentence subsequent to revocation. See table VII.8 for cost of initial supervision. Prison cost was constant at \$22,300.

^cBased on revocation rate projected for 400 offenders.

^dProjected cost for number of offenders revoked at 3-month intervals.

^eCost for and number of offenders who successfully completed IPS sentence.

**Appendix VII
 Projected Costs of IPS and Prison Sentences
 Including Revocation Costs**

Table VII.10: Projected Costs Including Revocations at 3-Month Intervals for Class 5 Offenders Sentenced to IPS, Pima County^a

3-month intervals	Supervision cost^b	Projected number revoked^c	Projected cost^d
3	\$17,641	34.4	\$606,850
6	18,670	41.2	769,204
9	19,699	48.0	945,552
12	20,728	27.6	572,093
15	21,757	6.8	147,948
18	22,786	20.8	473,949
21	23,368	13.6	317,805
24	23,815	6.8	161,942
27	24,261	0	0
30	24,708	0	0
33	25,154	6.8	171,047
36	25,600	0	0
Success ^e	9,055	194	1,756,670
Total IPS cost for 400 class 5 offenders			\$5,923,060
Per capita IPS cost for class 5 offender			\$14,808

^aCosts were projected for 400 offenders and rounded to nearest dollar.

^bCost of initial supervision (IPS and probation) plus cost of prison sentence subsequent to revocation. See table VII.8 for cost of initial supervision. Prison cost was constant at \$16,612.

^cBased on revocation rate projected for 400 offenders.

^dProjected cost for number of offenders revoked at 3-month intervals.

^eCost for and number of offenders who successfully completed IPS sentence.

**Appendix VII
 Projected Costs of IPS and Prison Sentences
 Including Revocation Costs**

Table VII.11: Projected Costs Including Revocations at 3-Month Intervals for Class 6 Offenders Sentenced to IPS, Pima County^a

3-month intervals	Supervision cost^b	Projected number revoked^c	Projected cost^d
3	\$13,918	34.4	\$478,779
6	14,947	41.2	615,816
9	15,976	48.0	766,848
12	17,005	27.6	469,338
15	18,034	6.8	122,631
18	19,063	20.8	396,510
21	19,645	13.6	267,172
24	20,092	6.8	136,626
27	20,538	0	0
30	20,985	0	0
33	21,431	6.8	145,731
36	21,877	0	0
Success ^e	8,906	194	1,727,764
Total IPS cost for 400 class 6 offenders			\$5,127,215
Per capita IPS cost for class 6 offender			\$12,818

^aCosts were projected for 400 offenders and rounded to nearest dollar.

^bCost of initial supervision (IPS and probation) plus cost of prison sentence subsequent to revocation. See table VII.8 for cost of initial supervision. Prison cost was constant at \$12,889.

^cBased on revocation rate projected for 400 offenders.

^dProjected cost for number of offenders revoked at 3-month intervals.

^eCost for and number of offenders who successfully completed IPS sentence.

**Appendix VII
 Projected Costs of IPS and Prison Sentences
 Including Revocation Costs**

Table VII.12: Projected Costs Including Revocations at 3-Month Intervals for Class 4 Offenders Sentenced to Prison, Pima County^a

3-month intervals	Cost		Projected number revoked ^d	Projected cost ^e
	Parole ^b	Prison + parole + return to prison ^c		
3	\$249	\$44,922	40.4	\$1,814,866
6	499	45,172	5.2	234,893
9	748	45,421	5.2	236,189
12	997	45,670	0	0
Success ^f	997	22,300	349.2	7,787,041
Total prison cost for 400 class 4 offenders				\$10,072,989
Per capita prison cost for class 4 offender				\$25,182

^aCosts were projected for 400 offenders and rounded to nearest dollar.

^bMonthly parole cost was \$83.10.

^cInitial prison cost was \$21,302 (\$1,034 monthly for 20.6 months); return to prison cost was \$23,371 (\$1,034 monthly for 22.6 months).

^dBased on revocation rate projected for 400 offenders.

^eProjected cost for number of offenders revoked at 3-month intervals.

^fCost for and number of offenders who successfully completed prison sentence.

**Appendix VII
 Projected Costs of IPS and Prison Sentences
 Including Revocation Costs**

Table VII.13: Projected Costs Including Revocations at 3-Month Intervals for Class 5 Offenders Sentenced to Prison, Pima County^a

3-month intervals	Cost		Projected number revoked ^d	Projected cost ^e
	Parole ^b	Prison + parole + return to prison ^c		
3	\$249	\$25,378	40.4	\$1,025,268
6	499	25,627	5.2	133,262
9	748	25,877	5.2	134,558
12	997	26,126	0	0
Success ^f	997	16,612	349.2	5,800,949
Total prison cost for 400 class 5 offenders				\$7,094,037
Per capita prison cost for class 5 offender				\$17,735

^aCosts were projected for 400 offenders and rounded to nearest dollar.

^bMonthly parole cost was \$83.10.

^cInitial prison cost was \$15,615 (\$1,034 monthly for 15.1 months); return to prison cost was \$9,514 (\$1,034 monthly for 9.2 months).

^dBased on revocation rate projected for 400 offenders.

^eProjected cost for number of offenders revoked at 3-month intervals.

^fCost for and number of offenders who successfully completed prison sentence.

**Appendix VII
 Projected Costs of IPS and Prison Sentences
 Including Revocation Costs**

Table VII.14: Projected Costs Including Revocations at 3-Month Intervals for Class 6 Offenders Sentenced to Prison, Pima County^a

3-month intervals	Cost		Projected number revoked ^d	Projected cost ^e
	Parole ^b	Prison + parole + return to prison ^c		
3	\$249	\$21,759	40.4	\$879,047
6	499	22,008	5.2	114,441
9	748	22,257	5.2	115,737
12	997	22,506	0	0
Success ^f	997	12,889	349.2	4,500,961
Total prison cost for 400 class 6 offenders				\$5,610,186
Per capita prison cost for class 6 offender				\$14,025

^aCosts were projected for 400 offenders and rounded to nearest dollar.

^bMonthly parole cost was \$83.10.

^cInitial prison cost was \$11,892 (\$1,034 monthly for 11.5 months); return to prison cost was \$9,617 (\$1,034 monthly for 9.3 months).

^dBased on revocation rate projected for 400 offenders.

^eProjected cost for number of offenders revoked at 3-month intervals.

^fCost for and number of offenders who successfully completed prison sentence.

Estimated Cost for Jail Incarceration

We define cost in this report as direct operating costs, using the specific program as the unit of analysis. That is, we do not attempt to determine costs that were charged to the budgets of other agencies. The underestimation arising from such "indirect" costs as jail incarceration, however, could be substantial. In 1987, before the 1989 statutory change that eliminated the mandatory 45-day minimum jail time, approximately 50 percent of IPS offenders were sentenced to more than 45 days in jail. The mean jail time served by offenders directly sentenced to IPS was 110 days for Maricopa County and 119 days for Pima County.

Following the statutory changes, counties continued to sentence offenders to some jail time. In August of 1989, the percentage of IPS offenders sentenced to more than 45 days jail time was 55 percent in Maricopa County and 40 percent in Pima County.

One source estimated the daily per capita jail cost to range from \$27 to \$70.¹ Using the average jail time for each county and the lowest estimated jail cost, we estimated an average cost of jail incarceration for Maricopa (110 x \$27 = \$2,970) and Pima counties (119 x \$27 = \$3,213). Thus, even at the lowest estimated jail cost, the estimated cost of jail incarceration constituted a substantial cost for the program.

¹Arizona Criminal Justice Commission, Adult Intensive Probation Supervision Program Evaluation Report (1987), p. 37.

Major Contributors to This Report

**Program Evaluation
and Methodology
Division**

**George Silberman, Assistant Director
Bertha Dong, Project Manager
Venkareddy Chennareddy, Referencer**

Ordering Information

The first copy of each GAO report and testimony is free. Additional copies are \$2 each. Orders should be sent to the following address, accompanied by a check or money order made out to the Superintendent of Documents, when necessary. Orders for 100 or more copies to be mailed to a single address are discounted 25 percent.

Orders by mail:

**U.S. General Accounting Office
P.O. Box 6015
Gaithersburg, MD 20884-6015**

or visit:

**Room 1000
700 4th St. NW (corner of 4th and G Sts. NW)
U.S. General Accounting Office
Washington, DC**

**Orders may also be placed by calling (202) 512-6000
or by using fax number (301) 258-4066.**

**United States
General Accounting Office
Washington, D.C. 20548**

**Official Business
Penalty for Private Use \$300**

**First-Class Mail
Postage & Fees Paid
GAO
Permit No. G100**
