1993 QUARTERLY LITIGATION REPORT

SECOND QUARTER

I. HEARINGS OR TRIALS

MID-ATLANTIC REGION

Peterson v. Bogan, Eastern District of Michigan

The plaintiff, and inmate at Milan, filed a <u>Bivens</u> case because the Warden denied the inmate's request to marry a former contract teacher. On February 8, 1993 a summary judgment hearing was held and the court ruled that the Warden acted within his discretion in denying the marriage. No precedent existed for the plaintiff's claim. The court found that the Warden was entitled to qualified immunity and dismissed the case.

Bryant v. Muth, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit

The Bureau appealed a court's ruling that a violation of the inmate's constitutional right of access to the courts may have occurred when staff refused to return legal research which Bryant had recorded on contraband computer diskettes in violation of BOP regulations. The District Court denied qualified immunity for the Bureau employees. On March 30, 1993 the Fourth Circuit heard oral arguments on whether BOP employees are entitled to qualified immunity. The government argued that because the employees followed valid Bureau regulations they were entitled to qualified immunity. A decision is expected this summer.

Shuell v. Dept. of Justice, Eastern District of Michigan

An inmate with a consecutive state life sentence, attempted to block his release from FCI Milan. The inmate sought to extend his federal incarceration by several years by waiving statutory good time credits. In addition, the inmate's attorney was granted an ex parte temporary restraining order. In a hearing held on February 8, 1993, the government successfully argued that the inmate had no liberty interest or other right to be housed or confined by the federal government, and when his federal sentence was determined to be satisfied, he had no right to remain incarcerated. He was placed in the custody of the State of Michigan. The inmate's attorney has appealed to the Sixth Circuit.

United States v. Mercado, Eastern District of Kentucky

Dr. Mercado was accused of accepting a bribe from an FCI Ashland inmate in exchange for expediting the inmate's medical care. The

defendant argued that he thought the money was given as a loan and on March 1, 1993, a federal jury returned a verdict of not guilty.

NORTH CENTRAL REGION

There were no reports of pending trials or hearings received from the institutions within this region.

NORTHEAST REGION

United States v. Smith, Eastern District of New York

In July, 1992 the court sentenced Smith to a three year sentence consecutive with his state term. The court recommended that the defendant be allowed to serve his federal sentence first before being turned over to state custody to complete his pending state sentence. At a hearing, the Bureau argued that it could not comply with the order because the state sentence would continue to run. The court granted the Bureau's motion and ordered Smith returned to state custody. The court held that any consecutive federal sentences do not commence until the prisoner completes service of his state sentence and is delivered to federal custody.

SOUTH CENTRAL REGION

Young v. Meese, Northern District of Florida

A former employee challenged his firing for inappropriate conduct toward another staff member and alleges that his dismissal was based on racial motivations. The trial began on April 6, 1993 and has been completed. A decision has not yet been rendered.

SOUTHEAST REGION

Foley v. Caulfield, et al., Northern District of Florida

In 1990, an inmate whose sentence was nonparolable was improperly released on parole and was returned to custody in 1991. The plaintiff claimed that he should be released from prison because returning him to custody after the erroneous release violated his due process rights. On April 7, 1992, in a motions hearing, the court held that the inmate was not required to exhaust his administrative remedies to obtain relief and ordered the BOP to release him.

Glass v. United States, Northern District of Florida

An inmate at FPC Pensacola requested that the time he spent in St. Petersburg Community Treatment Center in 1991 be credited to his sentence as time served. On January 14, 1993, the court dismissed the case on the merits, holding that pre-sentence and post-sentence inmates are not similarly situated and, therefore, treating them differently does not constitute an equal protection violation.

WESTERN REGION

Martin and San Francisco Chronicle v. Rison et al., U.S. Supreme Court

On March 22, 1993 the Supreme Court denied petition for certiorari filed by Dannie Martin and the San Francisco Chronicle.

United States v. Santiago Central District of California.

An inmate from USP Lompoc was charged with the murder of another inmate. Santiago was tried and convicted of murder on January 12, 1993.

United States v. Deloney, District of Arizona

A staff member was charged with introducing six ounces of marijuana and one ounce of cocaine into FCI Phoenix. A three day trial concluded on March 11, 1993. The staff member pled guilty to a five year bribery felony. The staff member also agreed to debrief and take a polygraph about other staff members who might be introducing contraband to the institution. Sentencing is tentatively set for May, 1993.

United States v. Benson, Central District of California

The government attempted to prosecute an FCI Terminal Island staff member for introducing contraband to the institution. At a hearing, the district court suppressed the confession of the staff member on the grounds that his request for a union representative was tantamount to invoking <u>Miranda</u> protection. The U.S. Attorney dismissed the indictment.

II. SETTLEMENTS AND AWARDS

MID-ATLANTIC REGION

Young v. United States, Eastern District of Kentucky

Decedent, a former FMC Lexington inmate sued under the Federal Tort Claims Act (FTCA) and under <u>Bivens</u> for damages, and alleged that because the BOP failed to perform mandatory physical examinations, her endometrial or uterine cancer was not diagnosed until the disease was terminal. The <u>Bivens</u> defendants were dismissed. Plaintiff died several months after a compassionate release from the BOP. The case was settled with the estate for \$70,000 which included reimbursement of Medicare costs (\$10,000) and attorney's fees.

Meade v. United States, Eastern District of Kentucky

In this FTCA case, inmate Meade alleged that a PA gave her improper contact lens solution, and when problems developed, she was refused medical treatment. Ms. Meade now requires a cornea transplant. During discovery it was realized that the case could not be defended. After consultation with the Warden, the Office of General Counsel and the Medical Director, the case was settled for \$35,000.

NORTHEAST REGION

Santos v. United States, et al., Southern District of New York

This case is a combination FTCA and <u>Bivens</u> case brought by former inmate Ana Santos. The <u>Bivens</u> case names as defendants: Doug Lansing, Former Warden, MCC New York; a former correctional officer (who was denied representation by U.S. Attorney); and a former physician's assistant. Santos alleged that the correctional officer raped her in July, 1987 and that she requested an abortion from the PA in September, 1987. The PA ordered a pregnancy test and allegedly told Santos not to say anything because she could get in trouble. Santos was transferred to FCI Alderson on September 30, 1987, released from custody on March 31, 1988, and had a son on May 3, 1988. The officer admitted having sex with the inmate, but denied it was a rape.

On June 16, 1992, the court denied our motion to dismiss Doug Lansing from the <u>Bivens</u> action. The court held that the complaint alleged a cause of action against Lansing for failing to train staff at MCC New York, failing to adequately supervise staff, and promoting an atmosphere where the violation of inmates' abortion rights could occur. The Court also held that

the constitutional right to an inmates' abortion was clearly established in September, 1987. The court denied the motion to reconsider. The case was settled for \$100,000.

Payton v. United States, Middle District of Pennsylvania

FTCA case filed by inmate for loss of property on a transfer. There was evidence that he had the jewelry in his possession. The case was settled for \$125 to spare litigation costs.

Oliveira v. United States, Middle District of Pennsylvania

FTCA complaint filed by inmate for the loss of 167 postage stamps allegedly lost on a transfer. Judgment was entered against the Bureau for \$48.43, which is the value of the stamps.

Young v. Quinlan, Middle District of Pennsylvania

This <u>Bivens</u> case was remanded to the district court by the Third Circuit. The two claims remanded were (1) the failure to protect Young from sexual assaults in the Special Housing Unit at USP Lewisburg, and (2) deliberate indifference to Young's needs while in a dry cell at USP Lewisburg. These incidents allegedly occurred in June, 1988. The case was settled on the basis of the FTCA count for \$8,000. This amount was based on anticipated costs and inconvenience to the BOP for continued discovery and trial.

SOUTH CENTRAL REGION

Manual v. Thornburgh, Western District of Texas

After a trial in February, the district court found that Manual had been subjected to sex discrimination by male lieutenants at FCI Bastrop during 1984 and 1985. This action will not be appealed. Ms. Manual was awarded \$12,610.27, as back pay, \$22,290.50 in attorney's fees, plus expenses, costs of court, and post-judgment interest in the amount of 3.45% per annum. In addition, Ms. Manual was granted reinstatement effective December 17, 1992. Ms. Manual was reinstated at FCI Bastrop, but has since resigned.

WESTERN REGION

Stewart v. Bureau of Prisons, District of Arizona

Former correctional officer sued alleging racial discrimination by staff at FCI Tucson in 1987. Administrative procedures have been exhausted and the claim was upheld. The Bureau was ordered to reinstate Stewart with back pay totalling \$150,000 and promote him to GS-8. BOP commenced litigation proceedings and the case was settled in March for \$79,000 without reinstatement.

Page 6

LITIGATION - 1993 SECOND QUARTER REPORT

	NUM	нс	FTC	BIV	отн	ANS	PEN	CLD	H/T	SET	AWD
MXR	40	21	6	11	2	35	132	117	4	3	0
NER	67	23	5	26	8	59	254	28	3	3	\$48
SER	45	20	2	15	8	45	N/A	41	0	0	0
NCR	68	33	9	25	1	N/A	572	46	0	0	0
SCR	45	19	5	20	1	32	254	21	9	0	\$34,901
WXR	55	23	7	19	5	52	579	30	9	4	\$22,100
со	10	3	0	5	2	7	108	22	0	0	0
TOT	330	142	34	121	27	230	1899	305	25	10	\$57,049

DEFINITIONS

N/A - Not Available - no method for tracking this information

LOC - Location

NUM - Total Number of Lawsuits Filed in Quarter

HC - Number of Habeas Corpus Actions Filed in Quarter

FTC - Number of FTCA Actions Filed in Quarter

BIV - Number of Bivens Actions Filed in Quarter

OTH - Other Actions Filed in Quarter

- Number of Litigations Reports Completed - Number of Actions Pending

CLD - Number of Actions Closed

H/T - Number of Hearings or Trials (Narrative Analysis Follows)

SET - Number of Settlements (Narrative Analysis Follows)

AWD - Amount of Awards

LITIGATION ANALYSIS

The number of lawsuits filed in the second quarter was slightly less than in the first quarter, with 354 filed in the first quarter and 330 filed in the second quarter. The amount of monetary damages awarded this quarter was significantly less than in the first quarter, with \$253,650 in the first quarter and \$57,049 in this quarter.

1993 QUARTERLY LITIGATION REPORT

THIRD QUARTER

I. HEARINGS AND TRIALS

MID-ATLANTIC REGION

Bryant v. Muth, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit

On May 24, 1993 the Fourth Circuit reversed and remanded this <u>Bivens</u> action to the District Court with instructions to dismiss based upon qualified immunity. The magistrate had ruled that Butner staff may have violated Bryant's right of access to the court when they refused to return legal research which the inmate had placed on contraband computer diskettes in violation of BOP regulations. The District Court accepted the magistrate's recommendation and the appeal on qualified immunity followed.

It was argued on appeal that staff were entitled to qualified immunity as they were following constitutional BOP regulations. The Fourth Circuit, however, took the position that Bryant had no right to any materials placed without authority and in violation of BOP regulations on contraband computer disks. To hold otherwise would allow him to benefit from the fruits of his unauthorized activity. The opinion contains dicta concerning the need to control inmates' access to computers.

Thomas v. Whalen, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit

This case is a complex sentence computation case involving an aggregation of U.S. Code and District of Columbia sentences. The District Court dismissed the petition in August 1992 without prejudice to the petitioner's right to pursue administrative remedies. Petitioner appealed. Oral arguments were held on May 6, 1993, in Richmond, Virginia. Because of the complexity of the computation, it was suggested by the Court that it may choose to remand the case to the District Court with instructions to have the BOP, at the highest administrative level, review and brief the District Court on the petitioner's computation. In anticipation of the remand, this office has retrieved Thomas' complete file and the RISA is recomputing his sentences. He has seven separate periods of incarceration. Thomas is currently in the D.C. Department of Corrections.

NORTH CENTRAL REGION

Bellecourt v. U.S., U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit

Plaintiff appealed the District Court's dismissal of his medical malpractice action. The basis of Plaintiff's appeal is whether a grossly negligent misdiagnosis is a form of deliberate

indifference prohibited by the Eighth Amendment of the United States Constitution, even where a physician states a personal belief that he has followed a reasonable course of treatment. Dr. Wynn, a defendant, was a government contractor. He crossappealed the trial court's conclusion that he was an independent contractor rather than an employee.

The Court of Appeals affirmed the trial court findings that (1) the plaintiff has not proven presentment of an administrative claim, (2) the contract physician was not deliberately indifferent, and (3) the trial court properly dismissed the pendant state action for medical malpractice because the plaintiff failed to file a timely notice of expert review. Dr. Wynn's cross-appeal was dismissed as moot.

NORTHEAST REGION

Bourgeois v. U.S., Middle District of Pennsylvania

USP Lewisburg inmate brought this Federal Tort Claims Act (FTCA) complaint requesting damages for a slip and fall down steps in September 1990. The inmate alleged that he slipped on apple scraps and banana peels left on an outside stairway. The trial was held from April 14-20, 1993 before U.S. Magistrate Judge Blewitt. The court has not yet issued a decision.

U.S. v. Hillstrom, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit

The Third Circuit remanded this sentencing guideline case for additional information concerning the nature of Federal Prison Camp Allenwood. At issue is which sentencing guideline should apply to an escapee from FPC Allenwood: the guideline applicable to walkaways from a community corrections center (CCC) or the guideline applicable to an escapee from a secure facility. The Third Circuit instructed the district court to consider whether FPC Allenwood is sufficiently similar to a CCC in its purpose and in its security and safety considerations. The resentencing hearing in this case has been postponed. In a similar Allenwood escape case the court found that FPC Allenwood was not a facility similar to a CCC. We anticipate that the court will reach a similar conclusion in the https://links.pyc.com/hillstrom case. CCM Ed Hughes and Peter Weld are expected to testify.

U.S. v. Salameh, Southern District of New York

Three of the pretrial detainees indicted for the bombing of the World Trade Center in New York filed motions challenging aspects of their pretrial custody at MCC New York. The detainees challenged their continued placement in administrative detention, and the following conditions of confinement: exercise, clothing, bedding, social phone calls, access to counsel, and inability to worship with fellow Moslems. The court denied the motion and

found the Warden's security concerns of potential retaliation from other inmates to be reasonable. The court also rejected allegations concerning the conditions of confinement.

SOUTH CENTRAL REGION

<u>Jackson v. U.S.</u>, Western District of Texas

The inmate filed this <u>FTCA</u> action alleging staff at FCI Bastrop handcuffed him and forced him to use one crutch to walk to the shower in the Special Housing Unit. Jackson had a leg injury which required that he use the crutches to ambulate. Upon exiting the shower, he slipped and fell. Jackson was treated at a local hospital. Upon his return to the institution, he alleges that four staff members assaulted him while he was in restraints resulting in the loss of use of his lower extremities.

A trial was held May 3-5, at which time the jury returned a verdict in favor of the defendants in the <u>Bivens</u> action. The judge also ruled in favor of the United States in the FTCA action.

Taylor v. U.S., Northern District of Texas

The inmate filed an FTCA action for \$155,000 and alleged destruction of 10,000 pages of legal material and other personal property due to rodent damage and a pipe bursting at USP Terre Haute in the property storage area. After a one day trial on the issue of damages, a judgment in favor of the plaintiff in the amount of \$313.51 was entered on June 14, 1993. We anticipate that the plaintiff will appeal.

SOUTHEAST REGION

Sun v. Delashmit, et al., Northern District of Alabama

An inmate at Talladega claims that he was denied medical care and bathroom privileges on a plane that was in transport between Petersburg and Talladega in 1989. The inmate also alleges that he was subject to excessive use of force. The two day trial began on June 4, 1993 and on June 8, 1993, a verdict for the defendants was announced. On June 14, 1993, the inmate appealed to the Eleventh Circuit.

Lee, et al. v. Thornburgh, Northern District of Georgia

Black employees at USP Atlanta allege discrimination based on race because they were denied promotions. The trial was completed on July 1, 1993. On July 23, 1993, the magistrate's report recommended that judgment be entered in favor of the

defendants, dismissing all claims, and that the plaintiff's bear all costs.

WESTERN REGION

Alexander v. Perrill, District of Arizona

Alexander is a former inmate who prevailed in a habeas action in the District Court in which he claimed he had not received enough foreign jail time credit. The Court granted his habeas request and ordered immediate release. An appeal was not sought because of time considerations. The inmate then filed a <u>Bivens</u> suit against BOP staff. The inmate contends his sentence recalculation resulted in his late release from custody. Credit had been erroneously awarded by an ISM at another institution. To further complicate matters the ISM at this institution is now deceased.

BOP and the U.S. Attorney's Office for District of Arizona filed a motion for summary judgment and qualified immunity for all defendants. All defendants were dismissed with the exception of Warden Bill Perrill and ISM Luis Rivera. We appealed and argued that the Warden and ISM should be granted qualified immunity because only Central Office can grant foreign JTC in conjunction with DOJ Office of International Affairs. Neither the Warden nor the ISM has authority to award foreign jail credit. In a 2-1 decision the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit denied our appeal for qualified immunity for the Warden and ISM.

The case was remanded to USDC in Tucson. Plaintiff seeks \$625,000 in damages. Discovery has been concluded. The AUSA offered to settle with plaintiff for \$30,000 (we were not consulted). DOJ would not authorize a monetary settlement in a Bivens case. Pretrial conference set for August 4, 1993. We anticipate trial this fall.

II. SETTLEMENTS AND AWARDS

MID-ATLANTIC REGION

Gatti v. Tyron, Southern District of Indiana

This case involves an automobile collision between a civilian (Gatti) and a government vehicle operated by Correctional Security Officer Tyron from USP Terre Haute. Mr. Tyron stopped at a stop sign and although he looked in all directions before proceeding into the intersection, his view was obstructed. As he crossed the intersection his government vehicle was struck by the plaintiff, who had the right of way. The government vehicle was totaled and the plaintiff alleges her vehicle was totaled.

Plaintiff's administrative claim requested a sum certain of \$100,000 for personal injury including medical expenses, lost wages, and pain and suffering. Additionally, plaintiff claimed property damage for the vehicle in the amount of \$700, for a total claim of \$100,700. The case was settled for \$10,000.

NORTHEAST REGION

Cardiff Circle Ass'n v. U.S., District of New Jersey

This FTCA complaint was filed as a result of the accidental fire damage to property by FCI Fairton SORT team. On April 15, 1992, the FCI Fairton SORT team was conducting tactical exercises on plaintiff's property without his permission. Plaintiff had given permission to local police to use his property for training exercises. The local police told the FCI Fairton SORT team they could use the property. The SORT team tossed two smoke grenades into a building. These grenades caused the entire building to catch fire. The fire was extinguished, but the building was destroyed. A warning on the smoke grenades stated that the device was for outdoor use only and that it can cause fires. Plaintiff did not accept a \$10,000 settlement offer of his administrative tort claim.

We had admitted liability in the litigation. The only remaining issue was the amount of damages. Plaintiff had sought \$63,500. The case was settled for \$25,000.

Sheptin v. U.S., et al., Western District of Pennsylvania

Inmate Louis Sheptin filed a combined <u>Bivens</u> and FTCA action alleging medical malpractice and deliberative indifference to medical needs at FCI McKean from February 19, 1992 through February 23, 1992.

On February 19, 1992, Sheptin was arrived at FCI McKean. Health Services Administrator Heath performed the medical screening on Sheptin, but failed to fill out the required screening form. Heath said he gave his notes to Physician's Assistant Calvo. Sheptin alleged he told Heath, Calvo, and other medical staff on rounds in the Special Housing Unit repeatedly that he was on medication (Dilantin) for a seizure disorder and that he needed his medication. Medical records confirm this. Calvo confirmed that Sheptin requested his medication, but Calvo said that he could not find the inmate's medical file. The medical file for Sheptin was in the "writ hold" section of the medical records On February 23, 1992, Sheptin had a grand mal seizure and was taken to an outside hospital. Sheptin alleged that as a result of this seizure, he fell and injured his head and Later examinations (including x-rays) showed no evidence of permanent injury. An internal investigation

concluded that medical staff were negligent in not obtaining the medical file and in not providing Sheptin his medication.

Sheptin agreed to accept \$3500 in full settlement of this litigation (FTCA and <u>Bivens</u>). A special assessment of \$500 will be offset from this amount.

Smith v. Lam, Southern District of New York

John Smith, a Witness Security inmate at FCI Otisville, filed this <u>Bivens</u> action alleging staff member Lam was deliberately indifferent to his safety at work. On January 11, 1991, Inmate Smith sewed through his finger while working at a sewing machine in the UNICOR Glove factory in the Witsec Unit.

Lam executed a June 9, 1992 declaration, in which he claimed that when the new sewing machines arrived at FCI Otisville, he personally placed the safety guards on the machines. Lam later admitted that he lied in his declaration and that he knew that the safety guards were not installed upon the machine Smith was working on and that he did not install safety guards on the machines when received at FCI Otisville.

The United States continued to represent Lam because important interests had to be protected in this litigation; information concerning the Witsec inmate had to be kept secure and there was potential for bad precedent on work related issues. The inmate agreed to settle the case for \$100.00, that was paid by Lam. No disciplinary action was taken against the employee.

III. CASES OF INTEREST

MID-ATLANTIC REGION

Alaouieh v. U.S., Eastern District of Michigan

This FTCA case involves the alleged misdiagnosis of herpetic infection of a cornea while inmate Alaouieh was at FCI Milan and alleged continuing substandard treatment at MCC Chicago and FCI Sandstone. We have received expert evaluation of the case from a number of ophthalmologists who all confirm there was a delay in providing treatment and there is some indication of cornea scarring. However, objective vision impairment is much less than that reported by plaintiff. The AUSA made a settlement offer under Rule 68 in the amount of \$5,000 which the plaintiff refused. Trial is scheduled for October 4, 1993.

SOUTHEAST REGION

<u>Green v. Department of Justice, et al.</u>, Northern District of Alabama

An inmate at Talladega claims a violation of the Eighth Amendment because he was housed with Cuban detainees and taken hostage during the August 1991 disturbance. On May 11, 1993, the court issued an order granting summary judgment on behalf of the government. The court held that FCI Talladega staff were not wantonly or callously indifferent to potential danger when they placed an American inmate in administrative detention with Cuban Detainees in Alpha Unit.

WESTERN REGION

U.S. v. George, Southern District of California

A pretrial detainee awaiting trial on federal felon in possession of a firearm charges was writted from custody by San Diego District Attorney for trial on minor state charges. After appearing in state Superior Court on June 2, 1992 the inmate assaulted a Deputy Sheriff, took her revolver, and escaped. As he fled, the inmate stopped a car and shot and killed the driver. He was recaptured on October 5, 1992.

George has three federal charges pending. Felon in possession of a firearm (original federal charge), escape from federal custody (June 2, 1992), and felon in possession of a firearm (recapture October 5, 1992). George was tried and convicted of all three charges in June. Sentencing is set for September. George faces 3 state charges from the events of June 2, 1992. Assaulting a law enforcement officer, escape, and capital murder. State trial for assault/escape/murder is continued to February 1994.

Family of murder victim has filed a \$2,000,000 FTCA claim against BOP, USMS, and San Diego Sheriffs Office for negligence resulting in escape and murder.

Wilmer v. Meyers, Northern District of California

This is a <u>Bivens</u> case against staff members at FCI Dublin. The inmate refused to be strip searched before placement in SHU pending investigation. Wilmer overpowered the two female Correctional Officers (CO) who were attempting the strip search. The Lieutenant and another CO restrained Wilmer while the female CO's wrapped her in a sheet and conducted the strip search. The inmate demands \$750,000 in damages and the case is scheduled for trial on September 20, 1993.

Date of request: 07/16/93 Summary Period: 22Mar93 thru 20Jun93

Number of Months Found: 3

ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES TRACKING DATA

REGIONAL OFFICE APPEALS FOR: Western Region

stitution Security Level: N/A Region: WXR

TOTAL Number of Inmates: 13407

Inmates in Population (excluding holdovers and in-transits): 12740 Inmates in Holdover Status: 667

291 Filed During Period: Pending at End of Period: 60 Answered During Period: 304 292 (96.1%) Overdue:

Average Time for Response: 19.47 days

		RI	EMEDI	ES INITI	ATED			* *	REMEDIE	S RES	OLVED
SUBJECT BREAKDOWN	Pe	umber & ercent ubmitted	P	umber & ercent ejected	P	umber & ercent iled	•	* N * P	umber & ercent nswered	P	umber & ercent ranted
Classificatn	37	9.9%	3	9.6%	29	10.0%	*	27	8.9%		7.4%
Non-mail Com	2	0.5%	0		2			2		ō	
Comm Prams	22	5.9%	6	7.2%	16	5 .5 %	*	10		1	10.0%
Staff	40	10.7%	14	16.9%	26	8.9%	*	26	8.6%	ī	
Control Unit	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	*	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
DHO Appeals	133	35.6%	25	30.1%	108	37.1%	*	126	41.4%	7	5.6%
F atn/Rec	3	0.8%	0	0.0%	3			3	1.0%	0	0.0%
	1	0.3%	0	0.0%	1	0.3%	*	1	0.3%	0	0.0%
Ast Operatn	10	2.7%	2		8		*	7	2.3%	1	14.3%
Inst Program	3	0.8%	0	0 .0%	3		*	2	0.7%	0	0.0%
Legal	8	2.1%	3	3.6%	5		*	8	2.6%	0	0.0%
Mail	3	0.8%	0	0.0%	3	1.0%	*	2	0.7%	1	50.0%
ch/Restrnt	2	0.5%	0	0.0%	2	0.7%	*	4	1.3%	0	0.0%
Spec Housing	14	3.7%	5	6 .0%	9	3.1%	*	10	3.3%	1	10.0%
Transfer	12	3.2%	5	ó.0%	7	2	*	6	2.6%	1	12.5%
UDC Actions	3 3	8.8%	6	7.2%	27		*	25	8.2%	6	24.0%
Visiting	10	2.7%	1	1.2%	9		*	9	3.0%	1	11.1%
Work Assign	9	2.4%	0	0.0%	9	3.1%	*	9	3.0%	1	11.1%
Dental Care	2	0.5%	1	1.2%	1	0.3%	*	1	0.3%	0	0.0%
Forced Med	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	*	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Medical	11	2.9%	4	4.8%	7	2.4%	*	9	3.0%	0	0.0%
Mental Hlth	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0		*	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Jail Time	13	3.5%	2	2.4%	11	3.8%	*	9	3.0%	0	0.0%
Records	3	0.8%	1	1.2%	2		*	2	0.7%	0	0.0%
Sentence Com	3	0.8%	0	0.0%	3	1.0%	* *	4	1.3%	0	0.0%
TOTALS:		100.0%	83	100.0%	291	100.0%	*	304	100.0%	23	N/A
% of Submitted		100.0%		22.2%		77.8%			_		
% of Answered	:						*		100.0%		7.6%
Reason for Re	jecti	on:				-					
Untimely	_		5 (6.0%)	M1	cong lev	re⊥			23(
informal n	resol	ution	1(1.2%)		-submit	;			0(0.0%)
chments			13(15.7%)	Ot	her	_			2(2.4%)
R_/SSS 7/16/	/1993	9:20 BO	P-0			page:	6	ot 6			

ate or request: 07/16/93 Summary Period: 22Mar93 thru 20Jun93

Number of Months Found: 3

ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES TRACKING DATA REGIONAL OFFICE APPEALS FOR: South Central Region . . .

nstitution Security Level: N/A Region: SCR

L Number of Inmates: 16642 Anmates in Population (excluding holdovers and in-transits): 16034 Inmates in Holdover Status:

iled During Period: 240
nswered During Period: 233
nswered On Time: 233 (100.0%) Pending at End of Period: Overdue: 0

.verage Time for Response: 22.35 days

		R	EMEDI	ES INITI	ATED			*	REMEDIE	S RES	OLVED
SUBJECT BREAKDOWN	P	umber & ercent ubmitted	P	umber & ercent ejected	P	umber & ercent iled		* 1 * I	Number & Percent Answered	P	umber & ercent ranted
lassificatn	30	€.2%	9	10.3%	21	8.8%	*	24	10.3%		8.3%
on-mail Com	2	0.6%	ō	0.0%	2			2		ō	
omm Proms	14	4.3%	3	3.4%	11			10		ō	
taff	36	11.0%	21	24.1%	15			17		ŏ	
ontrol Unit	0	0.0%	0		0	_		(Ö	
HO Appeals	80	24.5%	8	9.2%	72			74		7	
tn/Rec	0	0.0%	Ö	0.0%	0			C		Ó	
	1	0.3%	ĺ	1.1%	Ö	_		Ċ		ŏ	
nsc Operatn	9	2.8%	5	5.7%	4	1.7%		3		Ö	0.0%
nst Program	10	3.1%	3	3.4%	7			g		ŏ	0.0%
egal	5	1.5%	ī	1.1%	4	1.7%		3		Ö	0.0%
ia	4	1.2%	ī	1.1%	3	1.3%		3		Ö	0.0%
ren/Restrnt	1	0.3%	ō	0.0%	ī	0.4%		1		Ö	0.0%
pec Housing	5	1.5%	2	2.3%	3	1.3%	*	4		Ō	0.0%
ransfer	3 3	10.1%	10	11.5%	23	9.6%	*	21	9.0%	3	14.3%
DC Actions	24	7.3%	7	8.0%	17	7.1%	*	16		4	25.0%
isiting	5	1.5%	3	3.4%	2	0.8%	*	2		Ō	0.0%
ork Assign	14	4.3%	ĺ	1.1%	13	5.4%	*	11		0	0.0%
ental Care	3	0.9%	1	1.1%	2	0.8%	*	1	0.4%	0	0.0%
orced Med	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	*	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
edical	23	7.0%	7	8.0%	16	6.7%	*	14	6.0%	4	28.6%
ental Hlth	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	*	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
ail Time	11	3.4%	1	1.1%	10	4.2%	*	6	2.6%	0	0.0%
ecords	6	1.8%	Ō	0.0%	6	2.5%	*	4		1	25.0%
entence Com	11	3.4%	3	3.4%	8	3.3%	* *	6	2.6%	0	0.0%
OTALS:		100.0%	87	100.0%	240	100.0%		233	100.0%	21	N/A
of Submitted		100.0%		26.6%		73.4%	*		100 08		0.08
of Answered:							*		100.0%		9.0%
eason for Rej	jecti	on:					7			051	01 00 \
Untimely			12(13.8%)		ong lev				27(,
'nformal r	esol	ution	2(2.3%)		-submit	-			0(0.0%)
chments			7(8.0%)	Ot	her				22(25.3%)
I/SSS 7/16/	1993	9:20 BO	P- 0			page:	5	of 6			

OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL QUARTERLY REPORT THIRD QUARTER 1993

ADMINISTRATIVE CLAIMS - 1993 THIRD QUARTER April 1, 1993 THRU June 30, 1993

LOC	NUM	PROP	ΡI	APPR	TNUOMA	DEN	PEND	OD	A/0	A/P
MXR	212	135	69	14	1980	73	243	8	64	111
NER	154	123	31	27	5469	40	222	0	0	94
SER	114	101	13	0	0	43	216	19	**	121
NCR	168	123	45	16	326	38	145	0	0	81
SCR	183	149	33	1	0	25	278	1	1	83
WXR	138	106	32	64	10,621	70	370	154	**	**
СО	42	24	18	30	6,378	1	11	0	0	12
TOT	1011	761	241	152	24,774	282	1485	182	13	83

The Central Office settlement figure shows an increase due to the settlement in 2 automobile claims.

NARRATIVE ANALYSIS

DEFINITIONS

LOC - LOCATION

NUM - NUMBER FILED IN QUARTER

PROP - PROPERTY CLAIM

PI - PERSONAL INJURY CLAIM

APPR - APPROVED

AMT - AMOUNT APPROVED

DEN - DENIED PEND - PENDING

PEND - PENDING

OD - NUMBER OVERDUE

A/O - AVERAGE NUMBER OF DAYS OVERDUE

A/P - AVERAGE LENGTH OF TIME TO PROCESS

N/A - DATA NOT COLLECTED

ADMINISTRATIVE CLAIMS - 1993 THIRD QUARTER REPORT APRIL 1, 1993 THRU JUNE 30, 1993

LOC	NUM	PROP	PI	APPR	AMT	DEN	PEND	OD	A/O	A/P
MXR	212	135	69	14	1,980	73	243	8	64	111
NER	154	123	31	27	5,469	40	222	0	0	94
SER	114	101	13	0	0	43	216	19	**	121
NCR	168	123	45	16	326	38	145	0	0	81
SCR	183	149	33	1	0	25	278	1	1	83
WXR	138	106	32	64	10,621	70	370	154	**	**
со	42	24	18	30	6,378	1	11	0	0	12
TOT	1011	761	241	152	24,774	282	1485	182	13	83

DEFINITIONS

LOC - LOCATION

NUM - NUMBER FILED IN QUARTER

PROP - PROPERTY CLAIM

PI - PERSONAL INJURY CLAIM

APPR - APPROVED

AMT - AMOUNT APPROVED

DEN - DENIED

PEND - PENDING

OD - NUMBER OVERDUE

A/O - AVERAGE NUMBER OF DAYS OVERDUE

A/P - AVERAGE LENTH OF TIME TO PROCESS

- DATA NOT AVAILABLE

INC - INCONCLUSIVE

ADMINISTRATIVE CLAIMS - 1993 SECOND QUARTER REPORT JANUARY 1, 1993 THRU MARCH 31, 1993

LOC	NUM	PROP	PI	APPR	AMT	DEN	PEND	OD	A/O	A/P
MXR	175	103	57	8	1706	70	186	11	32	97
NER	174	141	33	23	2960	115	162	0	0	101
SER	160	156	4	18	3421	150	255	45	#	109
NCR	119	90	29	9	568	8	83	0	0	34
SCR	204	140	47	11	287	37	249	0	0	120
WXR	92	71	21	39	4988	126	355	156	#	#
СО	23	9	14	27	1051	1	1	0	0	14
TOT	947	710	205	130	14,981	507	1291	212	#	79

LITIGATION - 1993 THIRD QUARTER REPORT APRIL 1, 1993 THROUGH JUNE 30, 1993

LOC	NUM	НC	FTC	JIV	! OTH	ANS	PEN	CLD	H/T	SET	AWD
MXR	32	ષ્ટ	5	1 17	1 2	16	153	21	4	1	\$10,000
NER	59	15	7	: 30	7	57	267	46	3	4	\$ 3,600
SER	73	41	3	19	10	73	N/A	29	3	0	0
NCR	72	22	12	24	14	N/A	573	40	. 0	0	0
SCR	69	31	4	31	3	50	224	30	7	0	\$ 3 13
WXR	66	22	9	26	9	N/A	627	17	20	1	\$79,615
СО	11	4	0	3	5	8	100	12	0	0	0
TOT	382	143	40	150	50	204	1944	195	37	6	\$93,528

DEFINITIONS:

N/A - Not Available - no method of tracking this information

LOC - Location

NUM - Number of Total Lawsuits Filed in Quarter

HC - Number of Habeas Corpus Actions Filed

FTS - Number of FTCA Actions Filed

BIV - Number of Bivens Actions Filed

OTH - Other Actions Filed

ANS - Number of Litigation Reports Completed

PEN - Pending

CLD - Number of Actions Closed

H/T - Number of Hearings or Trials (Narrative analysis follows)

SET - Number of Settlements (Narrative analysis follows)

AWD - Amount of Awards

LITIGATION - 1993 SECOND QUARTER REPORT

JANUARY 1, 1993 THROUGH MARCH 31, 1993

LOC	NUM	HC	FTC	BIV	отн	ANS	PEN	CLD	H/T	SET	AWD
MXR	40	21	6	11	2	35	132	117	4	3	0
NER	67	23	5	26	8	59	254	28	3	3	\$48
SER	45	20	2	15	8	45	N/A	41	0	0	0
NCR	68	33	9	25	1	N/A	572	46	0	0	0
SCR	45	19	5	20	1	32	254	21	9	0	\$34,901
WXR	55	23	7	19	5	52	579	30	9	4	\$22,100
со	10	3	0	5	2	7	108	22	0	0	0
TOT	330	142	34	121	27	230	1899	305	25	10	\$57,049

FOIA LITIGATION QUARTERLY STATISTICS APRIL 1, 1993 - JUNE 30, 1993

PENDING FOIA CASES = 28 CASES FILED IN LAST QUARTER = 13

EEO QUARTERLY STATISTICS April 1, 1993 - June 30, 1993

Loc	N (1)	NO	RL	R	D	S	RP	A	ST	C (2)	FD	P (3)	O* (4)
MXR	8	1	0	2	0	7	0	1	1	5	0	17	0
NER	7	0	0	7	0	4	0	0	1	4	1	1 1	O
SER	9	1	0	1	0	3	3	1	2	11	1	32	0
NCR	4	0	0	1	0	2	1	1	1	2	6	19	1
SCR	12	5	0	8	0	6	1	1	4	15	3	22	1
WXR	4	0	0	2	1	1	2	1	1	4	4	26	0
СО	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	1
TOT	45	7	0	22	1	24	7	5	10	41	15	133	3

SEE ATTACHED KEY

KEY

N = Number complaints filed

NO = Number of complaints filed based on national origin
RL = Number of complaints filed based on religion
R = Number of complaints filed based on race
D = Number of complaints filed based on disability
S = Number of complaints filed based on sex
RP = Number of complaints filed based on reprisal
A = Number of complaints filed based on age
ST = Number of complaints settled

C = Number of complaints closed by BOP EEO Staff, including settlements

FD = Number of final agency decisions issued by the CAO and/or DOJ dismissals, cancellations, or rejections

P = Number of complaints pending under EEO Complaints Section

O - Number of complaints over 180 days being processed under 1614

- (1) Number of complaints filed differs from the bases filed because a complainant may file on more than on basis.
- (2) Number of complaints settled and the number of complaints in which the investigative files were sent to the complainant by the EEO Complaints Section.
- (3) Number of complaints pending that were under the control of the EEO Complaints Section. Number of complaints in total inventory is 223, which represents the number of Bureau of Federal Prisons complaints at the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) for hearing, Department of Justice (DOJ) for final agency decision, and in the EEO Complaints Section.
- (4) There were 63 complaints still being processed under the old regulations (1613) that are over 180 days.

^{*}Extensions were granted by the complainants

SETTLEMENTS

Northeast Region

1. Terms. Complaint filed against the Federal Correctional Institution, Schuyikill, Pennsylvania, was settled on April 2, 1993. The complainant had alleged that he was discriminated against because of his race (Caucasian) and sex when he was terminated from his position as a Correctional Officer. The complainant's SF-50 was changed from "Termination" to "Resignation for Personal Reasons".

Reason for Settlement. This complaint was settled by the EEO Investigator through factfinding/mediation with the approval of the Warden prior to the investigation of the complaint.

South Central Region

Complaint filed against the Federal Correctional 1. Institution, La Tuna, Texas, was settled on April 30, 1993. complainant had alleged that she was discriminated against because of her race (Caucasian) and sex when: (1) FCI La Tuna did not consider her application for a position as a Supervisory Recreation Specialist position; (2) her position as a Supervisory Recreation Specialist at FPC El Paso was changed to a nonsupervisory position, and she was told that she would not receive a GS-11 position; and (3) she did not receive a temporary promotion for her assignment as Acting Supervisor of Education. After filing the complaint, the complainant resigned her employment. The complainant withdrew her complaint prior to the hearing because she had been reemployed with the Bureau and with the condition that the agency would not retaliate against her for having filed a complaint.

Reason for Settlement. This complaint was settled by the Labor Management Relations Section prior to the hearing being conducted in her complaint by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

2. Terms. Complaint filed against the Federal Correctional Institution, La Tuna, Texas, was settled on June 3, 1993. The complainant had alleged that he was discriminated against because of his race (Black) when he was subjected to an investigation of alleged sexual harassment. He also alleged that he was discriminated against when he was not recommended for GS-11 Correctional Supervisor positions. The parties agreed that the complainant would receive all copies, except the original, of the files pertaining to this complaint within 60 days of the settlement. The complainant would also receive written assurance that management officials would not disclose the issues giving rise to this complaint with anyone, except as required by law.

Reason for Settlement. This complaint was settled by the Labor Management Relations Branch staff prior to the hearing being conducted in his complaint by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

3. Terms. This complaint filed against the Federal Correctional Institution, Memphis, Tennessee was settled on June 9, 1993. The complainant had alleged that she was discriminated against because of her race (Black), sex and in retaliation for her prior complaint of discrimination when she received negative entries on her significant incident logs; work assignments; and access to equipment. The complainant's attorney was given attorney's fees.

Reason for Settlement. This complaint was settled by the Labor Management Relations Branch staff prior to the hearing being conducted in her complaint by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

4. Terms. Complaint filed against the Federal Correctional Institution, La Tuna, Texas was settled on June 24, 1993. The complainant had alleged that she was discriminated against because of her sex when she was not selected for a Human Resource Specialist position. She also alleged that she was subjected to retaliation when she was not selected for the position of Legal Technician. The settlement terms of the complaint consisted of the complainant receiving priority consideration for a year for positions for which she applies and makes the best qualified list.

Reason for Settlement. This complaint was settled by the Labor Management Relations Branch staff prior to the hearing being conducted in her complaint by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

Southeast Region

1. Terms. Complaint filed against the Federal Prison Camp, Homestead, Florida was settled on May 4, 1993. The complainant alleged that he had been discriminated against because of his race (Caucasian) and handicap (head trauma) when he was not selected for a Correctional Officer position, GS-7. The agency agreed to hire the complainant as a Correctional Officer, GS-6, at the Metropolitan Correctional Center, Miami, Florida if he meets the pre-employment requirements as set forth in the settlement agreement.

Reason for Settlement. This complaint was settled by the Labor Management Relations Branch staff prior to the hearing being conducted in his complaint by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

2. Terms. Complaint filed against the Federal Correctional Institution, Tallahassee, Florida, was settled on May 27, 1993. The complainant alleged that she had been discriminated against because of her sex and in retaliation for filing a prior complaint of discrimination when she was not selected for an Employee Development Specialist position. The complainant and the agency agreed that the complainant would be selected for the next Employee Development Specialist position with backpay and attorney's fees.

Reason for Settlement. This complaint was settled with the agreement of the Warden, Regional Director and the General Counsel. A review of the facts in the investigative file indicated that the Complaint Adjudication Office might find for the complainant because she was the best qualified person.

Western Region

1. Terms. Complaint filed against the Federal Correctional Institution, Phoenix, Arizona, was settled on May 8, 1993. The complainant alleged that he had been discriminated against because of his race (Black) when he was terminated from his position as a Correctional Officer. In settlement of his complaint his SF-50 was changed from "Termination" to "Resignation for Personal Reasons."

Reason for Settlement. This complaint was settled by the EEO Investigator through factfinding/mediation with the agreement of the Warden.

North Central Region

1. Terms. Complaint filed against the Federal Prison Camp, Duluth, Minnesota was settled on April 21, 1993. The complainant had alleged that she was discriminated against because of her sex when she received a letter of reprimand and negative entries in her significant incident log. It was agreed that the letter of reprimand would only remain the complainant's personnel file for a year provided there were no other disciplinary actions.

Reason for Settlement. This complaint was settled by the EEO Investigator through factfinding/mediation with the agreement of the Warden.

EEO LITIGATION STATISTICS April 1, 1993 - June 30, 1993

roc	NUM	НС	FTC	BIV	отн	ANS	PEN	CLD	н/т	SE	AWD
MXR											
NER											
SER											
NCR											
SCR											
WXR											
со											
тот	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0

^{*}Title VII

NARRATIVE (update)

James I. Watts V. Federal Bureau of Prisons, Court of Appeals No. 93-5031

On April 5, 1993, Defendant-Appellee filed a Motion for Summary Affirmance, requesting that the Court of Appeals grant a summary affirmance of the District Court's Memorandum of November 18, 1992. which entered judgment for appellee after trial and dismissed the Plaintiff-Appellant then filed a Motion to Exceed Page Limits in his response to the Defendant-Appellee's Motion for Summary Affirmance. On April 15, 1993, Plaintiff-Appellant also filed a Motion for Leave to File Documents, in which he requested to attach a copy of the documents issued by the District Court to his Motion for Summary Reversal. On April 21, 1993, Defendant-Appellee filed its Reply to Appellant's Opposition to the Motion for Summary Affirmance. Plaintiff-Appellant also filed an Order to Show Cause on April 26, 1993, requesting that the Defendant-Appellee show cause why it disapproved plaintiff's request for Plaintiffreasonable and compensated administrative leave. Appellant then filed on April 27, 1993, a Motion to Extend Time for Filing, so that he could have additional time to file his response to Defendant-Appellee's Motion for Summary Affirmance. On April 29, 1993, the Court denied Plaintiff-Appellant's Motion to Exceed Page Limits. Also on that date, the Defendant-Appellee filed its Opposition to the Mation for an Order to Show Cause. On May 12, the Court coanted Plaintiff-Appellant's Motion for Extension of Time, and on May 21, 1993, it denied Plaintiff-Appellant's Motion ior an Order to Show Cause. Defendant-Appellee filed a Motion for Leave to File an Opposition to Appellant's Motion for Summary Leversal on June 10, 1993. On June 25, 1993, Plaintiff-Appellant filed his Opposition to Appellee's Motion for Leave to File Opposition to Appellant's Motion for Summary Reversal.

Helen L. Archie v. William Barr, Civil Action No. 91-1585

On May 19, 1993, Kelly Tirik, Attorney for the Federal Bureau of Prisons, and Jeff Sprung, Assistant United States Attorney, met with four witnesses to prepare them for their upcoming depositions. On May 20, 1993, the depositions of two of the witnesses were taken at the law office of the plaintiff's attorney. Those two witnesses were Sandra Parks and Stanley Wexler. However, the two other witnesses, Sandra Hurst and John Flynn, were unable to attend the depositions on May 20, 1993. Additionally, John Flynn retired at the end of May and moved to Arizona. The remaining two depositions have not been rescheduled as of this date.

Adnan Niaz Mir v. Federal Bureau of Prisons, No. 92B00225

On April 20, 1993, the Court issued an Order denying Defendant's motion for dismissal of the case, but it did dismiss the national

origin claim in the case. The Order also instructed the Plaintiff to file a statement by May 3, 1993, to assist the bench in resolving whether the case contains a viable citizenship status discrimination claim. On June 7, 1993, the Court granted the Plaintiff an extension until June 21, 1993, to file his responsive statement. On June 14, 1993, the Plaintiff asked for another extension of time, until July 30, 1993, to file a responsive statement with the Court. The Court issued an Order on June 22, 1993, granting the Plaintiff only until July 19, 1993, to file his responsive statement.

EEO - THIRD QUARTER REPORT 1993 APRIL 1, 1993 THROUGH JUNE 30, 1993

LOC	ทบ	N	RL	R	כ	s	R	A	С	FD	s	P	A/0
MXR	8	1	0	2	: 0	7	0	1	5	0	1	17	0
NER	7	0	0	7	: 0	4	0	0	4	1	1	11	0
SER	9	1	0	1	: 0	3	3	1	11	1	2	32	0
NCR	4	0	0	1	! 0	2	1	1	2	6	1	19	1
SCR	12	5	0	8	! 0	6	1	1	15	3	4	22	1
WXR	4	0	0	2	1	1	2	1	4	4	1	26	0
СО	1	0	0	1	! 0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	1
TOT	45	7	0	22	1	24	7	5	41	15	10	133	3

NARRATIVE ANALYSIS

LOC - LOCATION

- NU TOTAL NUMBER OF EEO COMPLAINTS FILED
- N NUMBER OF NATIONAL ORIGIN COMPLAINTS FILED
- RL NUMBER OF COMPLAINTS FILED ALLEGING RELIGIOUS DISCRIMINATION
- R NUMBER OF COMPLAINTS FILED ALLEGING RACIAL DISCRIMINATION
- H NUMBER OF COMPLAINTS FILED ALLEGING HANDICAP DISCRIMINATION
- S NUMBER OF COMPLAINTS FILED ALLEGING SEXUAL DISCRIMINATION
- R NUMBER OF COMPLAINTS FILED ALLEGING REPRISAL
- A NUMBER OF COMPLAINTS FILED ALLEGING AGE DISCRIMINATION
- C NUMBER OF COMPLAINTS COMPLETED BY CENTRAL OFFICE.
- FD NUMBER OF COMPLAINTS WITH FINAL DISPOSITION
- S NUMBER OF COMPLAINTS SETTLED
- P NUMBER OF COMPLAINTS PROCESSED
- A/O AVERAGE NUMBER OF DAYS OVERDUE
- A/P AVERAGE NUMBER OF DAYS TO PROCESS

EEO - SECOND QUARTER REPORT 1993

JANUARY	1,	1993	THROUGH	MARCH	31,	1993

LOC	אט	N	RL	R	D	s	R	A	С	FD	s	P	A/0	A/P
MXR	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	11	0	
NER	3	1	0	3	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	15	0	
SER	5	0	0	2	2	0	1	0	1	3	1_	30	0	
NCR	5	1	0	3	0	2	2	1	2	1	1	1.9	0	
SCR	9	1	1	7	3	3	4	2	1	3	0	34	0	
WXR	11	5	1	5	1	4	1	0	5	1	4	25	0	
СО	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	
TOT	35	8	2	20	7	11	8	4	11	9	6	137	0	

CONTRACT REVIEW STATISTICS REPORT FROM: 04/01/93 TO: 06/30/93

OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL COMMERCIAL LAW BRANCH							
No. of Contract Actions Submitted for Review							
No. of Contract Actions Completed							
No. of Pending Contracts							
Average Number of Days To Process							

Types c	f Contracts	Submitted for	Review
ADP	2	IGA	5
A&E	4	SITE PREP	0
ccc	27	UTIL	0
CONST	24	OTHERS	138
SUPPLY	0		

Division Generating Contracts								
ADM	36	FPI	135					
CPD	28	HRM	1					
DIR	0	MED	0					
PRD	0	ogc	0					
IPPA	0	CCD	0					
NIC	0							

DATE:

IAN 1 3 1994

REPLY TO:

George E. Pruden, II

ATTN OF:

Deputy Designated Agency Ethics Official

Federal Bureau of Prisons

SUBJECT:

Ethics Training Conducted for Federal Bureau of Prisons Personnel

TO:

Janis A. Sposato, Associate Assistant Attorney General Justice Management Division

I am pleased to report that Ethics training has been provided to 359 employees of the Federal Bureau of Prisons for the period covering April 1, 1993, to June 30, 1993.

The 17 training events (lists of attendees are attached) included the following:

- An Ethics training session on the new OGE regulations of 2 hours was offered to 41 Central Office Prong II employees on April 5, 1993.
- 2. An Ethics training session on the new OGE regulations of 2 hours was offered to 37 Central Office Prong II employees on April 6, 1993.
- 3. An Ethics training session on the new OGE regulations of 2 hours was offered to 17 Central Office Prong II employees on April 7, 1993.
- 4. An Ethics training session on the new OGE regulations of 2 hours was offered to 21 Central Office Prong II employees on April 7, 1993.
- 5. An Ethics training session on the new OGE regulations of 2 hours was offered to 13 Central Office Prong II employees on April 8, 1993.
- 6. An Ethics training session on the new OGE regulations of 2 hours was offered to 21 Central Office Prong II employees on April 9, 1993.
- 7. An Ethics training session on the new OGE regulations of 2 hours was offered to 15 Central Office Prong II employees on April 12, 1993.

- 8. An Ethics training session on the new OGE regulations of 2 hours was offered to 33 Central Office Prong II employees on April 14, 1993.
- 9. An Ethics training session on the new OGE regulations of 2 hours was offered to 16 Central Office Prong II employees on April 15, 1993.
- 10. An Ethics training session on the new OGE regulations of 2 hours was offered to 18 Central Office Prong II employees on April 16, 1993.
- 11. An Ethics training session on the new OGE regulations of 2 hours was offered to 16 Central Office Prong II employees on April 16, 1993.
- 12. An Ethics training session on the new OGE regulations of 3 hours was offered to 43 Prong I employees at the United States Penitentiary in Lewisburg, Pennsylvania on April 19, 1993.
- 13. An Ethics training session on the new OGE regulations of 3 hours was offered to 16 Central Office Prong I employees on April 30, 1993.
- 14. An Ethics and Sexual Harassment training session of 2.5 hours was offered to 2 Central Office employees as part of New Employee Orientation on May 4, 1993.
- 15. An Ethics and Sexual Harassment training session of 2.5 hours was offered to 8 Central Office employees as part of New Employee Orientation on June 2, 1993.
- 16. A procurement ethics training session of 1 hour was offered to 30 Community Corrections Management Contractors on June 25, 1993 in Baltimore, Maryland.
- 17. An Ethics and Sexual Harassment training session of 2.5 hours was offered to 12 Central Office employees as part of New Employee Orientation on June 29, 1993.

Attachments

LITIGATION - 1993 THIRD QUARTER REPORT

LOC	NUM	; HC	. FTC	BIV	OTH	! ANS	PEN	CLD	н/т	SET	AWD
MXR	32	l 8	15	17	1 2	16	153	21	4	1	\$10,000
NCR	72	22	12	. 24	14		573	40	0	0	0
NER	59	15	7	30	i 7	57	267	46	3	4	\$3,600
SCR	69	31	4	31	; 3	50	224	30	7	0	\$313
SER	73	41	3	19	10	73		29	3	0	0
WXR	66	22	9	; 26	9		627	17	20	1	\$79,615
co	11	4	; O	3	1 5	8	100	12	0	0	0
TOT	382	143	: 40	150	1 50	204	1944	195	37	6	\$93,528

DEFINITIONS

- N/A Not Available no method for tracking this information
- LOC Location
- NUM Total Number of Lawsuits Filed in Quarter
- HC Number of Habeas Corpus Actions Filed in Quarter
- FTC Number of FTCA Actions Filed in Quarter
- BIV Number of Bivens Actions Filed in Quarter
- OTH Other Actions Filed in Quarter
- ANS Number of Litigation Reports Completed
- PEN Number of Actions Pending
- CLD Number of Actions Closed
- H/T Number of Hearings or Trials (Narrative Analysis Follows)
- SET Number of Settlements (Narrative Analysis Follows)
- AWD Amount of Awards

LITIGATION ANALYSIS

The number of lawsuits filed in the third quarter increased by 52 over the previous quarter, with 330 filed in the second quarter and 382 filed in the third quarter. The amount of monetary damages awarded in this quarter was greater than in the previous quarter, with \$93,528 in the third quarter and \$57,049 in the second quarter.

1393 CUARTERLY LITIGATION REPORT

THIRD QUARTER

I. HEARINGS AND TRIALS

MID-ATLANTIC REGION

Bryant v. Muth, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit

On May 24. 1993 the Fourth Circuit reversed and remanded this <u>Bivens</u> action to the District Court with instructions to dismiss based upon qualified immunity. The magistrate had ruled that Butner staff may have violated Bryant's right of access to the court when they refused to return legal research which the inmate had placed on contraband computer diskettes in violation of BOP regulations. The District Court accepted the magistrate's recommendation and the appeal on qualified immunity followed.

It was argued on appear that staff were entitled to qualified immunity as they were following constitutional BOP regulations. The Fourth Circuit, however, took the position that Bryant had no right to any materials placed without authority and in violation of BOP regulations on contraband computer disks. To hold otherwise would allow nim to benefit from the fruits of his unauthorized activity. The opinion contains dicta concerning the need to control inmates' access to computers.

Thomas v. Whalen, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit

This case is a complex sentence computation case involving an aggregation of U.S. Code and District of Columbia sentences. The District Court dismissed the petition in August 1992 without prejudice to the petitioner's right to pursue administrative remedies. Potitioner appealed. Oral arguments were held on May 6, 1993, in Richmond, Virginia. Because of the complexity of the computation, it was suggested by the Court that it may choose to remand the case to the District Court with instructions to have the BOP, at the highest administrative level, review and brief the District Court on the petitioner's computation. In anticipation of the remand, this office has retrieved Thomas' complete file and the RISA is recomputing his sentences. He has seven separate periods of incarceration. Thomas is currently in the D.C. Department of Corrections.

NORTH CENTRAL REGION

Bellecourt v. U.S., U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit

Plaintiff appealed the District Court's dismissal of his medical malpractice action. The basis of Plaintiff's appeal is whether a grossly negligent misdiagnosis is a form of deliberate

indifference promitited by the Eighth Amendment of the United States Constitution, even where a physician states a personal belief that he has collowed a reasonable course of treatment. Dr. Wynn, a defendant, was a government contractor. He crossappealed the trial court's conclusion that he was an independent contractor rather than an employee.

The Court of Appears affirmed the trial court findings that (1) the plaintiff has not proven presentment of an administrative claim, (2) the contract physician was not deliberately indifferent, and (1) the trial court properly dismissed the pendant state action for medical malpractice because the plaintiff failed to file a timely notice of expert review. Dr. Wynn's cross-appear was dismissed as moot.

NORTHEAST REGION

Bourgeois v. U.S., Middle District of Pennsylvania

USP Lewisburg inmate prought this Federal Tort Claims Act (FTCA) complaint requesting damages for a slip and fall down steps in September 1990. The inmate alleged that he slipped on apple scraps and banana peels left on an outside stairway. The trial was held from April 14-20, 1993 before U.S. Magistrate Judge Blewitt. The court has not yet issued a decision.

U.S. v. Hillstrom, C.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit

The Third Circuit remanded this sentencing guideline case for additional information concerning the nature of Federal Prison Camp Allenwood. At issue is which sentencing guideline should apply to an escapee from FPC Allenwood: the guideline applicable to walkaways from a community corrections center (CCC) or the guideline applicable to an assume from a secure facility. The Third Circuit instructed the district court to consider whether FPC Allenwood is sufficiently similar to a CCC in its purpose and in its security and safety considerations. The resentencing hearing in this case has been postponed. In a similar Allenwood escape case the court found that FPC Allenwood was not a facility similar to a CCC. We anticipate that the court will reach a similar conclusion in the Hillstrom case. CCM Ed Hughes and Peter Weld are expected to testify.

U.S. v. Salameh, Southern District of New York

Three of the pretrial detainees indicted for the bombing of the World Trade Center in New York filed motions challenging aspects of their pretrial custody at MCC New York. The detainees challenged their continued placement in administrative detention, and the following conditions of confinement: exercise, clothing, bedding, social phone calls, access to counsel, and inability to worship with fellow Moslems. The court denied the motion and

found the Warden's security concerns of potential retaliation from other inmates to be reasonable. The court also rejected illegations concerning the conditions of confinement.

SOUTH CENTRAL REGION

Jackson v. U.S., Western District of Texas

The inmate filed this <u>FTCA</u> action alleging staff at FCI Bastrop handcuffed him and forced him to use one crutch to walk to the shower in the Special Housing Unit. Jackson had a leg injury which required that he use the crutches to ambulate. Upon exiting the shower, he slipped and fell. Jackson was treated at a local hospital. Upon his return to the institution, he alleges that four staff memoers assaulted him while he was in restraints resulting in the loss of use of his lower extremities.

A trial was held May 3-5, at which time the jury returned a verdict in favor or the defendants in the <u>Bivens</u> action. The judge also ruled in favor of the United States in the FTCA action.

Taylor v. U.S., Northern District of Texas

The inmate filed an FTCA action for \$155,000 and alleged destruction of 10,000 pages of legal material and other personal property due to rodent damage and a pipe bursting at USP Terre Haute in the property storage area. After a one day trial on the issue of damages, a judgment in favor of the plaintiff in the amount of \$313.51 was entered on June 14, 1993. We anticipate that the plaintiff will appeal.

COMMITTED DECTOR

Sun v. Delashmit, et al., Northern District of Alabama

An inmate at Talladega claims that he was denied medical care and bathroom privileges on a plane that was in transport between Petersburg and Talladega in 1989. The inmate also alleges that he was subject to excessive use of force. The two day trial began on June 4, 1993 and on June 8, 1993, a verdict for the defendants was announced. On June 14, 1993, the inmate appealed to the Eleventh Circuit.

Lee. et al. v. Thornburgh, Northern District of Georgia

Black employees at USP Atlanta allege discrimination based on race because they were denied promotions. The trial was completed on July 1, 1993. On July 23, 1993, the magistrate's report recommended that judgment be entered in favor of the

defendants, dismissing all claims, and that the plaintiff's bear all costs.

WESTERN REGION

Alexander v. Perrill, District of Arizona

Alexander is a former inmate who prevailed in a habeas action in the District Court in which he claimed he had not received enough foreign jail time credit. The Court granted his habeas request and ordered immediate release. An appeal was not sought because of time considerations. The inmate then filed a Bivens suit against BOP staff. The inmate contends his sentence recalculation resulted in his late release from custody. Credit had been erroneously awarded by an ISM at another institution. To further complicate matters the ISM at this institution is now deceased.

30P and the U.S. Attorney's Office for District of Arizona filed a motion for summary judgment and qualified immunity for all defendants. All defendants were dismissed with the exception of Warden Bill Perrill and ISM Luis Rivera. We appealed and argued that the Warden and ISM snould be granted qualified immunity because only Central Office can grant foreign JTC in conjunction with DOJ Office of International Affairs. Neither the Warden nor the ISM has authority to award foreign jail credit. In a 2-1 decision the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit denied our appeal for qualified immunity for the Warden and ISM.

The case was remanded to USDC in Tucson. Plaintiff seeks \$625,000 in damages. Discovery has been concluded. The AUSA offered to settle with plaintiff for \$30,000 (we were not consulted). DOJ would not authorize a monetary settlement in a Bivons case. Pretrial conference set for August 4, 1993. We anticipate trial this fall.

II. SETTLEMENTS AND AWARDS

MID-ATLANTIC REGION

Gatti v. Tyron, Southern District of Indiana

This case involves an automobile collision between a civilian (Gatti) and a government vehicle operated by Correctional Security Officer Tyron from USP Terre Haute. Mr. Tyron stopped at a stop sign and although he looked in all directions before proceeding into the intersection, his view was obstructed. As he crossed the intersection his government vehicle was struck by the plaintiff, who had the right of way. The government vehicle was totaled and the plaintiff alleges her vehicle was totaled.

Plaintiff's administrative claim requested a sum certain of \$100,000 for personal injury including medical expenses, lost wages, and pain and suffering. Additionally, plaintiff claimed property damage for the vehicle in the amount of \$700, for a total claim of \$100,000. The case was settled for \$10,000.

NORTHEAST REGION

Cardiff Circle Ass'n v. U.S., District of New Jersey

This FTCA complaint was filed as a result of the accidental fire damage to property by FCI Fairton SORT team. On April 15, 1992, the FCI Fairton SCRT team was conducting tactical exercises on plaintiff's property without his permission. Plaintiff had given permission to local police to use his property for training exercises. The ical police told the FCI Fairton SORT team they could use the property. The SORT team tossed two smoke grenades into a building. These grenades caused the entire building to catch fire. The fire was extinguished, but the building was destroyed. A warning on the smoke grenades stated that the device was for outdoor use only and that it can cause fires. Plaintiff did not accept a \$10,000 settlement offer of his administrative tort claim.

We had admitted liability in the litigation. The only remaining issue was the amount of damages. Plaintiff had sought \$63,500. The case was settled for \$25,000.

Sheptin v. U.S., et al., Western District of Pennsylvania

Inmate Louis Sheptin filed a combined <u>Bivens</u> and FTCA action alleging medical malpractice and deliberative indifference to medical needs at FCI McKean from February 19, 1992 through February 23, 1992.

On February 19, 1992, Sheptin was arrived at FCI McKean. Services Administrator Heath performed the medical screening on Sheptin, but failed to fill out the required screening form. Heath said he gave his notes to Physician's Assistant Calvo. Sheptin alleged he told Heath, Calvo, and other medical staff on rounds in the Special Housing Unit repeatedly that he was on medication (Dilantin) for a seizure disorder and that he needed his medication. Medical records confirm this. Calvo confirmed that Sheptin requested his medication, but Calvo said that he could not find the inmate's medical file. The medical file for Sheptin was in the "writ hold" section of the medical records area. On February 23, 1992, Sheptin had a grand mal seizure and was taken to an outside hospital. Sheptin alleged that as a result of this seizure, he fell and injured his head and shoulder. Later examinations (including x-rays) showed no evidence of permanent injury. An internal investigation

concluded that medical staff were negligent in not obtaining the medical file and in not providing Sheptin his medication.

Sheptin agreed to accept \$3500 in full settlement of this litigation (FTCA and <u>Bivens</u>). A special assessment of \$500 will be offset from this amount.

Smith v. Lam, Southern District of New York

John Smith, a Witness Security inmate at FCI Otisville, filed this <u>Bivens</u> action alleging staff member Lam was deliberately indifferent to his safety at work. On January 11, 1991, Inmate Smith sewed through his finger while working at a sewing machine in the UNICOR Glove factory in the Witsec Unit.

Lam executed a June 9, 1992 declaration, in which he claimed that when the new sewing machines arrived at FCI Otisville, he personally placed the safety guards on the machines. Lam later admitted that he lied in his declaration and that he knew that the safety guards were not installed upon the machine Smith was working on and that he did not install safety guards on the machines when received at FCI Otisville.

The United States continued to represent Lam because important interests had to be protected in this litigation; information concerning the Witsec inmate had to be kept secure and there was potential for bad precedent on work related issues. The inmate agreed to settle the case for \$100.00, that was paid by Lam. No disciplinary action was taken against the employee.

III. CASES OF INTEREST

MID-ATLANTIC REGION

Alaouieh v. U.S., Eastern District of Michigan

This FTCA case involves the alleged misdiagnosis of herpetic infection of a cornea while inmate Alaouieh was at FCI Milan and alleged continuing substandard treatment at MCC Chicago and FCI Sandstone. We have received expert evaluation of the case from a number of ophthalmologists who all confirm there was a delay in providing treatment and there is some indication of cornea scarring. However, objective vision impairment is much less than that reported by plaintiff. The AUSA made a settlement offer under Rule 68 in the amount of \$5,000 which the plaintiff refused. Trial is scheduled for October 4, 1993.

SOUTHEAST REGION

<u>Green v. Department of Justice, et al.</u>, Northern District of Alabama

An inmate at Talladega claims a violation of the Eighth Amendment because he was housed with Cuban detainees and taken hostage during the August 1991 disturbance. On May 11, 1993, the court issued an order granting summary judgment on behalf of the government. The court held that FCI Talladega staff were not wantonly or callously indifferent to potential danger when they placed an American inmate in administrative detention with Cuban Detainees in Alpha Unit.

WESTERN REGION

U.S. v. George, Southern District of California

A pretrial detainee awaiting trial on federal felon in possession of a firearm charges was writted from custody by San Diego District Attorney for trial on minor state charges. After appearing in state Superior Court on June 2, 1992 the inmate assaulted a Deputy Sheriff, took her revolver, and escaped. As he fled, the inmate stopped a car and shot and killed the driver. He was recaptured on October 5, 1992.

George has three federal charges pending. Felon in possession of a firearm (original federal charge), escape from federal custody (June 2, 1992), and felon in possession of a firearm (recapture October 5, 1992). George was tried and convicted of all three charges in June. Sentencing is set for September. George faces 3 state charges from the events of June 2, 1992. Assaulting a law enforcement officer, escape, and capital murder. State trial for assault/escape/murder is continued to February 1994.

Family of murder victim has filed a \$2,000,000 FTCA claim against BOP, USMS, and San Diego Sheriffs Office for negligence resulting in escape and murder.

Wilmer v. Meyers, Northern District of California

This is a <u>Bivens</u> case against staff members at FCI Dublin. The inmate refused to be strip searched before placement in SHU pending investigation. Wilmer overpowered the two female Correctional Officers (CO) who were attempting the strip search. The Lieutenant and another CO restrained Wilmer while the female CO's wrapped her in a sheet and conducted the strip search. The inmate demands \$750,000 in damages and the case is scheduled for trial on September 20, 1993.

QUARTERLY REPORT - ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES APRIL - JUNE 1993

Administrative Remedy data is provided directly from the Key Indicator (KI/SSS) system. The first three of the attached reports show information on institution fillings, regional appeals and central office appears aggregated for the Bureau as a whole (BOP - All Institutions). The remaining six reports display, for each region, aggregate information in regional appeals filed by inmates in all institutions in that region.

Administrative Remedy data for Community Corrections is also provided in Part II. The Bureau of Prisons Administrative Remedy Procedures were expanded to include inmates in Community Corrections Centers on August 15, 1992. The data provided in Part II shows aggregated data covering the previous four quarters. We are extremely grateful for the invaluable assistance that Suzanne Vanyur and Jennifer Batchelder of the research staff provided in the design and development of these reports.

Some observations about the data in the attached reports.

- o The total number of filings for this quarter showed increases at all levels as compared to last quarter's numbers. Institution filings went from 2,964 to 3,153; regional appeals from 1,731 to 1,764; and central office appeals from 681 to 717.
- c Grant rates for this quarter showed decreases at all levels. The grant rates at the institution level went from 16.3% to 16.0%; regional appeals from 11.7% to 8.6%; and central office appeals from 5.2% to 3.6%.
- o Staff complaints continue to be the highest category at the institution level (14.1% or 445 of the 3,153 complaints filed).
- o Classification returned as the second highest category at the institution level and increased from last quarter (323 or 10.2%, up from 299 or 10.1%).
- o Other categories in the top ten at the institution level were: Medical and UDC Actions (9.2%), Institution Operations (6.5%), Community Programs ((6.2%), Transfer (6.1%), Work Assignments (5.8%), Legal (4.9%), and Institution Programs (4.1%). This list is similar to the lists for the previous eight quarters, although the order of highest to lowest changed somewhat. The percentage distribution among the 25 subject codes is also similar to the distribution for the previous quarters

- o For regional appeals, the top five categories were: DHO Appeals 10.8%, down from 30.9%), Classification (9.5%, down from 9.1%), Staff Complaints (7.6%, up from 6.9%), UDC Actions (6.3%, up from 5.0%, and Community Programs 5.7%, down from 7.2%).
- o The highest number of regional appeals (391) was filed in the North Central Region, which has the lowest number of inmates (10,498). The lowest number of regional appeals (240) was filed in the South Central Region which has the highest number of inmates (16,642).
- At the central office level, filings for DHO Appeals remained as the highest category and increased for the first time since the July September 1992 quarter (166 or 23.2%, up from 116 or 17.0%).
- central Office Appeals in the Classification category decreased in relative frequency from 13.1% to 10.6%, however remained in second place for the fifth consecutive quarter. The remaining categories in the top five were: Staff (7.8%, up from 7.0%), Medical Complaints (6.8%, down from 6.6%), and Jail Time (6.7 up from 6.0).

PART II

QUARTERLY REPORT - ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES FOR COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

Administrative Remedy data for Community Corrections is also provided directly from the Key Indicator (KI/SSS) system. The attached reports snow information on CCM filings, regional appeals and central office appeals aggregated for Community Corrections as a whole (All Community Corrections) for each quarter beginning when community corrections inmates were first included in the Administrative Remedy Procedures (August 15, 1992). Because the information provided covers four quarters, we condensed the attached reports for quick reference. Subsequent reports concerning Community Corrections Administrative Remedy data will be provided in summary form.

TOTAL NUMBER OF FILINGS

QUARTER:	4 TH- 92	1 ST- 93	2 ND- 93	3 RD-93
LEVEL:				
CCM	1	24	35	19
Region	11	33	25	45
Central Office	0	6	2	4

PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL FILINGS GRANTED

QUARTER:	4TH-92	1 ST- 93	2 ND- 93	3 RD-93
LEVEL:				
CCM	0	26.3%	14.3%	13.6%
Region	25%	7.1%	2.9%	14.6%
Central Office	0	0	14.3%	0

CATEGORIES WITH GREATEST NUMBER OF REMEDIES ANSWERED

QUARTER:

_	4TH-92	1S T- 93	2 ND-9 3	3RD-93
CCM	Comm Pgm-1 0 0 0	Comm Pgm-15 Staff-4 CDC/Minor-4 Educ/Rec-1	Comm Pgms-18 Staff-3 CDC/Minor-3 Transfer-2	Comm Pgms-12 Staff-2 Mail-2 Class1

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

PAGE 2

Categories with greatest number of remedies answered, cont.

QTR-4TH-92	1 ST-9 3	2 ND- 93	3RD-93			
REGION CCM/Major-10 Inst Ops-1	CCM/Major-29 Inst Ops-1 Medical-1 Comm Pgm-1	CCM/Major-17 Comm Pgm-2 Staff-1 CDC/Minor-1	CCM/Major-37 CDC/Minor-4 Comm Pgm-2 Food/Med-1			
CENTRAL OFFICE	Dental-2 Educ/Rec-1 Inst Ops-1 Food-1	Comm Pgm-1 Jail Time-1	Comm Pgm-3 Jail Time-1			

REGIONAL APPEALS WITH HIGHEST AND LOWEST NUMBER OF FILINGS

QUARTERS	4TH- 92	1S T- 93	2ND-93	3RD-93
HIGHEST	MXR- 7	MXR-19	NCR-10 WXR-10	WXR-20
LOWEST	SER-1	SCR-0	NER-1 SER-1	NER-0

Date of request: 07/16/93 Summary Period: 22Mar93 thru 20Jun93

Number of Months Found: 3

ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES TRACKING DATA

CENTRAL OFFICE APPEALS FOR: BOP--wil Institutions. . .

Institution Security Level: N/A Region: .

TOTAL Number of Inmates: 83494 Inmates in Population (excluding noldovers and in-transits): 75094

Inmates in Holdover Status: 2906 Inmates In-Transit: 5494

* * * * * 717 Filed During Period: Pending at End of Period: 461 Answered During Period: Overdue: 38

759 451 (59.4%) Answered On Time:

Average Time for Response: 2.26 days

Average Time	for	Response	- 52	.26 days	5						
		RI		* REMEDIES RESOLVED							
SUBJECT BREAKDOWN	P	umber & ercent ubmitted	Ď	umber { ercent ejected	P	umber & ercent iled	* * *	r P	umber & ercent nswered	P	umber & ercent ranted
Classificatn Non-mail Com Comm Prgms Staff Control Unit Appeals	118 5 51 93 1 269	10.5% 0.4% 4.5% 3.3% 0.1% 23.9%	42 0 18 37 0	10.3% 0.0% 4.4% 0.1% 0.0% 25.2%	76 5 33 56 1 166	10.6% 0.7% 4.6% 7.8% 0.1% 23.2%	* * *	95 38 48 1	0.7% 5.0% 6.3% 0.1%	5 0 0 0 4	5.3% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%
atn/Rec Food Inst Operatn Inst Program Legal	1 9 5 3 3 6 6 6	0.1% 0.8% 4.7% 3.2% 5.9%	0 1 16 15 21	0.0% 0.2% 3.9% 3.7% 5.1%	1 8 37 21 45	0.1% 1.1% 5.2% 2.9% 6.3%		5 9 45 19 40	0.7% 1.2% 5.9% 2.5% 5.3%	0 0 0 1 1	0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 5.3% 2.5%
Mail Srch/Restrnt Spec Housing Transfer UDC Actions Visiting	28 5 17 47 58 15	2.5% 0.4% 1.5% 4.2% 5.2%	9 4 5 22 33 8	2.2% 1.0% 1.2% 5.4% 3.1% 2.0%	19 1 12 25 25 7	0.1%	* *	27 3 14 28 33 9	3.6% 0.4% 1.6% 3.7% 4.3% 1.2%	0 0 0 2 0	0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 7.1% 0.0%
Work Assign Dental Care Forced Med Medical	52 6 1 64	4.6% 0.5% 0.1% 5.7%	18 3 0 15	4.4% 0.7% 0.0% 3.7%	34 3 1 49	4.7% 0.4% 0.1% 6.8%	* * *	30 3 1 43	4.0% 0.4% 0.1% 5.7%	1 0 4	6.7% 33.3% 0.0% 9.3%
Mental Hlth Jail Time Records Sentence Com	5 70 16 39	0.4% 6.2% 1.4% 3.5%	2 22 6 8	0.5% 5.4% 1.5% 2.0%	3 48 10 31	0.4% 6.7% 1.4% 4.3%	* * *	3 68 7 38	0.4% 9.0% 0.9% 5.0%	0 3 0 4	0.0% 4.4% 0.0% 10.5%
TOTALS: % of Submitted % of Answered Reason for Re	i: :	100.0%	408	100.0%	7 17	100.0% 63.7%		759	100.0%	27	N/A 3.6%
imely 129(31.6%) Wrong level 46(11. informal resolution 1(0.2%) Re-submit 1(0.									11.3%) 0.2%) 9.3%)		

Date or request: 17/16/93 Summary Period: 22Mar93 thru 20Jun93

Number of Months Found: 3

ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES TRACKING DATA

REGIONAL OFFICE APPEALS FOR: BOP--All Institutions. . .

Institution Security Level: N/A Region: .

TOTAL Number of Inmates: Inmates in Population *excluding noldovers and in-transits): 75094

Inmates in Holdover Status: 2906

Pending at End of Period:

Filed During Period: 1764
Answered During Period: 1819
Answered On Time: 1800 (99.0%) 446 Overdue: 0

Average Fime for Pesponse: 12 51 days

Average Fime for Response: 12.51 days												
	REMEDIES INITIATED * REMEDIES RESOLVED *											
SUBJECT BREAKDOWN	2	umber 1 ercent ubmitted	Ď	umber & ercent ejected	P	umber & ercent iled	; ; ;	* N	umber & ercent nswered	Pe	umber & ercent ranted	
Classificath Non-mail Com Comm Prgms Staff Control Unit	18 135 225 4	9.5% 0.7% 5.6% 9.4% 0.2%	35 35 91 0	0.5% 5.5% 14.2% 0.0%	167 15 100 134 4	0.9% 5.7% 7.6% 0.2%	* * *	162 18 97 150 2	8.9% 1.0% 5.3% 8.2% 0.1%	12 0 3 7 0	7.4% 0.0% 3.1% 4.7% 0.0%	
Appeals atn/Rec Food Inst Operatn Inst Program	704 14 23 74 68	29.3% 0.6% 1.0% 3.1% 2.8%	160 4 5 16 21	25.0% 0.6% 0.8% 2.5% 3.3%	544 10 18 58 47	30.8% 0.6% 1.0% 3.3% 2.7%	* * *	5 97 9 17 6 4 43	32.8% 0.5% 0.9% 3.5% 2.4%	50 2 0 8 1	8.4% 22.2% 0.0% 12.5% 2.3%	
Legal Mail Srch/Restrnt Spec Housing Transfer UDC Actions	102 47 5 50 132 161	4.2% 2.0% 0.2% 2.1% 5.5% 6.7%	28 8 0 13 49	4.4% 1.3% 0.0% 2.0% 7.7% 7.7%	74 39 5 37 83 112	4.2% 2.2% 0.3% 2.1% 4.7% 6.3%	* * *	84 34 7 40 75 97	4.6% 1.9% 0.4% 2.2% 4.1% 5.3%	5 1 2 6	6.0% 2.9% 14.3% 5.0% 8.0%	
Visiting Work Assign Dental Care	32 77	1.3% 3.2%	6 13	0.9% 2.0%	26 64	1.5% 3.6%	*	28 71	1.5% 3.9%	19 2 6	19.6% 7.1% 8.5%	
Forced Med Medical Mental Hlth Jail Time Records	3 127 2 83 34	0.1% 5.3% 0.1% 3.5% 1.4%	2 42 0 13 9	0.3% 6.6% 0.0% 2.0% 1.4%	1 85 2 70 25	0.1% 4.8% 0.1% 4.0% 1.4%	* * * *	1 89 2 68 20	0.1% 4.9% 0.1% 3.7% 1.1%	0 21 0 5	0.0% 23.6% 0.0% 7.4% 10.0%	
Sentence Com TOTALS: % of Submitte % of Answered	d:	2.0% 100.0% 100.0%	9 6 39	1.4% 100.0% 26.6%	38 1764	2.2% 100.0% 73.4%	* *	37 18 1 9	2.0% 100.0% 100.0%	2 156	5.4% N/A 8.6%	
imely informal Attachments	informal resolution 5(0.8%) Re-submit 1(0.2%) Attachments 157(24.6%) Other 85(13.3%)											

Summary Period: 32Mar93 thru 20Jun93 Date of request: 07/16/93

Number of Months Found: 3

ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES TRACKING DATA

INSTITUTION FILINGS FOR: BOF--All Institutions. . .

Institution Security Level: "/A Region: .

TOTAL Number of Inmates: Inmates in Population (excluding noldovers and in-transits): 75094 Inmates in Holdover Status:
Inmates In-Transit: 2906 5494

* * * * Pending at End of Period: 763 187

Average Time	for	Response	e: 11	.88 d a y	'S						
		Ĩ	REMEDI	ES INITI	ATED			* *	REMEDIE	ES RES	OLVED
SUBJECT BREAKDOWN	P	umber & ercent	5	umber & ercent ejected	P	umber & ercent iled		* N * P	umber & ercent nswered	Pe	umber & ercent ranted
Classificatn Non-mail Com Comm Prgms Staff	47 2 13 5 60	1.2% 5.6% 14.8%	÷4 10 19	1.6% 3.0% 17.9%	323 37 194 445	1.2% 6.2% 14.1%	* *	316 38 192 429	10.2% 1.2% 6.2% 13.8%	42 5 31 49	13.3% 13.2% 16.1% 11.4%
Control Unit Appeals atn/Rec	8 5 5 5 8 7 0	0.2% 1.4% 1.5% 1.8%	3 3 8 9 5	5.9% 1.4% 0.8%	5 17 49 65	0.5% 1.6% 2.1%	* * *	4 14 39 65	0.5% 1.3% 2.1%	0 5 3 14	0.0% 35.7% 7.7% 21.5%
Inst Operatn Inst Program Legal Mail	258 181 185 117	6.8% 4.8% 4.9% 3.1%	: 3 : 1 : 1 : 5	7.9% 4.8% 2.3%	205 130 154 102	4.1% 4.9% 3.2%	* * *	218 127 138 103	7.0% 4.1% 4.5% 3.3%	52 26 19 17	23.9% 20.5% 13.8% 16.5%
Srch/Restrnt Spec Housing Transfer UDC Actions	13 131 224 349	0.3% 3.5% 5.9% 9.2%	2 26 32 6 0	0.3% 4.0% 5.0% 9.3%	11 105 192 289	9.2%	* * *	11 106 196 287	0.4% 3.4% 6.3% 9.3%	0 16 36 37	0.0% 15.1% 18.4% 12.9%
Visiting Work Assign Dental Care	86 2 12 37	2.3% 5.6% 1.0%	8 28 4	1.2% 4.4% 0.6%	78 184 33	2.5% 5.8%	*	72 193 28	2.3% 6.2% 0.9%	12 28 6	16.7% 14.5% 21.4%
Forced Med Medical Mental Hlth Jail Time	2 342 12 128	0.1% 9.0% 0.3% 3.4%	1 52 2 11	0.2% 8.1% 0.3% 1.7%	1 290 10 117	0.0% 9.2% 0.3% 3.7%	* * *	1 291 11 107	0.0% 9.4% 0.4% 3.5%	0 73 3 7	0.0% 25.1% 27.3% 6.5%
Records Sentence Com	5 4 8 7	1.4% 2.3%	14 10	2.2% 1.6%	40 77	1.3% 2.4%	* * *	3 7 76	1.2% 2.5%	5 10	13.5% 13.2%
TOTALS: % of Submitte % of Answered	d:	100.0%	543	100.0%	31 53	100.0%		3099	100.0%	496	N/A 16.0%
Reason for Reimely informal Attachments KI/SSS 7/16	resol		211(10.9%) 32.8%) 0.0%)	R€	ong lev -submit her page:	•	of 1		32(7(125(5.0%) 1.1%) 19.4%)

Date or request: 07/16/93 Summary Period: 22Mar93 thru 20Jun93

Number of Months Found: 3

ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES TRACKING DATA

REGIONAL OFFICE APPEALS FOR: Mid-Atlantic Region. . . .

Institution Security Level: N/A Region: MXR

TAL Number of Inmates: 12799

Inmates in Population (excluding holdovers and in-transits): 12633

Inmates in Holdover Status: 166

Filed During Period: Pending at End of Period: 320 320 360 358 (99.4%) 80 Answered During Period: Overdue: 0

Answered On Time:

Average Time for Response: 16.58 days

		REMEDIES INITIATED *							WHITDIES WESCHAED			
SUBJECT BREAKDOWN	Pe	Number & Percent Submitted		umber & ercent ejected	P	umber & ercent iled		P	umber & ercent nswered	P	umber & ercent ranted	
Classificatn	35	8.1%	10	9.1%	25	7.8%	*	24	6.7%	3	12.5%	
Non-mail Com	7	1.6%	2	1.8%	5		*	5	1.4%	0	0.0%	
Comm Prgms	27	6.3%	2	1.8%	25			30	8.3%	0	0.0%	
Staff	40	9.3%	12	10.9%	28			36	10.0%	4	11.1%	
Control Unit	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0			0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
' Appeals	125	29.1%	3 0	27.3%	95			114	31.7%	15	13.2%	
atn/Rec	5	1.2%	2	1.8%	3			2	0.6%	1	50.0%	
Feod	1	0.2%	0	0.0%	1	0.3%		1	0.3%	0	0.0%	
Inst Operatn	2 2	5.1%	3	2.7%	19			21	5.8%	5	23.8%	
Inst Program	3	0.7%	0	0.0%	3			3	0.8%	0	0.0%	
Legal	22	5.1%	5	4.5%	17			20	5.6%	1	5.0%	
	5	1.2%	2	1.8%	3	0.9%		2	0.6%	0	0.0%	
Srch/Restrnt	1	0.2%	0	0.0%	1	0.3%		1	0.3%	1	100.0%	
Spec Housing	5	1.2% 3.7%	2 9	1.8%	3 7	0.9%		8 8	2.28	1	12.5%	
Transfer	16 27	3.7% 6.3%		8.2%	-	2.2% 5. 9 %		17	2.2%	0	0.0%	
UDC Actions	4	0.9%	8	7.3%	19	0.9%		2	4.7%	7	41.2%	
Visiting	18	4.2%	1 4	0.9% 3.6%	3 14	4.4%	*	20	0.6%	0	0.0%	
Work Assign	10	4.46	4	3.06	14	4.46	^	20	5 .6 %	2	10.0%	
Dental Care	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%		1	0.3%	0	0.0%	
Forced Med	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%		0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Medical	31	7.2%	11	10.0%	20	6.3%		19	5.3%	15	78.9%	
Mental Hlth	0	0.0%	. 0	0.0%	0	0.0%		0	0.0%	0	0 .0 %	
Jail Time	19	4.4%	2	1.8%	17	5.3%		17	4.7%	3	17.6%	
Records	7	1.6%	4	3.6%	3	0.00		2	0.6%	1	50.0%	
Sentence Com	10	2.3%	1	0.9%	9	2.8%	* *	7	1.9%	0	0.0%	
TOTALS:	430	100.0%	110	100.0%	3 20	100.0%	*	3 60	100.0%	59	N/A	
% of Submitted		100.0%		25.6%		74.4%					·	
% of Answered	:						*		100.0%		16.4%	
Reason for Re	jecti	on:										
imely	-		13(11.8%)	Wı	ong lev	<i>r</i> el			41(37.3%)	
informal i	resol	ution	0 (0.0%)	Re	e-submit	=			0 (0.0%)	
Actachments			10(9.1%)	ot	her				4 (3.6%)	
KI/SSS 7/16/1993 9:20 BOP-0						page:	: 1 0	f 6				

Date or request: 07/16/93 Summary Period: 22Mar93 thru 20Jun93 Number of Months Found: 3

ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES TRACKING DATA REGIONAL OFFICE APPEALS FOR: North Central Region . . .

Astitution Security Level: M/A Region: MCR

TOTAL Number of Inmates: 10498

Inmates in Population : excluding holdovers and in-transits): 10273 Inmates in Holdover Status:

Filed During Period: 391 Pending at End of Period: Answered During Period: 411 Overdue: Answered On Time: 408 (99.3%) 95

Average Time for Response: 19.03 days

KI/SSS 7/16/1993 9:20 BOP-0

		RI	EMEDI	ES INITI	•	* REMEDIES RESOLVED					
SUBJECT BREAKDOWN	Р	umber & ercent ubmittea	Pe	umber & ercent ejected	P	umber & ercent iled		* h	lumber & Percent Answered	P€	mber & ercent eanted
Classificatn	0 c	10.3%		1.5%	42	10.7%	*	40	9.7%		5.0%
Non-mail Com	4	0.7%	1	0.5%	3	0.8%		5	1.2%	Ō	0.0%
Comm Prgms	27	4.6%	12	5.3%	15	3.8%	*	17	4.1%	0	0.0%
Staff	54	9.3%	2 3	12.1%	31	7.9%		33	8.0%	1	3.0%
Control Unit	3	0.5%	0	0.0%	3	0.8%		2		0	0.0%
DHO Appeals	142	24.4%	52	27.4%	90	23.0%	*	106	25.8%	0	0.0%
<pre>/ atn/Rec</pre>	2	0.3%	1	0.5%	1	0.3%	*	2	0.5%	0	0.0%
	12	2.1%	2	1.1%	10	2.6%	*	9	2.2%	0	0.0%
mst Operatn	13	2 .2 %	1	0.5%	12	3.1%	*	14	3.4%	0	0.0%
Inst Program	2 6	4.5%	11	5.8%	15	3.8%	*	16	3.9%	1	6.3%
Legal	30	5.2%	10	5.3%	20	5.1%	*	20	4.9%	2	10.0%
Mail	16	2.8%	3	1.6%	13	3 .3 %	*	13	3.2%	0	0.0%
ch/Restrnt	1	0.2%	0	0.0%	1	0.3%	*	1		0	0.0%
Spec Housing	20	3.4%	2	1.1%	18	4.6%	*	17		0	0.0%
Transfer	36	6.2%	ii	5.8%	25	5.48	×	17		0	0. 0 %
UDC Actions	41	7.1%	15	7.9%	26	6 .6 %	*	26	6.3%	0	0.0%
Visiting	5	0 .9 %	0	0.0%	5	1.3%	*	7	1.7%	0	0.0%
Work Assign	20	3.4%	6	3.2%	14	3.6%	*	16	3.9%	0	0.0%
Dental Care	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	*	1		0	0.0%
Forced Med	3	0.5%	2	1.1%	1	0.3%	*	1	0.2%	0	0.0%
Medical	34	5 .9 %	11	5.8%	23	5.9%		23		0	0 .0 %
Mental Hlth	2	0.3%	0	0.0%	2		*	2		0	0.0%
Jail Time	14	2.4%	4	2.1%	10	2.6%	*	13		1	7 .7 %
Records	7	1.2%	2	1.1%	5	1.3%	*	5	1.2%	0	0.0%
Sentence Com	9	1.5%	3	1.6%	6	1.5%	*	5	1.2%	1	20.0%
TOTALS: % of Submitted	i:	100.0% 100.0%	190	100.0% 3 2. 7%	3 91	100.0%	*	411	100.0%	8	N/A
% of Answered	:						*		100.0%	•	1.9%
Reason for Regulation informal information achieves	-		1(18.9%) 0.5%) 27.4%)	Re	ong lev -submit her				17(1(34(8.9%) 0.5%) 17.9%)

page: 4 of 6

Date or request: 07/16/93 Summary Period: 22Mar93 thru 20Jun93

Number of Months Found: 3

ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES TRACKING DATA

REGIONAL OFFICE APPEALS FOR: South East Region.

stitution Security Level: M/A Region: SER

TOTAL Number of Inmates: 12562

Inmates in Population (excluding holdovers and in-transits): 11763

Inmates in Holdover Status:

Filed During Period: 254 Pending at End of Period: Answered During Period: 237 Overdue: 236 (99.6%)

Average Time for Response: 17.45 days

	REMEDIES INITIATED								REMEDIES RESOLVED			
SUBJECT BREAKDOWN	P€	imber & ercent ibmitted	Ð.	umber & ercent ejected	P	umber & ercent iled	* * * *	P	umber & ercent nswered	P€	imber & ercent canted	
Classificatn	39	11.73	10	12.8%	29	11.4%	*	24	10.1%	2	8.3%	
Non-mail Com	2	0.6%	Ü	0.0%	2			2	0.8%	ō	0.0%	
Comm Prgms	23	5 .9%	6	7.7%	17			16	6.8%	2	12.5%	
Staff	18	5.4%	4	5.1%	14	5 .5 %	*	16	6.8%	1	6.3%	
Control Unit	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	*	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
DHO Appeals	106	31.9%	28	35.9%	78	3 0.7 %		70	29.5%	9	12.9%	
'_atn/Rec	4	1.2%	1	1.3%	3	1.2%	*	2	0.8%	1	50.0%	
	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	*	1	0.4%	0	0.0%	
Inst Operatn	10	3.0%	3	3 .8%	7	2.8%		10	4.2%	2	20.0%	
Inst Program	4	1.2%	1	1.3%	3	1.2%		4	1.7%	0	0.0%	
Legal	16	4.8%	1	1.3%	15	5 .9 %		20	8.4%	2	10.0%	
Mail	10	3.0%	2	2.6%	8	3.1%	*	3	1.3%	0	0.0%	
h/Restrnt	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%		0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Spec Housing	2	0.6%	2	2.6%	0	0.0%		0	0.0%	. 0	0.0%	
Transier	20	5.UŠ	6	1.7%	14	ち .5 を		⊥4	5 . 9%	1	7.⊥ช้	
UDC Actions	2 3	6 .9 %	7	9.0%	16	6.3%		6	2.5%	0	0.0%	
Visiting	6	1.8%	1	1.3%	5	2.0%		3	1.3%	0	0.0%	
Work Assign	5	1.5%	0	0.0%	5	2.0%	*	6	2.5%	3	50.0%	
Dental Care	2	0.6%	0	0.0%	2	0.8%		2	0.8%	0	0.0%	
Forced Med	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%		0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Medical	10	3.0%	2	2.6%	8	3.1%		10	4.2%	2	20.0%	
Mental Hlth	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%		0	0.0%	0	0 .0 %	
Jail Time	19	5.7%	3	3.8%	16	6.3%		15	6.3%	1	6.7%	
Records	4	1.2%	0	0.0%	4	1.6%		3	1.3%	0	0.0%	
Sentence Com	9	2.7%	1	1.3%	8	3.1%	* *	10	4.2%	1	10.0%	
TOTALS:		100.0%	78	100.0%	254	100.0%		2 37	100.0%	27	N/A	
% of Submitted		100.0%		23.5%		76.5%						
% of Answered:	;						*		100.0%		11.4%	
Reason for Rej	jecti	on:	<i>-</i> ,	c 40 \	••		7	•		.		
Untimely	1 .		5(6.4%)		ong lev				2(2.6%)	
informal r	esol	ution	0(-submit	•			0(0.0%)	
achments			31(39.7%)	Ot	her				9(11.5%)	
KI/SSS 7/16/1993 9:20 BOP-0 page: 3 of 6												

Tate or request: 07/16/93 Summary Period: 22Mar93 thru 20Jun93

Number of Months Found: 3

ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES TRACKING DATA REGIONAL OFFICE APPEALS FOR:

North East Region.

stitution Security Level: N/A Region: NER

TOTAL Number of Inmates: Inmates in Population (excluding holdovers and in-transits): 11651

Inmates in Holdover Status:

Filed During Period: 268
Answered During Period: 274
Answered On Time: 273 (99.6%) Pending at End of Period: 62 Overdue:

Average Time for Response: 10.78 days

		RI	EMEDI	ES INITIA		* REMEDIES RESOLVED					
SUBJECT BREAKDOWN	Pe	umber & ercent ubmitted	Pe	umber & ercent ejected	P	umber & ercent iled		N P A	umber & ercent nswered	P	umber & ercent ranted
Classificatn	27	7.5%	- 	5.6%	21	7.8%	*	23	8.4%		4.3%
Non-mail Com	1	0.3%	Ō	0.0%	1			2	0.7%	ō	
Comm Prgms	2 2	6.1%	6	6.6%	16	6.0%	*	14	5.1%	Ō	
Staff	37	10.3%	17	18.7%	20	7.5%	*	2 2	8.0%	0	
Control Unit	1	0.3%	0	0.0%	1	0.4%	*	0	0.0%	0	
DHO Appeals	118	32.9%	17	18.7%	101	37.7%	*	107	39.1%	12	
F atn/Rec	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0			0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	8	2.2%	2	2.2%	6	2.2%		5	1.8%	0	0.0%
Inst Operatn	10	2.8%	2	2.2%	8	3.0%		7	2.6%	0	
Inst Program	2 2	6.1%	6	6 .6%	16			9	3.3%	0	
Legal	21	5.8%	3	8 .8%	13	4.9%		13	4.7%	0	
Mail	9	2.5%)	0.0%	9	3.4%		11	4.0%	0	•
th/Restrnt	0	0 .0 %	0	0 .0%	0	0.0%		0	0.0%	0	
Spec Housing	4	1.1%	0	0.0%	4			1	0.4%	0	
Transfer	15	4.2%	ક	છે .છે જેં	7	2.68		7	2.68	1	
UDC Actions	13	3.6%	6	6 .6%	7			7	2.6%	2	-
Visiting	2	0.6%	0	0.0%	2	0.7%		5	1.8%	1	20.0%
Work Assign	11	3.1%	2	2.2%	9	3.4%	*	9	3.3%	0	0.0%
Dental Care	1	0.3%	0	0.0%	1	0.4%		1	0.4%	1	
Forced Med	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%		0	0.0%	0	0 .0 %
Medical	18	5.0%	7	7 .7 %	11	4.1%		14	5.1%	0	0 .0 %
Mental Hlth	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%		0	0.0%	0	0 .0 %
Jail Time	7	1.9%	1	1.1%	6	2.2%		8	2.9%	0	0.0%
Records	7	1.9%	2	2.2%	5	1.9%		4	1.5%	0	0.0%
Sentence Com	5	1.4%	1	1.1%	4	1.5%	* *	5	1.8%	0	0.0%
TOTALS: % of Submitted		100.0% 100.0%	91	100.0% 25.3%	268	100.0% 74.7%		274	100.0%	18	N/A
% of Answered		100.0%		23.3%		74.70	*		100.0%		6.6%
Reason for Rej	iecti	on:									
Untimely	<i>,</i> –	•	5(5.5%)	Wr	ong lev	rel			4 (4.4%)
informal n	cesol	ution	1(1.1%)		-súbmit				o (0.0%)
ıchments				48.4%)		her				14(15.4%)
KI/SSS 7/16/1993 9:20 BOP-0 page: 2 of 6											

LITIGATION - 1993 THIRD QUARTER REPORT

LOC	NUM	HC	FTC	BIV	отн	ANS	PEN	CLD	н/т	SET	AWD
MXR	32	8	5	17	2	16	153	21	4	1	\$10,000
NCR	72	22	12	24	14		573	40	0	0	0
NER	59	15	7	30	7	57	267	46	3	4	\$3,600
SCR	69	31	4	31	3	50	224	30	7	0	\$313
SER	73	41	3	19	10	73		29	3	0	0
WXR	66	22	9	26	9		627	17	20	1	\$79,615
со	11	4	0	3	5	8	100	12	0	0	0
TOT	382	143	40	150	50	204	1944	195	37	6	\$93,528

DEFINITIONS

- N/A Not Available no method for tracking this information
- LOC Location
- NUM Total Number of Lawsuits Filed in Quarter
- HC Number of Habeas Corpus Actions Filed in Quarter
- FTC Number of FTCA Actions Filed in Quarter
- BIV Number of Bivens Actions Filed in Quarter
- OTH Other Actions Filed in Quarter
- ANS Number of Litigation Reports Completed
- PEN Number of Actions Pending
- CLD Number of Actions Closed
- H/T Number of Hearings or Trials (Narrative Analysis Follows)
- SET Number of Settlements (Narrative Analysis Follows)
- AWD Amount of Awards

LITIGATION ANALYSIS

The number of lawsuits filed in the third quarter increased by 52 over the previous quarter, with 330 filed in the second quarter and 382 filed in the third quarter. The amount of monetary damages awarded in this quarter was greater than in the previous quarter, with \$93,528 in the third quarter and \$57,049 in the second quarter.

OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL QUARTERLY REPORT FOURTH QUARTER 1993

ADMINISTRATIVE CLAIMS - 1993 FOURTH QUARTER REPORT JULY 1, 1993 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 1993

				·						
LOC	NUM	PROP	PI	APPR	AMT	DEN	PEND	OD	A/O	A/P
MXR	162	121	41	17	814	92	265	14	93	130
NER	216	135	81	11	913	87	289	6	9	129
SER	167	139	28	20	618	92	263	61	**	134
NCR	167	118	49	31	2,620	67	183	6	40	100
SCR	212	174	38	1	879	114	274	4	4	150
WXR	162	138	24	51	348	13	321	59	**	**
CO	61	32	29	55	15,202	0	6	1	12	12
TOT	1147	857	290	186	21,394	465	1601	151	32	111

DEFINITIONS

LOC - LOCATION

NUM - NUMBER FILED IN QUARTER

PROP - PROPERTY CLAIM

PI - PERSONAL INJURY CLAIM

APPR - APPROVED

AMT - AMOUNT APPROVED

DEN - DENIED

PEND - PENDING

OD - NUMBER OVERDUE

A/O - AVERAGE NUMBER OF DAYS OVERDUE

A/P - AVERAGE LENTH OF TIME TO PROCESS

N/A - DATA NOT AVAILABLE

ADMINISTRATIVE CLAIMS - 1993 FOURTH QUARTER REPORT JULY 1, 1993 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 1993

	T		7							
LOC	NUM	PROP	PI	APPR	AMT	DEN	PEND	OD	A/O	A/P
MXR	162	121	41	17	814	92	265	14	93	130
NER	216	135	81	11	913	87	289	6	9	129
SER	167	139	28	20	618	92	263	61	**	134
NCR	167	118	49	31	2,620	67	183	6	40	100
SCR	212	174	38	1	879	114	274	4	4	150
WXR	162	138	24	51	348	13	321	59	**	**
СО	61	32	29	55	15,202	0	6	1	12	12
TOT	1147	857	290	186	21,394	465	1601	151	32	111

DEFINITIONS

LOC - LOCATION

NUM - NUMBER FILED IN QUARTER

PROP - PROPERTY CLAIM

PI - PERSONAL INJURY CLAIM

APPR - APPROVED

AMT - AMOUNT APPROVED

DEN - DENIED

PEND - PENDING

OD - NUMBER OVERDUE

A/O - AVERAGE NUMBER OF DAYS OVERDUE

A/P - AVERAGE LENTH OF TIME TO PROCESS

N/A - DATA NOT AVAILABLE

ADMINISTRATIVE CLAIMS - 1993 THIRD QUARTER REPORT APRIL 1, 1993 THRU JUNE 30, 1993

LOC	NUM	PROP	PI	APPR	AMT	DEN	PEND	OD	A/O	A/P
MXR	212	135	69	14	1,980	73	243	8	64	111
NER	154	123	31	27	5,469	40	222	0	0	94
SER	114	101	13	0	0	43	216	19	**	121
NCR	168	123	45	16	326	38	145	0	0	81
SCR	183	149	33	1	0	25	278	1	1	83
WXR	138	106	32	64	10,621	70	370	154	**	**
со	42	24	18	30	6,378	1	11	0	0	12
TOT	1011	761	241	152	24,774	282	1485	182	13	83

LITIGATION STATISTICS FOR FOURTH OUARTER, 1993

LOC	MUM	HC	FTC	BIV	отн	ANS	PEN	CLD	H/T	SET	AWD
MXR	55	28	5	20	2	61	169	39	5	1	10,000
NCR	59	26	7	24	2		533	42			0.00
NER	78	23	12	31	12	48	30	48	6	3	0.00
SCR	51	23	5	21	2	38	168	56	4	1	0.00
SER	48	19	3	19	7	48		74	1	0	0.00
WXR	31	18	0	12	1		651	24		0	0.00
СО	12	4	2	2	4	4	110	3	1	0	0.00
TOT	325	139	32	127	27	198	1554	286	17	5	\$10,000

DEFINITIONS

- N/A Not Available no method for tracking this information
- LOC Location
- NUM Total Number of Lawsuits Filed in Quarter
- HC Number of Habeas Corpus Actions Filed in Quarter
- FTC Number of FTCA Actions Filed in Quarter
- BIV Number of Bivens Actions Filed in Quarter
- OTH Other Actions Filed in Quarter
- ANS Number of Litigation Reports Completed
- PEN Number of Actions Pending
- CLD Number of Actions Closed
- H/T Number of Hearings or Trials (Narrative Analysis Follows)
- SET Number of Settlements (Narrative Analysis Follows)
- AWD Amount of Awards

LITIGATION ANALYSIS

The number of lawsuits filed in the fourth quarter decreased by 57 over the previous quarter, with 325 filed in the fourth quarter, and 382 filed in the third quarter. The amount of monetary damages awarded in this quarter was less than in the previous quarter, with \$10,000 in the fourth quarter, and \$93,528 in the third quarter.

1993 QUARTERLY LITIGATION REPORT

FOURTH QUARTER

I. HEARINGS AND TRIALS

MID-ATLANTIC REGION

Washington, et al. v. Reno, et al., Eastern District of Kentucky

Plaintiffs, inmates at FMC Lexington, filed this lawsuit alleging that the Inmate Telephone System (ITS) violates constitutional rights. On July 9, 1993, the court stayed implementation of the ITS at FMC Lexington. On August 18, 1993, the court ordered the Bureau to extend, for 60 days, the period for comment on the ITS rule. The court expanded the temporary injunction and enjoined the Bureau of Prisons from implementing the ITS system unless collect calls are also available in each housing unit and enjoined use of the commissary fund to pay for the ITS. The government is now considering whether this order is appealable and whether a stay of this order can be obtained.

NORTH CENTRAL REGION

Howard v. United States of America, District of Colorado

In this action for compensatory, punitive, and injunctive relief, the plaintiff sought an order compelling FCI staff to provide him time and space at the facility to perform the rituals of the Church of Satan. Plaintiff asserted that he has been a member of the Church of Satan since 1987 and that the institutions' refusal to allow him to practice his religion is a violation of his Constitutional rights arising under the First Amendment. The government's motion for summary judgment and Plaintiff's crossmotion for summary judgment were denied on August 31, 1993. A hearing is scheduled on October 8, 1993.

NORTHEAST REGION

U.S. v. Hillstrom, Middle District of Pennsylvania

In <u>U.S. v. Hillstrom</u>, 988 F.2d 448 (3d Cir. 1993), the Third Circuit remanded this sentencing guideline case for additional information concerning the nature of Federal Prison Camp - Allenwood. Defendant Carl Hillstrom escaped from FPC Allenwood in October 1990 by walking away from a work detail off the main compound of the camp. He was apprehended in November 1991. The sentencing guidelines provide the base offense level for such an escape. The issue was whether Hillstrom was entitled to a reduction in the base offense level because the escape was from the

non-secure custody of a CCC or "similar facility" as opposed to a secure facility. The sentencing Judge held that FPC Allenwood was not similar in nature to a CCC. The Third Circuit agreed that FPC Allenwood is not sufficiently similar to the pre-release component of a CCC. The Third Circuit, however, found that the sentencing judge did not consider whether FPC Allenwood was sufficiently similar to the community corrections component of a CCC. The Third Circuit remanded with instructions to the district court to consider this question. The hearing was held, but a decision has not yet been reached.

In re Friedlander, Eastern District of New York

Inmate Harry Friedlander filed a petition for mandamus requesting Kosher food at FPC Allenwood. For medical reasons, FPC Allenwood agreed to provide a medical, nutritious diet which comported with the inmate's religion. The inmate then filed a motion to compel compliance alleging that the lack of variety and the lack of warm meals violated the spirit of the agreement. A hearing was held on August 13, 1993 and the Judge recommended that the inmate's motion be denied. The petition for mandamus was dismissed.

United States v. Gonzalez, Southern District of New York

The plaintiff in this case challenged the authority of the Bureau of Prisons to require those placed in CCC's to provide subsistence payments to the institution when employed outside the CCC. The plaintiff's motion was denied. The Judge implied that the Bureau's authority to impose such payments on a probationer is derivative of the Sentencing Judge's authority to impose those conditions on probationers.

SOUTH CENTRAL REGION

Henthorn v. Hester, Western District of Tennessee

The plaintiff filed this <u>Bivens</u> action alleging he was homosexually fondled by FPC Millington Correctional Officer Michael Hester. A Motion for Summary Judgment/Motion to Dismiss was denied. The Judge believed that the defendant may, in fact, have been acting in accordance with normal and permissible procedures and that such procedures may include touching of genitalia while conducting a search. Because of this, the Judge stated that she would reconsider the motion for summary judgment if the defendant submitted an affidavit explaining what procedures he used while patting down plaintiff during the search(es) complained of. Such affidavits were filed and it is anticipated that this case will be dismissed.

SOUTHEAST REGION

Mitchell v. United States Department of Justice, Northern District of Georgia

An employee at USP Atlanta filed a complaint alleging discrimination. He claimed that the administration placed him on home duty status based solely on the allegation of a white officer. This officer alleged that Mr. Mitchell threatened him with a weapon while on duty in the tower. On August 9, 1993, a trial was held on the merits of the case. A decision has not yet been announced.

WESTERN REGION

Ajala v. United States Parole Commission, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

An American citizen who was convicted of importation of heroin in England was transferred to the United States to serve her sentence. The United States Parole Commission calculated her sentence, taking into account good time credit and jail time credit. The inmate contested the accuracy of the sentence calculation. The Ninth Circuit held for the inmate because the law in the Ninth Circuit indicates that the United States Parole Commission should calculate the inmate's sentence, but the Bureau of Prisons should calculate the good time credit and jail time credit. The region is awaiting the outcome of a similar case recently heard in the United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit in order to determine how to advise ISM's to proceed with treaty transfer sentence computations in the future.

Fraley v. Bureau of Prisons, et al., United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

The plaintiff, Fraley, had been placed on "house arrest" for 7 months prior to her trial. At sentencing, she received a ten month prison term with two years supervised release. The Bureau of Prisons did not award Fraley jail time credit for the time she spent on house arrest because it did not comport with Bureau policy. Fraley argued that house arrest was comparable to official detention under 18 USC § 3585. In the alternative, the plaintiff raised an equal protection argument. She argued that she was similarly situated to post-conviction inmates who are sent to CCC's to complete their sentences. The fact that post-conviction inmates get sentence credit for time in CCC's and those detained pre-trial do not get credit constitutes the violation of equal protection. The Ninth Circuit disagreed with the plaintiff on both theories and held both that house arrest is more like third party custody than official detention. The Court also indicated that a decision whether or not to award credit to post-conviction inmates is that of the Attorney General and the Bureau of Prisons.

Alexander v. Perrill, District of Arizona

Plaintiff brought a habeas corpus action claiming that he had not received the foreign jail time credit to which he was entitled. The plaintiff's claim was successful and his immediate release was ordered. This decision was not appealed. The inmate then filed a Bivens suit against BOP staff contending that his sentence recalculation resulted in his late release from custody. The Court refused to grant Warden Perrill and ISM Rivera qualified immunity and this decision was upheld by the Ninth Circuit on appeal. The case was remanded to the District Court. The only issue remaining is that of damages.

Robinson v. Sivley, District of Arizona

This case raised the question of whether inmates housed within the Ninth Circuit are to be given jail time credit according to the law of that circuit or the circuit in which they were sentenced. The Court ruled that the appropriate forum for deciding a jail time credit issue is the jurisdiction which has the "body" because the issue of credit arises during the execution of the sentence. We will recommend appeal if we are supported by the Solicitor General.

CENTRAL OFFICE

Lampkin v. U.S., District of Columbia

The plaintiff, a former federal inmate, alleged that he did not receive proper medical treatment for an injury to his Achilles tendon while he was at USP Lewisburg in 1989. The plaintiff sustained the injury while at the Alexandria Detention Center. was transferred to USP Lewisburg where a physicians' assistant diagnosed him as having acute tendinitis, or a strain or inflammation of the Achilles tendon. When the plaintiff was transferred to FCI Morgantown nearly two weeks later, it was discovered that he had a ruptured Achilles tendon. The case went to trial on August 9, 1993. The plaintiff claimed that the government breached a duty to provide timely medical treatment; specifically, that the physicians' assistant should have referred Mr. Lampkin to a physician for diagnosis. The Alexandria Detention Center settled a separate action for \$25,000 prior to the plaintiff filing this suit.

II. SETTLEMENTS AND AWARDS

MID-ATLANTIC REGION

Bevans v. United States, Eastern District of Pennsylvania

In this FTCA case, the plaintiff claimed he was entitled to \$50,000 because the Bureau failed to provide medical services during his pre-designation status at Petersburg, Atlanta and Lewisburg. An arbitration panel met on September 22, 1993, and awarded \$10,000 to the plaintiff. Essentially, the Panel found that the plaintiff's statements were believable, that he had complained of various severe symptoms and that his complaints had been unanswered. The plaintiff did receive a physical exam once he was designated to FCI Morgantown in April 1990. We have recommended to the Office of General Counsel that we do not appeal this case. We believe the violation of policy is likely to come out at trial, and risk a higher award.

NORTHEAST REGION

Pullman v. United States, Eastern District of New York

This wrongful death/FTCA case was brought by the estate of former inmate S. Frederick Pullman who died at FCI Otisville in May 1988. A trial was scheduled to commence on August 24, 1993. On the eve of trial, the Judge conferred with counsel and pressed for settlement. The evidence showed that medical treatment was delayed for at least a 25 minutes after Pullman showed signs of a heart attack. In addition, deposition testimony of the officer who first alerted the medical staff of the emergency was quite damaging. Prior to incarceration, Pullman was an oral surgeon. He expected to resume his practice upon release. The case was settled for \$300,000.

SOUTH CENTRAL REGION

Williams v. United States, Western District of Tennessee

The plaintiff, seventy-one year old James Perry Williams, filed this FTCA case alleging negligence on the part of the medical staff at FCI Memphis. The plaintiff claimed that the medical staff was negligent when it transported him to the Health Services Unit from the Recreation Yard in a golf cart type ambulance without fastening his seatbelt. When the cart went around a corner, the cart hit a flower bed and the plaintiff was thrown from the cart. Perry does not appear to have any permanent injuries; however, compensation for pain and suffering may be appropriate. Perry is represented by counsel. The Assistant U.S. Attorney is preparing to propose a settlement of \$7,500.00. Plaintiff agreed to a settlement of \$5,000.00. A Stipulation for Comprise Settlement has been forwarded to plaintiff's attorney for approval.

WESTERN REGION

Sisneros v. Harrison et. al., District of Colorado

A female inmate in Phoenix claimed she was sexually assaulted by a male correctional officer. Our investigation substantiated her allegations. The correctional officer was fired and the case was referred to the United States Attorney's Office in Phoenix for prosecution. The Office declined to prosecute. The inmate filed a Bivens/FTCA suit. Department of Justice representation was not authorized for the correctional officer. The Court denied the Bureau's motion for summary judgment. We have agreed to settle for \$85,000.

LITIGATION - 1993 FOURTH QUARTER REPORT JULY 1, 1993 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 1993

LOC	NUM	нс	FTC	BIV	OTH	ANS	PEN	CLD	H/T	SET	AWD
MXR	55	28	5	20	2	61	169	39	5	1	\$10,000
NER	78	23	12	31	12	48	30	48	6	3	0
SER	48	19	3	19	7	48		74	1	0	0
NCR	59	26	7	24	2		533	42			0
SCR	51	23	5	21	2	38	168	56	4	1	0
WXR	31	18	0	12	1		651	24		0	0
СО	12	4	2	2	4	4	110	3	1	0	0
TOT	325	139	32	127	27	198	1554	286	17	5	\$10,000

DEFINITIONS:

N/A - Not Available - no method of tracking this information

LOC - Location

NUM - Number of Total Lawsuits Filed in Quarter

HC - Number of Habeas Corpus Actions Filed

FTS - Number of FTCA Actions Filed

BIV - Number of Bivens Actions Filed

OTH - Other Actions Filed

ANS - Number of Litigation Reports Completed

PEN - Pending

CLD - Number of Actions Closed

H/T - Number of Hearings or Trials (Narrative analysis follows)

SET - Number of Settlements (Narrative analysis follows)

AWD - Amount of Awards

LITIGATION - 1993 THIRD QUARTER REPORT APRIL 1, 1993 THROUGH JUNE 30, 1993

*** ****	_,										
LOC	NUM	HC	FTC	BIV	отн	ANS	PEN	CLD	H/T	SET	AWD
MXR	32	8	5	17	2	16	153	21	4	1	\$10,000
NER	59	15	7	30	7	57	267	46	3	4	\$ 3,600
SER	73	41	3	19	10	73	N/A	29	3	0	0
NCR	72	22	12	24	14	N/A	573	40	0	0	0
SCR	69	31	4	31	3	50	224	30	7	0	\$ 313
WXR	66	22	9	26	9	N/A	627	17	20	1	\$79,615
СО	11	4	0	3	5	8	100	12	0	0	0
TOT	382	143	40	150	50	204	1944	195	37	6	\$93,528

FOIA LITIGATION QUARTERLY STATISTICS JULY 1, 1993 - SEPTEMBER 30, 1993

PENDING FOIA CASES = 13 CASES FILED IN LAST QUARTER = 8

EEO LITIGATION STATISTICS July 1, 1993 - September 30, 1993

LOC	NUM	нс	FTC	BIV	отн	ANS	PEN	CLD	н/т	SE	AWD
MXR											
NER											
SER											
NCR											
SCR											
WXR											
со											
тот	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0

^{*}Title VII

NARRATIVE (update)

Adnan Niaz Mir v. Federal Bureau of Prisons, No. 92B00225

On July 22, 1993, the Plaintiff filed his responsive statement, arguing why the Court should not dismiss the citizenship status portion of his suit. On August 6, 1993, the Defendant filed a Motion for Summary Decision.

EEO - FOURTH QUARTER REPORT 1993 JULY 1, 1993 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 1993

LOC	ทบ	N	RL	R	D	s	R	A	С	FD	s	P	A/0
MXR	5	. 0	0	0	3	0	0	2	7	3	0	11	0
NER	4	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	11	2	2	12	0
SER	8	0	0	7	0_	4	3	0	14	3	0	28	2
NCR	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	9	6	2	10	2
SCR	9	3	0	0	0	6	0	0	18	6	2	17	0
WXR	11	4	0	0	0	7	0	1	10	1	0	14	3
СО	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	1	0
TOT	43	10	0	7	3	21	4	5	71	23	8	93	7

NARRATIVE ANALYSIS

LOC - LOCATION

NU - TOTAL NUMBER OF EEO COMPLAINTS FILED

N - NUMBER OF NATIONAL ORIGIN COMPLAINTS FILED

RL - NUMBER OF COMPLAINTS FILED ALLEGING RELIGIOUS DISCRIMINATION

R - NUMBER OF COMPLAINTS FILED ALLEGING RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

H - NUMBER OF COMPLAINTS FILED ALLEGING HANDICAP DISCRIMINATION

S - NUMBER OF COMPLAINTS FILED ALLEGING SEXUAL DISCRIMINATION

R - NUMBER OF COMPLAINTS FILED ALLEGING REPRISAL

A - NUMBER OF COMPLAINTS FILED ALLEGING AGE DISCRIMINATION

C - NUMBER OF COMPLAINTS COMPLETED BY CENTRAL OFFICE

FD - NUMBER OF COMPLAINTS WITH FINAL DISPOSITION

S - NUMBER OF COMPLAINTS SETTLED

P - NUMBER OF COMPLAINTS PROCESSED

A/O - AVERAGE NUMBER OF DAYS OVERDUE

A/P - AVERAGE NUMBER OF DAYS TO PROCESS

EEO - THIRD QUARTER REPORT 1993

APRIL 1, 1993 THROUGH JUNE 30, 1993

LOC	אט	N	RL	R	D	s	R	A	С	FD	s	P	A/0
MXR	8	1	0	2	0	7	0	1	5	0	1	17	0
NER	7	0	0	7	0	4	0	0	4	1	1	11	0
SER	9	1	0	1	0	3	3	1	11	1	2	32	0
NCR	4	0	0	1	0	2	1	1	2	6	1	19	1
SCR	12	5	0	8	0	6	1	1	15	3	4	22	1
WXR	4	0	0	2	1	1	2	1	4	4	1	26	0
СО	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	1
TOT	45	7	0	22	1	24	7	5	41	15	10	133	3

EEO QUARTERLY STATISTICS July 1, 1993 - September 30, 1993

LOC	N (1)	МО	RL	R	D	S	RP	A	ST	C (2)	FD	P (3)	O* (4)
MXR	5	0	0	0	3	0	0	2	0	7	3	11	0
NER	4	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	11	2	12	0
SER	8	0	0	7	0	4	3	0	0	14	3	28	2*
NCR	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	2	9	6	10	2*
SCR	9	3	0	0	0	6	0	0	2	18	6	17	0
WXR	11	4	0	0	0	7	0	1	0	10	1	14	3*
со	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	1	0
тот	43	10	0	7	3	21	4	5	8	71	23	93	7

SEE ATTACHED KEY

KEY

N = Number complaints filed

NO = Number of complaints filed based on national origin

RL = Number of complaints filed based on religion

R = Number of complaints filed based on race

D = Number of complaints filed based on disability

S = Number of complaints filed based on sex

RP = Number of complaints filed based on reprisal

A = Number of complaints filed based on age

ST = Number of complaints settled

C = Number of complaints closed by BOP EEO Staff, including settlements

FD = Number of final agency decisions issued by the CAO and/or DOJ dismissals, cancellations, or rejections

P = Number of complaints pending under EEO Complaints Section

O - Number of complaints over 180 days being processed under 1614

- (1) Number of complaints filed differs from the bases filed because a complainant may file on more than on basis.
- (2) Number of complaints settled and the number of complaints in which the investigative files were sent to the complainant by the EEO Complaints Section.
- (3) Number of complaints pending that were under the control of the EEO Complaints Section. Number of complaints in total inventory is 269, which represents the number of Bureau of Federal Prisons complaints at the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) for hearing, Department of Justice (DOJ) for final agency decision, and in the EEO Complaints Section.
- (4) There were 63 complaints still being processed under the old regulations (1613) that are over 180 days.

*Extensions were granted by the complainants

SETTLEMENTS FOURTH QUARTER

North Central Region

1. Terms. The complainant alleged discrimination against the Federal Correctional Institution, Sandstone, Minnesota based on sex (female) and retaliation for being a witness in an EEO investigation when she was denied overtime at her convenience; negative entries were made in her Significant Incident Log; derogatory comments were allegedly made about her by the Health Services Administrator and the Health Services Secretary; and her duty assignments were not made appropriately. The complaint was settled on August 17, 1993, prior to a hearing conducted by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC). The settlement agreement provided that FCI Sandstone would hire the complainant as a GS-6/8, Unit Secretary.

Reason for Settlement. The complaint was settled by Labor Management Relations (LMR) staff prior to the hearing being conducted.

Central Office

1. Terms. The complainant alleged that she was discriminated against because of her sex (pregnancy) when her supervisor suggested that she find another position; her supervisor advised her that he was unable to authorize a flexible work schedule for her, and he did not respond to her written requests for flexiplace, and requests for compensatory time. The complainant also alleged that reprisals were taken against her for filing an EEO complaint when she received a "Fully Successful" performance evaluation; she was denied administrative leave to work on her EEO complaint; and she was denied four months of leave for maternity/child care.

In her second complaint, the complainant alleged discrimination based on her sex (female) and reprisals for filing an EEO complaint, when she received a fully successful rating on elements 2 and 4 on her Significant Incident Log (SIL) in August, 1992; a Fully Successful SIL rating in September, 1992; when she had to provide her supervisor a detailed accounting of her work on EEO matters during the month of October, 1992; and she had to submit special documentation for her request for leave on October 7, 1992.

Both complaints were settled on September 29, 1993, by agreeing to destroy all of the complainant's Significant Incident Logs; handle her requests for leave the same as for other staff members; pay the complainant compensatory damages in the amount of \$1,880.00 and attorneys fees in the amount of \$7,000.00.

Reason for Settlement. Both of these complaints were settled with the approval of the General Counsel, Acting Assistant Director, and the Director because there was a possibility that a finding of discrimination would be made by the Complaint Adjudication Officer or the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

North East Region

1. Terms. The Complainant alleged that he was discriminated against based on his race (Asian), religion (Christian), sex (male), national origin (Chinese), and was retaliated against for participation in the EEO process when he was not selected for a secretarial position at MCC New York. The complaint was settled on July 9, 1993, when his SF-50 was changed to reflect resignation from his position as a GS-6, Correctional Officer, MCC, New York, rather than termination.

Reason for Settlement. This complaint was settled by the EEO Investigator through fact finding/mediation. It was cost effective to settle this complaint.

South Central Region

1. Terms. A complaint, filed against the Federal Correctional Institution, Seagoville, Texas, alleged discrimination based on race (Caucasian) when the complainant received negative entries in her Significant Incident Log. The complaint was settled on June 10, 1993, when management agreed to withdraw documentation and other negative information contained in her performance file, and to remove all derogatory information from the Official Personnel File.

Reason for Settlement. This complaint was settled by the EEO Investigator prior to the investigation through fact finding/mediation. It was cost effective to settle this complaint.

CONTRACT REVIEW STATISTICS REPORT FROM: 07/01/93 TO: 09/30/93

OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL COMMERCIAL LAW BRANCH	
No. of Contract Actions Submitted for Review	255
No. of Contract Actions Completed	238
No. of Pending Contracts	17
Average Number of Days To Process	7

Types of	Contracts	Submitted for	Review
ADP	4	IGA	3
A&E	7	SITE PREP	0
ccc	47	UTIL	5
CONST	29	OTHERS	159
SUPPLY	1		

Div	Division Generating Contracts										
ADM	55	FPI	152								
CPD	0	HRM	0								
DIR	0	MED	0								
PRD	0	OGC	0								
IPPA	0	CCD	48								
NIC	0										

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT
MEMORANDUM
FEDERAL BUREAU OF PRISONS

OCT | 4 1993

ATE:

SPLY TO

THE CE.

"TAJECT:

:0:

George E. Pruden, II J

Federal Bureau of Prisons

Ethics Training Conducted for Federal Bureau of Prisons Personnel

Janis A. Sposato, Associate Assistant Attorney General Justice Management Division

I am pleased to report that Ethics training has been provided to three-hundred and four (304) employees of the Federal Bureau of Prisons for the period covering July 1, 1993, to September 30, 1993.

The four (4) training events (lists of attendees are attached) included the following:

- (1) An Ethics training session of one and one quarter (1 1/4) hours was offered to two-hundred and eighty-eight (288) Bureau employees at the National Association of Blacks in Criminal Justice Conference in Houston, Texas on July 20, 1993.
- (2) An Ethics and Sexual Harassment training session of two and one half (2 1/2) hours was offered to six (6) employees as part of New Employee Orientation on July 27, 1993.
- (3) An Ethics and Sexual Harassment training session of two and one half (2 1/2) hours was offered to six (6) employees as part of New Employee Orientation on August 24, 1993.
- (4) An Ethics and Sexual Harassment training session of two and one half (2 1/2) hours was offered to four (4) employees as part of New Employee Orientation on September 21, 1993.

Attachment

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT MEMORANDUM

FEDERAL BUREAU OF PRISONS

DATE: ()ctober 22, 1993

REPLY TO

John L. Megathlin, Administrator

ATTH OF: 'National Inmate Appeals

SUBJECT: CRIPA - Quarterly Activity Report

Wallace H. Cheney
Assistant Director\General Counsel

→ Thru: Mike Pearlman and Carolyn Sabol

We are pleased to provide you with our Quarterly Activity Report in the area of CRIPA.

JURISDICTIONS CERTIFIED

Swan River Correctional Alternative Training Center, Montana - Pursuant to our recommendation, the Swan River (Forest Camp), Montana Department of Corrections, was granted conditional certification on September 27, 1993.

Forsyth County Jail, North Carolina - Conditional certification was also granted to Forsyth County Jail September 27, 1993 following our recommendation.

Kansas - The Kansas Department of Corrections was granted full certification on October 15, 1993 pursuant to our recommendation.

PENDING RECOMMENDATIONS

New Mexico - Our recommendation that full certification be granted to the State of New Mexico Correctional Department was forwarded to the Department of Justice on October 21, 1993.

APPLICATIONS UNDER REVIEW

Guilford County, North Carolina - The Guilford County Sheriff's Department submitted a formal application on September 21, 1993. We completed our review on October 19, 1993 informing them of modifications needed in their grievance procedure in order to meet the minimum standards for certification.

Michigan - We continue to provide frequent assistance to the Michigan Department of Corrections in their certification efforts.

Vermont - We are awaiting further documentation from the Vermont Department of Corrections before we can continue with the certification review process.

Rhode Island - In January, 1993 we advised this jurisdiction that their application did not meet the minimum standards for certification. We are maintaining an open file for the remainder of the year pursuant to their request.

Correspondences

As noted in our last report, we continue to receive letters from concerned parties regarding various jurisdictions which have been involved in the certification process. A log is maintained to track the correspondences, the majority of which are generated by inmates.

The Colorado Department of Corrections recently advised us that they will seek a review of their grievance procedure.

Strategies

We are currently in the process of updating the CRIPA Information Handbook which is distributed to interested jurisdictions, courts, and other parties. The Office of Public Affairs has been very generous in their assistance.

Attachment

cc: Kathleen M. Hawk Director

CRIPA APPLICATIONS UNDER TITLE 28 C.F.R. PART 40 Updated: October 21, 1993

STATE PROCEDURES

LOCAL & COUNTY PROCEDURES

Certified

Virginia	12-14-82	
Wyoming St Pen	06-11-83	
Roanoke Cnty\Salem Jail, VA.	01-20-87	
Iowa	01-02-87	
Ohio	09-11-87	
Nebraska	09-28-87	
Portsmouth, VA.	11-28-88	
	07-11-89	Now Jefferson City Cor Cntr
Montgomery Cnty, MD.	04-04-91	
Nevada (Cond)	05-20-91	Lapsed
Missouri	03-20-92	Other than State Pen
Florida	03-25-92	
*Kansas (Cond)	03-27-92	
Hawaii (Cond)	04-17-92	Lapsed
Dist of Columbia	06-12-92	
New York	09-28-92	
County of Bucks/PA	12-08-92	Conditional
Connecticut	01-11-93	
Montana	01-11-93	
Wyoming	01-14-93	
Tennessee	05-26-93	
Swan River Forest Camp, MT	09-27-93	
	09-27-93	Conditional
Kansas (Full)	10-15-93	

REVIEW COMPLETED

New Mexico

10-18-93 (Recommended full cert)

Pending Applications

Vermont Rhode Island Michigan Guilford Cty, N.C.

Informal Review of Anticipated Applicant's Grievance Procedure

Arkansas

Arkansas (2nd Review)

Informal Inquiries

State
Alaska
Arizona
Colorado
Georgia
Illinois
Indiana
Louisiana
Massachusetts
South Carolina
Virgin Islands
Washington
West Virginia
Kentucky

Local
Alachua County, Florida
Caddo Parish, Louisiana
Cook County, Illinois
Dade County, Florida
Fairfax, Virginia
Hennepin County, Minnesota
Marion County, Salem, Oregon
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Prairie Correctional Facility, Appleton, MN
Prince Georges County, Maryland
Rappahannock County, Virginia
Sullivan County, New Hampshire
Frederick County, Virginia
Arlington County, VA

QUARTERLY REPORT - ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES JULY - SEPTEMBER 1993

Administrative Remedy data is provided directly from the Key Indicator (KI/SSS) system. The first three of the attached reports show information on institution filings, regional appeals and central office appeals aggregated for the Bureau as a whole (BOP - All Institutions). The remaining six reports display, for each region, aggregate information in regional appeals filed by inmates in all institutions in that region.

Administrative Remedy data for Community Corrections is also provided in Part II.

Some observations about the data in the attached reports.

- o The total number of filings for this quarter showed decreases at all levels as compared to last quarter's numbers. Institution filings went from 3,153 to 3,090; regional appeals from 1,764 to 1711; and central office appeals from 717 to 662.
- o Grant rates for this quarter showed increases at the institution and regional level and a decrease at the central office level. The grant rates at the institution level went from 16.0% to 16.3%; regional appeals from 8.6% to 8.9%; and central office appeals from 3.6% to 2.3%.
- o Staff complaints continue to be the highest category at the institution level (14.2% or 440 of the 3,090 complaints filed).
- o Medical complaints returned as the second highest category at the institution level and increased from last quarter(323 or 10.5%, up from 290 or 9.2%).
- o Other categories in the top ten at the institution level were: Classification (10.1%), UDC (8.5%), Transfer (7.6%), Institution Operations (7.1%), Community Programs (5.9%), Work Assignments (5.8%), and Institution Programs/Legal (3.8%). This list is similar to the lists for the previous nine quarter, although the order of highest to lowest changed somewhat. The percentage distribution among the 25 subject codes is also similar to the distribution for the previous quarters.

- o For regional appears, the top five categories were: DHO Appears 10.6%, lown from 30.8%), Classification 9.7%, up from 9.5%), Staff Complaints (6.3%, down from 7.6%), and Medical Complaints (5.7%, up from 4.8%).
- o The nighest number of regional appeals (392) was filed in the North Central Region, which has the lowest number of inmates 10,307). The lowest number of regional appeals (222) was filed in the Southeast Region which has the second lowest number of inmates (12,775).
- o At the central office level, filings for DHO Appeals remained the sighest category and decreased from last quarter (133 or 20.1%, down from 166 or 23.2%).
- o Central Office Appeals in the Classification category increased in relative frequency from 10.6% to 13.3%, and remained as second highest for the sixth consecutive quarter. The remaining categories in the top five were: Jail Time (7.1%, up from 6.7%), Medical (6.8%, equal to last quarter), Staff Complaints (6.3%, down from 7.8%), and Legal (6.3%, equal to last quarter).

Summary Period: 21Jun93 thru 19Sep93 Number of Months Found: 3 Pito of request: 10 10,00

ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES TRACKING DATA

INSTITUTION FILINGS FOR: BOP--411 Institutions. . .

Insultation Security Level: M/A Region: .

TOTAL Number of Inmates: 84854 Inmates in Population (excluding holdovers and in-transits): 76530 Inmates in Holdover Status: 2953

Inmates In-Transit: 5371

* 3 3090
Filed During Period: 3090
Answered During Feriod: 3033
Answered On Time: 2776 (91.5%) Pending at End of Period: 814 Overdue: 162

Average Time for Response: 14.50 days

| Average : .me | IUL : | Keapouse | 4 | .so day | ' 5 | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|---|---|--|-----------------|---|--|---|---|
| REMEDIES INITIATED * REMEDIES * | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SUBJECT
BREAKDOWN | Pe | umber &
ercent
ubmitted | P | umber & ercent ejected | Pe | umber &
ercent
iled | | * P | umber & ercent nswerea | Pe | umber &
ercent
ranted |
| Classificatn Non-mail Com Comm Proms Staff Control Unit Appeals tn/Rec | 365
29
206
520
6
34
41 | 10.0%
0.8%
5.6%
14.3%
0.2%
0.9%
1.1% | 54
5
24
80
1
26 | 9.7%
0.9%
4.3%
14.3%
0.2%
4.7%
1.1% | 311
24
182
440
5
8 | 10.1%
0.8%
5.9%
14.2%
0.2%
0.3%
1.1% | * * * * * | 316
25
191
448
5
9 | | 50
6
19
56
1
0 | |
| Inst Operatn Inst Program Legal Mail Srch/Restrnt Spec Housing Transfer UDC Actions Visiting | 56
264
139
146
115
33
120
277
342
90 | 1.5%
7.28%
4.02%
7.36%
7.64%
7.5% | 8
45
22
28
14
3
16
41
79
14 | 1.4%
8.1%
3.9%
5.0%
2.5%
7.3%
14.1%
2.5% | 48
219
117
118
101
30
104
236
263
76 | 1.6%
7.1%
3.8%
3.3%
1.0%
7.6%
8.5% | * * * * * * * * | 48
217
120
127
98
30
87
220
249
74 | 1.6%
7.2%
4.0%
4.2%
3.2%
7.3%
8.2%
2.4% | 12
48
24
20
16
3
19
34
34 | 22.1%
20.0%
15.7%
16.3%
10.0% |
| Work Assign Dental Care Forced Med Medical Mental Hlth | 213
21
3
356
9 | 5.8% 0.6% 0.1% 9.8% 0.2% | 35
0
0
33
1 | 6.3% 0.0% 0.0% 5.9% 0.2% | 178
21
3
323
8 | 5.8%
0.7%
0.1%
10.5%
0.3% | * * * * * | 168
18
2
303
8 | 5.5%
0.6%
0.1%
10.0%
0.3% | 23
3
0
87
0 | 13.7%
16.7%
0.0%
28.7%
0.0% |
| Jail Time Records Sentence Com TOTALS: | 120
68
76
3649 | 3.3%
1.9%
2.1% | 6
11
7
5 59 | 1.1%
2.0%
1.3% | 114
57
69 | 2.2% | *
* | 114
55
64
3033 | 3.8%
1.8%
2.1% | 5
10
4
494 | 4.4%
18.2%
6.3%
N/A |
| % of Submitte
% of Answered
Reason for Re | d:
: | 100.0% | | 15.3% | | 84.7% | | | 100.0% | | 16.3% |
| imely nformal chments | resol | | 2 20(
0(| 12.0%)
39.4%)
0.0%) | Re | ong lev
-submit
her | | | | 23(
44(
106(| 4.1%)
7.9%)
19.0%) |

Date of request: 10/13.93 Summary Period: 21Jun93 thru 19Sep93

Number of Months Found: 3

ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES TRACKING DATA REGIONAL OFFICE APPEALS FOR:

BOP--All Institutions. . .

Inscitution Security Level: N/A Region: .

TOTAL Number of Inmates: 84854 Inmates in Population (excluding holdovers and in-transits): 76530 Inmates in Holdover Status: 2953 Inmates In-Transit: 5**371**

1711 1632 1605 (98.3%) Pending at End of Period: Filed During Period: 541 3

Answered During Period: Overdue: Answered Cn Time:

Average Fime for Response: 22.42 days

| Average 11me | 101 | Keabouse | 4 | .42 day | 5 | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|---|--|--|---|---|--|
| | | *
* | REMEDIE | ES RES | OLVED | | | | | |
| SUBJECT
BREAKDOWN | P | umber &
ercent
ubmitted | P | umber & ercent ejected | Pe | umber &
ercent
iled | * F | umber &
Percent
Inswered | P | umber &
ercent
ranted |
| Classificath Non-mail Com Comm Prgms Staff Control Unit I Appeals I tn/Rec Inst Operath Inst Program Legal Mail Srch/Restrnt Spec Housing Iransfer JDC Actions Jisiting Vork Assign | 241
13
134
182
4
677
19
14
108
70
85
50
10
56
144
138
42
73 | 10.0%
0.5%
5.6%
7.6%
0.2%
0.8%
0.6%
2.9%
0.6%
2.9%
0.4%
6.7%
1.7%
3.0% | 75
3
44
74
0
154
3
5
32
20
27
1.5
2
19
43
46
10
21 | 10.9%
0.4%
6.4%
10.7%
22.3%
0.4%
0.7%
4.6%
2.9%
2.2%
0.3%
2.2%
0.3%
2.2%
0.3%
2.3%
2.2%
0.4%
10.7%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10.0%
10. | 166
10
90
108
4
523
16
9
76
50
58
35
8
37
101
92
32
52 | 9.6% * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * | 160
10
92
103
7
481
15
61
55
60
36
38
93
98
29 | 0.6%
5.6%
6.3%
0.4%
29.5%
0.6%
3.7%
3.4%
3.7%
6.0%
1.8% | 19
2
8
5
0
38
0
2
6
1
5
3
0
1
7
16
2
3 | 11.9%
20.0%
8.7%
4.9%
0.0%
7.9%
0.0%
20.2%
9.8%
8.3%
0.6%
7.5%
16.3%
6.5% |
| <pre>)ental Care 'orced Med !edical lental Hlth 'ail Time !ecords entence Com</pre> | 10
2
140
5
101
36
48 | 0.4%
0.1%
5.8%
0.2%
4.2%
1.5%
2.0% | 1
0
42
0
27
14
14 | 0.1%
0.0%
6.1%
0.0%
3.9%
2.0%
2.0% | 9
2
98
5
74
22
34 | 0.5% * 0.1% * 5.7% * 0.3% * 4.3% * 1.3% * 2.0% * | 10
2
93
5
69
22
32 | 0.1%
5.7%
0.3%
4.2%
1.3% | 2
0
16
0
5
2
3 | 20.0%
0.0%
17.2%
0.0%
7.2%
9.1%
9.4% |
| of Submitte of Answered eason for Remely nformal .chments | 61(
16(
168(
30P-0 | 8.8%)
23.3%)
24.3%) | Wr
Re | 71.2% * * ong level -submit | | 100.0% | | 8.9%
11.4%)
23.2%) | | |

Date.of request: 13,13/93 Summary Period: 21Jun93 thru 19Sep93

Number of Months Found: 3

ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES TRACKING DATA

CENTRAL OFFICE APPEALS FOR: BOP--All Institutions. . .

itution Security Level: N/A Region: .

TOTAL Number of Inmates: 84854 Inmates in Population (excluding holdovers and in-transits): 76530 Inmates in Holdover Status: 2953

Inmates In-Transit: 5371

Filed During Period: 662 Pending at End of Period: Answered During Period: 782 Overdue: Answered On Time: 645 (82.5%) 299 24

Average Time for Response: 44.95 days

| 11101040 11110 | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|--|---------------|--|---|--|---|
| | | F | *
* | | REMEDIE | S RES | OLVED | | | | |
| SUBJECT
BREAKDOWN | Number & Percent Submitted | | P | umber &
ercent
ejected | P | umber &
ercent
iled | ^ *
*
* | Ni
Po
Ai | umber &
ercent
nswered | Pe | umber &
ercent
ranted |
| Classificath Non-mail Com Comm Proms Staff Control Unit DHO Appeals F. catn/Rec Operath Inst Program Legal Mail Srch/Restrnt Spec Housing Transfer UDC Actions | 141
12
46
74
221
7
37
36
52
31
2
34
63 | 13.48
1.18
4.48
7.08
0.48
21.08
0.78
3.58
4.98
2.98
6.08 | 53
1
21
32
1
88
3
1
12
19
10
11
10
23 | 13.6%
0.3%
5.4%
8.2%
0.3%
22.6%
0.3%
2.6%
0.3%
2.6%
2.6%
2.6%
2.6%
2.6%
2.6%
2.6%
3.1%
2.6%
2.6%
2.6%
3.1%
2.6%
2.6%
2.6%
3.1%
2.6%
3.1%
2.6%
3.1%
2.6%
3.1%
2.6%
3.1%
2.6%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1%
3.1% | 88
11
25
42
3
133
4
6
25
17
42
20
1
24
41 | 0.9% 3.8% 2.6% 6.3% 3.0% 0.2% 3.6% 4.5% | ***** | 95
13
34
56
2
180
3
8
32
22
51
16
21
45
29 | 12.1%
1.7%
4.3%
7.2%
0.3%
23.0%
1.0%
4.1%
6.5%
2.0%
2.7%
53.7% | 4
0
0
0
0
5
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0 | 4.2%
0.0%
0.0%
0.0%
0.0%
0.0%
0.0%
0.0%
0 |
| Visiting
Work Assign | 19
31 | 1.8% | 6
1 6 | 1.5%
4.1% | 13
15 | 2.0% | * | 9
28 | 1.2%
3.6% | 0 | 0.0%
0.0% |
| Dental Care Forced Med Medical Mental Hlth Jail Time Records Sentence Com | 5
0
69
2
59
16
20 | 0.5%
0.0%
6.6%
0.2%
5.6%
1.5%
1.9% | 0
0
24
0
12
7
6 | 0.0%
0.0%
6.2%
0.0%
3.1%
1.8% | 5
0
45
2
47
9
14 | 0.8%
0.0%
6.8%
0.3%
7.1%
1.4%
2.1% | *
*
* | 2
0
43
1
52
13
25 | 0.3%
0.0%
5.5%
0.1%
6.6%
1.7%
3.2% | 1
0
2
0
5
0 | 50.0%
0.0%
4.7%
0.0%
9.6%
0.0% |
| TOTALS: % of Submitte % of Answered | d: | 100.0%
100.0% | 3 90 | 100.0%
37.1% | 6 62 | 100.0% | * | 782 | 100.0% | 18 | N/A
2.3% |
| Reason for Rejection: Untimely 'o informal resolution achments 3S 10/13/1993 8:41 | | | 0(
7 7(| 32.8%)
0.0%)
19.7%) | Re | cong lev
e-submit
cher | | | | 184(| 12.6%)
47.2%)
12.1%) |

Summary Period: 21Jun93 thru 19Sep93 Date of request: 10/13.93

Number of Months Found: 3

ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES TRACKING DATA REGIONAL OFFICE APPEALS FOR:

Mid-Atlantic Region. . . .

Institution Security Level: M/A Region: MXR

TOTAL Number of Inmates: 12858 Inmates in Population (excluding holdovers and in-transits): 12704

Inmates in Holdover Status: 154

Filed During Period: Pending at End of Period: 110

262 238 238 (100.0%) Answered During Period: Overdue: 1

Answered On Time: Average Time for Response: 13.60 days

| | | RE | MEDIES INITIA | ATED | | * | REMEDIES RESOLVED | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|---------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| SUBJECT
BREAKDOWN | Pe | imber &
ercent
ibmitted | Number &
Percent
Rejected | Pe | mber &
rcent
led | ^ *
*
* | P€ | imber &
ercent
nswered | P | umber &
ercent
ranted | |
| Srch/Restrnt Spec Housing Transfer UDC Actions Visiting Work Assign Dental Care Forced Med Medical Mental Hlth Jail Time Records | 33
424
46
0
91
4
0
10
6
19
19
8
9
2
0
4
2
2
1
7 | 3.7% 1.1% 6.3% 12.1% 0.0% 23.9% 1.1% 2.6% 1.2% 2.6% 1.0% 2.1% 0.6% 5.0% 2.1% 0.5% 0.6% 1.6% 5.0% 1.6% 5.8% | 12.7% 1 0.8% 9:7.6% 19:16.1% 0:0.0% 16:13.6% 0 0.0% 4 3.4% 0 0.0% 4 3.4% 2:1.7% 0:0.0% 2:1.7% 3:5.8% 5:2% 1 0.8% 4 3.4% 0 0.0% 1.7% 3 5.8% 5 4.2% 1 0.8% 4 3.4% 0 0.0% 1 9.3% 3 2.5% | 18
3
15
27
0
75
4
0
6
4
8
8
0
4
11
14
7
5
2
0
3
2
2
10
4 | 6.9% * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * | | 17
2
15
21
0
64
6
0
5
3
7
8
0
4
6
11
7
7
2
0
31
2
1
2
1
2
1
2
1
2
1
2
1
2
1
2
1
2
1 | 7.1%
0.8%
6.3%
8.8%
0.9%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1%
2.1% | 3
2
1
3
0
2
0
0
1
0
1
0
2
2
0
0
1
0
2
0
1
0
1
0 | 17.6% 100.0% 6.7% 14.3% 0.0% 3.1% 0.0% 20.0% 0.0% 20.0% 14.3% 0.0% 25.0% 18.2% 28.6% 0.0% 18.2% 28.6% 0.0% 18.2% 28.6% 32.3% 16.7% 33.3% | |
| Sentence Com rotals: 3 | 5
80 | 1.3% | 2 1.7% | 3
2 62 1 | 1.1% *
*
* 00.0% | • | 5
2 38 | 2.1% | 2
35 | 40.0%
N/A | |
| of Submitted: | | 100.0% | 31.1% | | 6 8. 9% * | | | 100.0% | | 14.7% | |
| leason for Rejerence mely nformal reachments | | | 1(0.8%)
0(0.0%)
27(22.9%) | Wro
Re-
Oth | ong leve
-submit
ner | :1 | | | 21(
49(
11(| 17.8%)
41.5%)
9.3%) | |

Date of reduest: 13,13/93 Summary Period: 21Jun93 thru 19Sep93

Number of Months Found: 3

ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES TRACKING DATA REGIONAL OFFICE APPEALS FOR: North Central Region . . .

Itution Security Level: N/A Region: NCR

TOTAL Number of Inmates: 10307

Inmates in Population (excluding holdovers and in-transits): 10077

Inmates in Holdover Status:

392 Filed During Period:
Answered During Period:
Answered On Time: Pending at End of Period: 123 Overdue:

362 351 (97.0%) Average Time for Response: 20.70 days

| | REMEDIES INITIA | * REMEDIES | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| Numbe SUBJECT Perce BREAKDOWN Submi | ent Percent | Number &
Percent
Filed | * Number & * Percent * Answered * | Number &
Percent
Granted | | | |
| Non-mail Com 6 1 Comm Prgms 21 3 Staff 41 7 Control Unit 4 0 DHO Appeals 138 25 J atn/Rec 2 0 5 0 HLL Operatn 26 4 Inst Program 18 3 Legal 32 5 Mail 12 2 Srch/Restrnt 4 0 Spec Housing 16 2 Transier 37 6 UDC Actions 40 7 Visiting 8 1 Work Assign 13 2 Dental Care 4 0 Forced Med 2 0 Medical 23 4 Mental Hlth 1 0 Jail Time 15 2 Records 3 0 | 2.2% 19 12.0% 1.1% 1 0.6% 3.8% 8 5.1% 7.5% 13 8.2% 0.7% 0 0.0% 5.1% 47 29.7% 1 0.6% 2 1.3% 4 2.5% 3.3% 4 2.5% 4.2% 3 1.9% 1.3% 4 2.5% 1.3% 4 2.5% 1.3% 4 2.5% 1.3% 4 2.5% 1.3% 4 2.5% 1.3% 4 2.5% 1.3% 4 2.5% 1.3% 4 2.5% 1.3% 4 2.5% 1.3% 4 2.5% 1.3% 4 2.5% 1.3% 4 2.5% 1.3% 4 2.5% 1.3% 4 2.5% 1.3% 4 2.5% 1.3% 4 2.5% 1.3% 4 | 48 12.2% * 5 1.3% * 13 3.3% * 28 7.1% * 4 1.0% * 91 23.2% * 1 0.3% * 2 5.6% * 14 3.6% * 22 5.6% * 14 3.6% * 23 5.9% * 3 0.8% * 23 5.9% * 4 1.0% * 20 6.6% * 4 2.3% * 4 1.0% * 20 6.6% * 4 1.0% * 20 6.6% * 20 3% * 20 6.6% * 20 3% * 20 6.6% | 46 12.7% 6 1.7% 14 3.9% 26 7.2% 6 1.7% 74 20.4% 0 0.0% 5 1.4% 16 4.4% 15 4.1% 24 6.6% 7 1.9% 3 0.8% 13 3.6% 30 8.3% 17 4.7% 5 1.4% 8 2.2% 4 1.1% 2 0.6% 20 5.5% 1 0.3% 7 1.9% 2 0.6% 1 3.0% | 5 10.9%
0 0.0%
0 0.0%
0 0.0%
1 1.4%
0 0.0%
1 20.0%
0 0.0%
0 0. | | | |
| TOTALS: 550 100 % of Submitted: 100 % of Answered: | | 392 100.0% *
71.3% * | 362 100.0%
100.0% | 12 N/A
3.3% | | | |
| Reason for Rejection: Untimely Informal resolution chments KI/SSS 10/13/1993 9: | 39(24.7%) | Wrong level
Re-submit
Other | | 5(3.2%) 31(19.6%) 42(26.6%) | | | |

Date or request: 10/10/93 Summary Period: 21Jun93 thru 19Sep93

Number of Months Found: 3

ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES TRACKING DATA REGIONAL OFFICE APPEALS FOR:

North East Region. . . .

itution Security Level: N/A Region: NER

TOTAL Number of Inmates: 13360

Inmates in Population (excluding holdovers and in-transits): 12900 Inmates in Holdover Status: 460

* * * *

Filed During Period: 276 Pending at End of Period: Answered During Period: 2**70** Overdue:

Answered On Time: 265 (98.1%) Average Time for Response: 23.21 days

| | | R. | EMEDI | ES INITI | *
* | TOTAL TEST TOTAL | | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|-------------|----------|------------------------------|--------|--------------------------|
| SUBJECT
BREAKDOWN | P | umber & ercent ubmitted | P | umber &
ercent
ejected | Pe | umber &
ercent
iled | | * No | umber &
ercent
nswered | Pe | mber &
rcent
anted |
| Classificatn
Non-mail Com | 37
1 | 10.0% | 11 | 11.8% | 26
0 | 0.00 | * | 20 | 7.4% | 0 | 10.0% |
| Comm Proms | 24
24 | 6.5%
6.5% | 6
1 1 | 6.5%
11.8% | 18
13 | 6.5%
4.7% | * | 16
13 | 5.9%
4.8% | 4
0 | 25.0%
0. 0 % |
| Staff | | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | 0.0% | * | 1 | 0.4% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Control Unit | 0
1 18 | 32.0% | 2 2 | 2 3.7 % | 0
9 6 | 34.8% | * | 101 | 37.4% | 12 | 11.9% |
| DHO Appeals atn/Rec | 6 | 1.6% | 1 | 1.1% | 5 | 1.8% | * | 3 | 1.1% | 0 | 0.0% |
| ath/kec | 2 | 0.5% | ō | 0.0% | 2 | 0.7% | * | 1 | 0.4% | ő | 0.0% |
| Operatn | 18 | 4.9% | 5 | 5.4% | 13 | 4.7% | * | 14 | 5.2% | 2 | 14.3% |
| Inst Program | 21 | 5.7% | 8 | 8.6% | 13 | 4.7% | * | 19 | 7.0% | ī | 5.3% |
| Legal | 10 | 2.7% | 3 | 3.2% | 7 | 2.5% | * | 9 | 3. 3 % | 1 | 11.1% |
| Mail | 4 | 1.1% | 2 | 2.2% | 2 | 0.7% | * | 3 | 1.1% | 1 | 33.3% |
| Srch/Restrnt | Ō | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | * | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Spec Housing | 7 | 1.9% | 2 | 2.2% | 5 | | * | 8 | 3.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Transfer | 17 | 4.6% | 5 | 5.4% | 12 | 4.3% | * | 11 | 4.1% | 2 | 18.2% |
| UDC Actions | 17 | 4.6% | 5 | 5.4% | 12 | 4.3% | * | 11 | 4.1% | 6 | 54.5% |
| Visiting | 1 | 0.3% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.4% | * | 1 | 0.4% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Work Assign | 16 | 4.3% | 3 | 3.2% | 13 | 4.7% | * | 8 | 3.0% | 1 | 12.5% |
| Dental Care | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Forced Med | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Medical | 22 | 6.0% | 3 | 3.2% | 19 | 6.9% | | 17 | 6.3% | 1 | 5.9% |
| Mental Hlth | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.00 | * | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Jail Time | 7 | 1.9% | 0 | 0.0% | 7 | 2.5% | | 6 | 2.2% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Records | 10 | 2.7% | 4 | 4.3% | 6 | 2.2% | * | 4 | 1.5% | 1 | 25.0% |
| Sentence Com | 7 | 1.9% | 1 | 1.1% | 6 | 2.2% | * | 4 | 1.5% | 0 | 0.0% |
| TOTALS: | | 100.0% | 9 3 | 100.0% | 2 76 | 100.0% | | 270 | 100.0% | 34 | N/A |
| % of Submitte % of Answered | | 100.0% | | 25.2% | | 74.8% | * | | 100.0% | | 12.6% |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Reason for Re | ject: | ton: | 4. | 4 28 V | 1.7~ | ong lev | 70] | | | 7(| 7.5%) |
| Untimely | ~~~ | ution | 4 (| 4.3%) | | cong rev
e-submit | | | | | 18.3%) |
| nformal | reso. | LUCTOR | 0(| 0.0%) | | :-submic | - | | | | 76.3%) |
| chments | | | 41(| 44.1%) | υt | -uer | | | | , 1 (| , 0 . 3 %) |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

Date Direction: 10/13/93 Summary Period: 21Jun93 thru 19Sep93

Number of Months Found: 3

ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES TRACKING DATA REGIONAL OFFICE APPEALS FOR:

South Central Region . . .

itution Security Level: N/A Region: SCR

TOTAL Number of Inmates: 16759
Inmates in Population (excluding holdovers and in-transits): 16170

Inmates in Holdover Status: 589

Filed During Period: 283 Pending at End of Period: 90
Answered During Period: 250 Overdue: 0

Answered During Period: 250
Answered On Time: 250 (100.0%)
Average Time for Response: 21.91 days

| | | R | EMEDI | ES INITI | * REMEDIES RESOLVE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|-------------|------------|------------------------------|-----|-----------------------------|
| SUBJECT
BREAKDOWN | P | umber &
ercent
ubmitted | P | umber &
ercent
ejected | P | umber &
ercent
iled | *
*
* | N
P | umber &
ercent
nswered | P | umber &
ercent
ranted |
| Classificatn | 35 | 9.0% | - - 13 | 12.4% | 22 | 7.8% | * | 20 | 3.0% | | 10.0% |
| Non-mail Com | 1 | 0.3% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.4% | | 1 | 0.4% | ō | |
| Comm Prgms | 16 | 4.1% | 7 | 6.7% | 9 | 3.2% | | 11 | 4.4% | 1 | 9.1% |
| Staff | 38 | 9.8% | 16 | 15.2% | 22 | 7.8% | | 22 | 8 .8% | 1 | 4.5% |
| Control Unit | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| DHO Appeals | 90 | 23.2% | 12 | 11.4% | 78 | 27.6% | | 5 8 | 23.2% | 10 | |
| E tn/Rec | 3 | 0.8% | 0 | 0.0% | 3 | 1.1% | * | 2 | 0.8% | 0 | 0.0% |
| F | 3 | 0.8% | 2 | 1.9% | 1 | 0.4% | | 1 | 0.4% | 1 | |
| In. Operatn | 2 9 | 7.5% | 6 | 5 .7 % | 23 | 8.1% | * | 16 | 6.4% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Inst Program | 15 | 3 .9 % | 7 | 6.7% | 8 | 2.8% | * | 9 | 3.6% | . 0 | 0.0% |
| Legal | 15 | 3 .9% | 4 | 3.8% | 11 | 3.9% | * | 10 | 4.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Mail | 11 | 2.8% | 3 | 2.9% | 8 | 2.8% | * | 7 | 2.8% | 1 | 14.3% |
| Srch/Restrnt | 4 | 1.0% | 1 | 1.0% | 3 | 1.1% | * | 2 | 0.8% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Spec Housing | 5 | 1.3% | 3 | 2.9% | 2 | 0.7% | * | 2 | 0.8% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Transier | 25 | 6.4% | 6 | 5 .7% | 19 | 6.7% | * | 19 | 7.6% | 1 | 5.3% |
| JDC Actions | 10 | 2.6% | 3 | 2.9% | 7 | 2.5% | | 9 | 3.6% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Visiting | 5 | 1.3% | 1 | 1.0% | 4 | 1.4% | * | 2 | 0.8% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Nork Assign | 20 | 5.2% | 6 | 5 .7% | 14 | 4.9% | * | 12 | 4.8% | 1 | 8.3% |
| Dental Care | 1 | 0.3% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.4% | | 2 | 0.8% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Forced Med | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | * | 0 | 0 .0 % | 0 | 0.0% |
| led ical | 20 | 5 .2 % | 7 | 6.7% | 13 | 4.6% | | 13 | 5 .2 % | 0 | 0.0% |
| Mental Hlth | 1 | 0.3% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.4% | * | 1 | 0.4% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Jail Time | 24 | 6.2% | 4 | 3 .8% | 20 | 7.1% | | 20 | 8.0% | 1 | 5.0% |
| ≀ecords | 7 | 1.8% | 3 | 2.9% | 4 | 1.4% | * | 4 | 1.6% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Sentence Com | 10 | 2.6% | 1 | 1.0% | 9 | 3.2% | * | 7 | 2.8% | 1 | 14.3% |
| OTALS: ; of Submitted | | 100.0%
100.0% | 105 | 100.0%
27.1% | 2 83 | 100.0% | * | 250 | 100.0% | 20 | N/A |
| of Answered | | | | | | . 2000 | * | | 100.0% | | 8.0% |
| leason for Re | jecti | on: | | | | _ | | | | 1 | |
| Ur+imely | _ | | | 12.4%) | | ong lev | | | | | 16.2%) |
| '_ nformal r | resol | ution | 10(| 9.5%) | | -submit | • | | | 24(| |
| chments | | | 17(| 16.2%) | ot | her | | | | 55(| 52.4%) |
| T/888 10/13 | /199 | 3 9·01 F | OP-0 | | | | | | | | |

Summary Period: 21Jun93 thru 19Sep93 Number of Months Found: 3 Date of request: 10/13/93

ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES TRACKING DATA REGIONAL OFFICE APPEALS FOR: South East Region. . . .

Itution Security Level: N/A Region: SER

TOTAL Number of Inmates: 12775

Inmates in Population (excluding holdovers and in-transits): 12056 Inmates in Holdover Status:

222 Filed During Period: Pending at End of Period: 70 247 244 (98.8%) Answered During Period: Overdue:

Answered On Time: Average Time for Response: 14.62 days

| | | RI | EMEDI | ES INITI | REMEDIES RESOLVED | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|--------------------|--------------|-------|---------------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|----|-------|------------------------------|------|--------------------------------|--|
| SUBJECT
BREAKDOWN | Pe | Percent Pe | | Number &
Percent
Rejected | | Number &
Percent
Filed | | | umber &
ercent
nswered | P | Number &
Percent
Granted | |
| Classificatn | 35 | 10.3% | 3 | 5.8% | 27 | 12.2% | * | 29 | 11.7% | 1 | 3.4% | |
| Non-mail Com | 1 | 0.3% | 0 | ୦.0% | 1 | 0.5% | * | 1 | 0.4% | 0 | 0.0% | |
| Comm Prgms | 23 | 6.8% | 8 | 5.8% | 15 | 6 .8% | * | 13 | 5.3% | 0 | 0.0% | |
| Staff | 15 | 4.4% | 7 | 6.0% | 8 | 3.6% | * | 11 | 4.5% | 0 | 0.0% | |
| Control Unit | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | | * | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | |
| DHO Appeals | 108 | 31.9% | 41 | 35.0% | 67 | 30.2% | * | 75 | 30.4% | 5 | 6.7% | |
| F itn/Rec | 2 | 0.6% | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 0.9% | * | 3 | 1.2% | 0 | 0.0% | |
| | 4 | 1.2% | 1 | 0.9% | 3 | 1.4% | * | 2 | 0.8% | 0 | 0.0% | |
| In. Operatn | 10 | 2.9% | 5 | 4.3% | 5 | 2.3% | * | 3 | 1.2% | 0 | 0.0% | |
| Inst Program | 6 | 1.8% | 1 | 0.9% | 5 | 2.3% | * | 4 | 1.6% | 0 | 0.0% | |
| Legal | 5 | 1.5% | 2 | 1.7% | 3 | 1.4% | * | 5 | 2.0% | 0 | 0.0% | |
| Mail | 9 | 2.7% | 3 | 2.6% | 6 | 2.7% | * | 10 | 4.0% | 1 | 10.0% | |
| Srch/Restrnt | 1 | 0.3% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.5% | * | 1 | 0.4% | 0 | 0.0% | |
| Spec Housing | 8 | 2.4% | 2 | 1.7% | 6 | 2.7% | * | 3 | 1.2% | 0 | 0.0% | |
| Transfer | 22 | 6.5% | 8 | 6 .8% | 14 | 6.3% | * | 15 | 6.1% | 0 | 0.0% | |
| UDC Actions | 31 | 9.1% | 12 | 10.3% | 19 | 3.6% | * | 30 | 12.1% | 3 | 10.0% | |
| Visiting | 14 | 4.1% | 4 | 3.4% | 10 | 4.5% | * | 11 | 4.5% | 0 | 0.0% | |
| Work Assign | 3 | 0.9% | 0 | 0.0% | 3 | 1.4% | * | 4 | 1.6% | 1 | 25.0% | |
| WOLK HOULSH | | | | | _ | | | | | | | |
| Dental Care | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | |
| Forced Med | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | |
| Medical | 14 | 4.1% | 7 | 6.0% | 7 | 3.2% | | 5 | 2.0% | 0 | 0 .0 % | |
| Mental Hlth | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 .0 % | * | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 .0 % | |
| Jail Time | 20 | 5 .9% | 5 | 4.3% | 15 | 6 .8% | * | 14 | 5 .7 % | 2 | 14.3% | |
| Records | 2 | 0.6% | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 0.9% | * | 4 | 1.6% | 0 | 0.0% | |
| Sentence Com | 6 | 1.8% | 3 | 2.6% | 3 | 1.4% | * | 4 | 1.6% | 0 | 0.0% | |
| | | | | | | | * | | | | | |
| TOTALS: | | 100.0% | 117 | 100.0% | 2 22 | 100.0% | | 247 | 100.0% | 13 | N/A | |
| % of Submitted | | 100.0% | | 34.5% | | 65.5% | * | | | | | |
| % of Answered | : | | | | | | * | | 100.0% | | 5.3% | |
| Reason for Re | jecti | on: | | | | _ | _ | | | | | |
| Urtimely | | | 13(| 11.1%) | | ong lev | | | | 23 (| 19.7%) | |
| nformal | resol | ution | 0 (| 0.0%) | | -submit | : | | | 34(| 29.1%) | |
| . chments | s 30(25.6%) Other | | | | | | 6(| 5.1%) | | | | |
| • | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Summary Period: 21Jun93 thru 19Sep93 Number of Months Found: 3 Cate of request: 13,13,93

ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES TRACKING DATA REGIONAL OFFICE APPEALS FOR:

Western Region

tution Security Level: N/A Region: WXR

TOTAL Number of Inmates: 13425

Inmates in Population (excluding holdovers and in-transits): 12624

Inmates in Holdover Status:

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Filed During Period: 276 Pending at End of Period: 81 Answered During Period: 2**65** Overdue:

Answered On Time: 257 (97.0%) 16.74 days Average Time for Response:

| | REMEDIES INITIATED | | | | | | | | REMEDIES RESOLVED | | | | |
|--|--------------------|------------------------|--------------|-----------------|-------------|------------------------------|--------|-------------|------------------------------|------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| SUBJECT
BREAKDOWN | Pe | umber & ercent ubmitte | Percent | | Pe | Number &
Percent
Filed | | | umber &
ercent
nswered | Pe | Number & Percent Granted | | |
| Classificatn | 34 | 9.0% | 9 | 9.0% | 25 | 9.1% | * | 28 | 10.6% | 6 | 21.4% | | |
| Non-mail Com | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Comm Proms | 26 | 6.9% | 6 | 6.0% | 20 | 7.2% | * | 23 | 8.7% | 2 | 8.7% | | |
| Staff | 18 | 4.8% | 8 | 8.0% | 10 | 3.6% | * | 10 | 3 .8% | 1 | 10.0% | | |
| Control Unit | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | * | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| DHO Appeals | 132 | 35.1% | 16 | 16.0% | 116 | 42.0% | * | 109 | 41.1% | 8 | 7.3% | | |
| I atn/Rec | 2 | 0.5% | 1 | 1.0% | 1 | 0.4% | * | 1 | 0.4% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | * | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 .0 % | | |
| M Operatn | 15 | 4.0% | 8 | 8.0% | 7 | 2.5% | * | 7 | 2.6% | 3 | 42.9% | | |
| Inst Program | 6 | 1.6% | 0 | 0.0% | 6 | 2 .2 % | * | 5 | 1.9% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Legal | 11 | 2.9% | 5 | 5.0% | 6 | 2 .2 % | * | 5 | 1.9% | 3 | 60.0% | | |
| Mail | 4 | 1.1% | 2 | 2.0% | 2 | 0.,0 | * | 1 | 0.4% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Srch/Restrnt | 1 | 0.3% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | | * | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Spec Housing | 14 | 3.7% | 6 | 6 .0% | 8 | 2 .9 % | * | 8 | 3.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Transter | 24 | 6.4% | 9 | 9 .0 % | 15 | J | * | 12 | 4.5% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| UDC Actions | 21 | 5.6% | 7 | 7.0% | 14 | J | * | 20 | 7.5% | 5 | 25.0% | | |
| Visiting | 6 | 1.6% | 2 | 2.0% | 4 | 1.4% | | 3 | 1.1% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Work Assign | 12 | 3.2% | 4 | 4.0% | 8 | 2.9% | * | 7 | 2.6% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Dental Care | 3 | 0.8% | 1 | 1.0% | 2 | 0.7% | | 2 | 0.8% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Forced Med | 0 | 0 .0 % | 0 | 0 .0 % | 0 | 0.0% | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Medical | 17 | 4.5% | 7 | 7.0% | 10 | 3.6% | * | 7 | 2.6% | 4 | 57.1% | | |
| Mental Hlth | 1 | 0.3% | 0 | 0 .0 % | 1 | 0.10 | * | 1 | 0.4% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Jail Time | 14 | 3.7% | 2 | 2.0% | 12 | 4.3% | * | 10 | 3.8% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Records | 7 | 1.9% | 2 | 2.0% | 5 | 1.8% | * | 5 | 1.9% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Sentence Com | 8 | 2.1% | 5 | 5 .0% | 3 | 1.1% | *
* | 1 | 0.4% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| TOTALS: | | 100.0%
100.0% | 100 | 100.0%
26.6% | 2 76 | 100.0%
73.4% | | 2 65 | 100.0% | 32 | N/A | | |
| <pre>% of Submitted % of Answered:</pre> | | 100.08 | | 20.03 | | /3.40 | * | | 100.0% | | 12.1% | | |
| Reason for Rej | ecti | on: | | | | _ | _ | | | <i>.</i> . | C 093 | | |
| Untimely | | . • | 3 (| 3.0%) | | ong lev | | | | 6(| 6.0%) | | |
| nformal r | esol | ution | 6(| 6.0%) | | -submit | - | | | 5(| 5.0%) | | |
| chments s 10/13 | /199 | 3 9:01 | 14(
BOP-0 | 14.0%) | Ot | her | | | | 20(| 20.0%) | | |

PART II

QUARTERLY REPORT - ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES FOR COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

Administrative Remedy data for Community Corrections is also provided directly from the Key Indicator (KI/SSS) system. The attached reports show information on CCM filings, regional appeals and central office appeals aggregated for Community Corrections as a whole (All Community Corrections) for the forth (4TH) quarter 1993. The remaining six reports display, for each region, aggregate information in regional appeals filed by inmates in all CCCs in that region.

Some observations about the data in the attached reports.

- o The total number of filings for this quarter showed an increase in CCM filings and decreases in regional and central office appeals as compared to last quarter. CCM filings went from 19 to 20; regional appeals went from 45 to 38; and central office appeals went from 4 to 2.
- o Grant rates for this quarter showed an increase in CCM filings and a decrease at the regional level. The grant rates at the central office level remained the same. The grant rates at the CCM level went from 13.6% to 23.1%; regional appeals went from 14.5% to 10.5%.
- o Community Programs continues to be the highest category at the CCM level and increased from last quarter (70.0% or 14 of the 20 complaints filed, up from 63.2% or 12).
- e Staff complaints remain as the second highest category and also increased from last quarter (20% or 4, up from 10.5% or 2).
- o The other complaints filed at the CCM level were Legal and Mail (each with 5.0% or 1).
- o For regional appeals, the categories as compared to last quarter were: CCM\Major (i.e., DHO) with 76.0% or 29, down from 82.2% or 37; Community Programs with 10.5% or 4, up from 4.4% or 4; CDC/Minor (i.e., UDC) 5.3% or 2, down from 8.9% or 4; Work Assignments with 5.3% or 2, up from 0.0% or 0; and Transfer with 2.6% or 1, up from 0.0% or 0.

- o The highest number of regional appeals (12) was filed in the North Central Region, which has the forth highest number of inmates (957). The lowest number of appeals (2) was filed in the Northeast Region, which has the lowest number of inmates (696).
- o At the central office, filings for CCM/Major (i.e., DHO) was the only category (100.0% or 2, up from 0.0% or 0 last quarter).

Date of request: 10/13.93 Summary Period: 21Jun93 thru 19Sep93

Number of Months Found: 3

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES TRACKING DATA

CCM FILINGS FOR:

All Community Corrections

Number of Inmates in Population: 3852 Region:

Filed During Period: 20 Pending at End of Period: 18
Answered During Period: 13 Overdue: 15

Answered On Time: 12 (92.3%)
Average Time for Response: 6.22 days

| | REMEDIES INITIATED | | | | | | | | * REMEDIES RESOLVED | | | | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|----------------------------------|----|------------------------------|--------|------------|---------------------------------|----------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| SUBJECT
BREAKDOWN | Number & Percent Submitted | | | Number &
Percent
Rejected | | Number &
Percent
Filed | | | lumber &
Percent
Answered | Pe | umber &
ercent
ranted | | |
| Classificatn | <u>J</u> | ე.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | * | | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Non-mail Com | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | ૦.0% | Ō | 0.0% | | C | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Comm Prams | 16 | 6 9.6 % | 2 | 66.7% | 14 | 70.0% | * | ϵ | 46.2% | 2 | 33.3% | | |
| Staff | 4 | 17.4% | 0 | 0.0% | 4 | 20.0% | * | 5 | 38.5% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Control Unit | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | Ō | 0.0% | | C | 0.0% | .0 | 0.0% | | |
| CCM/Major | 1 | 4.3% | 1 | 33.3% | 0 | 0.0% | * | C | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Educatn/Rec | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | Ō | 0.0% | * | C | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| · | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | * | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Operatn | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | Ō | 0.0% | * | C | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| H.L. Program | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | * | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Legal | 1 | 4.3% | 0 | 0. 0 % | 1 | 5.0% | * | 1 | . 7 .7 % | 1 | 100.0% | | |
| Mail | 1 | 4.3% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 5.0% | * | 1 | 7.7% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Srch/Restrnt | 0 | 0 .0% | . 0 | 0.0% | Ō | 0.0% | * | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Spec Housing | 0 | 0. 0 % | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | * | 0 | | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Transfer | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | Ŏ | _ | * | 0 | 0.0% | Ō | 0.0% | | |
| CDC/Minor | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | Ö | 0.0% | * | 0 | | Ō | 0.0% | | |
| Visiting | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | Ö | 0.0% | * | Ō | | Ö | 0.0% | | |
| Work Assign | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | Ö | 0.0% | * | 0 | | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Dental Care | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | * | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Forced Med | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | * | 0 | | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Medical | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | * | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 .0 % | | |
| Mental Hlth | 0 | 0.0% | . 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | * | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Jail Time | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | * | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Records | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | * | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Sentence Com | 0 | 0 .0 % | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | *
* | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| TOTALS: | | 100.0% | 3 | 100.0% | 20 | 100.0% | | 13 | 100.0% | 3 | N/A | | |
| % of Submitted | : | 100.0% | | 13.0% | | 87.0% | * | | | | | | |
| % of Answered: | | | | | | | * | | 100.0% | | 23.1% | | |
| Reason for Rejournment | | | 0(| 0. 0 %)
0. 0 %) | Wr | ong lev | vel | | | 1(| | | |
| chments | | 3 14:44 E | 0(
0(
3 0P- 0 | 0.0%) | | e-submit
ther | • | | | 0(
1(| 0.0%)
33.3%) | | |

Date of request: 10/13/93 Summary Period: 21Jun93 thru 19Sep93

Number of Months Found: 3

Pending at End of Period:

14 0

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES TRACKING DATA REGIONAL OFFICE APPEALS FOR:

All Community Corrections

Number of Inmates in Population: 8852 Region:

Filed During Period: 38 Pending at Answered During Period: 38 Overdue: Answered On Time: 38 (100.0%) Average Time for Response: 22.87 days

| | | RI | MEDI | es initia | 4 | | WINDING WINDING | | | | |
|----------------------|------|----------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|------------|--------------|-----------------|--------|------------------------------|-----|----------------------------|
| SUBJECT
BREAKDOWN | Pe | mber &
rcent
bmitted | Pe | Percent Percent Rejected Filed | | | | n
P | umber &
ercent
nswered | Pe | mber &
ercent
eanted |
| Classificatn | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | * | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Non-mail Com | Ō | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | Ō | 0.0% | | 0 | | Ŏ | 0.0% |
| Comm Proms | 6 | 11.8% | 2 | 15.4% | 4 | 10.5% | * | 3 | 7.9% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Staff | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | * | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Control Unit | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | * | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| ccm/Major | 38 | 74.5% | 9 | 69.2% | 2 9 | 76.3% | * | 28 | | 4 | 14.3% |
| i atn/Rec | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | 0 | | 0 | 0 .0 % |
| | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | * | 0 | | 0 | 0.0% |
| M.L. Operatn | 0 | 0 .0 % | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.00 | * | 0 | | 0 | 0.0% |
| Inst Program | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 .0% | 0 | 0.0% | | 0 | | 0 | 0.0% |
| Legal | 0 | 0 .0 % | 0 | 0 .0 % | 0 | 0.0% | | 0 | | 0 | 0.0% |
| Mail | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | 0 | | 0 | 0.0% |
| Srch/Restrnt | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | 0 | | 0 | 0.0% |
| Spec Housing | 0 | 0 .0 % | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | •••• | * | 0 | | 0 | 0.0% |
| Transier | T | 2.0% | U | ٧ ٠٥ % | T | 2.68 | | Ţ | | U | 0.0% |
| CDC/Minor | 4 | 7.8% | 2 | 15.4% | 2 | 5.3% | | 4 | | 0 | 0.0% |
| Visiting | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | 0 | | 0 | 0.0% |
| Work Assign | 2 | 3 .9 % | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 5 .3% | * | 2 | 5.3% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Dental Care | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | 0 | | 0 | 0.0% |
| Forced Med | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 .0% | 0 | 0.0% | | 0 | | 0 | 0.0% |
| Medical | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.00 | * | 0 | | 0 | 0.0% |
| Mental Hlth | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | 0 | | 0 | 0.0% |
| Jail Time | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | | * | 0 | | 0 | 0.0% |
| Records | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | * | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Sentence Com | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | * | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| TOTALS: | | 100.0% | 13 | 100.0% | 38 | 100.0% | | 38 | 100.0% | 4 | N/A |
| % of Submitted | | 100.0% | | 25.5% | | 74.5% | * | | 100.0% | | 10.5% |
| % of Answered: | ; | | | | | | * | | 100.0% | | 10.5% |
| Reason for Rej | ecti | on: | | | | | | • | | | |
| imely | | | 0(| 0.0%) | Wi | ong lev | rel | | | 0(| 0.0%) |
| nformal r | esol | ution | 0(| 0.0%) | | -submit | : | | | | 30.8%) |
| achments | | | 1(| 7 .7 %) | Ot | cher | | | | 3 (| 23.1%) |
| KI/SSS 10/13 | /199 | 3 14:44 | BOP-0 | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

Date or request: 13/13/93 Summarv Period: 21Jun93 thru 19Sep93

Number of Months Found: 3

1

0

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES TRACKING DATA

CENTRAL OFFICE APPEALS FOR: All Community Corrections

Number of Inmates in Population: 3852 Region:

Pending at End of Period: 2 Filed During Period: 4 Overdue:

Answered During Period:
Answered On Time: 2 (50.0%) Average Time for Response: 56.00 days

| Average Time to | r. | kesponse: | 36 | .uu days | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|-----|-----------|------|-----------|-----|-----------|-------|----|---------------|------|---------------|
| | | RE | MEDI | ES INITIA | TED | | * | | REMEDIES | RESO | LVED |
| | N | umber & | Nı | umber & | N | umber & | * | Nu | umber & | | mber & |
| SUBJECT | P | ercent | ₽€ | ercent | Pe | ercent | * | Pε | ercent | Per | rcent |
| BREAKDOWN | | ubmitted | Re | ejected | F | iled | * | Ar | nswered | Gra | anted |
| BREMINDOWN | | | | | | | _ * _ | | | | |
| Classificatn | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Non-mail Com | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | * | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Comm Proms | 1 | 20.0% | 1 | 33.3% | 0 | 0.0% | | 2 | 50.0% | 0 | 0 .0 % |
| Staff | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | * | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 .0 % |
| Control Unit | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | 0 | 0 .0 % | 0 | 0 .0 % |
| CCM/Major | 3 | 60.0% | 1 | 33.3% | 2 | 100.0% | * | 1 | 25.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Educatn/Rec | ō | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | Ō | 0.0% | * | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Educatily Nee | ō | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | Ō | 0.0% | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Operatn | ō | 0.0% | Ö | 0.0% | Ö | 0.0% | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Inst Program | Ö | 0.0% | Ö | 0.0% | Ö | 0.0% | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Legal | 0 | 0.0% | ō | 0.0% | ŏ | 0.0% | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Mail | 0 | 0.0% | Ö | 0.0% | Ö | 0.0% | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| | Ö | 0.0% | ő | 0.0% | ŏ | 0.0% | * | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Srch/Restrnt | 0 | 0.0% | ő | 0.0% | Ö | 0.0% | | Ō | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Spec Housing | 0 | 0.0% | ő | 0.0% | Ö | 0.0% | | Ŏ | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Transfer | 0 | 0.0% | ő | 0.0% | Ö | 0.0% | | Ō | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| CDC/Minor | 0 | 0.0% | Ö | 0.0% | Ö | 0.0% | | ō | 0.0% | Ō | 0.0% |
| Visiting | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | ō | 0.0% | Ō | 0.0% |
| Work Assign | U | 0.03 | U | 0.0% | U | 0.00 | | | | • | |
| Dental Care | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | k | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Forced Med | 0 | 0.0% | Ö | 0.0% | Ö | 0.0% | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Medical | 0 | 0.0% | Ö | 0.0% | Ö | 0.0% | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Mental Hlth | Ö | 0.0% | Ō | 0.0% | Ō | 0.0% | k | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Jail Time | 1 | 20.0% | ĺ | 33.3% | ō | 0.0% | | 1 | 25.0% | 0 | 0 .0 % |
| Records | ō | 0.0% | Ō | 0.0% | Ō | 0.0% | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Sentence Com | 0 | | Ŏ | 0.0% | ō | 0.0% | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Sencence com | Ŭ | | | | | 3 | k | | | | |
| TOTALS: | 5 | 100.0% | 3 | 100.0% | 2 | 100.0% | * | 4 | 100.0% | 0 | N/A |
| % of Submitted: | _ | 100.0% | | 60.0% | | 40.0% | k | | | | |
| % of Answered: | | 20000 | | | | | k | | 100.0% | | 0.0% |
| Reason for Reje | ct: | ion: | | | | | | | | | |
| Untimely | | | 0(| 0.0%) | | rong leve | el | | | | 33.3%) |
| No informal re | so. | lution |) o | 0.0%) | | e-submit | | | | | 66.7%) |
| achments | | | 1(| 33.3%) | 01 | ther | | | | 0(| 0. 0%) |
| | | | • | • | | | | | | | |

Date or request: 10/13/93 Summary Period: 21Jun93 thru 22Aug93 Number of Months Found: 2

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES TRACKING DATA

REGIONAL OFFICE APPEALS FOR:

CC: Mid-Atlantic Region

Number of Inmates in Population: 1139 Region: MXR

Filed During Period: 0 Pending at End of Period: Answered During Period: 5 Overdue: Answered On Time: 5 (100.0%)

0 0

Average Time for Response: 30.13 days

| | REMEDIES INITIATED | | | | | | | | * REMEDIES RESOLVED | | | | |
|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|------------------|------------------|---|--------------------------------------|---------------------|----|-----------------------------|--|--|
| SUBJECT
BREAKDOWN | Pe | imber &
ercent
ibmitted | Number & Percent Rejected | | Percent
Filed | | | * Number & * Percent * Answered * | | | umber &
ercent
canted | | |
| Classificatn | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% * | _ | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Non-mail Com | Ŏ | 0.0% | Ō | 0.0% | Ō | 0.0% * | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 .0 % | | |
| Comm Prgms | Ō | 0.0% | Ō | 0.0% | Ō | 0.0% * | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 .0% | | |
| Staff | Ō | 0.0% | Ō | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% * | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 .0 % | | |
| Control Unit | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% * | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 .0 % | | |
| CCM /Major | 2 | 50.0% | 2 | 50.0% | 0 | 0.0% * | | 3 | 60.0% | 1 | 33.3% | | |
| E_ tn/Rec | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% * | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 .0% | | |
| F | Õ | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% * | | 0 | 0 .0 % | 0 | 0 .0 % | | |
| Insc Operatn | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% * | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 .0% | | |
| Inst Program | Ō | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% * | | 0 | 0 .0 % | 0 | 0 .0 % | | |
| Legal | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% * | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Mail | Ō | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% * | | 0 | 0 .0 % | 0 | 0 .0% | | |
| Srch/Restrnt | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% * | | 0 | 0 .0 % | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Spec Housing | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% * | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 .0 % | | |
| Transfer | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% * | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| CDC/Minor | 2 | 50.0% | 2 | 50.0% | 0 | 0.0% * | | 2 | 40.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Visiting | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% * | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 .0% | | |
| Work Assign | Ō | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% * | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 .0% | | |
| MOIR MODIG! | • | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dental Care | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.08 * | | 0 | 0 .0 % | 0 | 0 .0% | | |
| Forced Med | 0 | 0 .0 % | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% * | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 .0% | | |
| Medical | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% * | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 .0% | | |
| Mental Hlth | Õ | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% * | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 .0% | | |
| Jail Time | Ŏ | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% * | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 .0% | | |
| Records | Ō | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% * | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 .0% | | |
| Sentence Com | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% * | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| OTALS: | _ | 100.0% | 4 | 100.0% | 0 | 0.0% * | | 5 | 100.0% | 1 | N/A | | |
| of Submitted: | | 100.0% | | 100.0% | | 0.0% * | | | 100.0% | | 20.0% | | |
| lesson for Reje | cti | ion: | 0(| 0 .0%) | Wre | ong le ve | 1 | | | 0(| 0.0%) | | |
| mely nformal re | en 1 | lution | 0(| 0.0%) | | -submit | _ | | | 1(| 25.0%) | | |
| nformal re | 5 0. | LUCION | 0(| 0.0%) | Oti | | | | | 2(| 50.0%) | | |

Date of request: 10/13/93 Summary Period: 21Jun93 thru 19Sep93

Number of Months Found: 3

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES TRACKING DATA

REGIONAL OFFICE APPEALS FOR: CC: North Central Region

Number of Inmates in Population: 957 Region: NCR

Filed During Period:
Answered During Period:

12 9 Pending at End of Period:

3

0

Overdue:

Answered On Time: 9 (100.0%)
Average Time for Response: 21.89 days

| | | RF | EMEDI | ES INITIA | * | | REMEDIES | MEDIES RESOLVED | | | |
|----------------------|------|-------------------------|-------|------------------------------|----|---------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------------------------|----|--------------------------|
| SUBJECT
BREAKDOWN | P | umber & ercent ubmitted | P | umber &
ercent
ejected | P | umber &
ercent
iled | *
*
* | Pe | umber &
ercent
nswered | Pe | mber &
rcent
anted |
| Classificatn | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% * | - | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Non-mail Com | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | | 0 | | | 0 | 0.0% | ō | 0.0% |
| Comm Prgms | 1 | | 0 | | ī | 8.3% * | | 1 | 11.1% | Ŏ | 0.0% |
| Staff | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% * | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Control Unit | 0 | | 0 | | Ō | 0.0% * | | 0 | 0.0% | Ŏ | 0.0% |
| CCM/Major | 11 | 78.6% | 2 | 100.0% | 9 | 75.0% * | | 6 | 66.7% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Educatn/Rec | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | 0.0% * | | 0 | 0.0% | Ō | 0.0% |
| . , | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% * | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Operatn | 0 | | 0 | | Ö | | | 0 | 0.0% | Ö | 0.0% |
| Mac Program | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% * | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Legal | 0 | 0 .0 % | 0 | 0.0% | Ō | 0.0% * | | 0 | 0.0% | Ô | 0.0% |
| Mail | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% * | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Srch/Restrnt | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% * | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Spec Housing | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% * | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Transfer | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% * | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| CDC/Minor | U | U .U % | O | 0.0% | 0 | U.U% * | | U | 0. 0 % | 0 | 0 .0 % |
| Visiting | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% * | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Work Assign | 2 | 14.3% | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 16.7% * | | 2 | 22.2% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Dental Care | . 0 | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% * | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Forced Med | 0 | 0 .0 % | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% * | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Medical | 0 | 0 .0 % | 0 | 0 .0% | 0 | 0.0% * | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 .0 % |
| Mental Hlth | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0. 0% * | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 .0% |
| Jail Time | 0 | 0 .0 % | 0 | 0 .0 % | 0 | 0.0% * | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 .0% |
| Records | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% * | | 0 | 0 .0 % | 0 | 0 .0% |
| Sentence Com | 0 | 0 .0 % | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% * | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| TOTALS: | | 100.0% | 2 | 100.0% | 12 | 100.0% * | | 9 | 100.0% | 0 | N/A |
| % of Submitted | : | 100.0% | | 14.3% | | 85.7% * | | | | | |
| % of Answered: | | | | | | * | | | 100.0% | | 0.0% |
| Reason for Rej | ecti | ion: | | | | | | | | | |
| Untimely | | | 0(| 0.0%) | Wi | cong level | Ĺ | | | 0(| 0.0%) |
| informal r | esol | lution | 0 (| 0 .0 %) | R€ | e-submit | | | | 0(| 0.0%) |
| ichments | | | 0 (| 0.0%) | | her | | | | 0(| 0.0%) |

Date or request: 10/13/93 Summary Period: 19Jul93 thru 19Sep93

Number of Months Found: 2

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES TRACKING DATA REGIONAL OFFICE APPEALS FOR:

CC: Northeast Region

Number of Inmates in Population: 696 Region: NER

Filed During Period:

2 1 Pending at End of Period:

Answered During Period:

Overdue:

1

Answered On Time: 1 (100.0%)
Average Time for Response: 10.50 days

| | REMEDIES INITIATED | | | | | | | | * REMEDIES RESOLVED | | | | | |
|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|-----|---------------------------|------------------------------|----------|----|---|------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------|--|--|--|
| SUBJECT
BREAKDOWN | P | umber & ercent ubmitted | Pe | mber &
rcent
jected | Number &
Percent
Filed | | | P | umber &
ercent
nswered | Number &
Percent
Granted | | | | |
| Classificatn | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | * | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | | |
| Non-mail Com | 0 | | 0 | 0.0% | Ō | 0.0% | | 0 | 0.0% | Ō | 0.0% | | | |
| Comm Proms | 1 | 50.0% | Ō | 0.0% | ì | 50.0% | | Ō | 0.0% | Ŏ | 0.0% | | | |
| Staff | 0 | 0.0% | Ö | 0.0% | ō | 0.0% | | Ō | 0.0% | Ö | 0.0% | | | |
| Control Unit | Ō | | Ö | 0.0% | Ō | 0.0% | | ō | 0.0% | Ŏ | 0.0% | | | |
| CCM/Major | 1 | 50.0% | Ō | 0.0% | ī | 50.0% | | 1 | 100.0% | Ō | 0.0% | | | |
| Fducatn/Rec | ō | | Ö | 0.0% | ō | 0.0% | | ō | 0.0% | Ŏ | 0.0% | | | |
| , (54511) 1155 | 0 | 0.0% | Ö | 0.0% | Ö | 0.0% | | Ō | 0.0% | Ö | 0.0% | | | |
| Operatn | ō | | Ö | 0.0% | Ö | 0.0% | | Ō | 0.0% | Ŏ | 0.0% | | | |
| Iliac Program | Ō | 0.0% | Ö | 0.0% | Ō | 0.0% | | Ō | 0.0% | Ö | 0.0% | | | |
| Legal | Ō | 0.0% | Ö | 0.0% | ō | 0.0% | | Ö | 0.0% | Ŏ | 0.0% | | | |
| Mail | 0 | 0.0% | Ö | 0.0% | ō | 0.0% | | ō | 0.0% | Ŏ | 0.0% | | | |
| Srch/Restrnt | ō | 0.0% | ŏ | 0.0% | Ö | 0.0% | | ō | 0.0% | Ŏ | 0.0% | | | |
| Spec Housing | 0 | 0.0% | Ö | 0.0% | Ö | 0.0% | | Ŏ | 0.0% | Ō | 0.0% | | | |
| Transfer | Ö | 0.0% | ŏ | 0.0% | ō | 0.0% | | ō | 0.0% | Ŏ | 0.0% | | | |
| CDC/Minor | 0 | 0.0% | Ŏ | 0.0% | Ö | 0.0% | | Ō | 0.0% | Ö | 0.0% | | | |
| Visiting | Ö | 0.0% | ŏ | 0.0% | Ö | 0.0% | | Ö | 0.0% | Ŏ | 0.0% | | | |
| Work Assign | Ö | 0.0% | ő | 0.0% | Õ | 0.0% | | 0 | 0.0% | Õ | 0.0% | | | |
| MOLY USSIAN | J | 0.00 | • | 0.00 | • | 0.00 | | | | • | | | | |
| Dental Care | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | * | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | | |
| Forced Med | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | | |
| Medical | Ō | 0.0% | Ō | 0.0% | Ō | 0.0% | | Ō | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | | |
| Mental Hlth | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | Ō | 0.0% | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | | |
| Jail Time | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | Ō | 0.0% | | Ō | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | | |
| Records | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | Ō | 0.0% | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | | |
| Sentence Com | Ō | 0.0% | Ö | 0.0% | Ŏ | | * | Õ | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | | |
| | | | | | | , | * | | | | | | | |
| TOTALS: | 2 | 100.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 100.0% | * | 1 | 100.0% | 0 | N/A | | | |
| % of Submitted: | | 100.0% | | 0.0% | | 100.0% | * | | | | · | | | |
| % of Answered: | | | | | | • | * | | 100.0% | | 0.0% | | | |
| Reason for Rejec | cti | ion: | 0(| 0.0%) | Wı | ong leve | el | | | 0(| 0.0%) | | | |
| informal res | sol | lution | 0(| 0.0%) | Re | -submit | | | | 0(| 0.0%) | | | |
| ichments | | | 0 (| 0.0%) | Ot | her | | | | 0(| 0.0%) | | | |

Date or request: 10/13/93 Summary Period: 21Jun93 thru 19Sep93

Number of Months Found: 3

0

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES TRACKING DATA

REGIONAL OFFICE APPEALS FOR: CC: South Central Region

Number of Inmates in Population: 3680 Region: SCR

Pending at End of Period: Overdue:

Filed During Period: 10
Answered During Period: 9
Answered On Time: 9 (100.0%)

Average Time for Response: 31.13 days

(I/SSS 10/13/1993 9:07 BOP-0

| | | REMEDIES INITIATED | | | | | | | REMEDIES RESOLVED | | | |
|---------------------------|------|---|-----|-----------------|---------------------------------|---------------|-------------|--------------------------|-------------------|-----------|---------------|--|
| SUBJECT
BREAKDOWN | P | Number & Number & Number & Percent Percent Submitted Rejected Filed | | * | Number &
Percent
Answered | | Pe | mber &
rcent
anted | | | | |
| Classificatn | | 0.0% | | 0 0.0% 0 0.0% * | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | | |
| Non-mail Com | Ö | 0.0% | ŏ | | 0 | 0.0% | | ō | 0.0% | ŏ | 0.0% | |
| Comm Proms | í | 9.1% | ŏ | | 1 | 10.0% | | ĺ | 11.1% | ŏ | 0.0% | |
| Staff | Ō | 0.0% | Ō | | ō | 0.0% | | Ō | 0.0% | Ŏ | 0.0% | |
| Control Unit | Ō | 0.0% | 0 | | Ö | 0.0% | | 0 | 0.0% | Ŏ | 0.0% | |
| CCM/Major | 9 | 81.8% | 1 | 100.0% | 8 | 80.0% | | 7 | 77.8% | 1 | 14.3% | |
| Educatn/Rec | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | | Ō | 0.0% | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | |
| | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | | 0 | 0.0% | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | |
| Operatn | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | * | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | |
| In. Program | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | * | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | |
| Legal | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | * | 0 | 0 .0 % | 0 | 0.0% | |
| Mail | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | |
| Srch/Restrnt | 0 | | 0 | 0 .0% | 0 | 0 .0 % | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 .0 % | |
| Spec Housing | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | |
| Transfer | 1 | 9.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 10.0% | | 1 | 11.1% | 0 | 0.0% | |
| CDC/Minor | 0 | 0 .0 % | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | 0 | 0 .0 % | 0 | 0.0% | |
| Visiting | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | |
| Work Assign | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | * | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | |
| Dental Care | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | |
| Forced Med | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 .0 % | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | |
| Medical | 0 | 0 .0 % | 0 | 0 .0 % | 0 | 0.0% | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | |
| Mental Hlth | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0. 0 % | 0 | 0.0% | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | |
| Jail Time | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 .0 % | 0 | 0.0% | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | |
| Records | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | |
| Sentence Com | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | * | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | |
| rotals: | | 100.0% | . 1 | 100.0% | 10 | 100.0% | * | 9 | 100.0% | 1 | N/A | |
| <pre>% of Submitted</pre> | | 100.0% | | 9.1% | | 90.9% | | | _ | | | |
| <pre>å of Answered:</pre> | | | | | | | * | | 100.0% | | 11.1% | |
| Reason for Rej | ecti | on: | | | | | | | | | | |
| [Intimely | | | 0(| 0.0%) | Wr | ong lev | <i>r</i> el | | | 0(| 0.0%) | |
| informal r | esol | ution | 0(| 0.0%) | | -submit | | | | | 0.0%) | |
| achments | | | 0(| 0.0%) | | her | - | | | <u>q(</u> | 0.0%) | |
| | | | ~ (| 0.00, | | re. T & | | | | 71 | - · · · · · | |

Date of request: 10/13/93 Summary Period: 21Jun93 thru 19Sep93

Number of Months Found: 3

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES TRACKING DATA

REGIONAL OFFICE APPEALS FOR:

CC: Southeast Region

Number of Inmates in Population: 773 Region: SER

Filed During Period:
Answered During Period:

5 5 Pending at End of Period:

Overdue:

2 0

Answered On Time: 5 (100.0%)
Average Time for Response: 13.67 days

| | R | EMEDIES INITIA | | * REMEDIES RESOLVED | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| SUBJECT
BREAKDOWN | Number & Percent Submitted | Number &
Percent
Rejected | Number & * Percent * Filed * | Number &
Percent
Answered | Number &
Percent
Granted | | | | |
| Classificatn Non-mail Com Comm Prgms Staff Control Unit CCM/Major Educatn/Rec Operatn Program Legal Mail Srch/Restrnt Spec Housing Transfer CDC/Minor Visiting | 0 0.0%
0 0.0%
1 12.5%
0 0.0%
0 0.0%
7 87.5%
0 0.0%
0 0.0%
0 0.0%
0 0.0%
0 0.0%
0 0.0%
0 0.0%
0 0.0%
0 0.0% | 0 0.0%
0 0.0%
1 33.3%
0 0.0%
0 0.0%
2 66.7%
0 0.0%
0 0.0% | 0 0.0% * 0 0.0% * 0 0.0% * 0 0.0% * 0 0.0% * 0 0.0% * 0 0.0% * 0 0.0% * 0 0.0% * 0 0.0% * 0 0.0% * 0 0.0% * 0 0.0% * 0 0.0% * 0 0.0% * 0 0.0% * 0 0.0% * | 0 0.0%
0 0.0% | 0 0.0%
0 0.0%
0 0.0%
0 0.0%
1 20.0%
0 0.0%
0 0.0% | | | | |
| Work Assign | 0 0.0% | 0 0.0% | 0 0.0% * | 0 0.0% | 0 0.0% | | | | |
| Dental Care Forced Med Medical Mental Hlth Jail Time Records Sentence Com | 0 0.0%
0 0.0%
0 0.0%
0 0.0%
0 0.0%
0 0.0% | 0 0.0%
0 0.0%
0 0.0%
0 0.0%
0 0.0%
0 0.0% | 0 0.0% * 0 0.0% * 0 0.0% * 0 0.0% * 0 0.0% * 0 0.0% * | 0 0.0%
0 0.0%
0 0.0%
0 0.0%
0 0.0%
0 0.0% | 0 0.0%
0 0.0%
0 0.0%
0 0.0%
0 0.0%
0 0.0% | | | | |
| TOTALS: % of Submitted: % of Answered: | 8 100.0%
100.0% | 3 100.0%
37.5% | 5 100.0% *
62.5% *
* | 5 100.0%
100.0% | 1 N/A
20.0% | | | | |
| Reason for Rejective informal resource. | | 0(0.0%)
0(0.0%)
1(33.3%) | Wrong level
Re-submit
Other | | 0(0.0%)
2(66.7%)
0(0.0%) | | | | |

KI/SSS 10/13/1993 9:07 BOP-0

Date of request: 10/13/93 Summary Period: 21Jun93 thru 19Sep93

Number of Months Found: 3

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES TRACKING DATA

REGIONAL OFFICE APPEALS FOR:

CC: Western Region

Number of Inmates in Population: 1607 Region: WXR

Filed During Period: 9 Pending at End of Period: Answered During Period: 9 Overdue:

Answered On Time: 9 (100.0%)
Average Time for Response: 17.90 days

| | | R | EMEDI | ES INITIAT | rED | | * | | REMEDIES | RESO | LVED | | |
|------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|------------|---------------------------------|-----|------------------------------|--------|---|------------------------------|------|--------------------------|--|--|
| SUBJECT
BREAKDOWN | P | umber &
ercent
ubmitted | P | Number &
Percent
Rejected | | Number &
Percent
Filed | | | umber &
ercent
nswered | Pe | Number & Percent Granted | | |
| Classificatn
Non-mail Com | 0 | 0.0% |
0
0 | | 0 | 0.0% | *
* | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Comm Proms | 2 | 16.7% | 1 | 33.3% | 1 | 11.1% | * | ì | 11.1% | Ö | 0.0% | | |
| Staff | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | * | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Control Unit | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | * | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| ccm/Major | 8 | 66.7% | 2 | 6 6.7 % | 6 | 66.7% | * | 6 | 6 6.7% | 1 | 16.7% | | |
| Educatn/Rec | 0 | 0 .0 % | 0 | 0 .0% | 0 | 0.0% | * | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| • | 0 | 0 .0 % | 0 | 0 .0 % | 0 | 0.0% | * | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Operatn | 0 | 0 .0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | * | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 .0 % | | |
| II Program | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | * | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Legal | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 .0 % | 0 | 0.0% | * | 0 | 0 .0 % | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Mail | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | * | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Srch/Restrnt | 0 | 0 .0% | 0 | 0 .0% | 0 | 0.0% | * | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Spec Housing | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 .0 % | 0 | 0.0% | * | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Transfer | 0 | 0 .0% | 0 | 0 .0 % | 0 | 0.0% | * | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| CDC/Minor | 2 | 16.7% | 0 | 0 .0 % | 2 | 22.2% | * | 2 | 22.2% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Visiting | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 .0 % | 0 | 0.0% | * | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Work Assign | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | * | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Dental Care | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Forced Med | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Medical | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Mental Hlth | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Jail Time | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.00 | * | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| ₹ecords | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| Sentence Com | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0 .0% | 0 | 0.0% | * | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | | |
| OTALS: | | 100.0% | 3 | 100.0% | 9 | 100.0% | | 9 | 100.0% | 1 | N/A | | |
| ; of Submitted | : | 100.0% | | 25.0% | | 75.0% | * | | | | | | |
| of Answered: | | | | | | | * | | 100.0% | | 11.1% | | |
| leason for Reje | ecti | on: | | | | _ | _ | | | | | | |
| Untimely | | 4 . 4 | 0(| 0.0%) | | cong lev | | | | 0(| 0.0%) | | |
| informal re | 2501 | ution | 0(| 0.0%) | | -submit | : | | | 0(| 0.0%) | | |
| ichments
SS 10/13/ | /199 | 3 9:07 B | 0(
OP-0 | 0.0%) | Ot | her | | | | 1(| 33.3%) | | |