T		
1	ARIZONA STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE	
2	to the	
3	UNITED STÂTES COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS	
4		
5	Open Hearing	
6	on the	
7	ARIZONA STATE PRISONS	
8	March 14-15, 1974	
9	THOSE PRESENT:	
10	DR. MORRISON F. WARREN, Acting Chairman	
11		
	COMMITTEE MEMBERS:	
12	Mr. Peterson Zah Rep. Diane B. McCarthy	
13	Dr. John Glass . Ms. Grace McCullah	
14	Rep. Edward Guerrero Ms. Cathrine A. Palmquist	
15	Ms. Maria E. Leon Mr. Theodore E. Williams	
16	STAFF MEMBERS:	
17	Mr. Joseph Muskrat Ms. Esther Johnson	
18	Ms. Grace Buckley Ms. Anita Espinosa-Larsen	
19	Ms. Lou Ann DeVargas Mr. William H. Levis	
20	Mr. Donald Goff, Prison Consultant	
21		
22	THE ABOVE ENTITLED hearing was held in the Phoenix	
23	City Council Chambers, Phoenix, Arizona, on the 14th day	
24	of March, 1974, and the following proceedings were had,	
25	to wit:	
	Į.	

-		
1	Civil Rights Commission	
2	March 14, 1974	ļ
3	Volume I	
4	INDEX.	
5	SPEAKER	PAGE
6	Attorney General Gary Nelson	12
7	Mr. J. Ford Smith	28
8	Senator William C. Jacquin	30
9.	Mr. Richard DeGraw	38
10	Mr. John J. Moran	47
11	Mr. John R. Schuster	88
12	Mr. John R. McFarland	89
13	Mr. David Tierney	91
14	Mr. Flint Anderson	97
15	Ms. Rita Mae Smith	120
16	Ms. Olivia Broussard	123
17	Ms. Mary Munoz	124
18	Ms. Armentha Richardson	126
19	Mr. Richard Geisenhoff	171
20	Ms. Marjorie Ward	188
21		
22	t3 e 4:	
23	, r °,	. به ^{به} ځر
24	g t varie	• +
25		,
		(a

BOULEY. SCHLESINGER, PROFITT AND DICURTI

1 1 4	
	Exhibits - Arizona Alvisony Committee Informal Hearings - Nanchillots, 1974
	Corrections National Abussay Commission on Crininal Tustice Stondards
	and cool, Tomany 23, 1973.
2	Haterial propared by Angene Department of Connecteens for
	Anizena State Advisory Committee, Hareli 12,1974 including
	response to Goff's model beselvio, mod negalations, cellblock
	rego for ASP, ASP Timata Reference Hannal, legestative
	history of Dept of Corrections and prolinum plan of Anisona
 	Correctional Training facility
3	Ettic MacDougell Report on Assoin Dept of Connections
4	Goff's model baseline
5	Testemony of Down C. Tierney.
· Ç	U.S. Commission Civil Rights Answer Letters Bearnice D.
7	Westery of Arizona Citizens' Commector or Prisons
8	ACCP Nouxeocoor
<u> </u>	Gersenlieff repponse to umate allegations
(0	Letter from G. M. Togendine requiring to appear as withers
	Henre ef Soffeno meals
	Saffara nucest regs
13	Ft. Grant Ruscist regs
	Ft. Grant Henry
	Pt. Grant Training Conton States
	Ariz Deates Correction States for institutions other than H. Great
	Maio Regs
	Memo from R.C. Camacao reflecing to appear at hearing
	Kummerlove statement on made and visiting
1	Approve thag list
1	these sensoned
l	Vierting Rego
i k	lancual inter for appointment of course - trail
1 /27	Sunata logal assistance memo from Cardwell

4.

	}
	Expression -cont' Q
25	Post Convictione Logal Assistance Clinic Occasionnaire
26	Delse memo on Coppe nuces - July 1973
. 27	Frank memo on Copple maso- gray 25, Kiz3
28	Dugues 60 ppe oncor- Aug 23,1973
	ASP priser definitions on immedicapproment
	Dest of Corrections desceptenciny rections report
	Dischiplement hoaning appears
	Control Cest - commissiony Iloms
33	Timate store procedures
*	
	,

1 / 28

PROCEEDINGS

2

3

4.

5

6

1

THE CHAIRMAN: May I have your attention, please?

Ladies and Gentlemen, this open hearing of the

Arizona State Advisory Committee to the U.S. Civil Rights

Commission will come to order.

7

8

9

I am Dr. Morrison Warren, Acting Chairman of the Arizona Advisory Committee to the U.S. Civil Rights Commission. The other members of this Committee are, on my right, my far right, Mr. Peterson Zah, and on my left, if you'll raise your hand please, Mr. Edward Guerrero.

10 11

Other members of the Committee who are not present,

13

14

12

Dr. Rudolph J. Gerber, Dr. John Glass, Ms. Maria E. Leon,

but we expect them later on today is Ms. Rita Madrid,

15

Ms. Diane B. McCarthy, Ms. Grace McCullah, Mr. Manuelity Pena

Also appearing with me today are Mr. Joe Muskrat,

16

and Mr. Theodore E. Williams.

17

18

who is the Director of the Mountain States Regional Office,

19

Ms. Anita Espinosa-Larsen, Mr. William Levis, Ms. Lou Ann

20

DeVargas, Ms. Esther Johnson, from the Denver office. And

This hearing is being held pursuant to rules appli-

21

Mr. Don Goff, who is the prison consultant.

22 23

cable to state advisory committees and other requirements

24

promulgated by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. The Commission on Civil Rights is an independent, bipartisan

agency of the U.S. Government established by Congress in 1957, '60 and '64, to, one, investigate complaints alleging that citizens are being deprived of their right to vote by reason of their race, color, sex, religion or national origin.

Two, collect and study information concerning legal developments which constitute a denial of equal protection of the laws under the constitution.

Three, appraise federal laws and policies with respect to denials of equal protection of the laws.

Four, serve as a national clearing house for civil rights information.

And five, investigate allegations of vote fraud in federal elections.

The Commission has constituted state advisory committees to advise the Commission of all relevant information concerning their respective states on matters within the jurisdiction of the Commission; to advise the Commission on matters of mutual concern in the preparation of reports of the Commission to the President and Congress; to receive reports, suggestions and recommendations from individuals, public and private organizations and public officials upon matters and inquiries conducted by the State Committees; and to attend, as observers, any open

hearings or conferences which the Commission may hold within

7 8

the state.

This is an informal hearing and not an adversary proceeding or court of law. Individuals have been invited to share with the Committee information relating to the adult corrections system in Arizona. Each person who will participate has voluntarily agreed to meet with the Committee.

Every effort has been made to invite persons who are knowledgeable about the problems and progress in the area to be dealt with here today, and tomorrow.

In an effort to get a well-balanced picture of the prison conditions in Arizona, we have invited state officials, prison officials, inmates, former inmates and community organizations representatives.

Since this is a public hearing, the press, radio and television stations as well as individuals are welcome. However, no witness shall be televised, filmed or photographed during a hearing, nor shall testimony be broadcast: or recorded for broadcasting if a witness objects.

We are very concerned that we bring out all of the information relating to the matters under inquiry. We're also concerned, however, that no individual be the victim of slander or libelous statements. And as a precaution against this happening, each person making a statement here today or answering questions has been interviewed

prior to this meeting.

However, in the unlikely event that such a situation should develop, it will be necessary for me to call this to the attention of the person making the statement and request that he desist in his action. If the testimony the person is offering, however, is of sufficient importance, it may be necessary for the Committee to hear the information in a closed session. The person against whom the allegations are being made also will have ample opportunity to make a statement in closed session before the Committee if he so desires.

In any event, prior to the time that the Committee submits its reports to the Commission, every effort will be made to obtain a complete picture of the situation as it exists in Arizona today.

During these two days of hearings, the Committee will examine conditions existing within each of Arizona's adult correction facilities, ranging from physical surroundings to such areas as health and medical care, disciplinary procedures, inmates jobs and the extent of education and vocational training programs.

We hope to develop information here on the need for a uniform set of guidelines to establish basic rights of inmates and what those guidelines should contain.

For this purpose a consultant to the Commission has

5

developed model guidelines for minimum standards of treatment to be used as a natural instrument to elicit response and ideas.

In addition, we will examine whether differences in treatment exist because of race, ethnic group or sex. This meeting will provide the basis for a written report by this Committee containing findings and recommendations concerning Arizona's adult correctional system.

It is also part of a nationwide study undertaken by the Civil Rights Commission, and the information gathered will be part of a statutory Commission report to the President and Congress on prison conditions nationally.

We have two other members of the Committee who are arriving, the first is Ms. Grace McCullah and the second is Dr. John Glass.

A representative from the governor's office has not arrived and the next item on the agenda will be the reading of the demographic materials by Ms. Grace Buckley.

MS BUCKLEY: This will be just a brief summary of demographic statistics on Arizona and a very little bit of background on the department of corrections.

Arizona's population in 1970 was one million seven hundred seventy thousand nine hundred people according to the U.S. Census. Over the past 20 years it has increased tremendously, by 36% between 1960 and 1970 and by an

5

overall 136% since 1950. Nearly 80% of Arizona's population now lives inside urbanized areas and nearly 50% inside central cities.

Twenty years ago only 55% of Arizona's population was urban. The largest ethnic minority group in Arizona consists of persons of Spanish language or Spanish surname who comprise almost 20% of the state's populations according to the U.S. Census.

Native Americans make up between 5% and 6% of the population and Blacks, 3%.

The majority of persons of Spanish speaking back-ground, 80%, and of Blacks, 90%, live in urbanized areas, whereas the majority of Native Americans, 82%, reside in the rural areas.

Crimes rates relate to the incidence of crime and population and are based on crimes reported to the police. It should be noted that not all crimes are reported, if they were, according to F.B.I. data, the rate would be from 3% to 30% higher. The total crime index as reported in uniform crimes rates is a combination of violent and property crime.

In 1972, with a population of one million nine and hundred forty-five thousand, Arizona's total index was 72,800 crimes, 8,700 violent crimes, and 65,120 property crimes. This breaks down to a rate of 3,746 crimes per

100,000 persons.

Arizona's total crime rate is lower than that for the western region as a whole, whose rate is about 4,000 per 100,000 people. And higher than the crime rate for the total U.S., which is about 2,830 per 100,000 people.

The State of Arizona established the Department of Corrections in 1968, prior to that time Arizona State Prison and the state juvenile facilities and the adult and juvenile parole services functioned as completely separate entities.

The first director of the department of corrections, Alan Cook, held that office from 1968 to 1973. He and one deputy supervised the department staff and all institutions under the department's jurisdiction.

In 1973, Cook was succeeded by John Moran, the present director.

The new director reorganized the structure of the department, creating four deputy director positions and a special office for inmate education and staff training programs. The deputy directors head offices for administration, community services, institutions and research program planning and education.

Of Arizona's adult correctional institutions, since
1968, the Arizona State Prison has remained essentially the
same type of institution, with a men's and a women's division.

BOULEY, SCHLESINGER, PROFITT AND DICURTI OFFICIAL COURT REPORTERS In 1970, Safford Conservation Center, an adult minimum security facility in eastern Arizona, was set up, in 1971, first adult community treatment center or Halfway House was established in Phoenix. Since then, two other state-operated adult Halfway Houses have been opened, another in Phoenix and one in Tucson.

In November, 1973, the department phased out Fort Grant Industrial School for Boys as a juvenile facility and created in its place an adult minimum security facility. When fully operational, this facility can house 300 to 400 people.

The department of corrections is presently engaged in preparing a five-yearsplan with specific goals to be fulfilled and changes to be made in the state corrections system.

At this point, much of this plan is only in the idea stage, however, there are several concrete areas where the department has plans.

In 1970 the Arizona Legislature passed a law authorizing the department to establish a new minimum security facility. The department began preliminary planning for a 500-man facility to be located in the Phoenix area. During the planning period it was determined that two smaller facilities should be constructed instead, one in Phoenix and one in Tucson.

In 1973, the legislature appropriated 5.1 million dollars for the construction of the first of the two facilities to house 240 to 300 men and to be located in the Phoenix area near South Mountain. The new South Mountain facility will be for the younger adult offender and will emphasize vocational training and intensive social and psychological counsel and treatment.

As of November, 1973, it was anticipated that construction of the facility would be completed in the late fall of 1975. Hopefully, the creation of these new facilities will alleviate the extreme overcrowding of the Florence facility which, though built to house about 800 inmates now houses more than 1,300.

Another recent undertaking has been the effort to have an education division established within the department of corrections. Senate Bill 1033 introduced in November, 1973, would create such an educational district and would require mandatory full time school attendance by those persons committed to the department who have not finished common school, that is grades one through eight, it would also provide for high school classes and vocational training and would be eligible for the state funds for programs such as special education and bilingual education.

Undoubtedly, it's establishment would allow the corrections institution to greatly improve and expand their

educational programs.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gary Nelson is the Attorney

General of the State of Arizona, and a member of the

National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards
and Goals, and this commission recently published a book
on corrections which listed 18 standards, which should
be afforded to inmates.

Will you come forward, Mr. Attorney General?

GARY NELSON

THE CHAIRMAN: For the record, will you please state your name, occupation, please?

A. (By Mr. Nelson.) Yes, Dr. Warren, thank you.

My name's Gary Nelson, I'm the Attorney General of Arizona. At least until January of 1975. Depending on other situations and not counting for potential intervening problems.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Nelson, you are a member of the National Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. And could you please outline the proposals concerning inmate rights made by the commission?

A. Yes, I'd be happy to. Perhaps I can catch you up on

time, too.

Ford Smith is the head of my Civil Rights Division and apparently he has had some work and I can welcome you on behalf of the governor, if you'd like.

THE CHAIRMAN: We appreciate that.

A. That would make us right on the money then.

I'm sure Ford will be here later.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee: I have here a book that's five inches thick that the corrections task force of the National Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals drafted, one of the chapters provides for rights of the individuals who are incarcerated as well as rights of the individuals who may not be incarcerated, but under control and I would think perhaps it would be a little redundant to read them all.

Let me briefly outline the matters that are covered. And I might say I have read, studied with some care, the standards or suggested standards that have been already prepared for the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, as well as the extent to which the Department of Corrections of the State of Arizona is currently implementing standards that are either comparable or in line to some degree, with these standards.

Now, the Rights of the Offenders is the title, it's chapter 2 and I would recommend that all of you, at some point

in your deliberations, and I think the printing and paper shortage not withstanding that these booklets are becoming increasingly available and hopefully the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, with all its authority, would be able to get you each a copy. Because there is an awful lot of material in here.

Now, the standards are substantially 18 in number.

And they address the following subject matter: Access to courts, access to legal services, access to legal materials, protection against personal abuse, healthful surroundings, medical care, searches, nondiscriminatory treatment, rehabilitation, retention and restoration of rights, rules of conduct, disciplinary procedures, procedures for nondisciplinary changes of status, grievance procedures, free expression and association, exercise of religious beliefs and practices, access to the public, and I think in there my independent recollection serves me right, it also access to the media as an important part of the public.

And remedies for violation of an offender's rights.

Now, that's in the chapter on the Rights of Offenders.

Now, it's my belief that sprinkled throughout the remaining chapters there are additional standards that bear upon what we would call civil rights or the rights of the offender, there is a standard on classification of offenders, which is a concern of both the department of

corrections and the inmates themselves, that their classifications be handled in a proper way.

There are additional standards on the management of adult institutions, major institutions, parole, probation services, so I think in order to fully glean from the report of the National Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, all of the impacts on individual rights, you would have to go into this in some detail.

But I think the fundamental principles that are contained in this report are the same as those that are contained in the draft report for the U.S. Civil Rights

Commission as well as those that are contained in the policy memorandums and programs and ideas of the department of corrections.

And I think it's important, and rather than discuss standard by standard which would take a lot more than 20 minutes that's allotted, let me give you some overviews of what I think is critical.

I think it's very important that we, and I say that collectively, as members of the public, are finally coming to the basic conclusion that seems to be fundamental in announcing all of these standards, and that is that people that we place in institutions, because they have violated laws, nevertheless remain people.

Now, that seems like a very fundamental kind of

judgment, but that isn't the way it's been, folks.

You know, anyone who tells you to the contrary is not, is not being fully candid. And of course, the easy thing to do would be blame it on the nasty, evil, lockup people that we hire to do this job for us, but think, historically speaking, if you look at them and talk to them, it was not their wish to handle these problems in the way they handled it, they mirrored, for many years, most of the time reluctantly, so, what you and I, that is to say the citizens of these fine communities, really wanted and that is to say get them out of here, forget them, they're nasty, evil people.

And take care of them but don't bother us about it.

Oh, and by the way, we won't spend any money. Except,

of course the basic kinds of bricks and mortars to try and

keep them in as opposed to letting them out.

And I think with this kind of a handicap, corrections authorities did a pretty good job. It's only been recently that the community has plugged into this and it still isn't totally plugged in, I think if you wouldn't get some testimony any other way, at least you'll get some now.

You heard the outline of the department of corrections' program, the location of a minimum security institution near South Mountain. Well, I happen to live out there, and the community out there is still a little bit

two-faced in a sense, they're coming around to wanting to do better in the area of reform, rehabilitation and assistance, except, man, we really would rather you locate the place somewhere else, was the word of the community.

Because when it comes to things like property values and our own personal safety, or what they believe to be their own personal safety, we're not quite as interested in supporting you as we are by words of mouth and deeds.

And if the media is anywhere accurate, and they're. of course, very accurate in this community, I believe they're having a little problem with their next suggested location of the minimum security prison.

So, the community is still not fully supportive of this really vital area of the criminal justice system.

Now, part of that's our fault, and by our, now, I'm talking about public officials, in informing, informing these people. But I think what the Arizona Legislature has done and what the Department of Corrections of the State of Arizona has done, what this Commission is doing, what the National Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals has done, is starting to reflect the necessary awareness, that in fact the first premise really is true, that the people who become offenders, whether they're incarcerated or not, that's the ones we're primarily talking about, are human beings, and must be treated that way to the maximum

extent possible consistent with where they are and why they are there.

And while this may, to us, in 1974, seem to be a very clear, simple, understandable thing, it hasn't always been that way. But I think that's the basis on which all of these other standards are based, and it's logical.

How can we expect them to come back into society as people, as civilized, rational human beings, if they're not treated that way? Well, we can't, and they don't and they haven't.

Now, some of them won't anyway. And of course, we hope to minimize the numbers of those that come out at all which I think is a perfectly reasonable course for civilization to take, still considering them human beings but giving them some kind of different treatment for protection of society but as we approach this problem of individual and civil rights, I think the biggest problem is not the discrimination against men or women or Blacks or Mexican-Americans or Chinese or Japanese, that has gone on, I think the biggest discrimination that has to be overcome and it's starting to be overcome, is just the discrimination against the offender. Period.

Now, I'm sure you're going to have incidences of potential and actual discrimination based on these other normal kinds of discrimination, I use the word normal

1

5

6

7

4

8

9

10

12

13

11

14

15 16

17

18 19

2021

2223

2425

advisedly, that human beings are familiar with based upon their own prejudices and biases and hate, and those we're working on much better, I think, than at any time before in our history.

But I don't think we ought to ever get away from the focus that the discrimination, if that's the right word and perhaps it's not, against the offender himself, just because he's an offender is what we have got to address ourselves and then we've got to break it down further into the areas of where we have a right to treat him differently because he behaved differently and where we have a right or an absolute obligation not to.

Primarily aimed, I suppose, if we're talking just about government and not about human reasons, primarily aimed at him in the context that when he gets out, he will behave like a civilized, rational human being.

Of course, the other reason and perhaps the reason that if that's the motivation is more likely to result in the end product, would be that we ought to treat him like a human being because he is one and he's a fellow man of ours and we ought to approach it that way from the standpoint of love and understanding and assistance but that I believe is the main thing that we're concerned about.

And I am excited, personally, about the progress that has been made across the country. Unfortunately it's taken

7 8

some tragic, ungodly, unbelievable situations in some of our states to bring it to the attention of the public.

That's the weakness of a democracy, I guess you need a crisis situation before the public really cares. Well, the public cares, and once the public cares probably 70% of your battle is over. Because at least then the communication comes from the bottom up, and I've been involved in both kinds of communications, and I guarantee you, especially in this kind of a situation in our society that's more aware, top-down communication is received with a very skeptical, jaundiced eye these days.

But communication that comes from the bottom up is much more likely to be productive. I'm sure we have a long ways to go in Arizona, and you can read our standard, that is the standards of the National Commission and the standards that are potentially proposed for the commission and you can see what our department of corrections is already doing and you find some discrepancies, there's no question about it, but I think if you read the documents carefully and you listen to the witnesses that appear before you very carefully, you will find that the motivational impact of the State of Arizona is to do it as well as can be done.

Aiming towards these standards, disagreeing in principle with some, primarily being unable to put some of them into effect at this point in time, simply because of

facilities, money and people. And time for training.

But I think clearly we're on the right road. And I believe very strongly that if in fact in the next ten years, which is the program that the National Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals talked about in terms of time frames, trying to push people to do something within some foreseeable future time, rather than, you know, down the road 150 years.

If these standards as well as the proposed standards of your Commission, and if the direction that the department of corrections is already a way ahead of many other states in, continues, I think you're going to see a remarkable success in this area, totally unrelated to any of the programs.

Now, how statisticians, and I'm inherently leery of them, will place the blame or the credit for the success, I don't know, but a lot of the success will simply be because we have treated these people not as they have treated us, but as we would like them to treat us:

And I think that will result in as much progress or certainly a great deal of progress as the other programs, so I think what we're doing here and what you're doing, what I've been privileged to participate in doing, what John Moran and his staff have been working hard at, are aimed in the correct direction, and I'd be happy to answer

any questions, if I could, Dr. Warren.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. I think, Mr. Nelson, you probably have alluded to answers to most of the questions that we had.

However, and they may appear somewhat redundant in view of what you have said, but there are a couple of specific ones that I would wish that you would speak to.

And the first one is, in effect, in your view, how do the proposals of the commission compare with the rights of inmates operationally in Arizona, in your view?

A. Well, I think they compare very favorably. I think there are some differences, whether they are great or small, I don't know, because I am not that familiar with the area but I know there are some differences concerning, oh, the handling of mail, if my recollection, and visitation, although those are being changed, there are some differences concerning radio-television, but there again minimal.

I did not notice what I believe to be, and maybe it was because I was looking at them with the point of hoping and praying that they were mostly in conformance, I didn't notice any great differences, and what is more important to me I noticed. And of course, I had to read into the documentation what I know from knowing the people that are involved, that there is a tremendous effort to bring into line, if not necessarily with the proposed standards for the commission, but the concepts generally enunciated by the

5

National Commission and this proposal and the American Correctional Institution and other people who studied the problem, the governors subcommittee of the governors conference, to bring our program into substantial compliance to the best of the ability.

Now, I'm sure they can give you a betterridea as to where they think numbers and things like, toh; I think there's some limitation on a visitor list or mail list, my recollection may be wrong, but I think the differences are minor, quite frankly, and I think that in the next nine months, 18 months, the differences will be almost infinitesimal.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have one other question, and you spoke to the issue of public awareness. And are there mechanisms being developed so that the public does become knowledgeable and understanding of the-

A. Yes, sir, there are and there need to be more, we need to get more cooperation at every level of government. I know that the director, Mr. Moran, either has now or will have in the future at least one and perhaps more, what I would call PSR men, I don't know if he might figure that's a little too direct for the legislature's understanding and they may be public information officers, I think would be the more, but information—type people who can educate the public. And I think we have to do that,

not just through the department of corrections but I think again at the justice planning agency which both Mr. Moran and I serve on, I think we should encourage grants to cities and counties and to maybe nonprofit corporations to educate people as to what happens to the offender and how, in many respects, you know they, we tend to categorize the offender as a, "they " a you know, when we're thinking of groups we don't like or can't understand or -- we always think of they or them and I think most people think of the offender in this category as opposed to their neighbors' son or their brother-in-law's uncle or some, you know, an honest-to-God name-face-type that's pretty normal and could have happened to them.

I think we need this kind of education, plus I think we need this concept that most of the people who go in come out again and live next door and walk up and down the street and they don't wear brands and striped clothes and you're going to be living with them and working with them, this type of education.

What they're trying to do in the way of employment, work release, well, for example, the one we shall -- I don't know that I would categorize that we're failing, but the simple, at least what ought to be the simple placement of a medium security institution near a major city to further implement the concept of community corrections

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

facilities and community crime prevention, is having a tough way to go with the community.

But there are plans in the department and outside the department in support of agencies to improve this.

THE CHAIRMAN: One other related question, Mr. Nelson.

In your overview, and perhaps it was an oversight, you did not indicate rehabilitation or protection against personal abuse. Was there any reason or is that just an over --

A. No, I believe I mentioned both of them, standard 2.9, I think I read it is rehabilitation and standard 2.4 is protection against personal abuse. Both of those are supercritical in my mind for the obvious reasons.

First of all, we've got to give some hope at the end of the tunnel when they get out and rehabiliation, work training, social, whatever it is, whatever you want to call it, whatever -- we use these big words, but enable these people to exist in the normal civilized society.

I think the rehabilitation concept and the protection against personal abuse go hand in hand. If we can not protect the inmates against each other and themselves or from the staff or make -- and I question at this point in time whether it's protection against themselves they need probably more than the staff, but this involves working, if we can't do that, if we can't guarantee that atmosphere within

a controlled, carefully regulated society, then they're going to be pretty skeptical that society can protect them outside either, so I think these two are very important and if I did underemphasize them it was not intentional oversight.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have a copy of the report and it will be entered as a part of the record.

Are there any other questions by any other -DR. GLASS: Mr. Chairman, I'd like towask Mr. Nelson
a question.

In reference to many of these job placements in the state, what can be done to make available jobs to these exconvicts in state jobs, in city jobs, this type of thing? This is one area that I know has been neglected a great deal, I'd like to hear your comments on this.

A. Mr. Chairman, Dr. Glass, I think what we need to do, here again, is working through the personnel commission, through our civil rights division, and ultimately through the legislature. And I would think maybe this year is not a good year, probably for all kinds of reasons, not the least of which is a political year and the public still has a little lack of understanding in this area. But there needs to be legislative enactments concerning the impact of a felony conviction.

And there needs to be a review of rules and regulation\$

"

1

of hiring agencies and state government, county government, city government, where this is a -- whether this is an absolute qualifying factor.

Now, I'm not one to do like they do in Russia, eliminate history, I think the first time you talk about being able to say no when the answer in, you know, in God's truth is yes, you're in trouble. But I think from the standpoint of availability of information and the absolute disqualification, it's just asinine and we've crossed that bridge and it's just not worked.

It hasn't been effective either, as a protection of the public, it certainly just wiped out many of the hopes and dreams of somebody who's made a mistake and who's come out and wants a job but he can't be a doctor, lawyer, janitor, he can't work for the state, the county, the city, the federal government, he can't work for anybody except the local burglary ring.

Well, that's what he's going to do. But I think we need higher education and impact on the legislature from the community and then an education at all stratas, we need education in the high schools, we need education in the colleges, we need an educational program in business organizations, because it's the businessman and he's going to be afraïd, there's no way you can stamp out fear.

Except by, you know, experience and the businessman who hires

the excon., some of them are going to be afraid and nervous, and watch a little more carefully, be a little more suspicious, well that's humanness, no way to wipe out that, but we certainly can wipe out the statutory and regulation barriers and there's still plenty that exist.

There is a subcommittee, I believe, both of the state bar association, I know that's true for sure, there may well be a committee also, a subcommittee of the state legislature that's got this project in mind.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there are no other questions, we wish to thank you very much, Mr. Nelson.

A. Thank you, my pleasure.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. J. Ford Smith, the Director of the Civil Rights Commission, is in the audience and will bring greetings from Governor Jack Williams.

J. FORD SMITH

A. (By Mr. Smith.) Dr. Warren, Members of the Arizona Committee for the -- Arizona Advisory Committee on the United States Commission on Civil Rights and the regional staff members, I bring you greetings from the Honorable Jack Williams, Governor of the State of Arizona.

Due to prior commitments, the governor was unable

to attend, but he did ask me to express the full cooperation of his office and staff during your two-day hearings.

The governor is also concerned about all citizens, be they incarcerated or not, and he further instructed me to request of you, the Arizona Advisory Committee, at your convenience, a total report on this hearing, and to you, Dr. Warren, and members of the staff, I'd like to apologize for being late, I'm very sorry.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, thank you very much.

Is Senator William Jacquin in the audience? And Mr. William DeGraw?

Will you both, for the record, state your name, occupation and address, please?

SENATOR JACQUIN: William C. Jacquin, President of the Arizona State Senate, Nine-month address, State Capitol, Phoenix, Arizona. Residential address, 5202 East Alhambra Place, Tucson, Arizona.

MR. DEGRAW: Richard DeGraw, Legislative Research Analyst, for the President's Office, Arizona State Legislature, 1700 West Washington.

THE CHAIRMAN: We understand, Mr. Jacquin, that you will give brief statements regarding the legislature and its overhaul of the state prison system?

SENATOR WILLIAM C. JACQUIN

A. (By Senator Jacquin.) Well, Dr., and Members of the Commission, I think we ought to put in perspective, perhaps, a little bit of ten-year history in the State of Arizona in the field of corrections.

Few people look at the field of corrections as something with great public furor and encouragement and interest, certainly we saw in the last, late '60's, early '70's, in the cry of the law and order and the campaigns and the movement of the public, some concern which brought about in public opinion some dicotomies that certainly need to be answered.

I think in terms of the State of Arizona, a young state, the state has had a great opportunity to do several things, we've made several strides and I'd like to touch on a few of those points because I think they're pertinent.

Number one, starting back in the mid '60's, shooting towards '67, '68, with a correctional system that was extraordinarily scattered, handled each facet of person by a different agency, a different system.

We moved to establish, in this state for the first time, a consolidated department, department that could handle the correctional problem as a problem in itself, handle people as people, we then moved on, because corrections

problems are not exclusive unto that title, to consolidate and move towards the development of combined and composite resources towards human nature and human problems in the development of the department of economic security which has been implemented only one year as of March, '73.

Combining that with recent enactment of health services.

I would suggest to you that the purpose of this is to combine the total resources towards the attack of human problems, social problems, social crimes, more serious offenses, to the effort of attacking a combined resource center from the state point of view and giving that allied support to a local point of view.

To go after the causal effects, the problems, and to work with the environmental effects, problems of law enforcement, people, correction, why people get in trouble, why offenses are committed, we have attacked this in other fashions.

Not only have we tried to combine those resources, but through LEAA, our own justice planning agency, we've tried to make the general movement towards looking at the grant programs through that resource, both nationally and stateside, to develop pilot projects at the local level to again attack human resources.

To move towards the combination of looking towards

people, their problems, most important, their environment.

I think we have to look at one great human cry that seems to crop up in the public sector over the years and that's the cry of protection of the public.

I have to suggest to you the question has to be answered publicly, with some sophistication and knowledge and that is what is protection of the public?

The protection of the public is simply that you give a human being the opportunity to be an honest member of society. Protection of the public is not a recycling of human nature through institutions. It's an attacking of his problems, his environment and his whole entourage that he finds himself in whether it's his family, his business, his social problems or whatnot.

And I think from a legislative point of view, that this has been the general approach and the general attack at 1700 West Washington.

I would like to echo, however, the attorney general's comments in terms of public support and public appeal.

It's only been probably in the last few years that we have seen citizen support come forth in this state, the educational process is not easy. You must go out and encourage it, you must try to excite people about the problems of dealing with social problems, whether they're welfare, whether they're correctional, whether they're health. Anyone who sits back

we have tried to do that, we have tried to make some awareness, we do have some citizens committees functioning in this respect and working in cooperation to move in directions that would be helpful to in fact gain maximum protection of the public and most important, maximum add not advantage to the rehabilitative nature of those who have gotten into trouble through an offense or through social error or whatever, yourmax call it.

and foolishly suggests that they're unrelated is sitting

somewhat in a vacuum in my personal opinion. So, I think

To that extent, that effort will continue and

I see some rising tide, further hope for further enactments,

further movement.

The attorney general alluded to another problem and that is statutory problems. You may go around and revises and redo bricks and mortars and personnel, but you run head on, eventually, as you do in all 50 states, into problems called statutory law.

What does the statutory law allow you to do? How may projects that maybe have some innovativeness, some method of getting a handle on individuals to help problems to correct, to protect the public, to put them on the street as a member of society.

How doesestatutory law react on these kinds of people and in light of that, two years ago we were fortunate in

securing an LEAA grant to go into the State of Arizona's criminal code and come up, a project that's geared towards the end of this year and mid next year, with a criminal code revision, having just finished our procedural rules by the court, we are following suit with our criminal code review, which is Title XIII in this state, to take a hard look at that whole area.

That whole long code which has been composited over several years, compounded on, has been enacted by the rise of public opinion, as public opinion has presented itself, whether it was in 1950, whatever was important that year, versus 1955 or '60, but to try to look at it as a composite of a total body of law that attacks a total problem and allows the state and the people and those people within the correctional and the rehabilitative and the manpower training programs to attack the problem of service to the public and minimize the offenses and maximize protection of the public.

I think in this sense, that the attitude of the legislative body, that the attitude of our new agencies and that personnel, is moving very strongly in that direction. We have enacted laws in terms of development of meaningful job-type programs within the prison system, and the correctional system, so we're not, even though we may still be doing some traditional things like stamping license plates,

 which, you know, that's a marvelous thing, but you can't go out and find a job to do that later, probably.

But we're trying to find meaningful occupation and vocational training.

We have a key billiin the legislature today which we've just passed last week, which establishes the department of corrections as an entity, as a district of education putting the full force and effect of the educational system within the correctional system.

A key piece of legislation that will pass this session.

To again give the same full advantage in helping trying to move offenders towards society.

It seems to me that our movement in urban, multiphasic-type institutions, one we have appropriated last
year and are basically committed to a second institution,
to do what? To develop within the urban allied resources
correctional facilities that can be meaningful in terms of
working with the offender, with the support services of
urban areas, combined with the ability of the system to
work with the environment.

For the recycling process is of no advantage if we're just recycling and throwing an individual back to the environment that only created the problem to start with.

So it seems to us that we're moving down that direction, we

do have some legislative support in that direction, nothing happens overnight, unfortunately, as many times many of us would like to see done.

But I think we've made significant progress in that respect and I am sure that that will continue with the support we have now built up in the state.

I am hopeful that that support will continue legislatively, I am hopeful and I feel that the attitude publicly in the State of Arizona has become more aware and more interested in providing these types of services, and doing these types of things, recognizing full well as we did in the last '50's, under other federal commissions and reports, that the old recycling process doesn't work.

We have brought some good pilot programs into this state, most of them are new but they're working and they're giving us a track record to further develop and expand those

1 areas.

2

.3

.4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

To that extent, Mr. Chairman, let me conclude my remarks, because perhaps what's most important is what you might like to ask me.

~ . , ,

THE CHAIRMAN: Fine.

Do you have a statement, Mr. DeGraw?

MR. DEGRAW: No, I have no statement.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions by Committee members of Senator Jacquin?

DR. GLASS: I'd like to ask Senator Jacquin a question, please?

- Q (By Dr. Glass.) On this, I understand, Senator Jacquin, you're chairman of that interim committee --
 - A. (By Senator Jacquin.) Which one?
 - Q. Well, this is the -- corrections, is that right?
- A. Well, no. I'm not sure which one you're dealing with. We had a continuing committee in the senate on corrections, the actual chairman has been Senator Corbett, our chairman of the judiciary, who unfortunately is in Washington and New York for the next three days. He could not be here but yes, Doctor, I'm familiar with that committee and some of its actions, if you want to proceed with the questions?
- Q On this legislation to create an educational district, would you briefly give us, summarize just what that bill's

2425

1 all about?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A. Let me let my staff research answer the question, he can probably recite the bill verbatim backwards to you.

RICHARD DEGRAW

(By Mr. DeGraw.) Thank you, Dr. Glass, Mr. Chairman. A. Senate Bill 1039 which passed the senate last week and is now in the house, would create for the department of corrections, an educational district run by a board of education, this board would be -- would consist of the department, director of the department of corrections, the director of the department of economic security the superintendent of public instruction, and two public members knowledgeable in the field appointed by the governor for two-year periods.

This board would be responsible for clearing with the state board of education any type of education provided to any institutionalized person or person under the control of the department of corrections, on parole, in community halfway houses, etcetera. Tanata

Senate Bill 1039 would mandate education for everyone under 16 or below the eighth grade level. This is what present state law says now. It would allow optional -- it

.22

would allow options for the department of corrections and the board to educate any other persons, no matter what their age, up to the senior high school level, so that any other person would have available to him GED, vocational training, or a normal high school program.

The state would fund this school district in the same way that they fund normal public school districts, so that a school district on the outside receiving, say \$1,000.00 per child, under a certain formula, the department of corrections would actually receive about \$1,200.00 a child because they would be running a year-round school district.

And presently we have only nine-month school districts or at least only nine-month attendance by a child on the outside.

The department of corrections would be able to apply for special education funds, bilingual funds, vocational training funds, other federal funds that they can not get now without the creation of a school district.

The department of corrections would be able to use community facilities where available, would be able to transport students between schools and would be able to set up special individualized classes and training for persons irrespective of age. This is a very large step forward in our state.

If, in the department and the board's opinion, they did not have enough money to run the district under the normal funding process, the money that a normal school district would get they still have the option to go to the legislature with supplementary budget to get additional funds for special projects.

In essence, I believe that is what Senate Bill 1039 does.

DR. GLASS: Sounds quite a step forward to me.

Senator Jacquin, I'd like to ask you one other question here, if I may, about, we've established two Halfway Houses here in Phoenix. I happen to have visited at these places. I've been very much impressed with them and they have gotten, they have — the results throughout the country on these, results of these Halfway Houses, rehabiliation has been tremendous.

I was wondering, is it because we don't have more money in the budget to allow to set up more of these Halfway Houses in the community or satellite Halfway Houses or just what is the --

A. (By Senator Jacquin.) Well, Doctor, there's -- you know, there's no question that there is legislative restraint when it comes to budgets. Certainly this year alone, you know we've just gone through a special session moving 171 million dollars from local level to state level. We're

 facing what we do not know what the impact will be on an energy crisis, for instance, in terms of budgetary impacts and revenue impacts.

So, certainly there are monétary restraints which you have to live with.

From the standpoint of the Halfway House program, I think legislatively and I think appropriations-wise, I think the attitude is positive in terms of trying to supply the funds. I think again the legislature feels strongly the best dollars we spend are the community-type dollars which Halfway Houses fall into.

So, I think there's a positive attitude but I would suggest to you, don't overlook the problem of public education. I think the problem that is currently developed in trying to place the multiphasic urban institution is a beautiful example of a typical community educational program. Halfway Houses are not different.

I remember the throes we went through in establishing the initial Halfway Houses. Because everybody is for it until it plops on the corner of their block. I think we have to recognize that. I think we have to educate people about what a Halfway House does, who's going to be there, how it's supervised, what the people are going to do, what the responsibilities are. I think you run into some more problems there sometimes, than you do in terms of the sheer monetary

considerations. I'm sure the Director of the department can speak to that to a greater extent.

But from the standpoint of, I think the legislature and the appropriations process, I think we're reasonably favorable and have been supportive of the Halfway House and the other types of community-based programs and the establishment thereof.

I think once we resolve the multiphasic institution in terms of the current problem in getting the land location or site location, you will see a move very rapidly within the next year or whatever, to move forward on the second institution, again the main purpose is to bring those offenders within the capability of the service delivery systems of a community and the state resources, there's another allied obvious reason for it and that is to lower the population of what is now currently the prison at Florence to a manageable, workable, human institution.

You can not put too many people in a hotel without having some discomfort when the hotel is overcrowded and all of you have done that because you've gone to a hotel and find out it's packed in the rooms and try to go, do this.

Well, any institution is no different when it's crowded and so certainly we're trying to move in that direction and lessen the problem so we can further develop the Florence institution to provide and do a better job with a

1 reasonable, workable population. 2 Q. 3 4 5 6 A. (By Mr. DeGraw.) 7 8 Q. 9 10 11

(By Dr. Glass.) Thank you.

I'd like to ask Mr. DeGraw a question.

Or rather to have him, if he will, review this House Bill 1255, or Senate Bill, I quess, Senate Bill.

- I'm sorry, Dr. Glass, you'll have to give me a short title at least on that.
 - Repayment of victim's bill --
- Oh, the victims of violent crimes compensation fund, is that what you're referring to?
 - Q. Yes.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The victims of violent crimes compensation fund is a bill sponsored by Senator Corbett and several others, with the initial idea that there is one group of people that are basically forgotten in the entire criminal justice area and that is the person that is injured.

The person who was there, had nothing to do with the crime or was injured by a direct action during the crime. These people are generally forgotten, have no one that they can sue and have no other recourse except through civil courts to cattempt to sue someone who generally would not have money in the first place.

Now, with the victims of violent crimes bill we're looking at the states such as New Jersey which created a victims of violent crimes compensation board, we would hope

5.

24 that the state could put together some information so that if someone were physically injured and were forced to be out of work for, I believe it's over two weeks, or were injured or lost personal property that could not be replaced over \$100.00, the state would pay that victim up to \$10,000.00 per incident, so that if someone were on the streets and a man robbing a bank came running out of the bank, knocked him over and he hit his head on a telephone pole as he fell and was seriously injured, did not have any insurance to cover it, and was put in the hospital for five or six weeks, or longer.

The state would attempt to help this person. This would be something in addition to any insurance the person has because it's specifically spelled out in there, that other insurance, medical insurance, injury insurance, etcetera, would come before the state compensation fund, but the person could apply to the state, you would not have to prove that someone committed the crime, just that there was a crime committed.

Therefore you don't have to prove or find the man that robbed the bank, you just have to know the bank was robbed and that this man was knocked over in the commission of that crime.

Now, it would not pay anyone actually involved in the commission of the crime or the family of anyone involved

in the commission of a crime. In fact, anyone within the immediate family of anyone involved in the commission of a crime.

DR. GLASS: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other questions?

I have, perhaps one, it has to do with the 1972 report of Mr. Ellis McDougall, to the Commission, the Department of Offender Rehabilitation in Georgia, he made approximately 30 recommendations as to what to do to improve Arizona State Prison, could you speak very briefly about the credibility of those recommendations and if they were, what has been done to implement them?

A. (By Senator Jacquin.) Well, Doctor, again basically I'm going to defer to Mr. Moran or director at the time when he comes on, because I think he speaks specifically in terms of the Ellis McDougall report at the time, as all of you know, probably Ellis McDougall has had quite a reputation throughout the country in Connecticut, Carolina and Georgia and where he was when we asked him to come and don a quick survey and look at it.

That report was initiated legislatively, and we had him go through, come up with those recommendations, those, at the same time, really and span of time was about the time we moved with the hiring of our current director and those recommendations, some were implemented at that time, some have

been implemented since, the status I think if you want to 1 go through a detailed report, would be much easier for 2 Mr. Moran rather than I go through a report --3 4 THE CHAIRMAN: Fine. If there are no other questions by the Committee, 5 we certainly want to thank you, Senator, and Mr. DeGraw 6 for your very fine testimony. 7 SENATOR JACQUIN: Thank you. 8 THE CHAIRMAN: Is Mr. Thompson, Representative 9 10 Thompson in the audience? If not, Mr. John J. Moran, who's the Director of the 11 Arizona State Department of Institutions, would you come 12 forward, please? 13 14 And Mr. John McFarland and Mr. John Schuster, if you wish you may also come forward. 15 MR. MORAN: Mr. Chairman --16 17 THE CHAIRMAN: We'll need your name, sir, your address and occupation, actually from each of you, for the 18 19 record, please, 20 MR. MORAN: My name is John J. Moran, Director, 21 Arizona State Department of Corrections, with offices 22 located at 1601 West Jefferson, Phoenix, Arizona. Mr. McFarland, sir, your name? 23 THE CHAIRMAN:

MR. McFARLAND: My name is John R. McFarland, I'm

Deputy Director for Community Services, Department of

24

25

Corrections.

MR. SCHUSTER: I'm John R. Schuster, Deputy Director for Institutions, the same address.

THE CHAIRMAN: Fine.

It's our understanding, Mr. Moran, that you will give a statement describing programs of the department of corrections since you've become director? And with the assistance of Mr. Schuster and Mr. McFarland?

JOHN J. MORAN

A. (By Mr. Moran.) Yes, Mr. Chairman, our overall plan is for me to do precisely what you've just indicated and then certainly with whatever time the Commission has available and with the assistance of Mr. Schuster and Mr. McFarland, to respond to any questions, some of which have already come up with respect to the McDougall report.

I'd like to make just a few rather general, and it's very bad to speak in generalities at a hearing like this since the, it's topeveryone's advantage to speak very specifically but I would like to put in a sense the attitude and the position of the department of corrections in proper perspective.

We have, without question, had some natural human

apprehensions about this activity, we're very busily engaged every day in many, many other things. We're being pulled in many, many different directions, and I think probably that apprehension resulted primarily from what we considered to be a very obvious increased work load as a result of it.

But I would like to say right in the very beginning that we've entered into this thing in a spirit of cooperative ness, with a very positive attitude, we have literally made available to your staff every scrap of information that we could reasonably put together, given the availability of staff and time, and the deadlines for the hearings and so on.

As evidence of that, and I say this mindful of recent problems in the White House, we hope that you've seen all the material that we've given to your staff people.

I can tell you without any reservation that these documents are accurate as we know the facts to be, we did not, under any circumstances, deliberately withhold anything.

In addition to that, we have provided this, which I assume all the Commission members received yesterday, it was only off the press so to speak, yesterday, and this represents our full and factual and honest position with respect to the minimum standards that are now serving as a

2·

baseline for the purposes of the study and at this time, I would like to officially, if this is the proper way to do it, request that this document be entered as part of the record.

Also, by way of preliminary remarks, I'd like to say that we come before this Commission in a very positive and frankly in the strongest possible fashion. Hopefully that will not be interpreted as obstructionistic activity or belligerism, we feel that we're in pretty good shape, frankly, with respect to the basic purposes of this study and with regard to the need to understand and to respect and — the basic civil human and legal rights of people.

Generally, with some few exceptions, we certainly totally support the need for minimum standards with respect to the care and treatment of offenders and inmates.

It might be assumed that as a result of the recent activity in the history and developments in Arizona that the so-called Copple (Phonetic) decision, which is of paramount importance, with respect to the area of concern here today, was jammed down the throat of the department of corrections.

While it is true that the activities with respect to that class action suit were underway before this present administration was put together and got into operation, I

4.

9.

--

think I can say without question that even had the suit not been active that we would have proceeded on our own to have developed the basic philosophy and operational procedures and the safeguard and requirements that are inherent in the Copple decision, so we come here today with some few exceptions totally in support of the need for minimum standard for the care of offenders and inmates.

I would respectfully also like to attempt to put the hearings in proper perspective and again respectfully remind the Committee we're talking about a hearing now in Arizona. We're talking about an administration that has been in operation only one year.

I'm indebted to Ms. McCarthy for the earlier history with respect to the agency. I think the history is important, this is a rather young department of corrections, it's been in operation less than six years.

So, we are in fact talking about 1973, 1974 in Arizona. I hope we're not talking about 1968 or 1969. I think that as testimony is presented, either by myself or my staff or by inmates or whomever that it's of critical importance that events, circumstances and impressions and allegations and assumptions or whatever, be properly dated.

I'd respectfully remind the Comittee as well, that we're not talking about New York State or Attica or California

or Mississippi or Alaska, or Hawaii, we're talking about Arizona. We would again, respectfully request that the members of the Commission very, very carefully, despite your very busy schedules and other responsibilities, thoroughly go into every detail as presented either by myself, my staff or by inmates or eximmates.

While we understand very well that your two days here represent perhaps a relatively small portion of your overall responsibilities to your community, these two days are of critical importance to the people of Arizona, the inmates and the continuing development of corrections here in Arizona.

So, during the next two days, we are prepared to discuss with you what we consider to be matters of critical concern to the staff of the department of corrections, certainly members of your Commission, inmates and eximmates of our institutions and the people of Arizona.

We approach these hearings in a most serious manner with frankness and openness and consider this event, if the hearings proceed as we expect, as being a significant opportunity to present the current state of affairs of the Arizona State Department of Corrections with respect to our commitment to the success of the criminal justice system and also with respect to the basic human rights of the many who are committed to our care.

As I said earlier, despite some natural apprehensions during the course of our preparing for these hearings, as a result of the great volume of work involved, we, that is the entire administration and staff of the department of corrections come here today with a constructive and positive posture with respect to the serious considerations at hand.

Now, while it is clear that these hearings are not intended to provide a forum for philosophical debate around the problems of crime and punishment, I feel that it is important, at least to me, that I briefly state what the current philosophy is of the Arizona State Department of Corrections and how it is reflected in our planning and daily operation. And in our attitude in terms of our fulfillment of the responsibilities and in meeting the needs of prisoners.

We actively and clearly accept as our basic responsibility, with the many other agencies which share in the administration of the criminal justice system here in the State of Arizona as our basic responsibility the protection of the public.

It certainly, as part of that responsibility we have at the moment committed to us, some 5,000 individuals, including juveniles and adults, in various institutions and in community programs. Therefore, our basic responsibility, and in our view, is to the nearly two million Arizona citizens

J ,

who, just as inmates, or prisoners have rights, have rights also to a safe and orderly community.

Free from fear of attack from that small minority who for many, many complex reasons have demonstrated that they are unable to conform to what is required for the common good and consequently are committed to the department.

We are, therefore, committed to the organization, development and expansion of a variety of quality programs that can best provide an increased measure of protection to the public.

Now, the argument of the philosophical difference of the difference of opinion in correction, correctional management often-comes in this area. We are convicted without question and are dedicated to the fact that we can best protect the public by having decent humane, quality programs of sufficient variety that inmates have an opportunity to do something with themselves while they're in our care.

So that when they leave the institution and these are cliches, I know, that they have a better self image, they're better educated, they've had some help with, particularly critical problems in the area of drug abuse and alcoholism and emotional instability and whatever, so that they're better able to go out, take their places as human beings along with everybody else, support themselves

17^{*}

and their family and to respect the rights and property of others.

Now, some of the confusing things about an operation like this. Please be sure that we fully recognize the seriousness and the extreme deprivation involved in the removal of an individual from his community and family, and while this is to be sure somewhat of an old cliche, again, we accept the fact that removal and confinement to an institution and the necessary restrictions resulting thereof, are in and of themselves sufficient punishment.

Lots of people give speeches about that, but we believe it. We believe that it is a severe deprivation, it is a severe punishment to remove him from the community and put him in the institution, from our standpoint, that's enough. We're not out abusing people beyond that.

While those who are under our care are of necessity under varying degrees of restrictions governing their movement, behavior and program, further disciplinary type restrictions and punishments, if you will, are imposed only upon a relative; few who continue to demonstrate that they're unable to accept their responsibilities and continue and repeatedly violate the rights or property of others while confined in our prisons or institutions.

I can categorically state, without reservation, there is absolutely no deliberate conscious plan or even implied

attitude or action which is intended to harass, degrade, the human dignity of the individual inmate. Or interfere with or eliminate his basic civil rights.

Now, to be sure, not all prisoners under commitment to this department are fully satisfied with their present state of affairs, that's very clear to all of us. The simplest and most basic fact is that they don't want to be there. But I would suggest that it's only natural that there is some dissatisfaction, disagreement, hostility, feeling of unfairness, in any group of human beings.

Whether it be a civil rights commission, a prison, a university, a military group, a community or even a family. I don't know of any group where everyone really feels that they're being treated 100% equally and fairly.

In our philosophy, planning and program development we readily and clearly understand and accept the uniqueness of each human being. That each has his own strengths and weaknesses, his assets and liabilities, level of intelligence, level of motivation, areas of interest and an everychanging potential for change.

We are, therefore, committed to the development of a sufficient variety of institutional services and programs and also community-based programs designed within reason and the resources available to meet these specific and unique needs. And in simple language, in our view, no two

3 4

human beings are alike. And as confusing as it may seem, herein lies one of the dilemmas that are faced daily in the operation of a department of corrections or an institution. In that while certain basic conditions applicable to all do prevail, there are also differences. It's really as a result of our recognition of the differences within human beings that these differences occur. So there truly is a difference and some variance in the way that individual inmates are classified, programmed, transferred from one housing unit to another or from one program to another, disciplined and released.

We do not in fact treat all of the people that are committed to our care precisely the same. And again this may sound like kindergarten language, but it's because they're not the same.

Now, some of the differences that are particularly related to the basic concerns of this Commission and which may have been reflected in whatever written material and information which has been provided or conveyed to you by your staff, occur because of our recognition of the individual person.

And not at all under any circumstances because the individual is or is not a member of a particular ethnic or minority group.

Incidentally, if I may digress for a moment, the

apprehension to which I referred earlier, concerning the entire process, has arisen primarily as a result of our concern over what we consider to be a rather immature, amateurish and incredible process whereby problems have been pinpointed and allegations presented to you solely based upon a very few incorroborated statements, either by staff, or by immates who may or may not have been sincere. But who in our judgment, are just not aware of all the facts in a given situation.

We are further convinced, without question, that some of the considerations that may have been presented as critical problem areas and as infringing upon the civil and human rights of inmates do not at all reflect the attitude or the position of the majority of our inmates.

In this process and in many other related activities,

I think it's fair to say that we had a 100% open door

policy, people were permitted to go wherever they wanted,

to talk to whomever they wanted, inmates, staff, with only

one minor restriction, I believe, in that we had a murder

trial going on and we didn't want to get into that for

obvious reasons.

So, -- with that one exception, people were permitted to go wherever they want and so on and talk with whomever they wanted and again we've got 5,000 people in the system.

2 3 4

.

In addition to our recognition of the uniqueness and inherent worth of the individual, we also recognize, understand and respect the uniqueness of each minority group.

We understand that all -- that not all groups of people are alike, that there is not truly one culture in America, that there are racial, ethnic, cultural, religious and traditional differences among ethnic or racial groups and individuals.

Give us credit for being smart enough to know that. We recognize also that we are operating and attempting to meet basic human needs in a community which is rapidly changing socially, economically and geographically. We recognize also that the causes and the solutions of the problems of delinquency, crimes and correction are many and complex, we recognize that prisons and correctional programs can not be operated as they were 20 or even ten or perhaps even five years ago.

We are committed as you heard other speakers already mention, to the recognition that the days of distant, isolated, quiet, closed institutions are gone.

We have taken a very firm stand with respect to needs, with respect to the need to locate new or more specialized and higher quality programs in the major metropolitan area, I might say at some risk. So we're not intending to operate closed, isolated, degrading, brutal, distant, destruc-

tive institutions.

We recognize also, certainly, that all inmates and all staff, let's not forget them, they're human beings too, you know, have certain basic civil constitutional and human rights, even though removed from society. Confined. We do not, however, subscribe to the theory that inmates fully retain all such rights. Of necessity or common sense or forthe welfare of the majority of those who are in these institutions, some rights have to be lessened in some areas.

We recognize also, that the most important and basic human right of both inmates and staff and the public for that matter, is to be able to live in fundamental safety, free from intimidation, free from threat, free from extortion, free from the theft of his property, freedome from attack, and yes, even freedom from rape and murder.

Now, we begin to get into the realities of a prison or a correctional department. Certainly the people that are involved in these activities are without question, in our judgment, a minority, so we recognize all the very broad and generalized civil, legal, basic human rights of people we think that the most basic right of any individual is to be able to live safely. Without being threatened and intimidated as I've already mentioned.

Therefore, in the reorganization of the policies and the procedures and the program of the Arizona State Prison,

g 4 5 4 3

.9

 our primary goal was to develop a safe, orderly, consistent and just environment. Where inmates and staff alike could live and function safely.

Now, I think most members of the Commission are somewhat aware of what conditions prevailed a year or 18
months or two years ago, there isn't any sense in going
into ancient history. We had a brutal chaotic jungle wherein
inmates were being cut and raped and intimidated on a daily
basis. So our primary responsibility is to the basic
human need of the individual inmate to have a safe environment.

I think I can report to you today, this has been accomplished. It's not 100%, nothing we do is 100%. I think I can tell you today that we have inmates walking the yard, as they call it, during what was called protective lockup, sometimes for years, out of what would happen to them. We've cut down that number from a 100 a year ago to somewhere in the area of 30 now, so that some inmates can now begin to get themselves together as they call it. To get interested in programs, and to move about without fear.

We've done this, and -- we've done this in a due process fashion. So that the attackers and the extortionists and the robbers and the rapists are no longer marauding around the institution preying upon their victims at will.

Now, we're only talking again, perhaps of about 35 out

of 1,450 in the prison.

3

4

2

The average inmate no longer has to carry a weapon for selfprotection.

5 6

Now, I mention all this so that as we proceed through these hearings, we put everything in proper context and we understand what the realities of life were then and are today, and that we examine the evidence and the testimony and the allegations in that light.

8

9

10

11

7

Now, look at the system as a whole, the history has already been given, we accept also the fact that werneed a balanced system, we do not at all think that all offenders need to be in a maximum custody institution, our every action has been devoted to the development of a variety of programs and a balanced system. With substantial differences in security and supervision and individual freedom and

12 13

14

15

16 responsibility, this is why in early preliminary discussions

17

with your staff we were quite insistent that we look

18 19

at the total adult system. We do not look only at the prison, we look at the Halfway House program and we look

20

at the Safford conservation Center and the development of

21

Fort Grant that's already been referred to that frankly

22

we're very proud of.

23 24

25

We have 150 men that have been taken out of the main institution at Florence and now living in minimum custody in a full time quality education and training program,

12⁻

preparation for their release.

It's obvious I talk too much.

We have presented in this document where we think we stand now, there has been significant progress in the area of due process, we do have written rules and regulations that are available to everyone, they do get written notification of violation of the rules of the institution, they do have a right to a hearing, they do have a right to witnesses, they have a right to counsel, they do have an appeal ability beyond the institutional disciplinary committee.

We've done many things in the area of mail, and visits, the only thing that hangshus up raththe moment with regard to visits, is lack of appropriate space.

I hope you know that we do have a warehouse that's immediately adjacent out front of the institution which because of the bureaucratic problems is long overdue which is now being remodeled as an open family-type visiting, decent visiting area.

Classification, we think, is more legitimate today than ever before, no longer is there favored treatment, no longer do certain more sophisticated inmates control where people will live and where they'll work. We have truly introduced a committee process for that area.

The staff now really makes, the decision with respect to who will be moved to the outside trustee area and so on,

rather than what I mentioned before. Safford, Fort Grant I've already mentioned, medical services. You have documents in hand that outline where we are, I can tell you a year ago we had one part time medical doctor. we have a full time dentist, we have a full time psychiatrist, and for the women of the Committee, it's a woman, who walks about the institution without fear, working with the inmates.

In addition to that we have two other M.D's, we have a vacancy now that we're trying to fill that would serve as medical director for the prison.

Beyond that we transport inmates all over the state, here to Phoenix, Maricopa County, for all kinds of out patient, inpatient specialized care and so on.

But we're going to talk about basicahuman needs of inmates, I don't think we can, simple as it is, forget We have cleaned up the institution. cleanliness. clean, it is sanitary. Inmates do have the opportunity for the basics in terms of clothing and showers and so on.

Now, we're not at all trying to tell you we're doing a 100% job, we're not at all satisfied with where we are with regard to the development of our program, mucm more action is required, we are very proud of what we characterize as an outstanding beginning with much more to be done and certainly the eadier references to the education district

5

are most important since we recognize that all of our people are not now able to get involved in appropriate education and training programs but certainly an increased number will be as a result of that legislation.

Now, while I understand very well that the primary concern of this Commission is the adult offender, we also have been doing a few things on the juvenile level and I'll not really mention too many of them.

We have, as you heard earlier, phased out a distant, remote, inaccessible, boys' training school, which is some 250 miles from Phoenix, we have taken these young boys and placed them in other programs and expanded and upgraded foster home program which went from 40 to 100 foster homes.

We were getting a higher quality of foster parent, where we're working with other agencies in that regard, where we have a training program for foster parents, and I don't know that you should put this in the record, don't think this is a snow job, it's just a fact, we had a group called Doberman's Coalition out of Tucson, Model Cities, inner city, minority group of citizens that were very concerned a year ago about practices at our boys' training school who came forward, we met with them, we discussed the situation, they visited the school.

To make a long story short, yesterday I signed a contract with that group who have now, with the assistance of

out staff, put together a Halfway House program in the inner city in Tucson and to which we will provide continuing consultant services and to which we will contract and place minority young men.

We have deliberately supported the active involvement of citizen groups, groups that have particular areas of interest, we have such activities in the institution, and it's very clear where we stand in that regard.

I think probably it would be of more value to all concerned if I concluded now and, with your indulgenceand help of Mr. Schuster and McFarland, attempt to answer any questions that you might have.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Moran, and there will be some questions.

However, before we begin the questioning, I think it's important that press and television understand some of the ground rules that we've established.

I'd like to quote a statement that was read earlier at the beginning of the session, "Since this is a public hearing, the press, radio and television stations as well as individuals are welcome.

"However, no witness shall be televised, filmed or photographed during a hearing nor shall testimony be broad-cast or recorded for broadcasting if a witness objects."

That is a statement from the hearings of the U.S.

25 That is

I to the same to have the

 Civil Rights Commission and certainly apply to the state advisory committee, so from time to time through the session, I will affirm that statement and if necessary we'll have to establish some kinds of constraints.

But hopefully, we can live by that statement.

Mr. Guerrero?

MR. GUERRERO: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Moran, could you please describe your duties as director, when you were hired and your past experience in corrections?

A. (By Mr. Moran.) Yes, sir.

I officially was appointed Director of the Arizona State Department of Corrections on March 1, 1973, a little over one year now.

In that capacity, it's very clear that, and within the existing statutes, that I have the full authority, responsibility for the coordination and development of correctional programs which involve both juveniles and adults in the areas of community prevention programs, juvenile detention, inspection service, after care or parole for juveniles, parole for adults, both instate parole as well as interstate cases that are transferred from other states, we also have the responsibility on both the juvenile and adult level, for the development of programs for those transferred in under probation.

We maintain, at the present time, four major juvenile

institutions, one of which is called the Arizona Youth Center now in Tucson, that functions as a reception, diagnostic and continuing program for quite a while for generally younger boys, more recently the small, separate unit and program has been set up to handle the more disturbed and difficult juvenile offender that had prior to that time been programmed at Fort Grant.

We also have a Conservation Center in Alpine up in the White Mountains that has 80-some boys where the primary emphasis until recently had been on a work effort in the forests and where more recently we we been involved in upgrading and expanding the education and prevocational and counseling programs.

We also have a coeducation institution for juveniles north of the city here, we have about 60 girls there and 30 boys.

We have also a, within our division of community services, seven Halfway Houses, four for adults, three for juveniles, we maintain the Arizona State Prison, Safford Conservation Center, Fort Grant Correctional Training Facility, so we have, my office that is, and I, have the responsibility virtually for all state level correctional programs.

I've been in the correctional business 19 years, beginning in Massachusetts. I have a bachelor's degree in

sociology, a master's degree in psychiatric social work.

I served in Massachusetts as a street corner worker with inner city teenage gangs, I've worked in a juvenile detention home. I was assistant superintendent of a security institution for older delinquent boys. I served as executive director of a private United Fund correctional, which in the old days had been called Prisoner Aid Agency, involved in working directly with inmates, parolees and their families, job finding, legislative activity and believe it or not, the development of standards in those early days when it was not nearly as popular as it is today.

I served also in the State of Vermont as Deputy
Warden at Vermont State Prison and Superintendent of the
boys', Youthful Offender Diagnostic and Treatment program,
Director of Juvenile and Adult Corrections in the State of
Delaware before I came here.

Sorry to bore you, but that's the whole story.

Q (By Mr. Guerrero.) Mr. Chairman, Mr. Moran, recently you opened a new adult facility at Fort Grant, formerly it was a school for juveniles. I wonder if you could please give us a brief description of this program and your plans for new facilities in the future and we also understand that the department has a five-year plan.

I wonder if you could indicate to us how this, what the five-year plan is and how this facility fits into that

BOULEY, SCHLESINGER, PROFITT AND DICURTI OFFICIAL COURT REPORTERS

five-year plan?

3

A. Yes, sir.

4 5

6

Further on in the agenda I'm sure you'll get into a much more detailed look at Fort Grant. Fort Grant is located in a very scenic spot, it has outstanding physical facilities, that probably in today's market, could not be duplicated for 15 million dollars.

7 8

9

In years gone by it had as many as 400 to 500 juvenile boys there. As a result of expanded community programs under

10 11

the expansion and diversification of our program, the popu-

the aegis of the various juvenile courts as well as also

12 13

lation at Fort Grant in the one-year period went down from

14

in excess of about 250 down to about 50 boys, those boys

were relocated in foster homes, specialized private

15

institutions, other kinds of community programs and insti-

16

tutions.

17

So, at the other end of this consideration we had a prison that was overcrowded, we always had in excess of

19

18

200 inmates that were within six months of being released.

20

We have many inmates that did not need to be in maximum

21

custody institution so we worked this switch so to speak,

22

and we've gone ahead and that now is minimum open custody,

23

educational training center.

24

25

We have about 150 men there now, we have 20, kind of permanent long term men that are involved in operating the

institution, maintenance and food service and whatnot.

All others are involved in education and training programs.

This is done cooperatively with the local community college, it's done deliberately for that purpose so that we have the flexibility and quality and input from an outside quality agency. We intend to expand that program.

We haven't had any problems at all in the operation of that facility.

With regard to the five-year plan, we don't have it, we're overdue in having it. Someone said earlier, it's more, at least from our point of view, in the idea stage, we have some of the basics together, what we intend to do, and we've been diverted from that task by other pressing responsibilities to put together, one, the philosophy of the department of corrections, number two, the long term priorities with respect to program, institutions, staff, put price tags on it, operating budgets, needed legislation, needed activity and cooperation with other public and private agencies.

This will chart the future for the department over the next five years.

Q. Mr. Chairman, I had another question.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions by any of the Committee members?

Mr. Zah?

MR. GUERRERO: I had just one more, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry.

Q. (By Mr. Guerrero.) Mr. Chairman, Mr. Moran, I ha

- Q (By Mr. Guerrero.) Mr. Chairman, Mr. Moran, I have a copy of the McDougall report before me, are you familiar with this report?
 - A. (By Mr. Moran.) Yes, I have one too.
- Q Mr. Chairman, Mr. Moran, the Commissioner of Federal Rehabilitation, Mr. McDougall, made a survey of the Arizona State Penitentiary in 1972 during the fall. He made 30 recommendations, including the closing of the Arizona State Prison.

What has been done, or should be done, or what is being done, to implement these proposals?

A I would say the majority of the proposals, let's say with respect to the organization of the department, the administrative structure of the department, the breakdown in terms of services and the attention that each area of service needs, the need, for example, for additional deputy directors, increased emphasis on the establishment of the new institution, and many of the other things have already been implemented.

I would disagree that it's at all realistic that the Florence prison could be totally abandoned, we have taken a different tack and we have said as I indicated directly earlier, that we want to reduce that population over a five-

2<u>1</u>

year period from its 1,450cto 800 through the development of alternatives that I mentioned. One being Fort Grant.

Secondly, the expansion of our Halfway House program, more specialized parole services, and then, also, the establishment of two youthful offender institutions.

Our plan, then, is to continue the operation of Florence for about 800 men that need to be in that degree of supervision and program. Realistically, you just can not abandon it.

Now, we've cleaned a lot of it up, we've repaired it and we think that there are sufficient basic services now there or are already funded which will allow us to have a decent operation. For example, we're already funded for a new infirmary, we're already funded for a new dining room, we have this visiting thing underway that I mentioned. We got the administration building complete, which will allow us to develop areas that are more appropriate for people to visit the institution, groups to visit, the institution, family groups and also for professional people such as attorneys and clergymen.

So I think that we can have a decent operation at Florence.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions by the Committee?

Ms. McCullah?

 MS. McCULLAH: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Moran, what has been done since you became director to insure the inmates are afforded their lawful civil rights, and what is your opinion on the feasibility of implementing the model baseline of inmate rights proposed by the Commission consultant, Donald Goff?

A. There's been an awful lot done to insure the basic human rights of both inmates and staff. I think probably the one area of major importance is the establishment of due process in keeping with the Copple order that I referred to earlier.

There has been much activity in the mail and visiting area, the institution has been virtually opened up to the point where it's at a degree that we're in this. Another dilemma that you have with an agency like this, while on the one hand you want the public to be aware and to see and to be knowledgeable and visit, you don't want to make a zoo out of the place, either, so we've opened up the institution.

I dare say we've had more legislators and other agency and public people in that institution in the last year than perhaps walked through there the previous ten years.

The media has had free access to the institution with one exception, they have developed, again without any controls, without any wraps, all kinds of newspaper material.

6·

I might just say that I receive copy of every disciplinary report that's written in the entire department of corrections, it's screened by other people before I get it, inmates again clearly have the ability to write sealed letters to me and to — they have free access through the mails to newspapers, reporters, elected officials, virtually anyone.

I've never received a letter from an inmate, there's been one exception to that, who alleged that he was at all being brutalized. I think in keeping with the interest of this Commission as I said earlier, it is now a safe insttution for the majority of decent people that want to do their time.

We have actively gone out to work and solicited special interest groups as I said, to work with them.

Perhaps you'd have something more specific you'd want me to respond to. I think we've opened the institution, we have people in there, I think we have an atmosphere where inmates, I say this not because I'm involved but I think it's important, I have walked the yard of that prison, always have, day and night, any inmate may speak to me or any other staff person in a gentlemanly fashion and get an answer.

MR. GUERRERO: Mr. Chairman?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, before other question, I think our

staff attorney needs to make a statement.

MR. LEVIS: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to introduce into the record some of the documents that Mr. Moran has referred to, as Exhibit 2, the documents that Mr. Moran has submitted to staff and to the State Advisory Committee members, which includes his response to the questions on the model baseline, plus the mail regulations, and the inmate reference manual of the Arizona State Prison.

In addition to the cell block regulations and the preliminary plan of the Arizona Correctional Training facility, Arizona Department of Corrections, and that would be entered as Exhibit 2.

A. These fellows are never that quiet, I wish you'd get on them.

MR. LEVIS: There are two more exhibits, Exhibit 3 would be the McDougall report, which has been referred to, which was submitted by Mr. McDougall in October of 1972, and Exhibit 4 would be the minimum civil and human rights baseline prepared by Donald H. Goff, Consultant for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, which has also been referred to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there other questions by any member of the Committee?

MR. GUERRERO: Mr. Chairman, I didn't get right into

the revision, if there's been a revision on mailing privileges of inmates, but I did want to ask Mr. Moran a question at this point, in relation to the point that the lady took over here rec.) At this part in a the requestion of the point that the lady took over here rec.) At this part in a the request (By Mr. Guerrero.) Mr. Chairman, Mr. Moran, presently is mail leaving the penitentiary from inmates, is it censored?

A. No, it's not censored. We -- within the court -- it's not routinely censored.

However, in simple language, when there's, and I'm not an attorney, but when there's good grounds to feel that something significant involving let's say the safety of the institution or whatever, there is a provision which allows us to look at a certain percentage, but routinely, no, it's not censored.

Q. Mr. Chairman --

- A. Let me just say quickly, sir, from my point of view, censoring inmate mail really does nothing for us but take someone's time.
- Q But, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Moran, but the mail is opened before it leaves the penitentiary, is that correct?
- A. Not all mail, mail, you got to look into fine details of the rules. Mail is submitted to the mail room generally, let's say routine mail to family or friends or whatever, unsealed. The man opens the envelope to make sure that

OFFICIAL COURT REPORTERS

nothing in there, just looks, at it and seals it.

Letters to attorneys, public officials, legislators, judges and whatnot, are brought personally by the inmate to the mail room officer. The mail room officer inspects that in the inmate's presence and seals it in his presence. The letters to me come unsealed.

What am I saying? "Sealed. The inmate seals it in the cell, puts it in the mail box, nobody touches it.

Q Well, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Moran, does a person who this mail is given to to inspect, does he in any way read that mail before he inserts it in the envelope?

A Not routinely, he's not required to, but for me to say that any human being might not be a little nosy would be ridiculous. But he's not required to and does not do it as a policy or a practice.

He may look and see it's to Ms..Jonessor something like that, I don't know, but no, he doesn't.

Q Mr. Chairman, Mr. Moran, I understood that at a point in time just recently, that any mail to legislators would be sealed and not opened, it would be mailed directly from the penitentiary --

A. Oh, yes.

Q -- can they seal it? Does it have to be opened before it's brought to the person inspecting it, can he just give it to him sealed?

He brings it up to the mail room, now there will Α. be other people again, later on, in your agenda, that know the precise mechanics better than I do, he brings it to the mail room unsealed, the mail room staff person makes sure that there isn't a \$100.00 bill in there, or whatever, seals it and that's it.

Now, the inmate is right there. And I'm sure if they were reading that stuff, I would know about it.

> MR. GUERRERO: Thank you, sir.

> > Yes.

MR. ZAH:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have a question, Mr. Zah?

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Moran, in your (By Mr. Zah.) statement, you know, in the beginning, I was somewhat surprised on your comment about the Copple decision. You know, it having been thrown down your throat while you weren't ready for that.

I just thought you might want to elaborate on that? A. Yes.

I think I was concerned that this Commission might feel that we are now doing these things only because we have been ordered to do so by the court. Now, the fact of life is that these proceeding were underway, decisions were nearly completed by the time I got here.

Had there never ever been a Copple order, administratively on our own we would have proceeded to implement the

procedures that are required by the Copple order.

That's what I'm saying. So, we're not in disagreement with them. And the record is clear, and I've done this before in another jurisdiction.

We would have changed the visiting and the mail and the due process in discipline whether the court told us to do it or not.

Q I think I also have a somewhat related question, you know, regarding the complaints, you know, that you might receive, let's say at Arizona State Prison.

I don't really know what the procedure is now.

A An inmate may write to me directly in a sealed letter. I can tell you that the nature, seriousness and volume of complaints from inmates has dwindled down to a degree that's not at all comparable to what it had been six, eight months, a year ago.

I do not get, for example, mail from inmates that reflects let's say what I would characterized as a general concern of the inmate population as a whole. Now, what I'm getting, which might have been the case sometime ago.

Now, what the gettare especific problems involving individual inmates. For example, a fellow, oh, now this is a -- this is a fact, the rule says apparently you can't have boots higher than nine inches above the ankles, so he had a pair of boots ten and a half inches and he wanted me to

intercede so he could wear the boots, as he takes care of the pigs.

You get letters about wanting interstate transfers.

You get letters of complaint, particularly lately, around
two for one, which is a major item. The loss of two for one.

There was a time and a practice whereby all inmates generally, except those that are clearly in disciplinary status, received two for one reductions on their sentence. Now the law says very clearly on the other hand, that only those that are involved in a position of trust and confidenceal may be given two for one, so we have people, for example, 30-some inmates in protective lockup that write to me saying that this is illegal. That this is contrary to the Copple decision, wanting two for one. You get that sort of thing.

You get a man writing and saying that he needs dentures or he needs glasses and he doesn't seem to be able to get anywhere. But we don't get letters now, again, that reflect concerns of general and major importance to the inmate body as a whole.

Q I have one more sort of similarly related question.

In that when you do receive, let's say an individual complaint from one of the inmates it still goes to, let's say employees of that particular facility, would you be opposed to, let's say appointing somebody that's independent of that agency or

that facility so that he can take a look at the complaint on its merit and monitor it in some fashion, if possible?

A. You may say, and I'll understand if this is the way you react that what I'm about to say is a lot of gobbledegook very misleading. I can not say that I'm unalterably opposed to an ombudsman, on the other hand, we think that we can develop, again we're not talking about Attica or the prison at Parchman (Phonetic), Mississippi or the Cook County Jail, we're convinced that we can develop an atmosphere wherein there is communication, where there is mutual respect, where there is an interest in both directions, so that an inmate can communicate appropriately with any staff person and get a legitimate answer.

I think it's only when you have that lack of communication and lack of the other things I have mentioned, that you truly need a third party to objectively look at these things. And I can assure you these things are not ignored.

Now, they're not always answered to the satisfaction of the inmate. So I believe we have that kind of an atmosphere. I tell you this not because it's me but I walk the yard of that institution. I've never refused to talk to an inmate yet; unless because of the pressures of time I had to go somewhere else. I deliberately go alone. So, I think we've made progress in that regard.

DR. GLASS: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a rebuttal

to that statement.

17.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before the rebuttalis made, I'd like to ask the staff, is this in order? In the hearing, is rebuttal in order?

MR. LEVIS: Mr. Chairman --

MR. MUSKRAT: Mr. Chairman, I certainly, you know, would hope that the Committee members, of course a Committee member can say anything they want to, however what we're here to do is to obtain information from Mr. Moran and we certainly wouldn't want to get in a public debate with him at this time?

THE CHAIRMAN: It's within my franchise, if it's okay with Dr. Glass, may I declare that out of order and proceed?

DR. GLASS: Well, it was more of an informative thing, statement I was going to make rather than a rebuttal to -
THE CHAIRMAN: If it's a misclassification and then I would suspect it's in order.

MR. GUERRERO: Mr. Chairman, if it's in the form of a question, form of a question.

DR. GLASS: No, it was merely a comment about the fact regarding this ombudsman's bill, we did have a group here that did go before the legislature to try and get an ombudsman's bill, under the circumstances of the way the department is changed, we personally didn't feel as though this was necessary. That's the only comment I had.

A Mr. Chairman, just quickly, we have probably a thousand ombudsmen, they're not officially on the payroll, but there are all kinds of people that have free and private contact with inmates, and nothing that can happen anyplace today that isn't known by a wide range of people.

THE CHAIRMAN: Fine.

Ç

Are there other questions of Mr. Moran?

If not, I have one brief one, sir. And it's somewhat related to statements made by attorney general as well as you in your philosophical statements.

And that is the whole area of public awareness, public sophistication about the realities of the criminal justice system. And do you feel that you have a responsibility, and if so, I'm interested in the mechanism, the device, as feedback into the system that creates the problems that finally, in the way of a person one, two, three, ends up in the criminal justice system, call it what you may, racism, discrimination, poverty or whatever, do you feel, philosophically, that your department has a responsibility?

A Absolutely. And a very active one and I never make a presentation anywhere that I don't conclude by saying that we will succeed or not. Now, these are the wide range of groups whether they be PTA groups or high school students or college students or League of Women Voters, republicans,

democrats or whatever, without saying we will succeed or not, directly in proportion to the degree of public understanding and support we get from you.

We also always make the point more recently around the difficulties that we've had in trying to locate the new institution of saying that, these are the, whatever you want to call them, the criminals, the offenders, the unfortunates, the inadequates of your community, it's your responsibility, the total community has got to get involved in this thing.

We also say that even if we had unlimited funds, we couldn't do the job alone, we wouldn't want to do the job alone, so we have an active public education program on the way. We have a full time staff person funded with a federal grant, we have had more attention through the media in recent months than ever before. We have a speakers bureau lined up, just about two weeks ago we had a beginning meeting right in this very room in an attempt to get civic and religious and community leaders involved in a volunteer fashion.

We have an active program, again with a need to keep some balance so that the institutions don't become a zoo, to involve citizens to visit.

We actively encourage it. I dare say half the people that are here this morning are here because we asked them to

come.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, from my view as an educator, it appears to me that we're talking about, you know, a pretty needed, powerful intervention process to develop knowledge and understanding, and my question was, you know, the mechanism, the device for this kind of powerful intervention, you know, do you feel -- you referred to a federal project, will this become institutionalized do you feel, and become a regular part?

A. We hope so.

I know you don't want the mechanics but yes, we're committed to that. And we're doing it in a lot of other very subtle ways, we're reaching out more with all kinds of groups.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, is this concept a new order of things in the whole criminal justice system process?

A. Well, I -- people often say to me, you know, where is there a good system? You know, in corrections? I just have to say there's good and bad in all systems, so I think some jurisdictions do better at that than some of them, and I recognize the problem that Attorney General Nelson had in using public relations, some have only public relations, see, you go out and tell everybody what a good job they're doing.

Well, we don't have public relations, we think we

well, we don't have public relations, we dillik we

1 have public education. And we'll talk about the good and 2 the bad, so to speak, we don't tell everybody everything's 3 rosy. 4 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you so very much, sir. MR. GUERRERO: Mr. Chairman, one further question? 6 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. 7 (By Mr. Guerrero.) Mr. Chairman, I don't know 8 whether I should direct this question to you or maybe Mr. 9 Schuster or McFarland may be better able to respond, but I 10 wonder if you could supply us the ethnic breakdown of 11 employees in the department of corrections and also at the 12 Arizona State Prison? 13 14 A (By Mr. Moran.) I can't give you off the top of 15 my head, we're woefully weak in that area, it varies from 16 one part of the department to another. 17 Does anybody know? 18 Tom, can you put your finger right on that? 19 We have a disproportionate percentage of minority 20 employees. In the negative. In the negative. 21 Both in the department of corrections and at the 22 penitentiary? 23 A. All -- yes. 24 Now, you know, I don't want you, to bore you with some 25

of the reasons for that, but part of it's the location of the

given program. If we get down where we have two major operations down in the Graham County area, namely Fort Grant and Safford, I don't believe we have one Black staff person there.

Now, I'm told there are only 400 Blacks in that area, period, to begin with. I can honestly tell you this, that we're actively pursuing minority staff, but we're nowhere near in our patterns comparable to how the community and population would break down.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Moran, how is this personnel being pursued, is it being pursued publicly or what kind of procedure are you using to try to secure?

A We work through and within the state personnel commission ground rules on some occasions we've asked for a selective, what's called a selective certification list, which is deliberately intended to zero in on a particular individual, with a certain background.

These are the figures for the prison. We have gone out actively after particular individuals. We've worked through some community groups in an attempt to get minority staff. I'm not sure I can even read this.

Suppose I just give you this, rather than try to waster your time and figure it out.

Oh, just quickly, as I look here we got like 286 correctional officers, 245 are White, 34 are Mexican-American,

1 four are Black, one's an Asian-American and two are American 2 Indians.

Total, department-wide, 86.7% White, 9% Mexican-American, 2% Black, point five percent American Indian. Point three percent, as it's termed here, Oriental. So, clearly the vast percentage is White.

3

4

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE CHAIRMAN: There's one other question of staff, Mr. Moran.

(By Mr. Levis.) Mr. Moran and Mr. Schuster and McFarland, as deputy directors for community services in institutions, how do your positions relate to the director and the various institutions which we will be discussing in the next two days? Does the institutions report to either of you or how's that set up? COTTON-PIBER

JOHN R. SCHUSTER

A. (By Mr. Schuster.) I'm responsible for the six institutions and directly responsible to the director.

THE CHAIRMAN: So, left on the superintendents, administrators or wardens of the institutions, report directly to you?

The chain of command is a direct line between Mr. Moran, myself and the superintendents.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: And your job is supervising those 2 various institutions? 3 And coordinating the activities to move the immates 4 into the community program which is the thrust of the department. 6 THE CHAIRMAN: And Mr. McFarland, do you have any 7 direct supervision? 8 9 10 JOHN R. MCFARLAND 11 12 (By Mr. McFarland.) My responsibility involves 13 programs outside the institutions which includes the state-14 wide parole systems, the Halfway House, the resources, the 15 purchase services, under the direction of the director. 16 THE CHAIRMAN: So, the supervisors of the Halfway 17 Houses would report to you? 18 Parole officers, supervisors, Halfway Houses. 19 MR. LEVIS: I have no further questions. 20 THE CHAIRMAN: Fine, if there are no other questions 21 we certainly want to thank you gentlemen for your very fine 22 testimony. 23 Thank you very much, we look forward to a fruitful A. 24 hearing.

THE CHAIRMAN: And thank you for your cooperation.

25

1 Are those persons who were expected from the womens' 2 division of the Arizona State Prison in the audience? 3 MR. SCHUSTER: Yes, they are. 4 THE CHAIRMAN: We expect to have an executive 5 session arranged. 6 One of the procedures in a hearing entails in some 7 cases the possibility of defaming and degrading, and the 8 procedure is to hear those who will testify in executive 9 session, so that's what we are in the process of determining, 10 how we'll go about it. 11 In the meantime, we will continue with the hearing, 12 and the next persons involved will be Mr. David C. Tierney 13 and Mr. Flint Anderson, who will speak to outside community 14 groups. 15 Will you come forward, Mr. Tierney and Mr. Anderson? 16 You may either stand or sit. 17 And may I ask of each of you to state your name and 18 your occupation and your address, please? 19 MR. TIERNEY: Mr. Chairman, my name is David C. 20 Tierney, formerly a member of your Committee. I have a 21 written account of my testimony, and I am an attorney by 22 profession. I have my office here in Phoenix. 23 May I come forward and give this to you, Mr. 24 Chairman?

THE CHAIRMAN: Certainly.

25

9.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, according to your March 1st letter, I have put my testimony in written form, and let me pass over it briefly so that the people --

THE CHAIRMAN: May I interrupt, did you say Mr. Moran left the --

MR. ANDERSON: No, I said Dr. Burrell, who used to be chairman of your Committee, left with me a file and I think you might want that.

ĽĎÄVÍD&ÝIEŘŃĖY

A. (By Mr. Trerney.) You've asked me to testify this morning concerning outside groups, and their interest and actions concerning corrections in Arizona. I think what you mean by outside groups is probably any groups not connected with the state officially.

I am chairman of the state bar special committee on corrections and rehabilitation, my report for the state bar has just been prepared and I have attached it to my written testimony so that you know what they know.

Let me pass over that written report to the statebar just quickly.

During the last year, which is the first year of our committee's existence, we have done three concrete things.

4 5

6 7

We have worked with the members of the department of corrections, and the attorney general's office in preparing a means, a vehicle whereby people who are up for parole revocation may obtain counsel if they are indigent. We've got a series of volunteer counsel, we've got a list prepared, we set up the procedure whereby people who are going through such revocation hearing could obtain counsel if they could not afford counsel, they're entitled to it.

Secondly, we prepared a survey of the restrictions of exoffenders' employment, it's a document which is about two or three inches thick. It has some 80 boards and committees that are under state control represented.

Those are boards which license professions or which control licensing boards in professions, for example, barbering, cosmetology and so on.

What we did was to obtain the services of an Arizona State University law student who, for a sum, paid by the state bar, prepared the glossary by talking with the boards that administer, say the licensing of barbers.

We have their regulations and the relevant statutes compiled right along with her report on personal contact with each board. A copy of that glossary has been turned in to the department of corrections. I do not know exactly what they're doing with it now, it will go from them to Mr. Joe Duke of the attorney general's office.

The third thing that we are doing is that attached to my report to the state bar is our questionnaire concerning local jail conditions. That questionnaire goes principally to disciplinary rules, mail rules, visitation privileges and incidentally, to the conditions at the jail that refer to those things.

The purpose in attempting to do that kind of survey is to broaden some information that we have in the state concerning our local jails. There are really two sources of information in our state concerning local jails. One is the 1970 jail survey that was done nationwide, it has very limited information.

The second source is a committee which has prepared for the state legislature an assessment of the physical conditions of our local jails. That information was obtained in 1970 and 1973, and it does not concern the rules which govern prisoners' lives.

We would like to find out about those rules. The reason we are bothering to check into that area is that many people have told us that the rules are very different from county to county and city to city and that they are in some cases, kind of crazy and they make life miserable for the inmates in the jail, the people who try to visit the inmates and sometimes the jailers because of the aggravation they get from the inmates and the visitors.

5

6

8

7

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

We'd like to find out what the rules are, we'd like to perhaps propose a uniform set of rules which local jails could make very minor changes in as they needed and kind of clear up an area where a lot of aggravation is being produced by everybody. We think that lawyers are kind of suited to do that kind of thing.

I want to say that I have some limitations on my value to you as a witness, the last time that I was in the Arizona State Prison, which I believe you are primarily concerned with, was on March 10, 1973. And at that time I went down in behalf of our committee to interview a prisoner down there. I haven't got any hard information about the prison since that time. All the information I have is hearsay.

In your letter to me you asked for comments on the Goff guideline. I did not know that Mr. Goff would be here today, but what I have to say is complimentary, anyway.

Mr. Goff, it's a good guideline, I read it, the easy way to say what I have to say is that I agree with every one of your boldfaced statements which heads up your sections and nothing comes to mind that I would take issue with, it's the way things should be if we could get to that point.

Secondly, I want to just call attention to a couple of issues that I think that your Committee might want to pay

7 8

special attention to in the next several days, the next two days, I guess it is.

I'm very concerned with the providing of health services and psychiatric services to prisoners at the state prison. I know the department has made attempts since the change in administration to improve the medical as well as the educational facilities down at the prison and I consider that very important, I hope you'll inquire into those facilities in your hearings, especially tomorrow when you're in the neighborhood of the prison.

I can not fault the department on anything it's doing on any of the subjects which are raised in the Goff guideline. Partly that's because I don't have very much information on what's happening now in the prison. If I had more information I might want to try and fault them, whenever you fault somebody you have to know something about the restrictions they're working against. That would be budgetary and perhaps, I don't know, the makeup of personnel at the prison and so on.

I'm almost done now. I want to say one more thing about a subject I want to ask you to inquire into in the next day or so. And that is prisoner against prisoner violence.

In approximately January of 1973, while I was a member of your Committee, I prepared a seven-page report and

it was entitled Prisoner Against Prisoner Violence and in that report I recited statistics which I obtained from thenwarden Bud Gomes, and those statistics were pieces of paper that he gave me reciting the figures concerning assaults, deaths, beatings, woundings, escapes, and so on.

And in that January, 1973, report, I said at the end that I felt this was a subject that was not attended to sufficiently in any jail in the United States. And that I felt it was very unfair to lock a man up and to take away from him his right to protect himself, his person, against his fellow prisoners.

Or to ward off the depredations of disease as in the case of medical problems. And at the Arizona State Prison those figures which I received from the then-warden indicated that there had been a steady rise in the number of reported beatings, stabbings, shootings, so on, even though the population during that same period had declined.

I'm sure that report's in your files, and I hope you'll pay attention to that issue in the next few days.

In conclusion I just want to say that I consider
the level of interest in Arizona and other places too, in
prisons by both the public and by the members of the bar
to be very low, and I congratulate you people on having
organized in Arizona, a hearing which if properly carried
out will result in focusing the attention of the citizens of

our state on an area in which I think we are spending a lot of money and we should be getting better and better results and the results are very important to the citizens of our state.

And I'd like to welcome your questions on any subject which I can answer.

THE CHAIRMAN: Fine.

In that we're speaking to representatives of community organizations, if you would sit a few minutes, Mr. Tierney, while Mr. Anderson gives us an overview, I think there are just a very few questions that we would ask.

A Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Anderson, may I have your name, occupation --

FLINT ANDERSON

A (By Mr. Anderson.) Flint Anderson, Executive Secretary for the Arizona Citizens Committee on Prisons.

Address? Tucson, Arizona, 715 North Park Avenue.

THE CHAIRMAN: It's my understanding that you will give a brief description of the Arizona Citizens Committee on Prisons.

A. Yes. I'd like to preface my remarks with the caution

that given the time limitation that my statements flirt on the edge of dangerous generality. And some of the remarks are prefaced to give some orientation to why in fact we are doing what we are doing.

Open space has played a pronounced role in the history of the United States. It evoked and nurtured a sense of unlimited possibility, the frontier fear.

We have historically considered space and relocation as in themselves endowed with creative potential, always a new beginning. Thus can we in part understand the general necessity of the penitentiary, an American innovation.

In colonial American it was firmly believed that beyond punishment the controlled environment of enforced
solitude would bring an offender to his or her senses. That
is to penance or restored relationship with his or her
God and consequently with the offended community.

Imprisonment was considered a form of constructive banishment. The efficacy of which was rightfully reflected. From this quite optimistic beginning, incarceration has fundamentally evolved to simple relocation, the purging of the free world's living space.

The idealism which characterizes this early experience has evaporated and with it the conviction that solitude alone with one's God is rehabilitative. Yet we consider to warehouse in wholesale fashion, our social problems, still

8 9

believing that forced relocation through imprisonment serves constructive ends.

It simply has not worked and issues we have tried to resolve punitively come back to haunt us in ever greater force. It is read in the lives and faces of embittered individuals who are the first line victims of the criminal justice process which tends to be arbitrary and tends to single out the already disadvantaged and it haunts us in high crime rates and high rates of recidivism.

This failure is primarily of systems rather than professionals. A model prison with a model staff would still be a failure as long as communities continue to export and relocate individuals who could and should remain in the community. And as long as those returning home from incarceration must battle discrimination and nonacceptance at every turn.

A correctional system is sometimes better but never worse than the concern of the public it serves. Nationwide, the message has been clear in the past, neither the keepers nor the kept have ranked anywhere but at the bottom of the general public's social priorities. Out of sight, out of mind.

We can now say that the situation is beginning to change. It is ultimately the public which is responsible for the failures of the criminal justice system and we dare

not lynch scapegoats to pacify our own accountability.

It was of concerned citizens that the Arizona Citizens
Committee on Prisons organized itself in May, 1972,
following a work stoppage at Arizona State Prison. Its
first concern was to investigate allegations of unjust
and unconstitutional treatment of prisoners at Florence.
A public hearing into conditions at the Arizona State Prison
was organized by concerned citizens in Pima County, to
hear testimony primarily from exoffenders.

Since that time, the Arizona Legislature has committed itself to reforms of the criminal justice process. This work is slow and not without its setbacks.

With the appointment of Mr. John Moran as the new director of the department of corrections in early 1973, the commitment to change was reaffirmed, with special emphasis given to the community-based treatment as both an alternative and as a supplement to prison detention. The purposes of the Arizona Citizens Committee on Prisons can be defined as follows: One, as citizens of Arizona we will monitor the work of state and local agencies entrusted with the care and treatment of offenders.

Two, since the best guarantee for humane treatment of all who are affected by the criminal justice system is an informed and active public, public education is one of our major functions.

1 2 3

4

7 8

9

11 12

10

13 14

15

17

16

18 19

20

21 22

24

25

23

Three, we will support those agencies, departments and individuals, legislation and programs which in our view serve the constructive needs, both of society and the offender, through the delivery of correctional care and services which victimize neither the individual nor society.

We will continue, number four, to advocate further reforms both at the state and local levels and will act as facilitating agents for community support and programs.

The following are our present programs now active. We have just recently in Pima County won a battle together with many other organizations and individuals, parents and so on, over the juvenile court judge, who is a strong advocate of community-based treatment as an alternative to incarceration.

Our public education efforts include a regular news letter which is now received by over 1,000 Arizonans. A speakers bureau and a reading and reference library on prison reform and prisoners' rights.

We are in the process of compiling a directory of community resources concerned specifically with offenders, exoffenders and their families beginning with Pima County, specifically adult offenders, exoffenders.

The following task forces have been created: One, employment for exoffenders beginning in Pima County.

Two, jail standard and conditions focusing primarily
Pima County, southern Arizona.

Three, a legal task force formed together with a CLU southern chapter. Legislative acts task forces, one based in Maricopa County, the other in Pima County, and finally a volunteer task force based in Maricopa County which is presently cooperating, working with the department of corrections in its efforts to create and implement varied volunteer programs initially here in Maricopa County.

The Family Friend program based in Pima County includes visitation to families of immates upon request of the incarcerated family member. It is presently based only in Pima County. And we are now negotiating with the department of economic security to establish an advisory committee made up of citizens to review and make recommendations regarding their services to exoffenders and their families.

That ends my statement, I'll welcome any questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions by any

Committee members of these two gentlemen?

MR. GOFF: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could raise a question of Mr. Tierney with regard to other citizen organizations that might be in existence in the State of Arizona.

I believe you mentioned, sir, that there were other

3 4

groups other than yours and Mr. Anderson's group?

A. (By Mr. Tierney.) Yes, Mr. Goff, there are and the one that comes to mind quickest is the Arizona Correctional Association. That's a group which existed even prior to the one Mr. Anderson is with, and it is based primarily here in Maricopa County, in Phoenix.

I've known the presidents of that group over the last couple of years and the present president is Dr. Glass, who's a member of your Committee.

any given time, right now I believe the membership is around 75 persons and that membership includes exquards, parents of prisoners, exprisoners, people who have academic interest in the field of corrections and so on. They've held their meeting in a variety of places, I remember one time meeting in traffic court courtroom. They get together on the call from the chairman, their principal contribution over the last several years has been to faithfully show up at the legislative hearings on bills which are proposed concerning corrections, or on any presentation given by the correctional department.

I remember during the last several years that they were the ones who were most faithful about bearding the tiger in his den.

The department of corrections, prior to the arrival of

Dr. Moran, in my opinion, did not present both sides of many questions, and it was this group, the Arizona Correctional Association, that presented the other side.

I guess that's a complete summary of what they do.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions by any

Committee members?

Mr. Anderson, do you have a statement, an exhibit that you wish to give or do you want to hold onto your copy?

A. (By Mr. Anderson.) I can include a copy of our most recent news letter and also a brochure which describes in a bit more detail the history and the programs that we have.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you could, we could make that a part of the record.

And would you enclose as Exhibit 5, testimony of Dave Tierney and Exhibit 6, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, prisoner letters that were sent by the former chairman of the Arizona State Advisory Committee, Dr. Jose Burruel, B-u-r-r-u-e-l, and with, we can submit those later on.

Are there any other questions of Attorney Tierney and Mr. Anderson?

Q (By Mr. Goff.) Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman, if I might raise a question of either or both of these gentlemen.

Has there been any consideration given in the State

1 2 3

council, commission or whathaveyou, comprised of citizens
to work directly out of the governor's office in relationship with the whole matter of corrections in the state?

A. (By Mr. Anderson.) I'd be more than happy to respond
to that, and stick my neck out.

of Arizona to the development of an official advisory

There is one, it's interesting that it's not scheduled to testify, which in my own personal opinion is indicative of its relevance.

Frankly, in the whole area of corrections citizen involvement, concerned with longevity, input, and action, is just fairly new.

Small interest groups around specific issues have certainly been true but a concerted effort on the part of citizens, taxpayers in the whole correctional area is fairly new in Arizona and we're frankly -- since I'm putting my neck out I won't put the name of the organization out, but we're not happy with the kind of input that this body, which does exist on paper, is in fact providing as a citizens group.

And we would like to see it reconstituted, in fact, citizens who are concerned, who are working and who are putting time in as citizens who are concerned, right now it's on paper but it's not functioning.

A. (By Mr. Tierney.) Dr. Goff, the chairman of that

governor's council on corrections is named Mullan, M-u-l-l-a-n, he's available in the Phoenix area, I've spoken to him in the last week or two.

Their interests are in stirring up some community support, mostly in the field of probation or parole counseling, but so far as I know at this time, no concrete actions have been taken. The committee has been in existence approximately one year.

MR. ZAH: Mr. Chairman?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Zah.

Q (By Mr. Zah.) Yes, I have a question that I'd like to ask Mr. Tierney.

Since you have an organization, you know, from the state bar association, I was just wondering in so far as the bar itself, in planning things in the future, do you envison that, say a panel of attorneys who would be available, let's say, to serve in terms of the legal services or let's say complaints that might be directed, let's say to, or against let's say an agency or facility in the State of Arizona, do you envison at some point, that there would be, let's say a panel of attorneys who would be available to take, let's say some of these cases?

A (By Mr. Tierney.) My answer, Mr. Zah, Mr. Zah, the answer is that the state bar would not organize a panel of attorneys who would take cases, whatever they might be in the

7 8

future. An individual group like Mr. Anderson's group, might obtain some fellow traveler, friendly attorneys who would sort of be on tap for Mr. Anderson to suggest matters, but the state bar probably wouldn't get involved in that kind of thing.

What the state bar would do would be ask attorneys to spend time on a project that would affect all prisoners equally or, you know, take an issue and try and resolve that issue, in some way, but it wouldn't organize a panel which would take individual cases.

I don't know if that would be sort of -- it would be too close to an ethical question as to whether that was proper, individual attorneys, however, could sign on to help Mr. Anderson or any other group and I believe that he has now organized 20 attorneys down in Tucson and I don't know how many up here in Maricopa County, but I guess the bottom line is that groups of attorneys do exist that are interested in doing the kind of thing that you're talking about, they're just not organized under the state bar.

- Q I wasn't really raising the question in terms of ethics, but I was really, you know, trying to draw the line between, let's say law reform related cases as opposed to let's say primarily giving services, where it's needed.
 - A. I do want to say, and I only say it because I happen

to know something about what's going on in this area.

I want to say that it seems to me that the resources that are available to prisoners within the prison for postconviction assistance, that is conviction has occurred, they're in the jug and they're serving their time and they think there was something wrong with the proceedings in which they were convicted and they didn't appeal right after their conviction, those services seem to me to be very much below the level that they are in other states.

And I speak from experience regarding Massachusetts and some knowledge of New York, when I was in law school I knew something about those two states and the postconviction assistance.

To my mind, in Arizona, there are precious few lawyers or, I don't know of any organizations that are really providing postconviction assistance to people who can't pay for it.

Did I hit it better that time?

- Q Yes.
- A. Okay, thank you.

A (By Mr. Anderson.) Elaborating further on that,
there is a postconviction clinic at the University of
Arizona and you'll hear it from one of their staff people,
which is based in Tucson, one of the problems that we ran
into immediately when we initially worked with approximately

1 2

30 lawyers to create what we had hoped would be a prison legal panel. Dealing specifically with problems of postconviction remedies, etcetera.

Mr. Moran and others have already indicated one of the emphasis on community-based treatment, new facilities, is the inaccessibility of Arizona State Prison for one.

To find lawyers who are willing to volunteer normally on a gratis basis. Not only money, but time, to travel to Florence on a regular basis, and more often than not, civil action or civil rights actions cases will end up in Maricopa County, so that lawyers from Tucson would be making a tremendous commitment.

I think this is one area of an indication of the failure of system, even beyond the willingness of some individual lawyers.

There's one law firm in Tucson, for instance, over 50% of their case load is gratis involving prison-related matters, also, but it's an area where there is no real satisfaction beyond the postconviction clinic right now.

Q I was interested also in what kinds of reaction do you get, let's say from the facilities throughout the states? In relation to, let's say the inmates wanting to, say to obtain the services of a lawyer, do they know that there is such an organization, there are such a panel of attorneys that might be able to assist them if they request

that, what kind of reaction have you been getting, let's say from the Arizona State Prison in Florence, from the state officials?

A. (By Mr. Tierney.) I can answer one question about the Arizona State Prison concerning attorneys who go there. I've gone there on numerous occasions and every time the guards have been most solicitous to make sure that you get in to see the man you're there to see, that wherever he is or whatever he's doing he's located as quickly as possible, that your opportunity to speak with him is in a secluded area where you have a private conversation and so forth.

I never had any trouble that way. I've heard other attorneys say once or twice they did have trouble and I'd say that's an exception and probably an individual guard who made some particular problem. I couldn't speak to you about the level of awareness of the people at the prison about the postconviction clinic, frankly it didn't enter my mind because I've only heard of it once or twice before and my impression is it's not doing a large volume of representation on postconviction matters.

A. (By Mr. Anderson.) One of the limitations is that it's primarily a teaching program, so that it's governed by the parameters of a classroom kind of context, for example.

In my own experience we've received letters from inmates, primarily out of Arizona State Prison, which simply

OFFICIAL COURT REPORTERS

1 2 3

referred them to the postconviction clinic and have written a letter to the inmate advising him that he should hear from the postconviction clinic and thus far every indication points that the fact that they've at least followed up, but to emphasize again one of the areas where there's a real deficiency in geography dictates a lot in Arizona, there simply is no built-in guarantee that every inmate has equal access to postconviction remedy.

And frankly, how we address that problem I don't know. The court appoint lawyers? And at this point, I think frankly there's not much more we can do beyond that, until the legal profession perhaps establishes different priorities.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other questions?

For your information, concurrent with the meeting upstairs, we're having an executive session below, in view of the fact that there had been a possibility that some defaming or degrading statements would be made in open hearing and there is a process that we're working through. Therefore we shall take a break now and reconvene at 11:20

VOICE: Mr. Chairman. Since this is a public hearing, I'm John Alba, Channel 12, KTAR television. Since this is an open meeting, public hearing, I'd like to know why you feel it's necessary to go into secret meeting to preview already-previewed testimony, testimony that's been taken on

1 paper from the inmates?

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you want to explain that?

MR. MUSKRAT: Yes, sir, my name's Joe Muskrat, I'm the Regional Director of the United States Commission on Civil Rights.

Our statute provides not only that we may, but that we shall, in the event that we feel or have any indication that some testimony to be given by a witness is going to defame or degrade any identifiable person, then we are required by law to hear those statements in executive session, whereby the person defamed or degraded will have a chance to respond to them.

If the Committee members in attendance decide that there was some basis to those statements or decides that they are just not totally false, then they are heard in open session.

If, on the other hand, the Committee feels that there's no basis whatsoever to the statements, then those statements are not heard.

Now, we have prepared an explanation of this process for you, have you received that? It was a flyer that we left on the table up here, I believe. Have you gentlemen of the press received that?

VOICE: We have it, yes.

MR. MUSKRAT: Well, that adequately, I feel, states the

law that we are operating under, this is not something that we're doing because we decided that we wanted to do it, this is something that we are required by law and by rules of the Commission to do.

VOICE: Who do you feel could be defamed by this testimony?

MR. MUSKRAT: Ma'am, I can't say that until after the Committee members decide whether or not they're going to use that testimony because I would be adding to the defaming process if in the event it is defaming.

THE CHAIRMAN: We shall take a break until 11:20.

(Recess.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The meeting will reconvene.

And the panel will involve the womens' division of the Arizona State Penitentiary, Ms. Olivia Broussard,
Ms. Rita Mae Smith, Ms. Mary Munoz, and Ms. Armentha Richardson,
if they would come down front, please and sit at the table?

MR. MORAN: Mr. Chairman, could we clarify whether or not these ladies want to be photographed before anything gets going here?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, I think we need to clarify that.

VOICE: Mr. Chairman, we have releases already from

two of the ladies and those are the only ones we'll film.

1 2 3

4 5

7 8

 MR. DUKE: And could we ask for one other point of clarification?

With regard to the executive session, what we just went through as far as how these are constituted, perhaps Mr. Levis can best direct himself to that, as far as membership and what we might anticipate in the future sessions of that nature, what constitutes a quorum and will it always be the same Commission members or how this is arrived at and also whether or not the two participants from the regional office are there in a chairman and secretarial function or as members of the executive commission session? Committee session?

MR. LEVIS: Mr. Chairman, by statute and by rules and regulations of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, any testimony which may tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person, has to first be heard in closed or executive session.

And the state advisory committee has prepared a flyer explaining that procedure. Basically, if any allegations are made, the person making those allegations, plus the person accused in those allegations, have to face each other in closed session, and if those allegations are substantially refuted they will not be heard in open session, but if those allegations are not refuted, as determined by the state advisory committee and it's counsel,

they will be heard in open session.

At that time, both the person making the allegations plus the person accused, has a right to make statements, submitting anything into the record concerning those allegations, any person accused of any allegations has been notified previously by letters as to the allegations.

MR. DUKE: Then I guess the question would be is what constitutes, as far as membership, an executive session of the state advisory committee?

MR. LEVIS: For membership in an executive session of a state advisory committee, you need members of the state advisory committee, it does not specify by statute or rules and regulations as to the number in closed or executive session.

MR. DUKE: Then we may be having executive session before one state advisory committee member, is that correct? Or seven or whatever?

MR. LEVIS: It is possible, but it is not likely, as indicated by the agenda, there are subcommittees for the individual panels, their names are listed on the agenda, and they do comprise the subcommittee.

Members of the staff of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights do not make up the subcommittee, they are there to advise the subcommittee and take minutes of the closed session.

COTTON FIRE

MR. MORAN: Mr. Chairman, we respectfully request that some sort of a formal statement be issued which reflects the position of the Chair and the Arizona Commission with regard to the makeup of the executive committee, how it's determined as well as who makes that determination and what constitutes a quorum and a fair representation of the Commission as a whole.

MR. LEVIS: Mr. Chairman, if I could get into the issue brought up by Mr. Moran and Mr. Duke, in meetings held by the Arizona State Advisory Committee which were held last night and various times in the last several months, the Committee voted to create subcommittees to hear the various panels, and that agenda which is available indicates those members of the subcommittees.

And it is the members of the subcommittee who have been chosen by the Committee as a whole, to hear testimony concerning those institutions, it is also those subcommittees who are -- have been assigned by the Committee as a whole to hear testimony in closed or executive session.

The, again the rules and regulations are silent as to the number of Committee members necessary to be in a closed or executive session. We've been advised by counsel in Washington that that could be any number of the state advisory committee members as long as they are represented by counsel from the Commission.

MR. MORAN: Mr. Chairman, is it clear, then, that the subcommittee in a particular area of concern, has the full authority to decide whether or not the items at hand are to be heard in the open session or do they, in turn, form — make an evaluation, arrive at a decision and then make a recommendation to the Commission as a whole, which makes that decision?

THE CHAIRMAN: Actually, the authority to hear and to arrive at a decision has been granted by the full Committee to the subcommittee, the thought being that as we allocated resources and as we allocated resources including time and energy, a selected subcommittee more intensively worked in certain areas, there was no attempt for every member of the Committee to be able to conceptionalize the totality of the criminal justice system. But in most cases, become in depth familiar with by visitations, etcetera, and therefore the Committee allocated the responsibility for this decision based upon the judgment in the case of these small panels.

Are there any other questions?

MR. DUKE: Not at this time.

MR. LEVIS: Mr. Chairman, I think there was one other issue relating to the use of television cameraz, and I think it's necessary at this time to see if there are any objections from the witnesses called after they've been

identified by the Chair. THE CHAIRMAN: All right. 2 Ladies, the procedure is for you to state your name, 3 occupation and address, for the record, please. 4 We can begin with Ms. Smith. 5 MS. SMITH: My name is Rita Smith, I'm a prisoner 6 at the Women's Division, Florence, Arizona. THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have any objection to being 8 televised, for the record? 9 MS. SMITH: No, no. 10 THE CHAIRMAN: Ms. Broussard? 11 MS. BROUSSARD: My name is Olivia Broussard, and I'm 12 a prisoner at the Women's Division in Florence, Arizona. 13 MR. DUKE: Mr. Chairman, is there some way we could 14 have them either speak up or is there a microphone they 15 could use? It's very hard to hear on this side of the room. 16 THE CHAIRMAN: Speak into the mic, please. 17 MS. BROUSSARD: Olivia Broussard, and I am a prisoner 18 at the Women's Division in Florence, Arizona. 19 THE CHAIRMAN: The Arizona State Prison? 20 MS. BROUSSARD: Yes. 21 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. 22 Ms. Richardson? 23 I'm sorry, may I ask, do you have any objection, Ms. 24 Richardson, of being televised, filmed or photographed during 25

1	the hearings or testimony recorded for later broadcast?
2	MS. BROUSSARD: No.
3	MS. RICHARDSON: Armentha Doretha (Phonetic)
4	Richardson, Arizona State Prison for Women.
5	THE CHAIRMAN: I'll ask you the same question, Ms.
6	Richardson, if you have any objection to being televised,
7	filmed or photographed during the hearing or your testimony
8	being recorded for later broadcase?
9	MS. RICHARDSON: No.
10	MS. MUNOZ: Mary Munoz, prisoner, I'm a prisoner at
11	the Arizona State Prison, Women's Division, Florence,
12	Arizona.
13	THE CHAIRMAN: And I'll ask you the same question,
14	Ms. Munoz, do you have any objection to being televised,
15	filmed or photographed during the hearing?
16	MS. MUNOZ: No.
17	THE CHAIRMAN: Or testimony being recorded for
18	perhaps later broadcast?
19	MS. MUNOZ: No.
20	THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
21	Are there any questions by any members of the panel,
22	please?
23	REP. McCARTHY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin
24	questioning if I might, and I think in the interest of only
25	one microphone being on the table, with the Madies, I'll

start with Rita Mae Smith and then we can proceed down the 1 table. 2 3 5 RITA MAE SMITH 6 (By Rep. McCarthy.) Do you live in a dormitory 7 style quarters at the institution, is that correct? (By Ms. Smith.) Yes, I do. 9 10 Could you describe the dormitory and about how much space each inmate has? 11 I live in dorm. 1, and our living areas are about 12 13 six-by-three-and-a-half, and this covers room for a twin bed size and they have two beds to each cubicle, which 14 is divided by a closet which makes the space equal on each 15 side. 16 17 And there are about three-and-a-half-foot dividers between each cubicle, that's our sleeping area. 18 Our dormitory size is 24 beds to each wing, 12 19 20 cubicles and our day room size is about 40-by-36 feet. 21 Is there any privacy as far as the dorm. is concerned? 22 No, there is not. As far as sleeping and dressing areas, what we have is just area that I've told you about. 23 24 The other is we have no privacy in our showers, which 25 are very small, I would say about two-by-two.

1 Are you, as inmates, allowed to decorate your own 2 cubicle areas? 3 We are allowed to decorate our own areas as far as 4 hanging doilies or curtains and things on our closets. What about such things as bedspreads? 6 Yes, we are allowed to have bedspreads. 7 Stuffed animals, things of that nature? 8 A Yes. 9 Would you state the position of the women's prison 10 in terms of wearing your own clothes, do you wear uniforms 11 or do you wear your own clothes? 12 Just towards the end of last year -- well, the 13 middle of last year, we were permitted to start wearing our 14 own clothes and we do have our own dothes that are made 15 at the institution or that we can buy or have sent in by 16 our families. 17 Are ladies at the women's prison, do they wear 18 numbers? 19 No, they do not. 20 You stated about the showers, how many times or how 21 often are you allowed to take showers? 22 You're permitted to take a shower any time that you 23 want to, as long as it's -- doesn't interfere with your 24 regular two for one or the job detail that you're on. 25 Do the dormitories have common rooms where inmakes

1 may watch television in the evenings? We have one large day room that accomodates television 2 and other activities, such as card playing, dominoes, 3 checkers, whatever, is all done in one, in the day room that I described to you before, and it's very noisy. 5 6 How do you decide who watches television? 7 Well, it's decided, the inmates decide among themselves, we have one television, and it's one room that 8 accomodates everybody that's in the dorm. which is about, 9 the dorm. will hold 48 women. 10 How many women are in that dorm. gight now, Rita Mae? 11 12 Well, there are about two empty beds on one wing and about three on the other, so I would say about 42, maybe. 13 14 So there's a goodly number of inmates in that dorm. 15 right now? 16 Yes. 17 Do inmates receive any pay for the jobs in the 18 institution? 19 There are some women who are assigned to the prison payroll which is, I think the 18 cents an hour, and these 20 21 are picked either by staff or as they -- as they 22 qualify for the position. 23 What do you -- how would you describe the qualifications 24 for the positions? 25 Well, one of the paying jobs is a cook, you have to know

how to cook to be able to get that job.

And another is laundry, and you have to know pretty much about clothes. Well, not pretty much, but you have to be able to wash clothes and so on to get that paying job.

Q I'd like to ask some questions of Ms. Broussard, if I could, next.

OLIVIA BROUSSARD

Q Ms. Broussard, would you describe the visiting facilities at the institution?

A. (By Ms. Broussard.) Visiting?

Q. Yes.

A Well, there's about maybe six large tables in the visiting area, and there's one big room, and to the left there's another small room and I really don't know what that one's for.

And I say about maybe 30 people might fit in the visiting room at one time.

Q Would you describe the visiting regulations at the women's prison, please?

A On Saturdays, I think it's from 12:00 to 2:00. On Sundays it's from 9:00 till 11:30 and from 12:00 to 2:00. And during the week, I don't know.

	THE RESIDENCE OF THE PROPERTY
1	Q Most of the SAC members have had a chance to visit
2	both the men's and women's prison, the various correctional
3	institutions around the state and I was quite interested
4	in noting at a visit to the women's prison, that you had at
5	least one animal in the common area out there. Does that
6	animal belong to the prison or does that belong to an indi-
7	vidual in there?
8	A There is there were three dogs, there is two there
9	now and they belong to inmates that are there.
10	Q Their own individual pets then?
11	A. Yes.
12	Q Are any other kind of pets permitted?
13	A. No, not that I know of.
14	Q. Okay.
15	Ms. Munoz, I have a couple of questions for you, if
16	I might, and then I'll turn the microphone over to Ms.
17	McCullah.
18	
19	
20	MARY MUNOZ
21	
22	Q How long have you been at the women's division?
23	A. (By Ms. Munoz.) About four months.
24	Q Okay.
25	Do you have any children?

1 A Yes. 2 And how often can your children visit? 3 If they could make it up here they could visit every 4 weekend, but unfortunately my parents live in Yuma and I might see them once every two or three months. 6 Do you feel that increasing of the visiting hours 7 or relaxing the visiting rules or perhaps a furlough program 8 for inmates to visit families, would be helpful, and this 9 specifically to women inmates in their personal lives? 10 A. Yes, I -- I have a lot to say about -- well, not a 11 lot, but about the furloughs, I think it would strengthen, 12 you know, families whereas in other parts you might be 13 falling apart or losing touch, and it would give you a 14 chance to be with your children like with my daughter, the 15 first time she came up here she didn't even recognize or up 16 to Florence she didn't even recognize me and we had only 17 been apart about three months. 18 How old is your daughter? Q. 19 Well, she's only two and a half. 20 You tend to forget --21 Well, it bums your head -- you know, it doesn't make 22 you feel good. 23 I know what you mean. I was in a hospital once, when

mine was only two, and she didn't recognize me when I got

24

25

out, either.

COTTON FIBER

1 I'd turn the Chair over to Ms. McCullah at this 2 point. 3 (syvits, Machiller,) 5 ARMENTHA RICHARDSON 6 7 (By Ms. McCullah.) Ms. Richardson, in an interview 0. 8 with Commission staff you indicated that you are a 9 diabetic, is that correct? 10 (By Ms. Richardson.) Yes, it is. 11 Have medical staff at the prison ever recommended 12 that you have a special diet? 13 Yes. 14 And what sort of a diet? 15 A. Juices, eggs, the best that they have to offer, 16 which is not much, but nevertheless, the best that they do. 17 Do you feel that the lacks in your diet affects your 18 health? 19 Well, I couldn't answer that because I'm not a 20 physician, and I really don't know. 21 I think everyone should have a lot of fresh fruits and 22 fresh vegetables and this we do not have. 23 In a staff interview you also indicated that you 24 have other medical problems? 25 Yes.

1	Q. Have you sought medical attention while at the
2	prison?
3	A. Yes.
4	Q What were the results?
5	A. Well, I've just had a GI about three weeks ago,
6	and they're doing the best they can.
7	Q. I notice in your interview you said you asked for
8	an exploratory test on a cyst on your back?
9	A. Yes.
10	Q. Has anything been done about that to date?
12	A. Well, as I said, I've had x-rays and it just, it
13	didn't show anything, I had a GI but nothing showed up.
14	So it's just still there.
15	Q. Have you ever received any psychiatric care while you
16	were at the prison? In the women's division?
17	A. Well, no, I see her, our head well, I don't know,
18	he's not he doesn't have a Ph.D. In psychiatry, but
19	he's a very trained man for the job, I guess, his name is
20	Sanchez.
21	Q Are you referring to Gilbert Sanchez?
22	A. Right.
23	Q. Then to your knowledge, is there any psychiatric help
24	available to you women inmates?
25	A. Well, as I say, and being all honesty I wouldn't
	know who have a degree and who would not, so I would have to

1 say no, not to my knowledge. You also indicate that you have a job at the insti-3 tution? Yes, I do. Do you know who assigns jobs and how did you get 6 vours? 7 I was assigned when I entered Florence, in 1971, to 8 the laundry. 9 In your opinion, are the working conditions in 10 the laundry safe? 11 Safe? 12 0. Yes. 13 Well, frankly speaking, I think that the laundry 14 needs all new equipment. 15 (By Rep. McCarthy.) I have a couple more questions 16 I'd like to go back to Rita Smith, if I might. 17 Would you explain to us the various activities that 18 are available other than vocational training and academic 19 training that are available to the inmates, please? 20 (By Ms. Smith.) Well, at the present time we are in 21 softball, this is physical education class that's sponsored 22 by CAC, Central Arizona College, and we do have other 23 functions that are just starting to get back into full 24 swing now and that's organization called SIS, which is a 25 selfimprovement society, and there's a Black Heritage club

1 that has just started and a Chicano club. 2 And as far as softball is concerned, do you play 3 just among yourselves or do you play with outside softball teams? 5 Well, since the season is just started right now 6 we're just playing amongst ourselves. But later on teams 7 will be coming in. 8 Do you ever go outside the walls to play softball 9 against other teams? 10 No, we do not. 11 I have been told that you also have a choir there 12 at the prison? 13 Yes, we do. 14 Would you explain about the choir? 15 The choir does have privileges of going out to sing 16 at churches and various projects that are arranged for 17 them to go out and sing to, they put on plays, and it's 18 made up of just girls that like to sing, really. 19 About how many inmates belong to the choir? 20 I think that there are about 12, I think. 21 REP. McCARTHY: Rep. Guerrero would like to ask a 22 question. 23 (By Rep. Guerrero.) There was reference made to 24 vocational training there for the women inmates. What type 25 of vocational training was made available to you people

down there?

- A. (By Ms. Smith.) At the women's division right now we only have one secretarial business school, and that accomodates 12 women. Other than that, there is no vocational training at all.
- Q. Mr. Chairman, Ms. Smith, how many female inmates would you say there are presently at the institution?
 - A. I think about 54.
- Q Mr. Chairman, Ms. Smith, could you tell me the duration of what, how much time does it take to complete one of these courses?
- A. Well, the course is sponsored for, I'm pretty sure that it takes a year to complete the whole course and you have to be near a board date, primarily to be able to attend the school. You have to be within a couple -- six months or a year to it, something like that, there's special qualifications that have to be met before you can attend the school.
- Q Well, then, Mr. Chairman, and Ms. Smith, would you repeat this for me, you say 12 can participate in a year's period and how many inmates did you say there were?
 - A. There are about, I think about 45, 44, 45.
- Q. Do you have any idea, Mr. Chairman, Ms. Smith, do you have any idea what you have to -- how you could qualify to participate? What qualifications do you have to meet

the requirements in order to participate in this program?

A. Well, the first thing that's necessary is you have to want to be a secretary or you have to want to work in some kind of business because the only thing that is offered there is things like shorthand and typing and keypunch and things like that, and you have to want to be a secretary. Which a lot of times doesn't apply to everybody.

So, as far as qualifications go, you would have to just want to be a secretary or be very interested in this line.

Q (By Rep. McCarthy.) I'd like to ask some questions of Ms. Munoz, if I could.

As far as the academic courses that are available there at the women's division. It's my understanding that you have some academic courses as well as vocational courses available, is that true?

A Yes, there's a GED course offered for the girls there that haven't gotten their GED. CAC is offering four classes right now, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Saturday, English, comp. 101, class discussion, world religion and physical education course, anyone can go to these.

Alls they need to do is sign up. A lot of girls out there are working on getting their AA's and have acquired quite a number of classroom hours, as she stated there is also the secretarial voc. school.

	1	Q Would you comment on how the courses are chosen
	2	that Central Arizona College comes in and teaches?
	3	A They send in a selection of what can be offered at the
	4	prison, and the girls list their interest or whatever,
	5	and the ones that the most people would participate in and
	6	go to, they would have.
	7	Q So that the courses that are offered by Central
	8	Arizona College, then, are chosen by the women in the
	9	prison?
	10	A. Yes.
	11	Q Are legal books available to the inmates?
	12	A. I really don't know, I believe there's some over in
	13	the library, but I'm not sure.
	14	Q Is there anyone knowledgeable among the inmates to help
	15	you use them?
	16	A There's one girl there that knows about the law,
	17	and when she has time she, you know, will explain what's
	18	happening and things when we get our papers from courts or
	19	various other places.
	20	Q But she will give you the advice, then, right there
	21	in the yard?
	22	A. When she has time, yes.
	23	Q Is there any inmate council or similar inmate body
	24	at the women's division?
	25	A. No.
1		

1 What do you think of that as an idea? 2 I think it probably would be a good idea, so that 3 people could know what's happening and perhaps have a say 4 in what's happening and see where the administration is coming from on a lot of decisions. 6 What kind of -- if there were such a thing as an 7 inmate council, what kind of responsibilities do you think 8 they ought to have? I really don't know. 10 I guess the director over there could like, you know, 11 on points or whatever, decisions that we could take part 12 in or something. Like have just like a council, you know. 13 Like a student council in school or something like 14 that? 15 A. Yes. 16 To advise the administration as opposed to taking 17 an active role in actually determining policy within the 18 prison? 19 Well, you know, things could -- you know, -- well, 20 I don't know how to put this. I don't know how to answer 21 that, I really don't. 22 REP. McCARTHY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I have no 23 further questions. 24 DR. GLASS: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask a few 25 questions, if I may.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Glass? 2 (By Dr. Glass.) Ms. Munoz, is it? Is there any 3 program at the prison -- first I'd like to ask you this question of all of you, how many -- how many women are alcoholics in the women's division? 6 Do you know? Does anyone know here? 7 And is there any alcoholic treatment program at the 8 womens' prison? 9 (By Ms. Munoz.) AA comes in every Wednesday night 10 and conducts AA meetings and things like that. 11 How many attend those classes? 12 It -- it varies usually about six to 12 sometimes. 13 What about a drug program, do they have any type of 14 a drug program for inmates that have been on hard narcotics, 15 for example? 16 They have a Hope, out of Tucson, Hope Center has a 17 person coming there every Friday to talk to those that 18 want to go. 19 Is there good participation in these programs at 20 the prison? 21 I don't know. I don't go. 22 Ms. Smith, could you elaborate on this a little bit? 23 (By Ms. Smith.) The participation of the women at 24 the Arizona State Prison at times reaches pretty far, I 25 mean at times there are women that participate and at times

1 there are women who do not, they use their own discretion 2 about this. 3 As far as AA goes, there has been large groups of 4 women attend AA and there has been small. As far as the drug program, they're not having too 6 much success right now, but I think that it may pick up. Q. Thank you. DR. GLASS: I think that's all I have, Mr. Chairman. 9 (By Ms. McCullah.) Mr. Chairman, Ms. Richardson, 10 getting back to the extracurricular activities, vocation, 11 recreation, etcetera, as a lifer, do you feel you have 12 access to adequate recreation in arts and crafts or education 13 programs that benefit you and other inmates? 14 (By Ms. Richardson.) No, a lifer is shut out of 15 these things. 16 Well, recreation yes. We can participate. The 17 doors have been opened since Mr. Moran stepped in, lot of the 18 ladies are going out to work, I do see where lifers will 19 go out. I feel like that, a lifer will go out, it's up 20 to the lifer whether, you know, to prove himself, but yes, 21 I do. 22 A similar question too, do you feel the educational 23 opportunities towards you as a lifer are adequate? 24 No, I do not. 25 MS. McCULLAH: Thank you.

	1	Q (By Rep. Guerrero.) One question.
	2	Mr. Chairman, Ms. Richardson, how about your mailing
	3	privileges, what kind of procedure do you go through in
	4	order to mail a letter out of the penitentiary?
	5	A Well, now you can write to anyone, they've passed
	6	a law that you can write so you just write and mail it out.
	7	It's no problem.
	8	Q Mr. Chairman, Ms. Richardson, do you just seal the
	9	envelope and mail it or do you have to present it to some-
1	10	body and they fold it for you and put it in?
1	11	A Well, you fold it and put it in an envelope, no, you
1	12	do not seal it, I understand that the reason that you do
:	13	not seal it is they check it for contraband.
	13	not seal it is they check it for contraband. But you can write to most anyone.
	34	
	14	But you can write to most anyone.
	14	But you can write to most anyone. Q. Thank you.
	14 15 16	But you can write to most anyone. O. Thank you. O. (By Dr. Glass.) Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make one comment on
	14 15 16 17	But you can write to most anyone. Q. Thank you. Q. (By Dr. Glass.) Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make one comment on a question that wasn't carried out too far here, I'd like to find
	14 15 16 17	But you can write to most anyone. On Thank you. On (By Dr. Glass.) Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make one comment on a question that wasn't carried out too far here, I'd like to find out more about it if I may.
	14 15 16 17 18	But you can write to most anyone. O Thank you. O (By Dr. Glass.) Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make one comment on a question that wasn't carried out too far here, I'd like to find out more about it if I may. Ms. Richardson, the point came up a while ago about
	14 15 16 17 18 19	But you can write to most anyone. On Thank you. On (By Dr. Glass.) Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make one comment on a question that wasn't carried out too far here, I'd like to find out more about it if I may. Ms. Richardson, the point came up a while ago about programs for lifers. And I know this is a real problem
	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	But you can write to most anyone. ① Thank you. ② (By Dr. Glass.) Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make one comment on a question that wasn't carried out too far here, I'd like to find out more about it if I may. Ms. Richardson, the point came up a while ago about programs for lifers. And I know this is a real problem in the men's prison too.
	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	But you can write to most anyone. Q. Thank you. Q. (By Dr. Glass.) Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make one comment on a question that wasn't carried out too far here, I'd like to find out more about it if I may. Ms. Richardson, the point came up a while ago about programs for lifers. And I know this is a real problem in the men's prison too. What type of programs do you think would be adequate

1 be considered just like a regular person with her three to 2 five or ten to 15, myself. 3 Well, go out where, I don't understand your point here? Well, now the women's division do have a program 6 set up where the women can go in different varieties, we 7 have some downtown in the courthouse working, we have a 8 9 And we have some out at the children's colony, so I 10 feel like that the lifer should have the same opportunity, 11 yes. 12 DR. GLASS: Thank you. 13 MS. McCULLAH: Mr. Chairman? 14 THE CHAIRMAN: Ms. McCullah? 15 (By Ms. McCullah.) Ms. Richardson, are you paid 16 for the work you do in the laundry? 17 (By Ms. Richardson.) No, I'm or a nonpaying job. 18 Is anyone paid in the laundry? Q. 19 Yes, there are two or three paid in the laundry. 20 Just another question. 21 Since you have been at the institution, have you 22 received regular physical checkups or gyneological 23 examinations? 24 Well, the doctor is free to see you at any time, not 25 only me but any inmate, you're allowed to see the doctor

1 whenever you want to see him. 2 Well, how do you get the doctor to see you if you 3 don't get there? Well, this is what I'm saying, he's there, and the nurse is very good in seeing that you do see the nurse if 6 you want to see the doctor, I mean it's your own fault if you don't see him because he will come. You call him then? 9 No, the nurse does. 10 The nurse calls him? 11 Yes. 12 MS. McCULLAH: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to pursue the 13 further questioning. 14 Ms. Broussard? 15 I'm sorry, Ms. Smith. 16 (By Ms. McCullah.) How would you describe the 17 inmate-staff relationship at the institution? 18 THE CHAIRMAN: Before you answer that, Ms. Smith, 19 I think that as a statement of possible procedure that we 20 need to pursue briefly and we'll have our staff attorney, 21 Mr. Bill Levis, speak to this procedure, please? 22 MR. LEVIS: Mr. Chairman, as we stated earlier in 23 response to Mr. Duke's question, we have had a closed 24 session concerning some allegations from inmates. And 25 there will be questions asked concerning those allegations

since it was the position of the subcommittee that those questions should be asked in open session.

Once the questions are raised, the allegations are brought forth. Any person accused of -- any person defamed, degraded or incriminated by that testimony will have the opportunity to fully respond and also has had the opportunity in closed session and by letter to fully respond.

And that will be conducted immediately after any questions that tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person.

If any information comes out concerning incidents that we were not aware of or did not discuss in closed session, the chairman will warn that person to cease that testimony, but if the Chairman feels that that testimony is of merit, the testimony will first be heard in closed session again, where the person accused will have the chance to refute those allegations again.

If the subcommittee feels it should be heard in open session, they will then be heard in open session.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, do you want to proceed, Ms. McCullah?

MS. McCULLAH: Yes, I'll ask the question again.

Q. (By Ms. McCullah.) Ms. Smith, how would you describe the inmate-staff relationship at the institution?

1 (By Ms. Smith.) The relationship between the in-2 mates and the staff at the institution, I would say that 3 on the whole, the relationship between the inmates and the 4 staff is very good. We don't have quite -- not quite any trouble between staff and inmates. I mean we pretty much 6 relate to each other, as far as that goes, we are treated 7 very well. I mean as far as just treatment by matrons at 8 the institution. Ms. Broussard, -- may I ask the question, Mr. 10 Chairman? 11 Have you been before the disciplinary committee for 12 a rule infraction? 13 (By Ms. Broussard.) Ask that again, please? 14 Have you been before the disciplinary committee for 15 a rule infraction? 16 A Yes. 17 Were you confined to isolation immediately prior to 18 the disciplinary hearing? 19 Well, when you get a writeup they have five days 20 to give you the writeup, and they can have court within any 21 time in those five days. 22 Were you told that this, at the time, part of 23 this time would serve as part of your disciplinary sentence? 24 A. No.

How long were you sentenced to isolation after the

25

1 hearings and were you told when it would start and end? 2 A. I was on every disciplinary report I've had I've 3 spent 15 days and I have had one 30-day confinement to 4 quarters. Were you told when it began and when it ended? It -- well, yes. 7 Have you viewed any action on the part of the disci-8 plinary committee, a member of that committee which you feel racially discriminatory? 10 Yes. 11 Can you give a specific example? 12 Well, I was involved in fighting and so were two A 13 other girls, I was involved with a Chicano chick and the 14 other two girls, one was White and one was Chicano. 15 received 15 days and they received ten. 16 17 Chairman? 18 19 has asked if you would repeat your last statement, Ms. 20 Broussard? 21 I received 15 days for fighting, and the other 22 two chicks received ten. One was White and one was Chicano 23 and I had a hassle with the Chicano chick. 24 (By Ms. McCullah.) Were the disciplinary actions 25 taken by the disciplinary committee, were your sentences even

REP. GUERRERO: Could she repeat that, please, Mr. THE CHAIRMAN: One of the members of the Committee BOULEY, SCHLESINGER, PROFITT AND DICURTI OFFICIAL COURT REPORTERS

1 or equitable, were they the same? 2 No. 3 They were not? No. 4 A. What was the -- what was the disciplinary action 5 towards the other two chicks, as you mentioned? Were they 6 -- the disciplinary days? Well, when you go to disciplinary court, they just regardless if you're guilty or not, they don't look into 9 it, they just give you how much time they feel you should 10 have. 11 Do you feel that your disciplinary action was much 12 Q harsher than the other couple that were in the fight? 13 Yes. 14 THE CHAIRMAN: There's a statement by a staff lawyer? 15 MR. LEVIS: Mr. Chairman, if I could, Ms Broussard, 16 we discussed this allegation in closed session, and you 17 made some statements concerning four disciplinary procedures 18 against you, one in August 10, 1973, August 17, 1973, 19 December 3, 1973, and December 10, 1973. Do you feel that 20 any of the decisions of the disciplinary committee as a result 21 of those rule infractions were racially discriminatory? 22 23 Yes, I do. A. (By Mr. Levis.) All the incidents that I have re-24 25 lated to you by date or only some of them, and why?

	1	A. Just two.
	2	Q. What incidents would they be?
	3	A. I mean three.
	4	Q. Three.
	5	A. The two, the kissing and one fighting.
	6	Q. Could you explain each incident, please, and why
	7	you feel it was racially discriminatory?
	8	A. Well, I received 15 days on all charges, and one
	9	couple received five days, the other received ten days.
	10	And the same couple that was caught kissing received ten
	11	days for fighting and ten days for kissing and I received
	12	15 days on both charges and they were the same.
	13	Q Why do you think that was racially discriminatory?
	14	A. Because they were not Black.
	15	Q Did you and anyone else participate in the incidents
	16	that led to the 15 days isolation?
	17	A. Rita Smith.
	18	Q Rita Smith who's sitting next to you?
	19	A. Yes.
	20	Q And what is the incident of those?
	21	A. The two kissing.
	22	Q That would be the August 10th incident?
	23	A. Yes.
	24	Q. And the rule violation concerning waiting on another
	25	inmate?
1		

1 A Yes.

And it's your allegation that you received longer sentences because you were Black?

- A I feel this, yes.
- Q And the other persons who were sentenced for the same or similar offenses were not Black?
- A. Right.
- Q You mentioned one other incident concerning fighting when you received, you received 15 days isolation. Why do you feel this was racially discriminatory?
- A Well, a fight is a fight, and regardless of where it was, -- well, I put it this way, we're inside, and we had a hassle. And the other two girls were outside and one of them got their blouse ripped and they received ten days.

And the other girl's face was all scratched up, and we were just having a fist fight inside and we received 15 days and they received ten. And I don't feel that that was fair at all.

- Now, were there any articles of personal property or property of the institution that were disrupted, either in the indoor fight or the outdoor fight?
- A Well, we were fighting in a TV area. And when we fell the chairs just moved on out of the way, there was no throwing of the chairs or nothing like that.

1 Is that the only thing that occurred as far as 2 personal property? 3 A Yes. Do you have any knowledge of the outdoor fight? I was on the inside when the fight occurred. 6 But from where they were, they were right outside 7 the dorm. and you can just hear the screaming and yelling 8 but Ms. Smith was there when it occurred. 9 Thank you. Thans. 10 Now, you stated that the persons who received the 11 lesser sentence were not Black. 12 Right. 13 Were the persons with whom you were fighting Black? 14 No, she was a Chicano. 15 And what was the other -- the racial background of 16 the other persons who were fighting? 17 One was Caucasian and one was Chicano. 18 And the kissing incident, who were you -- who was 19 cited along with you in that incident? 20 A. She's Caucasian. 21 And that's Ms. Smith? 22 Yes. A 23 Is that also true with the 30 days loss of privilege, 24 the waiting on another inmate? 25 A Yes.

1		
	Õ	That was with Rita Smith?
2	A.	Yes.
3	Q	Ms. Broussard, are there any individuals who you
4	feel	discriminated against you or do you feel it's
5	again	st the women's division generally?
6	A	No.
7	Q	It's against the women's division generally or against
8	one i	ndividual?
9	A.	How can I put this?
10		Geisenhoff. He's just a whole big problem in
11	Arizo	na State Prison.
12	Q	And who is Geisenhoff?
13	A	He's the assistant director.
14	Q	Mr. Richard Geisenhoff?
15	A.	Yes.
16	Q	Assistant Director to the Women's Division?
17	A.	Yes.
18		
19	Q	Why do you feel that he's a whole problem?
20	A.	He just he has a very nasty attitude among the
21		s especially, and he's just a bully-type person.
22	Q	Did he either cite you for the violations or sit
23	on th	e disciplinary committee that rendered the decisions
24	for e	ach rule violation?
	A.	Yes.
25	Q	He sat on the committee?
1000000		

1	A. Yes.
2	Q In all the incidents which we related today?
3	A. Yes.
4	Q Ms. Smith, you've heard the allegations by Ms.
5	Broussard, concerning the two incidents that you were in-
6	volved in, that was the kissing
7	MR. DUKE: Mr. Chairman, could I register, I don't
8	want to do it in the form of an objection, but just an
9	inquiry, is that as far as you're going to develop those
10	incidents, could I ask Mr. Levis?
11	MR. LEVIS: No, I think we'll get it in more detail
12	with this.
13	MR. DUKE: Well as far as the allegations of Ms.
14	Broussard, is that as far as you intend to go?
15	MR. LEVIS: No, I don't think so.
16	MR. DUKE: Because I think there's some confidential
17	things that should be established here with regard to some
18	fairly general statements she's made, if you'll go into
19	them I'll appreciate it, so we may properly respond.
20	MR. LEVIS: Okay, that will be fine.
21	Ms. Smith, you've heard the allegations by Ms.
22	Broussard concerning the August 10, '73 incident, the
23	kissing incident and the December 3, 1973, incident, in-
24	volving waiting on another inmate. Is it your opinion that
25	these were violations and resulting punishments were racially motivated?

6 7

8

9

10 11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20 21

22

24

23

25

(By Ms. Smith.) No, I do not feel that the sentences in either one of the cases were at all just, I feel that -- there was reasons why that for one thing that I carried her tray to her table and that was main, you know, because she was unable to do it herself.

Could you go into detail on this, in this, is the December 3rd incident, right?

A. Yes.

Ms. Broussard had been involved in a track and field day at the prison, and she had pulled some muscles in her legs, and on the morning of the incident we asked the matron to call the nurse that was supposed to be on call. And they were not able to reach her or her line was busy or something and so we had to go ahead and go to the dining room.

When we went through the line at the dining room, which is the regular serving line set up like smorgasbord, I guess you would say, and I got Ms. Broussard's tray and told her to go ahead and sit down at the table.

Well, as I was going by the kitchen matron, she addressed me and said, Rita, you're getting a lot of food today. And so I said, well, I'm getting it, you know, some for Olivia because she's unable to walk.

And the matron didn't say anything to me about it, she didn't say I couldn't do it, you know, I had explained to her what had happened, so she let me go ahead.

Well, when I reached the end of the food service line there was another matron there who told me that I was being written up for, well, she told me that if I didn't have Olivia go through the line and get the food herself, that she would write me up.

And I told her that I didn't care, you know, that she wasn't the kitchen matron because the kitchen matron who is in charge of that department did not, you know, say anything to me about taking the food.

And so I told her that I would go up and talk to the sergeant that was on duty in the front office about it.

And so we left the dining room after breakfast and went to the dorm, and then the matron that was on duty did get a hold of the nurse and the nurse came and she told Olivia to stay in bed and not to get up and that all her trays were ordered to her cubicle. Therefore, the reason that I didn't feel that it was right was because the nurse knew how severely and sore that she was, and the matron that was on duty at this time did know too.

You know, and she said that she would clarify that before the disciplinary committee, which I guess that she didn't do, because when we went for her for receiving the food and me for taking it to her, we both received 30 days confinement to our quarters.

That's Olivia Broussard and yourself?

1 A. Yes.

Q Was Mr. Geisenhoff involved in this incident in any way?

- A. Yes, he was, he sat on the disciplinary committee.
- And it's my understanding that you were both found guilty for that incident?
 - A. Yes, we were.
 - Q Sentenced to 30 days loss of privileges?
 - A. That's right.

Well, as the rules read, disobeying an order, the way this come about is the disobeying an order goes along with, if a matron tells you to do something and you don't do it, that's disobeying an order, no matter how you feel about it. So, when you go to your disciplinary court, if they say did you disobey an order, you know we don't want to hear no reason behind it we just want to know did you break this rule and if you say yes, then you're guilty.

- Q Do you feel this decision by the disciplinary committee was racially motivated?
 - A. Yes, I do.
- Q Why?
 - A. Because I am Caucasian and Ms Broussard is Black
 I feel that Mr. Geisenhoff really frowns on this kind of
 relationship at all, no matter to what depth that it goes
 into. I mean as far as if we were just friends or whatever.

1 Is that relationship among or with Blacks or among Q. 2 or with Whites or what? 3 I would say -- well, for one thing, he frowns on 4 the whole thing completely, but I would say moreso because 5 it is a Black and White. 6 When you mean whole thing completely, what kind of 7 relationship? 8 A. Well, as far as the relationship, any relationship, 9 if he sees two people that are fairly close or really good 10 friends and stick up for each other in any kind of thing, he, 11 you know, kind of appears to frown on that because, 12 you know, where one is the other one always is. 13 Do you mean a sexual relationship or just a friend? O. 14 That too, any kind. 15 A friendly relationship in addition? 0. 16 The other incidents in which you were involved, con-17 cerning Olivia Broussard, was the August 10th incident re-18 lating to kissing, I wonder if you could explain that 19 incident? 20 Yes, as the writeup read, Ms. Valzuela was coming A 21 down the aisle, she's an officer at the prison and she said 22 that she saw me and Ms. Broussard engaged in a passionate 23 kiss. 24 Now, we were not engaged in a passionate kiss, for 25

one thing, however, I may add, maybe the position that we

were in would appear to have been a kiss from the point that she was standing.

We both received 15 days on this writeup, and at the same time, not more than two weeks prior, or later, two other women were found in the same thing only they were laying on top of each other, in a cubicle, and engaged in a passionate kiss also, and they got ten days.

- Q Do you think the difference was racially motivated?
- A. Yes, I do.
- Q Why is that?
- A. For the same reason on the other one that I answered, I feel that it was racially motivated because I am White and Ms. Broussard is Black, and it's a pretty tight-knit relationship.
- Who were the other individuals sent to isolation
 for a similar incident?
 - A. Do I have to give their names?
 - Q No, if you could just give their ethnic --
 - A. Oh, Mexican and White.
 - And you think that is a sufficient racial distinction?
- A. Yes, I do.

Well, I feel that against -- if you would put to me if you would put a Mexican and a White and a Black and stand him up and say which two are closest together, you'd find the Mexican and the White. I mean in terms of looking at it the

way that I would feel that he would look at it.

Q He being Mr. Geisenhoff?

- A That's right.
- Q Could you explain that more fully? Do you mean that he would prefer one or the other or what do you mean?
- A. Yes, I would say that he would prefer the Chicano and the White to the Negro.
- Q You mean Chicano and the White together to the Black and any other together?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q Why is that, do you have any idea?
- A. I don't know.
- There is one other incident relating to your relationship with Olivia Broussard and that occurred on October 10, 1973, smuggling contraband charge that you were found guilty, do you feel there was any discriminatory basis in this incident?

A. Yes, I do.

For one thing, Ms. Broussard was in isolation, and at the time that I went before the disciplinary board, the disciplinary board was well aware or they had pretty well figured it out, they're supposed to do some kind of workup before they, you know, go into this court or read the report or something. And Mr. Geisenhoff knew or had good reason to know that I was not the one that put the cigarettes and

things in the sandwich to be smuggled to Ms. Broussard.

However, when he asked me who did and I refused to comply, I was given 30 days confinement to my quarters, I mean -- 24 days isolation, excuse me.

Q For two charges?

- A. Yes, two charges stemmed from that and that was smuggling and securing -- no, smuggling and contraband.
- Now, you said Mr. Geisenhoff said something, was this in a disciplinary committee or was it, did he just charge you with a violation?
- Well, he didn't just say anything, but when I went into the disciplinary court he told me, if you didn't do it, you know who did, and I wouldn't, you know, I just said well, you know, if you say I did it, I did it, you know, I wasn't -- if they had done any kind of workup behind these disciplinary court proceedings, they would have, you know, I'm pretty sure they came up because the officer that was on duty herself admitted to me later that she knew that I didn't do it.
- Q Do you feel this incident was racially motivated too?
- A. Yes, I do.
 - Q And why is that?
- A Again for the same reason, because Ms. Broussard is Black and I'm White and I felt that he felt that I was

3

4

6

8 9

10

11

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

24 25 securing favors by doing something for Ms. Broussard that I normally wouldn't have done.

That was also true as far as, I think I mentioned earlier about a visitation that I had that was terminated because, well, the man that had come to see me would sometimes bring a lot of money and he would be flashing and all this, and Mr. Geisenhoff should immediate disapproval of this visit, I did not know, I can not really sit here and say that that was the reason — that he was the reason that this was pulled but I do know that he showed remarkable dislike that I was having a visit, and that the visit was terminated and I was given no reason except for administrational reasons.

- Q You mean visitation was terminated, you mean that particular visitation or the right of that person to visit you in the future?
- A. The right of that person to visit me in the future or correspond with me in any way.
 - Q What is the ethnicity of that person?
 - A. He's Black.
- Q Ms. Broussard, I think there was one other incident involving you in being sentenced to isolation concerning an inmate in August, I think August 17, 1973.

And before we get into details I wondered if you first felt that this incident was racially motivated also, or the

1 decision of the disciplinary committee? 2 A. (By Ms. Broussard.) I couldn't say because a girl 3 went home that she got paroled home, we both received 15 4 days, and within four days she got paroled home and I 5 stayed in isolation for the rest of those 15 days. 6 She was paroled? 7 Yes. A. 8 Now, in all these incidents that both of you have Q. 9 related, is it my understanding that Mr. Geisenhoff sat on 10 the disciplinary committee? 11 On that one I don't think he did. 12 But on the other incidents that you've related, was Q. 13 he on the disciplinary committee? 14 A. Yes. 15 Were all the other members of the disciplinary com-16 mittee the same or did they change from incident to 17 incident? 18 A. Yes. 19 Is that true with you, Ms. Smith? 20 (By Ms. Smith.) A. Yes. 21 MR. MORAN: Mr. Chairman? 22 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, sir. 23 MR. MORAN: Once again I'm at a loss with regard to 24 procedure here. I don't for a minute question the veracity 25 and the sincerity of the statements of the women from the

institution. However, since I think this is, you know, still America and there is a law and whatnot, I feel that as a result of what's been said here and what may be said later on in the hearings, that we are being put in a very unbalanced, unfair and illegal situation in that specific instances are being brought up of which we have no prior knowledge, which we have not been able to research, which has not allowed us to get into the precise details of the kinds of situations that are now being brought up.

We have with us, really only the major supervisory administrator people, we do not have the line staff that would likely have been involved in these precise situations. And as I said in my original presentation, we do not; in fact, have fixed, rigid penalties, that the precise nature of each situation and the individual involved, is a consideration.

So, we don't see how we can proceed under these circumstances if people are going to pull rabbits out of hats and that we're not given fair warning. Even the most difficult of offender prior to going to court, knows what he's to be -- what the allegations are.

We have only generalities again, we have no way to respond, we're not wanting to get into a debate with the inmates, and incidentally, we did not have anything to say about who would come here, we were very free in that regard.

These are in effect, the Commission staff witnesses, I don't think that legally and in fairness and in common sense and with a view toward the human civil rights of my people that we can proceed under such circumstances until we get some kind of a definitive statement on behalf of the Commission as a whole, and particularly with respect to what other matters of a similar nature are likely to be brought up that we can properly prepare for.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think it's important for staff to comment briefly, first of all, on the substantive nature of the question you raised about unbalanced, unfair, and illegal, as it relates to the frames of references and parameters, the areas of understanding that were agreed upon by staff.

Maybe, do you wish to comment?

MR. MUSKRAT: Well, I'd like to comment generally and then I'd like to ask Mr. Levis to comment specifically.

I'm sorry to say I must disagree wholeheartedly with you, Mr. Moran, the people who were going to be, or the people where we had some indication that there was going to be testimony that would defame or degrade them were sent written notices of this. And --

THE CHAIRMAN: At least the people, you mean staff.

MR. MUSKRAT: How long ago was that, Bill?

MR. LEVIS: That was approximately two and a half to

three weeks ago.

MR. MORAN: Yes, I would acknowledge it very clearly.

MR. MUSKRAT: May I finish, please?

MR. MORAN: Do I know they're going to come up with an October 10th incident, October 10th incident, January 20th incident? No, we don't have that kind of detail, it's humanly impossible for anyone who deals in such a number of matters of this type to have responses to that precise a situation immediately at hand.

MR. MUSKRAT: Mr. Moran, this is a meeting of the State Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, and I must insist that it be an orderly meeting. And I must insist that if I have the floor, that you allow me to retain that until after I finish.

Now, the people, the staff wholwe felt there was a possibility was going to be defamed and degraded were sent notices of this testimony, two to three weeks before this hearing. They have appeared with members of the state advisory committee in executive session, and they heard this testimony and were given a chance to respond.

Now, Bill, is it my understanding that Mr. Moran was sent these letters of defame and degrade letter notices too?

MR. LEVIS: Mr. Chairman and Mr. Muskrat, Mr. Moran and the director of the various institutions plus the staff members possibly defamed or degraded were sent these notices

two or three weeks ago with the request for information relating to these charges.

Also approximately two weeks ago, the department of corrections was sent a list of all inmates who would be asked to testify. And it was also given to the department of corrections after we looked at this information, and they were given specific names approximately two weeks ago of the inmates who would testify and I explained to Mr. Moran and his assistant on the phone that they would explain to the inmates would be testifying, also, yesterday, I indicated to the department of corrections those particular inmates.

Also, in closed session, the person possibly defamed had information relating to these particular incidents after they related to, by the persons who have so testified today.

So, I can not see how the department of corrections has not been prepared for this testimony, especially since they responded to the testimony and the particular incidents.

MR. MUSKRAT: Mr. Moran, what we have done is we have gone further than what the law requires us to do in an effort to be fair, not only to you, the department of corrections, but to the staff members who were involved in this.

MR. DUKE: Mr. Chairman, in the interest of decorum,

1 2 3

 could I specify what our objection is and file it, pursuant to your rule 702.6, executive session, on this particular thing?

And again we're talking in terms of generality like we were earlier when we're talking about the formation of the membership of an executive session.

Here it reads....that a brief summary of the information which the Commission has determined may tend to
defame or degrade or incriminate such person shall be
supplied to him.

We have exactly that, in the case which we are presently dealing with, a brief summary, if you could call it that.

With regard to what we've been talking about here, there are allegations that as chairman of the disciplinary committee, Mr. Geisenhoff gave certain immates harsher disciplinary sentences, that is the sum total of brief summary that we have.

Downstairs, during an executive session, for the first time we found and we had specific allegations on specific incidents presented to us, and I refer particularly to things now we're discussing cases which have been in effect tried before the institution's disciplinary committee.

At this time, we are hearing one side of that case.
We had no idea that these particular incidents were going to

be raised so that we could present witnesses who could present the other side of the case, which was presented at that time, and I don't see how anyone can make a fair judgment on the determination made by the hearing officers without hearing both sides of the issue.

That's our specific objection, is to any testimony with regard to cases from the disciplinary committee.

And we would like to have that as a standing objection to any further testimony on the same regard.

MR. LEVIS: Mr. Chairman, if I could briefly respond to Mr. Duke's and Mr. Moran's statements, the allegations that were related in the letter were more than those related by Mr. Duke, but that is not the point.

The point I think that is of most importance is that the staff, possibly defamed and degraded by this testimony, does have an opportunity to present his or her statements, the information was presented to that person in closed session, the inmates were related to staff, as to who would testify concerning possible defame and degrade testimony. Staff has been notified, staff was prepared to respond to those charges in closed session, all procedures provided for in the statutes and rules and regulations of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights have been followed and moreso. And in any other incidents where this could possibly occur staff has been notified along with copies of those letters

to Mr. Moran.

Mr. Moran has been notified, by telephone, in writing, all inmates who would possibly testify, and as far as anything that is not permissible by the regulations or the statutes, the Commission has not done anything that would be in violation of the statutes.

It's our opinion, the opinion of the general counsel's office of the Commission, that the Commission has done more than is provided for under the law, and one thing that must be pointed out is that staff will have the opportunity after the testimony is concluded, to present their side of the story.

Present anything into the record and if anything can not be provided today they will have several weeks, up to 30 days to add anything to the record, to clarify it, and as I understand it, staff is fully prepared to answer those charges.

MR. MORAN: Mr. Chairman, am I to conclude from that that if there are likely, during the continuing course of this hearing, to be specific dates, specific people, specific incidents brought up in this fashion, that the spirit is such here that you won't tell us ahead of time so that we can get working on it tonight?

THE CHAIRMAN: I would think not, Mr. Moran, actually, in the parameters established in terms of our relationship

with the criminal justice system, we try to be rather specific about the questions that would be asked, even though legally and I think we have stuck rather closely to them, we could ask some peripheral-type questions.

We also try to identify those possible questions whereby an individual may be defamed or incriminated or degraded, and also provided an opportunity at the time to be aware of those and to gather the information in order that if it was -- if the questions actually were raised in the open hearing, he'd have an opportunity to respond.

This is why we've been downstairs working through the issues of the possible questions that could defame, etcetera.

So, I would suspect that the relative agreements that we have reached about the way that we would respond and we would interact in these hearings, I would suspect that we're living up to those, and I would suspect that we will continue to live up to those agreements.

MR. MORAN: Mr. Chairman, there may be issues raised, then, that might require us to go in to an executive session so that we can properly prepare. If something is just bombed out there, and we're unprepared, it could very well be that we need time to respond.

MR. LEVIS: Mr. Chairman, could I answer that?
THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

7 8

 MR. LEVIS: As provided for in the rules and regulations and the statutes, and as I think you explained in your opening remarks, if anything comes up at the opening — at the open meeting which is unexpected, which tends to defame, degrade or incriminate anyone, the Chairman must first warn that person to cease in that testimony, and if it continues, to dismiss that person, but if the information so provided by the person, the person's statement has any substance at all, the Chairman must ask the subcommittee responsible for that panel, to go into closed session.

At that time, again, the staff which will possibly be defamed, degraded or incriminated, will have a chance to respond. If at that time the department of corrections feels it needs more time to respond, I think we can deal with that question.

MR. MORAN: What would be the answer to that, please?

MR. LEVIS: If you needed documents --

MR. MORAN: If we needed more time to properly respond.

MR. MUSKRAT: Mr. Moran, I'm certain that if something came up that was unexpected, in this hearing, and you needed more time to respond, I can't speak for the Committee, but I can certainly speak for the staff and it would be our recommendation to the Committee that you be allowed that time to respond.

MR. MORAN: So that matter would be tabled until such

1 time?

MR. MUSKRAT: That matter would be tabled, now that would be my recommendation to the Committee.

MR. MORAN: Thank you.

MR. MUSKRAT: But now, on all of the things that we have sent defame and degrade letters on, all of the anticipated testimony, we intend to -- it would be my recommendation to the Committee that we hear that testimony today if the Committee in executive session finds that that testimony can be supported.

MR. MORAN: We are prepared to discuss anything that was specifically outlined in the letters which I agree were sent to us, but we're not prepared to discuss other things that we're completely unprepared for.

MR. LEVIS: Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. LEVIS: That is also our position and we, of course, feel we've complied with that fully and more than to the letter of the law.

MR. DUKE: We still have our objection standing as to testimony on the -- testimony as to disciplinary court actions?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, we'll make that part of the record, but I've examined a letter here to one of the staff members at the Arizona State Penitentiary, regarding the testimony

1 that has been made, and in my judgment, actually, even 2 though it may have been relatively general, and dates not 3 specifically identified, but all of the questions that 4 have been asked by the ladies appear to me to be in order 5 and certainly legitimate. 6 Therefore, we will continue with the hearing. 7 Are there any other questions that anyone of the 8 Committee has to ask? 9 MR. GOFF: Yes, could I ask a substantive question? 10 THE CHAIRMAN: Certainly. 11 MR. GOFF: Of any member of the panel. 12 How many members are there on the discipline courts? 13 (By Ms. Broussard.) Three. 14 a (By Mr. Goff.) There are three individuals on the 15 court, who make a decision as to what the discipline will 16 be? 17 A. Yes. 18 So this is a joint operation of three individuals? 0. 19 Yes. 20 Secondly, how many Blacks are in the institution at 21 the present time? 22 I think there's 14. 23 There are 14. 24 Ms. Richardson, do you feel that there is a general 25 discriminatory -- racially discriminatory practice in the

1 institution? 2 (By Ms. Richardson.) Beg your pardon, I didn't 3 hear your question. 4 Do you feel there is generally a racial discriminatory 0. 5 practices in the institution, without being specific? 6 A. Well, no, I'll tell you why, I have had, I guess 7 more writeups than anyone there, and to me, now I'm only 8 speaking for myself, I'm 43 and I've always had to fight for 9 my rights, no matter where, inside or out. 10 And in the courts in Florence I fight them very 11 hard, when I go to the disciplinary board. And I have to 12 say that my sentences has been very fair. 13 So you think that the disciplinary board, in your Q. 14 instances, which have meted out disciplinary actions have 15 done it based upon your actions rather than upon the fact 16 that you are Black? 17 A. Black, right. 18 MR. GOFF: Thank you. 19 MR. ZAH: Mr. Chairman. 20 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. 21 MR. ZAH: I have really two questions, make it 22 short and just a point of information. 23 Q. (By Mr. Zah.) What is the maximum penalty for incidents 24 that you have described in your rule books? 25 A. Well, are you speaking to me, sir?

	STATE OF THE PROPERTY OF THE P
1	Q. Yes.
2	A. I have violated just about every one of them, I
3	guess.
4	Q What is it, in terms of days, you know, I think Ms.
5	Broussard was talking about 15 days?
6	A. Well, I had a fight and I did receive 15 days and
7	we were both sisters and we both got 15 days.
8	Q. The next question is, how many Native Americans are
9	at the women's institution?
10	A Well, now, when you say Natives, I don't know how
11	many foreigners we have, to my knowledge, none.
12	THE CHAIRMAN: He means Indians, American Indians.
13	A Oh, I think we have three.
14	MR. ZAH: Thank you.
15	A. And none of them have been to isolation.
16	THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions by
17	members of the Commission?
18	REP. McCARTHY: Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order,
19	are we going to hear from Mr. Geisenhoff now, in rebuttal?
20	THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, I think rather than go to lunch
21	we ought to hear him.
22	REP. McCARTHY: That would be my request.
23	THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ladies, for your testimony.
24	The next item will be the testimony of staff, which
25	includes Ms. Marjorie Ward, Ms. Mercy Johnson, Ms. Linda Blat

1	and Mr. Richard Geisenhoff.
2	MR. DUKE: Mr. Chairman, could we have approximately
3	two minutes just to confer?
4	THE CHAIRMAN: Certainly.
5	MR. DUKE: Not to leave, just briefly confer.
6	THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready, Mr. Duke?
7	MR. DUKE: Yes, we are, I'm sorry.
8	THE CHAIRMAN: May we ask of each of those who will
9	testify to give their name, the address and occupation,
10	please, for the record?
11	MR. DUKE: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, I hate to
12	interrupt, do you have any other need of the four women who
13	just testified? We'd like to feed them.
14	THE CHAIRMAN: Just a minute.
15	MR. LEVIS: Not that I know of.
16	MR. DUKE: We'd like to get them fed, that's all.
17	THE CHAIRMAN: No.
18	MS. JOHNSON: Mercy Johnson, Florence, Arizona.
19	THE CHAIRMAN: And the position you are nurse?
20	MS. JOHNSON: A nurse at the women's division.
21	THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
22	MS. BLATT: Linda Blatt, Correction Officer, Florence,
23	Arizona.
24	MS. WARD: Marjorie Ward, Administrator, women's
25	division.
28.23	

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Arizona State --2 MS. WARD: Arizona State Prison. 3 MR. GEISENHOFF: R.K. Richard Geisenhoff, Assistant 4 Administrator, of women's prison, Florence, Arizona. 5 THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions any Commission 6 member wishes to raise? 7 REP. McCARTHY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to question 8 Mr. Geisenhoff first, if I might, please, about the alle-9 gations that have been raised against him by two of the 10 women inmates. 11 (By Rep. McCarthy.) First of all, Mr. Geisenhoff, 12 would you respond to the executive session that we held 13 downstairs this morning where certain allegations were made, 14 you did present or had some evidence there before you, is 15 that correct? 16 17 18 RICHARD GRISENHOFF 19

20

21

22

23

(By Mr. Geisenhoff.) Rep. McCarthy, I received this letter from the Mountain States Regional Office of the United States Civil Rights Commission on March 5th, and the allegations I would like to read into the record at this time. May I?

24 25

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Levis, before -- I think I can

respond to that.

23.

We do have a copy of the letter that you received and it's my intention to ask you to identify all of these papers that you have submitted to the Civil Rights Commission along with all of the violations and with an asterisk indicating the disciplinary committees upon which you sat and I would ask that all of these are entered into the record as Exhibit Number 6.

Is that all right with Mr. Duke?

MR. DUKE: I would request that certain of those be allowed to be read into the record, this is a public forum and submitting an exhibit, since we do have some public here, we'd like everybody to be informed as to what they are.

And with regard to the allegations it's only a brief paragraph and this isn't because -- we realize you're informed on that, we would just like to be able to put the entire proceedings with regard to Mr. Geisenhoff in perspective, time-wise, as far as the nature and also as to the nature of the allegations.

MR. LEVIS: Mr. Chairman, I think we've gone over this issue sufficiently with Mr. Moran and Mr. Duke before, I don't see any purpose that would be served by getting into the same issue again.

I think we're more concerned with the charges that

۰,٦

5 .

1 were raised by the two inmates and I think that isothe 2 important thing that should be discussed before this 3 Committee. 4 MR. DUKE: We didn't intend to raise this as an 5 objection, but just as part of his response. 6 REP. McCARTHY: Mr. Duke, would it meet with your 7 approval if we asked a series of questions of Mr. Geisenhoff 8 and by his response answer all of the allegations that 9 have been raised? 10 At the same time introducing these various items 11 into the record, and I've been told they're Exhibit 9 12 rather than 6. 13 MR. DUKE: Fine. 14 REP. McCARTHY: Would that meet with your approval? 15 MR. DUKE: All we would request is that all of the 16 allegations of which Mr. Geisenhoff is informed. 17 either through your questions or his reading it, whichever 18 way, he'd like to make a statement of what he came here 19 prepared to defend. 20 REP. McCARTHY: Before we ask some questions, would 21 you like to make a statement --22 MR. DUKE: This is part of it; is developing what he 23 knew about when he came here today. 24 REP. McCARTHY: Well, Mr. Geisenhoff, then, before 25 I begin to ask questions about the allegations leveled by the 1 2 3

4 5 6

two inmates, would you like to make an opening statement?

A. I received this letter from the United States
Civil Rights Commission on March 5, 1973, approximately
nine days ago. The allegations I found to be extremely
general, and I was -- found it very difficult to prepare
a proper defense of these allegations.

In response to the charge that I harass minority inmates I would like to either read or offer or have you read into the record, my letter that I wrote to the Civil Rights Commission.

Would this be all right with you people?

Q (By Rep. McCarthy.) Well, we are going to make that a part of the record anyway, Mr. Geisenhoff, and what I would prefer to do is after you make your opening statement ask you some specific questions regarding those allegations.

MR. DUKE: I would only like to raise one point,
I was informed by Mr. Levis downstairs that with regard
to this particular part of his submissions that there
would be a chance to read it into the record, did I misunderstand you, Bill?

MR. LEVIS: I think the point I was making downstairs is that as part of his response at the closed session, if we had time he was going to read that, but as far as the open session, I think it would be best because of the length of his response, to have Mr. Geisenhoff summarize it briefly

1 and then submit the total document into the record. If that is fine with Mr. Geisenhoff. 2 MR. DUKE: He can summarize it, it may take him a 3 bit of time, there's quite a bit of material there. 4 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Moran? MR. MORAN: Mr. Chairman, admittedly there's con-6 siderable time involved, but all we ask is equal time as the 7 saying goes, and I think Mr. Geisenhoff has put together some things here that are significant to an understanding 9 10 of him as a person and his attitude. 11 THE CHAIRMAN: How many pages is it, Mr. Geisenhoff? 12 It's two and a half. 13 THE CHAIRMAN: Fine, proceed. 14 Okay. 15 This letter was dated March 11, 1974, addressed to the U.S. Civil Rights Commission and --16 DR. GLASS: Pardon me, could you put the microphone 17 up closer? I can't even hear you. 18 It's as follows: "Dear Sirs. This response is in-19 20 tended to negate the allegations that I, one, harass minority inmates and nonminority inmates who are married to or 21 associated with minorities. And two, that as chariman of 22 23 the disciplinary committee, you give such inmates harsher

disciplinary sentences than nonminorities for the same or

24

25

similar offenses.

"These allegations were leveled against me in the letter which I received from the Civil Rights Committee on March 5, 1974. For me to present tangible evidence that I do not harass minority inmates in the time available would be extremely difficult or impossible.

"Therefore, all that I cancido is to state unequivocally that any and all decisions that I have made in the past and will make in the future, regarding inmates or policy, are not intended to discriminate against anyone because of race, religion or national origin.

"Perhaps a brief description of my family's activities will help you in your determinations of the veracity of this first allegation.

"Last year my wife taught a federally funded preschool program for the underprivileged children in Coolidge, Arizona. In her classroom she had children from a wide range of ethnic background, Black, Mexican-American, Native American and White.

"Prior to her teaching in Arizona she taught in Minneapolis in a target area school for nine years. Currently my wife is enrolled in a college level Spanish class for the main purpose of learning enough Spanish to enable her to better communicate with her Mexican-American students and with their parents.

"This is being done in night school at our expense.

1 2 3

3

6

7

8 9

10 11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

21

22

2425

"My oldest daughter, who is a high school student and speaks fluent Spanish, is tutoring a group of children from mixed ethnic backgrounds. She teaches them Spanish for a half-hour every day.

"My youngest daughter's two best friends are Mexican-American.

"Last October we invited a foreign exchange student from Cali, Colombia, to live in our home. Maria is loved and treated the same as one of our own daughters.

"In response to the second allegation, that I give harsher disciplinary sentences to minority inmates and to nonminority inmates who are married to or associate with minorities, I will try to give a brief description as to how the disciplinary process works. In my brief -- in my belief that this explanation will help to negate the second allegation.

"During the course of the day every staff member observes many institutional rules being violated. The vast majority of these infractions are minor in nature and are resolved in an informal manner by simply talking with a particular inmate or inmates involved. The decision as to whether a rule violation will be handled in an informal manner or referred to disciplinary committee, is usually determined by the staff member who observes the incident. If the staff member observing the incident believes that it

is of a serious nature or that the particular inmate has been forewarned and intentionally broke the rule , she will bring formal rule infraction charges against the inmate.

"This report is then referred to the director,"
Ms. Ward. If it is the opinion of Ms. Ward that the situation can best be resolved by informally talking to the inmate herself, she does so. Then Ms. Ward will either give the inmate a verbal or written warning, destroy the report or refer it to the disciplinary committee for formal action.

"The disciplinary committee is made up of three members, one from care and treatment, one from custody and a third member whenever possible from a department other than custody.

"No staff member that was involved in the incident or its investigation may be a member of the disciplinary committee.

"Prior to appearing before the disciplinary committee each inmate is informed of her minimum constitutional rights. After hearing the testimony given by the staff member and the inmate, the committee has both the right and the obligation to dismiss the charges against the inmate if it feels the decision would be appropriate. If the inmate is found guilty by the majority of the committee members, then the particular sanctions are decided by a

majority vote of the committee members.

"The decision of the disciplinary committee is not always final. The prison superintendent also has a right to veto any and all actions taken by the committee. If the inmate feels that justice was not afforded her during the hearing for any reason, or if she feels that the sanctions imposed were too harsh, then she has a right to appeal her case to the appeal officer in Phoenix.

42,00

"If the case is appealed, all notes and tape recordings of the hearing along with a list of the inmate reasons for appeal are referred to this appeals officer. Although the whole procedure might appear to be unwieldy, it was designed to protect the constitutional and civil rights of all inmates and has been approved by Judge Copple of the U.S. District Court.

"No one committee member, including the chairman, has the authority to impose his or her findings or sentence on a particular inmate without the support of at least one other committee member. This eliminates the chance of any one committee member from acting in a capricious and irresponsible manner."

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you want to proceed with your questions?

Q (By Rep. McCarthy.) Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Geisenhoff, would you also read into the record,

the cover letter on the actions taken by the disciplinary committee and then we can talk specifically about the allegations brought.

A. Okay, this letter was dated March 11, 1974, addressed to Mr. William H. Levis, Regional Attorney of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission in Denver.

"Enclosed, as you requested, is a list of all sanctions taken by the disciplinary committee in the women's division since July, 1973. Items marked with an asterisk are decisions in which I was involved. If you have any further questions concerning this matter, please feel free to contact me at the women's division. R.K. Geisenhoff."

Q Thank you, Mr. Geisenhoff.

6.

- A. If I might add, we have one correction to make in the list, it's regarding inmate number 31127, Betty Joe Rogers. The date that she appeared in court was October 17, 1973, she's listed as a Black inmate. There is no asterisk by her name and there should be because I was involved in that decision also.
 - Q. Thank you very much, Mr. Geisenhoff.
 Now to the specific allegations.

Ms. Broussard mentioned that she felt that she was being discriminated against because in a case where she was cited for fighting with a Mexican, and in another incident where a White and a Mexican were involved in a fight,

Ms. Broussard was given 15 days in isolation and in the other incident, the two women were only given ten days in isolation.

She felt that this was discriminatory. Could you reply to that, please?

- A This was the incident regarding the fighting you say?
- Q Yes, sir.
- A. Okay.

First of all, I'd like to say that it's difficult to take any one single case out of context. The sentences imposed by the disciplinary court are based on a number of different things, one of them being prior record.

The situation involving Olivia Broussard and fighting took place in the dormitory in which, if I might just read part of it here, "I stepped into the day room and called to Olivia to be quiet and they stopped. I went to the closet and looked for a game. When I started back to control I saw Olivia Broussard standing over Frances Corancho (Phonetic), they were both shouting and knocking over chairs.

"I hurried into control to call the guards from across the street. Sgt. Craig in first as I got to the phone and she said call the guards. Both inmates stopped fighting and I told Sgt. Craig to take them -- and I got -- excuse me. And told Sgt. Craig to take them to isolation."

Î

The "I" is not me, it's the reporting officer, in this particular case a Ms. Leona Watts.

The other fight that you refer to --

- Q. I believe that was Ms. Jimenez and --
- A. Yes, that's correct.

This was written by Officer, or Sgt. Craig. "At approximately 5:45 p.m. I", Sgt. Craig, "was entering the yard from dorm. 1. I could hear somebody cursing. I checked around the corner of dorm. 1, east wing. Inmate Susan. Timenez and Shirley Smith were physically encountered in a fight. I called to both inmates by name to stop fighting. And both inmates were confined in isolation."

In both cases the inmate pleaded guilty in disciplinary court. And in -- I was the only member that happened to sit in on disciplinary court on both of these two cases, the other two court members were different in both cases.

- Q Mr. Geisenhoff, it was brought up in executive session and I think it's worthy of telling here, beforeathe entire Committee, that there does seem to be a distinction at the women's prison for fighting indoors and fighting outdoors, would you care to --
- A. Not necessarily fighting indoors and outdoors but depending upon how explosive the situation might be.

In the first case, where Olivia Broussard was fighting indoors there were chairs being thrown around many other

1 inmates and it could have resulted in a tragedy if other 2 inmates joined in. 3 Like I say, I myself, did not witness both situations, 4 and I don't know exactly what the situation was in the 5 fight outside. If it was significantly different or not. 6 But at the time that these inmates appeared in court, we felt that it was different enough to warrant 7 8 different sentences in isolation. 9 Here again, the witnesses have the right, the in-10 mates have the right to call witnesses on their behalf, 11 both staff and fellow inmates at their court hearing. 12 Were either of the incidents that have been mentioned 13 here, appealed by the people cited? 14 A. Let's see. 15 On the Broussard's case it was not appealed, and 16 also on the Jimenez and Shirley Smith fight, it was not 17 appealed either. 18 REP. McCARTHY: Mr. Levis, are there any other 19 questions you'd like to ask regarding that incident? 20 MR. LEVIS: Yes. 21 (By Mr. Levis.) Mr. Geisenhoff, could you give us Q. 22 the ethnicity of Shirley Smith and Susan Jimenez? 23 A. Well, Shirley Smith is Caucasian, Susan Jimenez is 24 Mexican-American.

25

Q.

And you were the only staff person involved in both

1	decisions?
2	A. Right.
3	Q. And those are the files of those decisions in front
4	of you?
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. And you stated that for Shirley Smith and Susan
7	Jimenez they were given ten days in isolation?
8	A. That's correct.
9	Q. And for Olivia Broussard and Ms. Corancho, it was
10	15 days in isolation each?
11	A. Yes, that's correct.
12	Q And the incident involving Olivia Broussard and Ms.
13	Corancho, you said occurred inside?
14	A. Yes.
15	Q. To the best of your recollection?
16	A. As I read from the record here, yes.
17	The chairs were, both were shouting and knocking
18	over chairs.
19	Q. Does it indicate whether other people were present?
20	A. No, it doesn't.
21	Q. Now, the incident outside, is there any indication
22	as to whether there were other people around or if anything
23	occurred besides the fighting, or were the persons' clothing
24	torn up as I think Ms. Broussard alluded to?
25	A. No, no mention that clothing was torn, I'm reading off

7 2 3 1 the record on Shirley Smith. 2 It just indicates that they had a fight outside? Q. 3 Ä. Yes. That is the sum total of what it indicates? 5 A. Yes. 6 As in the Copple decision, it just calls for a 7 brief description of the incident, here again the inmates 8 gave testimony at the hearing. 9 And you stated that the reason for the different 10 sentences is because in the estimation of the two disci-11 plinary panels, they were incidents of different degrees? 12 A. I offer that up as one possibility. 13 The other possibility could be the composition of 14 the board members, another possibility could be previous 15 records, prior records within the institution. A number 16 of different possibilities. 17 At that point in time, though, the committee members 18 decided to give 15 days to Broussard in this case and 19 Shirley Smith in --20 For various possible reasons? 21 A. Yes. 22 Because it was brought up and only because it was 23 brought up, : was one of those reasons because of racial 24 differences? 25

A.

Absolutely not.

1 Okay. MR. LEVIS: 2 Rep. McCarthy? 3 REP. McCARTHY: No, I don't have any further 4 questions, you may continue. 5 MR. DUKE: Mr. Levis, could I direct --6 MR. LEVIS: Mr. Duke, do you have any questions 7 relating to this incident? 8 MR. DUKE: Yes, specifically to is this incident and 9 some things directly on point, I believe, I'd just like 10 to clarify a couple of things with a couple of questions. 11 MR. LEVIS: As long as Mr. Duke is identified for 12 the record. 13 MR. DUKE: Mr. Geisenhoff, could you explain what 14 you have before you at this time, the record? 15 A. I have a Xerox copy of the report submitted by the 16 officer. And a one-sentence summation of the sentence 17 imposed. 18 MR. DUKE: Mr. Geisenhoff, when the committee makes 19 a determination on sentence do they have more before them : 20 than what you have now? 21 Yes, we have the records, we have, of course, the Α. 22 testimony that's given at the hearing, too. 23 MR. DUKE: So then, would it be fair to say that 24 because you don't have the rest of the record which was 25 before you, that that's what makes it difficult to determine

1 what the sentence was? 2 A. That's correct. 3 MR. DUKE: You can't refer to priors, etcetera? 4 Right. 5 MR. LEVIS: Mr. Duke, do you have any other ques-6 tions relating to that? 7 MR. DUKE: No, I just wanted to clarify that. There 8 was more before him at the time than there is now. 9 MR. LEVIS: Thank you. 10 (By Mr. Levis.) Mr. Geisenhoff, there was several 11 other incidents which were alluded to by, testified to by 12 Ms. Broussard and Ms. Smith, and one specific incident 13 which both of them were involved, concerns the August 10th 14 rule violation. I think it's a 206, which is immorality, I 15 think, under the old rules, which were in effect at that 16 time? 17 A. Yes. 18 Could you explain the reasoning for the disciplinary 19 decision and whether you served on the disciplinary 20 committee? 21 This is the August 10th, 1973 situation you say? A. 22 Q. Right, right, refers to I think both Elizabeth Brous-23 sard and Rita Mae Smith. 24 A. Okay. 25 Olivia was received at the institution on July 18, 1973.

On or about that date, Ms. Ward had a discussion with Olivia regarding her homosexual behavior. Or history of it. She warned Olivia Broussard or cautioned her that this wouldn't -- that this was not an acceptable form of behavior in the institution.

Q Excuse me, Mr. Geisenhoff, were you present at that discussion or did Ms. Ward relate that to you?

A. I think that I was in the room but I don't remember all the details about it. I may not have been, though,

I -- I'm just not that clear on it.

Q Ms. Ward, iff there are any differences, you just let us know, I'll appreciate it.

MARJORIE WARD

A (By Ms. Ward.) Well, as I remember, most of the time when inmates come in he's usually at the next desk. I couldn't say for sure, but I related to him, even before this came up, exactly what I had stated to Olivia because these type of things do cause problems in the prison.

And before they get involved in it, they should know the consequences so that we're fair with them.

Q. (By Mr. Levis.) Okay, now Mr. Geisenhoff, relating to the August 10th incident?

1 (By Mr. Geisenhoff.) Okay. Approximately two weeks after this, Olivia Broussard 2 was written up for this rule violation of engaging in 3 some immoral behavior, as is described in the rule book as 4 5 immoral behavior. And what was the behavior she was written up for 6 7 and also Rita Mae Smith, is that correct? 8 A. They were kissing, they were engaged in a very 9 passionate kiss, as the report shows. 10 Now, as I understand it, you sat on the disciplinary Q. 11 committee that rules on the violations? That's correct, I did. 12 Α. 13 And what was the result of that committee's decision? Q. 14 Fifteen days isolation. A. 15 Q. For both? 16 For both, yes. 17 And the subject did appeal the decision, and it 18 was denied. 19 Q. Which subject? 20 Olivia Broussard appealed the decision. 21 Q. Rita Mae Smith did not appeal the decision? 22 A. I don't believe she did. 23 It's my recollection, from their testimony, that 24 they said that two other inmates, as I remember the same 25 two inmates we talked about before, Shirley Smith and Susan

1 Jimenez were cited for the same rule violation and re-2 ceived ten days isolation, and you sat, as I understand it, 3 on the disciplinary committee for both? 4 A. Yes. 5 Their infractions? 6 Yes, again. 7 Could you explain the incident which resulted in the 8 violation and if there was a difference in the sentence, 9 why there was a difference in the sentence, to the best 10 of your recollection? 11 Reading from the report, it's very difficult to 12 determine if there was a significant difference. 13 However, like I said earlier, a number of things 14 go into deciding the sentences, composition of the court, 15 for one thing, prior record, prior warnings, a number of 16 different things. 17 And they were given, as I understand it, that is 18 Susan and Jimenez, were given ten days isolation --19 A. That's correct. 20 Q. Where Olivia Broussard and Rita Mae Smith were given 21 15 days for A206, which is immorality? 22 That's correct. A. 23 I think it's also important to point out here that 24 between the time of July, 1973, and to date, I am just 25

estimating now, but I think it would be fair to say that

1 I've sat in on perhaps 250 disciplinary court sessions 2 'so these court sessions tend to run together. And again, 3 just like any superior court judge, it's awfully hard to 4. determine whether a sentence was appropriate or not just 5 by seeing the rule violation and the sentence given. 6 There's much more to a case than just that. 7 As your prior testimony indicated, Shirley Smith is Q. 8 White and Susan Jimenez is a Chicano? 9 A. Yes. 10 Or a Mexican-American? 11 Yes. 12 MR. : LEVIS: Regarding this particular incident; I-13 have no further questions, Mr. Chairman, does Mr. Duke 14 have any questions? 15 MR. DUKE: Just two brief ones. 16 With regard to these proceedings, in fact, there is 17 a provision for prosecution, we'll call it prosecution 18 witnesses to appear, staff witnesses, who witness these 19 incidents to appear? 20 Yes, that's correct. 21 MR. DUKE: And this is another thing that goes into 22 your determination --23 A. Absolutely. 24 MR. DUKE: -- as to the guilt or perhaps the magnitude?

25

A.

That's right.

าเ

74. A.

MR. DUKE: One other point.

*

Under the disciplinary court rules, which as you mentioned earlier, have been approved through the federal court, is there any provision for a particular sentence for a particular violation?

- A. No, there isn't.

 MR. DUKE: Thank you.
- Q (By Mr. Levis.) Mr. Geisenhoff, pertaining to one of Mr. Duke's questions, he stated that the person charged has a right to request that witnesses appear on that person's behalf, is that correct?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q It's my reading from the disciplinary rules, which were admitted into evidence as part of the documents presented by Mr. Moran, that the list of witnesses and I think I'm correct that a summary of their testimony has to be submitted to the disciplinary committee in advance so that the committee can determine whether that information is material to the discussion or to the hearing, is that correct?
 - A. That's correct.
- MR. DUKE: That's more particularly whether or not it's cumulative.
- Q (By Mr. Levis.) I think, if the Chairman will let me for a few minutes, I'd like to read this one sentence from

the Arizona State Prison inmates' records manual, which is in a sense the Copple ruling, is that not correct, Mr. Duke?

MR. DUKE: That's an attachment exhibit to the stipulated judgment in the class action suit, yes, it was drafted by attorneys representing a class of inmates and by staff of corrections and staff from our office, the attorney general's office.

- Q. (By Mr. Levis.) And was approved by Judge Copple?

 MR. DUKE: Correct.
- Q (By Mr. Levis.) It's my understanding that III, Section E6, which is the conduct of disciplinary hearings, states that the number of witnesses to be called and heard shall be at the discretion of the committee in order to prevent cumulative or more irrelevant testimony.

So, the committee has discretionary powers.

MR. DUKE: Correct.

Q. (By Mr. Levis.) Okay.

Olivia Broussard and Rita Mae Smith also discussed several other incidents that they considered to be discriminatory, another one that Olivia Broussard brought up concerned an incident that was heard before the disciplinary committee on August 17, 1973, again relating to immorality, is that not correct?

A. That's correct.

Q. And it's my understanding that again she was given 15 days for this violation, after appealing her initial violation on August 10th?

A. One of the reasons why she was given 15 days is just two days after she appeared in court on the first charge, she was written up again for essentially the same charge.

We didn't put here in isolation at the time, because we were waiting for her appeal to come back, and it was just a matter of two days before she was written up for the same charge again.

- Q. And you claim that is the reason you gave her 15 days, one of the reasons you gave her 15 days isolation in the second case?
 - A. That certainly entered into it, yes.
- Q Now, it's my understanding also that the inmate that she was involved with, Mary Osmund, is that correct?
 - A. That's correct.
- 19 Q. Was also given 15 days?
- 20 A. That's correct.

Q. Now, in the information that you submitted to me at my request, am I correct in stating that the, I think it's approximately four pages or five pages that you submitted, that there are no other similar rule infractions besides the ones which we've discussed, that is A206, immorality?

1 That I have been involved in? A. 2 Right, that you've been involved in since July of 0. 3 1973? 4 As I said earlier, I've been involved in perhaps A. 5 250 disciplinary court cases in both the men's and the 6 women's prison and I couldn't possibly estimate how many 7 of these involve this particular rule. 8 Well, based on a reading of the information you sub-0. 9 mitted to me, it appeared that there's no similar violation 10 to the ones we've discussed .-- than the ones we have dis-11 cussed. 12 A. Let's see, I think this rule violation VI B8 C13 13 concerning -- yes, concerning inmate Sandra Miller and 14 Corky Rojas, a White and a Chicano. And they were given 15 ten days isolation too. 16 Were either of them Black? Was either of them Black? 17 A. No, White and Chicano. 18 Excuse me? Q. 19 White and Chicano. 20 MR. LEVIS: Mr. Duke, do you have any questions con-21 cerning those incidents? 22 MR. DUKE: No. 23 Q. (By Mr. Levis.) The next incident involves both 24 Ms. Broussard and Ms. Smith and it's the December 3, 1973 25

incident, loss of privileges for 30 days, which they talked

about, I wondered if you could respond to their allegations concerning the giving of favors. I think is the allegation?

Or at least one of the allegations.

A. They both pled guilty to the charge or at least

-- excuse me, Broussard pled guilty to the charge and if I'm

not mistaken it was her third time that she had appeared

in court.

Yes. And I am told also that she did not request to go to the nurse to see the nurse before she laid in sick in the dorm. on that particular day.

Anyway, the court sentenced her to loss of privileges for 30 days and she did not wish to appeal the case, she pled guilty and a stipulation was read in that she would be able to go to work, go to meals in the dining room, attend church and attend the Christmas program.

So, essentially, what it meant was that it slowed her up during her off hours.

Q. See, I think there was one more incident, Mr. Geisenhoff, that Ms. Smith discussed, and that was the October 10, 1973, incident, smuggling contraband to Ms. Broussard, as I understand, is that correct?

In which she was found guilty and given two counts of 12 days isolation each for a total of 24 days? And I again wondered if you could respond to their allegations?

A. What was the question now, again, please?

1 On October 10, 1973, Rita Mae Smith appeared before Q. 2 the disciplinary board for rule violations A205 and A222, 3 smuggling contraband into isolation, in to -- it would be 4 Olivia Broussard's isolation cell, she was found quilty 5 and given 12 days isolation for each count, total of 24 6 days. 7 A: That's correct. 8 The items that she was smuggling into isolation 9 was ten Camel cigarettes; two books of matches and one 10 pill, a pink pill. 11 And she was cited for two counts, is that not 12 correct? 13 That's correct. 14 As I understand it they're multiple acts under the Q. 15 Arizona State Prison inmates manual approved by Judge 16 Copple, can be given no more than 12 days in isolation on 17 two or more counts? 18 A. Right. 19 No more than 15 on any single count. 20 MR. LEVIS: Vis... We will get into that tomorrow. 21 Are there any other questions of any other Committee 22 members concerning the allegations? 23 DR. GLASS: Mr. Chairman. 24 Mr. Geisenhoff, it sounds to me like these women

must have pretty bad records in that prison, by all the

25

.

involvement they've been in here.

And I can't see continuing talking about this same thing, I'd like to hear some of the history of these women's past performances as prisoners in your — in your women's prison.

My second question is, I would like to get an answer to what isolation is in the women's prison, I've never seen it, I'dilike to find out what we're talking about?

A. First of all, the description of isolation?

We have, I believe ten isolation cells located in one building, and they are a closed room and they are used for discipline, disciplinary measures.

They have a bed and they have a toilet and a wash basin, staff members visit them very frequently throughout the day. They get the same food as the regular population does, they are allowed showers and exercise three times a week for one hour period. And they're allowed visits, they're allowed to receive mail and send out mail, they're allowed to have reading material.

It's just that they're separated from the population. It gives them an opportunity to, as they put it, get themselves together.

MR. LEVIS: Mr. Chairman, I think that we have sufficiently covered the background of the inmates we've

9⁻

discussed, all the disciplinary actions taken against them since July, 1973. Mr. Geisenhoff briefly went into their backgrounds and I don't think at this time, we need to raise the total history of an inmate's record.

I think we're concerned primarily with allegations raised by the inmates, and any refutation by Mr. Geisenhoff and supporting witnesses concerning those allegations.

DR. GLASS: Well, I happen to be, Mr. Chairman,
I happen to be on this panel and I asked that question, I'd
like to get an answer to it, I feel I'm entitled to it.

THE CHAIRMAN: It's within your franchise to ask that question, actually in view of the fact that you did not attend the closed hearing, we were trying to give Mr. Geisenhoff an opportunity to answer the alleged criticisms that were made by the -- by women from the Arizona Prison and that's why we were trying to follow, particularly in the interest of time, it's within your franchise, if you think it's --

DR. GLASS: Well, I just felt like there's two sides of the story, we've heard one side. I just wondered what the behavior pattern was as inmates in the prison because as I heard Mr. Geisenhoff say a while ago, that there are other things besides the patients' -- prisoners' behavior pattern in the prison has some bearing on the sentencing.

4.

5 6

7

8

10

9

11 12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19 20

21 22

23 24

25

And that's why I was wondering if these women were kind of irritating, keeping the prison in a state of disturbance quite a bit of the time, I was curious to know.

MR. LEVIS: Mr. Chairman, may I just make one comment?

I think that Mr. Geisenhoff has outlined the --Ms. Broussard's behavior since she was admitted to the institution in July, is that correct?

(By Mr. Geisenhoff.) No, we haven't outlined all the behavior, certainly. There are some inmates in the population, like in the -- there's some inmates in the institution that are very similar to people on the streets, you have a certain percentage that try to push their way around with other inmates in the institution.

And these, it is our duty and responsibility to protect all the rights of all the inmates, not just a few.

(By Ms. Ward.) I have one comment, one allegation A. that was made against Mr. Geisenhoff and Mr. Geisenhoff wasn't even around at the time Rita Smith testified that she was refused a visit by a Black.

And the reason being that he was -- he was -- the police were after him, we had gotten a call from the sheriff's office that we were to turn him in immediately and that's why he was removed from her list.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there questions of the Committee of

1 any of the other members of the panel? 2 Or have we satisfied ourselves that Mr. Geisenhoff 3 has had an opportunity to answer questions? 4 MR. LEVIS: Mr. Duke, do you have any questions? 5 I have two questions that relate to this, MR. DUKE: 6 one for Mr. Geisenhoff and one for Ms. Ward. 7 Mr. Geisenhoff, could you tell me how many men are 8 employed in the women's division? 9 (By Mr. Geisenhoff.) I'm the only male. A. 10 MR. DUKE: As the only male, are you called upon to 11 intercede in the more violent types of activities when 12 they occur? 13 A. I would say it was fair to say that in perhaps 95% of 14 the cases where there is violence being displayed by the 15 inmates, I am called. 16 The only time that I won't be called is when I'm not 17 physically on the grounds. 18 MR. DUKE: And a question to Ms. Ward, are you 19 aware or have you had any other complaints of this nature 20 filed with you against Mr. Geisenhoff? * 21 A. (By Ms. Ward.) I have not any complaints, I think 22 the allegations are ridiculous due to the fact before he 23 came I had a writeup in the Phoenix paper which stated that 24 I was prejudiced and when I came here to Arizona they told 25 me that the job attthe prison was a snake pit and that was

> بر دشا

1 before I was ever even interviewed for the position. 2 I didn't know the difference between Black, White 3 or whatever before I came here, but they sure put it to-4 gether now. THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Duke, do you have other questions? 6 Because what we plan to do is take a lunch break 7 for a half-hour and then we will return, there's some 8 questions that we wish to ask of Ms. Ward, Ms. Platt and 9 Ms. Johnson and perhaps some other questions of Mr. 10 Geisenhoff, that may not be directly related to the alle-11 gations. 12 MR. DUKE: I would just like to make one comment to 13 Dr. Glass' question. 14 I believe it is well taken to properly evaluate 15 the quality of the sentencing, I think you have to have all 16 the facts before it that the sentencers had, and time 17 limitations perhaps do not permit bringing this all in. 18 However, we just want to -- want everyone to be 19

aware of the fact that not everything has been presented here.

THE CHAIRMAN: And what you can do is to enter it into the record as an exhibit.

MR. DUKE: We will do so within our 30-day limitation. THE CHAIRMAN: And we are not dismissing the panel, we'll be in session again at 2:30. Thank you very much.

(Noon recess.)

20

21

22

23

24

25