



2016

Impacts of Prisons in Rural Communities: Economic and Social Factors

Ashleigh T. Rasheed
Georgia Southern University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/honors-theses>

 Part of the [American Politics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Rasheed, Ashleigh T., "Impacts of Prisons in Rural Communities: Economic and Social Factors" (2016). *University Honors Program Theses*. 168.

<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/honors-theses/168>

This thesis (open access) is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in University Honors Program Theses by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

***Impacts of Prisons in Rural Communities:
Economic and Social Factors***

An Honors Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for Honors in
Political Science.

By
Ashleigh Rasheed

Under the mentorship of *Dr. Joshua Kennedy*

ABSTRACT

Rural communities in the United States have been declining economically for the past four decades. Some local government officials have seen prisons as a golden opportunity to revitalize their economies. Why and how do local officials decide to invest in prisons? What process do local officials go through to decide to invest in prisons? What are the economic impacts associated with a prison siting? What effects do stigmas associated with prisons have on the residents living in the community? I argue that prisons provide a short term economic gain for rural communities by providing jobs for the residents, thus boosting the economy. I also argue that over time the economy will reach a plateau and start to decline as result of the stigmas associated with the prison siting. I will test this argument using quantitative analysis of national prison data and I will also test this argument using qualitative analysis of an original single case study of Millen, Georgia.

Thesis Mentor: _____

Dr. Joshua Kennedy

Honors Director: _____

Dr. Steven Engel

April 2016
Political Science
University Honors Program
Georgia Southern University

Acknowledgments

I would first like to thank my professors and other faculty administrators who were supportive of me throughout the entire writing process of my thesis. Specifically, I would like to thank Dr. Cathy Skidmore-Hess, my academic advisor, Mrs. Erin Marin, Dr. Jamie Scalera, and Dr. Joshua Kennedy for their encouragement, patience, generosity of time, and mentorship throughout the completion of my project. I would like to thank my academic advisor and Dr. Skidmore-Hess for encouraging me to apply to the University Honors Program. Without their encouragement and recommendation, I would not have applied to the University Honors Program, and for that I thank them. I would also like to thank Mrs. Marin who met with me several times to go over requirements needed to successfully complete the program. I was hesitant at first when I found out that I had to write a research paper, but Mrs. Martin assured me that with careful planning and execution, I would complete the project. When it came time to start the actual paper, I was still unsure of what I wanted to write about. Dr. Scalera was one of the main people who provided me with the structure and confidence needed to complete this project. Without her expertise, love, kindness, and endless support and encouragement, I would not have been able to successfully complete my project. Dr. Scalera gave me the mentorship and support that needed to overcome that challenges that I faced to complete my thesis, and for that I will always be thankful and grateful of her. I would finally like to thank Dr. Kennedy, my mentor for his role in helping me to complete my project. Like Dr. Scalera, Dr. Kennedy devoted his time and energy to read over countless drafts, aided me in getting IRB approval, and assisted me whenever I needed help. When it came down to the final days leading up to the due date of my thesis, Dr. Kennedy allowed me to use his office to finish my statistical analysis of my data. Without his generosity, I would not have been able to finish my project on time and for that I thank him. All of the people mentioned above played a major role in the successful completion of my thesis. I am forever grateful, and I look forward to them reading and enjoying my work.

Introduction

In the past few decades, the United States of America (USA) has experienced a significant increase in the construction of prisons in rural communities. An example of this phenomenon can be seen in Jenkins County, a rural community south of Augusta, Georgia. In 2012, the county decided to construct a private prison in the community (Brown, 2010). After the collapse of the housing market in 2008, the recession took a toll on the county's job sector. The recession resulted in the loss of nearly all of the county's industry, leaving many of the residents jobless. The struggling county needed another source to stimulate the county's withering economy.

When Corrections Corporation of America chose Jenkins County as the site to build a private prison, officials jumped at the opportunity in hopes that the prison would spark a growth in economic development in the community. King Rocker, mayor of Millen, stated "the civil war prison will bring a lot of people to town and the new state prison will be a good backbone, a good job provider and good tax payer" (Brown, 2010). The tenacity and optimism of the officials seemed to serve them right. Prior to the construction of the prison, the county was plagued with a high unemployment rate that reached a high of nearly 20% (Hackle, 2014). Many of the residents in the community were struggling to find work and were uncertain about the future of their economic state. The construction of the prison not only created over two hundred jobs, but it also boosted the county's economy by reviving jobs in the local area and dropping the unemployment rate to 14% (Hackle, 2014).

This case suggests that the construction of the private prison was actually beneficial to the community by serving as the major source of revenue for the county. It

provided more jobs for the residents who were out of work, which resulted in the decline in the unemployment rate and a boost in the county's economy. Aside from the economic benefits, however, the article failed to mention the public's concerns over having a prison in their community. Maybe in this case it may not seem as important to some because of the benefits that are associated with having the prison in the community. Be that as it may, it is still important to note the negative stigmas that arise in having a prison in one's community as well as considering that having a prison in one's community doesn't necessarily guarantee economic prosperity.

Why did the local officials decide to allow the prison to be constructed in their community? Scholars such as Rick Hatcher (1994) have argued that the construction of prisons can positively impact the rural communities by providing jobs to residents which in turn stimulates economic growth. Conversely, there have been scholars such as Amy Glasmeier (2007) who have argued that the construction of prisons in rural communities does not lead to economic prosperity for the community. If this argument holds, what do local governments do if the prisons are not economically beneficial? I will investigate this inquiry by examining whether or not prisons in rural communities promote economic growth. I argue that prisons provide a short term economic gain for rural communities by providing jobs for the residents, thus boosting the economy. I also argue that over time the economy will reach a plateau and start to decline as result of the stigmas associated with the prison siting.

It is important that we investigate this topic to understand why local governments allow for prisons to be constructed in their communities as well as to inspect the economic impacts prisons have on the rural communities. In addition, we can also

examine the positive and negative stigmas associated with having a prison in the community and the effects those stigmas or the prison have on the citizens. This subject will spark a general interest from the public as well as from scholars, because the construction of prisons in communities directly impacts and influences the people living in those communities. This subject will bring awareness to the citizens and local government officials, because the decisions made by the local government to allow for prisons to be built in their communities may positively and/or negatively affect the lives of the citizens living in the community.

This subject will be of interest to scholars because they can attempt to explain or interpret the economic impacts of prisons and how those impact the public in either a positive or negative way. From their analysis, we can then evaluate whether or not the construction of prisons will be economically beneficial or detrimental to the community. Their findings will also be crucial for local government officials, because they would be able to decide whether or not the construction of prisons will be economically beneficial for their community.

Literature Review

Local Government Decisions

When searching for alternative economic stimuli to enhance the towns' economy, local government officials in rural areas have to make sound and well thought out decisions to determine what market of investment would be most beneficial for the community. With only a finite number of options to choose from, some local government officials make the decision to invest in prisons because they see it as a way to boost the

town's economy by providing jobs for local residents and other amenities. King (2013) and Blankenship (2004) examine this topic in their articles and propose theories to explain local prison development.

King (2013) investigates why local government officials in rural communities make the decision to invest in prisons and the impacts the prison siting has on the community. King (2013) proposes that the decline in the agricultural and manufacturing sector in the late 20th century had left the rural regions in America struggling to maintain financial integrity. The exponential growth in the prison population in the 1980's created the demand for prison expansion. This growing market attracted many investors including local government officials from rural communities, who saw the prisons as a potential tool that could revitalize their town's economy. King (2013) argues that despite the popularity of prison hosting, there is little empirical evidence to test the claim that investing in and using them as a tool will enhance economic recovery. King (2013) investigates this by examining 25 years of economic data from counties in New York. In his results, King (2013) finds that there is no empirical evidence to support that prisons are valuable economic tools. While the prison siting may provide some jobs, King (2013) argues that using job growth as means to measure prison as a tool for economic growth is inadequate. King (2013) showed that a prison was not an efficient tool in measuring job growth because most of the people who were getting employed by the prison were not local residents, but people outside of the community. Due to this finding, King (2013) concludes that using a prison as a tool to measure job growth does not adequately represent the people living in the community.

Blankenship (2004) examines the effectiveness of local public officials in rural communities' use of prison recruitment as a strategic policy tool for economic development. Blankenship (2004) includes how local government officials in rural communities were influenced by the popular belief that prison could enhance the town's economic development. In his analysis, Blankenship (2004) finds that there is not enough empirical evidence to support that the use of prison recruitment as a strategic policy tool furthers economic development in rural communities. Blankenship (2004) also notes that the prison policies local officials invest in are not sufficient enough to enhance the economic state of the community. Instead Blankenship (2004) argues that until rural communities gain policy tools and native resources to strengthen their economies while preserving their character, those communities will not see true economic development.

One of the major critiques of the studies above is that both fail to explain the process as to how and why local governments make the decision to build a prison in their communities. I plan to examine this by investigating the process local government officials go through to make the decision to invest in a prison and the policies that they adopt to finalize the process.

Economics of Prisons

As mentioned earlier, there have been academics who have argued for and against the construction of prisons in rural communities, and whether the impacts of those prisons are positive or negative. They have written journal articles supporting or refuting the argument that prisons bring economic benefits, providing empirical evidence to back

up their claims. While conducting my own research on the topic, I found articles by authors who supported the argument and those who did not.

In the article “The Economic Impacts of the Prison Development Boom on Persistently Poor Rural Places,” the author Amy Glasmeier (2007) finds that there is little evidence to support that prison impacts are significant enough to foster economic growth. In the article, Glasmeier (2007) briefly discusses the heightened growth in the construction of prisons during the 1980s and 1990s and how many rural communities welcomed and embraced the construction of prisons in their communities in hopes of it providing jobs for the residents in the area. Glasmeier (2007) points out that that up until that period, there was no empirical evidence that existed to examine the economic impacts of prison construction in rural counties. The author employed a quasiexperimental control group method to examine the effect of state-run prisons constructed in rural counties between 1985 and 1995 on county earnings by employment sector, population, poverty rate, and degree of economic health. From her results, she was able to conclude that the construction of prisons in rural areas had a limited economic effect on rural places in general (Glasmeier, 2007). However, prisons may have a positive impact on poverty rates in persistently poor rural counties, as measured by diminishing transfer payments and increasing state and local government earnings in places with relatively good economic health (Glasmeier, 2007). In other words, prisons may have a positive impact on poverty rates by providing jobs for the local residents, which will not only help reduce the poverty rate but may also help boost the local economy due to the increase in income of the residents. In summary, Glasmeier (2007) found that there was little evidence to support that prison impacts were significant enough to foster structural

economic change, but there were some prisons that provided jobs for a portion of local residents.

Glasmeier (2007) was not the only academic who did not find any empirical evidence to support the argument that the construction of prisons in rural communities promotes economic development. Gregory Hooks (2010) as well as Bert Useem (2014) reached similar conclusions. In his article “Revisiting the Impact of Prison Building on Job Growth: Education, Incarceration, and County-Level Employment,” Gregory Hooks (2010) raises the question as to whether or not the construction of prisons offers economic benefits to the local community. Hooks (2010) tests the claim by analyzing data on all existing and new prisons in the United States since 1960 to examine the impact that these prison systems have on the local communities and the employment growth from 1976 to 2004 (Hooks, 2010). From the results, Hooks (2010) finds that the enhanced human capital is what contributed to the economic benefits to the local communities, not the prisons. Hooks (2010) was able to gather enough evidence to show that the construction of prisons actually impedes economic growth in rural areas because prisons do not offer economic benefits to the local community.

In his article “Prison Siting and Economic Development,” Bert Useem (2014) discussed the effect prisons have on rural communities in respect to economic development. The author mentions how rural communities compete for prison development in their communities because of the potential economic gain that can result from having a prison in their community. Useem (2014) then brings up an argument that the building of new prisons in a rural community will foster economic development in that community (Useem, 2014). To test the validity of this claim, Useem (2014) examines

economic data on seven economically distressed rural counties that had at least one facility opened within their boundaries since 1982. From the data, Useen (2014) was able to compare and contrast the economic conditions of the rural community before and after a prison facility opened. The hypothesis that a county's fortunes improve after the opening of a prison in the community was not supported by the data. Prison siting had no statistically significant impact on either dependent variables unemployment or per capita income (Useem, 2014). Useen (2014) incorporated the reactions of other authors who offered their own opinions as to how to go about conducting the study to get sharper results.

In contrast to this research, Rick Hatcher (1994) argues that the construction of prisons in rural communities promotes economic development. In his article "Some Impacts of a Prison on a Community," Rick Hatcher (1994) examines the impact of prisons located in Texas. Hatcher (1994) examines the economic impact of prisons in Texas by referencing two case studies to show how the presence of prisons in Huntsville and Venus resulted in economic growth in those communities. Hatcher (1994) highlights the importance of the construction of prisons and the impact the prisons have on the communities, mainly in the form of an increase of jobs. Hatcher (1994) also mentions how employment and payroll was also impacted by the prisons. In the article Hatcher (1994) states "that no matter what the economic conditions may be, a certain number of persons will be required to remain employed at prison facilities" (page 64). Hatcher (1994) goes on to discuss the impact that the prisons had on local businesses. According to Hatcher (1994), the prisons were very beneficial to the local businesses because they promoted job growth in multiple sectors that resulted in economic development. The

prisons were also beneficial to the local businesses because they provided more consumers for the open market to buy more goods and services from the local businesses. Hatcher (1994) concludes the article by emphasizing how prisons have become a common tool used to further economic development in Texas communities. He closes by highlighting that as long as problems in society exist, the community can profit significantly in terms of economics, by building of prisons in their communities (Hatcher, 1994).

One of the major critiques of the studies above is that they fail to make the distinction between the long term and short term effects of prison economics in the community. I plan to examine this question by investigating the long term and short term economic benefits prisons have on the community.

Stigmas

In addition to examining the economic impacts of a prison in a rural community and investigating why government officials make the decision to permit a prison to be built in their communities, scholars such as Dina Rose, Todd R. Clear, and Judith A. Ryder (2001) examine the positive and negative effects associated with having a prison in the community and the impact they have on the citizens. In the article, "Addressing The Unintended Consequences Of Incarceration Through Community-Oriented Services at the Neighborhood Level," they investigate the consequences of incarceration and the affects it has on the community.

Rose (2001) conducts a survey where she asks residents in two- high incarcerated residents to discuss the positive and negative ways incarceration effects them and their

families. Rose (2001) categorizes the comments in four categories: stigma, financial impacts, issues regarding identity, and maintaining interpersonal relationships. The results from the study show that the effects of incarceration on communities are complex, in that they yield both positive and negative effects amongst the community. Some of the bad stigmas included loss of the community's reputation as a good place to live and to do business, and families can sometimes feel public shame as a result of the incarceration of one of their own family members (Rose, 2001). One positive effect of incarceration is the removal of problematic members from the community (Rose, 2001).

Cheryl Swanson (1997) also examines the impacts a prison has on a community by analyzing the attitudes of the residents living in a rural community with a prison siting. In her article entitled *Have Attitudes Changed? Citizens' Views of Prison Effects on Their Community over Time*, Swanson (1997) investigates this phenomenon by conducting a four-year case study of residents living in Century, Florida. Swanson (1997) examines the attitudes of residents living in a rural community with a prison siting. Swanson (1997) investigates this phenomenon by conducting a four-year case study of residents living in Century, Florida, a small rural community, where she assesses the residents' perceptions of the social and economic effects of the prison siting in the community. The results from the study revealed that the citizens' attitudes showed both stability and change with respect to the community and the prison's effect on it (Swanson, 1997). For example, there were major differences in the results of the two surveys conducted in 1991 and 1995, in regards to the perception of the type of economic development that the prison would generate. Prior to the opening of the prison, most of the respondents from the 1991 survey had an expectation that the prison would provide

new jobs and that the prison would have a multiplier effect, that would stimulate economic growth beyond prison jobs (Swanson, 1997). In the 1995 survey that was conducted by Swanson, the respondents were less likely to endorse multiplier effects, but focused almost exclusively on prison related employment (Swanson, 1997). Most of the community responded positive on the outlook of the community and the lifestyle (Swanson, 1997). Proponents of the prison siting were able to identify economic benefits such as the creation of new jobs that were associated with the prison, while opponents continued to express deep concern for community lifestyle issues, particularly safety (Swanson, 1997). With respect to change, the results showed that support for the prison had increased over time (Swanson, 1997). Much of the increased support, Swanson (1997) asserts, was attributed to the reduced fear of prison escapes. The results from the study also showed that from the residents' standpoint, the prison had not created prosperity, but that the prison had not hurt the community either (Swanson, 1997).

One major critique of the studies above is that Rose (2001) only lists stigmas associated with the consequences of incarceration while Swanson (1997) only examines the residents' attitudes on the effects of the prison siting in their community over time. Swanson's study offers greater insight on the perspectives of the residents' view of the prison's effects on the community. However, the study fails to examine how the residents' attitude towards the prison impact the local government in terms of how much influence the citizens' attitudes have on government officials' decision to invest in prisons. I plan to build on this study by expanding the knowledge on this phenomenon by investigating how a community is impacted by the stigmas associated with the prison. In doing so, I will determine whether the stigmas associated with the prison are influential

enough to impact the local government's decision to invest in a prison, as well as determine whether the stigmas impact the local economy, in terms of job growth and availability. I will also determine whether there is a tradeoff between furthering economic growth and public security.

To conclude, I fill in the gap of current literature by bringing together these literatures to examine why local governments in rural communities make the decision to invest in the prison industrial complex and the economic impacts this decision has on the community. I investigated the process local government officials go through to answer why and how government officials in rural communities make the decision to invest in prisons. I examined the policies they adopted to examine the short and long term economic impacts of the prison siting. I explored the socioeconomic impact the prison had on the residents living in the community to determine whether the prison siting resulted in a tradeoff between furthering economic growth or public security and safety.

Theory

Rural communities have typically relied on the manufacturing sector, as shown in Table 1, as a basis for their economic prosperity. In the past, the manufacturing sector provided jobs for hundreds of thousands of Americans, which assured their economic security. As time passed, companies began looking for new ways to capitalize off of their investments to increase and maximize their profits. In doing so, many companies in the United States opted to move their companies abroad to less developed countries, where the labor was cheap and the raw materials more accessible and affordable. As a consequence, many of those same communities who depended on those manufacturing

jobs for a source of income and economic stability, lost those jobs to globalization which left a huge dent in the economic infrastructure of some of those communities.

Table 1
Employment by Rural-Urban Classification

	Percent of employment					
	Urban		High-density rural		Low-density rural	
	1970	2007	1970	2007	1970	2007
Agriculture, forestry, and fishing	3	1	13	6	23	12
Manufacturing	22	7	23	13	10	7
Government	18	13	17	15	19	18
Services	19	44	16	34	15	30
Wholesale and retail trade	20	14	17	14	17	13
Finance, insurance, and real estate	7	10	4	6	4	6
Mining	1	0	2	1	3	3
Other	10	10	9	10	8	11

Table 1: “Employment by Rural-Urban Classification.” The White House. Web. 6 Oct. 2014

*See Table in appendix A.

Local governments only have a finite number of options to choose from when considering possible ways to enhance their economy and to ensure that their residents have access to jobs. Some of those alternative options include raising taxes, cutting public healthcare services, investing in small businesses, and/or investing in the manufacturing sectors or sporting industry. The first two alternatives mentioned above would help enhance the economy but would likely be highly unfavorable amongst the public. Raising taxes would not be popular amongst the public because many would see it more as a deduction from their income rather than as an addition to public revenue. A majority of the public would not support cutting public healthcare services because they would lose programs such as Social Security and Medicare, which are essential to many citizens.

The other three alternatives may also contribute to enhancing the economy of the local government, but investing in small businesses is unpredictable because they might not be competitive enough to compete with other, more established businesses. The manufacturing sector would help boost the economy tremendously but due to the outsourcing of manufacturing jobs, the market for this line of work in America has sharply declined. Investing in the sporting industry would also boost the economy of the local government, but it takes a long time and a lot of money to launch big projects such as those.

Due to the lack of manufacturing jobs, rural communities must rely on other external stimuli, such as retail corporations like Walmart or colleges to fuel their economies. One possible external stimulus that could revitalize the economy of those rural communities is a prison. It has been argued by some such as Hatcher (1994) that the construction of a prison in rural communities fosters economic developments in terms of job growth. Rural communities make good candidates for a prison locations because of the massive land availability in the area, as well as the need for residents in the area to obtain jobs.

I argue that local governments in rural communities that make the decision to invest in a prison will foster economic growth in those communities in terms of increased job availability for their residents. The decision by local government officials construct a prison in their community will enhance the local economy by providing jobs for the residents that were not there before. The influx of jobs will give the residents more spending power to buy more goods and services, which in turn will help rebuild and revitalize the local economy.

As mentioned earlier, there are stigmas that are associated with having a prison in a community. Many of those stigmas arise from the concerns of the public in regards to their safety and wellbeing. While many of the residents may see the prison as a major economic source for boosting the town's economy, others may see it as a threat to their livelihood and security. Housing convicted murderers and rapists in the same community that you live in may not sit well with you or some of the other residents living in the area. This uneasiness could possibly lead to resistance from those uncomfortable with the idea of housing criminals in their community, which in turn in the future could result in a decline in economic productivity. If local government officials approve of a prison siting in their community, it could hurt the long term growth because of public resistance. With that in mind, local government officials have to take into consideration the concerns of the public when deciding whether or not to allow for the construction of a prison in their community. It is an important decision for government officials to make as they must carefully evaluate the tradeoff between furthering economic growth and the security of the public.

I have four predictions. First, I predict that if local government officials in rural communities are struggling economically then some will make the decision to invest in prisons to boost their economies. Second, I predict that if local government officials allow for the construction of prisons in their rural communities, greater economic development will transpire in those communities in terms of job growth (short term). Third, I predict that if local government officials allow for the construction of prisons in their rural communities, the greater the negative stigmas will be associated with the construction of the prison from the community (long term). Finally, I predict that

investing in a prison from the public's perspective, will result in the tradeoff of furthering economic development over public security.

Hypotheses:

H₁: In rural communities that are struggling economically, some local government officials will make the decision to invest in prisons to boost their economies.

H₂: Investing in a prison will lead to greater economic development in the community in terms of job growth (short term).

H₃: The construction of a prison in rural communities will result in greater stigmas associated with the prison from residents living in the community (long term).

H₄: Investing in a prison from the public's perspective, will result in the tradeoff of furthering economic development over public security.

Research Design

I used a mixed method approach to test my hypotheses. First, I used quantitative analysis to measure job growth over time. The data that I collected was drawn from a national prison database of randomly selected prisons throughout the country. Then, I used qualitative analysis to investigate the impact the prison has had on the residents living in the community, to determine whether the stigmas associated with the prison are influential enough to impact the local government's decision to invest in a prison, as well as to determine whether the stigmas impact the local economy, in terms of job growth and availability. I also used qualitative analysis to determine whether there is a tradeoff between furthering economic growth and public security.

The sample for my quantitative data was drawn from randomly selected prisons located in rural and urban communities in the United States. The data from my sample was also collected from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, United States GDP Growth Rate, U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis and Prison Siting and Economic Development. I used this data from my quantitative analysis to examine job growth before and after each prison was constructed in the rural communities to compare those findings to the results of my qualitative analysis. The unit of analysis for my quantitative data was the urban and rural communities that I selected randomly throughout the country.

For my quantitative analysis, I used data that I gathered from randomly selected prisons located in rural and urban communities in the United States and from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, United States GDP Growth Rate, U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis and Prison Siting and Economic Development, to examine in more detail, the economic impacts associated with a prison siting. My primary independent variable was the prison siting. The source of my data was collected from a national prison database and the prison located in Millen, Georgia. I measured the prison siting by its location and the date that it opened. My dependent variables were job growth, unemployment rate, and GDP of various localities. I measured my dependent variables by analyzing the job growth, unemployment rate, and GDP before each prison was built in the community and after the prison was constructed. Job growth was measured as the percentage of jobs available in the community. The unemployment rate was measured as the number of unemployed individuals in the community divided by all individuals currently in the labor force. The GDP was used to measure the economic development of the county and other communities.

I used qualitative analysis to conduct a case study to examine the process that local government officials go through to answer how and why local governments in rural communities invest in a prison. For the case study, I studied Millen, Georgia, a small town north east of Savannah, Georgia, that just a few years ago built and opened a private male correctional facility in the community. Once I received approval from the institutional review board (IRB) at Georgia Southern University, I conducted my qualitative analysis. I used observations, interviews, and surveys as instruments to collect my qualitative information. *See interview instrument in appendix B. *See survey instrument in appendix C. I attended a local government council meeting in Millen, Georgia to observe how meetings were conducted. I attended an additional city council meeting to interview one of the five city council members. Before I conducted the interview I handed the city council member a consent form to read over and once the council member agreed to the terms of the interview and signed the form, I proceeded to ask the council member a series of questions. After the interview, I typed up the responses and stored them on a word document on my personal laptop. *See consent form in appendix D.

I returned to Millen, Georgia to give surveys to the public to examine their attitudes towards the prison in their community. I disseminated the surveys to the residents of Millen, Georgia through random sampling. I did so by setting up a post at a local Rite Aid Pharmacy in the community and randomly selected each person by selecting every third individual that walked. I then proceeded by handing them a hard copy of the informed consent. Once the person agreed to the terms of the study, I handed them a hard copy of the survey for them to fill out. I brought a table and I also provided

the writing utensils for the participants. Each participant completed the survey at the site where the surveys were distributed. After I collected the surveys, I transferred the data onto an excel spreadsheet. All of the information gathered from my observations, surveys and the interviews are stored on my personal laptop. The data I collected will be stored and secured for 3 years in my password protected computer, which will be locked and located in my home office in Atlanta, Georgia.

The independent variable for my qualitative analysis is the stigmas associated with the prison siting. The dependent variables for my qualitative analysis are the residents' attitudes towards the prison siting, the decisions made by government officials, and the economic development (job growth & job availability) in the community. I collected the data for my dependent variables from the observations, surveys, and interviews. The sample for my qualitative data was comprised of the residents of Millen, Georgia (30), a member of Millen's City Council, and the mayor of Millen, Georgia. The unit of analysis for my qualitative data are the residents of Millen, Georgia, the city council member, and the mayor of Millen, Georgia.

The control variables were the type of prison (private vs. public), the location (city vs. rural area), and the measurements of the job growth, unemployment rate and GDP of other rural communities with prisons. I also included the national job growth, unemployment rate and GDP of the country to use as a comparison. I created a spreadsheet to store the data where I compared and contrasted my findings from the national prison database to the reports of Millen, Georgia. The sample consists of the randomly selected prisons located in rural communities and urban communities (collected

from a national prison database- BES, BLS). The unit of analysis were the urban and rural communities.

Results

Data Tables

Prison	County/City	Location (Rural: 0/Urban: 1)	Prison Type (Private: 0/Public: 1)	Year	Siting	Unemployment Rate	GDP
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	1990	0	12.5	.
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	1991	0	5.9	.
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	1992	0	8.1	.
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	1993	0	6.3	.
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	1994	0	5.8	.
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	1995	0	7.7	.
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	1996	0	4.9	.
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	1997	0	5.4	.
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	1998	0	6.9	6.9
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	1999	0	5.8	7.6
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	2000	0	5.3	7.0
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	2001	0	7.7	5.7
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	2002	0	6.4	2.7
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	2003	0	7.6	5.9
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	2004	0	7.2	6.7
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	2005	0	6.8	8.6
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	2006	0	5.6	5.5
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	2007	0	8.6	3.8
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	2008	0	16	1.9
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	2009	0	19.8	2.6
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	2010	0	15.9	3.4
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	2011	0	14.9	1.9
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	2012	1	15.2	2.9
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	2013	1	14	2.3
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	2014	1	11.1	1.9
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	2015	1	9.1	.

Table 2: Data for Jenkins County

*See Table in appendix E

FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	1990	0	10.8	.
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	1991	0	11.7	.
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	1992	0	13.6	.
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	1993	0	12.1	.
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	1994	0	9.7	.
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	1995	0	9	.
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	1996	0	10	.
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	1997	0	9.7	.
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	1998	0	9.7	5.2
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	1999	0	15	5.4
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	2000	0	8.8	4.1
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	2001	0	8.6	3.7
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	2002	0	8.8	4.2
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	2003	0	9.7	4.7
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	2004	0	8.6	9.2
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	2005	0	6.4	6.1
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	2006	0	6.2	4.6
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	2007	0	5.6	3.2
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	2008	0	8	1.9
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	2009	0	16.9	-2.5
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	2010	0	14.9	4.1
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	2011	0	13.5	3.4
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	2012	0	11.7	2.5
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	2013	1	10.4	4.1
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	2014	1	10	2.4
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	2015	1	7.8	.

Table 3: Data for Pickens County

*See Table in appendix F

FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	1990	0	9.7	
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	1991	0	12.2	
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	1992	0	14.4	
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	1993	0	15.1	
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	1994	0	13.2	
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	1995	0	13.4	
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	1996	0	11.9	
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	1997	0	12.6	
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	1998	0	14	7.1
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	1999	0	13.3	8.6
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	2000	0	9.9	9.4
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	2001	0	9.8	1.3
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	2002	0	10.7	3.9
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	2003	0	11.2	5.9
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	2004	0	10	7.1
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	2005	0	8.4	7.1
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	2006	0	7.6	6.2
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	2007	0	8.1	4.5
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	2008	0	9.6	2.2
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	2009	0	14.3	-4
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	2010	0	16	2.7
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	2011	1	16.4	3.4
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	2012	1	15	4.5
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	2013	1	12.8	4.1
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	2014	1	10.9	4.5
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	2015	1	9.5	

Table 4: Data for Fresno County

*See Table in appendix G

FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	1990	0	5.5	
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	1991	0	8.7	
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	1992	0	10.2	
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	1993	0	10.4	
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	1994	0	9.1	
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	1995	0	8.4	
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	1996	0	7.8	
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	1997	0	7	
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	1998	0	6.3	7.1
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	1999	0	5.4	8.6
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	2000	0	5.2	9.4
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	2001	0	5.2	1.3
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	2002	0	6.2	3.9
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	2003	0	6.9	5.9
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	2004	1	6.2	7.1
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	2005	1	5.5	7.1
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	2006	1	5.1	6.2
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	2007	1	5.8	4.5
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	2008	1	8	2.2
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	2009	1	13	-4
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	2010	1	13.6	2.7
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	2011	1	13.4	3.4
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	2012	1	12.1	4.5
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	2013	1	10.3	4.1
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	2014	1	8.1	4.5
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	2015	1	6.5	

Table 5: Data for Victorville City

*See Table in appendix H

FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	1990	0	5.5	.
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	1991	0	5.8	.
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	1992	0	8.7	.
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	1993	0	8.7	.
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	1994	1	5.9	.
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	1995	1	5.8	.
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	1996	1	5.1	.
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	1997	1	4.4	.
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	1998	1	4.5	9.4
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	1999	1	4.1	8.9
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	2000	1	4.1	9.9
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	2001	1	4.9	3.9
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	2002	1	6.5	2.3
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	2003	1	7.7	3.3
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	2004	1	6.8	4.9
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	2005	1	6.2	8.3
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	2006	1	5.9	4.8
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	2007	1	4.7	5.2
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	2008	1	6.3	4.4
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	2009	1	8.7	-2.3
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	2010	1	11.5	3.2
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	2011	1	11.4	3.2
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	2012	1	11.6	3.8
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	2013	1	10.7	4.2
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	2014	1	8	6.4
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	2015	1	7.1	.

Table 6: Data for Fremont County

*See Table in appendix I

CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	1990	0	4.4	.
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	1991	0	4.2	.
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	1992	0	8.4	.
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	1993	0	6.3	.
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	1994	0	5.1	.
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	1995	0	7.8	.
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	1996	0	9.8	.
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	1997	0	4.6	.
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	1998	1	5.8	8.9
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	1999	1	5	8.9
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	2000	1	4.5	6.0
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	2001	1	4.5	3.7
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	2002	1	5.6	2.3
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	2003	1	6.8	3.6
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	2004	1	5.8	5.3
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	2005	1	6	6.7
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	2006	1	5.4	4.6
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	2007	1	4.9	4.5
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	2008	1	6.7	0.2
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	2009	1	12.2	-1.5
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	2010	1	11.1	1.5
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	2011	1	10.9	3.0
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	2012	1	10.1	3.4
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	2013	1	9.1	4.0
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	2014	1	8.5	4.4
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	2015	1	6.9	.

Table 7: Data for Charlton County

*See Table in appendix J

FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	1990	0	2.7	.
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	1991	0	2.5	.
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	1992	0	3.3	.
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	1993	0	3.5	.
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	1994	0	4.7	.
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	1995	0	5.1	.
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	1996	0	5.7	.
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	1997	0	5.6	.
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	1998	0	5.8	-0.8
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	1999	0	5.3	4.1
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	2000	0	4.6	5.3
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	2001	1	4.7	3.7
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	2002	1	4.6	5.6
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	2003	1	4.7	7.5
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	2004	1	3.7	9.8
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	2005	1	3.3	9.0
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	2006	1	3.3	6.1
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	2007	1	3.2	5.3
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	2008	1	4.4	2.7
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	2009	1	6.7	-2.2
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	2010	1	6.4	3.8
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	2011	1	6.3	3.4
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	2012	1	6.1	3.7
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	2013	1	4.8	3.4
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	2014	1	4.6	3.1
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	2015	1	4.1	.

Table 8: Data for Honolulu City

*See Table in appendix K

FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	1990	0	4.7	.
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	1991	0	5.9	.
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	1992	0	7	.
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	1993	0	6	.
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	1994	1	4.4	.
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	1995	1	3.7	.
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	1996	1	5.8	.
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	1997	1	3.5	.
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	1998	1	3	4.9
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	1999	1	3.7	5.1
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	2000	1	3.6	5.8
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	2001	1	4.2	2.2
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	2002	1	5.3	2.0
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	2003	1	6.1	3.4
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	2004	1	5.4	5.5
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	2005	1	4.5	4.9
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	2006	1	3.8	5.9
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	2007	1	4.2	4.0
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	2008	1	5.3	-0.1
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	2009	1	10.7	-0.9
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	2010	1	9.7	2.0
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	2011	1	8.4	3.9
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	2012	1	7.5	4.4
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	2013	1	8.9	2.0
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	2014	1	6.6	2.9
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	2015	1	5.5	.

Table 9: Data for Tazewell City

*See Table in appendix L

USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	1990	0	7.6	
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	1991	0	12.5	
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	1992	0	12.4	
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	1993	0	12.1	
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	1994	0	9.3	
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	1995	0	15.7	
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	1996	0	16.1	
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	1997	0	10.3	
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	1998	0	10.9	4.5
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	1999	0	15.7	5.5
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	2000	0	7.5	-0.7
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	2001	0	6.1	3.3
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	2002	0	7.5	4.2
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	2003	1	9.3	3.9
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	2004	1	8.1	5.6
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	2005	1	8	6.0
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	2006	1	8.1	5.7
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	2007	1	8.7	2.1
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	2008	1	8.4	2.5
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	2009	1	12.4	-1.8
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	2010	1	10.2	6.2
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	2011	1	9.3	4.0
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	2012	1	9.3	3.4
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	2013	1	10.6	2.7
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	2014	1	9	2.7
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	2015	1	8	

Table 10: Data for Martin County

*See Table in appendix M

FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	1990	0	7	
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	1991	0	9.8	
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	1992	0	11.4	
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	1993	0	7.4	
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	1994	0	13	
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	1995	0	11.1	
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	1996	0	11.9	
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	1997	0	11.3	
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	1998	0	10	2.9
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	1999	0	7.8	4.7
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	2000	0	7.4	5.5
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	2001	0	7.4	4.5
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	2002	0	8	1.1
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	2003	0	10.2	11.1
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	2004	0	8.4	9.6
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	2005	0	7.8	16.1
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	2006	0	4.6	3.7
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	2007	1	6.1	0.9
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	2008	1	5.8	4.3
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	2009	1	9	-3.7
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	2010	1	9.6	10.6
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	2011	1	9.6	3.7
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	2012	1	9.5	3.7
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	2013	1	9.1	-1.6
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	2014	1	8.2	1.9
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	2015	1	8.3	

Table 11: Data for Grant Parish

*See Table in appendix N

FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	1990	0	11.4	.
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	1991	0	12.2	.
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	1992	0	14.8	.
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	1993	0	12.8	.
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	1994	1	9.8	.
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	1995	1	9.4	.
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	1996	1	9	.
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	1997	1	10.1	.
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	1998	1	8.3	6.5
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	1999	1	7	6.2
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	2000	1	6	6.0
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	2001	1	6.3	6.9
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	2002	1	6.6	5.9
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	2003	1	6.1	5.2
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	2004	1	6.3	7.7
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	2005	1	6.1	7.0
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	2006	1	5.9	5.1
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	2007	1	5	4.4
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	2008	1	5.6	2.8
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	2009	1	8.9	1.8
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	2010	1	9.3	3.5
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	2011	1	9.3	2.8
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	2012	1	9.2	2.3
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	2013	1	8.5	2.7
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	2014	1	7.6	2.7
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	2015	1	7.4	.

Table 12: Data for Allegany County

*See Table in appendix O

FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	1990	0	3.8	.
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	1991	0	4.7	.
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	1992	0	5.1	.
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	1993	0	5.7	.
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	1994	0	4.4	.
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	1995	1	3.6	.
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	1996	1	4.3	.
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	1997	1	3.1	.
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	1998	1	2.9	6.8
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	1999	1	3.2	5.4
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	2000	1	3	9.0
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	2001	1	3.7	2.8
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	2002	1	4.6	3.9
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	2003	1	4.7	5.8
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	2004	1	4.6	6.3
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	2005	1	4.4	5.6
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	2006	1	4.1	2.6
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	2007	1	4.8	3.3
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	2008	1	5.4	2.4
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	2009	1	8.2	-2.1
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	2010	1	7.5	5.0
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	2011	1	6.3	4.6
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	2012	1	5.8	3.6
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	2013	1	5.5	3.9
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	2014	1	4.7	2.9
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	2015	1	4.4	.

Table 13: Data for Waseca County

*See Table in appendix P

FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	1990	0	6.5	.
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	1991	0	8.4	.
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	1992	0	10.4	.
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	1993	0	9.1	.
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	1994	0	7.0	.
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	1995	0	6.4	.
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	1996	0	6.6	.
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	1997	0	5.3	.
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	1998	0	3.9	5.7
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	1999	0	4.1	2.6
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	2000	0	3.6	7.0
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	2001	0	5.3	2.3
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	2002	0	6.6	5.2
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	2003	0	5.2	5.8
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	2004	0	4.5	5.7
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	2005	0	4.1	5.6
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	2006	0	4.2	4.2
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	2007	0	4.6	2.6
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	2008	0	5.2	0.0
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	2009	0	8.0	1.1
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	2010	0	7.2	3.7
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	2011	0	7.2	2.2
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	2012	1	7.5	3.5
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	2013	1	6.2	3.3
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	2014	1	5.8	4.1
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	2015	1	4.9	.

Table 14: Data for Coos County

*See Table in appendix Q

CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	1990	0	13	.
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	1991	0	13.7	.
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	1992	0	13.3	.
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	1993	1	12.1	.
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	1994	1	10.3	.
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	1995	1	1910.3	.
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	1996	1	13.4	.
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	1997	1	10.7	.
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	1998	1	8.6	-3.7
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	1999	1	7.8	5.3
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	2000	1	6.8	4.5
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	2001	1	6.1	2.3
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	2002	1	6.4	3.4
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	2003	1	6.2	8.0
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	2004	1	5.7	10.3
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	2005	1	5.6	5.6
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	2006	1	4.5	4.7
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	2007	1	4.2	3.9
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	2008	1	4.6	4.6
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	2009	1	6.9	-3.6
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	2010	1	9.5	3.5
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	2011	1	9	3.3
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	2012	1	8.1	1.7
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	2013	1	8	3.0
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	2014	1	8	2.3
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	2015	1	7.8	.

Table 15: Data for Milan City

*See Table in appendix R

CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	1990	0	5.8	
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	1991	0	8.7	
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	1992	0	9.5	
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	1993	0	9.5	
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	1994	0	6.9	
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	1995	0	5.7	
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	1996	0	5.7	
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	1997	0	5.1	
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	1998	0	4.4	4.9
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	1999	0	3.9	8.0
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	2000	0	5.1	5.1
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	2001	1	7.1	5.3
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	2002	1	7.1	3.5
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	2003	1	6.1	4.0
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	2004	1	5.8	6.0
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	2005	1	5.9	7.6
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	2006	1	5.5	8.0
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	2007	1	5.2	2.4
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	2008	1	6.6	2.9
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	2009	1	9.6	0.8
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	2010	1	10.6	2.8
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	2011	1	11.3	2.7
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	2012	1	10.7	2.9
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	2013	1	9.3	4.8
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	2014	1	7.2	3.4
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	2015	1	7	

Table 16: Data for Winton City

*See Table in appendix S

USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	1990	0	9.5	
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	1991	0	10.5	
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	1992	0	14.5	
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	1993	0	11.2	
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	1994	0	10.4	
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	1995	0	11.7	
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	1996	0	11.9	
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	1997	0	9.0	
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	1998	0	8.0	6.9
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	1999	0	8.8	7.6
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	2000	0	4.2	7.0
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	2001	0	5.0	5.7
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	2002	1	5.7	2.7
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	2003	1	6.0	5.9
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	2004	1	5.7	6.7
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	2005	1	5.1	8.6
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	2006	1	4.4	5.5
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	2007	1	4.2	3.8
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	2008	1	5.3	1.9
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	2009	1	7.2	2.6
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	2010	1	7.9	3.4
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	2011	1	7.6	1.9
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	2012	1	8.3	2.9
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	2013	1	8.8	2.3
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	2014	1	8.2	1.9
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	2015	1	7.3	

Table 17: Data for Lee County

*See Table in appendix T

Economic Status before Prison was healthy	overall attitude: positive	relationship between prison & community: healthy	prison effective in boosting the economy	overall prison good for town
3	3	3	3	3
4	4		6	4
3	3		3	3
5	1		4	5
5	3		4	3
1	4		3	2
4	3		3	3
6	3		6	4
4	5		5	5
3	5		6	5
3	5		5	5
5	1		6	1
2	3		3	2
1	3		4	3
3	4		3	2
3	4		2	4
3	4		3	3
2	3		4	3
1	3		4	4
1	4		4	4
5	5		4	5
3	2		4	2
3	3		4	3
1	5		3	1
3	2		2	2
1	4		4	4
3	5		5	5
6	5		3	6
1	5		5	5

Table 20: Survey Responses (Part C)
 *See Table in appendix W

stigmas associated with prison impact negative	public involved in process	individual personally invilved in process	tradeoff btw economic growth & public security	tradeoff favors economic growth
3	3	3	3	3
6	6		6	6
3	6		6	6
1	4		2	5
1	6		6	4
1	4		5	5
3	3		3	3
6	6		6	6
2	4		4	4
6	5		1	6
3	3		6	5
1	5		1	5
3	4		4	3
5	4		1	4
2	3		3	2
3	2		2	3
2	3		6	3
2	3		2	3
1	4		1	4
4	4		4	4
5	5		1	5
2	3		3	2
1	4		1	4
2	2		2	1
2	2		3	2
1	4		1	4
2	4		1	4
6	6		6	5
3	4		4	5

Table 21: Survey Responses (Part D)
 *See Table in appendix X

Data Results

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	272
				F(2, 269)	=	2.67
Model	39.4082485	2	19.7041243	Prob > F	=	0.0709
Residual	1982.71958	269	7.37070475	R-squared	=	0.0195
				Adj R-squared	=	0.0122
Total	2022.12783	271	7.46172629	Root MSE	=	2.7149

	GDP	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
	Siting	-.8130819	.3540801	-2.30	0.022	-1.510203	-.1159612
	PrisonTypePrivate0Public	.1315182	.4218188	0.31	0.755	-.698968	.9620044
	_cons	4.682065	.4474872	10.46	0.000	3.801042	5.563087

Table 22: Results for GDP

*See Table in appendix Y

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	416
				F(2, 413)	=	2.58
Model	44568.5801	2	22284.2901	Prob > F	=	0.0772
Residual	3570155.81	413	8644.44507	R-squared	=	0.0123
				Adj R-squared	=	0.0075
Total	3614724.39	415	8710.17926	Root MSE	=	92.976

	UnemploymentRate	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
	Siting	7.109316	9.137818	0.78	0.437	-10.85312	25.07175
	PrisonTypePrivate0Public	-24.87154	11.67923	-2.13	0.034	-47.82969	-1.913392
	_cons	28.81806	11.62051	2.48	0.014	5.975343	51.66078

Table 23: Results for Unemployment Rate

*See Table in appendix Z

stigmas associated with prison impact negative

Percentiles		Smallest		
1%	1	1		
5%	1	1		
10%	1	1	Obs	30
25%	2	1	Sum of Wgt.	30
50%	2.5		Mean	2.833333
		Largest	Std. Dev.	1.662639
75%	3	6		
90%	6	6	Variance	2.764368
95%	6	6	Skewness	.7724062
99%	6	6	Kurtosis	2.479178

Table 24: Results for Stigmas

*See Table in appendix AA

tradeoff favors economic growth

Percentiles		Smallest		
1%	1	1		
5%	2	2		
10%	2	2	Obs	30
25%	3	2	Sum of Wgt.	30
50%	4		Mean	4.033333
		Largest	Std. Dev.	1.325697
75%	5	6		
90%	6	6	Variance	1.757471
95%	6	6	Skewness	-.3326441
99%	6	6	Kurtosis	2.420771

Table 25: Results for Tradeoff Favors Economic Growth

*See Table in appendix AB

public involved in process				
	Percentiles	Smallest		
1%	2	2		
5%	2	2		
10%	2.5	2	Obs	30
25%	3	3	Sum of Wgt.	30
50%	4		Mean	3.966667
		Largest	Std. Dev.	1.217214
75%	5	6		
90%	6	6	Variance	1.481609
95%	6	6	Skewness	.2975031
99%	6	6	Kurtosis	2.287264

Table 26: Results for Public Involvement

*See Table in appendix AC

Analysis

The evidence collected from the single case study where I conducted interviews of a city council member of Millen, Georgia and the Mayor of Millen, Georgia, largely supported my first hypothesis, which stated that during times of economic despair, local government officials in rural communities will make the decision to invest in a prison to boost their economies. In their interviews, both the city council member and the mayor agreed that the prison was necessary in order to help create jobs to revitalize the struggling economy. The city council member mentioned in the interview that how prior to the construction of the private correctional facility, the town had experienced an unemployment rate that reached a high of 20%. Both the city council member and the mayor agreed that something needed to be done in the town in order to repair the economic state of the community. Mayor Rocker mentioned in his interview how he embraced the idea of investing in a prison because it would create jobs for that the town that were desperately needed to revitalize the community.

In their interviews, the city council member and the mayor also discussed that during the process of deciding whether or not to invest in a prison, that there were a number of major players involved that included the City Commissioner, the city council members as well as the mayor, representatives from the prison, representatives from the Board of Education Development Authority, and members from the Kent family. In addition to that, the community was also heavily involved during the process. The council member stated that several county hearings were held before the mayor and the city council members made the final decision to invest in the prison. Results from the survey responses supported the claim made by the city council member and mayor about the general public being involved in the decision making process. In Table 26, the results show that when the residents were asked if the public was involved in the decision making process for the prison, the average number for the response was 3.967. On the rating scale, this number indicates that on average the people of Millen, Georgia who were surveyed agreed that the public was involved in the decision making process. Although the information gathered was from a single case study, the results showed that when faced with financial struggles, some local government officials will invest in a prison.

The results from the statistical analysis compiled from the data collected from the prisons that I surveyed across the country, partially supported my second hypothesis which stated that investing in a prison would lead to greater economic development in the community in terms of job growth (short term). The results from Table 22 showed that the presence of a prison siting decreases the total GPD in the selected communities. The results were statically significant and had a p-value of 0.022. Although the results showed

that a prison siting can decrease GDP, there are a number a factors that could have contributed to this finding. One factor that could have contributed to the decline in GDP in the locations of the prison siting, could have been the financial crisis that occurred in late 2007 that resulted in a global economic recession. In data Tables 2-17, in the years ranging from 2009 to 2012, each prison siting surveyed showed a consistent pattern of having relatively low and/or a declining GDP. This pattern could have skewed the results in favor of decreasing the GDP, which may explain why we see a decline in GDP in the results. A second factor that could have contributed to the decline in GDP was that there was no data available for the GDP for each of the counties/cities where the prisons where located. Due to that factor, I was limited to using the GDP of the states with the prisons that were selected for the study. This could have also impacted the final results, in terms of evaluating the effects a prison siting can have on GDP. Due to these factors, the results gathered for the GDP and prison siting may not properly assess the effect the prisons may have actual GDP in those states. However, even with those potential factors, I cannot ignore the general decline in GDP from the results in the states with the prison siting.

Contrary to these findings on GDP, the results from Table 23 shows that public prison facilities decrease the unemployment rate in the selected communities. The results were statically significant with a p-value of 0.034. This finding supported the claim that prisons, more specifically public correctional facilities, can help decrease the unemployment rate. I acknowledge that there may be other factors that may contribute the rise and decline in the change in the unemployment rate, however, one cannot ignore the general decline in the unemployment rate from the results in the counties/cities where the prisons were located. Once the appropriate data is available, future research can be

conducted to further investigate the affect prisons may or may not have on the overall change in the unemployment rate and the GDP in the area. As for now with the data that has been collected thus far, the results show that a prison siting can decrease GDP in the area while public correctional facilities can decrease the overall unemployment rate in the counties/cities and states where the prisons are located.

The evidence collected from the single case study where I conducted surveys of the residents of Millen, Georgia, did not support my third hypothesis which stated that the construction of a prison in rural communities will result in greater stigmas associated with the prison from residents living in the community (long term). In Table 24, the results show that when the residents were asked if the stigmas associated with the prison impacted the community in a negative way, the average number from the responses was 2.833. On the rating scale, this number indicated that on average the people of Millen, Georgia who were surveyed disagreed that the stigmas associated with the prison impacted the community in a negative way.

The evidence collected from the single case study where I conducted surveys of the residents of Millen, Georgia, supported my final hypothesis, which stated that investing in a prison from the public's perspective, will result in the tradeoff of furthering economic development over public security. In Table 25, the results show that when the residents were asked if when investing in a prison the tradeoff between economic development and public security favored economic growth, the average number for the response was 4.033. On the rating scale, this number indicated that on average the people of Millen, Georgia who were surveyed agreed that when investing in a prison the tradeoff favors economic growth over public security.

Conclusion

To conclude, the results from the data collected supported two of my hypotheses and part of one. In my findings I was able to show that in rural communities that are struggling economically, some local government officials will make the decision to invest in a prison to boost their economies. I was also able to show through my qualitative analysis of the survey responses from the residents in Millen, Georgia, that investing in a prison from the public's perspective, will result in the tradeoff of furthering economic development over public security. I was partially able to show that investing in a prison can be beneficial in furthering economic development in terms of lowering the unemployment rate in areas that have public correctional facilities. However, I also found that a prison siting can decrease the overall GDP. Although there may have been other factors that could have contributed to the trends associated with the changes in the unemployment rate and GDP, the results from the qualitative and statistical analysis provides a general idea of the effect a prison siting and the type of prison can have on a community, in regards to the overall decline and rise in the unemployment rate and GDP. From my findings I was unable to show support for the claim that the construction of prisons in rural communities will result in greater stigmas associated with the prison from residents living in the community.

From the results provided from my investigation, I would recommend that investing in a prison can be beneficial for a struggling community that is in need of furthering its economic development in terms of lowering the unemployment rate and creating jobs. Although investing in a prison from the public's perspective, may result in the tradeoff of furthering economic development over public security, the economic

development that may result from initial investment will outweigh the concerns for public security. In addition, stigmas associated with the prison will not impact the residents in the community in a negative way, which may lessen concerns for public security in regards to the prison siting.

Bibliography

- Bennett, Josephine . "Jenkins County Gets Jobs." GPB News . Georgia Public Broadcasting, 2 Feb. 2012. Web. 18 Oct. 2014.
<<http://www.gpb.org/news/2012/02/02/jenkins-county-gets-jobs>>.
- Blankenship, Susan E., and Ernest J. Yanarella. "Prison Recruitment As A Policy Tool Of Local Economic Development: A Critical Evaluation." *Contemporary Justice Review* 7.2 (2004): 183-198. Legal Collection. Web. 28 Jan. 2015.
- Boom On Persistently Poor Rural Places." *International Regional Science Review* 30.3 (2007): 274-299. Web. 21 Sept. 2014.
- Brown, Noel . "Struggling County Welcomes New Prison." GPB News. Georgia Public Broadcasting, 17 Sept. 2010. Web. 18 Oct. 2014.
<<http://www.gpb.org/news/2010/09/17/struggling-county-welcomes-new-prison>>.
- "Best Places to Live | Compare Cost of Living, Crime, Cities, Schools and More. Sperling's BestPlaces." Best Places to Live | Compare Cost of Living, Crime, Cities, Schools and More. Sperling's BestPlaces. Web. 10 June 2015.
- "Commerce.gov." Department of Commerce. Web. 10 June 2015.
- "Current State Rankings." JP Morgan Chase Outlook Center. Web. 10 June 2015.
- "Federal Bureau of Prisons." BOP: Web Site. Web. 10 June 2015.
- Glasmeyer, Amy K., and Tracey Farrigan. "The Economic Impacts Of The Prison Development Boom On Persistently Poor Rural Places." *International Regional*

Science Review 30.3 (2007): 274-299. Business Source Complete. Web. 21 Sept. 2014.

Hackle, Al. "Prison brings jobs, cash." Statesboro Herald. 15 Jul. 2014: 13-14. Print.

Hatcher, Rick. "Some Impacts Of A Prison On A Community." Economic Development Review 12.3 (1994): 64. Web. 21 Sept. 2014.

Hooks, Gregory, et al. "Revisiting The Impact Of Prison Building On Job Growth: Education, Incarceration, And County-Level Employment, 1976–2004." Social Science Quarterly (Wiley-Blackwell) 91.1 (2010): 228-244. Web. 24 Sept. 2014.

King, Ryan, Marc Mauer, and Tracy Huling. "Big Prisons, Small Towns: Prison Economics in Rural America." Big Prisons, Small Towns: Prison Economics in Rural America (2003): 1-22. Print.

"In Calif. Town, Prison May Fix One Employment Problem, But Create Another." *PBS*. PBS, 5 May 2011. Web. 28 Jan. 2015.
<http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/social_issues-jan-june11-mendota_05-05/>.

Rose, Dina R., Todd R. Clear, and Judith A. Ryder. "Addressing The Unintended Consequences Of Incarceration Through Community-Oriented Services At The Neighborhood Level." *Corrections Management Quarterly* 5.3 (2001): 62-70. Business Source Complete. Web. 1 Feb. 2015.

Samuels, Alana. "Can a New Prison save a Town?" *Los Angeles Times*. Los Angeles Times, 3 May 2010. Web. 28 Jan. 2015.
<<http://articles.latimes.com/2010/may/03/business/la-fi-0503-prisons-20100503>>.

"Strengthening the Rural Economy - The Current State of Rural America." The White House. The White House. Web. 6 Oct. 2014.

"USDA ERS - Home." USDA ERS - Home. Web. 11 June 2015.

Useem, Bert. "Prison Siting And Economic Development." *Criminology & Public Policy* 3.3 (2004): 451-452. Web. 23 Sept. 2014

"U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics." U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Web. 10 June 2015.

"U.S. Economic Accounts." U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA). Web. 10 June 2015.

"United States GDP Growth Rate | 1947-2015 | Data | Chart | Calendar." United States GDP Growth Rate | 1947-2015 | Data | Chart | Calendar. Web. 10 June 2015.

Appendix

Appendix A:

“Employment by Rural-Urban Classification.” The White House. Web. 6 Oct. 2014

Table 1
Employment by Rural-Urban Classification

	Percent of employment					
	Urban		High-density rural		Low-density rural	
	1970	2007	1970	2007	1970	2007
Agriculture, forestry, and fishing	3	1	13	6	23	12
Manufacturing	22	7	23	13	10	7
Government	18	13	17	15	19	18
Services	19	44	16	34	15	30
Wholesale and retail trade	20	14	17	14	17	13
Finance, insurance, and real estate	7	10	4	6	4	6
Mining	1	0	2	1	3	3
Other	10	10	9	10	8	11

Appendix B:

Survey Questions

Instructions: Please circle and complete the following questions to reflect your opinions as accurately as possible and to answer factual questions to the best of your knowledge.

Your information will be kept strictly confidential.

Demographics

Gender: Male Female

Ethnicity: Asian Black Hispanic White Native American Other

(_____)

Age: Under 20 20-29 30-39 40-49 Over 50

Employed: Yes No

Annual Income: Below 20,000 20,000-29,999 30,000-39,999 40,000-49,999 Over 50,000 (specify) _____

Education (highest level Completed): High School College (Associate's Bachelor's)

Masters PHD Other (specify) _____

Children: None 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 More than 10 (specify) _____

Personal Connection with Prison: Yes No

Resident of Jenkins County: Yes No

Instructions: On a scale of 1 to 5, 5 meaning you strongly agree and 1 meaning you strongly disagree, circle the number that indicates your degree of satisfaction with each of the following items. (Check NA if the item is not applicable or if you lack personal knowledge of it.)

Please rate the following questions:

1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neither agree nor disagree 4) Agree 5) Strongly agree NA

· The economic status of the community before

the construction of the prison was healthy.

1 2 3 4

5 NA

· Your overall attitude towards the city

investing in a prison was positive.

1 2 3 4

5 NA

· The relationship between the prison and

the community is healthy.

1 2 3 4

5 NA

· Overall the prison has been effective in
boosting the town's economy. 1 2 3 4

5 NA

· Overall the prison has been good
for the town. 1 2 3 4

5 NA

· The stigmas associated with the prison have
impacted you in a negative way. 1 2 3 4

5 NA

Please rate the following questions:

1) Strongly Disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neither agree nor disagree 4) Agree 5) Strongly
agree NA

· During the process of opening the new
prison the general public was involved. 1 2 3 4

5 NA

-You were involved. 1 2 3 4

5 NA

· The prison has presented a tradeoff between
furthering economic growth and public security. 1 2 3 4

5 NA

- The tradeoff favors economic growth 1 2 3 4

5 NA

Appendix C:

Interview Questions

Instructions: Please answer the following questions to reflect your opinions as accurately as possible and to answer factual questions to the best of your knowledge.

Your information will be kept strictly confidential.

What was the town's main source of revenue before the prison opened?

What other options/measures were considered to help alleviate the financial state of the town?

From your perspective, why did you/the city decide to invest in a prison?

- Was it the town's only option?

How did the city go about making the decision to allow for the prison to be constructed in the community? What was the process?

- Did you involve the local residents? Positive/Negative of prison coming into town
- What policies did you/the city are adopt?

During the process of opening the new prison was the general public involved?

During the process of opening the new prison how much did the community have to give up?

- What were some of the tradeoff?
- Which ones were more beneficial?

How would you rate the relationship between the prison and the community?

Has the prison been economically beneficial? Has it fostered economic growth in the community?

- In what ways?

Has there been a decline in the economic development sense the prison opened?

What other economic developments have been introduced since the prison has been added?

What are some major positives that the community has seen since the introduction of the prison?

What are some major negatives that the community has seen since the introduction of the prison?

What is the current status of the community since the addition of the prison?

Appendix D:

Residents of Millen, Georgia

COLLEGE OF (College of Liberal Arts & Social Sciences)

DEPARTMENT OF (Political Science)

Georgia Southern University

Institutional Review Board

Informed Consent Form

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A Research STUDY

Title of Project: Impacts of Prisons in Rural Communities: Economic and Social Factors

Principle Investigator(s): This study will be conducted by Ashleigh Rasheed, an undergraduate student at Georgia Southern University, under the direction of Dr. Joshua Kennedy joshuakennedy@georgiasouthern.edu and Dr. Jamie Scalera jscalera@georgiasouthern.edu.

Purpose of Study: The purpose of this study is to examine the stigmas associated with the prison in the community, to investigate the impact those stigmas have on the residents living in the community. The results from this study will help determine whether or not the stigmas associated with the prison have enough influence to affect the local economy, in terms of job growth and job availability in a rural community.

Procedures to be followed: After participants read and understand this informed consent form, they can begin filling out the survey. Participation in this research will include completion of series of questions that are relevant to the study. Participants will also be asked to provide some

demographic information. Each participant will complete the survey at the site where the surveys are distributed.

Discomforts and Risks: There are no risks associated with your participation in this study and we do not anticipate any discomfort.

Benefits: Although there are no direct benefits to you for participating in our study, your participation will allow us to expand our knowledge about the impact a prison setting can have on the residents living in the community. Implications of this study may also be used to better understand the process local government officials go through when making the decision to invest in prisons and the policies that they adopt.

Costs or Compensation: Your participation is strictly voluntary. There is no cost or compensation associated with your participation in this study.

Duration: Approximately 20 minutes

Statement of Confidentiality: Your participation in this study will be kept completely confidential. We will not be collecting your name or any other identifying information in this study thus, your responses will be confidential and there will be no way for anyone to identify your responses. The original data sheets and the electronic file with your data will be stored in a safe location, and only those who are directly involved in the study will have access to your information. Finally, findings from this study will be presented in aggregate form with no identifying information to ensure your confidentiality.

Right to Ask Questions: You have the right to ask any questions during and after you participate in this study. Participants may contact Dr. Joshua Kennedy at (912) 478-7928 or email joshuakennedy@georgiasouthern.edu or Dr. Jamie Scalera at (912) 478-4204 or email jscalera@georgiasouthern.edu with any questions about the study. You may also contact the Institutional Review Board at Georgia Southern University at (912)478-0843 or email IRB@georgiasouthern.edu.

Voluntary Participation and Right to Withdraw: You must be at least 18 years old to participate in this study. Participating in this study is completely voluntary. You have the right to refuse to answer any individual questions without withdrawing from the entire study; however, we strongly encourage you to answer all questions, since failing to do so could invalidate your results. Again there is no penalty for deciding not to participate in the study. You may decide at any time to discontinue the study and may withdraw without penalty or retribution.

You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep for your records. This project has been reviewed and approved by the GSU Institutional Review Board under tracking number **H16027**.

Principal Investigator: Ashleigh Rasheed, (404) 938-2721 ar04863@georgiasouthern.edu

Faculty Advisor(s): Dr. Joshua Kennedy, (912) 478-7928, joshuakennedy@georgiasouthern.edu; Dr. Jamie Scalera, (912) 478-4204, jscalera@georgiasouthern.edu

Participant Signature

Date

I, the undersigned, verify that the above informed consent procedure has been followed.

 Investigator Signature

 Date

Millen City Council Member

COLLEGE OF (College of Liberal Arts & Social Sciences)

DEPARTMENT OF (Political Science)

Georgia Southern University

Institutional Review Board

Informed Consent Form

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A Research STUDY

Title of Project: Impacts of Prisons in Rural Communities: Economic and Social Factors

Principle Investigator(s): This study will be conducted by Ashleigh Rasheed, an undergraduate student at Georgia Southern University, under the direction of Dr. Joshua Kennedy joshuakennedy@georgiasouthern.edu and Dr. Jamie Scalera jscalera@georgiasouthern.edu.

Purpose of Study: The purpose of this study is to examine the stigmas associated with the prison in the community, to investigate the impact those stigmas have on the residents living in the community. The results from this study will help determine whether or not the stigmas associated with the prison, have enough influence to affect the local economy, in terms of job growth and job availability in a rural community.

Procedures to be followed: Each council member will be asked to be interviewed on their knowledge of the influence the prison has had on the economic development in Millen, Georgia. The council members will also be asked to be interviewed on their knowledge of the impact the prison has had on the residents living in the community. After each council member reads and understands this informed consent form, they can then proceed with the interviewing process. Participation in this research will include completion of answering a series of questions that are relevant to the study.

Discomforts and Risks: There are no risks associated with your participation in this study and we do not anticipate any discomfort.

Benefits: Although there are no direct benefits to you for participating in our study, your participation will allow us to expand our knowledge about the impact a prison setting can have on

the residents living in the community. Implications of this study may also be used to better understand the process local government officials go through when making the decision to invest in prisons and the policies that they adopt.

Costs or Compensation: Your participation is strictly voluntary. There is no cost or compensation associated with your participation in this study.

Duration: Approximately 30 minutes

Statement of Confidentiality: We will not be collecting your name to ensure your confidentiality. For the purposes of the study however, we will only refer to you as council member followed by a variable (i.e. council member X). By doing so this will allow us to be able to reference a government official throughout our findings without having to reveal your actual identity. The original data sheets and the electronic file with your data will be stored in a safe location, and only those who are directly involved in the study will have access to your information. Finally, findings from this study will be presented in aggregate form with no identifying information other than the name given to you, to ensure your confidentiality.

Right to Ask Questions: You have the right to ask any questions during and after you participate in this study. Participants may contact Dr. Joshua Kennedy at (912) 478-7928 or email joshuakennedy@georgiasouthern.edu or Dr. Jamie Scalera at (912) 478-4204 or email jscalera@georgiasouthern.edu with any questions about the study. You may also contact the Institutional Review Board at Georgia Southern University at (912)478-0843 or email IRB@georgiasouthern.edu.

Voluntary Participation and Right to Withdraw: You must be at least 18 years old to participate in this study. Participating in this study is completely voluntary. You have the right to refuse to answer any individual questions without withdrawing from the entire study; however, we strongly encourage you to answer all questions, since failing to do so could invalidate your results. Again there is no penalty for deciding not to participate in the study. You may decide at any time to discontinue the study and may withdraw without penalty or retribution.

You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep for your records. This project has been reviewed and approved by the GSU Institutional Review Board under tracking number **H16027**.

Principal Investigator: Ashleigh Rasheed, (404) 938-2721 ar04863@georgiasouthern.edu

Faculty Advisor(s): Dr. Joshua Kennedy, (912) 478-7928, joshuakennedy@georgiasouthern.edu; Dr. Jamie Scalera, (912) 478-4204, jscalera@georgiasouthern.edu

Participant Signature

Date

I, the undersigned, verify that the above informed consent procedure has been followed.

Investigator Signature

Date

Mayor of Millen

COLLEGE OF (College of Liberal Arts & Social Sciences)

DEPARTMENT OF (Political Science)

Georgia Southern University

Institutional Review Board

Informed Consent Form

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A Research STUDY

Title of Project: Impacts of Prisons in Rural Communities: Economic and Social Factors

Principle Investigator(s): This study will be conducted by Ashleigh Rasheed, an undergraduate student at Georgia Southern University, under the direction of Dr. Joshua Kennedy joshuakennedy@georgiasouthern.edu and Dr. Jamie Scalera jscalera@georgiasouthern.edu.

Purpose of Study: The purpose of this study is to examine the stigmas associated with the prison in the community, to investigate the impact those stigmas have on the residents living in the community. The results from this study will help determine whether or not the stigmas associated with the prison, have enough influence to affect the local economy, in terms of job growth and job availability in a rural community.

Procedures to be followed: The mayor will be asked to be interviewed on his knowledge of the influence the prison has had on the economic development in Millen, Georgia. The mayor will also be asked to be interviewed on his knowledge of the impact the prison has had on the residents living in the community. After the mayor reads and understands this informed consent form, he can then proceed with the interviewing process. Participation in this research will include completion of answering a series of questions that are relevant to the study.

Discomforts and Risks: There are no risks associated with your participation in this study and we do not anticipate any discomfort.

Benefits: Although there are no direct benefits to you for participating in our study, your participation will allow us to expand our knowledge about the impact a prison setting can have on the residents living in the community. Implications of this study may also be used to better understand the process local government officials go through when making the decision to invest in prisons and the policies that they adopt.

Costs or Compensation: Your participation is strictly voluntary. There is no cost or compensation associated with your participation in this study.

Duration: Approximately 30 minutes

Statement of Confidentiality: Due to the nature of this study, concealing your identity will be very difficult because of your political stature. What we can ensure is that the information gathered will be stored in a safe location, and will only be accessible to those whom are directly involved in the study. **Right to Ask Questions:** You have the right to ask any questions during and after you participate in this study. Participants may contact Dr. Joshua Kennedy at (912) 478-7928 or email joshuakennedy@georgiasouthern.edu or Dr. Jamie Scalera at (912) 478-4204 or email jscalera@georgiasouthern.edu with any questions about the study. You may also contact the Institutional Review Board at Georgia Southern University at (912)478-0843 or email IRB@georgiasouthern.edu.

Voluntary Participation and Right to Withdraw: You must be at least 18 years old to participate in this study. Participating in this study is completely voluntary. You have the right to refuse to answer any individual questions without withdrawing from the entire study; however, we strongly encourage you to answer all questions, since failing to do so could invalidate your results. Again there is no penalty for deciding not to participate in the study. You may decide at any time to discontinue the study and may withdraw without penalty or retribution.

You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep for your records. This project has been reviewed and approved by the GSU Institutional Review Board under tracking number H16027.

Principal Investigator: Ashleigh Rasheed, (404) 938-2721 ar04863@georgiasouthern.edu

Faculty Advisor(s): Dr. Joshua Kennedy, (912) 478-7928, joshuakennedy@georgiasouthern.edu; Dr. Jamie Scalera, (912) 478-4204, jscalera@georgiasouthern.edu

Participant Signature

Date

I, the undersigned, verify that the above informed consent procedure has been followed.

Investigator Signature

Date

Appendix E:

Prison	County/City	Location (Rural: 0/Urban: 1)	Prison Type (Private: 0/Public: 1)	Year	Siting	Unemployment Rate	GDP
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	1990	0	12.5	.
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	1991	0	5.9	.
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	1992	0	8.1	.
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	1993	0	6.3	.
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	1994	0	5.8	.
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	1995	0	7.7	.
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	1996	0	4.9	.
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	1997	0	5.4	.
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	1998	0	6.9	6.9
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	1999	0	5.8	7.6
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	2000	0	5.3	7.0
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	2001	0	7.7	5.7
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	2002	0	6.4	2.7
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	2003	0	7.6	5.9
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	2004	0	7.2	6.7
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	2005	0	6.8	8.6
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	2006	0	5.6	5.5
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	2007	0	8.6	3.8
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	2008	0	16	1.9
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	2009	0	19.8	2.6
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	2010	0	15.9	3.4
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	2011	0	14.9	1.9
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	2012	1	15.2	2.9
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	2013	1	14	2.3
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	2014	1	11.1	1.9
CCA Jenkins Correctional Center (Georgia)	Jenkins County	0	0	2015	1	9.1	.

Appendix F:

FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	1990	0	10.8	.
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	1991	0	11.7	.
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	1992	0	13.6	.
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	1993	0	12.1	.
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	1994	0	9.7	.
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	1995	0	9	.
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	1996	0	10	.
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	1997	0	9.7	.
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	1998	0	9.7	5.2
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	1999	0	15	5.4
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	2000	0	8.8	4.1
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	2001	0	8.6	3.7
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	2002	0	8.8	4.2
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	2003	0	9.7	4.7
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	2004	0	8.6	9.2
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	2005	0	6.4	6.1
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	2006	0	6.2	4.6
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	2007	0	5.6	3.2
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	2008	0	8	1.9
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	2009	0	16.9	-2.5
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	2010	0	14.9	4.1
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	2011	0	13.5	3.4
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	2012	0	11.7	2.5
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	2013	1	10.4	4.1
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	2014	1	10	2.4
FCI ALICEVILLE (Alabama)	Pickens Co	0	1	2015	1	7.8	.

Appendix G:

FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	1990	0	9.7	.
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	1991	0	12.2	.
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	1992	0	14.4	.
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	1993	0	15.1	.
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	1994	0	13.2	.
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	1995	0	13.4	.
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	1996	0	11.9	.
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	1997	0	12.6	.
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	1998	0	14	7.1
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	1999	0	13.3	8.6
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	2000	0	9.9	9.4
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	2001	0	9.8	1.3
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	2002	0	10.7	3.9
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	2003	0	11.2	5.9
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	2004	0	10	7.1
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	2005	0	8.4	7.1
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	2006	0	7.6	6.2
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	2007	0	8.1	4.5
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	2008	0	9.6	2.2
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	2009	0	14.3	-4
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	2010	0	16	2.7
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	2011	1	16.4	3.4
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	2012	1	15	4.5
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	2013	1	12.8	4.1
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	2014	1	10.9	4.5
FCI MENDOTA (California)	Fresno Co	0	1	2015	1	9.5	.

Appendix H:

FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	1990	0	5.5	.
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	1991	0	8.7	.
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	1992	0	10.2	.
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	1993	0	10.4	.
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	1994	0	9.1	.
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	1995	0	8.4	.
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	1996	0	7.8	.
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	1997	0	7	.
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	1998	0	6.3	7.1
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	1999	0	5.4	8.6
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	2000	0	5.2	9.4
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	2001	0	5.2	1.3
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	2002	0	6.2	3.9
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	2003	0	6.9	5.9
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	2004	1	6.2	7.1
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	2005	1	5.5	7.1
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	2006	1	5.1	6.2
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	2007	1	5.8	4.5
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	2008	1	8	2.2
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	2009	1	13	-4
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	2010	1	13.6	2.7
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	2011	1	13.4	3.4
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	2012	1	12.1	4.5
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	2013	1	10.3	4.1
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	2014	1	8.1	4.5
FCI VICTORVILLE MEDIUM II (California)	Victorville Ct	0	1	2015	1	6.5	.

Appendix I:

FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	1990	0	5.5	.
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	1991	0	5.8	.
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	1992	0	8.7	.
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	1993	0	8.7	.
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	1994	1	5.9	.
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	1995	1	5.8	.
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	1996	1	5.1	.
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	1997	1	4.4	.
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	1998	1	4.5	9.4
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	1999	1	4.1	8.9
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	2000	1	4.1	9.9
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	2001	1	4.9	3.9
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	2002	1	6.5	2.3
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	2003	1	7.7	3.3
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	2004	1	6.8	4.9
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	2005	1	6.2	8.3
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	2006	1	5.9	4.8
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	2007	1	4.7	5.2
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	2008	1	6.3	4.4
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	2009	1	8.7	-2.3
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	2010	1	11.5	3.2
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	2011	1	11.4	3.2
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	2012	1	11.6	3.8
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	2013	1	10.7	4.2
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	2014	1	8	6.4
FCI FLORENCE (Colorado)	Fremont Co	0	1	2015	1	7.1	.

Appendix J:

CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	1990	0	4.4	.
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	1991	0	4.2	.
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	1992	0	8.4	.
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	1993	0	6.3	.
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	1994	0	5.1	.
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	1995	0	7.8	.
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	1996	0	9.8	.
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	1997	0	4.6	.
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	1998	1	5.8	8.9
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	1999	1	5	8.9
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	2000	1	4.5	6.0
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	2001	1	4.5	3.7
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	2002	1	5.6	2.3
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	2003	1	6.8	3.6
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	2004	1	5.8	5.3
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	2005	1	6	6.7
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	2006	1	5.4	4.6
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	2007	1	4.9	4.5
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	2008	1	6.7	0.2
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	2009	1	12.2	-1.5
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	2010	1	11.1	1.5
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	2011	1	10.9	3.0
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	2012	1	10.1	3.4
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	2013	1	9.1	4.0
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	2014	1	8.5	4.4
CI D. RAY JAMES (Georgia)	Charlton Co	0	1	2015	1	6.9	.

Appendix K:

FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	1990	0	2.7	.
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	1991	0	2.5	.
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	1992	0	3.3	.
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	1993	0	3.5	.
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	1994	0	4.7	.
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	1995	0	5.1	.
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	1996	0	5.7	.
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	1997	0	5.6	.
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	1998	0	5.8	-0.8
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	1999	0	5.3	4.1
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	2000	0	4.6	5.3
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	2001	1	4.7	3.7
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	2002	1	4.6	5.6
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	2003	1	4.7	7.5
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	2004	1	3.7	9.8
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	2005	1	3.3	9.0
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	2006	1	3.3	6.1
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	2007	1	3.2	5.3
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	2008	1	4.4	2.7
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	2009	1	6.7	-2.2
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	2010	1	6.4	3.8
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	2011	1	6.3	3.4
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	2012	1	6.1	3.7
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	2013	1	4.8	3.4
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	2014	1	4.6	3.1
FDC HONOLULU (Hawaii)	Honolulu Ct	1	1	2015	1	4.1	.

Appendix L:

FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	1990	0	4.7	.
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	1991	0	5.9	.
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	1992	0	7	.
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	1993	0	6	.
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	1994	1	4.4	.
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	1995	1	3.7	.
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	1996	1	5.8	.
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	1997	1	3.5	.
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	1998	1	3	4.9
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	1999	1	3.7	5.1
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	2000	1	3.6	5.8
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	2001	1	4.2	2.2
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	2002	1	5.3	2.0
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	2003	1	6.1	3.4
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	2004	1	5.4	5.5
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	2005	1	4.5	4.9
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	2006	1	3.8	5.9
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	2007	1	4.2	4.0
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	2008	1	5.3	-0.1
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	2009	1	10.7	-0.9
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	2010	1	9.7	2.0
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	2011	1	8.4	3.9
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	2012	1	7.5	4.4
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	2013	1	8.9	2.0
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	2014	1	6.6	2.9
FCI PEKIN (Illinois)	Tazewell Ct	1	1	2015	1	5.5	.

Appendix M:

USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	1990	0	7.6	.
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	1991	0	12.5	.
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	1992	0	12.4	.
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	1993	0	12.1	.
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	1994	0	9.3	.
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	1995	0	15.7	.
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	1996	0	16.1	.
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	1997	0	10.3	.
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	1998	0	10.9	4.5
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	1999	0	15.7	5.5
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	2000	0	7.5	-0.7
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	2001	0	6.1	3.3
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	2002	0	7.5	4.2
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	2003	1	9.3	3.9
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	2004	1	8.1	5.6
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	2005	1	8	6.0
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	2006	1	8.1	5.7
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	2007	1	8.7	2.1
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	2008	1	8.4	2.5
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	2009	1	12.4	-1.8
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	2010	1	10.2	6.2
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	2011	1	9.3	4.0
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	2012	1	9.3	3.4
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	2013	1	10.6	2.7
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	2014	1	9	2.7
USP BIG SANDY (Kentucky)	Martin Co	0	1	2015	1	8.	

Appendix N:

FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	1990	0	7	.
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	1991	0	9.8	.
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	1992	0	11.4	.
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	1993	0	7.4	.
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	1994	0	13	.
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	1995	0	11.1	.
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	1996	0	11.9	.
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	1997	0	11.3	.
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	1998	0	10	2.9
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	1999	0	7.8	4.7
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	2000	0	7.4	5.5
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	2001	0	7.4	4.5
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	2002	0	8	1.1
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	2003	0	10.2	11.1
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	2004	0	8.4	9.6
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	2005	0	7.8	16.1
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	2006	0	4.6	3.7
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	2007	1	6.1	0.9
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	2008	1	5.8	4.3
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	2009	1	9	-3.7
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	2010	1	9.6	10.6
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	2011	1	9.6	3.7
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	2012	1	9.5	3.7
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	2013	1	9.1	-1.6
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	2014	1	8.2	1.9
FCI POLLOCK (Louisiana)	Grant Parish Co	1	1	2015	1	8.3	.

Appendix O:

FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	1990	0	11.4	.
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	1991	0	12.2	.
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	1992	0	14.8	.
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	1993	0	12.8	.
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	1994	1	9.8	.
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	1995	1	9.4	.
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	1996	1	9	.
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	1997	1	10.1	.
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	1998	1	8.3	6.5
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	1999	1	7	6.2
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	2000	1	6	6.0
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	2001	1	6.3	6.9
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	2002	1	6.6	5.9
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	2003	1	6.1	5.2
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	2004	1	6.3	7.7
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	2005	1	6.1	7.0
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	2006	1	5.9	5.1
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	2007	1	5	4.4
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	2008	1	5.6	2.8
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	2009	1	8.9	1.8
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	2010	1	9.3	3.5
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	2011	1	9.3	2.8
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	2012	1	9.2	2.3
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	2013	1	8.5	2.7
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	2014	1	7.6	2.7
FCI CUMBERLAND (Maryland)	Allegany Co	1	1	2015	1	7.4	.

Appendix P:

FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	1990	0	3.8	.
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	1991	0	4.7	.
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	1992	0	5.1	.
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	1993	0	5.7	.
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	1994	0	4.4	.
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	1995	1	3.6	.
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	1996	1	4.3	.
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	1997	1	3.1	.
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	1998	1	2.9	6.8
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	1999	1	3.2	5.4
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	2000	1	3	9.0
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	2001	1	3.7	2.8
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	2002	1	4.6	3.9
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	2003	1	4.7	5.8
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	2004	1	4.6	6.3
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	2005	1	4.4	5.6
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	2006	1	4.1	2.6
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	2007	1	4.8	3.3
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	2008	1	5.4	2.4
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	2009	1	8.2	-2.1
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	2010	1	7.5	5.0
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	2011	1	6.3	4.6
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	2012	1	5.8	3.6
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	2013	1	5.5	3.9
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	2014	1	4.7	2.9
FCI WASECA (Minnesota)	Waseca Co	0	1	2015	1	4.4	.

Appendix Q:

FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	1990	0	6.5	.
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	1991	0	8.4	.
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	1992	0	10.4	.
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	1993	0	9.1	.
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	1994	0	7.0	.
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	1995	0	6.4	.
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	1996	0	6.6	.
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	1997	0	5.3	.
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	1998	0	3.9	5.7
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	1999	0	4.1	2.6
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	2000	0	3.6	7.0
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	2001	0	5.3	2.3
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	2002	0	6.6	5.2
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	2003	0	5.2	5.8
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	2004	0	4.5	5.7
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	2005	0	4.1	5.6
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	2006	0	4.2	4.2
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	2007	0	4.6	2.6
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	2008	0	5.2	0.0
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	2009	0	8.0	1.1
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	2010	0	7.2	3.7
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	2011	0	7.2	2.2
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	2012	1	7.5	3.5
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	2013	1	6.2	3.3
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	2014	1	5.8	4.1
FCI BERLIN (New Hampshire)	Coos Co	0	1	2015	1	4.9	.

Appendix R:

CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	1990	0	13	.
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	1991	0	13.7	.
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	1992	0	13.3	.
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	1993	1	12.1	.
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	1994	1	10.3	.
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	1995	1	1910.3	.
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	1996	1	13.4	.
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	1997	1	10.7	.
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	1998	1	8.6	-3.7
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	1999	1	7.8	5.3
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	2000	1	6.8	4.5
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	2001	1	6.1	2.3
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	2002	1	6.4	3.4
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	2003	1	6.2	8.0
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	2004	1	5.7	10.3
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	2005	1	5.6	5.6
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	2006	1	4.5	4.7
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	2007	1	4.2	3.9
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	2008	1	4.6	4.6
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	2009	1	6.9	-3.6
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	2010	1	9.5	3.5
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	2011	1	9	3.3
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	2012	1	8.1	1.7
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	2013	1	8	3.0
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	2014	1	8	2.3
CI CIBOLA COUNTY (New Mexico)	Milan Ct	0	0	2015	1	7.8	.

Appendix S:

CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	1990	0	5.8	.
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	1991	0	8.7	.
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	1992	0	9.5	.
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	1993	0	9.5	.
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	1994	0	6.9	.
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	1995	0	5.7	.
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	1996	0	5.7	.
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	1997	0	5.1	.
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	1998	0	4.4	4.9
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	1999	0	3.9	8.0
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	2000	0	5.1	5.1
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	2001	1	7.1	5.3
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	2002	1	7.1	3.5
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	2003	1	6.1	4.0
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	2004	1	5.8	6.0
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	2005	1	5.9	7.6
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	2006	1	5.5	8.0
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	2007	1	5.2	2.4
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	2008	1	6.6	2.9
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	2009	1	9.6	0.8
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	2010	1	10.6	2.8
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	2011	1	11.3	2.7
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	2012	1	10.7	2.9
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	2013	1	9.3	4.8
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	2014	1	7.2	3.4
CI RIVERS (North Carolina)	Winton Ct	0	0	2015	1	7.	.

Appendix T:

USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	1990	0	9.5	.
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	1991	0	10.5	.
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	1992	0	14.5	.
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	1993	0	11.2	.
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	1994	0	10.4	.
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	1995	0	11.7	.
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	1996	0	11.9	.
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	1997	0	9.0	.
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	1998	0	8.0	6.9
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	1999	0	8.8	7.6
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	2000	0	4.2	7.0
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	2001	0	5.0	5.7
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	2002	1	5.7	2.7
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	2003	1	6.0	5.9
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	2004	1	5.7	6.7
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	2005	1	5.1	8.6
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	2006	1	4.4	5.5
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	2007	1	4.2	3.8
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	2008	1	5.3	1.9
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	2009	1	7.2	2.6
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	2010	1	7.9	3.4
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	2011	1	7.6	1.9
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	2012	1	8.3	2.9
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	2013	1	8.8	2.3
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	2014	1	8.2	1.9
USP LEE (Virginia)	Lee Co	0	1	2015	1	7.3	.

Appendix W:

Economic Status before Prison was healthy	overall attitude: positive	relationship between prison & community: healthy	prison effective in boosting the economy	overall prison good for town
3	3	3	3	3
4	4	6	6	4
3	3	3	3	3
5	1	4	5	5
5	3	4	3	3
1	4	3	2	2
4	3	3	4	3
6	3	6	3	4
4	5	5	5	5
3	5	6	5	5
3	5	5	5	5
5	1	6	5	1
2	3	3	1	2
1	3	4	1	3
3	4	3	3	2
3	4	2	4	4
3	4	3	3	3
2	3	4	4	3
1	3	4	4	4
1	4	4	4	4
5	5	4	5	5
3	2	4	3	2
3	3	4	3	3
1	5	3	3	1
3	2	2	2	2
1	4	4	4	4
3	5	5	4	5
6	5	3	1	6
1	5	5	5	5

Appendix X:

stigmas associated with prison impact negative	public involved in process	individual personally invlved in process	tradeoff btw economic growth & public security	tradeoff favors economic growth
3	3	3	4	3
6	6	6	6	6
3	6	6	6	6
1	4	2	1	5
1	6	6	4	4
1	4	5	5	5
3	3	3	3	3
6	6	6	5	6
2	4	4	4	4
6	5	1	3	6
3	3	6	5	5
1	5	1	5	5
3	4	4	2	3
5	4	1	1	4
2	3	3	2	2
3	2	2	3	3
2	3	6	2	3
2	3	2	3	3
1	4	1	6	4
4	4	4	4	4
5	5	1	5	5
2	3	3	3	2
1	4	1	4	4
2	2	2	1	1
2	2	3	3	2
1	4	1	4	4
2	4	1	5	4
6	6	6	1	5
3	4	4	5	5

Appendix Y:

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	272
Model	39.4082485	2	19.7041243	F(2, 269)	=	2.67
Residual	1982.71958	269	7.37070475	Prob > F	=	0.0709
				R-squared	=	0.0195
				Adj R-squared	=	0.0122
Total	2022.12783	271	7.46172629	Root MSE	=	2.7149

	GDP	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
	Siting	-.8130819	.3540801	-2.30	0.022	-1.510203	-.1159612
PrisonTypePrivate0Public		.1315182	.4218188	0.31	0.755	-.698968	.9620044
	_cons	4.682065	.4474872	10.46	0.000	3.801042	5.563087

Appendix Z:

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	416
Model	44568.5801	2	22284.2901	F(2, 413)	=	2.58
Residual	3570155.81	413	8644.44507	Prob > F	=	0.0772
				R-squared	=	0.0123
				Adj R-squared	=	0.0075
Total	3614724.39	415	8710.17926	Root MSE	=	92.976

	UnemploymentRate	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
	Siting	7.109316	9.137818	0.78	0.437	-10.85312	25.07175
PrisonTypePrivate0Public		-24.87154	11.67923	-2.13	0.034	-47.82969	-1.913392
	_cons	28.81806	11.62051	2.48	0.014	5.975343	51.66078

Appendix AA:

stigmas associated with prison impact negative

	Percentiles	Smallest		
1%	1	1		
5%	1	1		
10%	1	1	Obs	30
25%	2	1	Sum of Wgt.	30
50%	2.5		Mean	2.833333
		Largest	Std. Dev.	1.662639
75%	3	6		
90%	6	6	Variance	2.764368
95%	6	6	Skewness	.7724062
99%	6	6	Kurtosis	2.479178

Appendix AB:

tradeoff favors economic growth

	Percentiles	Smallest		
1%	1	1		
5%	2	2		
10%	2	2	Obs	30
25%	3	2	Sum of Wgt.	30
50%	4		Mean	4.033333
		Largest	Std. Dev.	1.325697
75%	5	6		
90%	6	6	Variance	1.757471
95%	6	6	Skewness	-.3326441
99%	6	6	Kurtosis	2.420771

Appendix AC:

public involved in process

	Percentiles	Smallest		
1%	2	2		
5%	2	2		
10%	2.5	2	Obs	30
25%	3	3	Sum of Wgt.	30
50%	4		Mean	3.966667
		Largest	Std. Dev.	1.217214
75%	5	6		
90%	6	6	Variance	1.481609
95%	6	6	Skewness	.2975031
99%	6	6	Kurtosis	2.287264