

154183

154183

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

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

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by
Ohio Governor's Select Committee
on Corrections

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

Final Report and Recommendations of the Governor's Select Committee on Corrections

January 1994

* * * * *

Committee

Dr. Kathleen Burlew
Dr. Simon Dinitz, Chair
Judge Burt Griffin
Sheriff Gary Haines, Vice Chair
Mr. Robert Millan
Dr. Ruth Peterson
Mr. Michael Quinlan
Mr. Charles See

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Members of the Committee	i
Introduction	1
Background.	1
Procedure of Inquiry.	2
I. General Principles.	4
II. Addressing the Major Problems	5
A. Prison Crowding and Inmate Idleness	6
B. The Need for Diversion Programs	9
C. Offenders with Substance Abuse Problems	10
D. Mentally Ill and Mentally Retarded Offenders.	11
E. Prison Security, Security Threat Groups and Gangs	13
III. Female Offenders and Other Special Program Needs.	15
A. Special Needs of Female Offenders	15
B. Program Concerns.	16
IV. Administrative Concerns	18
A. Community Input and Coalition Building.	18
B. Management Information Systems and Research	19
C. Medical and Dental Services	21
D. Personnel and Human Resources	22
E. Management Control.	24
Appendix A - Committee Meetings and Speakers	27
Appendix B - Tables.	31
Appendix C - Testimony of David L. Blodgett.	38

GOVERNOR'S SELECT COMMITTEE ON CORRECTIONS

MEMBERS

- Dr. Simon Dinitz, Chair - Professor Emeritus, Department of Sociology, The Ohio State University
- Gary Haines, Vice Chair - Sheriff of Montgomery County
- Dr. Kathleen Burlew - Professor, Department of Psychology, University of Cincinnati
- Burt W. Griffin - Judge of the Court of Common Pleas, Cuyahoga County
- Robert Q. Millan - Chair of the Ohio Prison Labor Advisory Board, former President and Chairman of the Board, First National Bank of Middletown
- Dr. Ruth D. Peterson - Associate Professor, Department of Sociology, The Ohio State University
- J. Michael Quinlan - Consultant, U.S. Sentencing Commission, former Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons
- Charles R. See - Executive Director of the Community Re-Entry Program and Associate Director of the Lutheran Metropolitan Ministry Association, Chairman of the N.A.A.C.P. (Cleveland Branch) Prison Committee

STAFF

- Evalyn Parks - Chief, Bureau of Planning and Evaluation, Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction
- Delores Brown - Coordinator, Ohio Quality Corrections, Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction
- Catalina DeLeón - Personnel Officer I, Orient Correctional Institution

GOVERNOR'S SELECT COMMITTEE ON CORRECTIONS

INTRODUCTION

Background

The longest, most deadly and destructive prison riot in Ohio history (an inmate-set fire at the now-abandoned Ohio Penitentiary in Columbus took 322 inmate lives in 1930) began at the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility (SOCF) in Lucasville at about 3 p.m. on Easter Sunday, April 11, 1993. Before it ran its course eleven days later, twelve Correctional Officers had been taken hostage and one of them was killed. Nine inmates were also murdered by fellow prisoners. The L housing complex consisting of eight cellblocks and a gymnasium was gutted, with property damage estimated to exceed \$10 million. The riot, siege and stalemate, which commanded national media attention, ended with a 21-point agreement between the prisoners and the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction (DRC).

In the aftermath of the SOCF riot, Ohio Governor George V. Voinovich appointed an eight-member committee to study the massive Ohio penal system (over 40,000 prisoners and nearly 10,000 employees) and make recommendations for needed change and improvement. Governor Voinovich, with Lt. Governor Mike DeWine, DRC Director Reginald A. Wilkinson and DRC Assistant Director Thomas J. Stickrath present, convened the first meeting of the Select Committee on May 6, 1993 and issued a mission statement to the members. The goals of the inquiry were to examine the philosophy, policies and practices of the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction and to submit recommendations for making Ohio's prisons safer, more secure, less stressful environments for staff and prisoners and for preventing and reducing inmate violence. Prison programs - education, work, training, counseling and substance abuse education and treatment, among others - were to be studied with the goal of returning prisoners to the community as lawful, responsible and productive citizens. This charge parallels the mission statement of DRC, which reads as follows:

The Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction protects Ohio citizens by ensuring effective supervision of adult offenders in environments that are safe, humane and appropriately secure; the Department seeks to instill in offenders an improved sense of responsibility and the ability to become productive citizens.

As an addendum to this statement, the Department has pledged to...

demonstrate excellence in every facet of our operation to inspire confidence in our ability to continuously improve in a system that:

- . meets employee personal growth and professional needs;*
- . demonstrates justice and fairness for offenders;*
- . responds to the concerns of the citizens of Ohio, and other internal and external stakeholders.*

Although the riot at the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility gave rise to the Select Committee, it was not the purpose of the Select Committee to determine the cause of the riot, to evaluate the response of the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction, or to recommend procedures for dealing with the inmates who were or are at SOCF. That is the function of other groups.

Procedure of Inquiry

The Select Committee set about discharging its responsibilities by holding hearings at the DRC Central Office and at the following prisons: Mansfield, Lorain, Lebanon, Dayton, Ohio Reformatory for Women, Southern Ohio Correctional Facility (Lucasville), and London. Facility tours followed the planned presentations. In addition, the Committee studied the Monday program in Dayton (a Community-Based Correctional Facility) and devoted a day to hearings at the Corrections Training Academy. Speakers and presenters were chosen to represent significant stakeholders in the daily operation of the system. The Committee heard from DRC's medical director, the two regional deputy directors for prisons (north and south regions), wardens, and sometimes deputies as well, at all the institutions visited, the deputy director for Parole and Community Services, human resources development chiefs (personnel, minority recruitment, the assessment center administrator), the Corrections Training Academy superintendent, the Chief and Assistant Chief Inspectors, the head of the Bureau of Classification and the chief of Construction, Activation and Maintenance. Many others from the Department also appeared before the Committee, including the DRC security administrator, the medical director at the Ohio Reformatory for Women and local personnel such as the health care administrator at a reception center, the reception center coordinator and the records manager. [A complete list is found in Appendix A.]

Notable presenters from outside the system included Senator Betty Montgomery who heads the legislative investigation into the Lucasville riot and Peter Davis, executive director of the Correctional Institution Inspection Committee of the Ohio Legislature. The Committee was fortunate to hear from Dr. Michael Hogan, Director of the Ohio Department of Mental Health, and his

aides. Attorney Niki Schwartz, who was instrumental in fashioning the 21-point agreement and the subsequent inmate surrender, spent a lot of time with the Committee. Later, Attorney Vincent Nathan and his associates talked with us about their initial work in implementing the agreement with the prisoners. Judge John M. Meagher of Dayton discussed community sentencing options and Professor Ronald Huff of the Ohio State University presented the prison gang situation.

The Committee heard from Lt. Governor Mike DeWine, and on several occasions from the Director and Assistant Director of the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction. We twice called on Mr. Paul Goldberg, the Executive Director of the Ohio Civil Service Employees Association, AFSCME Local 11 to talk about the union's position on prison policies, practices and needs. Several Correctional Officers presented their views of the rights and wrongs of the system, and others were in attendance at our institutional visitations. Their input was especially challenging and is herein recognized.

Finally, a number of inmates were formally interviewed at the Warren, London and Mansfield Correctional Institutions. Many others were encountered in our facility tours and spoke with members of the Select Committee.

Lastly, "white papers" were solicited and received from operational personnel in DRC. In addition to the areas enumerated above, "white papers" were obtained from the chief of Management Information Systems, the head of Research, and the various program areas - religious services, inmate work and education programs. "White papers" were also received on management and security issues and on support services. These "white papers" and the discussions with those responsible for them were of inestimable value in framing our report.

Before presenting our recommendations, we wish to thank everyone involved in this investigation. The cooperation given us was outstanding at every level of the Department and by staff and inmates at the institutions. The Committee is particularly grateful to the Director and Assistant Director, Reginald Wilkinson and Thomas Stickrath, for their participation and encouragement. We encountered no roadblocks, no resistance, and found our informants to be forthcoming and eager to present their views. The Committee has already noted the input of the union and its local officers. Finally, the Committee is deeply in the debt of our proficient and hard-working staff members, Evalyn Parks, Delores Brown and Catalina DeLeón. Without them, this report would still be in the making.

This report and its recommendations try to meet the issues fairly and without favor. Despite the riot, we believe the Department is in good hands, highly professional and outward-looking. Nevertheless, the problems confronting corrections cannot be solved by management alone. The greatest problem is a surfeit of prisoners, enough to overwhelm facilities and programs

and to overtax the infrastructure. Corrections is the last subsystem in the criminal justice chain, and it cannot, therefore, control its own destiny. It will remain reactive into the foreseeable future with little freedom of movement or ability to control its population and their terms of incarceration or release. Unless it is understood that corrections is not master of its destiny, the very real dilemmas faced by DRC and addressed in this report will remain largely unresolved, even if all these recommendations are accepted and implemented.

I. General Principles

Before detailing our recommendations, the Committee wants to highlight nine general principles, whose importance undergirds our thinking.

* Appropriate Commitments to Prison

Not all offenders can or should be sent to prison. Prison is only one of numerous sanctions available for sentencing felony offenders. It should generally be reserved for the violent or dangerous offender, the offender who has committed an offense whose seriousness would be demeaned by a lesser sanction, the offender who earns or tries to earn a livelihood by crime, and the offender who has not responded to non-prison sanctions and for whom there is no remaining suitable community sanction.

* Safe and Humane Operation

It is in the best interests of prisoners, prison personnel and the general public that prisons be operated in an efficient, humane, safe and secure manner.

* Idleness

Idleness of inmates is inconsistent with the goals of both punishment and rehabilitation.

* Substance Abuse

Substance abuse is one of the most significant contributors to crime and recidivism. Over 70 percent of offenders who are sentenced to prison have been chemical users and abusers; and continued abuse of alcohol or illegal drugs is a major factor in crimes which return offenders to prison. Substance abuse education and appropriate treatment opportunities must be provided to prisoners. Parolees must be monitored for continued substance abuse and also afforded reasonable treatment opportunities in the community.

* Opportunities for Self-Improvement

Prisoners who desire to improve their levels of education, job skills or social skills should be given reasonable opportunities to do so while in prison.

* Moral Development

We must lower our expectations of the extent to which prison programs can be devised to change inmate behavior. Although prisons lack the ability to force inmates to change behavior, the prison experience itself induces some inmates to change, and the prison system must promote an environment consistent with the values expected of law-abiding citizens. The prison system must persistently explore more effective ways to foster such attitudes, values and behavior in prison inmates.

* Mentally Ill and Mentally Retarded Inmates

National estimates, confirmed by Ohio statistics, indicate that approximately 15 percent of prison inmates are either mentally ill, mentally retarded or dual-diagnosed prisoners. Unless their crime is extremely serious or they pose a danger to society that civil institutions cannot protect against, the mentally ill and mentally retarded should not be imprisoned. When in prison, however, they must be given adequate treatment and protection and, if necessary, other prisoners must be protected from them.

* Racial, Ethnic and Religious Fairness

Racial, ethnic and religious discrimination either by prison employees or inmates cannot be tolerated.

* Citizen Input and Support

The prison system must be open to and seek input and support from the criminal justice system which uses it and from the general public.

II. Addressing the Major Problems

Five problems -- (1) prison crowding, (2) inmate idleness, (3) inmate threat groups (gangs), (4) mentally ill, psychologically disturbed and chronically anti-social inmates, and (5) offenders with substance abuse problems -- override all others. Until they are properly addressed, the prison system will be seriously impeded in achieving its goal of "operating safe, secure, and humane" institutions. The solution of these problems will enhance the possibility that prisoners will be returned to

the community with an "improved sense of responsibility and the ability to become productive citizens."

A. Prison Crowding and Inmate Idleness

The problems of prison crowding and inmate idleness are so severe that they dwarf other major concerns of the prison system. Prison crowding exacerbates problems of staffing, physical infrastructure, violence, and inmate programming.

Appendix B presents a set of charts and tables showing the extent of overcrowding. As of January 1, 1993, Ohio's prisons were 178.5 percent of rated capacity [Table B-1]. A chart in the Appendix indicates that prison population will continue to increase, resulting in seriously crowded conditions over the next three years, in spite of the planned building program [Table B-4]. Even with the projected community facilities, the Committee estimates that an additional 4,000 to 5,000 beds will be needed to bring the population and capacity to a more manageable ratio.

The sheer number of inmates which the prison system must fit into spaces designed for considerably fewer prisoners results in certain consequences which outside observers might find surprising. Some of the most troublesome are outlined below:

1. Space which is intended for prison industries, inmate recreation, or vocational training has been converted to dormitory space to house inmates.
2. Responsibility for too many inmates (on the part of prison staff) or of living in extremely close proximity to strangers (on the part of inmates) frequently leads to stress, shortened tempers, impatience, and what the Committee has called a "diminution of civility." It is not uncommon to see increased inmate tensions (manifested in conduct reports and assaults), coupled with high levels of staff stress (seen in the use of sick leave and high levels of turnover). These problems constitute an unacceptable threat to the safety of both staff and inmates.
3. "Prison culture" has changed significantly in the past decade. The emergence of inmate threat groups such as gangs makes the management of the population considerably more difficult than in the past.
4. Education and work opportunities available to inmates are barely adequate to keep them productive when institutional populations are at design capacity. When populations rise, it becomes impossible to keep a substantial proportion of inmates productive.

5. Essential services for inmates (including psychological services, substance abuse programs and medical services) are severely diluted by the sheer numbers of inmates needing such services.

6. Prison infrastructures were designed to deal with a specific number of prisoners - the design capacity of the institution. Generally, a prison can handle 10, 20, or even 30 percent more prisoners than the design capacity. However, in older institutions, the infrastructures are already taxed beyond their ability to function properly. The need for major maintenance and renovation is chronic. And even in the new institutions, some of which are currently operating at twice design capacity, the constant wear and tear on the facilities has caused the premature deterioration or breakage of major, critical sub-systems such as water, sewer, heating and ventilation, electrical, roofs, kitchens, shower areas - the list is almost endless. And the maintenance budget for the Department is such that routine maintenance must sometimes be sacrificed to crisis management.

7. Constant pre-occupation on the part of administrators with the problems of dealing with such staggering numbers of prisoners severely compromises their ability to attain other correctional objectives.

Recommendations

The Committee believes the following steps should be taken immediately to address the problems of prison crowding and inmate idleness:

1. At each institution, the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction should determine the safe operational capacity. This will be the level at which the safety of inmates or personnel will be substantially threatened if more inmates are added. The General Assembly should respect that determination by providing sufficient resources so that the staff and inmates are not placed at unreasonable risk.

2. Although the precise number of beds needed to bring the inmate-space ratio to safe operational capacity must await a proper assessment by prison administrators, the Committee believes that the number may be even higher than the additional 4,000 to 5,000 beds mentioned earlier. [See Table B-4] Those housing units are needed now, and the Committee sees no alternative to providing these physical facilities even if all other recommendations of the Committee are implemented.

3. One of the new prisons should be the 400-500 bed, high security facility now being planned by the Department for male inmates who present the most serious behavioral problems and security threats. This facility should be located in the northeastern section of the state.

4. The Department's plans for the construction and opening of other facilities must be expedited.

5. In constructing new facilities, high priority should be given to creating lower security, state-operated prisons for short-term offenders -- those sentenced to serve 18 months or less of actual time. Such prisons would include the following:

a. Intensive Confinement Centers (modified "boot camps"). With the approval of the sentencing Judge, for a substantial reduction in actual time to be served, the Department will send eligible prisoners to Intensive Confinement Centers. These Centers will minimize institutional amenities, such as as non-educational television and structured recreation and will provide suitable programming.

b. "Theme" prisons. Targeted groups of prisoners would be sent to these facilities. Programming would emphasize heavy substance abuse treatment and education, intensive work and vocational programs, community service programs and a range of intensive educational opportunities.

c. Technical parole violator centers. Technical parole violators should be sent to low security facilities as a last sanction before parole revocation.

6. The Committee has not studied the proposals of the Ohio Criminal Sentencing Commission in depth. Nonetheless, this Committee believes that some of the recommendations of the Sentencing Commission for reducing population growth (such as community alternative sanctions and post-incarceration supervision) warrant attention.

7. To eliminate at least some of the intolerable back-up in reception centers, the Committee recommends that the Department study the requirement that prisoners must be delivered to the state prison system even if their definite sentences will expire almost immediately thereafter.

8. The Department should work with military and other agencies, state and national, to determine whether any military or other government facilities can be converted into short-term facilities.

9. Security concerns and classification status, rather than prison crowding, should determine the celling of inmates. In spite of overcrowding, the Committee recommends that no inmate who is classified as maximum security be double-celled. Incentives should be established to reduce the possibility that inmates would be motivated to progress to or remain in maximum security status. In medium and minimum security facilities, where inmates are likely to be double-celled, prisoners should have the right to petition for cell assignment changes, unless contraindicated by good correctional practice.

10. Prison crowding contributes to the physical deterioration of prison infrastructures. Ohio has several prisons which are more than seventy years old and which are in deplorable physical condition. Even the relatively new institutions already need additional maintenance because of the strain of overuse. The Committee recommends that sufficient resources be available to allow the Department to maintain facilities at a minimum acceptable level. [See Appendix C, Testimony of David Blodgett before the Governor's Select Committee on Corrections.]

B. The Need for Diversion Programs

The State generally has greatly underutilized and underfunded community correction-based alternative punishment sanctions. The Committee has endorsed the *Cornerstones for Corrections* proposal of the Governor and Lt. Governor regarding the need for community corrections programs.

The Committee supports the principles of a comprehensive penal sanctioning system, the continuity of care, oversight and treatment, and the coordination of efforts on the part of local, county and state agencies. The penal sanctioning system must include appropriate graded sanctions, ranging from fines to long-term incarceration. The range of sanctions generally should be available in all areas of the state, so that imprisonment is not the only option beyond probation. To strengthen the position of community-based correctional alternatives, the Committee makes the following recommendations, with the understanding that the use of such non-prison sanctions will not afford a one-for-one reduction in prison commitments:

Recommendations

1. The Committee strongly recommends that a suitable range of penal sanctions be made available to sentencing judges. These sanctions would include but not be limited to: intensive probation supervision, specialized probation caseloads, halfway-in houses, community

work programs, day reporting centers and day fines, electronic monitoring, sheltered workshops, and Community-Based Correctional Facilities.

2. Currently, post-prison services are severely restricted and the ability of people in the criminal justice system to receive necessary mental health, substance abuse and other programs is usually limited to the period of their incarceration. Health, mental health, job placement and vocational training service agencies have not been eager to offer programming to convicted offenders after their release. The failure to offer these services is reflected in the large number of second and subsequent admissions of juvenile and adult offenders. We recommend that efforts be intensified to ensure the immediate availability to released offenders of follow-up services in the community. Local ADAMHS Boards (Alcohol, Drug Addiction and Mental Health Services) should be encouraged to view released offenders as a priority population.
3. The Committee recommends that all targeted offenders, such as sex offenders and inmates with a history of violence, be supervised on their return to the community.

C. Offenders with Substance Abuse Problems

About 70 to 80 percent of new admissions to prison have a history of substance abuse. In addition, about 15 percent of all inmates in Ohio's prisons at this time are in for some type of drug offense and more than 30 percent of new admissions have been convicted of a drug offense. Substance abuse programs offered in prison range from Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous programs to highly-structured therapeutic communities.

Recommendations

1. All inmates should be afforded an opportunity to participate in a substance abuse prevention program suitable to their needs and motivation and to their expected length of imprisonment.
2. The Committee supports random drug testing of inmates; for security purposes, we recommend random testing of all institutional personnel. Action should be taken against all personnel whose drug tests indicate usage.
3. Recognizing the seriousness of drug and alcohol abuse among convicted offenders, the Committee recommends the provision of specialized services in conjunction with community-based programs for released drug or alcohol abusers. We recommend that no inmate who has had a

substantiated drug or alcohol problem be released on parole without developing an appropriate plan for treatment and monitoring compliance. The Department is urged to make such mandatory follow-up a condition of parole.

Although inmates released without subsequent supervision at the expiration of definite sentences are no longer within the control of the Department, the Committee recommends that referrals to community drug and alcohol abuse treatment resources be made for these inmates, too. This recommendation for referral to community programs for non-supervised releasees is also appropriate for flat sentence sex offenders and offenders with physical disabilities.

4. All parolees should be subjected to regular, random drug testing.

D. Mentally Ill and Mentally Retarded Offenders

Mental illness problems of offenders derive from two sources. Some inmates were psychotic or in other ways severely mentally ill when they were sentenced, but the mental illness did not result in a finding of not guilty by reason of insanity or was not even diagnosed at the time of sentencing. Many other inmates become overtly psychotic or severely depressed while they are imprisoned.

There is a consensus among psychiatrists and psychologists that more than 400 inmates (between 1 and 3 percent of the population) are in need of intensive psychiatric care and treatment. It is estimated that 12 percent of the inmate population have a treatable mental illness that requires intervention. A recent study indicated that the inmate community has a proportionately high rate of psychiatric and psychosocial impairment. Therefore, prisons should be provided with the same services available at outside community mental health centers. Currently, mental health services are provided by both DRC and the Department of Mental Health. Ohio is one of only six states that have such a split service delivery system. More than half of all facilities have no psychiatric services available.

Services are sorely needed to deal with the increasing number of people in the prison system who have mental health problems; and efforts need to be made throughout the criminal justice system to avoid sentencing the mentally ill and mentally retarded to prison unnecessarily.

Recommendations

1. Pilot projects already exist in Cleveland and other cities to identify the mentally ill and mentally retarded at the presentence stage and to divert them from

the prison system. These pilot programs have been financially supported by funds from the Ohio Department of Mental Health and the Ohio Department of Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities. The programs establish probation officers who specialize in supervising the mentally ill and mentally retarded and link them with mental health caseworkers who specialize in supervising criminal offenders. The programs should be extended to all Common Pleas Courts and all parole offices.

3. Much dissatisfaction was expressed to the Committee with the current bifurcated system for delivering psychiatric service to inmates. The Committee recommends that psychiatric services in prison be run by the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction. This would require the hiring of psychiatrists and other mental health personnel currently provided by the Department of Mental Health and the transfer of funds, currently part of the Department of Mental Health budget, to the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction.
4. Regardless of the shape of the service delivery structure, the Committee recommends that additional resources be allocated to achieve the Department's recommended level of psychiatric and psychological services.
5. Inmates treated by Department of Mental Health or Department of Rehabilitation and Correction staff while incarcerated are rarely followed closely in the community to see that treatment continues after release. Released inmates, by virtue of their prior confinement, are generally not integrated into the community mental health system. Parole officers have indicated the unwillingness of some agencies to accept released inmates as clients. Adaptation to parolees of the Cleveland experiment with probationers would correct this problem. We recommend increased use of referrals of released inmates to local mental health services and close linkages between parole officers and mental health caseworkers.
6. We recommend an increase in the number of dedicated beds for mentally ill inmates, such as the Oakwood Forensic Center, and space in dedicated units in one or two of the other institutions, as necessary, for the housing and treatment of these inmates.
7. Mental health staff currently do not deal with the families of mentally ill inmates, a service which would greatly facilitate a released inmate's re-entry into the community. We recommend that local ADAMHS Boards provide services to the families of mentally ill inmates to smooth their transition into the community.

8. Many mentally retarded inmates are under-served in DRC because education and work programs are not geared to include them. We recommend that a detailed analysis be made of this and other special populations (e.g., physically and medically disabled, the geriatric group) with a view to extending programming for them.

E. Prison Security, Security Threat Groups and Gangs

The safety and security of both staff and prisoners are of the utmost concern to the Select Committee. The incident at Lucasville demonstrated the importance of the recognition of security threat groups/gangs as a force in the institutions, the need to identify such group members and to track their movement through the system. The existence of gangs in the civilian community associated with drug trafficking and their continuation into the prison community cause these organized groups to be of special concern.

Recommendations

1. The Committee supports DRC in creating the position of Gang Coordinator. DRC must continue to identify and track prisoner threat group/gang members.
2. Religious groups should not be equated with gangs, although there is some possible overlap between the two. This differentiation requires screening, intelligence and understanding on the part of the security forces.
3. To minimize the threat from disruptive groups, the Department should not tolerate the show of colors, symbols or other means of gang identification. Individuals identified with gangs, particularly leaders, shall be transferred to other institutions when they pose a threat to the safety and security of the parent institution.
4. The Department should work with the prison employee unions in each institution in identifying staff members at all levels who are affiliated with hate groups and limiting their contact with prisoners.
5. At SOCF, staff was led to believe that certain locations were safe havens in the event of inmate unrest. The Mohr Committee also determined that there were other security lapses. The Select Committee therefore urges the use of the newly created DRC Bureau of Accreditation and Standards or the National Institute of

Corrections Technical Assistance Program to conduct security audits of all correctional facilities. Security audits are most critical for high security institutions.

a. Each facility should be examined for sports equipment and commissary and other items which are not appropriate for the assigned security level.

6. During tours of older facilities serious fire and life safety hazards were observed by Committee members.

a. A fire inspection should be conducted on an annual basis by either the local fire inspector or the State Fire Marshal's office and a plan of action put into place to bring these facilities into compliance with fire code expectations.

b. Training must be provided to contract employees or personnel from other agencies who work in DRC institutions regarding their responsibilities in the event of a fire or other emergency within the facility.

7. Mass movement of inmates in the older linear facilities for meals, recreation, work programs, and other purposes provides numerous opportunities for security breaches, inmate disturbances and hostage-taking by inmates. Metal detectors currently in use provide at best a false sense of security for staff.

The Committee recommends that policies should be developed to regulate the movement of reasonable groups of inmates where appropriate and allow for the provision of meals, recreation and other services in their housing units to inmates who pose an unacceptable security threat.

8. The Committee recommends that DRC's Bureau of Accreditation and Standards as well as each facility's labor/management group accept the responsibility of determining whether the security systems, including portable radios, telephones and electronics, facility construction and written policies are adequate for the security level of the individual facility and that facility's mission.
9. The Department should review and monitor its policy of Administrative Control to assure that it is adequate for the inmate population of that facility.
10. Adequate beds must be available for the transfer of inmates for security reasons or because they have been identified as gang members or predators by the corrections staff.

11. The system for both the classification and reclassification of inmates and the appropriate security level needs to be re-examined. Current inmate population pressures make the system of classification non-functional at times because of the lack of beds at the appropriate security level. The classification system appears to exist in name only. During visits by the Committee, Wardens indicated they were housing inmates that belonged in other facilities, many times at a lower security level, but there was no way to transfer them to a more appropriate institution. Beds at each security level are a limited commodity and the policies must assure that inmates housed in each security level are classified appropriately at admission, and are reviewed as the inmate's conduct changes.
12. Discipline within a correctional facility needs to be fair, swift and sure. Dedicated Administrative Segregation beds need to be allocated in each facility for use by the corrections staff for those inmates violating institutional rules which endanger the safety of both inmates and staff. These beds should not be considered part of the facility's available housing capacity.
13. The employment of inmates is valuable for both the inmate and Department but these workers should not be used in jobs that allow them access to sensitive information regarding other inmates, such as inmate histories, or that could compromise the security and operation of the facility.
14. Department operating procedures, emergency or disaster plans and policies should not be stored in offices or other locations where they are accessible to inmates on a daily basis or would be available in the event of riot or unrest.
15. The Corrections Training Academy should develop and provide both pre-service and in-service training on critical safety issues such as Tactical Response, Emergency Preparedness, and Disturbance Control.
16. All inmate assaults on staff or other inmates should be fully investigated and, if appropriate, charges should be filed in the local court. The Ohio Attorney General should be asked to assign an Assistant Attorney General to prosecute these cases on behalf of the State.

III. Female Offenders and Other Special Program Needs

A. Special Needs of Female Offenders

The needs of female offenders certainly overlap but may not be completely identical with the needs of male offenders. Since the female population is the fastest growing sub-group within the Ohio system, the Department needs to monitor its operations constantly to ensure that its procedures are appropriate for that group. The Committee's research revealed that at least the following recommendations may be appropriate:

Recommendations

1. The overwhelming majority (77.8 percent) of female offenders are mothers with dependent children. Many will assume responsibility for the welfare of their children upon release. That reality suggests that it is in the best interests of the children, the women, and society to make every reasonable effort to maintain as much contact as possible between these mothers and their children during the period of incarceration. In addition, many families find that the period of re-entry is a difficult transition period. In anticipation of potential difficulties, female offenders may benefit from increased programming on parenting skills for connecting back with children after a period of separation.

2. The Committee urges DRC to take advantage of the openness of the community to the involvement of female offenders in the community. The Department may wish to explore the expansion of community involvement beyond service projects to include training or educational opportunities.

3. The Committee recommends medical services adequate to meet the increased and unique medical needs of female offenders. According to information presented to the Committee, the majority of female offenders are in the age group where their medical needs are greatest.

B. Program Concerns

Inmate idleness is both intolerable and dangerous. Regardless of the prison system's population level, the system's goal must be a meaningful work experience or a meaningful opportunity for each inmate to participate voluntarily in self-improvement programs. As a result of prison crowding, such programming has seriously deteriorated.

Recommendations

1. Program opportunities can be especially helpful for those offenders who have the potential to benefit most: young, short-term, non-violent, under-educated/unemployed offenders. Programming should be developed to meet the needs of long-term inmates.
2. Educational programs ranging from literacy training to grade school, high school and post-secondary are an essential component of institutional programming. Innovative methods, including individualized instruction, team teaching, and computer-assisted instruction, can be useful in reaching men and women who have failed in schools on the outside.
3. Work training programs must be expanded to accommodate more than the current 2 or 3 percent of the prison population. These programs must prepare people to achieve certification in their specialty and placement in a suitable institutional job as well as for post-release employment. More programs, with a broader representation of specialties, are required and more opportunities should be made available to inmates who wish to participate.
4. As population increased, meaningful work experience opportunities have decreased. A smaller percentage of inmates are now employed in Ohio Penal Industries. Every effort must be made to expand the demand for prison-made goods by state government agencies. Efforts must be made to make OPI into an off-shore source.
5. Counseling, including vocational counseling, family counseling, parenting training, social skills, survivors of domestic violence programs, programs of health-related issues, and money management classes, should be expanded where they already exist and begun elsewhere to ensure that any interested inmate has the chance to develop and grow as a human being while in prison.
6. Athletics and other physical exertion programs are important to inmate well-being and space for these activities should not be converted into inmate housing space, if at all possible. The importance of athletics and physical exertion as factors in inmate well-being and rehabilitation should be carefully examined and appropriate efforts should be undertaken to maximize the contribution they can make.
7. Religious differences and misunderstandings were a central issue in the SOCF riot. In view of the passage

of recent legislation in Congress (opposed by all state departments of corrections in the U.S.), the Department must be sensitive to protecting different religious needs in the institutional setting.

8. The Committee supports the T.I.E. (Training, Industry and Education) concept and recommends the continuation of an integrated, individualized approach to the selection of appropriate programming for each inmate.
9. The Department should consider the development of a Resource Group which would provide outside expertise in various programming areas. This Group could provide the same type of information and support to program administrators and staff as the Community Support Groups will provide the Wardens.
10. The Department recently launched a program of community service work projects using inmates. Meaningful work experiences of this type should be greatly expanded. In order to facilitate these projects, institutions will have to make maintenance and work shops available during second and third shift hours.

IV. Administrative Concerns

The Committee believes that the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction has done a remarkably good job of using inadequate resources to cope with the rapid growth of the prison population. The following suggestions are not meant to criticize the Department but rather to augment the Department's efforts.

A. Community Input and Coalition Building

DRC presently lacks a supportive constituency. It is isolated from those who use it (courts, probation departments and law enforcement) and from those who could provide private and public resources. The Department greatly needs input and support from those institutions which are most touched by it and from those which could help it. It needs a partnership with its users and supporters. To create this partnership and facilitate the needed input and support, the Committee recommends:

Recommendations

1. Each institution should have a Community Support Group modeled on the initiative already taken by DRC that includes possible resource providers, court and law enforcement representatives and interested local

citizens who could inform the Warden on needed activities, link the institution to private and public resources and advocate for institutional improvement.

2. The Governor's Select Committee should be restructured to be a resource to the Governor, the Director and to the Legislature regarding Ohio's prison problems. The Committee should have the responsibility to explore ways in which the Department can receive needed support from other components of government and from private persons and institutions. The restructured Governor's Select Committee should also work with the division of Parole and Community Services to improve parole and probation supervision practices and to link parole and probation more closely to local resources, both public and private.

B. Management Information Systems and Research

It is vital for managers to have accurate, complete and timely information on the inmates in their charge. In addition, research and analysis can provide the groundwork for intelligent and productive executive decisions.

Recommendations

1. The Inmate Progression System (the Department's mainframe-resident inmate database) is a good beginning for an inmate database but is not sufficiently comprehensive in terms of data elements nor is it available to enough staff to make it a good management tool.

The Committee recommends that additional resources, including programming and data entry staff, be committed to the upgrading and maintenance of the Department's inmate database, allowing the expansion of the database in terms of available information and ensuring the timely and accurate entry of information into the system. The goal should be to develop a system of information and tracking which is comparable to the federal system and more advanced state systems.

2. The Department needs a system which allows access to data regarding previous contacts with the criminal justice system as well as prior incarceration with the department.

The Committee recommends that information relating to an inmate's criminal history be added to the Inmate Progression System. Mandatory pre-sentence investigations for all offenders sentenced to the state prison

system constitute a basic pre-requisite for a sound Inmate Progression System.

3. The Inmate Progression System and other stand-alone databases should be available in a user-friendly environment to all department staff who have a need for the information.

We recommend the development and use of local and wide area networks, with appropriate safeguards for the security of the equipment and data.

We also recommend that the Inmate Progression System be expanded to include sufficient inmate information to allow the computerization of the production of many of the instruments used by the Department, such as the Security Classification instrument, the Parole Risk instrument and the Parole Guideline instrument.

4. In order to increase the efficiency of the Management Information System, the Committee suggests the appointment of a coordinating committee within the Department to rationalize the system and recommend additional useful applications. The value of information systems as management tools has already been demonstrated within the Department with such systems as the T.I.E. approach. The applicability of this model for other management areas should be explored.
5. The state-level offender-based tracking system and the DRC inmate database, as well as mental health and mental retardation tracking systems, should be integrated for the purpose of improving the quality and specificity of the data for all users. Currently, DRC does not know and cannot readily obtain information on how many of its prisoners have been clients of systems other than corrections (for example, mental health or mental retardation).
6. The Committee endorses the concept of a pilot program such as the Serious Habitual Offender program, an automated tracking system which identifies and monitors individuals in trouble with the law, beginning with juvenile problems.
7. At least a substantial portion of research resources should be dedicated to the conduct of research, rather than using research resources to respond to requests for routine information.
8. The research unit in DRC currently lacks the resources to do both basic and applied research and to respond to the needs of varied stakeholders in the Legislature, the courts and the media for policy research information. The Committee recommends that sufficient re-

sources be made available to permit the research unit to conduct methodologically rigorous, quantitative studies on such issues as recidivism, parole outcome and program effectiveness. The basic findings of this research should be routinely disseminated to all interested stakeholders, including presentence investigation writers, judges and probation and parole supervisors.

C. Medical and Dental Services

About 10 percent of the Department's budget is used for medical services for inmates. Although a relatively young population, the socioeconomic status and lifestyle of inmates predisposes them to a variety of ailments not seen to a comparable degree in outside populations. Special health problems include tuberculosis, hepatitis and sexually transmitted diseases. In this area the Committee offers a number of recommendations:

Recommendations

1. Minimum health care standards must be met. This includes staffing of facilities, bed space and medication. The medical system is currently being overwhelmed by population pressures, particularly at reception and intake institutions.
2. We urge the Department to exempt the medical area from policies which result in staffing below authorized levels. We urge the Department to re-evaluate the authorized staffing levels for medical personnel to reflect the increases in inmate populations in recent years.
3. Purchasing regulations should be revised so that medical staff is able to manage medical equipment purchases without inordinate delays from the state purchasing bureaucracy. The Department must purchase most supplies (medical supplies and pharmaceuticals) from the Pharmacy Service Center operated by the Department of Mental Health. The Center charges a mark-up of 8 percent. It is recommended that this "middle-man" be eliminated.
4. Some inmates characteristically over-utilize the institutional medical care system. Direct and indirect incentives (such as changes in work assignments) currently prompting inmates to over-use the system must be controlled.

5. Dental care should be expanded in those facilities where prisoners now wait more than six months for routine dental work.
6. The Committee commends the Department for providing specialized care, through its Ohio State University Hospitals contract, to inmates with special needs. The new Corrections Medical Center and the Frazier Health Center are models for the organization and delivery of medical care to the correctional system.

D. Personnel and Human Resources

We cannot overemphasize the need for adequate staffing levels and high quality personnel, both uniformed and non-uniformed. Currently, staffing is inadequate, being predicated on a smaller inmate population base. The Committee also wishes to note that it is line staff members who run Ohio's institutions twenty-four hours a day. It is vital that all staff, managers and union, operate in concert.

Recommendations

1. The Department must insist on the highest practicable standards for the recruitment of qualified persons at every level. The Committee recommends:
 - a. The Committee supports the Department's initiative in establishing centralized recruitment and assessment for Correctional Officers. This can eliminate redundancy, ensure the maintenance of standards, and enable the department to hire individuals and get them on the job quickly.
 - b. The recruitment and special emphasis on career development of qualified minorities must be emphasized. DRC should establish generous "targets" for minority hiring and promotion.
 - c. We recommend that a high school diploma or GED become a minimum standard for hiring Correctional Officers and other personnel.
 - d. The Department should reach out through advertising, job fairs and career days participation to recruit the broadest possible range of qualified candidates.
 - e. All candidates for Correctional Officer should be tested to ensure that they can work comfortably in a multicultural setting. Preference should be given to

candidates exhibiting good "people skills."

f. The Department should make every effort to avoid hiring individuals affiliated with or espousing the views of hate groups.

2. With respect to training, the Committee recommends:

a. Entry level training is vital. Pre-service training for Correctional Officers should be long enough to encompass all of the subjects and skills the Department believes are necessary for job competence.

b. Specialized in-service training, particularly for professional staff should be up-graded. Training for those called upon to perform non-routine, highly skilled functions should be mandatory. When necessary, private vendors should be employed on a contract basis to provide this training.

c. Cultural diversity training should be an integral part of both pre-service and annual in-service training of DRC staff. All current staff members should complete diversity training as soon as possible.

d. DRC should offer course materials for self-development which staff members can pursue on their own time.

e. Leadership development training programs should be expanded to include a larger number of interested staff. Successful candidates for entry into these programs should meet rigorous standards.

3. Regarding staff issues in general, we recommend:

a. An in-depth analysis of DRC human resources should be undertaken to determine whether DRC actually has sufficient staff, or has enough authorized positions, to enable the Department to accomplish its mandate. The analysis of human resource needs should look not only at the need for Correctional Officers, but also at the need for non-uniformed and professional staff.

b. The four-month probationary period for Correctional Officers (of which one month is spent in pre-service training) is often not adequate to allow the supervisor to judge the competency and potential of the probationary employee. The average probationary period nationally for new Correctional Officers is 8.2 months. Ohio's probationary period should be extended to meet the national average.

c. Special programs such as mental health services and substance abuse education and treatment must be

adequately staffed with qualified personnel. The expanded use of private and other public agency contractors is recommended.

4. Regarding labor/management relations, we recommend:

a. In order to improve morale and operations, particularly at the Correctional Officer level, an effort should be made whenever possible to involve labor representatives, in the institutions and with Central Office, in reaching decisions affecting institutional security, safety and operations (inmate movements, dining hall procedures).

b. Understanding and cooperation among labor, middle management and top management in each institution is critical for safe and efficient operation. An on-going dialogue among representatives of these groups is essential and should be regularized.

E. Management Control

A number of operational subsystems which managers use to control inmates or to chart the course of the system should be reviewed.

Recommendations

1. One of the most persistent complaints the Committee heard from prisoners concerned the institutional inmate grievance procedures. Although departmental policy requires that inmate kites be answered within a few days of receipt, inmates complained that their kites are either not answered at all or not answered within the prescribed time lines. The Committee recommends that greater efforts be made to follow prescribed procedures in responding to inmate grievances.
2. Institutional inspector training programs should be broadened to include mediation and conciliation.
3. The grievance system is designed to adjudicate individual complaints against the system. It is not designed to resolve philosophical and other disputes, particularly involving identity, tenets, dogma and practices of religious groups. In unique or unusual situations involving disputes regarding religious and philosophical dogmas and practices, the Department should consider enlisting outside expertise to help resolve these disputes. The Committee wishes to emphasize that the use of these experts should be restricted

to such one-of-a-kind events as the tuberculin testing controversy at SOCF, identified by the Department as a major precipitating factor in the riot.

4. The DRC Central Office must give serious indication that it believes in the unit management concept and will do everything necessary to make it an effective management control system.
5. The Committee supports the concept of unit management. To be successful, unit management requires physical facilities congruent with the concept. In older institutions, unit management has not been effective. The Committee urges DRC to implement unit management where feasible and to study new approaches to its implementation in older facilities.
6. Cooperation with the institutional employee unions in each institution should help in the implementation of the unit management concept.
7. DRC should ensure that the actions of unit management staff (unit managers, case managers and correctional counselors) are congruent with security needs. Unit management should not be defined as exclusively a treatment modality but as an attempt to integrate security and treatment needs.
8. The Committee recommends that DRC place greater emphasis on operational audits and proactively disseminate results of those audits to key decisionmakers in the Department and, if appropriate, to the Legislature.
9. The Committee commends the Department for recognizing the need for such audits and urges the Department to resume its practice of annual audits, expanded by the inclusion of American Correctional Association standards, as soon as practical.
10. The Committee commends the Department for recognizing the need for strategic planning and for its use of a systems approach to strategic planning.
11. DRC is encouraged to implement a strategic planning process that involves staff from all levels, that empowers them to work together to accomplish objectives, and that communicates to all stakeholders the priorities of the organization.

APPENDIX A

Governor's Select Committee on Corrections

Meetings and Tours

APPENDIX A

GOVERNOR'S SELECT COMMITTEE ON CORRECTIONS

MEETINGS AND SPEAKERS

Following its initial meeting with Governor George Voinovich and Lt. Governor Mike DeWine on May 6, 1993, the Governor's Select Committee on Corrections held a number of meetings and heard the following speakers:

<u>Date</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Speakers(s)</u>
5/12/93	DRC Central Office	Lt. Governor Mike DeWine Director Reginald Wilkinson Paul Goldberg (Executive Director, OCSEA)
6/9/93	Mansfield Correctional Institution	Warden Dennis Baker Dr. Michael Hogan (Director, Ohio Department of Mental Health) Dr. Lawrence Mendel (DRC Director of Medical Services) Dr. J. Lamar Johnson (DRC Psychological Services) Dr. Sylvester Briggs (DRC Psychological Services)
6/10/93	Lorain Correctional Institution	Warden Terry Collins David Meeker (Reception Coordinator, LORCI) Debbie Miller (Record Officer, LORCI) Lois Love (Medical Services, LORCI) Roger Overberg (DRC Chief of Classification)
6/23/93	Lebanon Correctional Institution	Warden William Dallman Norm Hills (DRC Deputy Director, North Region) Eric Dahlberg (DRC Deputy Director, South Region) David Blodgett (Chief, Bureau of Construction, Activation and Maintenance)

<u>Date</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Speakers(s)</u>
7/8/93	DRC Central Office	T.D. Taylor (DRC Chief Inspector) Warden Carole Shiplevy (Hocking Correctional) Warden Arthur Tate (Southern Ohio Correctional Facility) Niki Schwartz (Attorney)
7/14/93	Montgomery County MonDay Program	Judge John M. Meagher (Administrative Judge) Tim DePew (Administrator, MonDay Program) Jill D. Goldhart (DRC Deputy Director, Parole and Community Services)
	Dayton Correctional Institution	Warden John Manuel Director Reginald Wilkinson
7/15/93	Ohio Reformatory for Women	Warden Christine Money (ORW) Warden Barbara Nichols (Franklin Pre-Release) Acting Warden Norm Rose (Northeast Pre-Release) Dr. John Bradley (ORW Medical Director)
7/21/93	Southern Ohio Correctional Facility	Warden Arthur Tate Dorothy Evener (DRC, Chief of Personnel) Barbara White-Terry (DRC Minority Recruitment Coordinator) Cheryl Reed (DRC Assessment Center Administrator) Janis Lane (Superintendent, Corrections Training Academy)
9/1/93	Corrections Training Academy	Janis Lane, Superintendent Peter Davis (Executive Director, Correctional Institution Inspection Committee)
9/15/93	DRC Central Office	Professor C. Ronald Huff (Ohio State University, School of Public Policy and Management) Matt Meyers (DRC Office of Prisons)

<u>Date</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Speakers(s)</u>
9/15 (cont.)		Ben Bower (DRC Security Administrator) Paul Goldberg (Executive Director, OCSEA)
9/16/93	London Correctional Institution	Warden Melody Turner T.D. Taylor (DRC Chief Inspector) Jeff Carson (DRC Assistant Chief Inspector) Jeff Mathew (DRC Assistant Chief Inspector) Marc Houk (Inspector of Institutional Services, LORCI)
9/29/93	DRC Central Office	
10/13/93	Senate Office Building	Senator Betty Montgomery
10/27/93	DRC Central Office	
10/28/93	DRC Central Office	
11/11/93	DRC Central Office	
11/12/93	DRC Central Office	Vincent Nathan (Attorney, Appointed to monitor the implementation of the 21-point agreement)

APPENDIX B

TABLES

TABLE B-1
PRISON CROWDING
January 1, 1993

<u>Rank</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Inmate Population</u>	<u>Rated Capacity</u>	<u>% Over Capacity</u>
1	Ohio	37,991	21,283	78.5%
2	Hawaii	2,674	1,566	70.8
3	Maryland	18,990	11,446	65.9
4	California	103,812	62,952	64.9
5	Massachusetts	10,395	6,624	56.9
6	Nebraska	2,604	1,706	52.6
7	Wisconsin	8,812	5,952	48.1
8	Pennsylvania	24,227	16,713	45.0
9	Oklahoma	12,211	8,646	41.2
10	Federal System	71,671	52,013	37.8
11	Vermont	873	647	34.9
12	Illinois	31,640	23,535	34.4
13	Delaware	3,975	2,979	33.4
14	New Jersey	18,110	13,749	31.7
15	Michigan	35,433	27,714	27.9
16	South Dakota	1,390	1,090	27.5
17	Washington	9,027	7,256	24.4
18	Virginia	16,996	13,852	22.7
19	Montana	1,521	1,276	19.2
20	Iowa	4,995	4,214	18.5
21	Idaho	2,219	1,926	15.2
22	North Carolina	20,642	17,913	15.2
23	Maine	1,519	1,353	12.3
24	Indiana	13,166	11,991	9.8
25	Connecticut	11,055	10,393	6.4
26	Alaska	2,599	2,466	5.4
27	Arizona	16,316	15,520	5.1
28	Minnesota	3,832	3,658	4.8
29	Missouri	16,198	15,630	3.6
30	New York	61,736	60,054	2.8
31	Utah	2,968	2,897	2.5
32	South Carolina	16,327	16,216	0.7
33	Colorado	7,535	7,496	0.5
34	Arkansas	7,627	7,614	0.2
35	Nevada	5,982	5,995	-0.2
36	Georgia	25,081	25,252	-0.7
37	Oregon	6,375	6,437	-1.0
38	New Hampshire	1,758	1,800	-2.3
39	Alabama	16,035	16,456	-2.6
40	Kentucky	8,729	9,119	-4.3

<u>Rank</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Inmate Population</u>	<u>Rated Capacity</u>	<u>% Over Capacity</u>
41	Louisiana	16,350	17,128	-4.5
42	New Mexico	3,288	3,443	-4.5
43	West Virginia	1,687	1,775	-5.0
44	Mississippi	7,898	8,365	-5.6
45	Tennessee	10,569	11,440	-7.6
46	Kansas	5,930	6,460	-8.2
47	North Dakota	536	596	-10.1
48	District of Columbia	9,798	11,000	-10.9
49	Wyoming	958	1,084	-11.6
50	Florida	48,466	55,100	-12.0
51	Texas	51,592	58,672	-12.1
52	Rhode Island	2,783	3,292	-15.5

Source: 1993 *Corrections Yearbook*, Criminal Justice Institute, Inc.

TABLE B-2
CRIME RATES 1983 - 1992

<u>Year</u>	<u>Ohio Prison Population</u>	<u>Ohio Crime Rate</u>	<u>USA Crime Rate</u>
1983	18,054	4,505	5,175
1984	18,479	4,273	5,031
1985	19,864	4,187	5,206
1986	21,621	4,358	5,480
1987	23,230	4,575	5,550
1988	24,750	4,645	5,664
1989	30,153	4,733	5,741
1990	31,875	4,843	5,820
1991	33,356	5,033	5,898
1992	37,057	4,665	5,660

*Crime rate is the number of reported crimes per 100,000 population.

Source: FBI Crime Data for Ohio 1992

TABLE B-3
CRIME RATES COMPARED WITH INCARCERATION RATES

Crime Rates			Incarceration Rates		
Rank	State	Crime Rate 1992	Rank	State	Prison Pop. per 100,000
1	Dist. Columbia	11,407	1	Dist. Columbia	1,651
2	Florida	8,358	2	Louisiana	503
3	Texas	7,057	3	S. Carolina	499
4	Arizona	7,028	4	Delaware	494
5	California	6,679	5	Oklahoma	482
6	Louisiana	6,546	6	Nevada	427
7	New Mexico	6,434	7	Arizona	422
8	Georgia	6,405	8	Alabama	417
9	Maryland	6,224	9	Michigan	409
10	Nevada	6,203	10	Georgia	395
11	Washington	6,172	11	Maryland	388
12	Hawaii	6,112	12	Texas	385
13	Colorado	5,958	13	Alaska	367
14	S. Carolina	5,893	14	Arkansas	347
15	New York	5,858	15	Florida	347
16	Oregon	5,820	16	New York	347
17	N. Carolina	5,802	17	Ohio	345
18	Illinois	5,765	18	California	344
19	Utah	5,658	19	Mississippi	337
20	Michigan	5,610	20	Missouri	310
21	Alaska	5,569	21	Virginia	307
22	Oklahoma	5,431	22	N. Carolina	294
23	Kansas	5,319	23	New Jersey	290
24	Alabama	5,268	24	Tennessee	283
25	Tennessee	5,135	25	Connecticut	279
26	Missouri	5,097	26	Kentucky	275
27	New Jersey	5,064	27	Illinois	269
28	Connecticut	5,052	28	Colorado	253
29	Massachusetts	5,002	29	Indiana	248
30	Delaware	4,848	30	Rhode Island	243
31	Arkansas	4,761	31	Kansas	241
32	Indiana	4,686	32	Wyoming	225
33	Ohio	4,665	33	Idaho	220
34	Montana	4,596	34	Oregon	216
35	Minnesota	4,590	35	S. Dakota	212
36	Rhode Island	4,578	36	Pennsylvania	206
37	Wyoming	4,575	37	New Mexico	205
38	Nebraska	4,324	38	Vermont	200
39	Wisconsin	4,319	39	Hawaii	195
40	Virginia	4,298	40	Massachusetts	191

Crime Rates

<u>Rank</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Crime Rate 1992</u>
41	Mississippi	4,282
42	Idaho	3,996
43	Iowa	3,957
44	Maine	3,523
45	Vermont	3,410
46	Pennsylvania	3,392
47	Kentucky	3,323
48	New Hampshire	3,080
49	S. Dakota	2,998
50	N. Dakota	2,903
51	W. Virginia	2,609

Incarceration Rates

<u>Rank</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Prison Pop. per 100,000</u>
41	Montana	188
42	Washington	186
43	Wisconsin	180
44	Iowa	178
45	New Hampshire	165
46	Nebraska	164
47	Utah	164
48	Maine	126
49	W. Virginia	118
50	N. Dakota	88
51	Minnesota	87

Source: FBI Crime Data for 1992 and 1993 *Corrections Yearbook*, Criminal Justice Institute, Inc.

TABLE B-4
POPULATION PROJECTIONS

Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction
July 1, 1994 - July 1, 2002

	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Total</u>
July 1, 1993 (Actual*)	37,286	2,506	39,792
July 1, 1994	38,177	2,679	40,856
July 1, 1995	39,587	2,692	42,279
July 1, 1996	40,490	2,763	43,253
July 1, 1997	40,956	2,740	43,696
July 1, 1998	41,987	2,746	44,733
July 1, 1999	42,734	2,770	45,504
July 1, 2000	43,610	2,873	46,483
July 1, 2001	44,268	2,895	47,163
July 1, 2002	45,129	2,962	48,091

*Includes 343 male and 53 female furlougees.

PROJECTED CAPACITY

	<u>Capacity</u>	<u>Population Projection as Percent of Proposed Capacity</u>
July 1, 1993	21,283	187.0%
July 1, 1994	24,383	167.6
July 1, 1995	25,895	163.3
July 1, 1996	27,155	159.3

APPENDIX C

TESTIMONY OF DAVID L. BLODGETT, CHIEF
BUREAU OF CONSTRUCTION, ACTIVATION AND MAINTENANCE

APPENDIX C

TESTIMONY OF DAVID L. BLODGETT, CHIEF BUREAU OF CONSTRUCTION, ACTIVATION AND MAINTENANCE

GOVERNOR'S SELECT COMMITTEE ON CORRECTIONS LEBANON CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION JUNE 23, 1993

First of all, I would like to thank Chairman Dinitz and the Department's support staff assigned to the Committee for the invitation to address you today. The staff specifically requested that I address the issue of crowding as it impacts the physical plants and infrastructure of the institutions.

This is an area of concern that often gets overlooked as we discuss the increasing inmate population in our facilities. Generally what comes to mind are programs filled to capacity with waiting lists for openings to participate; never-ending lines of inmates at the dining halls at meal times; bunks stacked two high which are jammed end-to-end into large dormitory rooms with little aisle space between bunks; cells double-bunked with little space for movement; recreation areas filled with inmates; and dormitory wings with inmates standing, sitting, sleeping in these areas.

These pictures are vivid. You have seen them in your visits to the facilities; you will see some of them instantly re-enacted today. They paint a picture of crowding which conveys an air of apprehension for the real issues of safety and security. These two issues are dominant colors in this picture of crowding; they are primary responsibilities and at the heart of the correctional institutional component of the criminal justice system.

Hidden from view in this picture, and often overlooked as we review and discuss the crowding issue, is that of the physical plants themselves. They are in the background of the picture and provide the support that is needed, but they generally do not stand out specifically in our walk-throughs. Generally, they are only noticed for a fleeting moment before the next vivid scenario appears.

These concerns include the wear and tear on the physical structures, the demands on its utilities...electrical, heat, water, sewer, and the wear on its capital equipment which supports the operation of the facilities, without which, normal, routine procedures and institutional life functions are jeopardized. With disruptions and breakdowns in the physical plants, safety and security immediately rise to the top of the list and take on immense importance and concern. What has been taken for granted - smoothly functioning dishwashers; hot water in the showers and wash basins; heat radiating from fin tubes and radiators when it's needed; lock and door controls; hinges that allow doors to operate properly; toilets that carry away human waste; air handling units that change the air in living areas and work units to provide for proper healthful ventilation; potable drinking water in the fountains and faucets - pose immediate threats to the safety

and security of the facilities when they don't function as expected. Even a slow-down or a temporary halt to their services is suspicious in a crowded atmosphere and climate.

"Over capacity" simply means use over and above the designed use, designed capacity. When demands are put onto a structure or onto a piece of equipment in excess of its designed load or use, then problems necessarily happen.

For comparative and illustrative purposes, I have categorized the correctional institutional physical plants into three categories:

- 1) Those institutions which were designed and built as adult correctional institutions prior to the construction efforts authorized in House Bill 530, the primary prison construction program.
- 2) Those institutions in the department which are presently used as adult correctional facilities but which were not originally constructed as places of incarceration for adult felons.
- 3) Those twelve institutions which were designed and built as a result of House Bill 530 and which have opened since 1987.

The first group of institutions, those designed and built as adult correctional facilities, are six in number:

Lebanon
Marion
Chillicothe
London
Ohio Reformatory for Women
Southern Ohio Correctional Facility

These six facilities house 31% of the inmate population in the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction. These six facilities collectively are operating at 173% of the rated capacities, with the exception of the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility.

These physical plants are all more than twenty years old, with the Southern Ohio Correctional Facility being the youngest. This group of institutions all have million and multi-million dollar shower and restroom renovation projects either currently underway, recently completed, or in preliminary design. All have had major heating plant upgrades or conversions, or presently have such projects in progress. The physical abuse, the wear and tear of living and daily use of these particular facilities, is not as readily evident as that in the third group of institutions because these were constructed with harder materials and finishes than the most recent facilities. I shall explain more on this later.

The second category of facilities houses 22% of the Department's inmate population and collectively are at 170% of rated capacity. The five institutions in this category are physical plants that were neither designed nor constructed as adult correctional institutions, with perhaps the exception of one, the Lima Correctional Institution

which previously was Lima State Hospital for the Criminally Insane.

The other facilities in this category are the Hocking Correctional Institution, designed as a tuberculosis sanitarium which contained patient rooms as you would expect to find in such a hospital. The walls defining these rooms were removed in the renovation transitions to reveal large open dormitories

The Orient Correctional Institution, a campus type facility of cottages for mentally retarded individuals; its companion, the Pickaway Correctional Institution, also a campus complex for mentally retarded individuals at the Orient site; and the Southeastern Correctional Institution at Lancaster, previously the Boys' Industrial School, a campus-style set of buildings for juvenile offenders.

These five facilities have been reconditioned to house 22% of the Department's adult inmate population and are also operating at 170% of recommended rated capacity.

Some components of the physical plants of these five units are in bad shape and antiquated, although they have received capital improvement attention since their acquisitions and transfers to the departments.

An important consideration with this group is that they were not designed for felons; they were not expected to take the abuse and wear and tear of adults, which, in turn, is compounded by their housing 70% more individuals than the rated design capacity recommendation.

Capital projects which address the infrastructure at these facilities include a \$4 million shower renovation project at the Orient Correctional Institution, a \$440,000 shower renovation project administered at the Pickaway Correctional Institution, a \$2.8 million project administered over a ten year period to address the heating and hot water supply systems for both the Pickaway and the Orient Correctional Institutions, and a \$600,000 project to initially address the water and steam distribution system at the complex. Also, major electrical power upgrades and electrical distribution system renovation occurred at this complex for a cost of \$800,000.

The fact that these facilities were renovated into correctional facilities poses special and unique problems. Compounding this is the crowding issue in antiquated facilities not designed for such correctional use.

The third group of institutions are those twelve new institutions the Department has activated since 1987. These twelve institutions, authorized by funds available in House Bill 530; are currently operating at an average of 200% of design capacity. These 12 institutions house 47% of the Department's inmate population. Although nice and new, these facilities were not designed nor intended to operate at this level. Rather they were intended to operate at slightly above design, possible at the 140% level of capacity, certainly not at the 200%. Consequently, these new facilities face distinct problems of their own and not something you would expect to

find in recently opened facility.

As a group, you recently visited the Lorain Correctional Institution which houses almost three times its design capacity. The sewage lines leading waste from the facility are at capacity; the hot water generating capabilities are at peak performance; the grease traps in the kitchen are overloaded and require constant attention and maintenance. The heating and ventilation systems cannot function properly as designed. Warden Collins related to several of you that because the HVAC system was designed with heat regulated by the temperature in the central dayroom areas, in the winter time, cells cannot not be maintained at a comfortable temperature. The heating and ventilation system equipment and balancing was designed for activity in the dayroom areas and was not designed with the extra heat in mind that is produced by the conversion of the dayroom to living quarters. Also, the ventilation system, including the circulation and mixing of fresh air in the living areas as well as the ventilation of moist air from the shower areas, is overworked and not capable of functioning at the correct volume considering the crowded quarters.

One area of all institutions which has suffered the effects of crowding is that of the shower/restroom areas. All institutions in the first two categories have extensive shower/restroom renovation projects.

It is ironic that water, which is primary for our existence, is also one of the most damaging and destructive elements. Leaking showers contribute to extensive structural problems. You will see that in certain areas of this facility today. This, coupled with the damage caused by constant water vapor and the inability to adequately ventilate these humid areas, solicits damage. The over-use of the shower areas does not permit the rooms to dry out. Major renovation projects result. This problem is compounded in the second group of institutions- those not initially designed for adult prisoners - because their shower areas were added upon transfer to the Department for prison use. The original design of the facilities did not anticipate this need; especially they did not anticipate use as an adult male facility to incarcerate inmates.

Major shower projects include a recently completed extensive remodeling of Marion for \$1 million; shower floor, ceiling, and floor replacement at SOCF for \$400,000; and four projects in preliminary design: at Chillicothe Correctional Institution for \$4 million; at the Pickaway Correctional Institution for \$400,000; and the beginning of a project at the Ohio Reformatory for Women which has an ultimate estimated price tag of \$1 million.

Water treatment and waste water treatment sewage plants are strategically impacted by the crowding. Earlier, I mentioned sewage lines at capacity; at the sewage lift station at the Grafton Correctional Institution which services both that facility and the Lorain Correctional Institution, pumps which were designed and intended to pump alternately and sporadically, now run three times more than designed. The lift station is designed to store 70,000 gallons of sewage while aerating it at the same time in order to equalize the flow of sewage

from the facilities to the treatment plant. Such cannot be done; rather, pumping must be constant with no equalization of the flow nor aeration of the product. The station is pumping 650,000 per day of sewage to the treatment plant that expected a flow of 470,000 gallons equalized over a 24 hour period. This is a difference of 180,000 gallons per day.

At the Chillicothe Correctional Institution, a plant designed to treat and pump 1.4 million gallons of water/sewage per day is currently processing 1.75 million gallons of sewage per day.

The average water use in a correctional institution is 150 gallons per day per inmate. This does not differ significantly with that found in the private sector. Those institutions, however, which have agricultural and large industrial settings average 200 gallons per day per inmate. Crowding causes water treatment capability problems in present plants, as well as water storage considerations. At the Chillicothe Correctional Institution, the water plant was designed to treat 1.7 million gallons of water per day; treatment now is at 1.95 million gallons per day, 250,000 gallons per day more than recommended. The water demand at peak periods, which exceeds the production capacity, is necessarily supplemented with treated water held in storage. The reserve tank is filled at night during quiet, little used/demand periods, in preparation for the demand supply needed during the peak usage periods.

The demands on the support systems do not permit shut-downs or slow downs for maintenance purposes, especially that of a preventative nature. Yet, such maintenance is necessary in order to keep the system functioning. We have a type of "Catch 22" position. The three pumps I mentioned earlier at the Grafton Correctional Institution which service Lorain and Grafton cannot be shut down; they must continually pump. To save the situation, we recently installed a bypass so that if something happens, we can continue pumping.

The same situation surely describes other equipment and facility maintenance situations. Dishwashers, for example, as well as most pieces of equipment in the food service areas, are critical to the operation of a facility. These areas, however, are in almost constant operation with shut down almost impossible. Dishwashers themselves take tremendous beatings from the constant use and overload. Their life expectancy is shortened greatly without constant vigilant attention.

Four new institutions have recently replaced their original dishwashers which are less than three years old- Lorain, Ross, Allen and Warren Correctional Institutions. The constant hard use and the constant humidity in the area play havoc with the systems.

Related to this are the demands on maintenance and support staff. The more and longer equipment and facilities are taxed, the more critical becomes preventative maintenance. Preventative maintenance requires staff and dedicated attention to schedules, the same as the automobile you drove here today requires regular oil changes, transmission checks, battery checks, new brake linings, etc. Without

these attentions, serious problems occur which would take your auto out of circulation. Such is the same with this equipment in the correctional institution. Only this equipment suffers the extra burden of over-demands plus another factor, that of a lack of personal ownership. The personal attention you may give your own auto to make sure it is in working order may not apply to this equipment which belongs to no one personally. Regular preventative maintenance requires staff; and additional staff in this area has not been a luxury.

For the past ten years, five capital improvement biennium episodes, a total of \$124 million has been channeled toward capital improvements projects in the correctional institutions. These amounts have been steadily rising from an initial appropriation of \$13.5 million, then \$19 million, followed by \$25 million in the fiscal years 89-90; \$26 million in fiscal years 91-92; and the largest, \$40 million, in fiscal years 93-94.

Although these figures are large, they still do not address all the projects and capital needs identified. They hit the most critical. The present six-year capital plan submitted for consideration included projects for the first biennium totaling \$220 million; the next two-year period contained projects totaling \$229 million. Only a fraction were funded.

In the HB 350 prison construction program, in order to both stretch the construction dollar to fund more beds as well as to develop a more residential and relaxed internal atmosphere, the interior of the compounds were designed to be soft in nature with well supported and hard perimeter security shells and envelopes. The use of soft materials, as cost savings measures, in conjunction with designed security levels, brought with it the requirement for constant and necessary maintenance. Harder, more expensive materials require less attention. An example of this direct correlation is that of floor coverings--vinyl floor tile, at the low end of the cost requires constant and careful attention. With proper maintenance, their life expectancy is extended. Going up the line, to more expensive floor coverings and that which requires less maintenance are monolithic plastic type poured/troweled covered floors. At the top of the line, we find terrazzo floors which are very expensive, yet they last years with little maintenance. But if one opts for less expensive materials in floors, one opts for more maintenance.

The same analysis and comparison applies to doors and hardware--locks, hinges, handles etc. Three grades are in use, commercial, institutional, security. Each is more substantial than the next; each is more expensive than the next. More maintenance is required at the lower level. In order to stretch the construction dollars, doors and hardware were selected depending upon intended usage and population numbers. Commercial hardware is used, which required more maintenance, but crowding and overuse taxes this lighter equipment, yet initial costs prohibited the heavier hardware throughout the facilities. The need for maintenance was central to this decision concept to achieve more beds but crowding has put additional demands on the system which has, in turn, reduced maintenance time.