

NCJRS

APR 19 1978

Final Report  
of  
An Assessment  
of  
Work Release  
and  
Related Furlough Programs

ACQUISITIONS

Prepared For

THE VIRGINIA STATE CRIME COMMISSION

By

James E. Murphy

Potomac Justice Foundation, Inc.  
5225 Pooks Hill Road  
Suite A27N  
Bethesda, Maryland 20014

January 9, 1975

46464

## CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	1
Preface	3
Methodology	4
Legislative Recommendations	5
Work Release (general)	10
The Virginia Work Release Program	19
Furloughs for Work Releasees	39
Local Work Release Programs	Appendix A
No. 7 North Second Street	Appendix B
Pre-Release Activities Center	Appendix C
Correctional Unit 28	Appendix D
Adult Correctional Enterprise I	Appendix E
Adult Correctional Enterprise II	Appendix F
Adult Correctional Enterprise III	Appendix G
Harrisonburg Correctional Unit	Appendix H
Bibliography	Appendix I

## Acknowledgements

The writer is deeply appreciative of the cooperation and assistance of Mr. Lewis W. Hurst, Executive Director of the Virginia State Crime Commission, the staff who gave unremittingly of their time, and the members whom he had the opportunity and pleasure to meet. These included Mr. Erwin S. Solomon, Chairman of the Corrections Subcommittee; Delegate A.L. Philpott who gave generously of several hours of his time to conduct Mr. Hurst and myself to the Ridgeway institution and to visit a major work release employer in Bassett; Senator George S. Aldhizer, who guided me in Harrisonburg and Senator Stanley C. Walker, Chairman of the Crime Commission, who guided the thrust of the study.

In addition, Mr. Maurice Rowe, Secretary of Administration, Mr. Jack Davis, Director of the Department of Corrections and his staff were most generous of their time as were the superintendents and staffs of the several institutions visited. Mr. Pleasant Shields, Chairman of the Probation and Parole Board and Mr. Anthony Gaudio, Director of the Division of Probation and Parole and his staff were also most helpful.

The writer and Mr. Hurst also had the benefit of a meeting arranged by Dr. E. Preston Sharp, Chairman of the study group on work release established by Mr. Davis. This meeting, which was of about two hours and forty-five minutes in length, was attended by Mr. William Diggs of the Department of Corrections, and Messrs. J.J. Clark and Paul Skelton, consultants employed by the Department. The writer also met informally with Messrs. Clark and Skelton on three occasions. Mr. Walther Fidler, Chairman of the Advisory Board to the Department of Corrections was also very

generous of his time in giving Mr. Hurst and the writer the benefit of his experience and views.

Because of the incident which provoked this report and the nature of the charge given the writer, much of the content of this report is critical of operations of the Department of Corrections as it relates to the work release program. It would be an injustice, however, not to commend the many dedicated and highly motivated staff the writer met, many of whom are working long hours of overtime on a voluntary basis, without compensation, in the service of the Department. It should also be mentioned that the staff of the newly created Department of Corrections, under Mr. Davis' leadership, pointed out to me that they are aware of many of the problems discussed here and are actively seeking the resources required to resolve them.

## Preface

There seems little reason to repeat findings recorded in reports of other groups which have studied various operations and programs of the Department of Corrections in the recent past although where appropriate, reference is made to those reports.

The writer finds himself in agreement with many of the findings of several earlier reports and many of their recommendations; there is need now for efforts aimed at designing and implementing meaningful action programs and upgrading existing programs.

### Methodology

The writer visited, in the company of Mr. Hurst, Executive Director, the headquarters of the Department of Corrections and the following units:

- Chesterfield (December 12)
- Chesapeake (December 16)
- Ridgeway (December 18)
- Pulaski (December 19)

In addition, I visited the following units alone:

- Woodbridge (December 13 and January 8)
- Harrisonburg (December 20)
- #7 North Second Street (Richmond Halfway House, -  
December 26)

A visit was also made to the Chesapeake Sheriff's Department Work Release Program and telephonic contact was made with work release programs operated by local authorities in Fairfax County, Newport News City, Richmond, Roanoke and Harrisonburg (Rockingham County).

In each location visited, discussions were held with the superintendent, principal staff and some prisoners. In addition procedures were reviewed and discussed, the facility was inspected and a random selection of inmate files were examined. Unfortunately, time did not permit a sampling of community attitudes.

Mr. Hurst and I also visited Mr. Pleasant Shields, Chairman of the Probation and Parole Board and I personally consulted with several headquarters staff of the Department of Corrections.

## I. Legislative Recommendations

In general, the statutory basis for work release seems adequate although some refinement would assist the program. It is recommended, therefore, that the following phrase be deleted from 53-38: "...provided, however, that he is on route directly to or from or in authorized attendance or employment at such place of business or educational program." (It is not clear what purpose this phrase serves and it seems to cloud the section preceeding it.)

- A minor change is also suggested so that the following section will read: "Any wages earned shall have deducted from them an amount determined by the Director to be sufficient to help defray the costs of administering and supervising the program. The Director shall then credit the balance..." (This change will remove the constraint from the program that it should be self-supporting which may be a contributing factor to the gross understaffing of the program.)

To the author's knowledge, no work release program in the nation is directly self-supporting. If, however, one takes into consideration the state and federal taxes paid, the fines and costs paid, support of dependents, restitution and savings utilized for post release purposes by participants, such programs do have a favorable over-all cost-benefit impact. The above change will also provide the opportunity to train prisoners in responsible use of their funds.

- It is also recommended that the Commission consider legislation which would permit and encourage the Director

to contract for work release programming, community correctional center services, and half-way house operation with public and private agencies, firms, organizations and individuals.

This recommendation is based upon the fact that re-integration of offenders into the community can logically best be achieved by the local community rather than by a state agency. In further support of this recommendation is the fact that some local jurisdictions have moved beyond the state and there are several excellent work release programs now operated by sheriffs in the Commonwealth which could be expanded to incorporate state prisoners and, in addition, provide a base on which release on recognizance, pre-trial diversion, post-trial diversion and other programs could be developed. That such programs can function effectively without jeopardizing the public safety and at the same time conserve costs has been well demonstrated elsewhere in the nation. Of immediate import is the fact that these programs will reduce the need for future capital outlay expenditures by the state at a time when the economy is less able to support such expenditures than at any other time in recent history.



On a long range basis, as more local programs are developed, on which state authorities can "piggy-back," they will provide the state with the opportunity for work release programs much closer to prisoners' homes than would be possible without this partnership with local authorities. It will also encourage more imaginative programming designed to meet local needs and conditions than is possible with a single, bureaucratic approach and would be in keeping with the national trend to place responsibility for such programming with local officials which permits and encourages increased participation of citizen leaders, employers, educators, volunteers, community leaders and other groups in program planning and execution.

- \* Basic to any sound criminal justice program is the availability of information which makes informed decisions possible. In fact, the criminal justice system may be thought of as a series of decision points -- beginning with the decision of whether to arrest, confine, how to sentence and eventually ending with the decision of whether to parole. Incremental accumulation of information from the arresting officer's report through to the parole progress report utilized by the paroling authority is essential.

It is recommended, therefore, that the Commission consider legislation which would make presentence or postsentence reports mandatory for all felon offenders. Presently, the percentage of cases in which such reports

are prepared varies from court to court. Firm data is not available on the percentage of offenders on whom such reports are prepared; official estimates range from a low of 50% in some jurisdictions to a high of 96% in others. The additional workload for probation and parole staff by making such reports mandatory can be ameliorated somewhat by use of a short form pre-sentence report for lesser felonies and misdemeanor cases.

The short report, for instance, may be considered for use in so-called "victimless crimes" such as drug possession for personal use, crimes against property when the offense is not habitual, is not committed with force or violence against property or person, when not committed with criminal skill or viciousness and when the magnitude or dollar value of the offense is not so great as to provoke special public concern. Short reports have also been used in the case of crimes against persons when these are simple unarmed altercations between acquaintances not resulting in serious injury.

- It is recommended that the purposes for which furloughs may be granted be expanded to include provision for unescorted travel for the purpose of arranging for employment or for a suitable residence for use following release or other compelling reason consistent with the public interest. (Such provision, for instance, will permit selected inmates approved for work release to go without

escort, for prescribed periods of time, for pre-arranged employment interviews, for scheduled medical appointments, to shop for work clothes and other necessities, etc., thereby saving staff time and again, provide the opportunity to increase the amount of responsibility given inmates as they demonstrate the capacity to handle it responsibly.

## II. Work Release

### 1. Development

One of the intrinsic values of work release is that it tends to ease the impasse between the desire to help and the need to punish. By partially converting confinement - society's conventional method of exercising punishment - into an opportunity for the disciplined practice of community living, work release simultaneously serves both goals. Properly executed, work release can exploit the positive features of confinement while it is mitigating the destructive ones. However, experience reveals that work release is not immune from the same hobbling which afflicts other criminal justice programs which fail to articulate a philosophy and operate in terms of a set of principles keyed to it.

Given the slow pace at which social institutions evolve, work release is still in its childhood. Born in Vermont in 1906, work release was practiced only sparingly and intermittently at the local level in two or three states, most notably Wisconsin. Only since about 1955 has the concept of work release penetrated the awareness of most local criminal justice officials and been accepted. The slow and hesitant way in which the concept has been implemented is indicative of the formidable nature of obstacles which must be overcome in order to convert the concept into practice.

Anyone who views the existing state-of-the-art of work release cannot but note a certain amount of confusion of purpose and method, its lack of integration with other criminal justice activities, and results less than gratifying to its sponsors. Yet, one would also observe that growth is occurring and progress is being made. Case-by-case and step-by-step, in a growing number and variety of local criminal justice settings throughout the country, operational

experience is slowly being acquired and expertise being created. Unfortunately, there has been a minimum of interaction among individual work release operations and little sharing of the expertise which has been generated. Thus, work release programs, and the criminal justice operations of which they are a part, are the poorer because of their isolation from one another and their failure to contribute to and benefit from a common reservoir of knowledge.

## 2. Key Program Considerations

It would be difficult if not impossible to either design or recommend a single operational model for work release which would apply to all jurisdictions. It would also be undesirable because experience indicates that different models have evolved which seem to work well in their host jurisdictions. Thus, it is believed preferable that each jurisdiction develop a program which is compatible with its needs and resources and which will best gain community acceptance. A single model would also tend to discourage innovation and responsiveness to the local community.

Population differences are one of the most important and obvious factors which contributes to variation in implementation. In some areas, there may be an insufficient number of offenders to justify a formalized program while the population in heavily populated areas may justify its elaboration with separate housing, staffing and administration. The implementation, for instance, in rural Southwestern Virginia would be very different than in Richmond or either the Tidewater or Northern Virginia areas.

Differences in legislation and legislative history are also strong forces for dissimilar implementation of work release. Some statutes define work release eligibility very loosely while others are

quite restrictive both as to eligibility and method of administration. Existing legislation in Virginia offers considerable flexibility; the refinements recommended earlier should improve it further.

The physical facilities in which work release programs are housed are an important determinant of program. The scope of supportive programs possible is very limited in "stick camps" and other field units which were designed many years ago merely to confine. The availability of space for even a private interview is at a premium much less for group counseling, recreation and other programs regarded as essential to a healthy program.

Staffing is a major factor in planning and implementing work release. If staffing is viewed as necessary only for the purpose of checking participants out of the facility in the morning and back in the evening with an occasional shakedown, the program is going to encounter problems, the seriousness of which will be determined largely by those assigned to work release rather than by the administration and staff. This is not to say there will never be problems if staffing is adequate. Adequate staffing is crucial, however, along with screening, planning, community acceptance and other essential ingredients if work release is going to be reasonably successful and not become a threat to public safety.

The development and use of a management information system is needed if program administration, legislators and the public are to have useful feedback about the program, its achievements and problems. The absence of computer capability should not be an excuse for the absence of record keeping of basic information essential to evaluation.

### 3. Prevalence and Growth

As of April 1, 1972, every state except Mississippi and Nevada were either operating or on the verge of operating work release

programs for persons under commitment to their correctional organizations. Five of the work release states had no statutes specifically authorizing the use of work release and had proceeded to operate on the basis that the practice was not expressly prohibited by law.

State laws providing for the employment of work release by state corrections departments vary widely in form and content. In a few states, authorizing sections are very brief and general. In several other states, the statutes incorporate detailed program rules and procedures.

The extent to which the states use their work release laws also varies greatly. The average number of felony prisoners who were in work release status on a given day in 1971 ranged from less than a dozen in one state to in excess of five hundred in another. The extent of use does not always correspond to the size of a state's total prison population. During 1971, the 50 state departments of corrections were caring for an average of about 200,000 men on any given day. There is evidence that about 5,000 of this number were held in work release status. However, approximately one-half of the total of all work releasees were to be found in just four states.

#### COUNTIES

As of April 1, 1972, the laws of 40 states provided authorization for the use of work release for misdemeanants. In seven of these states, work release programs for persons convicted of misdemeanors were state-administered. In thirty-three, programs were based upon local facilities administered by local officials. Some statutes require individual counties to pass implementation ordinances.

At the county level of government, work release is utilized both as a sentencing disposition and as a prerelease procedure. When used

as the latter, the approval of the sentencing court is required in most states.

- 552 (17.6% of the nation's total) counties used work release.
- 22,515 persons were granted work release during the 12-month period
- 4,600 persons were on work release status on any given day.
- California counties accounted for about one-fifth of all misdemeanor work releases in the United States.
- Florida, Massachusetts, North Carolina, and Wisconsin accounted for about one-third of all misdemeanor work releasees in the United States.
- California, Florida, Massachusetts, North Carolina, and Wisconsin together (5 states) accounted for over one-half (58%) of all misdemeanor work releasees in the United States.

#### CITIES

An unknown number of municipalities are authorized by state law and/or local ordinance to provide work release status to inmates of their jails, houses of corrections, workhouses, and prisons. The cities of Detroit, Minneapolis, St. Louis, Cincinnati, Cleveland, and Dayton are examples.

#### Current Trends in Usage

To the extent that one can identify and project from present trends, it seems likely that work release will have a lively adolescence. The movement towards community-based correction is building in force. In some states, there is a pronounced shift in



responsibility from state government to local government for the care of sentenced defendants. In other states where most if not all correctional activity has shifted from local government to state government, the actual sites of activity are increasingly found in local communities rather than in a few isolated sites in the form of large prisons. It seems likely that in the future whether corrections is basically a state responsibility or a county responsibility, or a shared one, that increasing emphasis will be placed on alternatives to incarceration and, when incarceration is necessary, upon smaller facilities extensively interrelated with the communities in which they are located.

These broad trends favor the expansion of work release. There is already some sentiment among institutional administrators that every prisoner who is to be released be granted work release at some point prior to the termination of his commitment. On the other hand, there can be little question that unless more effective probation services are developed there will continue to be some overuse of work release by many communities.

When one studies the practices being employed in existing work release programs and examines the planning which is preceding impending ones, it is apparent that the following trends are developing relative to local program administration:

1. The removal of work release populations and programs from maximum security jails and establishing them in community correctional centers in the form of minimum security facilities and halfway houses.
2. A greater involvement of administrative authority in decision-making processes relative to

the selection and approval of program participants accompanied by a diminishing of judicial involvement.

3. The granting of a greater degree of responsibility to participants for the handling of their earnings, arranging transportation, and finding employment.
4. Increasing use of existing community programs for self-improvement activities and a decreasing dependence upon activities staged in the work release institution itself.
5. Assignment of specialized staff to plan, program, coordinate, and supervise case service activities involved in work release programming.
6. The selection and assignment of custodial personnel to work release facilities on the basis of temperament and knowledge and skills relative to human relationships.
7. Increased participation of citizen leaders, employers, educators, volunteers, and other groups in program planning and execution.
8. Increasing disinclination to place a higher priority upon the recovery of program costs from participants' earnings and an increasing willingness to allow part of the participants' earnings to be used for post-release needs.
9. An increasing tendency to place responsibility for work release administration with correctional rather than law enforcement officials.
10. A growing practice for the process of selecting

applicants for work release by representatives of all agencies with responsibility for applicant, rather than by <sup>a</sup> a single staff official or staff of one agency.

It appears, then, that future work release programming will be more and more community-based, administratively rather than judicially controlled, professionally administered, participant-centered, and better integrated into and articulated with other elements of the criminal justice machinery of the community.

#### 4. Current and Future Trends

It is crucial that the concepts, methodology, and relationships of work release be studied, defined, and practiced carefully now, for all indications point to the probability that the use of work release is expanding rapidly. Trends are already apparent which suggest that work release will have an even more strategic role to play tomorrow. Diversion of alcoholics, addicts, vagrants, marijuana users, prostitutes, and homosexuals - to name only the larger categories - away from the processes of criminal justice; the elaboration of such practices as police citations, release on recognizance, reasonable bail schedules and plea bargaining; and the strengthening of adult probation services can be expected to result in tomorrow's institution populations being smaller but more sophisticated. Superficial rehabilitation programs will no longer be acceptable and will have to be replaced by far more intensive ones if the individual prisoner is to be reinstated in the community with the risk to the public safety being maintained within tolerable limits.

In this context, work release cannot be just an attractive, experimental innovation. It will have to be a strong, disciplined, and

effective core program. To stand any chance of achieving this status, work release programs will require, as a minimum, a philosophical base justifying objectives and procedures, careful planning, central administration, appropriate housing, competent staffing, and ongoing evaluation.<sup>1</sup>

### III. The Virginia Work Release Program

#### 1. History

As in most jurisdictions, work release, first authorized by statute in Virginia in 1968, was cautiously inaugurated in September, 1969 when ten men were transferred to the Richmond City Jail. At that time, processing of men entering the program was accomplished at the penitentiary. With the opening of the Pre-Release Activities Center at Pocahontas in July, 1971, the processing function was shifted to the Center. Men who completed "processing" were then transferred back to their institutions prior to job assignment. In 1972, a procedure was initiated whereby men were assigned to one of the Work Release Units in the State and entered employment after processing at the Center but this was discontinued in August, 1973 when processing and orientation were shifted to the individual units.

As of December, 1974, in addition to the Pre-Release Center, there were three units designated primarily for work release referred to as Adult Correctional Enterprise (ACE) units. These were ACE I (formerly Unit 22 at Chesapeake), ACE II (formerly Unit 6 at Woodbridge) and ACE III (formerly Unit 1 at Pulaski).

A few other locations continue work release but most are phasing out with the notable exceptions of those at Ridgeway and Harrisonburg.

Approximately one year ago, an effort was reportedly made to expand the work release program dramatically to a target population of 1,000 participants. Unfortunately, neither the plan, staff nor facilities existed to support such an increase in program. Equally unfortunate was the fact that there apparently had been little effort over the preceding five years to keep records and develop a base of experience which would permit the exploration of options and the

probable outcomes of each. Even more crippling was the fact that written policies, guidelines and procedures were either out-dated or non-existent.

To compound matters, the Division itself was attempting to adjust itself to a series of court orders which required major adjustments in many procedures, the development of new procedures where none had previously existed and procedural safeguards regarding such areas as inmate discipline, transfers and other programs. Concurrently, the then - Director and several other officials were indicted. The indictments were eventually dismissed but these many assaults on the Division understandably had taken their toll on the organization.

Thus, the Division was ill-prepared to mount an innovation which would have taxed a healthy correctional agency much less one which had only recently resisted giving up, under court order, practices long since abandoned by neighboring states. It was inevitable that the effort to expand work release without adequate planning, clearly defined objectives and operating concepts experienced confusion and serious incidents such as that which precipitated this assessment. Attempts by loyal, dedicated staff were not sufficient to prevent incidents which made the program suspect. Some staff who can be described as pro-work release even alledge that other staff members of the Department have sabotaged work release either by overt action or by inaction, e.g., not assigning sufficient staff, permitting or continuing inadequate supervision, etc.

Whatever the cause, the work release program is currently experiencing serious problems. The discussion of those problems will necessarily touch upon other aspects of correctional programs because any one program or program component cannot exist in a vacuum. It is

not only influenced by other programs but influences them.

## 2. Current Situation

Not all persons eligible for work release are suitable for work release. Some have personal characteristics or are subject to environmental pressures which render them incapable of benefiting from or using work release at a given point in time. Others may not be motivated to put forth the effort required to be benefited. Such individuals need to be identified and denied work release unless and until there is adequate evidence that the disqualifying factors no longer exist.

The guideline (Division Guideline No. 806, March 15, 1974) which governs the work release program is inadequate. It speaks primarily of eligibility for the program and does not address the issue of suitability. Eligibility criteria cited have two principle bases:

- (i) Time remaining to serve before parole eligibility
- (ii) Institutional conduct record

Only passing mention is made of "the development of release funds, extension of institution training, community reorientation, and entry on release into stable employment" as "factors that will be considered." These and related areas should be major goals of the program.

Just as all eligible prisoners are not suitable candidates for work release by any standard of selection, so work release, as a correctional tool, not only has little or nothing to offer some offenders but presents them with temptations and opportunities for further criminal behavior which is not only inconsistent with the public interest but detrimental to their own well being. Further,



as a matter of public policy, there are offenders sentenced to imprisonment primarily for the protection of society and there is little reason to believe that, with our present state of knowledge, much can be done to change their ways.

Offenders whose history indicates they are or at one time were dangerous to others should be considered for work release only after a very thorough review such as that recently proposed by Mr. Norman Cox, Superintendent of Work Release. (See report of Mr. Lewis Hurst dated December 11, 1974, entitled Report on ACE I.)

Special program controls are required for some offenders, e.g., urine surveillance for drug offenders and alcohol abuse control for those with records of alcohol abuse. These should be linked with drug and alcohol treatment programs.

Experience elsewhere suggests that participation in work release is best limited to six (6) months with some well justified exceptions permitted in extraordinary situations involving training, etc. Optimum periods of participation are generally believed to be somewhere between four and six months. Achieving this requires close communication with the paroling authority.

In addition to being contra-indicated for programmatic reasons, prolonged assignment to work release represents an inefficient utilization of correctional program resources. The writer noted some individuals who had been on the program for over two years. For every individual who had been on the program for two years, six others who might have benefitted from a work release experience of four months had, in effect, been denied the benefit of work release.

Work release and study release, then, should be viewed primarily as correctional tools to serve those offenders' needs for which there are appropriate resources in the community. For convenience, these needs can be categorized as follows:

1. Temporary (applicable to many)
  - a. Release funds
  - b. Extension of training or education
2. Transitional (applicable to limited number)
  - a. Community re-orientation
  - b. Use of community resources for problem solving
3. Permanent (applicable to those being released locally)
  - a. Entry or return to stable employment or training program
  - b. Re-establishment of family and community ties<sup>2</sup>

For further elaboration of work release program models, see the report of Mr. Norman Cox, Superintendent of Work Release, entitled Work Release Program Status Report, dated October 3, 1974.

It is not suggested that the following example of guidelines for implementation of and selection or suitability for work release and be utilized verbatim. They represent a composite of guidelines that have been utilized by other jurisdictions, including the federal system. As has been stressed throughout this report, no one model is suitable for all jurisdictions. The following may, however, prove useful for reference.

1. Custody. Full minimum custody should be a prerequisite in all cases. Work/study release should not be authorized for offenders identified with large scale organized criminal activity, nor for others whose presence in the community is likely to evoke adverse public reaction toward the inmate or the Commonwealth.

Offenders convicted of serious crimes against the person, or

whose records include a history of such offenses, and offenders whose offenses involved violations of public trust may be considered but should be subject to approval of the Director who may wish to check with local authorities to ascertain whether participation would evoke an unduly adverse reaction from the community.

2. Physical conditions. The candidate for work release shall be in good health and physically able to perform the proposed assignments. This requirement should not preclude the use of work release as an unusual opportunity to aid a physically handicapped person in obtaining training or other community employment consistent with his capabilities.

3. Emotional and behavioral factors. Candidates with disabling emotional or personality defects and those with histories of violent or assaultive behavior should be excluded. However, work/study release may be considered for those who are mentally or emotionally handicapped and who are not dangerous to others, when it is apparent that community employment or training will significantly aid their post-release adjustment.

4. Type of work. There need be no general restrictions on the kinds of work release jobs for which candidates may be considered. The expectation is that the job selected will be that which best fulfills the purpose of work release in each case, consistent with the fact that the employed inmate is still in custody. Good employment placement will give preference to jobs that are related to prior training, work experience, or institutional training and may be suitable for continuing post-release employment. The "break-even" point between wages and expenses will tend to eliminate temporary, part-time, and intermittent employment except when combined with a

study release program.

5. Duration. When used for pre-release purposes, work release placements ordinarily should be limited to a period of approximately six months immediately preceding the probable release date. The optimum period will probably be four to six months. Exceptions can be made when fully justified.

When study release is on a part-time basis (as attendance at evening classes), the same time limitation applies. When participation is to be on a full-time basis in excess of one academic year, prior approval of the Director should be obtained.

6. Transfers. Inmates shall be recommended for transfer to an institution operating a work/study release program, so long as all other eligibility requirements for transfer are met and the receiving institution can accommodate them.

7. Field checks. The determination of suitability should not be thought of as a singular event with a once and for all connotation. Rather, just as human behavior is dynamic, continuous and subject to change, so is determination of suitability for work and study release. To insure this, field checks should be made at reasonable intervals on community trainees and work releasees. These checks should be conducted in a professional manner and in no way constitute harassment of either the offender or the employer/trainer or be disturbing to them. The underlying purposes of them are to provide supervision of the offender, to insure that the placement is satisfactory, that individual and program goals are being met and to develop and maintain a relationship with the employer/trainer in which mutual responsibilities are appreciated and shared.

8. Community activities. To the extent permitted by pre-

vailing statutes, participation in community religious, educational, social, civic, and recreational activities will contribute significantly to the offender's learning and exercise of personal responsibility. Such participation should be based upon individual needs and goals and the offender's progressive self-sufficiency in the community.

9. Guidance and counseling. To the fullest extent possible, guidance and counseling services shall be available to work/study release participants. Often there will be special and immediate needs for such services arising from problems on the job and working conditions in addition to the usual range of personal and family matters. Counselors' hours should be scheduled so that they work at least two or three evenings each week to insure frequent contact with participants on both a group and individual basis.

10. Terminations. The removal of an inmate from work/study release for any reason is as much a case management decision as was the approval for entering the program initially. He or she should be required to live up to rules and expectations of the program. While a double standard of conduct within the institution should not exist the status of a work/study releasee is different. As a guiding principle, judgments and standards which underlie counseling and removal decisions are more similar to effective management of a parolee than to adherence to traditional prison discipline.

11. Transportation. All transportation arrangements should be approved by the head of the institution. Where possible, public transportation is preferable but when not available or feasible, an institution vehicle should be used with a charge to users which would be comparable to the documented cost of public transportation. Employers may provide transportation if the arrangements meet with

the approval of the superintendent of the institution. The Division should explore the possibility of utilizing inmate drivers to conserve staff time. Schedules should be developed, monitored and revised as necessary to avoid leaving participants an undue amount of "dead time" in the community awaiting transportation. Pickup points should be selected which will avoid, as far as possible, unsavory locations and those which are close to "sources of temptation" such as taverns, liquor stores, etc.

12. Records and reports. Responsibility to design and coordinate essential documentation of the work/study release program should be fixed. Planning must begin at initial classification. Progress reports and other communications must clearly explain the purpose, placement in and the removal from community programs as with any other such event or process. Progress in these programs must be spelled-out and interpreted with reference to treatment needs and goals, readiness for parole and release planning.

13. Community relations. It is essential that the superintendent and staff of each institution with a work release program endeavor to promote public understanding and support for work/study release. In part, this is a matter of developing and maintaining communication networks for the purpose of imparting basic information, interpreting the purposes of the program and explaining its role in the total correctional process. This should be taken into account in designing staff training programs. It is also important that the official and other important segments of the community be kept advised of progress, modifications and program innovations. To realize the program's full potential and to guard against any tendency on the part of employers and others to over-protect par-

ticipants, the understanding and continuing good will of community groups must be maintained.

It is noted that existing guidelines state that when a work/study releasee is out of the institution, he is the responsibility of the work release program staff and when in the institution, the responsibility of the superintendent. Such a dichotomy of responsibility has been experimented with elsewhere, found unworkable and abandoned. In short, that which is everybody's responsibility frequently becomes nobody's responsibility. This may contribute to lack of support of community programs by correctional staff because it lends support to the notion that work release is a program separate from the Division of Adult Services. To quote the October 3, 1974, report of Mr. Cox again, the problems of the program are not "work release problems" alone but the "Division's problems with its work release program." Superintendents should be responsible and accountable for all programs at their respective institutions, subject to written policy guidelines.

### 3. General

In the time permitted for preparation of this report, it is impossible for the writer to study and report on in detail the many problems and deficiencies noted in the operation observed and studied. Only the most obvious and serious will be noted here.

- Classification of prisoners is basic to any correctional program but is impossible without essential information which is well maintained, regularly updated and easily accessible to those responsible for classification. Major impediments to this include:
  - Lack of a pre- or post-sentence report in many cases
  - Duplicate files on the same inmate
  - Lack of fixed responsibility for maintenance of inmate files
  - Lack of standard filing procedures
  - Lack of established mechanisms, procedures and schedules for up-dating information in files
  - Unavailability of files to those responsible for making decisions
- Decision-making is spread among so many elaborate review processes, committees and layers of the organization that fixing responsibility and accountability is impossible. This is also frustrating and demoralizing to both staff and inmates. It is axiomatic that decisions should be made as close as possible to the situation requiring the decision. It is recommended that some of the committees, layers and repetitive



reviews be eliminated and that lines of authority and responsibility be clarified. Superintendents should ultimately be responsible for all programs at the institution which they head, again, subject to written policy guidelines. This maze of review processes and lack of clear lines of authority may be partially responsible for one incident the writer witnessed. This consisted of the transfer, on December 20, from the Pre-Release Activities Center in Chesterfield County, of thirty-three men who had been on work/study release there to Unit 8 at Harrisonburg for "re-evaluation." They were returned to the Chesterfield facility three days later on December 23. It is highly questionable whether the disruption and expense of this double transfer served any useful purpose, especially in view of the fact that a member of the Central Classification Board informed me that all were returned to work/study release status.

- At various times during the past year, a pre-work release program of sixty to ninety days was required as a prelude to work release. As described to the writer, the purpose of this program is to orient inmates to work release and to provide an opportunity for intensive observation by staff of all candidates which would assist in determination of each candidate's suitability for work release. As described to me by both staff and inmate participants, no program activities

exist. Rather, the inmate candidate serves "dead time," sitting on his bunk, watching television, asking staff for work assignments, etc. One inmate told the writer that this period was handicapping to him; he had been on a highway crew and was in good physical condition by reason of the arduous duties he had been performing. As a result of several weeks of enforced idleness, however, he was no longer in good physical condition and doubted if he could "put in a good eight hours of work." Opinions of staff were equally negative regarding the destructive impact of this program.

Pre-assignment orientation can be accomplished within a few hours; continuing orientation regarding such matters as budgeting, utilization of community resources, etc., can best be achieved concurrently with work release on a problem solving basis with the current reality utilized as a learning situation.

- Staff Training needs are so massive and pervasive that they are almost overwhelming. For instance, a few counselors and superintendents are quite aggressive in identifying community resources which can provide services to prisoners both prior to and following their release. Other superintendents and counselors were either unaware of the existence of such resources and/or did not believe that they should be concerned about them. Thus, services of untold value go unused and needs of prisoners similarly go unmet. Even within

the Department of Corrections, no line staff member with whom I spoke was aware of a halfway house operated in Richmond by the Department. (The Federal Bureau of Prisons has a contract with this program and uses it for federal prisoners.) A similar project in Charlottesville reportedly closed during November for want of clients. Paradoxically, inmates were identified to the writer who had been granted parole but remained in confinement for varying periods of time because they had no ties or resources in the community.

- Services available from other agencies should be identified and a resource manual developed for use by staff which described the services available, their source, whom and how to contact, eligibility requirements, etc.
- A directory of all Department of Corrections institutions and offices should be developed which gives, for each institution, such information as its location, mailing address, telephone number, how to reach it by auto, bed capacity, staffing, population criteria (e.g., adult felons over 25 with less than two years remaining to serve), programs (e.g., four teachers, G.E.D. program), special services (e.g., community mental health center, community alcohol treatment program), the custody requirements (e.g., medium and minimum custody only - single fence, no single cells or towers) and any other appropriate information.

Such a directory should include probation and parole offices and the parole board. It could be utilized by staff to make better informed transfer recommendations, improve communications and help the Department to make better use of limited resources. For both the resource manual and directory, a new page would serve as notice to staff of a change, i.e., a new addition or an update.

- Agreements for service should be concluded by the Department of Corrections with other appropriate state agencies. At the present time, the delivery of services to prisoners by other state agencies is uneven and highly dependent upon the personalities involved and the propensities of given situations. For instance, the writer encountered a situation in which a vocational rehabilitation counselor refused services to a camp, apparently because he was a former employee of the Department of Corrections who felt he had been unjustly or unfairly treated.

Agencies with which such agreements may be developed might include:

- Office of Education
- Employment Commission
- Department of Labor and Industry
- Council for the Deaf
- Department of Health

Department of Mental Health and Retardation

Department of Vocational Rehabilitation

- Administrative and management problems are complex and as yet, not fully understood by the writer. Superintendents had no idea what their budget was nor, they said, did they have any input into the budgetary process. Employees of one camp are on as many as three different payrolls (penitentiary, Bureau of Field Units and work release) which inordinately complicates management. - This confused situation may be partially responsible for the fact that such basic elements as a planned facility maintenance program apparently do not exist. Maintenance problems sometimes become crises before they are resolved. (See report to E. Eugene Miller of October, 1974, for further discussion of administration and organization.)
- Counseling services appear to be available only to work releasees. They should not only be available to all prisoners but are grossly inadequate even for work releasees. They should not only be available to all prisoners but are grossly inadequate even for work releasees. In at least one situation, one counselor was responsible for providing the following services to upwards of 70 individuals:
  - (i) Job development
  - (ii) Job finding
  - (iii) Job placement
  - (iv) Job follow-up

- (v) Funds management
- (vi) Liaison with other agencies
- (vii) Release planning
- (viii) Arrange supportive services for families
- (ix) Crisis intervention
- (x) Preparation of parole progress reports
- (xi) Liaison with the Central Classification Board

For proper management of work releasees, there should be at least one professional staff for every fifteen work releasees. For a caseload of thirty work releasees, this may become one counselor and one employment specialist rather than two counselors. It is further recommended that the Department utilize case managers rather than counselors. The present utilization of the counselors is too narrow for optimal utilization of staff resources.

- Work release programs which are not supported by sufficient staff to do more than a superficial job of screening applicants, supervising and monitoring program participants, and facilitating prisoner movement between the institution and the community can only afford to grant work release status to casual offenders who pose little or no risk to the community. These are usually those inmates who least need the assistance of work release program activities and staff. If poorer risk prisoners are to be placed on work release, programs must be pre-

pared in terms of staff and treatment activities to counteract and control the risk factor.

- The status of counselors in the various units also was confusing. In some instances, they were responsible to the superintendent, served on the classification committee and were, for all apparent purposes, full staff members. In other situations, they appeared to operate as adjuncts and both the counselor and institution superintendent either were not sure if they were fully accountable to the superintendent or both to him and the work release supervisor for the area.
- Use of the "T" custody classification seems redundant and appears to create more problems than it solves. According to published guidelines, inmates who are classified as minimum custody do not require continuous supervision. It is not clear what purpose a further reduction in custody serves; in fact it seems to inordinately complicate matters when an individual's conduct requires removal from work release. It then becomes necessary to go through various review processes in order to increase the custody classification to minimum. It is not clear why approval for work/study release is not sufficient without concurrent reduction of custody to the "T" classification.
- Intramural programs of any kind - diagnostic, testing, educational, vocational, work, industrial, alcohol or drug treatment, counseling, etc., seem to be almost

totally lacking. No evidence was found of the use of volunteers, who can be a major source of assistance.

- Communication between staff and the Parole Board must be improved. The Chairman of the Board indicates a willingness to advise on selection of work release participants. Parole Board reviews of work releasees should occur at least quarterly.



#### IV. Furloughs for Work Releasees

Major shortcomings of the furlough program are found to be similar to those of the work release program.

For instance, there is no clear articulation of goals and objectives; Guidelines again emphasize technical eligibility rather than suitability for the program.

Based upon the writer's observation of implementation of the furlough program and discussions with staff, being technically eligible seems to automatically entitle a work releasee to the maximum number of furloughs permitted. There was no apparent effort to utilize them as short term incentives, e.g., a four-hour furlough after two weeks of satisfactory participation in work release with gradual increases in the number and duration of furloughs contingent upon continued achievement of goals in work release and other programs.

- It is recommended that purposes and goals of the furlough program be better articulated and guidelines be established giving superintendents greater authority and latitude in their use within prescribed limits.

APPENDIX A

LOCAL WORK RELEASE PROGRAMS

Several small but excellent work release programs are operated by local sheriffs in the Commonwealth. Five of these with basic data are listed below:

Fairfax County - Sheriff James D. Swinson  
Began: 1972

Average No. participants: 4-5  
Most at any one time: 6  
No. participants this year: 20

Richmond City - Andrew W. Winston, Sergeant  
Began: 1972

Capacity: 18  
Average No. participants: 12  
Total No. participants: 300

Rockingham County (Harrisonburg)  
Sheriff Glenn Weatherholtz

Capacity: App. 15  
Average No. participants: 8  
Highest No. participants: 13  
Total No. participants: 84 between 4/73 and 9/74  
Removals: 12 (3 for escape, 9 for drinking)  
Average length of participation: 5 mos. (8 mos. maximum)

Total Earnings: \$58,263

Disposition:	Federal income tax:	6,372
	Social Security:	3,372
	State income tax:	1,072
	Subsistence paid:	11,151
	Family support:	9,214
	Fines and costs paid:	4,734
	Personal expenses:	4,371
	Restitution:	1,181
	Attorney fees:	616
	Legitimate debts:	940
	Savings for use at release	15,240

Chesapeake - Sheriff John Newhart  
Began: 1972

Capacity: 15  
Average No. participants: 12  
Total participants: 170

44  
APPENDIX B

NO. 7 NORTH SECOND STREET

On the evening of December 26, the writer visited the halfway house at No. 7 North Second Street in Richmond. The writer was informed by staff that the facility was operated by Probation and Parole and serves both probationers and parolees on a referral basis and can accommodate 25 residents. It does not accommodate work releasees.

The facility was well laid out and well maintained. Morale of residents contacted was good. The staff member on duty gave the impression of being dedicated and knowledgeable about the program. At the time of my visit, there were 22 residents assigned -- four were federal offenders there under contract and the balance equally divided between state parolees and probationers. The latter were there by reason of assignment by courts because they lacked community resources or as in need of "stabilization," i.e., they had been experiencing difficulty in the community and were assigned to the program so that they could have benefit of the more intensive services offered there. Parolees were assigned for similar reasons. The program was well designed with three levels of responsibility and accompanying privileges. As each resident fulfills the requirements of one level, he earns the privilege of moving to the next level and assuming the responsibilities required of it. Privileges consist primarily of increasingly later curfews. Both group and individual counseling are utilized and once each week all residents meet with staff to discuss matters of concern to all.

Offenders with a history of alcohol or drug abuse are not admitted; drug abusers are referred to the Rubican program and alcoholics to other resources. A wide range of community resources

42

Several of the above programs incorporate community services such as mental health services, drug and alcohol abuse control and treatment services, vocational rehabilitation, education and vocational training, and volunteer services.

Time did not permit a survey of local community attitudes toward the programs but a limited number of key persons indicated the programs were well accepted.

In addition to these, the City of Charlottesville and Albemarle County have recently opened a new joint city-county jail and work release and a number of other programs are planned. The program plan for work release (including criteria for selection) have been written but the program will not be inaugurated until the local court and other officials have reviewed and approved the program plan.

APPENDIX C

PRE-RELEASE ACTIVITIES CENTER

On December 12, 1974, Mr. Lewis W. Hurst and the writer visited the Pre-Release Activities Center (Also referred to as the Pre-Release Center) in Chesterfield County.

The Center is located adjacent to Unit 13 (The Pocahontas Correctional Unit) and the outer appearance of the facility is good.

We met first with Mr. Norman Cox, Superintendent of Work Release who was very generous in explaining the program. Mr. Cox assumed his duties in July. He was formerly on the staff of Probation and Parole in a planning capacity.

Mr. Cox is responsible for four units throughout the state which are primarily work release units. In addition, the Harrisonburg facility, which is under the Bureau of Correctional Field Units has 32 work releasees assigned and approximately 12 other units have a few work releasees each.

Formerly, Mr. Cox explained, all work release candidates came here for ninety days as their "pre-release" period. A decentralized pre-release program is now being proposed by Mr. Cox, who agreed that the rationale for this program is questionable.

Mr. Brown, Superintendent, conducted me on a tour of the facility. By generally accepted standards, it is overcrowded. Living quarters are of the open dormitory type and offer no privacy. Recreation space is available in a large open room but because of a lack of sound-proofing and partitions, the impression is one of noise and confusion. A library is available but had been closed to inmates for several weeks (except on weekends) because visiting auditors were using it. Limited outdoor recreation is available when weather permits.

43  
are utilized including mental health, vocational rehabilitation,  
employment services and a number of training and educational programs.

46  
APPENDIX D

CORRECTIONAL UNIT 28

On December 18, Mr. Hurst, Mr. Philpott and the writer visited Unit 28 in Ridgeway. The institution superintendent is Captain M.S. Rhea, who was recently transferred there.

The facility was typical of permanent camps and in fair to good condition. The work release counselor, Mr. Mays, is only at this unit on a part-time basis. Captain Rhea is preoccupied at present with administrative problems and has not been able to give a great deal of his time to work release.

Most of the participants are employed by a large furniture manufacturer in nearby Bassett. Mr. Philpott introduced Mr. Hurst and the writer to staff there. They indicate they are pleased with the cooperation of Captain Rhea and institution staff.

This work release employer is an outstanding example of cooperation and initiative by an employer. The firm provides transportation by means of a company bus which is driven by an inmate in the employ of the company. Close supervision is provided by the company and at least two work releasees have been promoted to supervisory positions. The company is interested in the work releasees continuing as permanent employees after release from custody, and a number have done so.

The program began with the firm in April, 1970 and approximately seventy individuals have been employed since that time, with only two removals from the program.

44  
The unit seemed adequately staffed except for counselors, of whom there were only three for ninety residents.

Considerable idleness was apparent on the part of men in pre-release status.

This facility also serves as headquarters for the work release program and the usual headquarters activities, records, accounting, personnel, etc., are housed here.

The writer selected at random six inmate files to review. Of the six, three individuals were serving terms for murder, one was a drug trafficker from the Norfolk area and the other two were relatively minor property offenders.

Other staff with whom we spoke expressed the opinion that the program's main problems were poor planning, a cumbersome classification and review process, poor selection for work release and a lack of supportive programs. Other staff observations included what was felt to be an inordinate amount of staff time in taking candidates for job interviews, an inadequate number of vehicles and poor staff selection.

In this location, there is a good relationship with vocational rehabilitation services; that staff conducts most of the job finding.

Mr. Cox and the staff were very courteous and candid in responding to questions. In addition, Mr. Cox provided us with considerable written material about the program, including his report of October 3 which identified many of the problems with the program. It should also be noted that he favors an upper time limit of six months in the program with exceptions for unusual situations.

An attempt is made to control alcohol and drug use through regular shakedowns, breathalyzer testing and urine surveillance and there reportedly has been no serious problem. Unfortunately, the urine test results are not known for several days and this limits their effectiveness.



407  
APPENDIX E

ADULT CORRECTIONAL ENTERPRISE I

On December 16, Mr. Hurst and I visited Adult Correctional Enterprise I (ACE I) which was formerly Unit 22, the Tidewater Correctional Unit.

Facilities consist of a small administration building and a large permanent building built on the same general plan as other "permanent camps." Mr. C. Maloney, a military retiree, is superintendent. At the time of our visit, the impact of the recent incident in which a police officer was killed was still evident. The work release program had been suspended.

Mr. Maloney had been superintendent for only six weeks and is an impressive individual who has a good grasp of the functions of command and leadership. The situation there could easily have deteriorated, with the suspension of work release, into one of enforced idleness and tension. Mr. Maloney, however, launched an intensive facility maintenance and upgrading program which occupied a good share of the men.

It was obvious that he had launched an effort to better organize all aspects of the program following his arrival and positive results were already showing. Morale of both inmates and staff was surprisingly high in view of the circumstances and the discension among the staff following the assignment of five superintendents in less than a year.

Alcohol and drug testing had been used on a spot check basis for work releasees but unfortunately the turn around time on drug reports was one week.

40

In view of the desirable location of the facility, it is unfortunate that it became necessary to terminate work release here; with adequate staff it would appear there is potential for an excellent program.

48  
APPENDIX F

ADULT CORRECTIONAL ENTERPRISE II

On December 14 and January 8, I visited Adult Correctional Enterprise II (ACE II) which was formerly known as the Woodbridge Correctional Unit or Camp 6 and is a temporary or "stick camp."

The superintendent there is Mr. James Ingle, who was assigned as a regional supervisor of work release before assuming his present position.

The facility here is in even worse condition than the one at Pulaski. Inmates are housed in a dormitory of wood construction which is heated by two old fashioned coal stoves and two oil burners. The rated capacity is seventy which Mr. Ingle says is too high; he prefers sixty. Judging from the crowded condition in the dormitory, I find myself in agreement. During daylight hours, one can see daylight through walls. Maintaining fires adequate to keep the dormitory warm results in coal and oil fumes. Lockers and other basics are lacking. There is no recreation space other than a small shack with donated weight lifting equipment and another with TV viewing. Mr. Ingle has sought improvements in heating equipment and recently learned he is to get a used furnace from the camp at Hanover.

The dining room and food preparation area are marginal. Worn out equipment in the kitchen includes a gas stove which must be left on constantly because of difficulty starting it.

Mr. Ingle shares an office with the counselor and secretary, several filing cabinets, a safe and duplicating machine. The office is about sixteen feet square and again, the writer could see daylight through the outside walls. The office is heated through a hole about ten inches in diameter which was made in the wall separating the office

47

from officer's sleeping quarters. The fan from a discarded air conditioner was installed in the hole to pull heated air into the office. By the time of my second visit, this had broken and coats were necessary in cold weather in spite of two small electric space heaters furnished by Mr. Ingle.

At the time of my first visit, the population of the camp was fifty-four, of whom thirty eight were employed. Until recently, the employment situation had been excellent but has recently shown signs of becoming difficult. Because the camp is nearly 20 miles south of the Washington Beltway, transportation is a major problem with some men traveling as long as two hours each way to and from their jobs. The situation was further complicated by the fact that one of the two vans was out of commission at the time of my first visit. It was back in service by January 8 and was being utilized to transport workers to Arlington in order to take advantage of employment opportunities there.

Mr. Ingle believes selection of work releasees could be improved. He also believes some men are on the program too long; six months is an optimum period, he believes. In reference to selection procedures, he states they recently received a young man for work release who stated he was approved over his objections. He was just starting his sentence and states he did not trust himself in the community.

On another occasion, Mr. Ingle states, an individual diagnosed as a catatonic schizophrenic was transferred to Woodbridge for work release. He was incapable of holding a job and was referred to a local mental health clinic.. He had previously been hospitalized for mental illness and had committed a bizarre robbery, the offense for which he was serving sentence.

Mr. Ingle is doing very well in utilizing community resources but lacks the time and staff to fully benefit from them. At present he is being assisted by the mental health clinics at Mannassas and Alexandria, the Fairfax Drug Abuse Program and the Prince William County schools. The OAR, Second Genesis (private drug program) and St. Vincent de Paul Society have also assisted him. He has had several men transferred to him without adequate clothing and both OAR and St. Vincent de Paul have been helpful. One man arrived with only one pair of trousers, a T-shirt and a pair of shoes. He was unable to go to work until donated clothes could be obtained. There are no clothes available for issue. Apparently there is a system wide shortage because transferees arrive with only the bare essentials. During one of my visits, a work releasee came to inquire if there was anything new in his clothing situation. He had been working as a welder for three weeks with only one outfit of clothing, including a light denim jacket. Efforts to get an allowance for him had become snarled in red tape and been unfruitful thus far.

The handling of inmate funds was a major problem, according to Mr. Ingle. Because there is no regular report to inmates about their accounts, Mr. Ingle and the staff spend an inordinate amount of time making individual inquiries for inmates.

Community attitudes toward the camp are very positive. Shortly prior to my visit, a deputy sheriff stopped by to call to Mr. Ingle's attention the fact that the place of employment of one man was viewed as a hangout for unsavory characters and the individual might come under the influence of some of them if he remained there. The man's employment was changed.

Initially, vocational rehabilitation services were unavailable

because the local counselor, a former corrections employee, was miffed at the department. By the time of my second visit, this had improved and some services were being delivered including psychiatric services.

Three principal problems listed by Mr. Ingle were, in order of priority:

- a) The physical plant
- b) Transportation
- c) Inadequate staffing
- d) Accounting procedures

Mr. Ingle also said that people who believe there is treatment at Woodbridge are mistaken. All they are able to do is provide a minimum of basic services needed to run the program.

At the time of my second visit on January 8, the population had increased to sixty-two, of whom forty-nine were employed. A review of the records revealed this to be an error -- only forty-seven were employed. This error is not wholly Mr. Ingle's but points up the lack of any standard procedure for even population accountability, the most fundamental corrections procedure.

Of the remaining fifteen, six could go to work and had jobs but Mr. Ingle was told by headquarters not to put them out because his employment quota was filled. Thus, these men were forced to remain idle although jobs awaited them.

During my second visit, a review of the records for classification purposes revealed the following:

- i. a) Ten (10) men entered the work/study release program more than six (6) months prior to parole eligibility. Of these ten, convictions were as follows:

## APPENDIX G

### ADULT CORRECTIONAL ENTERPRISE III

On December 19, Mr. Hurst and the writer visited Adult Correctional Enterprise III near Pulaski. This institution, formerly Unit I, is known as a temporary or "stick camp."

We arrived at 5:20 A.M., when inmates going to work that day were being awakened. Two correctional officers were on duty. Breakfast was being prepared by five inmates. It was very adequate and included eggs, bacon, toast, dry cereal, milk, juice and coffee. The kitchen facility was somewhat primitive and the cooks of marginal skill but the food was wholesome.

There were two officers on duty at the time of our arrival and they cited as major problems the use of drugs in the camp -- including "hard" drugs. One pointed out that a syringe had recently been picked up but "nothing had been done about it." (We later were informed by Mr. Underwood, superintendent, that this syringe was a discarded one that had been used in the medical program.) Lack of support for and resistance to the program on the part of some officers was very obvious to us. Some openly harkened for the "good old days" of "gun gangs" and voiced disapproval of permitting prisoners to go to school, especially college. The most vocal individual in this regard, it should be pointed out, was an eighth grade graduate who claimed to have been with the Department for nearly 30 years.

The social and cultural gap between the officers, most of whom were over forty-five, and natives of the area and the inmates, whose average age was in the mid-twenties and reared in larger cities, was obvious and inhibited good communication and understanding.

Murder	4
Robbery	3
Rape	1
Malicious wounding	1
Distributing drugs	1

- b) Twenty-nine of the forty-seven were convicted of crimes such as murder, rape, malicious wounding, robbery, etc., which would have required the Director's approval under proposed guidelines.
- c) Twenty-four received initial sentences of ten (10) years or longer.
- d) Fourteen (14) were serving sentences of five years or less; only one was serving as little as two (2) years.

Mr. Ingle advised the ICC had recommended removal of three (3) individuals from work/study release because of the length of their sentences. Because of their excellent performance, however, they were restored to the program.



At the time of our visit, some renovation of the facility was underway; central heating, new windows and interior walls were being installed in the dining and sleeping areas. This was being done by staff and inmates. In addition, heating stoves had just recently been replaced by furnaces.

This camp and the one at Woodbridge are among the worst correctional facilities the writer has seen. Some of the inmates were still sleeping when I entered the dormitory at approximately 6:00 A.M. It was so foul smelling that it was necessary to leave after a few minutes. The situation was exacerbated by the renovation underway but even allowing for this, it borders on being unfit for human habitation. It is very doubtful if it would meet even minimal standards of sanitation, fire and safety.

The renovation program itself has some penny-wise and pound-foolish aspects to it. Mr. Underwood sought to get insulation material for the ceiling but could not get either the materials or funds to purchase it locally. The resulting cost of heat lost would probably pay for the insulation in a relatively short time.

While the renovation is a significant improvement and badly needed, it will not bring the facility up to generally accepted minimum standards.

An example of questionable classification was encountered there. Among the files reviewed was that of a young man who had recently escaped on the day prior to his scheduled release. He had a detainer from Florida at the time of his assignment to work release at Pulaski. His anxiety about the detainer was evident from correspondence in the file. There was considerable negotiation aimed at having it dropped through both his attorney and corrections headquarters in Richmond. The negotiations were unsuccessful and he escaped, leaving

a farewell letter. A staff member told me the detainer had been dropped but this was not learned until after the escape. There was no documentation of this. Thus, the Department not only failed to maintain basic custody but the escapee is at large under the impression that he has two outstanding criminal charges -- that charged in the detainer and the escape charge. Staff was well aware of the situation as it developed but nobody took the initiative to intervene in order to insure that the individual would be securely confined until discharged by law.

It is also appropriate here to point out that we were informed on several occasions about the necessity of having two staff members on duty from midnight to 6:00 A.M. Yet, both staff members apparently make the institution office their center of activities, with occasional checks made on inmate quarters. One officer informed us he "hated to check" inmate quarters because of the awful things going on. This comment was not supported by other staff or by inmates. This arrangement does, however, represent poor supervision and utilization of staff.

## APPENDIX H

### HARRISONBURG CORRECTIONAL UNIT

On December 20, I visited the Harrisonburg Correctional Unit, also known as Camp 8, which is located north of Harrisonburg. It is of the same design as other "permanent" camps.

Captain D.W. Simpson is superintendent of this institution, having recently returned there after an assignment elsewhere. Mr. Ellinger serves as work release counselor. Because this unit is still a part of the Bureau of Correctional Field Units, all staff are on the payroll of that organization except Mr. Ellinger, who is on the work release payroll.

Although inadequate in many respects in terms of space and design for program purposes, this unit was the best maintained of any visited by me. Considerable "cleaning up" had reportedly been achieved by Mr. Simpson since his arrival. He has a good grasp of custodial procedures and plant maintainance. The staff appears alert and sharp -- reflecting the fact that Mr. Simpson perceives training to be one of his major functions. High standards were evident throughout the basic services of the unit. A few days prior to my visit, the population had been 34, but eleven inmates were moved there from Chesapeake when the program there was terminated and a few hours prior to my arrival, an additional 33 had been received from the Pre-Release Center for "re-evaluation."

This made for a difficult situation, Mr. Simpson pointed out, because there were only 72 beds in the institution -- six fewer than the number of prisoners. Later that day, he received permission to move six men elsewhere. It should be noted that three days later, the thirty-three received from the Pre-Release Center were returned there.

Of those on work release at Harrisonburg, the ICC recommended removal of three but the CCB ordered them restored. I was told all three were doing very well and that removal was based on the long terms they were serving.

The employment picture was said to be becoming increasingly difficult in the area. Only seventeen were employed at the time of my visit. Some go as far away as Staunton, some thirty-five miles and others to New Market. The fact that Rockingham County has over 1,600 people unemployed at present was, Mr. Simpson pointed out, indicative of the problem and he anticipated more work releasees would be laid off soon. In view of the location of this unit, its continuation as a major work release site should be examined.

As noted earlier, the staff here was impressive. The counselor, although inexperienced and in need of training, was well motivated. His academic background is political science, however, and he has little knowledge of social and other services available. He had not, for instance, utilized OAR (Offender Aid and Restoration) for assistance in release planning. One of the work releasees was described to me as a very institutionalized, older individual who has served thirty years on a life sentence for armed robbery. Family and community ties are non-existent or lost. He has been granted parole but remains in custody because of the lack of community resources although he has been on work release for two years and performs well. The need for training is evident from the fact that the counselor was not aware of either the halfway house in Richmond or the OAR group. The writer has since contacted OAR and the staff there has said they will make contact with the Correctional Unit to determine whether they may be of assistance.

## APPENDIX I

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Busher, Walter H., Ordering Time to Serve Prisoners,  
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S.  
Department of Justice, Washington, D.C., 1973.
2. Work/Study Release Policies and Procedures, Bureau  
of Prisons, Washington, D.C., November, 1971.



**END**