

MCLS NOTES

January 2009

Published by MCLS d/b/a Prisoners Legal Services, 8 Winter Street, 11th Floor, Boston MA 02108-4705. Director: Leslie Walker.

Phones: (617) 482-2773; WATS (800) 882-1413
County prisoner collect: (617) 482-4124
Massachusetts state prisoner calls: *9004#

Strategies For Re-Entry: page 2
Prison Building Boom: page 7

Boston Forum Highlights Long Voyage to Re-Entry

On Tuesday November 18, the End The Odds Coalition sponsored a public forum addressing prisoner re-entry and reintegration at St. Paul's Cathedral on Tremont Street in Boston. The End the Odds Coalition is a group of community activists who are trying to reverse the ascendancy of the philosophy of punishment over that of rehabilitation that was implemented under Gov. William Weld in the early 1990s. The coalition's members, some of whom are ex-prisoners themselves, are trying to help men and women gain a foothold in society following incarceration. They listened to each others' presentations and to former and present corrections officials including Harold Clarke, the present Commissioner.

Some of the voices heard were from behind the walls, in the form of letters from current prisoners read from the podium by Coalition members. A letter from Joseph Wood at Walpole described how his release planning began this past October for a release date

projected for mid-December, despite regulations providing that release planning should begin a year in advance. At the time he wrote his letter, Mr. Wood expected to be homeless and without a health care plan on his release, a result of the lack of mandated adequate release preparation.

Other speakers included Lyndia Downie, who runs the Pine Street Inn, Leslie Walker, the director of MCLS, and Robert Dellelo, who did more than forty years in the Massachusetts system and now works with the American Friends Service Committee. Ms. Downie said that over the past two years the number of ex-prisoners coming into the Inn has increased by almost fifty percent, which she attributed to the current restrictions on employment and housing facing ex-offenders. Leslie Walker criticized the over-classification which continues despite the DOC's 2007 changes to classification, and which results in far too many individuals being released into the community in a high-security state of mind, which is not conducive to successful functioning in free society.

MCLS' speed dial phone number for state prisoners is automatically authorized on all DOC pin cards. The speed dial number is *9004#. The office accepts calls about new matters on Monday afternoons from 1 to 4 (Tuesday, if Monday is a holiday). County prisoners should call (617) 482-4124, collect, during that same time.

Commissioner Clarke said that in the state of Washington, where he was commissioner of correction before coming to Boston Massachusetts, he had statutory authority over the community-based elements of sentences. In Massachusetts those aspects of

sentences are the responsibility of the Parole Board and the Probation Department. That made the design and implementation of a continuum of planning from prison into the community much easier there than it is here. The commissioner suggested that those wishing to facilitate better continuity between prison and community in programming speak to their legislators about centralizing authority over the structuring of sentences. And legislators were scarcely in evidence at the forum, although at least a dozen had been invited. The ship of reform remains barely launched.

Strategies for a Successful Re-Entry Plan

By Robert Dellelo

This was Bobby Dellelo's presentation to the End The Odds Coalition Forum in Boston on November 18. Mr. Dellelo did more than forty years in the Massachusetts system.

There will never be a complete and successful re-entry plan without deep changes in the policies and practices implemented by the Department of Corrections inside the prisons. There will never be a complete and successful plan until all parties with vested interests in a complete and successful plan (stakeholders) are at the table and actively participating in the creation and implementation of that plan.

Further, in order to make change, the commissioner of corrections must understand the history of the present policies and practices, which he inherited. In the spirit of helping the commissioner acquire this knowledge I refer him to the now-infamous "Remarks by Governor William F. Weld, [to] The Attorney General's Summit

on Corrections," delivered on April 27, 1992, at Washington, D.C. The commissioner must understand that the unlawful philosophy enunciated in that document, and subsequently implemented, is what devastated the Massachusetts correctional system and created the present policies and practices. The commissioner should also duly note that in the implementation of this punitive philosophy (Weld: "I'm of the belief that prison should be like a tour through the circles of hell," and that it should, "reintroduce inmates to the joys of busting rocks") the Weld Administration forced out of corrections all staff that believed in the statutorily mandated concepts of rehabilitation in Massachusetts General Laws, chapter 124, Section 1, which sets forth the powers and duties of commissioner of correction. The only people that were allowed to stay were those individuals that were willing to create and support a purely punitive correctional system.

These individuals (your nemeses), commissioner, are your inheritance. Unless you have the wherewithal to replace them with qualified individuals that are trained in, and believe in, rehabilitation and reentry, corrections in Massachusetts will not really be about corrections, but about job security for the few, to the detriment of the prisoners and society at large.

The parties with a vested interest (stakeholders) in a complete and successful reentry plan are the Massachusetts Department of Corrections (including staff and correctional officers), the Massachusetts Parole Board, presently incarcerated offenders, ex-offenders, and the community, both organizations and individuals.

Duties and Responsibilities of Stakeholders

DOC: Reentry begins when a convicted individual enters the correctional system. Exactly what does this mean? Whatever else it should mean, as a bare minimum, it should include the following:

1. Upon entering the system every individual should be classified based upon psychological testing done by qualified psychologists. Including, but not limited to, personality tests, I.Q. test, aptitude tests, and educational level tests. Each such individual should be given a complete physical and mental evaluation identifying any physical and or mental needs of each individual, including substance abuse issues.

2. There should be a Psychological Department that evaluates this information and formulates a plan, designed specifically for every individual, that's conducive to a logical transition through the correctional system and prepares and assists each individual to assume the responsibilities and exercise the rights of a law abiding citizen of the commonwealth.

3. The Psychological Department should be responsible for the formulation and implementation of a system of classification for the specific purpose of developing a rehabilitation program for each prisoner.

4. The Psychological Department should identify lifers and long-termers who would qualify for and benefit from receiving post high school academic or vocational training. After receiving degrees or certifications these qualified individuals would then teach other prisoners. All final testing should be done through and by the Department of Education.

5. All such prisoner-teachers should be paid minimum wages. Other qualified prisoners working in the maintenance of the correctional facilities should be paid minimum wages. Not only would this allow an individual to pay taxes to help defray the cost of their confinement, but it would allow individuals to accumulate sufficient funds to assist their successful reentry into the community.

6. All Massachusetts universities, colleges, and vocational institutions that provide the prison educational and vocational training should be provided financial incentives to defray the costs of such training.

7. The Department of Corrections should hire qualified ex-offenders that have been law abiding citizens for a period of three years, to assist the Psychological Department in creating programs and identifying program needs for successful transition back to the community. And, were appropriate, the Department of Corrections should hire ex-offenders to assist the department in developing training and re-entry policies.

8. The Psychological Department should incorporate community organizations and individuals to assist in the development of, and participate in, programs designed for successful transition back to the community.

9. The experience of ex-offenders who have successfully transitioned back into the community, and the experience of community organizations and individuals who have successfully assisted individuals transitioning back into the community are essential components of any reentry plan. No reentry plan will or could be successful without the direct assistance and participation of these individuals and organizations.

10. The staff and correctional officers should be brought into the reentry process, in that, they have a vested interest in the smooth, orderly, and safe running of the prisons. The properly implemented reentry program, incorporating all individuals and organization with a vested interest will radically reduce violence and chaos throughout the correctional system.

Massachusetts Parole Board

Reentry does not begin when the individual reenters the community, but, in fact, began when the individual entered the correctional system. Exactly what does this mean relative to the Parole Board? Whatever else it should mean, as a bare minimum, it should include the following:

1. The Parole Board should have a greater duty and responsibility than simply determining, if and when, an individual should be paroled, or violated for violating parole. The Parole Board should be responsible for the reentry of all individuals directly back into the community, regardless of whether the individual is paroled or is wrapping up the sentence.

2. The Parole Board should become a Department of Reentry, with fully staffed offices in every Massachusetts correctional facility.

3. It should be the duty and responsibility of the Department of Reentry to start the process of reentry of every individual that has served five or more years at least one year from that individual's projected release date.

4. It should be the duty and responsibility of the Department of Reentry to start the process of reentry of every individual that has served less than five years at least six

months from that individual's projected release date.

5. It is the statutorily mandated duty and responsibility of the Department of Correction to provide every individual sentenced to its custody and care with the necessary programs and tools required to rehabilitate the individual. It should be the duty and responsibility of the Department of Reentry to make sure that that statutorily mandated duty and responsibility of the Department of Correction has been met.

6. The Department of Reentry should be responsible for, though not limited to, assisting individuals in finding housing, jobs, and obtaining the necessary identification papers to obtain driver licenses, Mass. Health, and Social Security, and be responsible for helping the individual obtain necessary documents.

7. The Department of Reentry should hire qualified ex-offenders that have been law abiding citizens for a period of three years, to assist the Department of Reentry in creating programs and identifying program needs for successful transition back to the community.

8. The Department of Reentry should incorporate the assistance of ex-offenders and community organizations and individuals to assist the individuals, not less than 90 days from the individual's projected release date, by bringing them out on escorted furloughs for job interviews, obtaining housing, and acquiring the necessary identification paper and documents needed for successful transition back into the community.

9. It should be the duty and responsibility of the Department of Reentry to negotiate with Housing Authorities and Landlords in the

development of housing for individuals reentering the community.

10. It should be the duty and responsibility of the Department of Reentry to negotiate with the Business Community and Chamber of Commerce in developing jobs, and obtaining the federal bonding for individuals reentering the community.

11. It is the statutorily mandated responsibility of the Department of Corrections to train individuals sentenced to its care and custody, however, it should be the duty and responsibility of the Department of Reentry to obtain jobs for the individuals trained by the Department of Corrections. It should also be the duty and responsibility of the Department of Reentry to "blow the whistle" on the Department of Correction if it is not doing its statutorily mandated duty. The Department of Reentry simply could not do its job if the Department of Corrections does not do its job.

CONCLUSION

Obviously, the devil is in the details, but there simply will be no meaningful, complete, and successful reentry plan without all stakeholders in a meaningful, complete, and successful plan being at the table

Required Reading: A Review of The Monthly Review

By Peter Berkowitz

The July/August 2001 volume of the Monthly Review, entitled *Prisons & Executions - The U.S. Model*, is an excellent analysis of the history and politics behind the U.S. Prison system. The issue contains eleven articles by prisoners, lawyers and

academics that touch on every facet of the prison system, including the increasing incarceration of disabled persons, the use of imprisonment to stifle dissent, women prisoners and political prisoners. I found the first article, "Prisons and Executions-the U.S. Model: A Historical Introduction," particularly interesting.

The history of American prisons can be viewed as the product of two great experiments. The first was the creation of the penitentiary at the end of the eighteenth century, an invention which quickly spread throughout the industrializing countries. The second experiment began in the 1970's and has been confined mainly to the U.S. It consists of massive reliance upon imprisonment for longer and longer periods of time in order to control crime and to contain and control the poorest classes.

Up until the 1780's punishment by incarceration was unknown in Europe or its colonies in North America. Crimes were punished by execution, public torture, mutilation or public embarrassment. Flogging was common. Branding was also practiced, and the stocks were used for lesser crimes. These punishments were reserved almost exclusively for the lower classes, since the rich were usually permitted to pay a fine instead.

The first prisons established as the main means of punishment for crime were in Pennsylvania. They were, oddly enough, created by the Quakers as an alternative to capital and corporal punishment. They were called penitentiaries (from the word penitence), "houses of repentance." Under this system, prisoners were imprisoned for long terms in total solitude, eating, sleeping and laboring in isolation. Talking was not permitted. This model was modified in New York where prisoners slept in separate cells

but worked and ate with other prisoners. Total silence was enforced in this model as well. Over time, the New York prison model became the most popular in the U.S. because of lower costs. But the ideas of isolation (being locked in a cell), labor and surveillance have continued as the basic principles of the prison system for the last two centuries.

The contradictions resulting from the penitentiary system became apparent within a short time. By the 1830's it was recognized that prisons didn't reduce crime but rather encouraged recidivism, and also that imprisonment was reserved largely for the poor and for people of color.

The incarceration rate in the U.S. during the twentieth century remained fairly steady until the 1970's. Then between 1970 and 1999, the incarceration rate rose 500%. It rose to five to eight times the incarceration rate in Europe even though the amount of crime was roughly the same. This was the second part of the great American prison experiment. It had its roots in the dissent of the 1960's against the Jim Crow system in the South and against the Vietnam War. The ruling class saw this dissent as essentially criminal in intent. Then-President Richard Nixon's White House Chief of Staff said, "[President Nixon] emphasized that you have to face the fact that the whole problem is really the blacks. The key is to devise a system that recognizes this while not appearing to." The political elite responded with a call for "law and order." Both Republicans and Democrats supported this call. Crime and dissent were to be controlled by massive imprisonment for longer periods of time. Criminals were to be incapacitated by keeping them in prison and thus driving down the crime (and dissent) rate. More and more money was diverted from social services to the "war on crime." This was

followed by the "war on drugs," which created whole new categories of crime and fell disproportionately on the poor and people of color. Mandatory minimum sentences were imposed.

Today, after almost 40 years of the second great experiment, the U.S. is actually a vast prison camp. It is the world leader in incarcerating people with over 2,200,000 people in jail or prison, approximately 740 prisoners per 100,000 of population. 1 out of every 32 adults is in prison, jail, on parole or probation. Black people comprise approximately 41% of the prison population. There is still no reliable evidence that this experiment in massive incarceration has in any way reduced the crime rate. While U.S. prison numbers are still well short of those associated with some of the great dictatorships of the last century (Stalin's Russia had between six and twelve million prisoners in the Gulags) they are unquestionably at levels incompatible with a democratic society.

Why has our government decided to remove poor people and people of color from society and into prison? I recommend the Monthly Review issue entitled *Prisons & Executions-the U.S. Model* for some of the answers.

Peter Berkowitz is an MCLS staff attorney.

CORI Regulatory Reform

At the beginning of this year, Governor Patrick issued Executive Order 495, easing somewhat the restrictions on hiring people with CORI by state agencies and organizations that contract with state agencies to provide human services. The purpose of this Executive Order was to revamp regressive policies that locked out people with CORIs from working in health

care and human service positions. This month, the Executive Office of Health and Human Services (EOHHS) has released proposed new regulations that implement these changes for public comment. Through ongoing conversations with EOHHS, the Boston Workers' Alliance has successfully secured a "ban the box" proposal in the regulations. This change will remove the criminal record question from initial job application forms, and only allows CORI checks for applicants at the end of the hiring process, after they have been otherwise deemed qualified for the job. This policy will impact over 180,000 positions, and affects thousands of agencies across the state.

There was a public hearing on the proposed regulations on December 22, 2008, at which almost all participants testified in favor of loosening the present restrictions on hiring individuals with CORI by the state and by organizations that contract to provide services to the state. The new regulations are too long to include in MCLS Notes, but they are posted on the MCLS website at <http://www.mcls.net>. MCLS will report on the revised regulations in their final form in the next issue of MCLS Notes.

Overcrowding Snapshot

DOC Population 9/29/2008: 11,510
County Population 9/29/08: 14,061
Total: 25,571

County total includes DOC prisoners in county houses of correction.

Massachusetts Commits to a Half-Billion Dollar Prison and Jail Construction Program

On August 10, 2008, Governor Patrick committed Massachusetts to a prison building boom. This major expansion of lock-up capacity, undertaken as the nation faces general economic collapse, is best appreciated by reprinting verbatim the relevant section of the bond bill, which is Section 2D of Chapter 304 of the Acts of 2008:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR PUBLIC
SAFETY AND SECURITY
Jails and Correctional Facilities

8900-8500. For costs associated with planning and studies, dispositions, acquisition of land and buildings and interests therein by purchase, lease for a term, including any extensions, not to exceed 50 years, gift or other transfer, or by eminent domain under chapter 79 of the General Laws and for the preparation of plans and specifications, repairs, construction, renovations, improvements, asset management and demolition for state and county jails and correctional facilities; provided, that all projects approved for funding under this item by the division of capital asset management and maintenance shall be consistent in priority and need with a corrections' master plan to be developed by the division of capital asset management and maintenance in consultation with the department of correction and the Massachusetts Sheriffs Association, and approved by the secretary of public safety and security and the secretary of administration and finance including, but not limited to, the following projects as provided for therein: a pre-release center and regional lock-up facility in Barnstable

county, capital improvements to facilities in Berkshire and Bristol counties, the relocation of the “E911” communications center and improvements to the facilities in the county of Dukes County, additional capacity in Essex county, additional capacity at the Western Massachusetts Regional Women’s Correctional Center in Hampden county, the replacement of modular facilities in Hampshire county, the construction of additional capacity in Middlesex county, the construction of additional capacity, a storage warehouse, and parking facility improvements in Norfolk county, capital improvements to facilities in Plymouth county, capital improvements to facilities in Suffolk county and the construction of additional capacity in Worcester county; provided further, that projects that are not included in the master plan may be approved for funding by the division of capital asset management and maintenance if the commissioner of capital asset management and maintenance determines that circumstances following the development of the master plan resulted in a compelling need for funding the projects; provided further, that costs payable from this item include, but are not limited to, the costs of engineering and other services essential to these projects rendered by division of capital asset management and maintenance employees or by consultants; and provided further, that amounts expended for division employees may include the salary and salary-related expenses of these employees to the extent that they work on or in support of these projects; provided further, that not less than \$100,000,000 shall be expended for costs associated with planning and studies, preparation of plans and specifications, repairs, construction, renovations, improvements, asset management and demolition and other capital improvements at the Middlesex Sheriff’s office facilities to address severe

and persistent overcrowding and staff training needs and for the costs associated with planning and studies, preparation of plans and specifications, acquisition of land and buildings therein by purchase for construction of a jail facility with adequate capacity in the southern portion of Middlesex county to replace the Middlesex jail in the city of Cambridge.....
\$550,000,000

Dealing With D-Tickets

Many jailhouse lawyers are familiar with the Prisoners Self-Help Litigation Manual, a comprehensive guide to prison law which now unfortunately is out of print. However, one of its co-authors, Daniel Manville, has a new publication: The Disciplinary Self Help Litigation Manual. This is a multi-state guide. Although there is no substitute for being familiar with the Massachusetts DOC disciplinary regulations, this manual provides a state by state discussion of disciplinary procedures in each state as well as the procedural requirements for bringing a challenge to a disciplinary conviction in the courts of that state. The volume comes with a supplement (no extra charge) discussing the effect of the Supreme Court’s 2004 decision in *Muhammad v. Close*, which further refines the complex law regarding the distinction between matters that must be litigated via habeas corpus and those subject to litigation pursuant to 42 USC 1983.

The Disciplinary Self - Help Litigation Manual is available from

Daniel E. Manville, P.C.
P.O. Box 20321
Ferndale, MI 48220

The price is \$34.95 for prisoners (which includes postage) and \$64.95 to non-prisoners.

Prisoners Legal Services / MCLS also provides, at no charge, information packets in both English and Spanish discussing how to handle disciplinary hearings in Massachusetts. Unlike the Disciplinary Self-Help Litigation Manual, the MCLS materials do not provide advice regarding disciplinary proceedings in other states. Prisoners Legal Services / MCLS does not, however, provide direct representation at disciplinary hearings. For direct assistance with d-hearings, contact PLAP, Austin Hall, Harvard Law School, Cambridge, MA 02138; collect calls: (617) 495-3127. Send PLAP a letter asking for help and include a copy of the disciplinary report.

Litigation

Update on Rommel Jones' Case - Damages for Being Held Long Beyond Release Date

The last issue of MCLS Notes reported that the DOC had not settled *Jones v. Commonwealth* despite having admitted that it held Mr. Jones for more than four years after his sentence had expired. The case settled in July for \$100,000, after having been stuck for a while because the DOC insisted that the plaintiff not reveal the settlement amount. Ultimately, DOC dropped that requirement. The settlement amount is the statutory maximum for a negligence action against the Commonwealth. In addition, the DOC sent Mr. Jones a formal letter of apology, and has overhauled its date computation system, after discovering that at least thirteen other prisoners had been

imprisoned beyond their legal discharge dates. The calculation error made in Mr. Jones' case was an old one. Date computation staff failed to run consecutive sentences concurrently during periods when Mr. Jones was out on parole. Mr. Jones intends to use his settlement to help provide for his daughter. The case was handled by MCLS Litigation Director James Pingeon.

Cruz v. Clarke – Challenge to DOC Failure to Apply Crooker Because of Unlawful Dis-Aggregation

In October, MCLS' Litigation Director, Jim Pingeon filed an *amicus* brief in the superior court in another sentence calculation case. The plaintiff is George Cruz, who is being denied credit for time on parole on the first of his two consecutive sentences because the DOC is taking the position that good time associated with that sentence caused it to expire prior to the date he was paroled. The MCLS *amicus* brief argues that application of good time to consecutive sentences in this way to trigger disaggregation violates well-settled case law, statutes, and that it is inconsistent with both the interpretation of the Parole Board in identical cases, and the practice of the DOC where the sentences are to different institutions. The matter is awaiting decision.

SJC Affirms Sheriff's Power to Use GPS Bracelet Program to Combat Overcrowding

This past August the Supreme Judicial Court upheld the Middlesex County Sheriff's long-standing practice of placing sentenced prisoners on home confinement with electronic bracelets. MCLS staff attorney Lauren Petit and MCLS board member Beth Eisenberg contributed to an *amicus* brief to

the case, *Commonwealth v Donohue*. It is unusual for MCLS to weigh in on the side of a sheriff, but the bracelet program in Middlesex has been an important component of that sheriff's strategy for dealing with overcrowding for many years. The case arose after a superior court judge ordered the sheriff to return to the house of correction a prisoner who was on the bracelet program during the latter part of his "committed" term; the Supreme Judicial Court determined that the sheriff has statutory authority, pursuant to G.L. c. 127, secs. 48, 49, and 49A to place suitably screened, sentenced prisoners on a GPS bracelet.

Nelson Rodriguez Estate Sues U. Mass. Correctional Health, Mental Health Staff and DOC Officials

At the beginning of December, MCLS staff attorney Peter Berkowitz filed an action for wrongful death, conscious pain and suffering, and civil rights violations against mental health staff and prison administrators on behalf of the estate of Nelson Rodriguez, a mentally retarded and mentally ill prisoner who hanged himself in Ten-Block at Walpole on the afternoon of December 20, 2005. Mr. Rodriguez had a long and well-documented history of mental illness and specific threats to harm himself, as well as written recommendations that he not be placed in segregation, prior to his suicide. The lawsuit seeks compensatory and punitive damages.

MCLS is involved with litigation brought by the Disability Law Center against the DOC in order to prevent future deaths like that of Mr. Rodriguez. The litigation seeks adequately-sized and properly staffed Residential Treatment Units throughout the DOC at all security levels. That case, *Disability Law Center v. Department of Correction, et al.*, is in federal court.

High In-State Collect Call Rates?

MCLS is considering action to address the high cost of collect telephone calls from county jails and houses of correction. We are interested in hearing from family members and friends of prisoners **who live in Massachusetts** and pay high rates for calls from county facilities. If you receive high collect call charges for in-state calls, please write to MCLS attorney Brad Brockmann at MCLS / Prisoners' Legal Services, 8 Winter Street, Boston, MA 02108, or by email at bbrockmann@mcls.net. Thank you.

MCLS understands that collect charges for calls to **other** states are an even bigger problem for prisoners who must make them. Such interstate calls are being addressed by an administrative proceeding filed in 2003 by the D.C. Prisoners' Project and others which is pending before the Federal Communications Commission, the national agency charged with overseeing and regulating interstate telephone calls. A ruling is unlikely to come before the Obama administration appoints new commissioners in 2009. MCLS is monitoring that proceeding and will put news of any important developments there in this newsletter.

Advocacy Staff at MCLS

MCLS staff changes from time to time. This is the current line-up.

Attorneys: Leslie Walker, (Executive Director), Jim Pingeon, (Litigation Director), Peter Berkowitz, Brad Brockmann, Peter Costanza, Lauren Petit, Bonnie Tenneriello, and Joel Thompson.

Paralegals: Al Troisi (Supervising Paralegal), Alphonse Kamanzi, Amelia Alex, and Inna Fain (Brutality and Civil Rights Project). Ms. Fain replaces Karim Wahid, who is now in law school.

Prison Finance Facts

- The current DOC operating budget is \$542,581,000.
 - DOC is spending \$66 million on programs this year, 12% of its budget. This is up from 3% of its budget in 2004.
 - Staff costs are 68% of the DOC budget.
 - Prisoner medical costs are 19% of the DOC budget, or \$104 million.
-

CRA Addresses a Fraction of The Problem

Eighty to ninety percent of prisoners have a history of substance abuse. This would be between eight and nine thousand DOC prisoners. Yet the Correctional Recovery Academy, the DOC's substance abuse treatment program, has 540 participants and another 518 on its waiting list. There are currently 67 prisoners who have graduated from CRA's first stage and in the second stage Maintenance Program. Three hundred and fourteen prisoners are waiting to get into that second stage.

Wanted: Art Against Prisons

Wisconsin Books to Prisoners is looking for donations of artwork about prison life.

Artwork will be displayed at the end of January 2009 along with posters created for Critical Resistance, a prison abolitionist movement. Please do not send anything that you need returned or which is not copyright free. Also send with any submissions directions as to how you should be identified. Donations of artwork are welcome at other times as well and are used for public education. Submissions can be sent to

Wisconsin Books to Prisoners, Rainbow Bookstore, 426 W. Gilman St., Madison, WI 53703

“Fixing” the Over - Classification Disaster

Percentage of DOC Prisoners in Maximum, Medium and Minimum Security, '03-'07.

	<u>2003</u>	<u>2008</u>
Maximum	17%	16%
Medium	73%	73%
Minimum	10%	11%

Apuntes de MCLS está disponible en español

MCLS Notes is available in Spanish. Please share this information with Spanish-speaking prisoners. Por favor informe a los presos que hablan español. MCLS has also translated many of its information packets into Spanish. También hemos traducido muchos de nuestras hojas informativas, los cuales son disponibles a personas que las piden. They will be provided, where available, to people who request them over the phone or in writing. Aceptamos cartas escritas en español y tambien llamadas.

Massachusetts Correctional Legal Services
Eight Winter Street, 11th Floor
Boston, MA 02108-4705

Non-Profit Organization
U.S. Postage Paid
Boston, MA

Permit No. 58866

Speed Dial phone number for MCLS for state prisoners: *9004#

MCLS has arranged with the DOC for a **toll free speed dial number** that is accessible to all **state** prisoners on the PIN system. **County prisoners must call collect on (617) 482-4124.**

Families and friends of prisoners can also call MCLS for free on 1-800-882-1413 toll free from anywhere in the state. Prisoners who cannot reach us by phone should write to: MCLS / Prisoners Legal Services, Eight Winter St., Boston, MA 02108.

Regular call-in hours are 1:00 to 4:00 on Monday afternoons unless it is an emergency, in which case you can call whenever you can get a phone during business hours (9:00 A.M. to 4:00 P.M., Monday to Friday). On weeks when Monday is a holiday, MCLS accepts calls on Tuesday from 1:00 to 4:00.

En la oficina de MCLS (Servicios Legales para Prisioneros) se habla español. El número directo de MCLS para los presos del DOC es *9004#. Los presos de los condados deben llamar el número (617) 482-4124 (a carga reversada).