

Massachusetts

Department of Correction

Quarterly Report on the Status of Prison Overcrowding, Second Quarter of 1998

**Submitted in Compliance with Chapter 799
Section 21 of the Acts of 1985**

A. Paul Cellucci
Governor

A. David Rodham
Secretary of Public Safety

Michael T. Maloney
Commissioner

Kathleen M. Dennehy
Deputy Commissioner

September, 1998

Approved by: State Purchasing Agent
Publication No: 14,602-09-45-10-10-86

1998 Second Quarter Report

Section Twenty-one of Chapter 799 of the Acts of 1985 directs the Commissioner of Correction to report quarterly on the status of overcrowding in state and county facilities. This statute calls for the following information:

Such report shall include, by facility, the average daily census for the period of the report and the actual census on the first and the last days of the report period.

Said report shall also contain such information for the previous twelve months and a comparison to the rated capacity of such facility.

This report presents the required statistics for the second quarter of 1998.

This report was prepared by Hollie Matthews of Research and Planning, and is based on daily count sheets prepared by the Classification Division.

1998 Second Quarter Report

Contents

Technical Notes	1
Abbreviations	2
Table 1. Population in Department of Correction Facilities, April 1, 1998 to June 30, 1998	3
Table 2. Population in Department of Correction Facilities, April 1, 1997 to March 31, 1998	4
Table 3. Population in County Correctional Facilities, April 1, 1998 to June 30, 1998	5
Table 4. Population in Bristol, Essex, Middlesex, and Norfolk County Correctional Facilities, April 1, 1998 to, June 30, 1998	5
Table 5. Population in County Correctional Facilities, April 1, 1997 to March 31, 1998	6
Table 6. Population in Bristol, Essex, Middlesex, and Essex County Correctional Facilities, April 1, 1997 to March 31, 1998	6
Figure 1. DOC Sentenced Population, Second Quarter of 1997 and 1998	7
Figure 2. HOC Population, Second Quarter of 1997 and 1998	7
Table 7. Court Commitments by Gender, 1997 and 1998	8
Figure 3. Court Commitments by Gender, 1997 and 1998	8

Technical Notes

- The official capacity or custody level designation for each facility can change for a number of reasons, e.g. expansion of facility beds, decrease of facility beds due to fire, or changes in contracts with vendors. In all tables the capacity and custody level reflects the status at the end of the reporting period. The design capacity is reported for correctional facilities in Tables 1 through 6.
- On November 15, 1996, one hundred new modular beds were added to MCI Concord, increasing its design capacity to 614. Ninety-six modular beds were also added to MCI Norfolk, increasing its total to 1,084 beds. Pondville Correctional Center was reclassified from Custody Level 3/2 to Custody Level 3.
- Two hundred forty-three new modular beds were added to Middlesex (Billerica) House of Correction during November 15, 1996, increasing its total to 1,035 beds.
- Due to changes in the Massachusetts General Law, DOC consolidated one unit at the Bridgewater Treatment Center and back-filled with general population inmates. These design capacity beds were placed on-line November 8, 1996 and first appeared on the November 12, 1996 daily count sheet. Three hundred additional beds were placed on-line during the third quarter of 1997.
- Due to the Department's policy changes, the security level of MCI-Shirley (Min) was changed from Security Level 3/2 to Security Level 3 during the first quarter of 1996.
- On January 31, 1995, the design capacity for the Departmental Segregation Units (DSU) at MCI-Cedar Junction and MCI-Norfolk were taken off the count sheets. The segregation units are considered support beds and are not shown on the daily count sheet as design capacity. This resulted in the elimination of 91 beds (60 at Cedar Junction and 31 at Norfolk) from the previous quarterly reports.
- In previous quarterly reports, the population figures for PPREP were included with the Park Drive population. The PPREP population is reported independently starting with the first quarter of 1995.
- Where relevant, the population figures for all facilities include both male and female inmates except as shown at Lancaster.
- State inmates housed in the Hampshire County contract program are included in the county population tables, as are all other state inmates housed in county facilities.
- Longwood Treatment Center is a specialized DOC facility for individuals incarcerated for O.U.I. Because the inmates are primarily county sentenced inmates, the inmate count and bed capacity are also included in Tables 3 and 4.
- The Massachusetts Boot Camp opened on August 17, 1992, and is located at the Bridgewater Correctional complex in Bridgewater, Massachusetts. Prior to 1995, the Boot Camp was listed as a DOC minimum security facility. In August, 1995, 128 beds were designated to security level 4 (state inmates) and 128 beds for county inmates. In October, 1995, these beds were added to security level 4 design capacity, and 128 beds were added to House of Correction tables.
- Beginning with the second quarter of 1998, the following county correctional facilities are presented individually: Bristol Dartmouth, Bristol Ash Street, David R. Nelson Correctional Addiction Center, and Bristol Pre-Release in Bristol County; Norfolk Braintree, Norfolk Dedham, and Norfolk Contract in Norfolk County; Middlesex Cambridge, and Middlesex Billerica in Middlesex County; and Essex Middleton, and Essex Lawrence Correctional Alternative Center in Essex County.
- Nashua Street inmates housed at other facilities are reported in the counts for the facilities in which they are in custody.
- In June, 1993, Plymouth House of Correction added 833 beds increasing, its total to 1,140 beds.
- On October 22, 1997, Eastern Massachusetts Correctional Alcohol Center, was renamed the David R. Nelson Correctional Addiction Center.

- On April 18, 1995, new security level designations were established according to 103 DOC 101 Correctional Institutions/Custody Levels policy which states:

Custody Levels:

- **Level One.** The least restrictive in the department and is reserved only for those inmates who are at the end of their sentence and have been identified as posing little to no threat to the community. Supervision is minimal and indirect.

- **Level Two.** A custody level in which both design/construction as well as inmate classification reflect the goal of restoring to the inmate maximum responsibility and control of their own behavior and actions prior to their release. Direct supervision of these inmates is not required, but intermittent observation may be appropriate under certain conditions. Inmates within this level may be permitted to access the community unescorted to participate in programming to include, but not limited to, work release, educational release, etc.

- **Level Three.** A custody level in which both the design/construction as well as inmate classification reflect the goal of returning to the inmate a greater sense of personal responsibility and autonomy while still providing for supervision and monitoring of behavior and activity. Inmates within this security level are not considered a serious risk to the safety of staff, inmates or to the public. Program participation is mandated and geared toward their potential reintegration into the community. Access to the community is limited and under constant direct staff supervision.

- **Level Four.** A custody level in which both the design/construction as well as inmate classification reflect the goal of restoring to the inmate some degree of responsibility and control of their own behavior and actions, while still insuring the safety of staff and inmates. Design/construction is generally characterized by high security parameters and limited use of internal physical barriers. Inmates at this level have demonstrated the ability to abide by rules and regulations and require intermittent supervision. However, behavior in the community, i.e., criminal sentence and/or the presence of serious outstanding legal matters indicate the need for some control and for segregation from the community. Job and program opportunities exist for all inmates within the perimeter of the facility.

- **Level Five.** A custody level in which design/construction as well as inmate classification reflect the need to provide maximum external and internal control and supervision of inmates. Inmates accorded to this status may present an escape risk or pose a threat to other inmates, staff, or the orderly running of the institution, however, at a lesser degree than those at level 6. Supervision remains constant and direct. Through an inmates willingness to comply with institutional rules and regulations, increased job and program opportunities exist.

- **Level Six.** A custody level in which both design/construction as well as inmate classification reflect the need to provide maximum external and internal control and supervision of inmates primarily through the use of high security parameters and extensive use of internal physical barriers and check points. Inmates accorded this status present serious escape risks or pose serious threats to themselves, to other inmates, to staff, or the orderly running of the institution. Supervision of inmates is direct and constant. Inmates are confined to their cells at all times, except when they are removed for authorized activities. Inmates within their status, when removed from their cell, are typically under escort and in restraints.

Abbreviations

AC	- Addiction Center	OSCC	- Old Colony Correctional Center
ADP	- Average Daily Population	OUI	- Operating Under the Influence
ATU	- Awaiting Trial Unit	PPREP	- Pre-Parole Residential Environmental Phase Program
CRS	- Contract Residential Services Includes Charlotte House, and Houston House	PRC	- Pre-Release Center
DDU	- Departmental Disciplinary Unit	SECC	- Southeastern Correctional Center
DOC	- Department of Correction	SDPTC	- Sexually Dangerous Person Treatment Center
DSU	- Departmental Segregation Unit	SMCC	- South Middlesex Correctional Center (formerly SMPRC)
HOC	- House of Correction	SH	- State Hospital
NECC	- Northeastern Correctional Center	TC	- Treatment Center (Longwood, Bridgewater)
NCCI	- North Central Correctional Institution at Gardner		

Table 1 provides the DOC figures for the Second quarter of 1998. As this table indicates, the DOC population (excluding Bridgewater SH, SDPTC, AC, Longwood TC, and county inmates at the Mass. Boot Camp) increased by 12 inmates during the second quarter. At the end of the quarter, the DOC operated with 10,147 inmates in the system, and the average daily population was 10,129 with a design capacity of 7,106. Thus, the DOC operated at 143 percent of design capacity.

Population in DOC Facilities, April 1, 1998 to June 30, 1998

Custody Level/ Facility	Avg Daily Population	Beginning Population	Ending Population	Design Capacity	% ADP Capacity
Custody Level 6					
Cedar Junction	797	793	801	633	126%
Framingham - ATU	114	103	128	64	178%
Custody Level 5					
OCCC	701	704	716	488	144%
Custody Level 4					
Concord	1,362	1,377	1,347	614	222%
Framingham	491	486	489	388	127%
Norfolk	1,502	1,513	1,494	1,084	139%
Bay State	294	296	292	266	111%
NCCI	934	934	935	568	164%
SECC	806	804	806	456	177%
Shirley-Medium	1,100	1,098	1,093	720	153%
Mass. Boot Camp	108	117	100	128	84%
*Bridgewater TC	349	346	351	345	101%
Sub-Total	8,558	8,571	8,552	5,754	149%
Custody Level 3					
Plymouth	178	180	171	151	118%
NECC	221	216	224	150	147%
SECC-Minimum	94	92	95	100	94%
Shirley-Minimum	337	326	347	403	84%
Pondville	174	170	180	100	174%
Custody Level 3/2					
Lancaster-Male	122	122	123	94	130%
Lancaster-Female	52	54	55	59	88%
SMCC	196	200	196	125	157%
Sub-Total	1,374	1,360	1,391	1,182	116%
Custody Level 2					
Boston State	92	93	93	55	167%
Park Drive	50	50	50	50	100%
Hodder House	23	27	29	35	66%
Custody Level 1					
Charlotte	12	11	8	15	80%
Houston House	12	11	14	15	80%
PPREP	8	12	10	n.a.	n.a.
Sub-Total	197	204	204	170	115%
Total	10,129	10,135	10,147	7,106	143%
Bridgewater SH	346	358	355	227	152%
Bridgewater TC	185	187	182	216	86%
Bridgewater AC	111	94	111	214	52%
Longwood TC	127	132	119	125	107%
Sub-Total	769	771	767	782	99%
Grand Total	10,898	10,906	10,914	7,888	138%
Houses of Correction	723	726	708	n.a.	n.a.
Federal Prisons	26	26	25	n.a.	n.a.
Inter-State Contract	365	363	365	n.a.	n.a.

(* See Technical Notes)

Table 2 provides the DOC figures for the previous twelve months - i.e., for the period April 1, 1997 to March 31, 1998. These figures indicate that the DOC population increased by 98, or 1 percent, over this twelve month period (excluding Bridgewater SH, SDPTC, AC, Longwood TC, and county inmates at the Mass. Boot Camp), from 10,038 in April, 1997 to 10,136 in March, 1998.

Custody Level/ Facility	Avg Daily Population	Beginning Population	Ending Population	Design Capacity	% ADP Capacity
Custody Level 6					
Cedar Junction	810	822	793	633	128%
Framingham - ATU	101	113	102	64	158%
Custody Level 5					
OCCC	698	694	703	488	143%
Custody Level 4					
Concord	1,267	1,344	1,373	614	206%
Framingham	502	489	488	388	129%
Norfolk	1,517	1,518	1,514	1,084	140%
Bay State	295	296	296	266	111%
NCCI	951	1,020	934	568	167%
SECC	809	846	804	456	177%
Shirley-Medium	1,094	1,099	1,099	720	152%
Mass. Boot Camp	96	92	114	128	75%
*Bridgewater TC	310	50	346	345	90%
Sub-Total	8,450	8,383	8,566	5,754	147%
Custody Level 3					
Plymouth	181	186	181	151	120%
NECC	229	241	215	150	153%
SECC-Minimum	95	106	92	100	95%
Shirley-Minimum	334	359	333	403	83%
Pondville	185	197	171	100	185%
Custody Level 3/2					
Lancaster-Male	121	119	124	94	129%
Lancaster-Female	53	65	56	59	90%
SMCC	194	192	195	125	155%
Sub-Total	1,392	1,465	1,367	1,182	118%
Custody Level 2					
Boston State	95	86	93	55	173%
Park Drive	49	41	50	50	98%
Hodder House	32	33	27	35	91%
Custody Level 1					
Charlotte	10	7	11	15	67%
Houston House	10	9	11	15	67%
PPREP	10	14	11	n.a.	n.a
Sub-Total	206	190	203	170	121%
Total	10,048	10,038	10,136	7,106	141%
Bridgewater SH	367	354	357	227	162%
Bridgewater TC	191	196	186	216	88%
Bridgewater AC	106	117	94	214	50%
Longwood TC	140	150	130	125	112%
Sub-Total	804	817	767	782	103%
Grand Total	10,852	10,855	10,903	7,888	138%
Houses of Correction	720	740	715	n.a	n.a
Federal Prisons	27	28	26	n.a	n.a
Inter-State Contract	378	370	363	n.a	n.a

(* See Technical Notes)

Table 3 presents the county figures for the second quarter of 1998. The county population decreased by 77 inmates, or minus 1 percent during this quarter. At the end of the quarter, the county system operated

with 12,475 inmates, and the average daily population was 12,477 in facilities with a total design capacity of 8,356. Thus, the county system operated at 149 percent of design capacity.

Population in County Correctional Facilities, April 1, 1998 to June 30, 1998					
Facility	Avg Daily Population	Beginning Population	Ending Population	Design Capacity	% ADP Capacity
Barnstable	247	246	250	110	225%
Berkshire	235	226	240	116	203%
Bristol	1,163	1,218	1,125	666	175%
Dukes	23	21	26	19	121%
Essex	1,371	1,388	1,371	635	216%
Franklin	137	149	132	63	217%
Hampden	1,680	1,670	1,693	1,178	143%
Hampden-OUI	139	139	143	125	111%
Hampshire	244	245	234	248	98%
Middlesex	1,451	1,422	1,486	1,035	140%
Norfolk	630	631	642	379	166%
Plymouth	1,164	1,162	1,145	1,140	102%
Suffolk-Nashua St	674	702	669	453	149%
Suffolk-So. Bay	1,870	1,860	1,885	1,146	163%
Worcester	1,256	1,284	1,271	790	159%
Longwood TC	127	132	114	125	102%
Mass. Boot Camp	66	57	49	128	52%
Total	12,477	12,552	12,475	8,356	149%

Table 4 presents the county figures for the second quarter of 1998. The following table presents a breakdown of Bristol, Essex, Middlesex and Norfolk Counties, by facility.

Population for Bristol, Essex, Middlesex and Norfolk Counties, April 1, 1998 to June 30, 1998					
Facility	Avg Daily Population	Beginning Population	Ending Population	Design Capacity	% ADP Capacity
<u>Bristol County</u>					
Bristol Ash Street	211	213	225	206	102%
Bristol Dartmouth	744	796	705	304	245%
*Bristol DRNCAC	107	98	99	100	107%
Bristol Pre-Release	101	111	96	56	180%
<u>Essex County</u>					
Essex Middleton	1,122	1,135	1,104	500	224%
Essex LCAC	249	253	267	135	184%
<u>Middlesex County</u>					
Middlesex Cambridge	255	255	278	161	158%
Middlesex Billerica	1,196	1,167	1,208	874	137%
<u>Norfolk County</u>					
Norfolk Dedham	509	501	525	302	169%
Norfolk Braintree	38	45	41	52	73%
Norfolk Contract	83	85	76	25	332%


Table 5 presents the county figures for the previous twelve months. These figures indicate that the county population increased by 128 inmates or 1 percent over this twelve-month period, from 12,436 in April, 1997, to 12,564 in March, 1998.

Population in County Correctional Facilities, April 1, 1997 to March 31, 1998					
Facility	Avg Daily Population	Beginning Population	Ending Population	Design Capacity	% ADP Capacity
Barnstable	278	295	242	110	253%
Berkshire	248	251	222	116	214%
Bristol	1,308	1,290	1,221	666	196%
Dukes	20	17	19	19	105%
Essex	1,359	1,409	1,388	635	214%
Franklin	139	129	148	63	221%
Hampden	1,645	1,558	1,675	1,178	140%
Hampden-OUI	140	137	138	125	112%
Hampshire	256	270	246	248	103%
Middlesex	1,385	1,340	1,412	1,035	134%
Norfolk	613	600	637	379	162%
Plymouth	1,199	1,256	1,162	1,140	105%
Suffolk-Nashua St	666	638	722	453	147%
Suffolk-So. Bay	1,805	1,874	1,854	1,146	158%
Worcester	1,240	1,165	1,291	790	157%
Longwood TC	139	150	130	125	111%
Mass. Boot Camp	63	57	57	128	49%
Total	12,503	12,436	12,564	8,356	150%

Table 6 presents the county figures for the previous twelve months. The following table presents a breakdown of Bristol, Essex, Middlesex and Norfolk Counties, by facility.


Population for Bristol, Essex, Middlesex and Norfolk Counties, April 1, 1997 to March 31, 1998					
Facility	Avg Daily Population	Beginning Population	Ending Population	Design Capacity	% ADP Capacity
<u>Bristol County</u>					
Bristol Ash Street	249	271	207	206	121%
Bristol Dartmouth	837	785	804	304	275%
*Bristol DRNCAC	115	126	99	100	115%
Bristol Pre-Release	107	108	111	56	191%
<u>Essex County</u>					
Essex Middleton	1,107	1,147	1,145	500	221%
Essex LCAC	252	262	243	135	187%
<u>Middlesex County</u>					
Middlesex Cambridge	230	273	249	161	143%
Middlesex Billerica	1,155	1,067	1,163	874	132%
<u>Norfolk County</u>					
Norfolk Dedham	482	447	513	302	160%
Norfolk Braintree	46	55	44	52	88%
Norfolk Contract	85	98	80	25	340%

Figure 1.
DOC Sentenced Population, Second Quarter of 1997 and 1998



The graph above compares the DOC sentenced population in 1997 to that in 1998. For April 1998 the DOC population increased by 118 inmates (1%) compared with the same month of 1997; for May, the population increased by 87 inmates (1%) ; and for June the population increased by 117 inmates, or 1 percent.

Figure 2.
HOC Population, Second Quarter of 1997 and 1998



The graph above compares the HOC population in 1997 to that in 1998. For April, 1998 the HOC population increased by 168 inmates (1%) compared with the same month of 1997; for May, the population increased by 157 inmates (1%) ; and for June, the population increased by 194 inmates, or 2 percent.

Note: Data from Figures 1 and 2 were taken from the end of the month daily count sheet compiled by the Classification Division.

Table 7 provides statistics on new court commitments by gender to the DOC in the first two quarters of 1997 and 1998. Overall, there has been a decrease of 50 new court commitments, or minus 3 percent for 1998 in comparison with the number of new court commitments in 1997 from 1,502 to 1,452. Male new court commitments for 1998 decreased by 16, or minus 3 percent from 1997. Female new court commitments during 1998 increased by 7, or 3 percent compared to the number of new court commitments during the same period in 1997.

DOC New Court Commitments by Gender

	1997	1998	Difference
Males			
First Quarter	545	517	-5%
Second Quarter	474	458	-3%
Sub-total	1,019	975	-4%
Females			
First Quarter	251	238	-5%
Second Quarter	232	239	3%
Sub-Total	483	477	-1%
Total	1,502	1,452	-3%

Figure 3 provides a graphical representation of the number of new court commitments by gender to the DOC during the second quarter of 1997 and the second quarter of 1998.

