

Tamms Closed Maximum Security Unit: Ten-Point Plan Brief

Point 1: Allow each inmate placed at Tamms CMAX to have a Transfer Review Hearing.

- Specific timelines to conduct Transfer Review Hearings are being designated.
- Inmates will be given an opportunity to refute information and/or offer evidence that may impact the transfer decision to “supermax,” with an opportunity to appeal their placement to the Chief Legal Counsel of the IDOC.
- An audio recording of all Tamms CMAX placement hearings will be maintained.

Point 2: Each inmate will be informed of an estimated length of stay and how privileges can be earned to provide for eventual transfer from Tamms CMAX.

- Based on the offense the inmate committed, staff will use professional correctional judgment to inform the inmate of a range of time he should expect to serve given their reason for being at Tamms CMAX.

Point 3: Promote the medical and mental health evaluation process conducted prior to and after placement, for each inmate sent to Tamms CMAX.

- Mental health services provided at Tamms CMAX exceed those provided at other prisons.
- From now on, full mental health evaluations will be conducted by a clinical mental health staff within 30 days of placement.
- Mental health staff will make weekly rounds in all housing units to identify any inmate that may be decompensating as a result of transfer to the facility.

Point 4: Increase inmate privileges throughout the Behavioral Level System to incentivize positive behavior at Tamms CMAX.

- The amount of out-of-cell recreation time, commissary, and frequency of showers will be increased, and telephone privileges also will be added.

Point 5: Begin offering General Educational Development (GED) testing at Tamms CMAX.

- Two action-oriented options have been developed for inmates to take the GED examination while at Tamms CMAX. The facility recently was designated as an approved GED testing site.

Point 6: Implement congregate religious services for inmates at Tamms CMAX.

Point 7: Rescind some of the printed materials restrictions for inmates at Tamms CMAX.

Point 8: Develop a plan for beginning a Reassignment Unit at Tamms CMAX to compliment the ADRMP operated at other step-down sites.

- A Reassignment Unit will be introduced as an intermediate step for inmates who present the most risk if transferred from Tamms CMAX, awaiting potential transfer to ADRMP step-down sites.

Point 9: Plan a media, legislative, and public outreach strategy that includes hosting a day-long visit to Tamms CC.

- The Department will emphasize the many mental health and program services available to Tamms CMAX inmates through a new outreach approach.

Point 10: Reexamine the cohort of inmates having served extensive time at Tamms CMAX for transfer eligibility.

- A review of inmates held at Tamms CMAX from program inception in 1998 through 2004 has determined that 48 of 133 cases reviewed were deemed eligible for release through ADRMP or the proposed Reassignment Unit.

Tamms Closed Maximum Security Unit: Overview and Ten-Point Plan

Illinois Department of Corrections
Michael P. Randle, Director



Submitted to Governor Pat Quinn
September 3, 2009

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Section 1: History of Tamms Correctional Center	1
• National	1
• Illinois	1
• Tamms Closed Maximum Security Unit	2
Section 2: Method of Review	3
Section 3: Tamms CMAX Population Data Overview	4
• Profile	4
• Inmate Movement Flow	5
Section 4: Review Findings	7
• Statutes	7
• Placement	7
• Long-term Isolation	8
• Legal and Advocate Issues	9
• Operational Indicator Impact	10
• Level 1 Bed Utilization	11
• Per Capita Cost and Staff Ratio	12
• Recidivism Analysis	13
Section 5: Ten-Point Plan	13
• <u>Point 1</u> : Allow each inmate placed at Tamms CMAX to have a Transfer Review Hearing.	14
• <u>Point 2</u> : Each inmate will be informed of an estimated length of stay and how privileges can be earned to provide for eventual transfer from Tamms CMAX.	16
• <u>Point 3</u> : Promote the medical and mental health evaluation process conducted prior to and after placement, for each inmate sent to Tamms CMAX.	16

- Point 4: Increase inmate privileges throughout the Behavioral Level System to incentivize positive behavior at Tamms CMAX. 21
- Point 5: Begin offering General Educational Development (GED) testing at Tamms CMAX. 22
- Point 6: Implement congregate religious services for inmates at Tamms CMAX. 23
- Point 7: Rescind some of the printed materials restrictions for inmates at Tamms CMAX. 23
- Point 8: Develop a plan for beginning a Reassignment Unit at Tamms CMAX to compliment the ADRMP operated at other step-down sites. 24
- Point 9: Plan a media, legislative, and public outreach strategy that includes hosting a day-long visit to Tamms CC. 25
- Point 10: Reexamine the cohort of inmates having served extensive time at Tamms CMAX for transfer eligibility. 26

Report Tables

- Table 1: Adult Male Prison Population Profile
- Table 2: Tamms CMAX Disciplinary Segregation and Administrative Detention
- Table 3: Tamms CMAX End-of-Month Population
- Table 4: Tamms CMAX Population Summary and Length of Stay
- Table 5: Tamms CMAX Population Movement by Month
- Table 6: Tamms CMAX Exits and Out-of-Sate Transfers
- Table 7: Selected Department Operational Variables
- Table 8: Level 1 Cell and Bed Utilization
- Table 9: Tamms Correctional Center Per Capita Cost and Staff-to-Inmate Ratio
- Table 10: Recidivism Rates for Inmates Released from Prison after Incarceration at Tamms CMAX by Type of Exit
- Table 11: Recidivism Rates for Inmates Released from Prison after Incarceration at Tamms CMAX by Fiscal Year
- Table 12: Three-Year Recidivism Rates: Tamms CMAX Inmates Versus Male Inmates Exiting with a Maximum Security Classification Designation
- Table 13: Mental Health Services by Parent Facility

Tamms Closed Maximum Security Unit: Overview and Ten-Point Plan Executive Summary

Overview

There are 57 “supermax” facilities in 34 states that house approximately 20,000 inmates within the United States. In Illinois the impetus for a “supermax” facility, termed Tamms Closed Maximum Security Unit (CMAX), took place in 1993 through the Illinois Task Force on Crime and Corrections. The Task Force cited factors such as too much double-celling within existing maximum-security prisons, increases in staff and inmate assaults, lack of segregation space throughout the Illinois Department of Corrections’ (IDOC) prisons, and the high number of system-wide lockdown days as part of the justification for a “supermax” facility. The impact of these and other factors created a “disruptive influence” on the entire correctional system. This included inhibiting opportunities for rehabilitative program services among inmates in Illinois prisons. While the Task Force unanimously agreed on the need for a “supermax” as a management tool, they also noted that the facility should not be utilized as a permanent assignment for inmates.

Tamms CMAX opened during March 1998 with a capacity to house 500 inmates. Tamms CMAX currently holds three classes of inmates: Disciplinary Segregation inmates, (inmates that have been found guilty of serious assaultive, predatory, or violent offenses while incarcerated), Administrative Detention inmates, (inmates that are validated members of Security Threat Groups), and Special Treatment Unit inmates (inmates that been diagnosed with a mental illness, but are clinically appropriate for Tamms CMAX placement).

Historically, there have been few inmates sent to Tamms CMAX among the entire prison population. Generally six-tenths of one percent of the prison population is housed at Tamms CMAX. A profile of “supermax” inmates indicates that Tamms CMAX inmates have an extensive disciplinary history or are heavily involved in gang activity. Most transfers to “supermax” are from maximum-security prisons. The overall average length of stay for Tamms CMAX inmates is 60.8 months; 51.6 months for exits and 73.4 months for the current population.

Based on the various methods of review detailed within this report, the following conclusions and recommendations are being submitted for consideration. There is and will continue to be a need for Tamms CMAX to be operated by IDOC. There is ample evidence contained in this report that note significant decreases in staff and inmate assaults within the correctional system that correlate with the opening and operation of Tamms CMAX. There have also been significant decreases in Security Threat Group activity since the introduction of Tamms CMAX. While the need for such a facility exists, there are several operational reforms that are being recommended for the facility in the form of a Ten-Point Plan.

Ten-Point Plan

Point 1: Allow each inmate placed at Tamms CMAX to have a Transfer Review Hearing.

Specific timelines to conduct Transfer Review Hearings are being designated. Inmates will be given an opportunity to refute information and/or offer evidence that may impact the transfer decision to “supermax.” The inmate will be given an opportunity to appeal their placement to the Chief Legal Counsel of the IDOC. An audio recording of all Tamms CMAX placement hearings will be maintained.

Point 2: Each inmate will be informed of an estimated length of stay and how privileges can be earned to provide for eventual transfer from Tamms CMAX.

This estimated length of stay will include information regarding the average length of stay for inmates at Tamms CMAX. Based on the offense the inmate committed, staff will use professional correctional judgment to inform the inmate of a range of time he should expect to serve given their reason for being at Tamms CMAX.

Point 3: Promote the medical and mental health evaluation process conducted prior to and after placement, for each inmate sent to Tamms CMAX.

Evidence supports that mental health services provided at Tamms CMAX exceed those provided at other prisons. Each inmate placed at Tamms CMAX will receive a full mental health evaluation by a clinical mental health staff within 30 days of placement. Mental health staff will make weekly rounds in all housing units to identify any inmate that may be decompensating as a result of transfer to the facility.

Point 4: Increase inmate privileges throughout the Behavioral Level System to incentivize positive behavior at Tamms CMAX.

Dependent on behavioral adjustment, the amount of out-of-cell recreation time, commissary, and frequency of showers will be increased. Telephone privileges also will be added to the Behavioral Level System at the facility.

Point 5: Begin offering General Educational Development (GED) testing at Tamms CMAX.

Two action-oriented options have been developed for inmates to take the GED examination while at Tamms CMAX. The facility recently was designated as an approved GED testing site.

Point 6: Implement congregate religious services for inmates at Tamms CMAX.

Dependent on behavioral adjustment, inmates will be allowed to participate in congregate religious services.

Point 7: Rescind some of the printed materials restrictions for inmates at Tamms CMAX.

Additional access to printed materials will be granted to “supermax” inmates.

Point 8: Develop a plan for beginning a Reassignment Unit at Tamms CMAX to compliment the ADRMP operated at other step-down sites.

The Department will introduce a Reassignment Unit as an intermediate step for inmates who present the most risk if transferred from Tamms CMAX, but have demonstrated appropriate adjustment behavior. Enhanced privileges will be allowed for these inmates until transfer to ADRMP step-down sites.

Point 9: Plan a media, legislative, and public outreach strategy that includes hosting a day-long visit to Tamms CC.

The Department will emphasize the many mental health and program services available to Tamms CMAX inmates through a new outreach approach.

Point 10: Reexamine the cohort of inmates having served extensive time at Tamms CMAX for transfer eligibility.

A review of inmates held at Tamms CMAX from program inception in 1998 through 2004 was conducted to determine if there were additional ADRMP candidates within the population. Of the 133 cases reviewed, 48 were deemed eligible for release through ADRMP or the proposed Reassignment Unit.

INTRODUCTION

The appointment of Michael P. Randle as Director of the Illinois Department of Corrections was announced on May 14, 2009 by Governor Quinn with one of several mandates to review the conditions and management of the Tamms Closed Maximum Security facility (Tamms CMAX). In response, the first order of business set forth by Director Randle was to complete an exhaustive evaluation of the Tamms CMAX program within the first month of appointment. The report that follows details the development and impact of the program, while providing recommendations for improving program operations.

SECTION 1: HISTORY OF TAMMS CORRECTIONAL CENTER

National

Over the course of world history there have been many types of prisons emphasizing variants of isolation environments, but “supermax” terminology did not begin until the 1980s. The concept of the “supermax” prison primarily evolved from two prisons: United States Penitentiary (USP) Marion in downstate southern Illinois which opened in 1963 and Pelican Bay State Prison operated by the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation which opened in 1989 in northern California. In 1983, two correctional officers were killed in separate incidents at USP Marion, and the facility went into permanent lockdown status. The USP Marion security level was not downgraded until November 1994 when USP Florence located in south central Colorado was opened. In 1989, Pelican Bay State Prison was opened with half of the prison operated as the Security Housing Unit, or “supermax” unit, designed to house inmates presenting serious management concerns.

After Pelican Bay State Prison became operational, a number of states opened “supermax” prisons or units within prisons designed to hold the most serious violent offenders. The number of “supermax” facilities is highly dependent on the definition that was employed to make the “number” determination. The number of facilities has not been constant as evidenced by the following: According to a 1996 survey conducted by National Institute of Corrections (NIC), there were 15 facilities opened from 1989 through 1993, five more from 1994 through 1996, and five projected to open by 1999.¹ The survey determined there were at least 57 “supermax” facilities nationwide, with 34 states operating or planning to open a “supermax” facility. A 2004 Urban Institute survey found that the number of states operating a “supermax” facility increased to 44, with a collective population of over 20,000 inmates.²

Illinois

In Illinois, the impetus for Tamms Correctional Center came from the Final Report of the Illinois Task Force on Crime and Corrections. The work conducted by the Task Force began in February 1992 and concluded with the publication release in March 1993. The Task Force was created by Governor Jim Edgar charged with “exploring new ways not just to deal with prison crowding, but also to protect society, to ensure justice, and to do so in an affordable, cost-effective manner.” Among 26 recommendations, two were directed at creating a “supermax” environment. The remaining recommendations targeted early release mechanisms encompassing good conduct credit and compassionate release; and alternatives to incarceration.

¹ National Institute of Corrections. (1997). *Supermax Housing: A Survey Of Current Practice*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Corrections.

² Daniel P. Mears. (2006). *Evaluating the Effectiveness of Supermax Prisons*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

The Task Force cited a number of factors surrounding the need for a closed maximum-security environment, including too much double-celling of maximum-security inmates, excessive gang-related activity, inordinate increases in staff and inmate assaults, lack of segregation space system-wide, and brevity of segregation stays because of lack of segregation space. The disruptive influence of these factors on the entire correctional system was such that rehabilitative opportunities were greatly affecting program effectiveness. The Task Force “concluded unanimously that the Department of Corrections absolutely must be given an adequate management tool for controlling the behavior of these violent inmates.” However, the Task Force also noted that “to succeed as a management tool, a Super-Max facility should not generally be used as a permanent assignment.” The Final Report advised that there be three progressively less restrictive levels of security within a “super-max” emphasizing out-of-cell time, privileges, and visits. They also suggested reviews of inmate behavior take place every thirty days.

Several years later, the Director of the Illinois Department of Corrections appointed a panel of correctional professional experts and charged them to “thoroughly and objectively appraise the Illinois Department of Corrections’ management of the adult inmate population and offer recommendations for improvement.” Amid a period of mounting national significance on crowded and antiquated correctional facilities, increasing numbers of violent and gang-affiliated inmates, and dwindling resources for inmate programs; corrections was attracting substantial public attention and IDOC was responding with many operational and organizational changes. The Performance Review Panel was established to examine these issues to help shape the Department’s future, which were detailed within a final report released in June 1997.

Of the six major charges given to the Panel, three included a focus on policies and practices to control inmate behavior, the extent of gang influence in the prisons, and other areas of enhancement. The Panel recommended that the Department examine policies and implement new procedures to better control contraband, drugs, and alcohol; to increase inmate discipline; to reduce inmate personal property; to reduce inmate movement; and to reduce some inmate privileges. Regarding gang activity, there was a recommendation that the Department should continue to examine practices and implement new procedures that would effectively reduce the status and influence of gangs in the correctional system. Another recommendation suggested that the Department conduct a thorough review and revalidation of their classification system. Further, the Panel recommended that unit management be expanded throughout the entire system and that additional resources be sought to achieve this goal.

Tamms Closed Maximum Security Unit

In response to the Department’s need to more effectively manage the disruptive influences contained within the correctional system as indicated by both the Task Force and Panel, construction on Tamms Correctional Center (CC) was completed. Tamms CC consists of two official physical locations: Tamms Closed Maximum Security Unit (CMAX) and Tamms Work Camp. The Work Camp was opened on June 8, 1995 with both ideal and rated capacity set at 200 to serve as a support facility for the CMAX. The CMAX admitted an initial set of inmates on March 9, 1998 with both ideal and rated capacity standards of 500. Note that the Department officially reports 530 cells that can hold individual inmates at the CMAX, which is higher than the capacity standards.

Tamms CMAX is comprised of inmates representing three sub-populations: Disciplinary Segregation, Administrative Detention, and Special Treatment. The Disciplinary Segregation population is made of inmates who have been found guilty of committing a singular or multiple serious infraction(s) through an administrative hearing. Administrative Detention inmates have been validated as a Security Threat Group (STG) affiliate and have not renounced STG affiliation, or have not progressively demonstrated positive adjustment behavior to be transferred to a step-down program. The Special Treatment Unit houses

inmates diagnosed with mental health issues that are deemed clinically appropriate for placement within the unit.

Tamms CMAX also contains the State execution chamber which has been utilized only once since becoming operational (March 17, 1999). With the State moratorium in place regarding execution of death sentences, there is no expectation that the execution chamber will be utilized soon, although the Condemned Unit at Pontiac Correctional Center (current population totals 15) continues to grow as a death sentence can still be imposed on offenders in Illinois.

SECTION 2: METHOD OF REVIEW

The context of the Tamms CMAX evaluation contained both a qualitative and quantitative emphasis. Quantitative data were analyzed from on-site records and centralized inmate databases. From a qualitative standpoint, elements employed included document review, on-site observation, off-site tour, and interviews with inmates and staff.

After Director Randle's appointment on May 14th, but prior to beginning work on June 8th, he directed staff to prepare all relevant policy, procedures, and directives regarding Tamms CMAX for systematic examination. These instructions corresponded with staff describing specific processes for transferring inmates to Tamms CMAX, providing program services and privileges to Tamms CMAX inmates, appraising adjustment behavior progress while incarcerated at Tamms CMAX, gathering and recording intelligence information, assessing mental health treatment methods and associated supervision techniques, and preparing inmates for release from Tamms CMAX. Director Randle began examination of these documents prior to his start with the Department.

Director Randle also required staff to conduct a random master file review of the entire Tamms CMAX population to determine the best possible candidates for transfer to the step-down program (Administrative Detention Re-entry Management Program or ADRMP). Random meaning that the Department already has a standardized process for reviewing inmate adjustment behavior progress every ninety days, and this task was outside of normal procedure.

Since beginning work in Illinois Director Randle has made at least one site visit to Department correctional centers per week. Given the import of issues presented by Tamms CMAX operation, his initial site visit was to Tamms CC on June 9th, the second day on-the-job. This site visit encompassed a roundtable meeting with facility administrators; and Department executive, intelligence, and planning staff. The discussion was supplemented with face-to-face interviews of more than fifty CMAX inmates, and also with facility operations and program services supervisory staff. Further, during the nine-hour site visit, Director Randle toured the entire facility and grounds to observe staff in-action and examine the physical plant of the facility.

Another task targeted the aggregate data collection effort describing the characteristics of Tamms CMAX inmates, flow of inmate movement from admission through release, and the impact the facility has had on inmate behavior and correctional system-wide operations. Data were tabulated mostly from program inception through recent dates, with some trend data compiled from earlier fiscal years; and across comparable prison populations.

Based on Director Randle's recommendation, three Tamms CC staff (warden, assistant warden of operations, and clinical services supervisor) conducted a site visit of the Ohio State Penitentiary (OSP) on June 30th and July 1st to gain another perspective regarding management of a correctional facility with a similar mission. The primary areas of interest were related to classification processes, security procedures, and program and service delivery.

The OSP off-site visit included a tour, presentation, and distribution of reference materials targeting a series of administrative responsibilities and operational functions within the facility.³ The OSP was opened in the same year as Tamms CMAX (1998) with a similar mission, and while the same types of problematic inmates are sent to both facilities and many management functions are identical; there are notable differences in several key areas:

- There is a specific classification process for placement at OSP.
- Notice provided to inmates is detailed including an anticipated length of placement and more information relative to their placement as opposed to Illinois.
- Related classification and disciplinary processes differ in that OSP does not continue an offender's disciplinary status at reclassification as Illinois does.
- OSP currently houses three different security levels including Closed Maximum, Maximum, and Death Row. However, the execution chamber is located elsewhere.
- The length of segregation time an offender can receive as a disciplinary sanction is limited to less than 6 months at OSP versus one year in Illinois.

SECTION 3: TAMMS CMAX POPULATION DATA OVERVIEW

Tables 1 through 6 profile the Tamms CMAX population and describe the flow of inmate movement since program inception on March 9, 1998. There have been 543 individual inmates placed at Tamms CMAX through June 30, 2009, with 42 having multiple terms, for a total of 589 admissions to the program.

Profile

Table 1 includes a profile of the adult male prison population on June 30, 2009 separated by 1) inmates at Tamms CMAX, 2) male inmates with a maximum security classification level designation, with Tamms CMAX excluded 3) male inmates, with Tamms CMAX and maximum security classification level designations excluded, and 4) all male inmates. Each of the groups are detailed according to selected variables, consisting of admission type, race, age, education level, committing county, average time served in prison, offense class, and offense type. The majority of the maximum security level inmates, including Tamms CMAX, were admitted directly from court, having no prior IDOC admissions. Within the race variable, there is more overrepresentation of minorities in the Tamms CMAX and maximum-security populations, with Tamms CMAX having a greater proportion of Hispanics. Inmates at Tamms CMAX are older, less likely to have attained a high school diploma/GED or above, and more likely to have been committed from Cook County. Tamms CMAX inmates have served considerably longer periods of time in prison overall, indicating a higher degree of correctional sophistication. As expected, the proportion of Tamms CMAX and maximum-security inmates convicted of Class Murder or Class X offenses, which comprises the great majority of Person crimes, is much higher than the remaining prison population.

After Director Randle's appointment, in preparation for a Tamms CC site visit scheduled during his first week of service, instructions were given to collect data detailing more specific information about the type of offenders within the "supermax" population (see Table 2). Data first were aggregated according to

³ The tour of the facility focused on observation of classification hearings, provision of telephone calls, recreation, medical services delivery, visitation, meal preparation and delivery, security escorts, provisions for congregate activities, Minimum Security Unit, and Dog Program. The presentation spotlighted the history of the facility, classification process, volunteer services, reentry process, education, dietary, security (facility breakdown), fiscal responsibility, union issues, and staffing. At the time of the tour there were no offenders preparing for transfer out of the facility; as a result the reentry process was explained rather than observed.

status representing the May 20, 2009 population: Disciplinary Segregation (DS) and Administrative Detention (AD). Categories of data were then established from master file and Offender Tracking System sources targeting the Intelligence Sheet, Tamms CMAX Placement Sheet, mittimus and movement overviews, Disciplinary Tracking System, and the Mental Health Summary.

The data table breaks down the information according to the variables from the aforementioned categories (*italicized*) against time served at Tamms CMAX. Time served was grouped as less than a year, one-to-five years, five-to-nine years, and nine years or greater:

- The row totals within the Intelligence Sheet make sense in that the proportion of AD offenders with Gang Renunciation Rejected, or Gang Member and Gang Leader points is higher than that of the DS inmates. Conversely, the Escape Risk and Aggression Level variables are more pronounced for higher-level attributes among the DS inmates versus the AD offenders.
- The Placement Sheet variables were coded according to whether the variable was specifically denoted within the Tamms CMAX recommendation prior to transfer. As expected, the DS inmates were more likely to have assaults emphasized, whereas the AD offenders were more likely to have a Security Threat Group indicator. However, when reviewing representation among the eight variables within this category, there is high representation on all eight variables for both population sets.
- The Convictions while Incarcerated variable within the Mittimus category is slightly different than the two similar variables within the Placement Sheet category as the Mittimus category would include convictions after placement. That's why the values are higher here. This provides some evidence that Tamms CMAX inmates are committing acts that are more likely to be prosecuted while at Tamms CMAX. Conversely, this variable may be showing that the offense was committed at other security-level prisons, but the conviction did not occur until after transfer to Tamms CMAX.
- As expected the DS inmates were more likely to have higher values for Major Guilty Tickets.
- The Mental Health category was coded as to whether the summary denoted presence of the associated variables. The DS inmates were more likely to have mental health attributes, but there is no way to determine whether those attributes existed prior to or after transfer to Tamms CMAX here. Further, the Special Treatment Unit cases are part of the DS inmates so there should be higher values among the mental health indicators (see Frequent Crisis Care Treatment).
- For both population sets, the Transferring Facility was usually a maximum-security population. However, there is a much higher value for Stateville CC with the AD offenders versus the DS inmates.

Overall, the profile data provide plausible aggregate evidence as to why these inmates are at Tamms CMAX. However, given a small sample size, intensive reviews of individual master files would need to be conducted to determine adjustment behavior on a case-by case basis detailing why some inmates serve inordinate durations of time at the "supermax." That outlook supports the context of Tamms CMAX as the Department has always held that placement decisions are situation-oriented.

Inmate Movement Flow

Table 3 contains the Tamms CMAX end-of-month on-site population for each month that Tamms CMAX has been in operation. After the first several months of operation when inmates were being transferred

into Tamms CMAX, the population reached 200 in July 1998 and has remained at or above 240 since October 1998. The population reached a high of 285 in mid-November 2004 and during periods between October and December 2006. For the most part, the population has remained constant after October 1998, fluctuating between 255 and 275 inmates. After October 1998, the population reached a low of 240 in April 2009. The average end-of-month population since Tamms CMAX opened is 261, and with the first eight months of operation excluded, the average is 266. On June 30, 2009, the Tamms CMAX population was 243, which represented 0.5% of the total prison population, 0.6 % of the male population, and 2.8% of the maximum security level population. Since the beginning of the program, the Tamms CMAX end-of-year population represents an average proportion of 0.6% of the entire prison population.

Table 4 summarizes Tamms CMAX admissions and exits by fiscal year, fiscal year-end population, the number and type of exits by fiscal year, the average length of stay by exit type, and the overall length of stay at Tamms CMAX. The *Population Movement Summary and Fiscal Year-End Population* sub-table, shows the number of admissions to Tamms CMAX remained high during FY98 and FY99, as inmates were initially being transferred into the facility. In FY00 the number of admissions declined to 33 and further declined from FY01 through FY03, with 15 or 16 admissions each of those years. The number of admissions then increased in FY04 through FY06, with 43 to 55 yearly admissions. Then in FY08 the number of admissions decreased to 24, and further decreased to 18 and 19 admissions in FY08 and FY09, respectively.

The number and types of exits within the *Exit Reasons* sub-table reveals that there were a total of 317 inmates transferred out of Tamms CMAX and 25 inmates that have been discharged or had an other type of release directly from Tamms CMAX. Of those inmates that were transferred because they did not meet Tamms CMAX guidelines, half were transferred in the first two fiscal years. The 100 inmates that were transferred due to a pending release to MSR, discharge, or parole accounted for 29.2% of the exits, which represented the largest proportion of total exits. The second largest proportion included 72 inmates (21.1%) transferred to the ADRMP, which was implemented in FY05. During FY06, FY07, and FY09, inmates transferred to the ADRMP accounted for the largest proportion of exits. The 72 inmates that exited to the ADRMP had the longest average length of stay at Tamms CMAX, which was 99.4 months.

As outlined in the *Length of Stay at Tamms CMAX* sub-table, since program inception the average length of stay for all inmates admitted to Tamms CMAX was 60.8 months. The average length of stay for exits was 51.6 months and the average time served for the current population is at 73.4 months. Of the inmates that have exited, the largest proportion (22.8%) had a length of stay less than one year. More than 40% of the exits were at Tamms CMAX less than three years. Among the current population, more than one-third (36.9%) has been at Tamms CMAX for less than four years, while another 70 inmates (28.3%) have been there for at least ten years.

Table 5 describes the overall Tamms CMAX population movement by month, which was summarized by fiscal year in Table 3. Disaggregating the data by month shows that 75 inmates were admitted to Tamms CMAX during the first month of operation, March 1998, and 47 inmates were admitted during the second month. Since program inception, there were more than ten admissions during each of the following months: March 1998, April 1998, June through September 1998, November 1998, February 2004, October 2004, and June 2005. The months with the largest number of exits from Tamms CMAX primarily encompass transfers to the ADRMP.

Table 6 lists each inmate that has exited directly from Tamms CMAX or transferred out-of-state. Exit reasons for these 25 inmates consist of four court discharges, one expiration of sentence, four deaths, one execution, two releases to the Department of Human Services, seven releases to MSR or parole, and six transfers out-of-state. Of the five total deaths, one was attributed to a suicide and none were homicides.

SECTION 4: REVIEW FINDINGS

The conclusions supported by the Department are that there is a definite need to continue operations at Tamms CMAX targeting the same type(s) of inmates currently being held there. The basis for those conclusions is discussed below:

Statutes

The Illinois Compiled Statutes clearly contain language authorizing the existence of a “supermax,” mandating the segregation of gang leaders from the general population, and allowing for the Department to restrict access to gang-related information. In conjunction with these statutes, and based on legal precedent (discussed below) the Department believes current Tamms CMAX operations and policies would withstand legal challenges if contested in court.

730 ILCS 5/3-2-2 Powers and Duties of the Department

Subsection (1) (r-10) mandates the Department to systematically and routinely identify gangs, gang affiliations and alliances, and gang leaders; and to “promptly segregate leaders from inmates who belong to their gangs and allied gangs.” The definition of “segregate” specifically states no physical contact, while also prohibiting visual and sound communication.

Subsection (s) allows the Department to “operate a super-maximum security institution, in order to manage and supervise inmates who are disruptive or dangerous and provide for the safety and security of the staff and the other inmates.”

730 ILCS 5/3-2-5 Organization of the Department of Corrections and the Department of Juvenile Justice

Subsection (c) allows the Department to “gather information regarding the inmate gang population, monitor the activities of gangs, and prevent the furtherance of gang activities through the development and implementation of policies aimed at deterring gang activity.” Briefly, the statute allows the Department to promulgate rules restricting access to gang-related information, including a Freedom of Information Act exemption from external parties.

Placement

The Department believes that admission to Tamms CMAX is a highly selective process determined by negative individual institutional adjustment behaviors exhibited throughout the correctional system. No inmate has ever been transferred directly from a Reception and Classification Center to Tamms CMAX as the placement criteria requires some form of recent or long-term evidence indicating non-compliance with administrative rules. Aggregating data on limited population counts would generally emphasize the need to review inmates on a case-by-case basis; which is how Tamms CMAX placement determinations are made. Since opening Tamms CMAX in March 1998 less than two-tenths of a percent of all prison admissions have eventually been placed there.

As mentioned above the Tamms CMAX population on average represents about six-tenths of a percent of the entire prison population. In Ohio, currently there are 173 administrative segregation inmates among 50,965 overall; calculating to three-tenths of a percent of the entire prison population. However, note that Ohio allows inmates to be admitted to prison with sentence lengths of less than a year, which affects the proportion comparison. Tamms CMAX opponents cite the Unit 32 “supermax” at Parchman Penitentiary in Mississippi as a successful reclassification adjustment, whereby the 1,000-bed unit comprised mostly of administrative segregation inmates (and some Death Row inmates) was reduced to a population level of 150 within a six-month period. As of July 28th, the administrative segregation population was down to 121 inmates accounting five-tenths of a percent of the total prison population (25,349). Note that

Mississippi Department of Corrections staff indicate “these inmates are screened vigorously and are reviewed every 90 days to include a release recommendation plan of action.”

Prior to placement at Tamms CMAX, staff conduct a comprehensive review of the inmate’s master record and medical files, including a thorough mental health review, to determine whether placement is appropriate. In cases of an emergency transfer, the inmate will have the comprehensive review completed at the Tamms CMAX to determine whether continued placement is appropriate.

The facility serves as a necessary management tool for controlling problematic inmates and maintaining order by keeping the inmates separated from other inmates. In addition, the facility acts as a deterrent to other potential disruptive inmates within the general population. With disruptive inmates housed at Tamms CMAX, system-wide management is improved and institutional security, safety, and control are enhanced.

Long-term Isolation

As pointed out above, there are inmates that have been at Tamms CMAX since program inception and/or for extended durations, despite attempts to release more inmates through the ADRMP (see Table 4.). Seventy (28.3%) inmates among the current population have been at Tamms CMAX for at least ten years; just more than half (124) have been there for at least five years.

The aforementioned Task Force on Crime and Corrections explicitly stated that inmates held within a super-max prison should not be assigned permanently and that there should be a steady stream of movement out of the facility. Also, court testimony from a prior Associate Director stated that, conceptually, placement should be short-term; approximately two years. And the first Tamms CC warden was quoted in the press that “stays should not be more than a year.”

During FY05, the Department introduced the ADRMP as a progressive approach to step-down offenders exhibiting positive adjustment behavior and unwilling to renounce gang affiliations. This resulted in 72 transfers from Tamms CMAX to Pontiac Correctional Center through FY09. Conversely, the Department has determined that there are inmates simply too dangerous and disruptive to transfer from Tamms CMAX due to notorious serious assaults on both inmates and staff. Tamms CMAX critics have documented that many inmates have not been convicted of new crimes while in prison, suggesting that these inmates should then not be placed in a ‘supermax’ environment. However, as is the case in general society, the ability to prosecute offenders is at the discretion of the local State’s Attorney; not the Department. Inmates that are housed at Tamms CMAX are considered to be the “worst-of-the-worst” and these inmates remain at Tamms CMAX because they present serious management concerns to the Department.

The issues of long-term isolation, whereby inmates largely are held in the same cell for up to 23 hours per day, are utilized as examples by Tamms CMAX opponents. However, these inmates have regular and daily interaction with medical and mental health services staff, security staff, chaplains, and other inmates. The medical director makes weekly rounds, the health care administrator makes routine rounds, and nurses make rounds three times a day in each housing wing. Inmates are seen by mental health staff at least once every thirty days for routine wellness checks and every ninety days for mental health evaluations. In addition, inmates are seen by mental health staff by request and/or referral and, if necessary, the facility psychiatrist. The ratio of mental health staff-to-inmates at Tamms CMAX is higher than at any other facility system-wide. Security staff at the facility make housing wing checks every thirty minutes, and duty wardens routinely make rounds. Chaplains and counselors visit inmates at the cell front at least once a month. Inmates are able to and frequently do have conversations with other

inmates as the cell fronts are perforated. They sometimes engage in games, such as checkers, with the other inmates remotely from their cells.

Another consideration is that the twenty-three hours per day in the cell is the maximum allowable, as the average time is less when accounting for time spent in the law library, time taking showers, or time spent with a visitor. Further, Tamms CMAX inmates are afforded a series of internal programs aimed at incentives for positive adjustment behavior. Administrative Detention inmates exhibiting improved behavior have the opportunity to increase their activities through the Behavioral Level System at Tamms CMAX. Activities range from two-to-five showers per week; two-to-seven hours of yard time per week; one-to-five four-hour visits per month; one-to-two commissary shops per month; audio-video privileges; and consideration for voluntary, housing unit, wing-specific assignment. This on-site program allows inmates to have more opportunities for time out of their cell. The Behavioral Incentive Program, which is a therapeutic behavior management program for inmates in Disciplinary Segregation status, reinforces appropriate behavior by rewarding inmates with incentives. Approved inmates in Disciplinary Segregation status at Tamms CMAX for a minimum of one year are eligible to receive audio-visual privileges, and after three years of being in the program, inmates may receive an expanded commissary list.

Legal and Advocate Issues

In *Wilkinson v. Austin* 545 U.S. 209, 125 S.Ct. 2384, 162 L.Ed.2d 174 (2005), the U.S. Supreme Court rendered a decision regarding affording due process to inmates prior to placement at a “supermax.” The case targeted placement policies in the State of Ohio as a violation of 14th Amendment rights of procedural due process. The Court held that the policy did not violate the procedural due process rights of inmates, stating:

“Were Ohio to allow an inmate to call witnesses or provide other attributes of an adversary hearing before ordering transfer to OSP, both the State’s immediate objective of controlling the prisoner and the greater objective of controlling the prison could be defeated.”

The Department believes that “supermax” operations within the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction are very similar to that in Illinois.

The class action lawsuit of *Westefer, et al. v. Snyder, et al* (00-162) is currently pending in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois per an appellate decision handed down in September 2005 by the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit (422 F.3d 570). Plaintiffs are arguing violation of 1st and 14th Amendment Rights claiming that transfer to Tamms CMAX was punishment for their being considered “litigators” who file too many grievances and lawsuits. Plaintiffs also state that their due process rights are being violated as no meaningful hearing is conducted prior to transfer.

The case of *Rasho, et al. v. Snyder, et al* (00-cv-528) filed in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois addressed mental health treatment at Tamms CMAX. There was an attempt to make this a class action lawsuit, but the case was settled after the Department agreed to provide treatment from a designated expert for one-to-two years for the two remaining plaintiffs.

Recently advocates from the Human Rights Watch group and Amnesty International have expressed their objections to “supermax” conditions and operations in Illinois through letters to the Director’s Office. Also, the March 30, 2009 *New Yorker* publication included an article depicting the “supermax” environment through the perception of inmates, of which Tamms CMAX was highlighted. Note that although Tamms CMAX has been targeted, there is no litigation associated with these advocates.

Operational Indicator Impact

Academic Study

Tamms CMAX critics have repeatedly noted that the “supermax” environment has had no impact on the correctional system statewide. Specifically, reference has been made to two academic journal articles written by Southern Illinois University staff. However, given the following, the basis for those criticisms was misinterpreted as evidenced by direct references within those same academic journal articles:

“...the opening of Tamms in Illinois was associated with a significant, permanent decrease in assaults against staff.”

Briggs, C.S., Sundt J.L., & Castellano, T.C. (2003). The Effect of Supermaximum Security Prisons on Aggregate Levels of Institutional Violence. *Criminology*, 41, 1341-1376.

“There was no association between the opening of a supermax and inmate-on-inmate assaults; however, the supermax appears to have resulted in an abrupt, permanent reduction in assaults against staff. The opening of the supermax was also associated with an abrupt, permanent reduction in the use of lockdown days.”

Sundt, J.L., Castellano, T.C., & Briggs, C.S. (2008). The Sociopolitical Context of Prison Violence and Its Control: A Case Study of Supermax and Its Effect in Illinois. *The Prison Journal*, 88, 94-122.

Further, these prior studies contain limited relevance to current Department practices, largely because the data were collected short-term during the initial stages of Tamms CMAX operations. In fact, the latest point in time whereby data were observed for any variables within each study was June 2002 (end-of-FY02). As discussed below, utilizing long-term trend data (collected for another seven years) indicates that Tamms CMAX has had a considerable impact on the safety of inmates and staff within the correctional system (though there may be other contributive factors).

Assaults

The number of inmate-on-staff assaults remained steady between FY92 and FY95, and then increased from 946 in FY95 to a record-high of 1,219 during FY96. In FY97, the number of assaults decreased to 940 and further declined in FY98 to 681 assaults during the year Tamms CMAX began operations. In FY99, the number increased by only five assaults. Overall, there were 43.7% fewer inmate-on-staff assaults reported in FY99 than in FY96. In FY00, the definitions of assaults were broadened (see Table 7 footnotes). After FY00, the number of assaults continued to decrease or remain steady from year-to-year through FY08. There were 52.2% fewer inmate-on-staff assaults reported during FY09 as compared to FY00.

The number of inmate-on-inmate assaults reached a record-high during FY95, with a total of 818 assaults reported. The number decreased to 763 in FY96 and to 670 in FY97. In FY98, the year that Tamms CMAX opened, there was a continued decrease to 578 assaults, and in FY99 there were 496 assaults reported. Overall, there were 39.4% fewer inmate-on-inmate assaults reported in FY99 than in FY95. Again, after the assaults definitions were amended, there was a slight increase in the number of inmate-on-inmate assaults between FY00 and FY01. However, there was a steady decline from FY01 through FY07, resulting in 36.6% fewer inmate-on-inmate assaults when comparisons are made between those two years. While assaults-on-inmates have increased in recent years, the number is still much lower than that experienced during the early part of the decade, and serious assaults on inmates have exhibited major reductions.

Lockdown Days

The total number of lockdown days within Department facilities increased considerably during the 1990s. In fact, there were more than three times as many lockdown days in FY97 than in FY90. During FY97, the Department had a total of 1,247 lockdown days, but that number declined by more than half to 597 during FY98; the year that Tamms CMAX was opened. The following year, FY99, the number was further reduced to 476. From FY00 through FY02, the number of lockdown days increased, due in part to administrative-based lockdowns that were needed to implement new Department policies and were the cause for the measure to be disaggregated beginning that fiscal year. However, the number of incident-based lockdown days remained below 500 every year from FY99 until FY06, with an exception of FY01. Increases during recent years may be attributed to reduced staffing levels, and alternative management factors requiring further examination.

Major Disciplinary Reports Written/Gang Activity

Corresponding with increasing prison population growth during the 1990s, the total number of major disciplinary reports steadily increased. The number of major disciplinary reports reached a high of 116,381 in FY97. Compared to FY97 the number of major disciplinary reports decreased by 12.5% to 101,784 during FY98, the year that Tamms CMAX was opened, and then another 10.8% to 90,770 in FY99. Despite the overall population continuing to grow or remaining constant from year-to-year, the number of major disciplinary reports decreased almost every year from FY98 to FY09, at much lower levels than experienced in the late 1990s.

For the specific rule violation of “Gang or Unauthorized Organizational Activity” (Rule 205), the Department had a total of 5,638 violations in FY96. These data were not compiled from FY97 through FY99; but in FY00, the Department reported 1,738 violations. This represents a reduction of 69.2% Rule 205 violations from FY96 to FY00. The number of Rule 205 violations decreased every year from FY00 through FY08, and then exhibited an increase during FY09. From FY96 to FY09, the Rule 205 violations declined 89.3%.

Intangibles

Finally, there has been no method to track the impact Tamms CMAX has had on staff throughout the correctional system. However, there is every indication that the great majority of line staff and the American Federation of State County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) believe that, individually, Tamms CMAX has made the entire correctional system a safer and more secure place to work.

Level 1 Bed Utilization

While there may be other factors that have affected the Department’s ability to provide for a safer and more secure environment, Tamms CMAX has been a major contributor toward that end. If the Department were to close Tamms CMAX, there would be an immediate impact on bed space at existing Level 1 locations (see Table 8). Because Tamms CMAX inmates are held within a single-cell environment, primarily Pontiac CC would feel the brunt of population pressure.

On June 30, 2009 the Level 1 locations excluding Tamms CMAX had 5,778 inmates of which 980 were single-celled and 4,798 were double-celled. Note that within this analysis; the Reception and Classification Centers, Condemned Unit, and Health Care Units were excluded because Tamms CMAX inmates would not be permanently housed there. Menard CC is utilizing a high proportion of both single- and double-cells, while Pontiac CC single- and double-cell utilization is at a much lower threshold because the East Cellhouse is not fully operational. Stateville CC does not consistently single-cell inmates, while the Pontiac CC Mental Health Unit and the Dixon CC Psychiatric Unit single-cell every inmate. Both Menard CC and Stateville CC are operating at exceedingly high double-cell proportions.

If the June 30, 2009 Tamms CMAX population (n=245) had been held at other Level 1 locations, the single-cell population at Menard CC would remain, but the Pontiac CC single-cells would be maximized and the Dixon CC Psychiatric Unit population would increase either through inmate transfers or displacement processes.

Given the ages of the three Level 1 prisons, infrastructure issues would become more enhanced as these prisons were not built to be consistently populated at current levels, much less adding another 245 inmates. Further, cell doors would need to be modified (steel plating, window guards, chuckholds, etc.) and cell interiors would need to be renovated to the greatest extent possible to reduce the ability to hide contraband or disassemble infrastructure to be utilized as weapons.

Dangerousness levels would be heightened for both inmates and staff as moving these inmates into the general population would cause staff to spend inordinate amount of time supervising these inmates, resulting in less supervision for Level 1 inmates. Plus, the ability to manage disturbances at Level 1 locations would be jeopardized as fewer options for moving traditional Level 1 inmates into single-cells would be available.

Per Capita Cost and Staff Ratio

Tamms CMAX opponents have cited excessive per capita costs as a rationale for closing the “supermax” without a full understanding of economies of scale. Further, the exchange of higher per capita costs against potential murders, sexual assaults, serious assaults, gang “hits”; etc. within traditional prison environments is actually an operational benefit. What would be an acceptable per capita cost to ensure the safety and security of inmates and staff exposed to the most disruptive inmates?

The budget for the two correctional locations at Tamms CC is comprised within the Tamms CC budget appropriated by law (see Table 9). The Department is not required to monitor internal fiscal allocations at the two sites individually, which would be complicated by determining how non-security functions and administrative tasks should be extracted. As one example of many, the Warden’s salary is part of the Tamms CC budget; there is no separate allocation for the two locations. For the same reason, and because of varying day-to-day operational responsibilities, security staff functions are overlapped between the two locations. Therefore, there are no data to specifically determine staff ratios at Tamms CMAX.

Any per capita cost comparisons with Tamms CC against other facilities is inappropriate for four reasons. First, maximum-security prison per capita costs are always greater than lower level-security prisons due to facility design and staff supervision requirements. Second, minimum-security units or work camps, if calculated, will cost more on a per capita basis, because the economies of scale are lost with such a small number of inmates being held. Third, the Tamms CMAX is a location within a prison comprised of a small number of beds compared to other Department maximum-security facilities. Also, the other maximum-security sites are comprised of multiple locations housing populations other than maximum-security inmates; encompassing medium- and minimum-security units, reception and classification centers, and mental health units at different correctional centers. The economies of scale are vastly different. Fourth, the implementation phase of CMAX during FY98 and FY99 was such that the prison population was very low. Further the facility population has never exceeded 285 of the more than 500 beds. These two factors also affect economies of scale.

Historical per capita costs are a function of average daily population, expenditures, operational utilization, facility design, staffing levels, etc. that subsequently are highly affected by economies of scale. For those reasons, the Department included footnotes addressing per capita cost comparisons within the Annual Report, similar to the Table 7 footnotes. There is no rational reason to make a per capita cost comparison of Tamms CC against other correctional centers without providing justification and instituting controls to standardize the data. To do so would require extensive study with appropriate research methods.

A review of annual historical per capita costs at Tamms CC shows fluctuations from program inception through FY06, followed by steady increases through estimated FY09 figures. However, these recent increases are not attributed to hiring more staff. In fact the inmate-to-staff ratio has been increasing since FY02, as staffing levels have been reduced.

A correctional system-wide audit of staffing level efficiencies conducted by the Harvey M. Rose Accountancy Corporation conducted during calendar year 2006 revealed that the minimum-recommended level for Tamms CC was 325 total staff of which at least 235 should be security staff. At end-of-FY09, there were 268 total staff, including 195 security staff at Tamms CC.

Recidivism Analysis

Tamms CMAX critics have suggested that recidivism rates for inmates held in long-term isolation will be higher than for other inmates within the correctional system. The latest analysis completed by the Department during October 2008, revealed that was not the case when reviewing prison exits that had served any time at Tamms CMAX during their incarceration.

Table 10 provides summary data for all 146 Tamms CMAX exits from program inception through FY08. The data are tabulated according to the type of exit and exposure to Tamms CMAX, disaggregated by three categories: releases directly from Tamms CMAX, releases from another facility within 6 months of being transferred from Tamms CMAX, and releases from another facility after 6 months of being transferred from Tamms CMAX. Note that these data represent all exits through FY2008, with no limitation on follow-up time. Table 11 utilizes the same cases, but breaks the data down according to the fiscal year of exit.

The Tamms CMAX inmates performed better in the community when comparing exits that had served any time at Tamms CMAX during their incarceration against male inmates that had exited prison with a maximum-security classification designation (see Table 12). The data represent exits within the respective study groups from FY98 through FY04, after each case had been tracked for a three-year follow-up period. The gap is even wider among offenders returned to prison for committing a new offense.

Note that the sample size for the Tamms CMAX group is limited; thereby, affecting the meaning of the statistics given identification characteristics. There also are issues related to isolating at-risk time in the community for technical parole violators, selection bias as inmates from Tamms CMAX may have characteristics that are considerably different than other maximum-security inmates, exposure to a closed maximum-security environment due to institutional adjustment problems which differentiates from other maximum-security inmates, and time inmates served in maximum-security level settings prior to Tamms CMAX placement for the Tamms CMAX exit group versus time in maximum-security levels for the maximum-security inmates that never were sent to Tamms CMAX. However, despite these limitations, at this time, no one can claim that Tamms CMAX inmates have higher recidivism rates than comparable offenders.

SECTION 5: TEN-POINT PLAN

While the Department believes that Tamms CMAX serves a crucial role within operations affecting the safety and security of staff and inmates, exhibiting a definite need to continue much of the existing policies and procedures currently in place; there is room to enhance program development by addressing the following Ten-Point Plan. The intention is to implement these elements as soon as possible with consideration that there may be changes as the Ten-Point Plan evolves.

Point 1: Allow each inmate placed at Tamms CMAX to have a Transfer Review Hearing.

Inmates and advocacy groups have voiced concern regarding the process for informing inmates at Tamms CMAX, including informing them of the reason for placement. Currently under 20 Illinois Administrative Code, Chapter 1, Subchapter e – Operations Part 505, *Closed Maximum Security Facility*, a Transfer Review Hearing is to be conducted within ten working days of the inmate’s placement at Tamms CMAX in administrative detention status or at the expiration of his disciplinary segregation term. Administrative Directive 05.02.110, *Placement at Closed Maximum Security Facility*, provides that the Chief Administrative Officer is to appoint members of the Transfer Review Committee.

Proposed Recommendation- The Department would make a series of changes in the official policy describing the Transfer Review Hearing process and within the established timelines for placing an inmate at Tamms CMAX. The proposed changes to the pertinent Department Rules and Administrative Directives are underlined within the text below. Further, the proposed procedures for conducting a Transfer Review Hearing follow the official policy changes. Note that the official filing of a grievance and the associated review policies will allow inmates to appeal the transfer to “supermax” to the Department Chief Legal Counsel, and not the Administrative Review Board.

Policy modifications

The ability to address this proposed recommendation requires amendments to official policies as addressed below within the underlined text:

20 Illinois Administrative Code, Chapter 1, Subchapter C–Operations Part 505, *Closed Maximum Security Facility*:

Section 505.50, *Transfer Review Committee*

- a) The Transfer Review Committee shall be composed of two persons selected by the Chief Administrative Officer of the Tamms Correctional Center.
- b) The Committee shall:
 - 1) Conduct transfer review hearings in accordance with Section 505.60; and
 - 2) Conduct routine reviews of persons in administrative detention at the Tamms Correctional Center in accordance with Section 505.70.

Section 505.60, *Transfer Review Hearing*

- a) Whenever possible, a transfer review hearing shall be conducted
 - 1) Within ten working days of a committed person’s placement in Administrative Detention in the Tamms Correctional Center or the expiration of the committed person’s term of disciplinary segregation.
 - 2) Within 30 calendar days of a committed person’s placement in Disciplinary Segregation at Tamms Correctional Center.
 - 3) Within 30 calendar days of the completion of the disciplinary hearing for a committed person transferred to Tamms Correctional Center in Investigative Status.
- b) The committed person shall be afforded the opportunity to appear at the hearing, to make statements relevant to his or her placement in the Tamms Correctional Center, and to present relevant documents. The committed person may also request that the Committee interview persons with relevant information.
- c) In determining whether to continue placement in administrative detention in the Tamms Correctional Center, the Committee may consider, among other matters, the factors set forth in Section 505.40(d).
- d) The Committee shall make recommendations to the Chief Administrative Officer of the Tamms Correctional Center. The Chief Administrative Officer shall approve or

disapprove the Committee's recommendations and shall submit his or her recommendation to the Chief of Operations for a final decision. The committed person shall be informed in writing of the final decision.

Administrative Directive 05.02.110, *Placement at Closed Maximum Security Facility*

AD 05.02.110, II, Section M, *Transfer Review Hearing*

1. The Chief Administrative Officer shall appoint members of the Transfer Review Committee.
2. The Transfer Review Committee shall conduct transfer review hearings for each offender transferred to Tamms Correctional Center.
(Change enumeration of 2-4 to 3-5)
3. The annual Transfer Review Committee hearing shall be conducted in accordance with 20 Ill. Adm. Code 505.70.
4. Upon completion of the hearing, the Transfer Review Committee shall complete a summary report that includes:
 - a. A record of the proceedings of the hearing; and
 - b. The offender's voluntary disclosure to willingly renounce STG membership association.
5. The summary of the hearing shall be forwarded to the Chief Administrative Officer for further review and assessment.

Proposed Transfer Review Committee Process

- 1) Inmates transferred to Tamms CMAX in Administrative Detention shall appear before the Transfer Review Committee (TRC) whenever possible within ten days of placement to participate in a Transfer Review Hearing.
- 2) Inmates transferred to Tamms CMAX in Investigative or Segregation status shall appear before the TRC whenever possible within thirty days of placement or at the conclusion of pending disciplinary proceedings, whichever is later.
- 3) The TRC shall advise the inmate of the stated reason for his placement.
- 4) The inmate shall be given the opportunity to refute the information and/or offer evidence on his behalf that may impact the final decision on placement.
- 5) The TRC shall prepare a written report of the hearing.
- 6) The report shall contain inmate demographics, reason for placement, summary of disciplinary history, status (Administrative Detention, Investigative or Segregation status) record of the proceedings, and committee recommendation on placement.
- 7) The report shall be forwarded to the Chief Administrative Officer for review, approval, or denial.
- 8) The Chief Administrative Officer's recommendation shall be forwarded to the Chief of Operations for review and approval or denial.
- 9) After receipt of the decision of the Chief of Operations, the TRC shall provide the inmate with written notification of the decision on his placement.

- 10) The decision of the Chief of Operations may be appealed by the affected inmate to the Chief Legal Counsel of the Department, who shall act as the designee of the Director for purposes of such an appeal.
- 11) An audio digital recording shall be made of all Transfer Review Hearings and shall be retained by the Department pursuant to standard record retention policy.

Point 2: Each inmate will be informed of an estimated length of stay and how privileges can be earned to provide for eventual transfer from Tamms CMAX.

As part of the current orientation process, inmates are not informed of how long they should expect to be incarcerated at Tamms CMAX, and the process of earning privileges based on positive adjustment behavior is under-amplified. However, on the day of arrival to Tamms CMAX, inmates are introduced to the facility via several forms of communication:

- 1) Inmates are provided an Orientation Manual which outlines the programs and services available at the facility. The inmate is required to sign a receipt for the manual.
- 2) Inmates view an orientation video which explains the chain of command at the facility. This is supplemented with directions for accessing available services. At arrival, inmates are evaluated by Health Care staff, and within 72 hours an initial assessment is conducted by a Mental Health Professional.
- 3) On the second day or the next business day after the inmate's transfer to the facility, a Correctional Counselor informs the inmate of the reason for placement at Tamms CMAX. For inmates transferred as a result of placement in Administrative Detention, they are informed of the Transfer Review Committee process and a hearing is scheduled. The Transfer Review Committee consists of a supervisor representing clinical services and a supervisor representing security operations.

Proposed recommendation- As part of the orientation process at arrival to the facility, all inmates will be informed of the current Tamms CMAX average length of stay, along with a descriptive explanation of how an inmate can earn greater privileges associated with positive adjustment behavior. These details will be provided by a Correctional Counselor, and will be supplemented with information regarding the Transfer Review Committee process and hearing schedule. Note that some inmates may not be transferred from Tamms CMAX due to past behaviors, but the restrictive status of their incarceration can change based on improved behavior.

Staff will utilize professional correctional judgment to specify an estimated length of stay at Tamms CMAX determined by factors associated with why the inmate was placed there. The inmate will be informed of their estimated length of stay based on a range (i.e., less than one year, one-to-three years, three-to-five years, and five or more years) given continued positive adjustment behavior.

Point 3: Promote the medical and mental health evaluation process conducted prior to and after placement, for each inmate sent to Tamms CMAX.

Currently mental health reviews are conducted on all inmates recommended for transfer to Tamms CMAX to determine if placement is appropriate. Administrative Directive 05.12.110, *Placements at a Closed Maximum Security Facility*, outlines the procedure for transfer and establishes which mental health conditions prohibit an inmate from being placed at Tamms CMAX. In addition, the Administrative Directive outlines the procedure for subsequent mental health reviews for inmates placed at Tamms

CMAX. All inmates housed at Tamms CMAX, the Administrative Detention, Disciplinary Segregation and the Special Treatment Unit (STU), are provided with access to mental health services.

Process for Transferring Inmates to Tamms CMAX

After a recommendation is initiated to transfer an inmate to Tamms CMAX, a review of mental health history is conducted. That is, the master record and medical files are reviewed by a Mental Health Professional (MHP) to evaluate institutional adjustment thus far and determine if there is anything either in the past or present that is manifesting that would contraindicate a transfer to Tamms CMAX. A face-to-face mental health evaluation also is conducted when determined to be clinically necessary.

After completion of the mental health review, the MHP writes a synopsis of any relevant mental health information and then records the information on the *Placement at Tamms Closed Maximum Security Facility* form and within the inmate's medical file. A recommendation is made for either a denial of transfer to Tamms CMAX, transfer to Tamms CMAX, or transfer to Tamms CMAX with placement in the Specialized Treatment Unit (STU). This information is then forwarded to the Department Chief of Mental Health Services (CMHS) for review.

The CMHS reviews the information provided by the referring facility's MHP and, if necessary, makes contact with the MHP to discuss the information. The CMHS subsequently approves or disapproves the transfer and, if the transfer is approved, indicates whether or not placement in the STU is warranted to provide intensive mental health treatment/services. If placement is approved or the recommendation is made that the inmate be placed in the STU, the determination and the reasons supporting such are submitted to the Transfer Coordinators Office.

Appropriateness for Tamms CMAX

The determination of appropriateness for Tamms CMAX is made by the mental health staff at the referring facility. If a mental health condition exists that contraindicates a transfer to Tamms CMAX, the determination and reasons for such are submitted to the Chief of Operations from the referring facility. Transfer to Tamms CMAX would not be approved for the following inmates: those who have been on enforced psychotropic medications or have had a diagnosis of a serious mental illness in the two years preceding the review; have been assigned to the Special Treatment Center or Psychiatric Unit at Dixon CC or the Mental Health Unit at Pontiac CC or who have been committed to a community mental health unit within the two years preceding the review; have had serious suicide attempts within the two years preceding the review; are actively psychotic or are evaluated as having a high probability of decompensating quickly in the near future; have a history of being non-compliant with prescribed psychotropic medication and exhibiting serious mental illness; display a behavior pattern of frequent and severe or bizarre self-mutilation; have been adjudicated Guilty but Mentally Ill; have a recent history or multiple incidents requiring the use of therapeutic restraints; have exhibited mental health problems during previous placements at Tamms CMAX; or present other serious mental health concerns that would suggest placement at Tamms CMAX would be inappropriate. An inmate could be transferred to Tamms CMAX if a clinical determination has been made by the MHP that the inmate's mental health needs can be met by the mental health staff at Tamms CMAX. In this case, STU placement is then considered.

STU placement is provided for inmates found to have a history (within the past two years) of, current symptoms of, or are currently receiving treatment for the following types of Axis I diagnoses, based on the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DMS-IV-TR): schizophrenia (all subtypes), delusional disorder, schizophreniform disorder, schizoaffective disorder, brief psychotic disorder, substance-induced psychotic disorder (excluding intoxication and withdrawal), psychotic disorder not otherwise specified, major depressive disorders, bipolar disorders I and II, a mental disorder that includes

being actively suicidal, a mental illness that is frequently characterized by breaks with reality or perceptions of reality that lead the individual to significant functional impairment, organic brain syndrome that results in a significant impairment if not treated, a severe personality disorder that is manifested by frequent episodes of psychosis or depression and result in significant functional impairment, or mental retardation.

Mental Health Procedures and Services at Tamms CMAX

Administrative Detention or Disciplinary Segregation

After transfer to Tamms CMAX, the inmate is interviewed and the medical and master record files are reviewed within seventy-two hours of placement. If any mental health concerns are identified at transfer, the inmate is placed in the facility infirmary until the initial mental health screening is completed. This screening includes review of all medical and master file information, personal clinical interview, and social history appraisal. All collateral mental health records from the community are requested if the inmate provides written consent. An inmate with a mental health history is referred to the psychiatrist on the next psychiatric line for a more thorough mental health assessment. Any inmate with a suspected mental illness or developmental disability in Administrative Detention or Disciplinary Segregation would be considered for placement within the Special Treatment Unit.

Subsequent mental health evaluations are conducted thirty days from placement and at least every ninety days thereafter to identify the existence of any significant mental health concerns. Additional reviews are conducted every thirty days during routine wellness checks and for crisis care contacts. Mental health referrals are seen within seventy-two hours and crises are seen immediately. All Tamms CMAX inmates have a quarterly file review to determine if continued placement at Tamms CMAX is appropriate. This review includes an examination of the inmate's medical and mental health records.

Any inmate on psychotropic medication is seen by the psychiatrist at least once every thirty days, and individual therapy sessions with a facility MHP are scheduled one-to-four times per month. Tamms CMAX inmates on the chronic caseload are seen per their treatment plans. Medical nurses that are crisis care trained conduct rounds three times a day in each housing wing. Referrals to the facility psychiatrist are made as necessary. Referrals for evaluation for placement in the STU are made as necessary if clinically appropriate for the program. If an inmate is determined to suffer from a serious mental illness while at Tamms CMAX, he is placed in the STU or transferred to the Dixon CC Psychiatric Unit.

Supervisory and healthcare staff at Tamms CMAX are trained as crisis team members to identify and respond to mental health concerns. Crisis team members are provided with ongoing in-service training. In addition, CMAX training given to all employees at Tamms CMAX includes instruction on recognizing the signs and behaviors of mental health issues.

All inmates at Tamms CMAX have access to eight correspondence clinics. At present, the eight clinics available include: Anger Management I & II, Conflict Resolution, Effective Decision Making, Parenting & Family Values, Self-Esteem Journaling, Substance Abuse, and Thinking Errors.

Specialized Treatment Unit

Tamms CMAX inmates meeting the guidelines for STU placement are referred for admission. Routine STU screenings are conducted by mental health staff. Inmates may be evaluated after the initial screening based on referral from any staff member. This assessment includes, but is not limited to, a comprehensive review of the medical and master files; requests for prior records as needed and as available; current mental status examination; diagnostic and level of functioning assessment; and appraisal of current medication and medication history as needed.

After an inmate is evaluated, if a serious mental illness is identified, the MHP completes a written diagnostic assessment specifying the mental disorder and immediately contacts the supervising psychologist. The supervising psychologist forwards a memo to the Chief Administrative Officer and Chief of Mental Health Services outlining the reasons for recommended placement in the STU. The inmate is notified of the recommendation in writing and is provided with the opportunity to have a hearing where opposing information and opinions may be offered. An inmate is admitted to the STU based on voluntary agreement or is found to need such treatment following a requested hearing. Inmates who have been recommended, but not yet moved, are housed in a crisis care area unless deemed clinically unnecessary by the institutional psychiatrist.

When practical, assessment and observation are completed within one month of STU placement (this may be modified pursuant to the Multidisciplinary Treatment Team approval). In addition to the initial assessment, the intake procedure includes, but is not limited to, a psychological and neuropsychological screening and/or testing as needed; daily observation by mental health staff to assess daily functioning, strengths, and weaknesses; review of significant disciplinary history and custodial placements; review with inmate specific risk factors for violence toward staff and others; and identification of maladaptive behaviors and deficits that limit or interfere with functioning.

The first month of STU placement is designated for evaluation, observation, and adjustment. During this period, inmates are exposed to program structure and expectations. They are introduced to all aspects of the program, which includes: individual therapy, psychiatric intervention, treatment planning, group therapy, case management and clinical rounds, monitoring of daily living skills, self-help materials, recreational groups, the Behavioral Level System, other clinical intervention programs as deemed appropriate, and discharge planning. If they meet the guidelines for continued placement at the end of the orientation period, they are scheduled for at least ten hours of structured therapy time weekly, which is in addition to ten hours of unstructured recreational time.

The Multidisciplinary Treatment Team (MTT) completes a formalized individual treatment plan for each inmate housed in the STU. The treatment plan includes an assessment of problems, treatment goals, and methods to achieve goals in a format consisting of basic identifying information; identified strengths and weaknesses; identified problems; summary of diagnosis; outcome objectives; intervention methods; proposed frequency of services; delivery of services; and inmate input. The treatment plan reflects a prioritization of treatment to address symptom reduction and stabilization; identify acquisition of adaptive skills and new behaviors; and clearly identify the expected outcome of therapeutic interventions. The treatment plan includes a summary with recommendations for continued treatment or discharge. All approved changes to the treatment plan are documented in the medical record and master record.

Individualized treatment plans are initiated and reviewed with the inmate on a regular basis by the MTT. The MHP assigned as the inmate's individual therapist discusses the treatment plan, in detail, with the inmate. The inmate then signs the new or revised treatment plan unless the MTT determines that it is clearly counter-therapeutic and the reason(s) why are documented. The MTT reviews treatment plans at least every thirty days for the initial three months and every ninety days thereafter. Each STU inmate is requested to attend his MTT meeting; which is conducted with the clinical case manager, individual therapist, psychiatrist, two activity therapists, psychiatric nurse, correctional counselor, and Pod lieutenant. Inmates are strongly encouraged to participate in treatment planning and are given adequate written notice of treatment review meetings unless the MTT determines that participation is clearly counter-therapeutic and the reason(s) why are documented. The inmate receives a copy of the treatment plan, unless the MTT determines that furnishing a copy is clearly counter-therapeutic and the reason(s) why are documented.

After STU placement, participation in all program services is voluntary. Inmates retain the right to refuse any and all treatment unless there is a safety concern. Inmates may be excluded from designated program services if the MTT or MHP determines attendance will be counter-therapeutic. A review of each inmate's placement within the STU is made during their scheduled MTT meeting. The staff psychiatrist and supervising psychologist are mandatorily required to be present for this review, which is made at least every six months. The results are included in the MTT plan provided to the inmate.

Length of stay in the STU varies depending on the nature of the inmate's clinical condition and participation in treatment as reflected in the MTT reviews. Progress is reviewed by the MTT, as outlined above, with recommendations forwarded to the Chief Administrative Officer. An inmate placed in the STU may be transferred from the STU with the written recommendation of the psychiatrist or physician for one or more of the following reasons: the inmate's condition has stabilized to a degree that placement in Administrative Detention or another Department facility is deemed appropriate; the inmate has refused reasonable efforts made over a period of not less than six months to engage the inmate in STU program services; the inmate has consistently and/or regularly disrupted STU treatment program services; or the inmate demonstrated no appreciable improvement in his condition despite a reasonable period of time, in no event less than a minimum of six months, in STU treatment program services. An inmate may be transferred from the STU without the approval of Mental Health staff for other reasons such as, but not limited to, transfer to another facility; court writ; supervised release; discharge; medical care; safety concerns; violent propensities. Subsequent placement of an inmate in the STU is not prohibited by Institutional Directive 05.505.005. Inmates no longer appropriate for Tamms CMAX placement are also considered inappropriate for STU placement and are transferred to the Dixon Psychiatric Unit.

An inmate may request a Placement Review Board hearing at anytime to review continued appropriateness of placement in the STU. STU inmates are reviewed every six months as follows: the Placement Review Board is composed of three members appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer (the supervising psychologist or designated MHP, one member not employed by the Department, and one additional member). This Board reviews psychiatric and medical records, and interviews the petitioner at discretion. The Board may call any employee or other person to present information determined to be relevant to the review. An agreement by a majority of the Board is the decision, and a written copy of the Board's decision is provided the inmate.

Within the STU, there is a Behavioral Level system through which inmates earn extra privileges by participating in program services and maintaining a positive disciplinary record. Those privileges include incentive movie groups, audiovisual privileges, an enhanced commissary list, and extra showers. Each housing wing is eligible to earn music three nights a week based on the noise level and aggregate disciplinary tickets accumulated on the wing. Inmates are allowed to participate in correspondence clinics through Mental Health Services. All inmates are offered ten hours of structured clinical activities as determined individually by the MTT. Structured activities include, but are not limited to; Expressive Therapies (art, music, video), Medication/Health Management Group, Life Management Skills Group, Anger Management Group, Stress Management Group, Symptom Management Group, Family Issues Group, Interaction Skills Therapy, Exercise/Fitness Group, and Dialectical Behavioral Therapy Group.

STU inmates are entitled to all emergency and non-emergency mental health services that are made available to each inmate housed at Tamms CMAX. STU inmates are seen per request and referral as needed. As with the Administrative Detention and Disciplinary Segregation inmates, referrals are seen within seventy-two hours and crises are seen immediately. Additionally, STU inmates are seen by the clinical case manager five times a week for rounds, once weekly for individual therapy, and twice monthly for psychiatric appointments. STU inmates participate in four therapy groups weekly with the activity therapist who has an office on the Pod. Group therapy sessions last up to two hours and vary depending on the inmates' needs. Community meetings are conducted within the treatment unit as

needed. A medication management group is offered weekly with a psychiatric nurse who is also stationed on the Pod. Clinical rounds are made daily by a MHP and weekly by the Psychologist and Psychiatrist or designee. Assigned nursing staff complete clinical rounds if no MHP is on-site. In the latter case, the on-call MHP is advised immediately of any concerns. Individual therapy with the assigned primary therapist is offered weekly as specified in the treatment plan. All inmates are scheduled to see the psychiatrist weekly, preferably out-of-cell, as specified in the treatment plan. Inmates are seen by assigned nursing staff each shift. When on-site, the mental health nurse will see each inmate at least once daily.

Department Mental Health Services

Information regarding Mental Health Services provided within the Department, including Tamms CC, is outlined in Table 13. The table includes each parent facility's population, whether the facility has a Mental Health Unit, the number of Mental Health Professionals (MHP), the number of inmates per MHP, psychiatric hours per month, psychiatric caseload, and psychiatric patients seen per hour. Level 7 and 8 facilities are excluded from the table, as Mental Health Services are administered through the parent facility.

Tamms CC is one of only four facilities with a separate Mental Health Unit. Tamms CC has more MHPs than every other prison except for Dixon CC (note that Dixon CC consistently has a population greater than 400 inmates within a Special Treatment Unit and a Psychiatric Unit). Tamms CC maintains the lowest number of inmates per MHPs. Compared to other facilities, psychiatric caseloads at Tamms CC are the lowest, resulting in Tamms CC having the highest number of psychiatric patients seen per hour by mental health staff. In fact, Tamms CC has more than double the rate of psychiatric patients seen per hour than the second-highest rated facility (Pontiac CC). Overall, inmates housed at Tamms CMAX have extensive Mental Health Services provided.

Proposed Recommendation- The Department considers placement at Tamms CMAX to be a highly important issue, whereby inmates are thoroughly screened according to established mental health practices. Further, assessment, services, and treatment provided to inmates during their stay at the facility are part of a comprehensive approach toward identifying and addressing mental health issues. The management of serious mental illness for inmates within the STU is an even more exhaustive process. Observational and document data indicate that efforts to provide mental health services regarding caseloads and contacts at Tamms CMAX exceed those at other prisons due the special needs of inmates held there.

A complete mental health evaluation will be conducted by a psychologist on every Administrative Detention (AD) and Disciplinary Segregation (DS) inmate within 30 days of placement at Tamms CMAX. Further, weekly rounds will be made by mental health staff for all AD and DS inmates to identify whether inmate mental health is decompensating as a result of transfer to the facility.

Point 4: Increase inmate privileges throughout the Behavioral Level System to incentivize positive behavior at Tamms CMAX.

Tamms CMAX contains a three-tiered Behavioral Level System with inmate adjustment being the factor that determines movement from one level to another. The Behavioral System Level is established based on providing access to more privileges as the inmate progresses through each level. Access to audio-visual equipment, recreation time, additional showers, commissary purchases, and program and religious services are determined by the policy for each level.

Proposed Recommendation- Amendments to policies describing privileges at each level of the Behavioral Level System will be implemented to increase the availability of commissary, out-of-cell recreation, and frequency of showers (see Table 14). Further, Institutional Directive 05.505.007, *Offender Phone Calls*, would be revised to reflect changes in procedure and telephone availability allowing for extended telephone privileges. Inmates who commit a violation of rules would be subject to losing those same telephone call privileges. Current policy only allows telephone calls for inmates due to legal consultation. Amending the policy whereby inmates can earn additional telephone privileges may be utilized as a behavioral modification incentive. Tamms CMAX was not constructed with inmates having extensive telephone communications access which would require telephone equipment and wiring to be installed.

Point 5: Begin offering General Educational Development (GED) testing at Tamms CMAX.

Current policy allows for Tamms CMAX inmates participating in educational program services to take GED classes, but they cannot take the actual test until transferred to another facility where the test is available. Given that some inmates have a prolonged length of stay at Tamms CMAX, these inmates should be able to take the GED examination after completing preparatory coursework.

Proposed Recommendation- The Department has developed two action-oriented options for conducting GED testing at Tamms CMAX as the need to present avenues for personal development still exists in a “supermax” environment. Both options could be offered to inmates as a means of pursuing their GED. Note that the process for implementing both options has already started.

Option 1

Several issues would need to be addressed to conduct GED testing at Tamms CMAX. First, to qualify to take the GED examination, an inmate is required to have achieved a Test for Adult Basic Education (TABE) score of 10.0 or higher, passed the United States Constitution examination, and passed the GED screening test, all during the preceding six months. Second, Tamms CMAX would need to establish policies and begin in-house preliminary testing for the GED (i.e. TABE, Constitution examination, and GED screening test). Preliminary testing would be reserved for inmates in CMAX Behavioral Level 3 who have been enrolled in the education program for a minimum of four months directly preceding testing. Third, the facility would need to develop a schedule for the GED examination. The GED subtests would need to be scheduled on separate days throughout the year due to the length of examination. Scheduling would occur over a five-day period allowing one day for each subtest, or three days with the subtests combined (i.e., Language Arts: Writing at 120 minutes; Math and Reading at 155 minutes; and Science and Social Studies at 160 minutes). Inmates would be allowed a pen, pencil, colored scratch paper, and a quiet place to test (cell is not feasible). A certified examiner must be able to hand out and collect test booklets and answer sheets; and be able to view students while testing (possibly utilize visiting rooms, but no visits will be permitted while testing is in progress).

Option 2

Currently thirteen inmates at Tamms CMAX are enrolled among six outside correspondence courses that allow them to work toward obtaining a GED or high school diploma. Each of these correspondence courses allow for degrees to be awarded at completion. When an inmate requests to take a GED exam, the Educational Facility Administrator could provide informational materials regarding appropriate correspondence courses. The Department should include a disclaimer that does not endorse these correspondence courses, because there is limited knowledge that these programs are reputable; therefore, the inmate should proceed with caution and pursue at individual risk. Inmates currently utilizing the correspondence course option may continue to do so at their discretion.

Other Considerations

Several issues should be considered with the implementation of GED testing at Tamms CMAX. Two educator positions recently were posted for Tamms CC. A site for testing at Tamms CMAX has been identified with pilot testing underway regarding the entire process. The Department currently has submitted for approval to the Illinois Community College Board for Tamms CMAX to be an approved GED testing site.

Point 6: Implement congregate religious services for inmates at Tamms CMAX.

Currently, there are no congregate religious services offered at Tamms CMAX. This activity will be incorporated into existing security operations, with consideration that this be the highest privilege an inmate can earn. Further, if this activity functions correctly, other congregate activities could be implemented in the same manner.

Proposed Recommendation- Congregate religious program services should be afforded to those inmates exhibiting consistent positive adjustment behavior. Note that the Department has already begun the process of hiring and completing background checks on faith practitioners, and is reviewing the possibility for having religious leaders conduct services as well.

The suggested criteria for accessing and participating in congregate religious services would be that:

- 1) inmates will only be authorized to attend services of their religious declaration.
- 2) services will be provided for only those religions recognized by the Department.
- 3) inmates must submit a written request to attend services to the facility Chaplain.
- 4) services will only be available to inmates assigned to Tamms CMAX Behavioral Levels 2 and 3.
- 5) potential inmates' institutional adjustment must be free of disciplinary action within a minimum of the preceding ninety days.

The facility Chaplain is responsible for scheduling religious services, coordinating volunteer services, and all other matters related to religious services as follows:

- 1) The Chaplain is currently and will continue to be responsible for confirming religious affiliation and scheduling services.
- 2) Jewish (Rabbi) and Catholic (Priest) religious leaders are currently retained by contract. Efforts are being made to secure a Muslim (Imam) cleric to provide services.
- 3) Volunteers of the Protestant Faith (Christian) currently serve at the facility on both limited and regular bases.
- 4) Services currently are provided once monthly as the religious leader makes rounds and conducts services at the cell front. Congregate services will be scheduled subject to availability of religious leaders of Department-recognized faiths.
- 5) The practice of initial training being provided to all newly approved volunteers by facility training staff, and annual training being provided to current volunteers by the facility Chaplain will continue.
- 6) The Chaplain is responsible for recruiting volunteers of recognized faiths; an on-going effort. Religious leaders on contract as well as volunteers will be escorted through the facility to the designated Pods by security staff.

Point 7: Rescind some of the printed materials restrictions for inmates at Tamms CMAX.

Currently, Tamms CMAX inmates are not allowed to have printed materials that include articles describing other inmates at Tamms CMAX or within the entire correctional system. Articles where the inmate is the subject are reviewed on a case-by-case basis for legitimate security concerns.

Proposed Recommendation- Remove media restrictions that ban inmates from viewing publications in which other inmates at Tamms CMAX or within the entire correctional system are the subject of the articles. While material documents will still be screened through the required publication review process for legitimate security concerns, inmates will receive additional access to publications.

Point 8: Develop a plan for beginning a Reassignment Unit at Tamms CMAX to compliment the ADRMP operated at other step-down sites.

Currently the ADRMP is provided at Pontiac CC and Menard CC. The establishment of a Reassignment Unit will be required to provide a means for reentry within Tamms CMAX. This unit would provide the Department with a means to continue monitoring an offender's behavior and adjustment in a less restrictive environment. The Reassignment Unit would supplement the other program enhancements presented within this report that describe additional privileges and movement for offenders who have exhibited positive adjustment.

Administrative Directive 05.12.115, *Administrative Detention Re-Entry Management Program* governs the current step-down program which is administered at Pontiac and Menard Correctional Centers. Inmates assigned to Administrative Detention who have had a positive adjustment but have not successfully renounced Security Threat Group affiliation may have the opportunity to transition from Tamms CMAX to the ADRMP. The ADRMP offers inmates increased activities and privileges. Every ninety days, inmates in the ADRMP have their behavior reviewed for compliance with Department and facility rules and policies and are considered for advancement, retention, or demotion. If at any time an inmate in the ADRMP successfully renounces Security Threat Group, he is removed from the ADRMP and placed in general population at a maximum-security location.

The ADRMP consists of three behavioral levels. Offenders assigned in Behavioral Levels 1 and 2 are housed at Pontiac CC. Inmates approved for the program are assigned to Level 1 which is ninety days in length. After successful completion of Level 1, inmates are promoted to Level 2 which is also a ninety-day term. Promotion to Level 2 requires the offender to display appropriate institutional adjustment, refrain from Security Threat Group activities, and refrain from rule violations. At Pontiac CC, twelve cells are designated for Behavioral Level 1 and 2 assignment, but no more than six inmates may be assigned to each Level.

Inmates exhibiting further positive adjustment may be promoted to Level 3 located at Menard CC. Again the term is ninety days and successful adjustment will lead to transfer within the general population at other maximum-security locations. Note that inmates assigned to any of the Behavioral Levels within ADRMP do not have routine contact with other inmates at Pontiac or Menard Correctional Centers.

Administrative Directive 05.12.115 lists guidelines for program services delivery, and specifies that the Director to designate the facility where the program may be offered. Accordingly, the privileges for the ADRMP by Level are as follows:

Behavioral Level 1 affords the assigned inmate:

- Orientation to the program
- Access to shower facilities three times per week.
- Individual out of cell recreation; five hours per week.
- Up to four pre-approved non-contact visits per month. Each visit is limited to two hours per visit.
- Two \$20.00 commissary purchases per month.
- Audio-visual privileges commensurate to general population.
- Meals served in the cell.
- Offenders are permitted only legal and emergency phone calls.

- Access to legal material in their cells and access to satellite library services.

Behavioral Level 2 affords the assigned inmate:

- Access to shower facilities three times per week.
- Individual out of cell recreation; five hours per week.
- Up to five pre-approved non-contact visits per month; each visit is limited to two hours per visit.
- Three \$25.00 commissary purchases per month.
- Audio-visual privileges commiserate to general population.
- Meals served in the cell.
- Offenders are permitted only legal and emergency phone calls.
- Access to legal material in their cells and access to satellite library services.

Behavioral Level 3 affords the assigned inmate:

- Access to shower facilities three times per week.
- Out of cell recreation, one hour per day with a maximum of five offenders in the recreation area.
- Up to five pre-approved non-contact visits per month; each visit is limited to two hours per visit.
- Four \$30.00 commissary purchases per month.
- Audio-visual privileges commiserate to general population.
- Two meals served in the cell; one meal served in the dining room with a limit of ten offenders (ADRMP) in the dining area.
- Offenders are permitted one ten-minute monitored collect phone call per month in addition to legal and/or emergency phone calls.
- Access to legal material in their cells and access to satellite library services.

Proposed Recommendation- Rather than reduce the privileges for inmates currently in Tamms CMAX Behavioral Level 3, as is the case of inmates transferred from the facility to ADRMP Behavioral Level 1, inmates would be eligible for privileges comparable to their assigned behavioral level at Tamms CMAX.

For those Administrative Detention inmates exhibiting positive adjustment behavior, there will be a Reassignment Unit at Tamms CMAX targeting inmates that may eventually be transferred to the ADRMP. The Reassignment Unit would be incorporated through the Behavior Level System with an opportunity to earn the highest level of privileges afforded to Tamms CMAX inmates. The Reassignment Unit would be structured for long-term inmates as not all of these inmates may leave Tamms CMAX. The Reassignment Unit would include a host of socialization and movement options targeting communal activities involving recreational (e.g., basketball) and dayroom privileges (e.g., playing cards, television or radio access), along with limited congregate program services. Placement within the Reassignment Unit would be completed in accordance with Administrative Directive 05.12.115.

Point 9: Plan a media, legislative, and public outreach strategy that includes hosting a day-long visit to Tamms CC.

Historically, the Department has honored very few media requests to visit Tamms CMAX, and records indicate that only Chicago Tribune staff have been accommodated. While accessibility to the facility is understandably limited, the Department has incurred difficulties associated with misinformation and conveyance of policies presented by external parties.

Proposed recommendation- The Department will specify one day for interested media and legislative parties to visit and tour the facility with a corresponding informational packet of materials provided to promote Department efforts in managing the Tamms CMAX and the role of the facility system-wide. One

emphasis area would target the quality and extent of mental health services at the facility. The same packet would be made available at request for those persons unable to attend.

Point 10: Reexamine the cohort of inmates having served extensive time at Tamms CMAX for transfer eligibility.

Since Tamms CMAX inception, inmate behavior adjustment progress has been monitored continuously, and evaluated every 90 days by a facility team including the warden, assistant warden of operations, and the clinical services supervisor. Director Randle required an additional review of inmates admitted into Tamms CMAX between 1998 and 2004 who are still held there. There were 133 Administrative Detention (AD) and Disciplinary Segregation (DS) case files reviewed, of which 48 were deemed eligible for the Department to begin a phased process for releasing inmates through ADRMP or the reassignment unit (see Point 8).

- Among 95 AD cases, 32 were deemed eligible for the current ADRMP, with another 12 eligible for the proposed Reassignment Unit that will later be transferred to the ADRMP sites (see Point 8). The remaining 51 cases were determined to be ineligible for transfer.
- Among 38 DS cases, two cases were determined to be eligible for the traditional Mandatory Supervised Release route. Another two cases may leave via that same route if compliance behaviors continue to be exhibited, while the remaining 34 cases were determined not to be eligible for transfer.
- For the 85 cases not deemed eligible for transfer, they will be provided an estimated time to serve at Tamms CMAX in line with the proposed range description (see Point 2). Further, for the cases admitted to Tamms CMAX beginning 2005, they will be informed during their quarterly reviews of the amount of time they should expect to serve at the facility in conjunction with the proposed range description.

Proposed recommendation- The Department will supplement the static quarterly evaluations with periodic reviews specifically targeting inmates who have been held at Tamms CMAX for durations exceeding five years. Staff from the Department's Investigations and Intelligence Unit will be fully integrated with this process. Further, Department management staff not involved with day-to-day operations at the facility will be consulted as independent third-party external reviewers. The goal is to investigate whether there are more eligible candidates for the ADRMP than being identified through the quarterly review practice.

ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

Table 1: Adult Male Prison Population Profile

June 30, 2009

	Tamms CMAX		Maximum Security Classification w/o Tamms CMAX		Prison Population w/o Tamms CMAX or Maximum Security Classification		Total Adult Male Prison Population	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Admission Type								
Direct from Court	131	53.9%	2,681	51.6%	14,922	39.8%	17,734	41.3%
Discharged and Recommitted	58	23.9%	1,662	32.0%	12,847	34.3%	14,567	33.9%
New Offense Violator	31	12.8%	502	9.7%	4,411	11.8%	4,944	11.5%
Technical Violator	8	3.3%	207	4.0%	4,690	12.5%	4,905	11.4%
Other	15	6.2%	141	2.7%	627	1.7%	783	1.8%
Race								
Black	131	53.9%	3,374	65.0%	21,798	58.1%	25,303	58.9%
White	46	18.9%	1,175	22.6%	10,589	28.2%	11,810	27.5%
Hispanic	65	26.7%	625	12.0%	4,927	13.1%	5,617	13.1%
Other	1	0.4%	19	0.4%	183	0.5%	203	0.5%
Current Age								
Less than 20 Years	0	0.0%	60	1.2%	1,382	3.7%	1,442	3.4%
20 - 29 Years	29	11.9%	1,448	27.9%	12,783	34.1%	14,260	33.2%
30 - 39 Years	103	42.4%	1,703	32.8%	11,316	30.2%	13,122	30.6%
40 - 49 Years	70	28.8%	1,192	23.0%	8,053	21.5%	9,315	21.7%
50 Years and Older	41	16.9%	790	15.2%	3,894	10.4%	4,725	11.0%
Missing	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	69	0.2%	69	0.2%
Average Current Age	39.9 years		37.3 years		34.8 years		35.1 years	
Last Grade Completed								
8th Grade or Less	17	7.0%	420	8.1%	2,744	7.3%	3,181	7.4%
Some High School	116	47.7%	2,106	40.6%	16,320	43.5%	18,542	43.2%
High School Graduate/GED	47	19.3%	1,472	28.3%	12,483	33.3%	14,002	32.6%
Technical School	0	0.0%	18	0.3%	247	0.7%	265	0.6%
College	26	10.7%	483	9.3%	3,582	9.6%	4,091	9.5%
Missing	37	15.2%	694	13.4%	2,121	5.7%	2,852	6.6%
Committing County								
Cook County	170	70.0%	3,171	61.1%	18,446	49.2%	21,787	50.7%
Collar Counties	18	7.4%	475	9.1%	4,461	11.9%	4,954	11.5%
Downstate Counties	51	21.0%	1,519	29.3%	13,953	37.2%	15,523	36.2%
Out of State	4	1.6%	27	0.5%	8	0.0%	39	0.1%
Missing	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	629	1.7%	630	1.5%
Average Time Served in Prison*	15.1 years		7.9 years		3.4 years		4.1 years	
Offense Class								
Murder	169	69.5%	3,183	61.3%	3,541	9.4%	6,893	16.1%
Class X	49	20.2%	1,288	24.8%	9,500	25.3%	10,837	25.2%
Class 1	7	2.9%	257	4.9%	7,163	19.1%	7,427	17.3%
Class 2	10	4.1%	301	5.8%	9,014	24.0%	9,325	21.7%
Class 3	5	2.1%	83	1.6%	3,285	8.8%	3,373	7.9%
Class 4	3	1.2%	80	1.5%	4,213	11.2%	4,296	10.0%
Unclassified	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	152	0.4%	152	0.4%
Missing	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	629	1.7%	630	1.5%
Offense Type								
Person	216	88.9%	4,101	79.0%	14,539	38.8%	18,856	43.9%
Property	7	2.9%	268	5.2%	8,065	21.5%	8,340	19.4%
Drug	4	1.6%	174	3.4%	9,139	24.4%	9,317	21.7%
Sex	13	5.3%	634	12.2%	4,687	12.5%	5,334	12.4%
Other	3	1.2%	15	0.3%	438	1.2%	456	1.1%
Missing	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	629	1.7%	630	1.5%
Total	243		5,193		37,497		42,933	

*Average Time Served in Prison is for court admissions, excludes technical violators

Note: Cases may not total 100% due to rounding.

ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
Table 2: Tamms CMAX Disciplinary Segregation (N=83)
 May 20, 2009

	Less than 1 Year		1 - 4.9 Years		5 - 8.9 Years		9 - 11.9 Years		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<i>Intelligence Sheet</i>										
Renunciation Stamp										
No Stamp	14	93.3%	31	91.2%	10	76.9%	19	90.5%	74	89.2%
Renunciation Rejected	1	6.7%	3	8.8%	2	15.4%	2	9.5%	8	9.6%
Renunciation Revoked	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Renounced	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	7.7%	0	0.0%	1	1.2%
Gang Member Points										
Not Validated	3	20.0%	10	29.4%	1	7.7%	5	23.8%	19	22.9%
Validated	12	80.0%	24	70.6%	12	92.3%	16	76.2%	64	77.1%
Gang Leader Points										
Not Validated	11	73.3%	30	88.2%	7	53.8%	19	90.5%	67	80.7%
Validated	4	26.7%	4	11.8%	6	46.2%	2	9.5%	16	19.3%
Escape Risk										
Low	0	0.0%	3	8.8%	0	0.0%	1	4.8%	4	4.8%
Moderate	8	53.3%	9	26.5%	2	15.4%	5	23.8%	24	28.9%
High	4	26.7%	13	38.2%	7	53.8%	7	33.3%	31	37.3%
Extremely High	3	20.0%	9	26.5%	4	30.8%	8	38.1%	24	28.9%
Aggression Level										
Low	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	4.8%	1	1.2%
Moderate	4	26.7%	4	11.8%	5	38.5%	3	14.3%	16	19.3%
High	9	60.0%	30	88.2%	8	61.5%	17	81.0%	64	77.1%
Missing	2	13.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	2.4%
<i>Placement Sheet</i>										
Assaults¹										
No	1	6.7%	6	17.6%	1	7.7%	2	9.5%	10	12.0%
Yes	14	93.3%	28	82.4%	12	92.3%	19	90.5%	73	88.0%
Staff Assaults²										
No	7	46.7%	10	29.4%	3	23.1%	6	28.6%	26	31.3%
Yes	8	53.3%	24	70.6%	10	76.9%	15	71.4%	57	68.7%
Inmate Assaults³										
No	4	26.7%	19	55.9%	6	46.2%	14	66.7%	43	51.8%
Yes	11	73.3%	15	44.1%	7	53.8%	7	33.3%	40	48.2%
STG Activity										
No	5	33.3%	25	73.5%	6	46.2%	17	81.0%	53	63.9%
Yes	10	66.7%	9	26.5%	7	53.8%	4	19.0%	30	36.1%
Convicted of Murder while Incarcerated										
No	15	100.0%	33	97.1%	12	92.3%	20	95.2%	80	96.4%
Yes	0	0.0%	1	2.9%	1	7.7%	1	4.8%	3	3.6%
Convicted of Other Crimes while Incarcerated										
No	14	93.3%	31	91.2%	13	100.0%	15	71.4%	73	88.0%
Yes	1	6.7%	3	8.8%	0	0.0%	6	28.6%	10	12.0%
Escape										
No	12	80.0%	32	94.1%	10	76.9%	18	85.7%	72	86.7%
Yes	3	20.0%	2	5.9%	3	23.1%	3	14.3%	11	13.3%
Make/Possess Weapon										
No	11	73.3%	21	61.8%	9	69.2%	9	42.9%	50	60.2%
Yes	4	26.7%	13	38.2%	4	30.8%	12	57.1%	33	39.8%
<i>Offender Tracking System (OTS) Mitimus</i>										
Convictions while Incarcerated										
None	11	73.3%	12	35.3%	5	38.5%	3	14.3%	31	37.3%
One or More	4	26.7%	22	64.7%	8	61.5%	18	85.7%	52	62.7%
<i>Disciplinary Record at Tamms CMAX</i>										
Major Guilty Tickets										
0	8	53.3%	4	11.8%	3	23.1%	0	0.0%	15	18.1%
1-5	7	46.7%	10	29.4%	1	7.7%	1	4.8%	19	22.9%
6-10	0	0.0%	3	8.8%	3	23.1%	0	0.0%	6	7.2%
11-100	0	0.0%	13	38.2%	3	23.1%	4	19.0%	20	24.1%
More than 100	0	0.0%	4	11.8%	3	23.1%	16	76.2%	23	27.7%

ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
Table 2: Tamms CMAX Disciplinary Segregation (N=83)
 May 20, 2009

	Less than 1 Year		1 - 4.9 Years		5 - 8.9 Years		9 - 11.9 Years		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<i>Current Mental Health</i>										
DSM-IV Axis I Diagnosis										
No	1	6.7%	4	11.8%	4	30.8%	5	23.8%	14	16.9%
Yes	13	86.7%	30	88.2%	9	69.2%	16	76.2%	68	81.9%
Deferred	1	6.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.2%
DSM-IV Axis II Diagnosis										
No	3	20.0%	6	17.6%	3	23.1%	3	14.3%	15	18.1%
Yes	11	73.3%	28	82.4%	10	76.9%	18	85.7%	67	80.7%
Deferred	1	6.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.2%
Substance Abuse/Dependence										
No	8	53.3%	23	67.6%	10	76.9%	16	76.2%	57	68.7%
Yes	7	46.7%	11	32.4%	3	23.1%	5	23.8%	26	31.3%
Current Chronic Caseload										
No	12	80.0%	21	61.8%	10	76.9%	15	71.4%	58	69.9%
Yes	3	20.0%	13	38.2%	3	23.1%	6	28.6%	25	30.1%
Frequent Crisis Care Treatment										
No	15	100.0%	28	82.4%	10	76.9%	17	81.0%	70	84.3%
Yes	0	0.0%	6	17.6%	3	23.1%	4	19.0%	13	15.7%
History of Mental Health Treatment Plans and/or Accessing Mental Health Services										
No	13	86.7%	14	41.2%	8	61.5%	6	28.6%	41	49.4%
Yes	2	13.3%	20	58.8%	5	38.5%	15	71.4%	42	50.6%
Program Participation										
No	7	46.7%	10	29.4%	3	23.1%	7	33.3%	27	32.5%
Yes	8	53.3%	24	70.6%	10	76.9%	14	66.7%	56	67.5%
<i>Transferring Facility</i>										
Transferring Location										
Big Muddy River CC	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Centralia CC	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Danville CC	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Department of Human Services	0	0.0%	1	2.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.2%
Dixon CC	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	4.8%	1	1.2%
Dixon Psychiatric Unit	0	0.0%	1	2.9%	1	7.7%	0	0.0%	2	2.4%
Hill CC	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Jacksonville CC	0	0.0%	1	2.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.2%
Joliet CC	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Lawrence CC	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	7.7%	0	0.0%	1	1.2%
Menard CC	9	60.0%	10	29.4%	8	61.5%	6	28.6%	33	39.8%
Pinckneyville CC	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Pontiac CC	5	33.3%	19	55.9%	3	23.1%	7	33.3%	34	41.0%
Shawnee CC	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	4.8%	1	1.2%
Stateville CC	1	6.7%	2	5.9%	0	0.0%	4	19.0%	7	8.4%
Western Illinois CC	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	4.8%	1	1.2%
Out of State	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	4.8%	1	1.2%
Total	15	100.0%	34	100.0%	13	100.0%	21	100.0%	83	100.0%

¹ Indicates whether or not any assault; including against staff, inmates, unspecified, or sexual assault, was denoted as a reason for placement

² Assaults against staff were denoted as a reason for placement

³ Assaults against other inmates were denoted as a reason for placement

ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
Table 2: Tamms CMAX Administrative Detention (N=162)
 May 20, 2009

	Less than 1 Year		1 - 4.9 Years		5 - 8.9 Years		9 - 11.9 Years		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<i>Intelligence Sheet</i>										
Renunciation Stamp										
No Stamp	1	100.0%	50	69.4%	19	67.9%	45	73.8%	115	71.0%
Renunciation Rejected	0	0.0%	22	30.6%	7	25.0%	15	24.6%	44	27.2%
Renunciation Revoked	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	3.6%	0	0.0%	1	0.6%
Renounced	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	3.6%	1	1.6%	2	1.2%
Gang Member Points										
Not Validated	0	0.0%	4	5.6%	1	3.6%	2	3.3%	7	4.3%
Validated	1	100.0%	68	94.4%	27	96.4%	59	96.7%	155	95.7%
Gang Leader Points										
Not Validated	0	0.0%	23	31.9%	11	39.3%	24	39.3%	58	35.8%
Validated	1	100.0%	49	68.1%	17	60.7%	37	60.7%	104	64.2%
Escape Risk										
Low	0	0.0%	9	12.5%	8	28.6%	7	11.5%	24	14.8%
Moderate	1	100.0%	41	56.9%	14	50.0%	32	52.5%	88	54.3%
High	0	0.0%	18	25.0%	5	17.9%	16	26.2%	39	24.1%
Extremely High	0	0.0%	4	5.6%	1	3.6%	6	9.8%	11	6.8%
Aggression Level										
Low	0	0.0%	8	11.1%	5	17.9%	8	13.1%	21	13.0%
Moderate	1	100.0%	31	43.1%	16	57.1%	27	44.3%	75	46.3%
High	0	0.0%	33	45.8%	7	25.0%	26	42.6%	66	40.7%
<i>Placement Sheet</i>										
Assaults¹										
No	0	0.0%	35	48.6%	12	42.9%	16	26.2%	63	38.9%
Yes	1	100.0%	37	51.4%	16	57.1%	45	73.8%	99	61.1%
Staff Assaults²										
No	0	0.0%	58	80.6%	22	78.6%	22	36.1%	102	63.0%
Yes	1	100.0%	14	19.4%	6	21.4%	39	63.9%	60	37.0%
Inmate Assaults³										
No	0	0.0%	40	55.6%	16	57.1%	36	59.0%	92	56.8%
Yes	1	100.0%	32	44.4%	12	42.9%	25	41.0%	70	43.2%
STG Activity										
No	0	0.0%	8	11.1%	3	10.7%	17	27.9%	28	17.3%
Yes	1	100.0%	64	88.9%	25	89.3%	44	72.1%	134	82.7%
Convicted of Murder while Incarcerated										
No	1	100.0%	72	100.0%	28	100.0%	54	88.5%	155	95.7%
Yes	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	11.5%	7	4.3%
Convicted of Other Crimes while Incarcerated										
No	1	100.0%	70	97.2%	27	96.4%	53	86.9%	151	93.2%
Yes	0	0.0%	2	2.8%	1	3.6%	8	13.1%	11	6.8%
Escape										
No	1	100.0%	69	95.8%	27	96.4%	56	91.8%	153	94.4%
Yes	0	0.0%	3	4.2%	1	3.6%	5	8.2%	9	5.6%
Make/Possess Weapon										
No	0	0.0%	58	80.6%	23	82.1%	28	45.9%	109	67.3%
Yes	1	100.0%	14	19.4%	5	17.9%	33	54.1%	53	32.7%
<i>Offender Tracking System (OTS) Mitimus</i>										
Convictions while Incarcerated										
None	1	100.0%	52	72.2%	24	85.7%	27	44.3%	104	64.2%
One or More	0	0.0%	20	27.8%	4	14.3%	34	55.7%	58	35.8%
<i>Disciplinary Record at Tamms CMAX</i>										
Major Guilty Tickets										
0	1	100.0%	37	51.4%	8	28.6%	3	4.9%	49	30.2%
1-5	0	0.0%	28	38.9%	15	53.6%	24	39.3%	67	41.4%
6-10	0	0.0%	6	8.3%	2	7.1%	12	19.7%	20	12.3%
11-100	0	0.0%	1	1.4%	3	10.7%	22	36.1%	26	16.0%
More than 100	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
Table 2: Tamms CMAX Administrative Detention (N=162)
 May 20, 2009

	Less than 1 Year		1 - 4.9 Years		5 - 8.9 Years		9 - 11.9 Years		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<i>Current Mental Health</i>										
DSM-IV Axis I Diagnosis										
No	1	100.0%	19	26.4%	17	60.7%	48	78.7%	85	52.5%
Yes	0	0.0%	53	73.6%	11	39.3%	13	21.3%	77	47.5%
DSM-IV Axis II Diagnosis										
No	1	100.0%	24	33.3%	10	35.7%	35	57.4%	70	43.2%
Yes	0	0.0%	48	66.7%	18	64.3%	26	42.6%	92	56.8%
Substance Abuse/Dependence										
No	1	100.0%	36	50.0%	21	75.0%	54	88.5%	112	69.1%
Yes	0	0.0%	36	50.0%	7	25.0%	7	11.5%	50	30.9%
Current Chronic Caseload										
No	1	100.0%	64	88.9%	27	96.4%	59	96.7%	151	93.2%
Yes	0	0.0%	8	11.1%	1	3.6%	2	3.3%	11	6.8%
Frequent Crisis Care Treatment										
No	1	100.0%	72	100.0%	28	100.0%	61	100.0%	162	100.0%
Yes	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
History of Mental Health Treatment Plans and/or Accessing Mental Health Services										
No	1	100.0%	63	87.5%	26	92.9%	50	82.0%	140	86.4%
Yes	0	0.0%	9	12.5%	2	7.1%	11	18.0%	22	13.6%
Program Participation										
No	0	0.0%	30	41.7%	13	46.4%	29	47.5%	72	44.4%
Yes	1	100.0%	42	58.3%	15	53.6%	32	52.5%	90	55.6%
<i>Transferring Facility</i>										
Transferring Location										
Big Muddy River CC	0	0.0%	3	4.2%	1	3.6%	2	3.3%	6	3.7%
Centralia CC	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.6%	1	0.6%
Danville CC	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	3.6%	0	0.0%	1	0.6%
Department of Human Services	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Dixon CC	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.6%	1	0.6%
Dixon Psychiatric Unit	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Hill CC	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.6%	1	0.6%
Jacksonville CC	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.6%	1	0.6%
Joliet CC	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	3.6%	2	3.3%	3	1.9%
Lawrence CC	0	0.0%	1	1.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.6%
Menard CC	0	0.0%	34	47.2%	5	17.9%	25	41.0%	64	39.5%
Pinckneyville CC	0	0.0%	1	1.4%	1	3.6%	0	0.0%	2	1.2%
Pontiac CC	0	0.0%	15	20.8%	1	3.6%	8	13.1%	24	14.8%
Shawnee CC	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.6%	1	0.6%
Stateville CC	1	100.0%	17	23.6%	18	64.3%	13	21.3%	49	30.2%
Western Illinois CC	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Out of State	0	0.0%	1	1.4%	0	0.0%	6	9.8%	7	4.3%
Total	1	100.0%	72	100.0%	28	100.0%	61	100.0%	162	100.0%

¹ Indicates whether or not any assault; including against staff, inmates, unspecified, or sexual assault, was denoted as a reason for placement

² Assaults against staff were denoted as a reason for placement

³ Assaults against other inmates were denoted as a reason for placement

ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
Table 3: Tamms CMAX End-of-Month Population
March 9, 1998 through June 30, 2009

Month/Year	End-of-Month Population	Month/Year	End-of-Month Population	Month/Year	End-of-Month Population
Mar 1998	75	Jul 2001	265	Jul 2005	272
Apr 1998	121	Aug 2001	268	Aug 2005	277
May 1998	122	Sep 2001	267	Sep 2005	274
Jun 1998	145	Oct 2001	266	Oct 2005	272
Jul 1998	211	Nov 2001	267	Nov 2005	270
Aug 1998	232	Dec 2001	266	Dec 2005	275
Sep 1998	244	Jan 2002	264	Jan 2006	273
Oct 1998	241	Feb 2002	262	Feb 2006	272
Nov 1998	252	Mar 2002	262	Mar 2006	272
Dec 1998	256	Apr 2002	265	Apr 2006	274
Jan 1999	261	May 2002	264	May 2006	266
Feb 1999	266	Jun 2002	263	Jun 2006	272
Mar 1999	264	Jul 2002	261	Jul 2006	275
Apr 1999	261	Aug 2002	259	Aug 2006	275
May 1999	265	Sep 2002	260	Sep 2006	283
Jun 1999	265	Oct 2002	261	Oct 2006	284
Jul 1999	266	Nov 2002	259	Nov 2006	285
Aug 1999	270	Dec 2002	260	Dec 2006	284
Sep 1999	272	Jan 2003	260	Jan 2007	275
Oct 1999	272	Feb 2003	260	Feb 2007	268
Nov 1999	272	Mar 2003	259	Mar 2007	272
Dec 1999	274	Apr 2003	256	Apr 2007	271
Jan 2000	271	May 2003	258	May 2007	269
Feb 2000	270	Jun 2003	257	Jun 2007	267
Mar 2000	273	Jul 2003	256	Jul 2007	271
Apr 2000	273	Aug 2003	261	Aug 2007	274
May 2000	273	Sep 2003	264	Sep 2007	273
Jun 2000	273	Oct 2003	260	Oct 2007	265
Jul 2000	271	Nov 2003	259	Nov 2007	261
Aug 2000	274	Dec 2003	259	Dec 2007	265
Sep 2000	276	Jan 2004	257	Jan 2008	264
Oct 2000	271	Feb 2004	265	Feb 2008	262
Nov 2000	269	Mar 2004	269	Mar 2008	259
Dec 2000	268	Apr 2004	272	Apr 2008	259
Jan 2001	269	May 2004	272	May 2008	259
Feb 2001	271	Jun 2004	275	Jun 2008	252
Mar 2001	268	Jul 2004	277	Jul 2008	251
Apr 2001	270	Aug 2004	273	Aug 2008	260
May 2001	271	Sep 2004	272	Sep 2008	253
Jun 2001	267	Oct 2004	282	Oct 2008	253
		Nov 2004	283	Nov 2008	253
		Dec 2004	279	Dec 2008	251
		Jan 2005	270	Jan 2009	246
		Feb 2005	272	Feb 2009	246
		Mar 2005	268	Mar 2009	248
		Apr 2005	269	Apr 2009	244
		May 2005	268	May 2009	244
		Jun 2005	278	Jun 2009	243

ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

Table 4: Tamms CMAX Population Summary and Length of Stay

March 9, 1998 through June 30, 2009

Population Movement Summary and Fiscal Year-End Population					
Year	Admissions	Exits	Year-End	On-Site	Off-Site
FY98	149	2	147	145	2
FY99	158	37	268	265	3
FY00	33	22	279	273	6
FY01	16	25	270	267	3
FY02	15	18	267	263	4
FY03	15	20	262	257	5
FY04	43	26	279	275	4
FY05	55	53	281	278	3
FY06	44	49	276	272	4
FY07	24	30	270	267	3
FY08	18	35	253	252	1
FY09	19	25	247	243	4
Total	589	342			

Length of Stay at Tamms CMAX						
	Admissions		Exits		Current Population	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Less than 1 Year	97	16.5%	78	22.8%	19	7.7%
1 - 1.9 Years	50	8.5%	34	9.9%	16	6.5%
2 - 2.9 Years	52	8.8%	30	8.8%	22	8.9%
3 - 3.9 Years	61	10.4%	27	7.9%	34	13.8%
4 - 4.9 Years	62	10.5%	30	8.8%	32	13.0%
5 - 5.9 Years	44	7.5%	21	6.1%	23	9.3%
6 - 6.9 Years	43	7.3%	38	11.1%	5	2.0%
7 - 7.9 Years	47	8.0%	37	10.8%	10	4.0%
8 - 8.9 Years	20	3.4%	16	4.7%	4	1.6%
9 - 9.9 Years	22	3.7%	10	2.9%	12	4.9%
10 - 10.9 Years	44	7.5%	18	5.3%	26	10.5%
11 Years or More	47	8.0%	3	0.9%	44	17.8%
Total	589	100.0%	342	100.0%	247	100.0%
Average (Months)	60.8		51.6		73.4	

Exit Reasons	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	Total	Avg. LOS (Months)
Transferred to Other IDOC Facilities														
(1) Did not meet Tamms CMAX guidelines	1	12	1	1	0	0	4	6	0	1	0	0	26	2.0
(2) Pre-Transfer Unit	0	0	4	6	9	6	0	6	6	3	2	2	44	53.7
(3) Segregation to Segregation	0	0	1	1	0	1	4	2	2	2	0	0	13	60.4
(4) Segregation to General Population	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6.5
(5) Step-Down Program (ADRMP at Pontiac)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	24	11	9	17	72	99.4
(6) Mental Health	0	16	7	8	2	5	1	6	2	4	5	1	57	21.1
(7) Lawsuit/Court Allowed Transfer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	73.6
(8) Medical Transfer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	82.2
(9) Pending MSR/Discharge	0	3	8	8	6	7	12	16	11	7	18	3	99	49.9
(10) Pending Parole	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	30.6
Discharged from Tamms CMAX														
(11) Reversal and Remand or Court Ordered	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	20.6
(12) Expiration of Sentence	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4.9
(13) Death	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	4	67.8
(14) Execution	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.0
Other Release from Tamms CMAX														
(15) DHS (Illinois Department of Human Services)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	11.2
(16) Out of State Transfer	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	6	32.4
(17) MSR/Parole	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	1	0	0	7	44.4
Total	2	37	22	25	18	20	26	53	49	30	35	25	342	51.6

Exit Reasons

- (1) Did not meet guidelines for Tamms CMAX placement - after transfer review hearing, determination was made that the inmate (Segregation or Administrative Detention) did not meet placement guidelines.
- (2) Pre-Transfer Unit - Administrative Detention inmates who are not validated as STG members or have successfully renounced their STG affiliation.
- (3) Segregation-to-Segregation - Segregation inmates that have shown improved behavior to warrant transfer to another Level 1 Segregation Unit.
- (4) Segregation-to-General Population - Inmates that have completed segregation time at Tamms CMAX, but do not meet the criteria for Administrative Detention, and returned to general population.
- (5) Step-Down Program - Administrative Detention inmates transferred to the Administrative Detention Re-entry Management Program (ADRMP).
- (6) Mental Health concerns - Inmates transferred due to mental health concerns.
- (7) Lawsuit/Court allowed Transfer - Inmates transferred to another facility due to either a civil suit or a criminal case.
- (8) Medical Transfer - Inmate's serious illness/condition renders transfer appropriate.
- (9) Pending MSR/Discharge - Inmates transferred to another facility due to impending MSR date. Administrative Detention inmates are transferred 90 days prior to MSR and Segregation inmates are transferred 30 days prior to MSR.
- (10) Pending Parole - Inmates transfer and are released pursuant to a PRB order.
- (11) Court Ordered Discharge - Inmates released pursuant to a court order.
- (12) Expiration of Sentence
- (13) Death
- (14) Executions
- (15) Illinois Department of Human Services (DHS) - Inmates transferred to the custody of DHS for competency issues.
- (16) Out of State - Transferred out of state.
- (17) MSR/Parole - Released to MSR or paroled directly from Tamms CMAX

ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
Table 5: Tamms CMAX Population Movement by Month
March 9, 1998 through June 30, 2009

Month and Year	First of Month Population	Transfers into Tamms CMAX	Tamms CMAX Exits																	End of Month Population				
			Transferred to Other IDOC Facilities										Discharged				Other Release			Total	On-Site	Off-Site	Total	
			Did Not Meet Tamms Guidelines	Pre-Transfer Unit	Segregation to Segregation	Segregation to General Population	Step-Down Program (ADRM)	Mental Health	Lawsuit/ Court Allowed Transfer	Medical	Pending MSR/ Discharge	Pending Parole	Reversal & Remand or COD	Expiration of Sentence	Death	Execution	DHS	Out of State	MSR/ Parole					
Mar 1998	0	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	0	75
Apr 1998	75	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121	1	122
May 1998	122	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	122	1	123
Jun 1998	123	25	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	145	2	147
Jul 1998	147	71	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	211	4	215
Aug 1998	215	24	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	232	4	236
Sep 1998	236	20	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	244	5	249
Oct 1998	249	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	241	4	245
Nov 1998	245	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	252	5	257
Dec 1998	257	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	256	3	259
Jan 1999	259	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	261	5	266
Feb 1999	266	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	266	3	269
Mar 1999	269	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	264	5	269
Apr 1999	269	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	8	261	3	264
May 1999	264	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	265	3	268
Jun 1999	268	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	265	3	268
Jul 1999	268	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	266	3	269
Aug 1999	269	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	270	3	273
Sep 1999	273	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	272	3	275
Oct 1999	275	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	272	3	275
Nov 1999	275	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	272	3	275
Dec 1999	275	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	274	2	276
Jan 2000	276	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	271	4	275
Feb 2000	275	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	270	4	274
Mar 2000	274	8	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	273	4	277
Apr 2000	277	4	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	273	4	277
May 2000	277	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	273	5	278
Jun 2000	278	3	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	273	6	279
Jul 2000	279	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	271	6	277
Aug 2000	277	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	274	5	279
Sep 2000	279	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	276	4	280
Oct 2000	280	2	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	271	4	275
Nov 2000	275	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	269	4	273
Dec 2000	273	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	268	4	272
Jan 2001	272	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	269	3	272
Feb 2001	272	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	271	3	274
Mar 2001	274	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	268	3	271
Apr 2001	271	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	270	4	274
May 2001	274	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	271	3	274
Jun 2001	274	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	267	3	270
Jul 2001	270	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	265	4	269
Aug 2001	269	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	268	4	272
Sep 2001	272	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	267	4	271
Oct 2001	271	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	266	5	271
Nov 2001	271	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	267	5	272
Dec 2001	272	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	266	4	270
Jan 2002	270	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	264	4	268
Feb 2002	268	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	262	4	266
Mar 2002	266	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	262	4	266
Apr 2002	266	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	265	4	269
May 2002	269	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	264	4	268
Jun 2002	268	0	0	268	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	263	4	267

ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
Table 5: Tamms CMAX Population Movement by Month
March 9, 1998 through June 30, 2009

Month and Year	First of Month Population	Transfers into Tamms CMAX	Tamms CMAX Exits																	End of Month Population				
			Transferred to Other IDOC Facilities										Discharged				Other Release			Total	On-Site	Off-Site	Total	
			Did Not Meet Tamms Guidelines	Pre-Transfer Unit	Segregation to Segregation	Segregation to General Population	Step-Down Program (ADRM)	Mental Health	Lawsuit/ Court Allowed Transfer	Medical	Pending MSR/ Discharge	Pending Parole	Reversal & Remand or COD	Expiration of Sentence	Death	Execution	DHS	Out of State	MSR/ Parole					
Jul 2002	267	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	261	4	265
Aug 2002	265	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	259	4	263
Sep 2002	263	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	260	5	265
Oct 2002	265	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	261	4	265
Nov 2002	265	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	259	4	263
Dec 2002	263	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	260	4	264
Jan 2003	264	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	260	5	265
Feb 2003	265	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	260	5	265
Mar 2003	265	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	259	5	264
Apr 2003	264	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	256	6	262
May 2003	262	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	258	5	263
Jun 2003	263	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	257	5	262
Jul 2003	262	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	256	5	261
Aug 2003	261	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	261	5	266
Sep 2003	266	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	264	5	269
Oct 2003	269	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	260	5	265
Nov 2003	265	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	259	3	262
Dec 2003	262	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	259	2	261
Jan 2004	261	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	257	4	261
Feb 2004	261	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	265	5	270
Mar 2004	270	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	269	4	273
Apr 2004	273	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	272	4	276
May 2004	276	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	272	5	277
Jun 2004	277	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	275	4	279
Jul 2004	279	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	277	3	280
Aug 2004	280	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	273	4	277
Sep 2004	277	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	272	3	275
Oct 2004	275	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	282	2	284
Nov 2004	284	8	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	283	2	285
Dec 2004	285	2	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	279	3	282
Jan 2005	282	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	270	4	274
Feb 2005	274	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	272	3	275
Mar 2005	275	3	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	268	3	271
Apr 2005	271	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	269	3	272
May 2005	272	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	268	4	272
Jun 2005	272	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	278	3	281
Jul 2005	281	1	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	272	3	275
Aug 2005	275	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	277	4	281
Sep 2005	281	2	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	274	1	275	
Oct 2005	275	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	272	1	273	
Nov 2005	273	8	0	0	1	0	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	270	2	272	
Dec 2005	272	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	275	1	276
Jan 2006	276	5	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	273	2	275	
Feb 2006	275	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	272	3	275	
Mar 2006	275	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	272	2	274	
Apr 2006	274	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	274	2	276	
May 2006	276	2	0	0	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	266	5	271	
Jun 2006	271	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	272	4	276	

ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
Table 5: Tamms CMAX Population Movement by Month
March 9, 1998 through June 30, 2009

Month and Year	First of Month Population	Transfers into Tamms CMAX	Tamms CMAX Exits																	End of Month Population					
			Transferred to Other IDOC Facilities										Discharged				Other Release			Total	On-Site	Off-Site	Total		
			Did Not Meet Tamms Guidelines	Pre-Transfer Unit	Segregation to Segregation	Segregation to General Population	Step-Down Program (ADRM)	Mental Health	Lawsuit/ Court Allowed Transfer	Medical	Pending MSR/ Discharge	Pending Parole	Reversal & Remand or COD	Expiration of Sentence	Death	Execution	DHS	Out of State	MSR/ Parole						
Jul 2006	276	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	275	3	278	
Aug 2006	278	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	275	4	279
Sep 2006	279	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	283	4	287
Oct 2006	287	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	284	3	287
Nov 2006	287	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	285	1	286
Dec 2006	286	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	284	1	285
Jan 2007	285	3	0	0	2	0	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	275	2	277
Feb 2007	277	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	268	6	274
Mar 2007	274	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	272	2	274
Apr 2007	274	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	271	4	275	
May 2007	275	1	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	269	2	271
Jun 2007	271	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	267	3	270
Jul 2007	270	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	271	3	274
Aug 2007	274	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	274	2	276
Sep 2007	276	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	273	1	274
Oct 2007	274	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	265	2	267
Nov 2007	267	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	261	5	266
Dec 2007	266	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	265	2	267
Jan 2008	267	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	264	1	265
Feb 2008	265	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	262	3	265
Mar 2008	265	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	259	4	263
Apr 2008	263	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	259	2	261
May 2008	261	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	259	2	261
Jun 2008	261	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	252	1	253	
Jul 2008	253	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	251	1	252
Aug 2008	252	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	260	0	260
Sep 2008	260	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	253	1	254	
Oct 2008	254	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	253	1	254
Nov 2008	254	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	253	1	254
Dec 2008	254	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	251	2	253
Jan 2009	253	2	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	246	2	248	
Feb 2009	248	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	246	3	249	
Mar 2009	249	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	248	2	250	
Apr 2009	250	1	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	244	1	245	
May 2009	245	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	244	1	245
Jun 2009	245	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	243	4	247	
Total		589	26	44	13	2	72	57	2	1	99	1	4	1	4	1	2	6	7	342					

ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

Table 6: Tamms CMAX Exits and Out-of-State Transfers

March 9, 1998 through June 30, 2009

DOC Number	Name	Date Released	Reason
B56011	Milburn, Matthew	05/19/98	Transferred out of state - Arizona
B80169	Carlton, Robert	10/05/98	Transferred to Department of Human Services
B17080	Leach, Charlie	12/26/98	Died - on medical furlough
N51086	Kokoraleis, Andrew	03/17/99	Died - Executed at Tamms
C81085	Rosario, Casper	04/20/99	Transferred out of state - Virginia
B67152	Fuller, Shawn	10/22/99	Discharged - Court Order
B78137	Johnson, John E.	10/10/00	Discharged - Expiration of Sentence
B00434	Almodovar, Johnny	03/13/02	Discharged - Court Order - Case Reversed/Remanded
B01816	English, Mark	04/09/03	Discharged - Court Order - Case Reversed/Remanded
A00254	Lyons, Willie	10/20/03	Died - on medical furlough
C61227	Dillard, Randy	11/25/03	Paroled
N50249	Smith, Eric	01/09/04	Paroled (court order, released from Stateville)
K55533	Manzanares, Javier	01/15/04	Transferred out of state - New Mexico
K95803	Fox, Corey L.	06/11/04	Discharged - Court Order - Case Reversed/Remanded
C02283	Haywood, Melvin	07/19/04	Paroled
N91384	Chapman, Marcus	08/25/04	Died - on medical furlough (suicide)
K59332	Blackmon, Marty	12/27/04	Transferred to Department of Human Services
K81527	Hall, Charles - (1)	08/26/05	MSR - violated at the door (returned to Tamms)
N66136	Durkee, Patrick	09/15/05	Transferred out of state - New Jersey
K81527	Hall, Charles - (2)	09/23/05	MSR - violated at the door (returned to Tamms)
K81527	Hall, Charles - (3)	10/27/05	MSR - violated at the door (went to Menard)
C01592	Cannon, Darryl	04/30/07	Paroled - (sentences overturned, released from Stateville)
R28620	Darnell Goracke	06/25/08	Transferred out of state - Arizona
B71891	Harris, Leodius	01/12/09	Transferred out of state - New Mexico
B54722	Foor, Robert	06/24/09	Died - on medical furlough

*There have been five deaths at Tamms CMAX, one attributed to suicide and no homicides.

ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
Table 7: Selected Department Operational Variables
FY90 - FY09

Fiscal Year	Assaults ²				Lockdown Days			Major Disciplinary Reports	
	Inmate/Staff		Inmate/Inmate		Number	Incident-Based	Administrative Based	Number	Gang Activity Violations ³
	Number	Serious Injury	Number	Serious Injury					
FY90	876	-	603	-	369	-	-	80,823	2,569
FY91	1,075	-	588	-	395	-	-	85,241	3,327
FY92	931	-	554	-	493	-	-	94,844	4,579
FY93	955	-	504	-	560	-	-	92,437	4,771
FY94	991	-	634	-	672	-	-	101,286	4,805
FY95	946	-	818	-	905	-	-	106,059	5,586
FY96	1,219	-	763	-	1,123	-	-	113,604	5,638
FY97	940	-	670	-	1,247	-	-	116,381	-
FY98	681	-	578	-	597	-	-	101,784	-
FY99	686	-	496	-	476	-	-	90,770	-
FY00 ¹	941	162	1,924	199	754	481	273	103,762	1,738
FY01	942	180	2,153	196	763	538	225	89,292	1,361
FY02	785	153	1,957	183	608	462	146	82,371	1,244
FY03	649	143	1,674	163	381	351	30	69,348	886
FY04	433	73	1,469	113	493	421	72	56,351	872
FY05	489	123	1,430	142	441	340	101	44,639	788
FY06	410	82	1,416	113	801	425	376	37,524	637
FY07	344	97	1,364	91	816	696	120	35,470	591
FY08	400	86	1,653	91	1,107	813	294	45,236	521
FY09	450	72	1,869	132	882	814	68	46,144	602

¹Starting July 1999 (FY00) the Indicator Report was implemented. Descriptive data definitions were provided to the facilities, making the data more standardized and requiring the facilities to become more accountable for data submission. More detailed information was required, which included separating serious injury assaults and incident-based versus administrative-based lockdown days; therefore, these specific data are not available prior to July 1999.

²From FY83 through FY99, the Warden's Report defined an inmate/staff assault as an incident of physical assault on an employee including kicking, hitting, use of weapons whether or not contact is made, and throwing objects for the purpose of causing injury or intimidation. Inmate/inmate assaults were defined as incidents of physical attacks upon another person, staff, inmate or visitor as recorded in an assault incident report. FY00 through current data the definition of assault is causing a person or an object to come into contact with another person in an offensive, provocative, injurious manner or fighting with a weapon. This may be spontaneous or a planned incident involving one or more inmates. Includes fighting, pushing, shoving, intentionally bumping or tripping, kicking, intentionally striking with an object, hand or other body part, spitting on, throwing food, liquids, or other material.

³Gang Activity Violations (Rule 205) data were not aggregated for FY97 through FY99.

ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

Table 8: Level 1 Cell and Bed Utilization*

June 30, 2009

	Single-Celled					Double-Celled				
	Cells	Beds	Population	Percent Single-Celled	Beds Available	Cells	Beds	Population	Percent Double-Celled	Beds Available
<i>Level 1 (excluding Tamms CMAX)</i>										
Menard CC	278	278	263	94.6%	15	1,420	2,834	2,785	98.3%	49
Pontiac CC	764	764	529	69.2%	235	258	516	418	81.0%	98
Pontiac CC Mental Health	94	94	59	62.8%	35	0	0	0	0.0%	0
Stateville CC	0	0	0	0.0%	0	829	1,658	1,595	96.2%	63
Dixon CC Psychiatric Unit	213	213	129	60.6%	84	0	0	0	0.0%	0
Total Level 1	1,349	1,349	980	72.6%	369	2,507	5,008	4,798	95.8%	210
	Single-Celled					Double-Celled				
	Cells	Beds	Population	Percent Single-Celled	Beds Available	Cells	Beds	Population	Percent Double-Celled	Beds Available
<i>Level 1 (including Tamms CMAX, n=245)</i>										
Menard CC	278	278	263	94.6%	15	1,420	2,834	2,785	98.3%	49
Pontiac CC	764	764	764	100.0%	0	258	516	418	81.0%	98
Pontiac CC Mental Health	94	94	59	62.8%	35	0	0	0	0.0%	0
Stateville CC	0	0	0	0.0%	0	829	1,658	1,595	96.2%	63
Dixon CC Psychiatric Unit	213	213	139	65.3%	74	0	0	0	0.0%	0
Total Level 1	1,349	1,349	1,225	90.8%	124	2,507	5,008	4,798	95.8%	210

* Reception and Classification Center, Condemned Unit, and Health Care Unit beds are excluded

Source: June 30, 2009 Cell and Bed Census and OERHP101 Housing Availability Report

ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

Table 9: Tamms Correctional Center Per Capita Cost and Staff-to-Inmate Ratio

FY98 - FY09

Fiscal Year	Average Daily Population			Average Monthly Total Staff	Inmate-to- Staff Ratio	Expenditures	Per Capita Cost
	Maximum	Minimum	Total				
FY98	32	194	226	233	0.97: 1	\$11,583,630	\$51,255
FY99	247	196	443	418	1.06: 1	\$22,165,505	\$50,035
FY00	271	196	467	426	1.10: 1	\$24,578,800	\$52,631
FY01	273	192	465	418	1.11: 1	\$25,607,800	\$55,071
FY02	265	184	449	420	1.07: 1	\$26,570,600	\$59,177
FY03	260	194	454	393	1.16: 1	\$26,783,050	\$58,994
FY04	265	193	458	371	1.23: 1	\$26,204,172	\$57,214
FY05	276	185	461	348	1.32: 1	\$26,546,931	\$57,586
FY06	271	193	464	326	1.42: 1	\$25,716,607	\$55,424
FY07	276	176	452	322	1.40: 1	\$26,490,700	\$58,608
FY08	264	167	431	304	1.42: 1	\$27,698,000	\$64,265
FY09 ¹	249	166	415	276	1.50: 1	\$28,217,600	\$67,994

¹FY09 expenditures and are estimated based on latest available data.

Note: excerpted from 2005, 2006, 2007, and 2008 Annual Reports

Historical intra-institution comparisons are affected by how the functional use of the institution has changed over time (i.e., security level is different, population may have housed juveniles or a different gender, primary role of the facility regarding program services has been altered, etc.).

Expenditures among satellite facilities cannot be extracted from parent facilities for a host of reasons as administrative, dietary, medical, staffing, services costs, etc. are shared. Also, the expenditures here only include correctional facilities; some expenditures such as parole, general office, shared services, etc. are not included. The FY08 General Revenue Fund expenditures for the Department of Corrections were \$1,208,473,900.

Per capita costs are calculated as expenditures divided by average daily population. For the same reasons listed in footnote #1, the historical intra- and inter-institution comparisons are affected. Further, per capita costs are a function of economies of scale which further limits an objective comparison between correctional sites; especially higher security level sites or sites with a small number of inmates.

ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

Table 10: Recidivism Rates for Inmates Released from Prison after Incarceration at Tamms CMAX by Type of Exit
 Prison Exits: Fiscal Years 1998 - 2008

Type of Exit	Number of Exits	New Offense Violators		Technical Violators		Total Returns to Prison	
		Number	Rate	Number	Rate	Number	Rate
<i>Category 1</i> ¹							
Parole from Tamms CMAX	3	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
MSR from Tamms CMAX	3	0	0.0%	3	100.0%	3	100.0%
Standard Discharge from Tamms CMAX ²	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Other Discharge from Tamms CMAX ²	5	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<i>Category 2</i> ¹							
Parole from Other Facility within 6 Months	1	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1	100.0%
MSR from Other Facility within 6 Months	91	8	8.8%	39	42.9%	47	51.6%
Standard Discharge from Other Facility within 6 Months ²	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Other Discharge from Other Facility within 6 Months ²	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<i>Category 3</i> ¹							
Parole from Other Facility after 6 Months	0	0	----	0	----	0	----
MSR from Other Facility after 6 Months	37	5	13.5%	13	35.1%	18	48.6%
Standard Discharge from Other Facility after 6 Months ²	0	0	----	0	----	0	----
Other Discharge from Other Facility after 6 Months ²	3	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	146	13	8.9%	56	38.4%	69	47.3%

ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

Table 11: Recidivism Rates for Inmates Released from Prison after Incarceration at Tamms CMAX by Fiscal Year
 Prison Exits: Fiscal Years 1998 - 2008

Fiscal Year of Exit	Number of Exits	New Offense Violators		Technical Violators		Total Returns to Prison	
		Number	Rate	Number	Rate	Number	Rate
1998	0	0	----	0	----	0	----
1999	6	2	33.3%	0	0.0%	2	33.3%
2000	10	2	20.0%	7	70.0%	9	90.0%
2001	9	3	33.3%	3	33.3%	6	66.7%
2002	9	2	22.2%	3	33.3%	5	55.6%
2003	10	0	0.0%	5	50.0%	5	50.0%
2004	20	1	5.0%	9	45.0%	10	50.0%
2005	19	0	0.0%	10	52.6%	10	52.6%
2006	19	2	10.5%	7	36.8%	9	47.4%
2007	17	1	5.9%	7	41.2%	8	47.1%
2008	27	0	0.0%	5	18.5%	5	18.5%
Total	146	13	8.9%	56	38.4%	69	47.3%

¹ Categories includes releases directly from Tamms CMAX, releases from another facility within 6 months of being transferred from Tamms CMAX, and releases from another facility after 6 months of being transferred from Tamms CMAX.

² Standard Discharge represents expiration of sentence; Other Discharge is defined as death and court order.

Note: Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

**Table 12: Three-Year Recidivism Rates: Tamms CMAX Inmates Versus Male Inmates Exiting with a Maximum Security Classification Designation
Prison Exits: Fiscal Years 1998 - 2004**

<i>Type of Exit</i>	Fiscal Year 1998 Exits			Fiscal Year 1999 Exits			Fiscal Year 2000 Exits			Fiscal Year 2001 Exits		
	<i>Exits</i>	<i>Returns</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>Exits</i>	<i>Returns</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>Exits</i>	<i>Returns</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>Exits</i>	<i>Returns</i>	<i>Rate</i>
Incarcerated at Tamms CMAX at any time before Release												
New Offense	0	0	-----	6	2	33.3%	10	2	20.0%	9	3	33.3%
Technical Parole Violation	0	0	-----	6	0	0.0%	10	7	70.0%	9	3	33.3%
Total	0	0	-----	6	2	33.3%	10	9	90.0%	9	6	66.7%
Other Maximum Security Classification Designation												
New Offense	529	207	39.1%	663	263	39.7%	908	309	34.0%	1,117	343	30.7%
Technical Parole Violation	529	81	15.3%	663	147	22.2%	908	274	30.2%	1,117	356	31.9%
Total	529	288	54.4%	663	410	61.8%	908	583	64.2%	1,117	699	62.6%
<i>Type of Exit</i>	Fiscal Year 2002 Exits ¹			Fiscal Year 2003 Exits			Fiscal Year 2004 Exits ¹			Total FY98 through FY04		
	<i>Exits</i>	<i>Returns</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>Exits</i>	<i>Returns</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>Exits</i>	<i>Returns</i>	<i>Rate</i>	<i>Exits</i>	<i>Returns</i>	<i>Rate</i>
Incarcerated at Tamms CMAX at any time before Release												
New Offense	9	1	11.1%	10	0	0.0%	20	1	5.0%	64	9	14.1%
Technical Parole Violation	9	3	33.2%	10	5	50.0%	20	8	40.0%	64	26	40.6%
Total	9	4	44.4%	10	5	50.0%	20	9	45.0%	64	35	54.7%
Other Maximum Security Classification Designation												
New Offense	982	307	31.3%	774	227	29.3%	686	217	31.6%	5,659	1,873	33.1%
Technical Parole Violation	982	261	26.5%	774	219	28.3%	686	212	30.9%	5,659	1,550	27.4%
Total	982	568	57.8%	774	446	57.6%	686	429	62.5%	5,659	3,423	60.5%

¹ Two Tamms CMAX cases, one in FY02 and one in FY04, were returned to prison following the three-year window.

Note: Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
Table 13: Mental Health Services by Parent Facility
June 30, 2009

Parent Facility ¹	Prison Population ¹	Mental Health Unit	Number of Mental Health Professionals	Inmates per Mental Health Professionals	Psychiatric Hours/Month	Psychiatric Caseload	Psychiatric Patients/Hour
Maximum							
Dwight CC ²	894	X	3 (+1 vac)	298	180	340	0.53
Menard CC ²	3,529		2 (+2 vacs)	1,765	64	430	0.15
Pontiac CC	1,178	X	2	589	286	188	1.52
Stateville CC ²	1,617		2	809	128	178	0.72
Stateville R&C ^{2,3}	1,760		4	440	264	-	-
Tamms CC	243	X	7	35	108	30	3.60
Medium							
Big Muddy CC	1,839		1	1,839	78	254	0.31
Centralia CC	1,541		1	1,541	34	159	0.21
Danville CC	1,817		1	1,817	28	107	0.26
Decatur CC	492		2	246	36	60	0.60
Dixon CC	2,155	X	10	216	607	903	0.67
Graham CC	1,904		3	635	64	145	0.44
Hill CC	1,831		1	1,831	48	200	0.24
Illinois River CC	1,965		1	1,965	50	105	0.48
Lawrence CC	2,013		3	671	104	396	0.26
Logan CC	1,899		1	1,899	48	154	0.31
Pinckneyville CC	2,107		2 (+1 vac)	1,054	69	272	0.25
Shawnee CC	1,848		2	924	64	266	0.24
Sheridan CC	944		3	315	40	61	0.66
Western Illinois CC	1,872		1	1,872	44	123	0.36
Minimum							
East Moline CC	1,043		1	1,043	4.8	33	0.15
Jacksonville CC	996		1	996	16	73	0.22
Lincoln CC	989		1.5	659	44	120	0.37
Robinson CC	1,208		1	1,208	6.5	80	0.08
Southwestern Illinois CC	605		1	605	24	70	0.34
Taylorville CC	1,201		2	601	22	105	0.21
Vandalia CC	1,143		1	1,143	26	76	0.34
Vienna CC	1,374		1	1,374	30	85	0.35

¹ Level 7 and 8 facilities are excluded, as Mental Health Services are administered through the parent facility.

² Mental Health Services for Dwight R&C, Menard R&C, and Graham R&C are shared with their respective Correctional Center. Mental Health Services at Stateville R&C are separate from Stateville CC.

³ The Psychiatric Caseload and Psychiatric Patients/Hour for Stateville R&C fluctuate from month to month with high variance levels; therefore, the numbers are not reported in the table.

ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
Table 14: Tamms CMAX Privileges by Behavioral Level
Current and Proposed

	Administrative Detention						Disciplinary Segregation	
	Level 1 ¹		Level 2		Level 3		Current	Proposed
	Level 1: Current	Level 1A: Current	Current	Proposed	Current	Proposed		
Showers per Week	Two	Two	Three		Five		One	
Yard per Week	Two Hours	Five Hours	Five Hours	Seven Hours	Seven Hours	Nine Hours	< 90 Days = 1 Hour > 90 Days = 5 Hours	
Four-hour, Non-contact, Pre-approved Visit(s) per Month	One	One	Two		Five			
Commissary								
Access per Thirty Days	One	One	One	Two	Two	Two	BIP ² : One	
Maximum Purchase Amount	Non-food items, \$30.00	Non-food items, \$30.00	\$30.00	\$30.00	\$30.00	\$50.00	\$30.00	
Audio-Visual Privileges	No audio-visual privileges.	No audio-visual privileges unless the inmate was already receiving this privilege in Segregation BIP ² .	No audio-visual privileges for recreational purposes unless the inmate was already receiving this privilege in the Segregation BIP ² . An inmate may request their personal television to access facility closed circuit educational/religious/mental health program services, subject to Chief Administrative Officer review.		Audio-visual privileges: One television or one AM/FM radio cassette player or one television and one walkman, as approved by the Chief Administrative Officer or designee. A request for exchange of either a TV or radio may be submitted once every six months.		BIP ² : Audio Visual	
Telephone Call(s) per Month				One 15-minute call to immediate family		Two 15-minute calls to immediate family and approved friends		One 10-minute call
Educational Programming			Eligible inmates may be afforded access to educational programming.	GED Classes and Testing	Eligible inmates may be afforded access to educational programming.	GED Classes and Testing		
Congregate Services						Allowed congregate service participation		
Library Services	Library and Law Library access	Library and Law Library access	Library and Law Library access		Library and Law Library access		Library and Law Library access	
Housing Assignment					Consideration for voluntary, non-paid, housing unit, wing-specific assignment as recommended by the Housing Unit Supervisor and approved by the Chief Administrative Officer.			

¹ Levels 1 and 1A do not have any proposed changes.

² BIP is the Behavioral Incentive Program for inmates in Disciplinary Segregation.