

T.A.S.C.

Texans Against Solitary
Confinement

ALU/Separate Seg Edition

Written By: Celandria “CJai”
Foster (Co-Director of the T.A.S.C
Campaign)

IN COLLABORATION WITH
TEXAS PRISONS COMMUNITY
ADVOCATES (TPCA)
WWW.TPCADVOCATES.ORG

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	2
Welcome to Administrative Lock-Up (ALU)	3
The who, what, when, where, and why's of ALU	3
Dictator or Director?	4
The omnipotent pen of TDCJ's Executive Director	4
No Review for ALU	6
Why men in ALU are not given Due Process through the State Classification Committee review process.	6
The Hypocrisy of ALU Housing	7
No Outside for ALU	9
The commonality of sensory deprivation.	9
The ALU Shuffle	10
The senseless 7-day move of ALU residents.	10
Visitation Violations	12
How men in ALU are put through unnecessary hardships to visit their family	12
Mental Mayhem	14
The mental Health Department's indifference and deterioration of men in ALU	14
No Way Out	16
The denial of programs and/or Step Down process for ALU residents	16
What Needs To Be Done	19
Suggestions to the Legislative Members to bring forth to TDCJ for Policy additions	20

INTRODUCTION

“Justice is a two-way street. Criminal Justice is a one-way street.”

Jeffery Reiman pointed this out in his book entitled “A Radical Perspective on Crime.” His observations were towards what plagues the Institutions that we know as Penal (mostly towards those that oversee them). He added-

“To look only at individual responsibility is to look away from social responsibility. To look only at individual criminality is to close one’s eyes to social injustices and to close one’s ears to the questions of whether our social institutions have exploited or violated the individual. Criminal Justice focuses on the first and looks away from the second. Thus, by focusing on individual responsibility for crime, the Criminal Justice system literally acquits the existing social order of any charge of injustice.”

These words of wisdom sum up what the men in ALU are undergoing. Have no doubts, they have been **thoroughly punished**, but have been **denied any further Due Process**. No policy, program, or progress is good enough for them. The research we have conducted has uncovered a group of men that live in a Guantanamo Bay-esque area. All the reforms achieved for Administrative Segregation have been excluded to these men and in most cases not even for what they did to be placed in ALU, but because they have been placed there by someone that wanted to prove a point. The point that we have come to is “We do this because we can.” **Hence, the entire Criminal Justice center has turned its eyes and ears from the ALU situation.**

We’ve decided to turn our eyes and ears to the men in ALU. They count as human beings. They have rights and they deserve better; not because we seek to reward these men, rather to show them they can still work towards and achieve reform and redemption. Even more so, to the authorities that stand over them, reminding them to their **MORAL and HUMANE** obligations.

Supreme Court Justice Brennan expressed that “*prisoners are persons whom most of us would rather not think about. Banished from everyday sight, they exist in a shadow world that only dimly enters our awareness. They are members of a ‘total’ institution that controls their daily existence in a way that few of us can imagine.*” *O’Lone v. Estate of Shabazz*, 482 U.S. 342, 107 S. Ct. 2400, 96 L. Ed. 2d 282 (1987).

A suggestion is, for once- let’s imagine something better- like a place where there’s no modern-day dungeons like ALU that set the precedence of who we are as humans. Perhaps then, just perhaps, we’ll begin to see the rehabilitations we pontificate about and not the atrocities we’ve paved the way for.

WELCOME TO ADMINISTRATIVE LOCK-UP (ALU)

THE WHO, WHAT, WHEN, WHERE, AND WHY’S OF ALU

WHO STARTED ALU? From our research, ALU was started under either Executive Director R.K. Procnier or James A. Lynaugh

WHAT WAS ALU STARTED FOR? ALU was started as an area for prison officials to punish inmates that were not just predators upon other inmates, but inmates that they felt were rabble rousers (even David Ruiz spend time in ALU for his lawsuits against TDC). During the time ALU was conceived there were only a handful of prisons in Texas and TDC officials needed an area to punish and quiet inmates that they felt were a threat (physically as well as politically).

WHEN DID ALU BEGIN TO BE USED? Our research is showing that ALU began being used in the mid to late 80s.

WHERE ARE ALU's LOCATED THROUGHOUT TEXAS? As of now, the only fully functional ALU is located at the Coffield Unit in Tennessee Colony.

WHY IS ALU STILL IN USE? ALU is the lasting legacy of solitary confinement. It is an area that officials still use to severely punish inmates that have violated rules in one way, or another has come to the bad side of TDCJ officials. There's not an inmate in ALU that has a disciplinary case that is not in regular segregation. The tactics that are used in ALU (which will be discussed in this booklet) are cruel and unusual punishment that amount to harassment and discrimination. This is the legacy that ALU is carrying on.

***THE QUESTIONS AT THE END OF EVERY CHAPTER ARE QUESTIONS (BASIC AT BEST) THAT WE FEEL OUR COMMITTEE MEMBERS SHOULD BE ASKING TDCJ OFFICIALS.

1. What are the main criteria for men to be placed and kept in ALU?
2. Why is a Warden not given any say so in who should be released from ALU?
3. Is TDCJ capable of safe and secure housing for the men in ALU at other High Security prisons?

THE OMNIPOTENT PEN OF TDCJ'S EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Throughout every aspect of TDCJ there is some form of Board or Committee that makes decisions about its functions below are just a few:

*TDCJ Board of Pardons and Paroles (BPP)

*Unit Classification Committee (UCC)

*State Classification Committee (SCC)

*Restrictive Housing Committee (RHC)

However, the housing area entitled Administrative Lock-Up (aka Separate Segregation), does not adhere to any Board or Committee. It is over-seen/managed by one person: the Executive Director.

For such a high-profile place, such a job would seem suitable for a high-profile person, yet what our research has found is that there has been at least 9 Executive Directors (see chart below) since the inception of ALU.

What we have found is that there is no specific policy for ALU (in writing) that these Executive Directors use to admit or exit these men. It seems some of these men have been placed here by former Executive Directors for disciplinary infractions that have spilled into personal vendettas (like the 18-year hold on Harold Laird).

These Executive Directors move on from this position every few years and these men are left to languish under the boot of the next Executive Director...then the next...then the next. It could reasonably be assumed that the Executive Director of today knows very little about the men placed in ALU before his time (as several there today were placed there over 10 years ago). ALU has become an Area 51 of sorts.

As you will read in this booklet, all programs are barred to these men. Also, having a review by the State Classification Committee does no good because they are not vested with the power to make a difference.

What this has created is a dictatorship of sorts, one where the Executive Director leads in the blind. When practices become mundane and redundant, usually any semblance of sense and fairness fade away. If something does not progress, it regresses. Such is the reality of ALU.

While we feel ALU has lost its meaning and purpose in TDCJ, if it were to continue, it needs to be regulated under the already established rules and regulations of the Restrictive Housing Plan, not an undemocratic process of a director punishing who it wants to punish, for however long they want to punish them.

When we delve into this realm, it not only pushes us 30, 40 years backward, it pushes us into the very brutal and inhumane systems that we preach against.

Bryan Collier	2016	Present
Brad Livingston	2004	2016
Gary L. Johnson	2001	2004
Wayne Scott	1996	2001
James “Andy” Collins	1994	1995
James E. Riley	1993	1994
James A. Lynaugh	1987	1993
Orson L. McCotter	1985	1986
Raymond K. Procnier	1984	1985
George Beto	1962	1972
Oscar Byron Ellis	1948	1961

1. How many times have Directors in the last 10 years visited ALU?

2. What reports of said visits have they documented?

3. Why don't Directors have one on one interviews with ALU offenders when they are the ones that have authority to release them?

WHY MEN IN ALU ARE NOT GIVEN DUE PROCESS THROUGH THE STATE CLASSIFICATION COMMITTEE REVIEW PROCESS.

The omnipotent pen of TDCJ's Executive Director has cheated the process and task of the State Classification Committee. It has given an intensive job to the Executive Director, one that most have failed greatly at rendering fairness to.

In accordance with the RUIZ final decree, TDCJ is required to create a State Classification Committee to review each prisoner in Administrative Segregation.

SCC is supposed to have input from multiple areas: security, medical, mental health, and unit classification.

The way that ALU has been allowed to be structured under the management of the Executive Director's pen only has virtually disregarded the information accumulated by these departments. For example, if there was input that an offender wasn't recreating, showering, or was cutting himself, it would totally be disregarded. Also, offenders that have gone multiple years with no disciplinary infraction (as several in ALU are) it has no bearing.

Offenders are supposed to be able to call witnesses, present documentary evidence, but if any reviewing Committee has no say, then these residents have been denied all Rights established for them.

(Note: for the first time in 2 years, on March 8, 2022, SCC ran committee for 3 ALU residents: Joseph Acker, Mario Sanchez, and Albin Zelaya-Zelaya. All 3 were denied)

1. How many ALU offenders have SCC done a review on?
2. How many received approval for release?
3. How many of those approved votes for release were accepted by the Director?

(The capricious process of admitting and exiting men in ALU)

In the history of ALU there has been approximately 48 offenders housed there. The infractions range from:

- Murder
- Assault
- Escape
- Extensive contraband
- Organized crime
- Hostage situation

Men with all the above infractions have been released from ALU. Not all these men had clean disciplinary records while in ALU, though there are men in ALU with clean disciplinary records (and some of the same charges) but are being refused release. What are the separating factors?

1. The main reason seems to be some adopted vendetta from someone in TDCJ and it has been passed down the line.
2. Most of the 8 men in ALU currently have very little outside support. Records show that only 2 of the current ALU residents receive family visits (Russell Kerr and Kenneth Foster). Therefore, offenders with no one to speak out for them are left behind as token residents just taking up a space TDCJ wants filled with the false bravado of needed housing area such as this.

Our research has found no other criteria than the already established rules for Restrictive Housing to place men in ALU. It seems men are placed in ALU either by the luck of the draw or a grudge by TDCJ officials.

One of the prime examples of a lack of sense in this process is the men that committed assaults upon staff or other ALU residents being released. We found that several offenders in ALU committed assaults upon a staff member or another offender in ALU and were released (in the case of Ronnie Otems's Jr. who ultimately dies from his wounds). In the case of Julio Casas, he illegally entered the cell of another ALU offender and was still released from ALU (though the offender he assaulted, Harold Laird, remains there 19 years later).

What is alarming is men that have been in ALU 8, 9, 10 years disciplinary case free have not been removed. The path that TDCJ is showing these men is the only way to leave this isolated housing area is to do something violent. We are unable to understand TDCJ's logic.

What we are discovering is that the men left inside ALU are men suffering from mental health conditions. If requested the activity logs for ALU will show these men rarely leave their cells for showers. One offender hasn't showered in a substantial amount of time.

TDCJ's track record in this housing placement has proven to be unprofessional and reckless.

This is the dilemma placed upon the TDCJ Executive Director's seat which wields full control but has very little true interaction.

ALU is a Bermuda Triangle where unconstitutional behavior is being hidden and lauded. Because TDCJ has shown that it cannot properly and fairly run this area it should be immediately closed. As of now, it is only inflicting harm to its staff, its residents, and the offender's family that must witness these injustices.

In the name of Human Rights, this area should be eradicated.

<u>Offender</u>	<u>Cause for ALU</u>	<u>Time In ALU</u>	<u>Reason Released</u>
Harold Laird	Assault/Escape	17 years	NOT RELEASED
Willie Sauls Jr.	Assaults	8 years	NOT RELEASED
Joseph Aker	Assaults	3 years	NOT RELEASED
Russell Kerr	Unknown	12 years	NOT RELEASED
Justin Beaman	Escape	2 to 3 years	NOT RELEASED
Mario Sanchez	Unknown	3 or 4 years	NOT RELEASED
Albin Zelaya	Unknown	7 years	NOT RELEASED
Kenneth Foster		November of 2021	NOT RELEASED
John K Murray	Attempted Escape	1996-2011	Unknown
Carlos Benavidez	Unknown	Before 1997 till 1999	Unknown
Dino Trevino	Unknown	Before 1997 till 1999	Unknown
David Ruiz	Protection	Before 1997 till 1998	Transferred to Estelle due to illness
Vernon Hooper	Attempted Escape	1998-1999	Transferred to Estelle for mass escape attempt

Sammy Rios	Attempted Escape	1997-1998	Transferred to Estelle
Yogi Yabarra	Unknown	1997-1999	Unknown
Adama Cruz	Unknown	1998-1999	Unknown
John K Murray	Unknown	1996-2011	Unknown
Mario Castillo	Attempted Escape	2004-2008	Released when Warden Thompson tried to shut down ALU in 2008
Tony Cavillo	Beat Celly to Death	2004-2011	Released to regular seg
Larry Samford	Serious Inmate Assaults	2003-2008	Released when Warden Thompson tried to shut down ALU in 2008
George Whitehead	Serious Inmate Assaults/Protection	2004-2006	Was sent to mental health facility after repeatedly stabbing himself in the stomach
Sam Duson	Assaulted Warden Chance	2004-2008	Released to regular seg when Warden Thompson tried to shut down ALU in 2008
Travis Runnels	Killed Prison Guard	2004-2006	Transferred to Death Row – Executed
Hicks	Staff Assault	2006-2008	Got out with the help of Terry Hodges
Julio Casas	Repeat Staff Assaults	2007-2008	Transferred to Michael's unit after assaulting Harold Laird in 2008

Danny Herrera	Suspected Dealer in phones and drugs	2008-2011	Released to regular seg on Coffield
Juan Cruz	Suspected Dealer in phones and drugs	2008-2010	Transferred to Estelle
Toby Gustafson	Cell Phones	2008-2010	Released to regular seg on Coffield
Jorge Salinas	Multiple Assaults on staff and inmates	2010-2017	Transferred due to suspected murder of Ronnie Odom's
Gee	Attempted Escape	2011-2013	Shipped to another unit
William S. Kelly	Hostage/Escape/Assaults	2009-2017	Paroled
Frank Jones	Suspected of Murder in regular seg	2010-2015	Released after Salinas speared him in the neck.
Ronnie Odom's Jr.	Serious Staff Assault	2011-2017	Died as a result of being speared
Matthew Gates	Attempted Escaped	2011-2013	Released to regular seg when case was dropped
Michael Giger	Staff Assault	2013-2019	Released to regular seg
George Yarborough	Writing threat letters to federal judges	2015-2019	Released to federal custody when state time was discharged
Clinton Crowley	Hostage Situation	2015-2016	Released to regular seg
Sidney Byrd	Cell Phone/Protection	2015-2015	Transferred
James Byrd	Politics	2015-2021	Transferred to Grad program after a lot

			of struggle and help from Mike Barber
Billy Tracy	Suspected Murder of Guard	2015-2017	Transferred to death row
Robert Baker	Assaulted Warden	2018-2019	Released to regular seg
Arron Williams	Escaped	2018-2019	Transferred to mental health program after many serious breakdowns
Alberto	Attempted Escape	2019-2020	Transferred after repeatedly cutting himself
Bobby Mattox	Cell phones	2019-2020	Released to regular seg
George B	Killed Celly	2019-2019	Released to regular seg
Beasley	Drugs	2020-2020	Released by order of Director Guerrero was never supposed to be there
Lynch	Drugs	2020-2020	Released by order of Director Guerrero was never supposed to be there

1. Are there worse offenses committed by TDCJ offenders than those in ALU and are housed elsewhere in TDCJ?
2. Why have offenders who have assaulted staff and other offenders released from ALU, but offenders who have been well behaved have not been released?

3. Why were some offenders with serious disciplinary records allowed access to programs like GRAD, but other offenders with less severe records not allowed?

No OUTSIDE FOR ALU

THE COMMONALITY OF SENSORY DEPRIVATION.

What is a reasonable amount of time that an offender should have outside recreation? Or rather, what is a reasonable amount of time that an offender should go without outside recreation (which provides fresh air, sun, and a positive sense of being)?

For men placed in Administrative Segregation type areas it seems it's the norm for them to be buried in bars and steel. Some outside recreation areas even have 20, 30 feet high walls that the only part of outside that is seen is the sky. We continue to overlook what we reap when we breed men in dark, cold, numbing places.

For the men in ALU leaving their small 12-man housing areas has been almost impossible. There seems to be no effort put forth to allow these men this small amount of time from full isolation, even when their recreation yard is only a few feet away from their cells. In fact, the ALU outdoor recreation area is so unused that it has become a roost for pigeons and cats and is currently infested and unsanitary for use.

While courts tiptoe around recreation claims, they do find that such time is needed. We also believe that they would find that such isolation and unsanitary yards for ALU verge on cruel and unusual punishment.

The bigger picture is when you seek to continuously bury a man's physical, you must then accept that you also bury a part of his spirit which influences his desire to want change, find peace and have dignity in his incarceration process.

If we continue to ignore this need of the human being, we also ignore the possibility of mental and spiritual growth.

1. How regularly has the outside yard been used for ALU?
2. When is the last time it was used?
3. Why is it not used any longer?

THE SENSELESS 7-DAY MOVE OF ALU RESIDENTS.

One of the most disturbing procedures we've discovered about residents in ALU is that they are moved cells every 7 days. In this scenario men are forced to pack their property every 7 days, move behind other offenders (many who don't shower, have mental and health issues), clean up those cells, unpack for a few days, then pack up again to move. This has been the torturous activity for some men for over 10, 15 years. This is a mentally degrading shuffle.

Through our search of TDCJ policy looking for any rule that sanctions such action is the Special Precautionary Detainer (SPD).

There are 5 main SPD's that may cause an offender to be housed restrictively and moved like this:

1. Escape (ES)
2. Hostage situation (HS)
3. Staff Assaultive (SA)
4. Defeating restraint devices (SR)
5. Life without parole (LWOP)

However, we are finding that many of the men placed in ALU have none of the above SPD's. Again, the discrepancies of men's placement in ALU have them enduring punishments not designed for them (simply because someone wanted them in ALU).

In a common scene- just to go a few feet away from a shower or dayroom-offenders have to be placed in one pair of cuffs with a security black box that clamps over it, along with a second set of cuffs around their wrist, all with their hands BEHIND their backs. For those with medical issues and need to be cuffed in the front, a leather belt is fastened around their waist and the cuffs are secured at the belt. Then the offender is placed in leg shackles.

All of this could be for an offender in ALU for an organized crime case. They have nothing for an escape or a hostage situation or any of the other SPD's.

The restraints and the moves are not even something that men on death row at Polunsky endure.

Also, in the years of ALU existence there has been only one report of any of the cells suffering any type of damage inflicted for escape (Ricky Smith in 1991). The cell searches have proven sufficient in all the years of ALU.

If ALU were to continue then the restraints and moves should only be applied to those that have incurred such SPDs, but the existence of ALU doesn't provide a fair or sensible structure and as long as it exists will continue to levy cruel and unusual tactics to the men there.

1. Why are men without an escape SPD subjected to this 7-day move?
2. What has the moves discovered/thwarted?
3. What is the general policy/criteria for an offender moved every 7 days?

VISITATION VIOLATIONS

HOW MEN IN ALU ARE PUT THROUGH UNNECESSARY HARDSHIPS TO VISIT THEIR FAMILY

There's absolutely nothing therapeutic in the prison experience than visiting one's family. TDCJ officials have come to acknowledge that point so deeply by now implementing Contact Visit Restriction for disciplinary infractions.

ALU visitation rules have moved beyond comprehension. The visiting window has been narrowed to a grim schedule. The senseless ALU label causes administrations to have to dance around already established policy for Ad Seg visitation schedule just to inflict an unnecessary isolation for ALU residents.

There's countless of other Ad Seg offenders that have just as extreme and "high profile" cases that attend visitation around other offenders. In fact, there's even ALU cases of less extremity than those in regular Ad Seg.

The current ALU visitation procedure causes more stress to the administration's time, staff, and to families trying to make it to the Unit during working hours.

In the last 2 decades ALU's visitation schedule has changed multiple times:

*2009 and before: Saturday and Sunday 8am-5pm. ALU visited with the rest of the Unit's offenders.

*2009 and after the days changed to Friday, Saturday, and Sunday, but only one ALU offender could go to the visiting room on the designated day.

*2019 the rule once again changed to Thursday and Friday for visiting (again with the one offender on any given day rule)

*Covid-19 arrived, and visitation was shutdown

*When visits opened back up visits were changed to Tuesday and Thursday, 1pm-5pm. Two offenders could go on any given day, but the time slot must be reserved ahead of time (1pm-3pm or 3pm-5pm). If a 3rd family member tried to reserve a visit for that day, they would be denied (though they could reserve for the next available Thursday or Tuesday). There's no weekend time offered for these family members (not taking into consideration that they have jobs as well).

All of these visitation schedules seem to change due to the feelings, opinions, and biases the Wardens have. There's no integrity in policies that change every few years due to personal agendas.

If men in ALU can live next to each other, recreate, and shower amongst each other, then having a visit in the same area (of course, separate visiting cages) should be permissible. These isolated ALU visits are a waste of time, resources, and energy in the name of a faux security.

Men in ALU should be visiting right next to regular Ad Seg offenders. This is the reason there is no need for ALU.

Let's free up the much-needed workforce that ALU is taking away from the unit. Such efforts in the name of security are only a self-inflicted wound that TDCJ is committing and an unnecessary harassment to the families that need a wider window of time for visits and the same weekend times that other restrictive offenders are afforded.

1. What is the reason that an ALU offender may live next to other ALU offenders (also recreate and shower), but cannot have a visit at the same time as them?

2. Why aren't working family members afforded a weekend visit?

3. Why are ALU visitors only given a 4-hour window for visits?

THE MENTAL HEALTH DEPARTMENT'S INDIFFERENCE AND DETERIORATION OF MEN IN ALU

One of the main objectives of the Mental Health Department when dealing with offenders in isolation is to monitor their progress and/or their deterioration. Their input is-in most instances-highly regarded amongst the Committee's that review men in Ad Seg.

But sadly, as we have highlighted, their input does no good in the ALU process. What this has done is inadvertently rendered the Mental Health Department useless and thus their stroll through ALU has become a hollow procedure. Even when these Mental Health Department staff members observe the deterioration of men, there's nothing they can do to change their situation due to how ALU is structured. This has caused them to stop monitoring what is going on in ALU.

Activity logs show that most of the eight men in ALU no longer attend dayroom time or even shower. There are offenders that have gone months without showering and this is a smoke signal for mental illness.

Also, there are records that show even one ALU resident taking multiple psychotropic medicines.

There are testimonies of men that have cut themselves so many times that the unit was forced to move them out of ALU. Other ALU offenders have played in fecal matter or have had bouts of long-term screaming.

So far, we have found one report of suicide but do not know the offender's name. He committed suicide in 2 cell.

While these symptoms are in regular Ad Seg, there are programs offered to these men that exhibit them. They are not offered to the men in ALU, and it is showing that one must do or suffer something extreme to be taken out of ALU.

It's also procedure that a high-ranking staff member is supposed to make rounds through ALU (Captain, Major, or Warden). These men also observe what is taking place to these men, but again are rendered useless in their ability to remove anyone from the area.

ALU has become a neglected cesspool. Its conditions are subhuman and dangerous. It's also rendering TDCJ's trained staff ineffective.

When a prison system creates a housing of full isolation and neglect it cannot deny the way it effects a human being. Barricading men behind a door doesn't make the symptoms they are facing disappear. Only extending our rehabilitative programs can help them combat the problems of despair and recidivism, and this simply cannot be done through ALU.

1. What does the Mental Health Department offer to ALU offenders?
2. How often does the Mental Health Department give status reports on ALU residents and to whom do they turn them in?
3. How often are Mental Health reports used in SCC?

At the end of this booklet, we find that the men have no viable escape from ALU. For men that want better for themselves, they don't want to succumb to assaulting someone just to get transferred, and even those suffering from mental health issues surely don't want to injure themselves. But under what we have come to see as the ALU way, all other options have been severely curtailed.

We also have been able to accumulate information that in many other ways ALU does not live up to its "high profile/high security" image. TDCJ is so short of staff (Coffield only having 45.72% of positions filled) that even ALU sometimes only has one officer inside its area (two officers are needed for daily functions). Even the Sgt. that is required to run this area is often pulled to other working areas. We would think that for such a "high profile/high security" area that a Sgt. Would never be pulled from this area. Many of the officers that come into this area sleep because there is nothing going on in the area. What is the need for this area then?

It's men in ordinary Ad Seg with the same offenses as the eight men currently living in ALU. There is a place for them, and they are there. Is TDCJ saying they can't stand on a platform of progress and that they- amongst 135 (??) prisons find a place for eight offenders (7 of which are over 40)?

Some of the programs denied to ALU are:

*PAMIO: The program provides mental health evaluation and treatment for the aggressive mentally ill inmate. The treatment program utilizes a multi-disciplinary approach through specific therapeutic modalities. The inmate is expected to work his way through the program and demonstrate progress. Upon successful completion of the program, treatment staff will make a

recommendation to the State Classification Committee (SCC) to review the inmate for a less restrictive housing assignment.

*GRAD (Gang Renouncement and Disassociation): The Returning Population Gang Renouncement and Disassociation program (RP GRAD) is a method for allowing inmates returning to Texas Department of Criminal Justice custody an option to avoid placement in restrictive housing by allowing them an immediate opportunity to renounce their previously established gang affiliation immediately upon their return. This six (6) month, two (2) phase process incorporates components designed to use Cognitive Behavioral strategies to address areas including functional thinking, emotional management, establishing pro-social support networks, establishing positive beliefs and attitudes, goal setting, spirituality and addiction. Interventions utilize both in and out of cell, individual and group activities to expedite the re-socialization process.

*DIVERSION: Diversion is generally divided into three categories: • providing sentencing alternatives at the time of conviction; • providing sanctioning alternatives to revocation; and • reducing the future likelihood of recidivism.

Any others??? (Research to find the answer)

Hidden housing areas like ALU are sores on the progress of Criminal Justice. They not only create unnecessary tasks and burdens for the understaffed units, but exemplifies malice, cruelty, and indifference. Senator John Whitmire and his Criminal Jurisprudence Committee went through many years of work to crack down on Ad Seg failures in the reform and reintegration process. They put in that work, because they recognized the need to work on the human mind and soul and not just the power to step on it. To not extend the work of these people for ALU is to stand against their wisdoms and compassions.

If there is a criterion for a man to come into ALU then there needs to be a criteria for them to get out.

Our hope is that it will be seen ALU is a remnant of the past and has just been one of the forgotten traditions still alive but must be shut down.

By ending such practices, we don't have to worry about the short comings and contradictions any longer and we can put our concerted efforts toward better reforms that enrich the lives of all involved in the Criminal Justice System.

1. What is the purpose of denying reformatory programs to ALU?
2. What separates the charges of men in ALU from the charges of the same disciplinary codes of men in regular Ad Seg?

3. What justification can TDCJ give for retaining men in ALU for over 15 years with little to no disciplinary problems, but not placing active violent offenders there?

The following are important forms and records that must be requested for ALU research
(Cited inside the Restrictive Housing Plan)

*Restrictive Housing Confinement Record, I-201

*Daily Activity Log, I-216

*Security Detention Initial Placement and Notification, I-169A

*Factors that may be considered for release from security detention, I-169B

*Restrictive Housing Log, I-188

*SCC security review hearing record, I-189

Restrictive Housing Review, I-203A

Referral to medical mental health services, I-214

Officers that frequent ALU that should be interviewed***

- Sgt. Anthony Lang
- Sgt. Jeffery Layton

- Sgt. Destiny Blair
- Sgt. Thomas Caldwell
- Sgt. Christopher High
- Sgt. Christopher Helmig
- Lt. Justin Rush
- Lt. William Mullins
- Lt. Kadeem Utuk
- CO Yessenia Camarena
- CO Donald Lee
- CO Donald Reese
- CO Clifton Drum
- CO Chelsea Smith
- CO Mary Dews
- CO Russell Greenlee
- CO Christopher Monk
- CO Abimbola Ajayi
- CO Cynthia Hessel

WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

We ask of the following 3 Committees:

Corrections Committee

Criminal Jurisprudence Committee

Senate Committee on Criminal Justice

To conduct the following:

1. Conduct a full investigation on the claims stated in this booklet. Start by requesting the history and records of ALU (Including why Executive Directors placed men in ALU and

took men out of ALU, all SCC reviews of men in ALU, the mental health records and reports of men in ALU, the Activity Log of ALU and their disciplinary records).

2. Visit the area known as ALU and interview the eight men living in this area.
3. Formulate an opinion as to whether TDCJ has violated established policies and/or the rights of men housed in ALU.
4. If any of the above is found to be true and correct, sponsor a Legislative Bill to permanently close ALU and assimilate these eight men into regular Ad Seg and afford them the ability to join programs that can change their lives for the better.

SUGGESTIONS TO THE LEGISLATIVE MEMBERS TO BRING FORTH TO TDCJ FOR POLICY ADDITIONS

Establish a GRAD program in EVERY region.

- If gang activity is a priority concern for prison units, then establishing programs to combat it is just as much a priority. As of now TDCJ has only two GRAD programs (Ellis One and Ramsey 3 ??) amongst its ———- units. Establishing a GRAD program in every region of TDCJ should become a policy so that inmates all throughout Texas has access to changing their lives and moving forward to more conducive adult activities. TDCJ should seek to establish positive programs as much as lock ups.

Establish a criteria and time frame chart for people that are placed in Administrative Segregation.

- TDCJ should not have an unlimited amount of time they can keep people in Ad Seg, especially when:
 1. There are a variety of offenses that may place a person in Ad Seg (some more severe than others)
 2. Good behavior requirements have been met

We feel there should be a time limit criterion based on the violation and the achievements (disciplinary record, classes accomplished, programs graduated). Just because a case says assault on the code or contraband shouldn't automatically give the State Classification Committee the authority to overlook an offender's progress. If requirements have been met, at a certain point then they should be released from Ad Seg and allowed to move forward in their lives. Giving an omnipotent pen to officials is not just, fair, or reformative.

Mental Health classes (like Anger & Grief management) offered at as many TDCJ Units as possible

The emergency of Mental Health issues GREATLY extends beyond people that suffer from such disorders as ADD, ADHD, PTSD, OCD (all common issues offenders experience), but now extends to offenders that abuse psychotropic drugs by snorting them or over taking them, and highly addictive drugs like meth, K-2, now the interest in Fentanyl (all 3 causing havoc amongst inmate attacks induced by hallucinations from the substances).

People do shake back and do look for help. Let's put time and effort into making firm programs-like C.I.P and Changes, but with a focus on the above issues. You cannot- in reality- talk about a TDCJ today if you are not talking about the above.

Program workers need to be educated in the way the "new" TDCJ is. There has been another generational change in TDCJ: younger, wilder, everything is a party. Yet, the above are recipes for destruction. Building networks of counselors for these matters- with as much fervor as the vast amount of STG workers- could show us the way for a more productive prison.

Extend Over the Counter medications and clothing as approved items under any restriction (Commissary, ZZ, CB) code.

TDCJ has maintained a firm and stable restrictive procedure since its inception. It recently extended its 45-day limit to 60 days. It has also added new restrictive measures under what's known as the Contraband Code (CB).

However, the prison of today is not the prison of yesterday. We are now in a Covid era. Prisons are already restrictive on allowing real hand sanitizer to inmates. They're afforded only the hygienic items offered on the prison commissary, mostly soap and shampoo items which are good for washing hands, but all the items that could be used to assist in physical health (vitamins, cough drops, ibuprofen etc.) are sold under OTC and are barred to anyone on restriction. Also, some of these codes bar an offender from buying a pair of gym shorts and a t-shirt (which is deeply odd as TDCJ requires you to wear these items). If an offender is not in violation of using clothing items to violate TDCJ policy then we should encourage them to retain good clothing. Also, offenders on restriction are afforded buying legal correspondence supplies, but not ribbons for their typewriter. Such should be included.

We need our officials to think forward and include the offender's life in the category of WORTHY for good health (physically, mentally, and spiritually). Good hygiene and a healthy body should be encouraged by TDCJ. It's needed in the age of Covid. Therefore, we seek to have OTC medications and clothing items afforded to people even if on commissary restriction.

Establish a housing area in each region only for offenders undergoing transgender hormonal treatment.

In the face of the newly evolving prison setting there is the transgender offender to bring into the equation. TDCJ is invested with the safety and security of all offenders, however, more education has to be brought into the institution regarding the bringing of an individual that identifies as a woman into a man's prison.

There has always been the struggle of sexual assault, peer pressure, and rape, which is why acts like PREA became law. To combat risky behavior, STI infections etc., officials must be realistic about how to combat having female identifying offenders amongst male offenders. For the safety and security of both sides we suggest a housing area in each region where transgender identifying inmates can be securely housed amongst staff members specially trained to deal with this delicate matter (which could range from body searches to cell searches, urine analysis, proper pat downs etc.) This will help protect the integrity of both sides as they seek to complete their sentences and return to their loved ones.

Adjust the restriction criteria for the new Contraband Code (CB)

Under the new cab code offenders are punished for:

- Possession of a cell phone (or components of one)
- Possession of drugs, tobacco, or cash money
- Dirty urine analysis

The initial punishment is a 180-day restriction of:

- Commissary/E-comm
- Offender telephone services
- No outside purchase (except legal)
- No deposits (except veteran benefits, government checks, pensions, tax refunds, estates, or donation (which are not defined))

Then for 5 whole years the offender cannot:

- Receive E-comm
- Have a deposit down electronically (only via money order or ACH)

We believe that a 5-year ban is extreme for a first-time offense. We believe there should at least be a progression of punishment for rule violation. Also, the 5-year punishment separated by offense.

For example:

First time offense for dirty UA -1 Year

Second time offense for dirty UA - 3 Years

Third time offense- 5 Years

First time offense for cell phone - 3 Years

Second time offense for cell phone - 5 Years

One must realize that just because an offender has some form of violation for example, he/she is caught with 3 cigarettes, this does not mean they are flooding the unit with tobacco and need a 5-year restriction. This is just not the reality.

Perhaps if an offender was caught with massive quantities of drugs or several cell phones, then such an extreme punishment would be reasonable. Our social leaders must realize that all people make mistakes. Give space for reform, but when an offender is adamant on violating rules, then give them the full extent of the punishment.