



UPAN Newsletter Volume 4 Number 5 | MAY 2017

"Empowerment and Growth Through Knowledge and Unity"

* * * * *

New Prison Update, SOTP Audit Part 2, IPP Issues

NEXT UPAN MEETING: MONDAY, June 12, 2017 6:30 – 8:30 PM

Location: Kafeneio Coffee House 258 WEST 3300 SOUTH SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84115

Topic: Parole issues related to employment, housing, resources.

NO JULY UPAN MEETING

UPAN AUGUST MEETING: Monday, August 14 6:30 - 8:30 PM

Location: Kafeneio Coffee House 258 WEST 3300 SOUTH SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84115

Topic: Legislative Performance Audit of SOTP, the auditors will be guest speakers.

FOCUS MEETING: Monday, June 5, 2017 6:00 PM – 8:00 PM

Location: Region 3 Adult Probation & Parole Office, 36 W. Fremont Ave (Just West of State St.)
Salt Lake City **Topic:** Adult Probation and Parole

In This Issue:

Meeting Announcements, UPAN Newsletter Contents in this issue and UPAN Disclaimer	Page 1
For Inmates: Mailing Updates <u>AND</u> Volunteers Needed To Mail UPAN Newsletters to Inmates	Page 2
Update On New Utah State Prison, by Molly Prince And Others	Pages 3-4
Explaining Criminogenic Risk/Needs Assessments (Helpful in reading SOTP Audit article)	Pages 4-5
Follow Up On SOTP Audit (Part 2) – Risk Assessments And Pre-Treatment, by Molly Prince	Pages 5-6
New Day In Daggett? – Future Plans For A Model Facility	Pages 7-8
IPP Issues, compiled from inmates and families' concerns	Pages 8
You Can't Sugarcoat IPP, by (Name/initials withheld) <u>Should Be Mandatory Reading By All</u>	Pages 9-10
UPAN Contact Information and List of UPAN Directors/Officers	Page 10

* * * * *

Disclaimer: Formulate your own opinions about the information presented.
This information is presented for the reader's enlightenment and evaluation.

UPAN DOES NOT PROVIDE LEGAL SERVICES OR ADVICE. PLEASE DO NOT SEND US LEGAL DOCUMENTS.

Note: A summary of the May UPAN meeting will appear in the June issue. Out of space. Ed.

Attitude is a little thing that makes a big difference. Winston Churchill

You are never too old to set another goal or to dream a new dream. C. S. Lewis

FOR INMATES: MAILING UPDATES

Change of Mailing Address

We're asking all inmates to please notify UPAN of facility housing changes-of-address or release. We have a lot of inmate newsletters returned due to moves to different facilities, including county jails. **Please notify us** of those changes as soon as you can when they occur. This way the volunteers who send your newsletters in to you are not wasting funds because the newsletter can't be delivered. **[Editor's Note:** Each newsletter costs about \$1.19, with back-to-back five sheets (10-pages) 65 cents, envelope 5 (five) cents, and stamp 49 cents. You can add it up to check my math. One commercial print shop I priced once, wanted 28 cents for one back-to-back sheet, times 5 = \$1.40 plus envelope and stamp for a total per newsletter of \$1.94. That's EACH! Ouch! **Ed.]** Thank you for those change-of-address notices.

Prepaid Postage From Inmates

We would like to thank all inmates who send us envelopes with the postage prepaid to try to help with mailing costs, it is very helpful. It would be most helpful to us if they were not already addressed. Sometimes they are addressed to inmates who receive their newsletters from one of our volunteers who live outside the Salt Lake Valley and it is not always possible to get that envelope to the volunteer. Some of our volunteers who mail newsletters for us even live outside of Utah! The blank envelopes you send are than used by the main UPAN directors to respond to letters from inmates or given to those volunteers who attend our meetings and send newsletters out to inmates.

Newsletter Mailing From Loved Ones

VOLUNTEERS NEEDED TO MAIL OUT INMATE NEWSLETTERS

We're Volunteers And Would Love To Have More

UPAN currently has about 38 volunteers who are dedicated to print and mail out monthly newsletters to approximately 275 incarcerated individuals who don't have family or friends in the community to do so. Our waiting list of inmates who have no one to mail in to them is growing weekly and more requests coming in daily.

Participation Warms Everyone's Heart

UPAN directors as well as the inmates that receive the newsletters DEEPLY APPRECIATE the volunteers who currently print and mail out newsletters each month to the individuals they are assigned. If you are interested in becoming a newsletter mailing volunteer, please email us and let us know of your interest and how many newsletters you would be able to mail out each month.

Please Read And Help Us Serve You Better

We have volunteers who mail newsletters to any inmates **who have no family or friends to do so**. If you have loved ones who are willing and able to print and send you the newsletter, that is the easiest way for you receive it. Ask your loved ones to contact us (email address below) to receive a newsletter by email. They can read it and then print it front and back and mail it to you. ***Please let us know if you are on our mailing list but have loved ones who are sending it to you and we will remove you from our list.*** This opens up spots for our volunteers to mail newsletters to other inmates who have no one to do so for them. Email: utahprisoneradvocate@gmail.com

Inmates Who Are Releasing

If you will be releasing from prison in the coming month or two, please send us notification of your release date, and if you will be paroling to a community correctional center, and the name of the halfway house. If you do not know the halfway house address but do know which one, let us know that. Once you have been released you can request our newsletters using email address above.

Help Reduce Our Frustrations And Disappointments

If you don't notify us of your release date, our volunteers waste their valuable time, paper, ink, envelopes, stamps (\$\$\$) sending a newsletter, only to have it returned by the prison or county jail. The prison doesn't forward mail. Sometimes it takes over a month to occur, so more than one month's newsletter is sent out in vain. **Thank you!**

Simple Procedures; Here's What's Required

Once the newsletter is complete, we email you a copy as an attachment, which you can then print. The newsletter is generally 10 pages long, so if you print it front and back, that ends up being 5 pages, which then fits into a standard #10 envelope and can be mailed for 1 Forever stamp. Anything more exceeds one ounce and requires additional postage (second-ounce postage is 23 cent stamp). When considering how many inmates you would be able to mail to, please consider the cost of paper, printing ink, envelopes, and postage.

We have inmates wanting the newsletter who are located in both Draper and Gunnison prisons as well as on Inmate Placement Program in county jails throughout the state. Email address: utahprisoneradvocate@gmail.com

* * * * *

**"Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world.
Indeed, it is the only thing that ever has." Margaret Mead**

UPDATE ON NEW UTAH STATE PRISON

by Molly Prince including information offered on the New Utah State Correctional Facility website and from a 4/15/17 Salt Lake Tribune article by Brady McCombs

Meeting For Transparency & Accurate Information

On March 21st, UPAN Directors Shauna Denos, Michael McAinsh and Molly Prince attended a stakeholders roundtable meeting for the new Utah State Prison. Governor Herbert requested that a meeting between stakeholders and the State be held for purposes of transparency and the dissemination of accurate information as the building of the new prison proceeds. The meeting was hosted by the Department of Corrections and the Utah Department of Administrative Services to provide updates on the development of the new Utah State Correctional Facility and to answer questions and seek input from community interest groups. About two dozen members of the community attended, representing various organizations, along with government officials.

Groundbreaking Scheduled For June 15th

Maria Peterson, UDC Public Information Officer welcomed the group and facilitated introductions. Project Director, Steve Turley spoke first by giving a status report that included a discussion about the haul-road construction, the plans for utility lines, and the project groundbreaking that is scheduled for June 15, 2017. In addition, he discussed the logistics and timeline for bringing in the one million tons of needed fill to prepare the site for construction.

New Programs Examined Before Implementation

Director of Institutional Programming, Dr. Victor Kersey, answered the group's questions that had been sent in prior to the meeting. The focus was programming. Dr. Kersey made it clear that in order for a program to be implemented, it must show quantifiable evidence that it reduces recidivism, increases safety, or increases an inmate's employability after he/she gets released.

New Goal: Normalizing Life Within The Prison

Directors Turley and Kersey also spoke about the importance of normalizing life within the correctional facility and the efforts being made to ensure that inmates' lives remain as normal as possible. The new prison has plans to have cafeteria style dining facilities. Other shifts into normalcy and responsibility that were mentioned will include inmates taking their own laundry to be done rather than having it picked up and delivered to their cells, and making appointments for haircuts. If inmates engage in normative behavior while incarcerated, they are more likely to be successful when released. This is the new correctional facility design goal.

Questions and comments were posed and discussed by a variety of other attendees that included Anna Thomas of the ACLU; Jim Taylor, a Salt Lake realtor; David Pace representing arts and culture in Utah; Rep. Luz

Escamilla; Don Wright of PrisonEd; Kurt Guner of SLCC Prison Program; Erin Castro of UPEP; and others.

Visits: Contact, Barrier, And Even Remote Video

Molly asked and we were assured by Dir. Turley that the *new Utah State Prison will continue to offer contact visits as well as barrier visits*. Possibly there will also be the opportunity for remote video visiting, which would be useful for families who live long distances away and cannot travel to the Salt Lake area to visit their loved one.

Safety Training Required for All Site Visitors

On March 27, the Utah Department of Administrative Services and the Utah Department of Corrections hosted a required safety training for any media personnel who wish to visit the new correctional facility site. Anyone who wants to visit the site is required to go through this mandatory training. Approximately two dozen members of local media outlets attended and can now be granted limited access to the site. The state plans to hold two additional safety training sessions in the near future.

Estimated Costs, Completion, And Move-In Dates

The new state prison is expected to cost \$650 million and the projected completion date is November 2020. Inmates will start moving in during 2021 and it is anticipated to take approximately six months for the moving process to be completed.

The Utah Legislature has approved \$240 million in bonds to be issued for the prison project for fiscal year beginning July 1, 2017. There will be a total of \$570 million in bonds allocated over the next three years to fund the building of the prison. The initial \$80 million was allocated in 2015.

Design Goals: Normalize Behavior & Interactions

Kevin Miller, President of GSBS Architects, designers of the prison, said the goal of the design is to "foster normal behavior and interactions between inmates and corrections officers rather than having inmates only be able to see guards who are behind thick glass." The UDC has adopted the direct supervision model for the new prison. This approach has been shown to be more effective throughout US prisons in terms of fostering safety in housing units and in the institution as a whole.

Different Types Of Housing For Different Behaviors

The new prison will include several different types of housing areas, and the assignment of inmates to those units will be based on the offenders' behavior. For example, individuals who do well and follow rules would be allowed to live in areas with common bathrooms rather than toilets in their cells, and they would have their own bed rather than a bunk-style arrangement.

By contrast, inmates who have broken the rules would be in traditional prison cells – bunk beds and “restrooms nearby” according to McCoombs’ article in the Tribune. Miller is quoted as saying “we are reinventing in many ways, how corrections are delivered in the state of Utah.” Prisoners who pose more danger to others will

be housed in maximum security housing with more protections afforded both correctional staff and other inmates. The prison will have the capacity to house 4000 persons, with potential for expansion if necessary. For updates on the new prison go to: <https://newutahstateprison.utah.gov/>

The degree of civilization in a society can be judged by entering its prisons. -- Fyodor Dostoyevsky

EXPLAINING CRIMINOGENIC RISK / NEEDS ASSESSMENTS

REFERRED TO IN THE PERFORMANCE AUDIT OF SOTP (In Preparation for Next Article In This Newsletter)

By Molly Prince

This article was first published in UPAN’s March 2016 Newsletter in response to the Legislative Audit of the Board of Pardons and Parole. We believe it is useful to publish it again due to the large number of inquiries UPAN has received due to the SOTP Audit regarding risk assessments.

The Jargon - Definition of Criminogenic

A system, situation, or place causing or likely to cause criminal behavior. Any factor that produces or contributes to the cause of crime or criminality.

What Are Criminogenic Risk Factors?

The following information is adapted from the article *Criminogenic Risk Assessments* by Jeanette Kinard and Jessica Johnson, published October 2, 2014 in Voice for the Defense Online, website address: www.voiceforthedefenseonline.com

Both internal and external factors contribute to criminal behavior and recidivism. These factors, known as risk factors, are split into two categories: dynamic and static. **Static factors** are those that **cannot** be changed, like gender, like criminal history, family criminality, age at first admission to a correctional facility, number of prior incarcerations, and the commitment offense. These are related to crime and recidivism, however they cannot be changed through education, treatment, punishment, etc.

Dynamic risk factors are factors that **can** change or be changed through education or treatment. They may fluctuate over the course of one’s life. Examples of dynamic factors can be where one lives, how one makes a living (environment); friends and associations; one’s belief system, attitudes, and core values; substance use; process addictions such as gambling, pornography; inadequate social skills; and employment status.

Dynamic risk factors are also known as criminogenic risk factors or criminogenic needs. They are directly associated with the choice to commit crime. The term criminogenic takes into account that “Offenders have many needs deserving of treatment but not all of these needs are associated with their criminal behavior.”

Criminogenic risk factors are those that can and should be identified and then addressed through the delivery of services. Various scholars, researchers, and other sources have compiled extensive lists of criminogenic risk factors, many of which overlap. According to

Kinard and Johnson, the Texas Administrative Code lists “antisocial peers; antisocial beliefs, values, and attitudes; substance abuse, dependency, or addiction; anger or hostility; poor self-management skills; inadequate social skills; poor attitude toward work or school; and poor family dynamics.”

Of the overlapping factors, those repeatedly asserted to be the most closely related to recidivism are an antisocial personality pattern (marked by impulsiveness, aggression, stimulation seeking); pro-criminal attitudes/antisocial thinking processes (such as negative attitudes towards the law, values, thinking styles, and general attitudes supportive of crime); and social supports for crime (criminal friends, isolation from prosocial others). Other criminogenic risk factors also related to recidivism include substance abuse, employment instability and/or dissatisfaction, family problems, and a lack of involvement in prosocial leisure activities.”

Why Are Criminogenic Needs Important?

The Risk-Needs-Responsivity (RNR) model, provides a means to assess and treat offenders in order to reduce recidivism. The RNR model is made of three core principles: 1) the risk principle, 2) the needs principle, and 3) the responsivity principle, all are based on criminogenic risk factors and needs.

1) The **risk principle** contends that “supervision and treatment levels should match the offender’s level of risk,” meaning that “low-risk offenders should receive less supervision and services, and higher-risk offenders should receive more intensive supervision and services.” It should be noted that research has also found that putting low risk offenders into more intensive supervision and services has the potential to backfire and cause them to become more high risk. So matching risk level to the level of supervision, intervention, and treatment is vital.

2) The **needs principle** states that the effective use of intervention services focuses on targeting an offender’s criminogenic needs. This principle acknowledges that though some static risk factors, such as criminal history,

play a role in the likelihood of recidivism, they cannot be altered; therefore, those involved in sentencing decisions should target an offender's criminogenic needs because they can potentially be altered through the delivery of services.

3) The **responsivity principle** is based on the idea that the key to reducing recidivism is targeting the offender's criminogenic needs by placing them in cognitive-behavioral programs and other forms of treatment that are the most likely to help the offender change thinking processes and behavior. To simplify, the idea is to place offenders in programs that address their criminogenic needs using strategies that have proven to be the most effective regardless of the type of offender. These should also include prosocial modeling (learning by example) while also focusing on the offender's strengths, personality, motivation, learning ability and style, gender, race, and cultural characteristics.

Risk/Needs Assessments (RNA)

An RNA can be compared to a "uniform report card that measures offenders' criminal risk factors and specific needs," which if addressed and changed, will reduce the likelihood of involvement in future criminal activity. These assessments are most often questionnaires that are used by an interviewer (anyone from a correctional officer to a case manager, to a trained therapist, depending upon the specific assessment used). The questionnaire explores the offenders' behaviors and attitudes that research shows are related to criminal reoffending. These instruments usually include questions about both static and dynamic risk factors.

Parole boards have begun using these assessments in a movement nationally to improve parole decisions. Supervising agencies (such as Adult Probation and Parole) use RNA to determine the level of supervision an offender needs, to determine the need for specialized treatment programs, and to develop an offender's supervision plan. They are also used to help make decisions about sanctions and revocations when someone violates parole. These instruments also have a use within correctional institutions for programming and education.

"Within our own society, we jail more prisoners than any other country in the world, 85 percent of them people of nonwhite races — red, black, brown, and yellow". – Robert Thurman (author & academic)

FOLLOW UP ON SOTP AUDIT: RISK ASSESSMENTS and PRE-TREATMENT

by Molly Prince

According to the 2017 Legislative Performance Audit of Utah's Sex Offender Treatment Program, there needs to be an incorporation of the Risk-Needs-Responsivity principle into SOTP. **[Ed. Note: Numbered paragraphs correspond to those in the preceding article.]**

1) RISK – The audit states, "The risk principle requires that offenders be assessed their risk of re-offense. Once the level of risk is determined (low, medium, or

According to Kinard and Johnson, there are over 60 different recidivism-related risk assessment instruments that are currently in use throughout the U.S. Some are specific to certain offenses, such as the risk of sex offender recidivism, or violating parole, 12 of these types of instruments are widely used and fairly well known. For example, the Ohio Risk Assessment System (ORAS) is one of the 12 most widely used RNA instruments nationally for general use.

Research over the past 20 years suggests that the use of RNA can significantly assist in reducing recidivism. Further, some studies have found that in some cases, conditions of probation or parole that don't appropriately target the offender's most critical dynamic risk factors are counter-productive wasting time and resources by requiring both the parole officer and offender to participate in activities that are "unlikely to reduce risk and distract both from focusing on the critical risk factors that do affect the likelihood of recidivism."

Proper use of RNA can be very beneficial in Utah's paroling process as well as the supervision of probation and parole. However, these risk assessments must be used appropriately and be applied in a culturally and gender sensitive manner.

One consideration that Utah needs to examine is that many of the assessment tools were originally developed for and tested on men. If these are applied to women, they could result in "over-classification of women offenders and sometimes a higher monitoring level for women than their behavior warrants."

Also, because many of the instruments were developed using small, homogenous sample sets, when applied to populations different from the original sample, the validity of the RNA is reduced. An example given by Kinard and Johnson states, "assessing risk on a population that is largely Native American and rural with a tool that was developed on a population of urban African Americans will not produce optimal results." Utah's prison system will need to be careful that they use appropriate assessments for all of our diverse populations.

high), the amount or dosage of treatment is likewise determined, with high-risk offenders receiving more treatment." In other words, to treat based on risk means to match the level and intensity of treatment with the level of risk to re-offend.

UPAN has been receiving a number of questions from inmates and families about how the risk assessments will be implemented and how the Board of Pardons and

Parole (BOPP) will be notified of the offender's level of risk. I sent some questions regarding this process to Institutional Programming Director Victor Kersey and will share some of his responses here.

He has advised that the initial, pre-treatment risk assessment will be assessed by the inmate's caseworker using a STATIC-99R. He reports that assessment has already been going to the Board for initial board hearings. In addition to the initial risk assessments, there are more reports that can be completed for the Board to make more informed decisions about offender risks and needs.

Dr. Kersey is working with Board Executive Director Greg Johnson to standardize the process by which the BOPP requests specific reports and assessments. An example he gave is that the DOC will provide the BOPP with some standard referral questions so they "can more appropriately and intelligently request specific functions of the SOTP and we will all be singing from the same sheet of music."

2) NEEDS – The needs principle cited by the Audit requires that treatment be individualized to target an offender's risk factors. These are factors that can change over time such as active substance abuse, versus being clean for a period of time, to social and environmental factors that also can change in a person's life over time. It also will address individualized needs of the offender in terms of cognitive function, disabilities and other factors.

According to Kersey, each offender is administered a LS/RNR for measuring criminogenic risk factors and needs. (See preceding article on Criminogenic Risk/Needs assessments explaining RNR.) He also advised me that Institutional Programming tracks original hearing and rehearing dates so they are aware of when someone is quickly approaching their date.

3) RESPONSIVITY – The principle of responsivity states that treatment is most effective when treatment interventions match an individual's learning styles and capabilities. The Audit states, "For a sex offender who is cognitively disabled to fully grasp treatment concepts, treatment must be tailored to their learning abilities." The term cognitive disability is used to include a variety of medical and mental conditions that affect different types of mental tasks, such as problem solving, attention span, memory, and reading comprehension.

Standardizing Risk Assessment Processes

Dr. Kersey is working to standardize the risk assessment process in terms of both the actual assessment tools used and the timeline when they are

administered.

He responded, "If one thing is for certain, each offender will receive an LS/RNR in the first 30 days of incarceration; however, if they are serving a 15 to Life, it wouldn't make much sense to administer a sexual risk assessment that early in their incarceration." This is because if they will be serving at least 15 years then the Board is not going to release them below their bottom number.

The LS/RNR assesses the rehabilitation needs of offenders, their risk of recidivism, and the most relevant factors related to supervision and programming; offers gender-informed norms; focuses on offender strengths; and captures the risks, needs, and responsivity of the offender.

In April, UPAN directors met with Greg Johnson of the BOPP to discuss ideas of how soon the Board wants to receive risk assessments from the DOC for sex offenders prior to their original hearing. It was suggested that during the first year of incarceration is a good time for an initial risk assessment and gives adequate time for the Board to have all risk assessments in their hands prior to the Original Hearing. Dr. Kersey seems to be doing everything he can to address this aspect of the recommendations of the Audit

Introducing New S O Pre-Treatment Program

Kersey also announced that he has identified and purchased the new evidence based S O Pre-Treatment program that the DOC will be putting into place. It will provide an increased number of individuals in both Draper and CUCF, who are currently awaiting admission into SOTP, to participate in the new Pre-Treatment phase of SOTP. This should help them adjust to regular SOTP more quickly and easily. It is unknown when the Pre-Treatment program will actually be implemented, but in the coming weeks there will be staff / provider training in it, and an offender orientation on the new program, in both Draper and CUCF.

Explaining The Time-Frames For Implementation

We need to remember that it all takes time to not only identify how they will make the targeted changes, but also the implementation details. Also the process of training correctional staff and therapists in the new procedures and processes. Dir. Kersey seems to be continuing to be responsive to the Audit recommendations. He said, "This process is like turning a battleship around in a bathtub. It will take significant time, coordination, and overhaul before we get where we want to be."

"To make no mistakes is not in the power of man; but from their errors and mistakes the wise and good learn wisdom for the future." Plutarch

"Whoever said small things don't matter never saw a spark start a wildfire". Anonymous

A New Day in Daggett?

by Molly Prince

On April 23, 2017, UPAN President Shauna Denos, her husband Rusty, and I were invited to a meeting by Jerry Steglich, a former Daggett County Commissioner and current LDS 1st Counselor and volunteer in Daggett County Jail, to discuss education, work programs, and other possible self-improvement programs the community leaders have a vision for once the problems there are resolved and they can re-open the jail.

Attendees included the current interim jail commander Adam Gonzalez, Jerry Steglich, and a variety of community and LDS Church leaders: Dr. Northcott, Superintendent of Daggett County School District; the ED Tech / Assessment Director of Daggett County School District; the Principal of Manila High School; the Regional Directors for LDS Correctional Services; the 2nd Counselor Green River Branch; the Addiction Recovery Missionaries, LDS Church at Daggett; and the Branch President Green River 8th Branch - assigned to Daggett County Jail. Unable to attend, but also very interested in expanding programs for the jail were the Pastor of Grace Community Baptist Church and the educator of Utah State University.

At the time of this meeting, we were still in the dark about the unconscionable behaviors by a few of the deputies and the failures of County Sheriff Jorgensen. However, we were pleased to learn that the acting jail commander and these other leaders are very invested in the opportunity for a new direction that the jail will be taking to improve the support and volunteer services in the areas of educational programs and work programs in the jail once it is up and running again under a new culture and with new administration.

Increasing The Number Of Courses Offered

Prior to its closing, it is our understanding that Daggett only offered GED and High School Diploma courses, as well as Thinking For A Change, Anger Management, Addiction Recovery, and others. Adam Gonzalez states, "It is our view that these course offerings can continue to be made available while also offering courses suited to the specific needs of the inmate population being housed. And by involving the inmates directly, we believe that we can better assess and address their most urgent needs." They are hoping to be able to expand that to include some college courses. Sarah Lamb, of Utah State, was unable to attend this meeting, but we were told she is on board to expand educational opportunities if the new jail administration will support this.

Dr. Northcott and Jerry Steglich have a vision (supported by the others) that this could become a model of what jail rehabilitative programs could be - spiritual improvement, as well as vocational training, self-help and recovery, work programs, and other programs to help build the skills of the incarcerated.

The educational programs would also help to prepare them for success in the community upon release.

Rehabilitation Favored Over Warehousing

They made it clear to us that they want to move into a rehabilitative direction rather than a warehousing approach that they feel the old administration was stuck in. We were able to become more familiar with the jail and what it can offer even in such a remote location. We liked that they have some outside recreation opportunity with a basketball hoop, as well as a courtyard type of rec area, and a gardening area. UPAN has issues with jails that don't offer outdoor yard time and recreation opportunities for our long-term prisoners.

It is a possibility, that with a new Sheriff and staff that are trained in rehabilitation and are supportive of a culture that promotes dignity, respect, safety, as well as quality programs and employment programs, this could provide the opportunity for state inmates to benefit from going out to Daggett - if the right inmates are chosen to fit with the programs they will be offering.

All present at this meeting were very interested in exploring any options that may be available. The Regional Directors for the LDS Church have a vision of using a variety of volunteers from the community and surrounding areas to help facilitate various programs. These plans and programs would keep Daggett from being simply a housing / warehousing situation and become a stronger facility that can truly make a difference. *NOTE: Many of these programs would not be formal DOC programming such as substance abuse or sex offender treatment. Unless they could recruit qualified licensed therapists to provide those types of programs, SOTP and SATP would not likely be provided due to the remote location of the jail.*

Goal: More Can Be Done And Should Be Done

It seems that the most important thing that came out of this get acquainted and brainstorming meeting was the idea that we can agree that through collaboration and under the new administration (based on the DOC's direction that Daggett must transform its correctional culture) in the words of Gonzalez, "more can be done, and more should be done." They expressed desire and dedication to figuring out ways to provide our inmates with a broader array of opportunities. They were interested in UPAN's ideas of what our inmates need to help them become more successful both while incarcerated and upon release.

Visiting Is Barrier, Not Video-Only

Visiting in Daggett is in-person barrier visiting rather than video visiting. This is a plus compared to so many Utah jails that have pay per view video-only visiting as their only option. While contact visits are the best,

especially for inmates incarcerated for long terms, actually seeing our loved ones in person even through glass is much better than the video only option.

Goal Details: Dignity, Respect, Healing & Growth

Acting jail commander Adam Gonzalez comes from Washington state with a background in security and has worked in the correctional field in Utah this past year. He has examined programming opportunities from several other states. It appears that Mr. Gonzalez is very oriented to treating the individuals in the custody and care of the county/state with dignity and respect, and offering them a chance to heal their issues, grow, and work to reach their potential. He hopes to provide an environment that will help prisoners realize that they do have potential and a place that is conducive for them

to work toward reaching it. He seems effective in recognizing and encouraging the community resources that are available to this goal.

Community Leaders Support Making It A Model

We want UPAN families and inmates to know that no matter what steps still need to be accomplished with the DOC in terms of the administration / sheriff / jail commander side of things, the community leaders are supportive of making Daggett a model jail in terms of rehabilitation. If they get the right leadership, we are optimistic that Daggett could be a good place for state inmates to spend some of their time.

We left this meeting hopeful that there will soon be *A New Day in Daggett*.

IPP ISSUES

compiled from communications from inmates and families

Complaints: Harassment, Medical, Cleanliness, Costs, No Outdoor Recreation Opportunity, No Jobs

UPAN receives reports of problems state inmates experience while housed in some of Utah's county jails. When the allegations are serious, UPAN contacts the DOC with the concerns. These complaints have included harassment by correctional officers, including harassment for sexual orientation; problems inmates have faced receiving medications or medical care in the jails that prisoners would have no problem receiving in the prison; complaints of mold in showers and poor cleanliness of the facility; high cost of commissary that inhibits state inmates without jobs from purchasing food to supplement reportedly meager diets provided by the counties; and lack of outdoor recreation opportunities.

We usually do receive a response to the submission of concerns from the PIO or IPP director letting us know the complaint was received and it is being looked into. Sometimes we are told the complaint was forwarded to the county jail in question, and then may not be advised of findings or resolution. We do follow up, but do not always receive specific details, particularly concerning problems related to medical issues in the jails.

We have been told to make sure the inmate has filed a grievance in the jail about the concern. This can be problematic in some situations, particularly when it is a correctional officer in a position of greater authority that is involved in the harassment or other problems, and that person is the one who will review the grievance.

More: Phones, Video Visiting, Now Postcards Only

Other concerns families and state inmates experience while placed in county jails include the high costs of inmate phone calls and video visitation; poorly functioning telecommunications systems that inhibit video visiting between inmates and their loved ones; and finally, the move of more county jails in Utah to a "postcard only" policy, which stops inmates from being able to receive or send regular letters via US mail to their loved ones. In some cases, the postcard only jails have an email service the inmate can access for a fee, thus placing even more financial burden on the inmate and family, while some families cannot afford internet.

One Exception: A Deputy In Cache County

UPAN has only once received direct communication and resolution directly from a county jail as a result of inmate or UPAN complaints. That was from Deputy Hulse at Cache County. Once he learned of the inmates wanting to receive UPAN newsletter, he stepped up and made sure that the prisoners receive copies of the UPAN newsletter in their library to read since Cache is a "postcard only" jail.

Finally, other areas of concern are the lack of sufficient employment opportunities in many Utah jails for the large number of state inmates housed there; lack of educational or programming opportunities in county jails except for San Juan, Sanpete, Kane and Beaver.

Sometimes, but not always, we hear from the inmate involved about the resolution (or lack thereof) and what the action taken was by both the jail and the DOC. Sometimes we learn how it impacted the offender, either positively or negatively. UPAN would appreciate receiving follow up from the inmates who send us their concerns to be looked into, to let us know what the resolution was, if any, from their perspective.

We Forward Complaints But Little Resolution

After reporting the problems to the DOC, UPAN directors often have no way of knowing what the findings are or if and how the problem was resolved.

The Other Side Of The Coin

Believe it or not, UPAN directors also want to know some good and positive happenings in the IPP system, along with what is not working well for Utah's incarcerated population.

You Can't Sugarcoat IPP

By (An inmate - name and initials withheld)

Author's Personal Opinion Of IPP

The Inmate Placement Program (IPP) was originally sold as a way to get inmates closer to their family and home town. It was also a way the state could keep from having to build a large, expensive prison. If that was the original goal, besides failing, it has mutated into an ugly, poorly-managed creature, to be exterminated.

Some Background Information

I am serving a five-to-life sentence for a sex crime I committed with an older teen back in 2010. After a long court battle, and jury trial, I soon found myself at Gunnison, where I started to rebuild my life. The judge told me he was sending me to prison so I could get rehabilitation and the programming that I needed. Upon arrival, I jumped in with both feet. As a former military officer, commercial pilot, and businessman, I was very accustomed with working with high-caliber people. That is exactly what I found in the instructors at Gunnison. Ms. Orgill, Mr. Hoblett, Mr. Kent and Ms. Maxwell are all top-shelf. Through their efforts and counseling, I was able to start the process of re-building after believing I had lost everything. They helped me realize the impact of my crime, and changed my thinking. I will be forever grateful for their time and kindness.

New Life Established – then WHAM!

I began trying to give back by teaching a few classes as a tutor. I was involved in fun choir and church choir. I was taking both piano and guitar lessons, as well as participating in the running class, "Couch to 5K." My family and friends often made the nine-hour round-trip drive in order to be able to sit with me at a table and get a brief hug, and a kiss. I discovered that all was not lost, and that I was still loved and forgiven by all. Then that fateful night in September occurred, when the two most-dreaded words that an inmate could hear came over my cell speaker, "Roll up! Bring all of your stuff out for inspection; you're going IPP."

It was like a shot in the gut. I had just re-established my life in prison. Now, for the second time, I was about to lose everything I had. The night before, I had just received a huge commissary order. That was gone! Hot pot gone! Knit cap and sun cap gone! Books, magazines, extra photos, extra hygiene, letters—all gone! I lost \$350 worth of property that night. It wasn't worth a nine-hour drive for anyone in my family to come and pick up my property, thus my indigent cellie of two days hit the jackpot! Now, after five months, I find myself at Davis County.

For anyone who really believes that IPP is a reasonable substitute for prison, they obviously have never experienced the difference. Once assigned to IPP, an inmate is only allowed to take a few items on "the list" with him in a garbage bag (shower shoes, running shoes, hygiene items, vitamins, legal materials, etc.). I

can only speak of the two counties where I've been housed at thus far. Both have taken all of my property away and stored it in a locker. I'm not sure why there is an approved list, but it means nothing to the jail when you arrive there. They simply give you an indigent pack, and show you your new home.

Expensive to be Caught Up In IPP

Here at Davis County, I've only been allowed to receive my legal materials. I have been required to repurchase all new hygiene and vitamins at the jail for very inflated prices. They claim they cannot verify the contents of the shampoo in the shampoo bottle, or the vitamins or tooth paste in their original containers. They will not even let me have my white prison running shoes because they have a small, black Nike symbol on the side. Their shoes are "only" \$80 in their commissary. The commissary prices for everything are almost double what the prison charges. (Ex. Ramen soup \$1.09 vs .40, or Boston's Best Coffee, 3 ounces equals \$6.89 vs. \$3.79 at the prison). We are not even allowed to have a real tooth brush. A two-inch thumb brush is the best that we can have [which in a prison is given to those on restriction, in max]. Any kind of flossing material is prohibited. We are given 30 minutes for the privilege of shaving with an indigent razor at 4 AM on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday. Getting the picture?

Davis County houses all offenders by category. I was placed in the sex offender (SO) pod which houses 48 inmates (both county and state). Only six of us are IPP. It is a dorm setting with six toilets, four showers, and one TV to fight over. The so-called "yard" is nothing more than a garage with no heat. We have no windows in our section; I have not seen the sun or breathed fresh air in over 120 days!

Food. Well it's something that is hard to describe, since many times we are not sure what it is! We have only had fresh fruit twice in the last few months, on Thanksgiving and Christmas. Every morning, we receive a plastic bag with a small amount of peanut butter and jelly, already mixed, a piece of cake bread and a cup of frosted flakes. We get no milk. Instead, we get a tablespoon of some kind of white powder in a plastic bag that is definitely not milk.

Lunches and dinners are always heavy on beans or beans and rice or seriously watered-down potatoes, or fake soy vegetable "meat." In January's UPAN Newsletter [Volume 4, No. 1, January, 2017] we read about how bad that author thought the prison food was. After being in IPP for six months, we view prison food on the same level as getting a trip to an all-you-can-eat, five-star restaurant!

Visiting. We are allowed two no-cost video visits, twenty minutes per visit, per week. Our families can

buy unlimited, poor-quality, skype visits from home for \$3.00 for 40 minutes. Phone calls are \$0.19 per minute. There are not any contact visits.

Programming. Programming is non-existent. Yes, I know that the jail's website brags about all the great options available to inmates. I arrived here with a guy straight out of R & O. Shortly after our arrival we both signed up for programming. We have heard nothing since. Even guys who have been here much longer than us laugh when we bring it up.

Jobs. State inmates are not allowed to have jobs at this county jail. (If you happen to be a prison administrator, or congressman who is shocked at this news, please come and conduct an interview!)

Mail. We are only allowed to receive one newspaper and two magazines, even if we have already paid for subscriptions at the prison, before being sent to this jail, and they are being forwarded. This jail throws them away and takes the time to print out a notice telling you about it. As of the first of February, we were no longer to receive letters. The jail went to postcards only. It's just as well, as at least half of my mail gets returned to sender for some minor detail, such as smeared ink, which becomes an "unknown substance!" Or this is my all-time favorite: "Contents threaten the safety or security of DC Jail." This mail comes from my 80-year-old uncle who is a doctor in Provo.

Other. Pill line is called any time between 5:30 and 6:30 AM. We have no library access; a small cart of books rolls in on Wednesday. We are only allowed two rolls of toilet paper per month per inmate. So I find myself guarding my TP as if it were a chocolate bar, (Bad comparison). If we run out, we have to beg and make deals. When someone gets rolled up, it's like

"flies to a dead carcass" to grab the left-over TP. All communications with staff, including the IPP caseworker, is done by kiosk on the wall. This is hardly a replacement for person-to-person interaction.

I know that, in writing this, some will accuse me of having an entitlement mentality. I guess that they could be right in the sense that I believe that IPP inmates should be entitled to the same rights and opportunities as other state inmates. Because we were good inmates at the prison and did not cause fights, and did not complain about our health or get on psych meds, we and our families are being placed under hardships of IPP that were neither requested or deserved.

IPP Is Counter-Productive Toward Reentry

This is, without a doubt, the worst quality of life that I have had since entering the prison, and there is no end in sight. We are told that, once in IPP, we will be in IPP for the remainder of our sentence. For those of us with 99 years or more for the end of our term, it is most distressing to think we may never be able to see our aging parents again, or be able to hug our wife and kids for years because of the restrictive visiting policies. It seems that the system is trying to drive a wedge between us and the very support system we will need in order to have a successful transition back to a civilian life, once we are released.

A Solution Begging To Be Implemented – Soon

I don't understand why prison officials cannot draw up a contract with the counties where they would have to guarantee certain minimum requirements be met that would standardize USP inmates' living conditions. The counties want the state money that comes with an IPP inmate. The time has come for a change in how long-term inmates are treated at county jails.

"Studies have shown that inmate participation in education, vocational and job training, prison work skills development, drug abuse, mental health and other treatment programs, all reduce recidivism, significantly." - Bobby Scott (politician)

***"There are moments in life when a single hug holds all the answers you need."
- Zachry K. Douglas (poet)***

***"It is said that no one truly knows a nation until one has been inside its jails. A nation should not be judged by how it treats its highest citizens, but its lowest ones."
— Nelson Mandela***

Though prompted to anger by stresses and injustices, we're strong and know we can handle it... by staying cool. Ed.

Utah Prisoner Advocate Network
P.O. Box 464, Draper, UT 84020
Website: UtahPrisonerAdvocate.org
Email: Utahprisoneradvocate@gmail.com

President: Shauna Denos
Past-President & Treasurer: Molly Prince
Vice-president: Unfilled
Secretary: Mike McAinch
Director of Communications: Shane Severson
Newsletter Editor: Warren Rosenbaum