FILED

Honorable Leif B. Erickson Federal Magistrate Judge Missoula Division P O Box 7219 Missoula, MT. 59807-7219

NOV 29 1994

LOUPALEKSICH JR CLERK

DEFINY CLERK

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MONTANA HELENA DIVISION

IN THE MATTER OF LITIGATION RELATING TO CONDITIONS OF CONFINEMENT AT MONTANA STATE PRISON!

CAUSE NO. CV 93-46-H-LBE

ORDER

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:

TERRY LANGFORD, JAMES BALL, JAMES PETERSCHICK, JEFF DELAPHIANO, TRUEMAN CONRAD, ANTHEL BROWN, DAN MASON, and RUDY MEISSNER, on behalf of themselves and all others presently incarcerated or who will in the future be incarcerated at the Montana State Penitentiary,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

MARC RACICOT, in his official capacity as Governor of the State of Montana; RICK DAY, in his official capacity as Director, Department of Corrections and Human Services; JAMES "MICKEY" GAMBLE, in his official capacity as the Administrator of the Corrections Division of the Montana Department of Corrections and Human Services; MIKE MAHONEY, in his official capacity as Deputy Warden, Montana State Prison; and THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND HUMAN SERVICES.

Defendants.

CAUSE NO. CV 92-13-H-LBE

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED on this 29th day of November, 1994, that the proposed Settlement Agreement of the parties for this action is approved and entered pursuant to Rule 23(e) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. A Rationale will issue following entry of this Order.

DONE and DATED this 29th day of November, 1994

Leif B. Erickson

United States Magistrate Judge

cc: American Civil Liberties Union Foundations

Cannon & Sheehy

Ogle & Worm

Attys. Dept. of Corrections & Human Serv. Keller, Reynolds, Drake, Johnson & Gillespie

David L. Ohler Department of Correction 2 and Human Services 1539 Eleventh Avenue 3 Helena, Montana 59601 4 P. Keith Keller Keller, Reynolds, Drake, 5. Johnson & Gillespie, P.C. ,38 South Last Chance Gulch б Helena, Montana 59601 406-442-0230 7 Attorneys for Defendants 8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MONTANA, HELENA DIVISION 9 10 IN THE MATTER OF LITIGATION Cause No. CV 93-46-H-LBE 11 RELATING TO CONDITIONS OF CONFINEMENT AT MONTANA 12 STATE PRISON 13 TERRY LANGFORD, ET AL. Cause No. CV 92-13-H-LBE 14 Plaintiffs, 15 SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT vs. 16 MARC RACICOT, ET AL., 17 Defendants. 18 19 20 THE TRANSACTION AND SETTLEMENT 21

1. History

22

23

24

25

26

This action was filed concerning conditions at Montana State On about December 30, 1993, the Plaintiffs filed their Prison. Fifth Amended Complaint and on January 14, 1994, the action was certified as a class-action by the Court. References to the action or the Complaint refer to the Fifth Amended Complaint.

2. <u>Settlement</u>

This agreement is entered to settle claims made by the Plaintiffs in the Fifth Amended Complaint as described in paragraph 4 below. The term "Plaintiffs" means all class members as certified by the Court in its Order of 14 January 1994.

3. No Admission of Liability

In negotiating for and entering into this settlement agreement, the Defendants do not admit or concede that any of the Plaintiffs' rights under the United States or Montana Constitutions or under any other law or regulations, are currently being or have been in the past violated at Montana State Prison (MSP).

4. No Additional Relief

Except as otherwise provided in this agreement, the Plaintiffs shall not seek additional relief as to any claims for injunctive and declaratory relief on all issues specifically agreed to by the parties in this agreement, except to recover reasonable and necessary attorneys' fees, expenses, and costs incurred, including those in negotiating or in future enforcement of the settlement agreement. It is understood that the Defendants may contest any and all such fee claims.

5. Admissibility of Settlement Agreement

This settlement agreement shall not be admissible in evidence in any proceeding or trial other than for the sole and limited purpose of enforcement of the agreement, and except for purposes of claim preclusion.

6. Construction of Agreement

This agreement is a document which all parties have negotiated and drafted so the general rule of construction interpreting a document against the drafter shall not be applied in future interpretation of this settlement agreement.

7. <u>Substantial Compliance</u>

The Defendants shall be deemed to be in compliance with the terms of this agreement when they have substantially complied with it. Incidents of non-compliance do not necessarily prevent a finding of substantial compliance. The determination of substantial compliance shall take into account the extent to which exceptions to substantial compliance are sporadic or isolated in nature, are unintentional, are the temporary result of actions by member of the Plaintiff class, and are addressed by corrective action.

Provided that the Defendants make reasonable efforts to hire professional staff and to fulfill the obligations of this agreement, the inability to recruit professional staff shall not be grounds for the Plaintiffs to seek an order of contempt of court. The Plaintiffs, however, may seek a specific enforcement order or other relief from the court to obtain compliance. For purposes of this paragraph, professional positions are those of medical, dental and mental health providers.

8. Emergencies

It may be necessary to temporarily suspend any provision of this agreement in the event of an emergency. An emergency is an

event which makes the terms of this agreement impossible or extraordinarily difficult, and is caused by riot, fire, weather events, acts of God, warfare, strikes, labor disputes, or similar events, not caused intentionally by the Defendants, their agents, or employees.

Should the State Legislature take action making compliance with the terms of this agreement impossible it shall not be grounds for the Plaintiffs to seek an order of contempt of court. The Plaintiffs, however, may seek a specific enforcement order or other relief from the court to obtain compliance.

9. Modification

The parties recognize that change of some conditions or practices may reduce the necessity of change of other conditions or practices. The parties recognize that the Defendants are entitled to substantial deference in their decision on how to improve conditions. Therefore, the parties agree that it may be appropriate that this agreement be modified from time to time. After six months of operation under this agreement, the Defendants may move to modify any portion of it. On a showing by Defendants that such proposed modification will still adequately protect the constitutional rights of the inmates the proposed amendment shall be approved; provided that the modification insures substantially the same level of rights and services as provided in this agreement. Other modifications may be requested by Defendants earlier but will be granted only on a showing of substantial

hardship and that granting of the modification will not jeopardize any of the constitutional rights of the inmates.

In addition, either party may seek modification of this agreement under any circumstance allowed in Rufo v. Inmates of Suffolk County, 502 U.S. ____, 112 S.Ct. 748, 116 L.Ed.2d 862, 867 (1992), and cases decided pursuant to its guidelines.

In addition, the Plaintiffs may seek modification on a showing that conditions at MSP have deteriorated substantially from the time when the complaint was filed.

10. Suspension of Discovery

2.3

From the date of approval of this agreement during the time period covered by it, Plaintiffs and their counsel will not proceed with litigation or discovery in either state or federal court on the subjects addressed by the complaint and by this agreement. Discovery in this action will be suspended. The suspension of discovery will not preclude the Plaintiffs' counsel from meeting with the Plaintiff inmates. Should the Defendants fail to comply with this agreement, the Plaintiffs may revive this action, including undertaking discovery, in accordance with the provisions of paragraphs II, 5, and III, Continuing Jurisdiction.

11. Periodic Reports

Not less than quarterly following the approval of this agreement, the Defendants will report to Plaintiffs' counsel the status of implementation of this agreement. It is the expectation of the parties that the Defendants will comply with this paragraph by providing copies of the monthly reports from the Bureau Wardens

to the Division Administrator deleting personnel matters. It is understood that such reports will be held confidential by Plaintiffs' counsel.

II. SUBSTANTIAL COMPLIANCE

1. Time for Compliance

Unless otherwise specifically provided, Defendants shall have one year from the Court's approval of this agreement to come into substantial compliance with its terms.

2. <u>Selection of Impartial Experts</u>

Defendants' substantial compliance with the terms of this agreement will be assessed by not more than two impartial experts. The impartial expert in general penal conditions will be selected jointly by Plaintiffs' and Defendants' experts.

The parties agree that Defendants' expert, Ronald Shansky, M.D., will be the impartial expert for judging substantial compliance with medical, dental, and mental health provisions.

The Defendants' expert will be:

General Conditions - Gary Deland.

The Plaintiffs' expert will be: General Conditions - Eugene Miller.

If the conditions experts cannot agree on an impartial conditions expert, and the parties cannot agree on an impartial conditions expert, they may request the Court appoint an impartial conditions expert.

3. <u>Determining Compliance</u>

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

1.6

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Approximately six months after the court's approval of this agreement, the Defendants shall arrange for the impartial experts to conduct on-site visits_of_MSP. On-site visits will be up to two days duration. All expenses and costs associated with the work of the impartial experts shall be paid by the Defendants. The cost of such on-site visit shall not exceed \$4,000.00. Each party may select a designee to accompany each impartial expert during the onsite visit. Each impartial expert may review all documents not otherwise privileged, speak with any Defendants or staff member at MSP, and may engage in private conversations with any class member. Each such expert shall abide by all Court Orders regarding confidentiality of prison files. Each such expert shall prepare a written report of his or her findings within 30 days of each onsite visit, and send a copy to Plaintiffs' counsel and Defendants' The report shall include a statement indicating whether or not the Defendants are making satisfactory progress in the opinion of the monitors toward substantial compliance.

Approximately twelve months from the date of the court's approval of this agreement, the Defendants shall arrange for a second set of on-site visits. These visits shall be conducted in accordance with the same terms as the initial visit. The report of each expert shall include a statement indicating whether or not the Defendants are in substantial compliance.

If after the initial site visit the impartial experts report that in their opinion the Defendants are not making satisfactory

progress toward substantial compliance, the Plaintiffs can seek appropriate relief from the court.

4. Early Substantial Compliance

б

In the event Defendants, believe they are in substantial compliance before the expiration of the one (1) year following the Court's approval of this agreement, Defendants shall notify the impartial experts and Plaintiffs' counsel in writing and the impartial experts will conduct an on-site visit and report as noted in paragraph 3 above. Defendants may seek a finding of partial early substantial compliance as noted in paragraph 5 below.

5. <u>Dismissal on Substantial Compliance</u>

Should the impartial experts find the Defendants have achieved substantial compliance, the impartial experts shall make one (1) final on-site visit at the end of four (4) months following the impartial experts' finding of substantial compliance. The impartial experts' final on-site visit will be conducted according to paragraph 3 above.

If, after the final on-site visit, the impartial experts find the Defendants are still in substantial compliance, Defendants' counsel may submit the impartial experts' reports to the Court and request an early dismissal of the action.

If the impartial experts' reports the Defendants have not achieved substantial compliance, the provisions regarding continuing jurisdiction will become effective.

Either party may disagree with the impartial experts' reports and seek relief by appropriate motion from a report of or against

substantial compliance. The impartial experts' reports will be considered as evidence, but not be binding on the Court which will make the final determination of substantial compliance. The parties may undertake discovery before the matter is submitted to the court.

Should the impartial experts report substantial compliance in some areas but not others, Defendants may seek dismissal of portions of the action relating to those areas with which they substantially comply.

III. CONTINUING JURISDICTION

1. Term; Burden of Proof

The Court shall retain jurisdiction over this action until a period of four (4) months after the first report of substantial compliance is reported for the purpose of enforcing the provisions of this agreement. In the event of any motion for an order to obtain relief based upon Defendants' alleged non-compliance, Plaintiffs must establish by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendants' failures or omissions to meet the terms of this agreement are not minimal or isolated, but are substantial and widespread.

2. <u>Non-Compliance</u>

Should the plaintiffs establish that the Defendants are not in substantial compliance, as set forth above, Plaintiffs may only seek the following relief from the Court:

a. An order requiring Defendants to file "Progress Reports" and continue the on-site visits by the impartial experts for the

sites or functions found to be out of compliance at such intervals as may be appropriate;

- b. An order extending the compliance period, but only for the sites or functions found to be out of compliance and by no more than one (1) year increments;
- c. An order extending its jurisdiction over this action, but by no more than four (4) months beyond the date that Defendants are in substantial compliance with this agreement; or
- d. An order seeking specific performance, or other relief, but not an order holding any Defendant in contempt or imposing a fine on any Defendant.

Defendants shall bear the costs of any additional on-site visits required by Defendants' non-compliance with this agreement.

IV. <u>DISPUTE RESOLUTION</u>

In the event a dispute arises as to whether Defendants have failed to substantially comply with the terms of this agreement, counsel for the parties shall proceed as follows:

- a. Counsel for the parties shall make a good faith effort to resolve any difference which may arise between them over matters of compliance. Prior to the initiation of any proceeding before the Court to enforce the provisions of this agreement, Plaintiffs' counsel shall notify Defendants' counsel in writing of any claim that Defendants are in violation of any provision of this agreement.
- b. Within twenty (20) business days of the receipt of this notice, counsel for Plaintiffs and Defendants shall meet in an

10. SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

1 0

4.0

attempt to arrive at an amicable resolution of the claim. If after twenty (20) business days following such meeting, the matter has not been resolved, Defendants' counsel shall be so informed by Plaintiffs' counsel, in writing, and Plaintiffs may then have due recourse to the Court.

V. TERMS ADDRESSING SUBSTANTIVE ALLEGATIONS

The terms and conditions of this part of the agreement are couched in terms of future acts. The Defendants contend that they have implemented many of the terms contained in this part of the agreement, a contention with which the Plaintiffs do not necessarily agree. The use of prospective terms in this portion of the agreement is without prejudice to the Defendants' claims that the programs described have already been implemented.

SECTION 1 - MEDICAL

1.4

A. Medical Director - The Defendants agree to appoint a Medical Director who is responsible for making recommendations for the development of medical policies and procedures which, when adopted, will be largely in compliance with the National Commission on Correctional Health Care Guidelines as they currently exist except as otherwise provided in this agreement. These policies and procedures would include, but not be limited to, such issues as quality assurance, programs for chronic care, special-needs inmates, admission to and administration of the infirmary, and a peer review of the practitioners who are contracting with the State of Montana. The Medical Director shall be responsible for implementing the medical policies and procedures, as well as the duties

- B. <u>Physicians</u> Defendants shall ensure that, in addition to the Medical Director, one or more licensed physicians shall provide medical services as described in Exhibit B. Additionally, Defendants shall ensure two (2) physician assistants or the equivalent, each on a 40-hour week.
- C. <u>Nurses</u> Defendants shall provide adequate nursing staff to cover sick call, the chronic care program, patient follow-up, and to be responsive to any routine or emergent medical situation which may arise on a day-to-day basis. Defendants shall ensure 24-hour nursing coverage of the infirmary.
- D. <u>Nursing Protocols</u> Defendants shall establish and implement standing orders or protocols for the treatment of common conditions by nurses performing sick call. Such standing orders shall be reviewed and approved by the prison Medical Director.
- E. TB Screening Defendants shall conduct TB screening of inmates in conformance with Center for Disease Control Guidelines. Most notably, this shall include a skin-test (PPD) of each inmate upon entry (except any inmate providing documentation of already testing positive for TB), to be administered and read by appropriately trained personnel and recorded in the inmate's medical record. Any inmate with positive skin-test reactions, or with symptoms suggesting TB (e.g., cough, anorexia, weight loss, fever), should be provided a chest x-ray within 72 hours of the skin-test reading or identification of symptoms. Further, all

inmates with negative skin-tests shall be administered a repeat skin-test on an annual basis.

- F. Intake Screening Defendants shall conduct an intake screening of each incoming inmate within 24 hours of admission, excluding weekends and holidays. The screening shall entail conducting a preliminary history and physical, including the taking of vital signs. Initial assessments shall be performed by nursing staff, and for every inmate shall be followed with a comprehensive physical examination to be completed by a physician assistant and/or a physician. Such physical examination shall be completed within the first 14 days of an inmate's admission into the prison. At the discretion of MSP health officials, returnees within one (1) year of their last separation may be exempted from the PE requirements.
- G. <u>Sick Call</u> Defendants shall conduct a daily sick call, except weekends and holidays. The sick call clinics shall be conducted in the satellite (out-patient) infirmaries by an on-site nurse and/or physician's assistant. In conducting these clinics, health care staff shall utilize triage protocols and shall ensure all appropriate follow-up care is provided. Further, Defendants shall ensure all inmates are seen at sick call, by a nurse and/or physician's assistant, within 48 hours of their submission of a request for health care services.
- H. <u>Sick Call/Maximum Security</u> Defendants shall conduct daily sick call, except weekends and holidays, in the Maximum Security Unit, with assessments to be done by the nursing staff and

appropriate follow-up care to be provided on a day-to-day basis. The Defendants shall provide an examination area within the Maximum Security building that is properly equipped and lighted for physical examinations and assessments, excluding weekends and holidays.

- I. Patient Referrals Defendants shall schedule referrals to primary care physicians according to clinical priority, but patients needing to see a physician shall be seen in no more than five (5) days. Patient referrals to specialists outside the prison shall be made by physicians timely, subject to review by the facility's medical review panel in appropriate cases. Medical Review Panel decisions shall be made consistent with DOC's level of therapeutic care policy number 528 attached as Exhibit C.
- J. Over-the-Counter Medications Defendants shall revise the current over-the-counter medication policy and implement such revised policy so that any over-the-counter medication that is authorized by a licensed health care provider shall be provided by the Defendants for the period of time recommended by the health care provider, and in any other instance over-the-counter medications shall be available for purchase to the inmate population through the canteen. The policy shall set forth under what conditions or circumstances over-the-counter medication is considered medically indicated. It is the expectation of the parties that over-the-counter medications shall be provided for common ailments when medically appropriate.

- L. <u>Medication Distribution</u> With respect to distribution of medication, Defendants shall comport with state law and the Administrative Rules of Montana Board of Nursing Guidelines.
- M. Chronic Care Patients Defendants shall develop and implement a program for the care of chronic care inmate/patients. The chronic care provided shall entail a clinic or examination for each chronic care patient at least once every four (4) months, and at greater intervals where medically indicated. Inmates who are considered to be chronic care patients shall include, but not be limited to, inmates who are: diabetic, asthmatic, HIV+, TB+, hypertensive, and epileptics.
- N. Eye Care The Defendants shall provide eyeglasses to those inmates who need them. Should an inmate break his eyeglasses through no fault of his own, the same shall be replaced at Defendants' expense. If an inmate's eyeglasses are broken through the inmate's fault, the Defendants shall replace the eyeglasses at the inmate's expense, provided that should an inmate be indigent, as defined in the indigency policy, the Defendants shall nevertheless replace the inmate's eyeglasses, billing the cost to his account. The Bureau Warden shall have the discretion to determine whether or not to replace an indigent inmate's eyeglasses more than one (1) time in one (1) year.

3.

4

5

6 7

10

11 12

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25 26

The Defendants shall provide adequate dental care to inmate population.

- <u>Dentist</u> Defendants shall retain or contract for dental staff who shall provide adequate dental services within 60 days of any routine or non-urgent request made regarding dental health care within the institution. If Defendants cannot provide such services within 60 days, Defendants shall add additional resources so as to reduce the inmate waiting period to within 60 days.
- B. Emergency Dental Care The Defendants shall ensure timely provision of emergency dental care to inmates.
- Elimination of Backlog Defendants shall contract with health care providers to eliminate the backlog of requests for dental health care. The backlog shall be eliminated within one (1) year of the date of the signing of this agreement. In the process of eliminating the backlog, the Defendants shall prioritize cases according to clinical priority. The Defendants shall re-evaluate the current level of staffing once every six (6) months to determine if additional dental staff is needed. Once the backlog has been eliminated, the Defendants shall initiate a program to provide dental hygiene services.

SECTION 3 - MENTAL HEALTH

The Plaintiffs' mental health expert, Jeffrey Metzner, M.D., and the Department of Corrections and Human Services psychiatrist, David Schaeffer, M.D., shall recommend a plan to the parties for provision of mental health care services to the inmate population

at MSP. MSP shall have a psychiatrist more than half time (more than 20 hours per week) to provide clinical and administrative leadership, as well as treatment. If the doctors cannot agree on recommendations, the matter shall be submitted to the parties under the dispute resolution provisions of this agreement.

SECTION 4 - OVER-CROWDING PHYSICAL PLANT

- A. Out of Cell Time As used in this agreement the term "general population" or "general population inmates" means inmates of Montana State Prison who are housed inside the prison security perimeter fence and specifically excludes inmates in maximum security, reception, temporary lock-up, detention, disciplinary restriction, or patients in the infirmary. The Defendants agree to provide the opportunity for all inmates in general population to spend at least eight (8) hours out of cell time on a daily basis.
- B. <u>Preventive Maintenance</u> The Defendants agree to establish and maintain a preventive building maintenance program.
- C. Work Orders on Housing Units The Defendants agree to make work orders affecting the housing units and pertaining to a violation of public health codes and/or fire safety codes priority projects, and the Defendants will respond to them within 48 hours, weekends and holidays excepted.
- D. <u>Compliance With Building Codes</u> The Defendants agree to comply with State building, Public Health and Fire Codes.

SECTION 5 - CLASSIFICATION AND TREATMENT

A. <u>Objective Classification</u> - The Defendants agree to implement an Objective Classification System largely in compliance

- B. <u>Coordination With Parole Board</u> The Defendants agree to work with the Parole Board in coordinating the development of treatment plans for all Reception inmates, if admission occurs more than one year from the date of last separation.
- C. Annual Review of Treatment Plans The Defendants agree to conduct annual reviews of treatment plans for the inmate population.
- D. <u>Priority for Treatment Programs</u> The Defendants agree to give priority for access to treatment programs to inmates who are nearest to parole eligibility and to inmates who have parole conditioned on their completion of specific treatment programs. The Defendants will keep rosters of parole eligibility requirements and projected discharge dates to prioritize enrollment.
- E. <u>Disciplinary Handbook</u> The Defendants agree to develop, implement and make available for all prisoners a disciplinary handbook that describes offenses, penalties, and proceedings relative to the disciplinary process.
- F. Temporary Lockup in Maximum Security The Defendants agree that any temporary lock-up situation that would place an inmate in Maximum Security must receive prior approval from the Unit Manager and/or his designee (the next person in the chain of command) or higher authority prior to placement in the Maximum Security Building. The Defendants also agree that a due process

1.1

hearing will occur within 72 hours (except weekends and holidays) unless additional investigation is needed to complete the case. The Defendants agree not to transfer any inmate to Maximum Security based solely on information obtained from a single confidential informant.

SECTION 6 - SECURITY

- A. <u>NIC Recommendations</u> The Defendants agree to implement those listed recommendations of the NIC Audit Team in Exhibit D.
- B. <u>Intercom</u> The Defendants agree to repair and maintain an all-unit intercom or similar system within the housing units inside the perimeter security fence at Montana State Prison.
- C. <u>Supervision and Training</u> The Defendants agree to provide appropriate supervision and security for the population of Montana State Prison consistent with the mission and quality management philosophy. Defendants shall insure provision of a staff training program for corrections officers both pre-service and in-service.

SECTION 7 - MAXIMUM SECURITY

- A. <u>Use of Force and Follow-up</u> The Defendants agree to maintain and adhere to Department of Corrections and Human Services use of force policy number 09-010 and MSP's Maximum Security policy.
- B. <u>General Population Maximum</u> Inmates who have moved satisfactorily through the stratification system within the Maximum Security Unit and have spent 60 days on Level IV with clean conduct are eligible for consideration as "Maximum Security-General

Population" (GP Max). The determination whether an inmate is classed as GP Max is in the discretion of the Maximum Security Unit Management Team. Inmates classified as GP Max will be allowed at least 26 hours out-of-cell per week, including one meal per day outside the cell, and 1 1/2 hours of recreation time every other day. It is the expectation of the parties that some inmates in this classification may be able to be outside the Maximum Security building but within the Maximum Security compound to perform work or recreation.

- C. <u>Programs in Maximum</u> The Defendants agree to preserve the current stratification program and offer inmates in the Maximum Security Unit cell study and Anger Management.
- D. <u>Mental Health in Maximum</u> The Defendants agree to conduct mental health rounds on a weekly basis in the Maximum Security Unit.

SECTION 8 - GOOD TIME

A. Revision of Good Time Statutes - The Administrator of the Corrections Division and Director of the Department of Corrections and Human Services agree to recommend to the Governor legislation in 1995 establishing a day-for-day good time allowance. In the event such legislation fails, the Defendants will work jointly with Plaintiffs to issue a memorandum to the population describing the good-time policy and explaining the nuances relative to this policy and to develop a simplified format for calculating good-time. If the parties are unable to agree on the memo or the format this

E. SECURITY

1. That the institution engage a security expert to conduct a full-scale security audit.

Response: Done.

2. That some person or method for coordinating intelligence across shifts and across living units be developed.

Response: Done.

3. That a policy be developed that requires video taping of any critical incident or use-of-force situation in which time allows video tape equipment to be brought into position. Make the use of the video tape a supervisory responsibility.

Response: Done.

4. That recreation be actively and regularly supervised for Max inmates.

Response: Done.

5.) That technical assistance be arranged for an analysis of post positions and staffing needs. $= \# \log A$

Response: Done.

6. That a psychological autopsy of any inmate suicide be mandated.

Response: Done.

7. That an appropriate analysis of every serious security threat or violent incident be prepared, even if it is a criminal act for which the AG has primary investigative responsibility.

Response: Done. The use-of-force policy requires review of any use of force.

F. INMATE PROGRAMS/SERVICES

1. That the amount of individual counseling time available to inmates within the living units be increased.

Response: Being improved as unit management is implemented.

2. That more inmate pay jobs for maintenance and clean-up be organized, both inside and outside the living units.

Response: Done.

 That a medium-ranged strategy to increase inmate programming opportunities and decrease idleness be developed.

Response: This is being done.

4. That a thorough audit of MSP medical services be conducted using outside medical experts.

Response: Done.

5. That the food service operation be reviewed with particular attention to sanitation, the food preparation area, presentation and temperature standards.

Response: Done.

6. That increased mental health programming be provided; develop medium-range plans for housing and services for special needs offenders, e.g., geriatric inmates, physically disabled inmates, etc.

Response: This is being done through the addition of additional psychiatric services.

7. That MSP plan to provide programming for Max inmates.

Response: A limited amount of programming is done for Max inmates and through stratification.

(8.) That the institution provide inside recreation space within Max (perhaps on the various blocks) and provide some recreation equipment or games that can be used for outside recreation.

Response: A limited amount of recreation space and equipment is available.

G. TRAINING

1. That some minimum amount of corrections-specific supervisory training and management be established as mandatory for those two groups of staff.

Response: A training program curriculum is being developed.