6415 Calder, Suite B . Beaumont, Texas 77706 409.866.9920 • www.correctionalexperts.com

Making a Difference!

April 19, 2008

MEMORANDUM FOR:

Gary E. Mead, Acting Director

Office of Detention and Removal Operations

FROM:

Reviewer-In-Charge

Creative Corrections

SUBJECT:

Euless City Jail Annual Detention Review

Creative Corrections conducted an Annual Detention Review of the Euless City Jail (ECJ) located in Euless, Texas, on April 14-15, 2008. The facility is operated by the Euless Police Department, which has a contract with the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS). As noted on the attached documents, the team of Subject Matter Experts included Health Services; Safety; and Food Services. A review closeout was conducted on April 15, 2008, with Chief of , Assistant Chief of Police; Lieutenant b6,67c Jail Administrator; and Sergeant and included a discussion of all deficiencies and concerns noted during our review.

Type of Review:

This review is a scheduled Detention Standard Review to determine general compliance with established ICE National Detention Standards for facilities used for under 72 hours.

Review Summary:

The facility is not currently accredited by any correctional or health organizations.

Standards Compliance:

The following information summarizes the standards reviewed and the overall compliance for this review. The following statistical information outlined provides a direct comparison of the 2007 ADR and this ADR conducted for 2008.

April 25, 2007	Review	April 14-15, 2008	Review 25		
Compliant	28	Compliant			
Deficient 0		Deficient	2		
At-Risk	0	At-Risk	. 0		
Not-Applicable 0		Not-Applicable	1		

Discipline Policy-Deficient

All facilities housing ICE detainees are authorized to impose discipline on detainees whose behavior is not in compliance with facility rules and regulations.

- Facility policy does not identify a written disciplinary system, which uses progressive levels of reviews and appeals. The policy states detainees can be sanctioned with loss of privileges, disciplinary isolation and possible formal charges; however, the policy does not describe any due process procedures to justify the imposition of sanctions.
- Facility rules do not prohibit disciplinary action from being capricious or retaliatory.
- Written rules do not prohibit staff from imposing the sanction "loss of correspondence privileges".
- The facility does not have a detainee handbook that informs detainees of the rules of conduct, sanctions, or procedures for violations. Likewise, this information is not disseminated to detainees verbally.
- Detainee rights and responsibilities, prohibited acts, disciplinary severity scale and sanctions are not posted in Spanish or English.
- The facility policy does not include provisions for informally handling minor rule violations.

Recommendations

Establish a written policy authorizing the facility to impose discipline on detainees whose behavior is not in compliance with facility rules and regulations. This policy should direct that disciplinary action is not to be capricious or retaliatory, that "loss of correspondence privileges" cannot be imposed as a disciplinary sanction, and it should contain provisions for informally handling minor rule violations. The rules of conduct, disciplinary sanctions and procedures for violations should be defined in writing and communicated to all detainees. Portions of the disciplinary policy containing detainee rights and responsibilities, prohibited acts, disciplinary severity scale and sanctions should be available in English and Spanish, and posted in the housing units.

Note: Although the Euless City Jail's disciplinary policy is deficient, their efforts to maintain a high measure of security and control of detainees is not without merit. This "Under 72 hour" facility is unable to employ a comparatively time-consuming disciplinary process since detainees would be removed from the facility before charges could be adjudicated.

Emergency Plans-Deficient

Every facility will develop plans and procedures for handling emergency situations reasonably likely to occur. The goal of these "contingency plans" is to control the situation without endangering lives or property.

The Euless City Jail's emergency plans do not cover work/food strikes, escapes, adverse weather or internal hostage situations. Additionally, there is no facility policy that mandates detainees will be protected from personal injury, disease, or property damage.

Recommendations

Plans and procedures should be developed for handling emergency situations reasonably likely to occur. These procedures should include statements addressing the protection of detainees from personal injury, disease, or property damage. Written procedures should cover work/food strikes, escapes, adverse weather, and internal hostage situations.

RIC Issues and Concerns

Environmental Health and Safety

Personal protective equipment (eye protection and eye wash station) is needed for staff or detainees using hazardous chemicals.

A technically qualified person should complete monthly fire and safety inspections.

Emergency exit floor plans and an area-specific exit diagram should be conspicuously posted in public areas.

Contraband:

Upon arrival at the facility, detainees should be notified of items they can and cannot possess.

Security Inspections:

A staff member should search each vehicle entering and leaving the facility.

Use of Force:

Staff members should be trained in the performance of the use-of-force team technique in addition to the two hours of self-defense tactics training they receive annually. The facility's use of force policy should be amended to provide staff direction on immediate use of force guidelines and requirements.

Recommended Rating and Justification

It is the Reviewer-in-Charge (RIC) recommendation that the facility receive a rating of "Acceptable." It is also recommended by the RIC that a Plan of Action be required for this facility to implement necessary corrective actions.

RIC Assurance Statement

All findings of this review have been documented on the Detention Review Worksheets and are supported by the written documentation contained in the review file.



DETENTION FACILITY INSPECTION FORM

FACILITIES USED LONGER THAN 72 HOURS

A. TYPE OF FACILITY REVIEWED	Other Charges: (If None, Indicate N/A)				
☐ ICE Service Processing Center	N/A				
☐ ICE Contract Detention Facility	Estimated Man-days per Year				
	6000				
D. Company Lyon Company	G. ACCREDITATION CERTIFICATES N/A				
B. CURRENT INSPECTION	List all State or National Accreditation[s] received:				
Type of Inspection	N/A				
Field Office HQ Inspection	IVA				
Date[s] of Facility Review	H. PROBLEMS / COMPLAINTS (COPIES MUST BE ATTACHED)				
April 14-15, 2008	The Facility is under Court Order or Class Action Finding				
C. PREVIOUS/MOST RECENT FACILITY REVIEW	Court Order Class Action Finding				
Date[s] of Last Facility Review	The Facility has Significant Litigation Pending				
April 25, 2007	☐ Major Litigation ☐ Life/Safety Issues				
Previous Rating	None				
☐ Superior ☐ Good ☒ Acceptable ☐ Deficient ☐ At-Risk	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
	I. FACILITY HISTORY				
D. NAME AND LOCATION OF FACILITY	Date Built				
Name	01/10/2002				
Euless Police Department	Date Last Remodeled or Upgraded				
Address	N/A				
1102 W. Euless Blvd	Date New Construction / Bed Space Added				
City, State and Zip Code	N/A				
Euless, Texas 76040	Future Construction Planned				
County	☐ Yes ☐ No Date: N/A				
Tarrant County	Current Bed space Future Bed Space (# New Beds only)				
Name and Title of Chief Executive Officer	75 Number: N/A Date: N/A				
(Warden/OIC/Superintendent)	J. TOTAL FACILITY POPULATION				
Chief of Police b6,b7c	Total Facility Intake for Previous 12 months				
Telephone Number (Include Area Code) 817 b6,67c	9083				
	Total ICE Man Days for Previous 12 months				
Field Office / Sub-Office (List Office with Oversight) Dallas Field Office	5717				
Distance from Field Office					
25 miles	K. CLASSIFICATION LEVEL (ICE SPCs AND CDFs ONLY)				
23 miles	L-1 L-2 L-3				
E. ICE INFORMATION	Adult Male N/A N/A N/A				
Name of Inspector (Last Name, Title and Duty Station)	Adult Female N/A N/A N/A				
/ RIC-Administration / Creative Corrections					
Name of Team Member / Title / Duty Location	L. FACILITY CAPACITY				
b6,b7c / SME-Security / Creative Corrections	Rated Operational Emergency				
Name of Team Member / Title / Duty Location	Adult Male 65 65 65				
/ SME-Medical / Creative Corrections	Adult Female 10 10 10				
Name of Team Member / Title / Duty Location	☐ Facility Holds Juveniles Offenders 16 and Older as Adults				
/ SME-Food Service / Creative Corrections	M. AVERAGE DAILY POPULATION				
Name of Team Member / Title / Duty Location	ICE USMS Other				
SME-Safety / Creative Corrections	Adult Male 15 N/A 22				
	Adult Female <1 N/A 2				
F. CDF/IGSA INFORMATION ONLY	- IVIA				
Contract Number Date of Contract or IGSA	N. FACILITY STAFFING LEVEL				
IGSAA/DLS-6060-92 February 23, 1991	Security: Support:				
(Amended)	b2High				
Basic Rates per Man-Day					
\$55.00					

SIGNIFICANT INCIDENT SUMMARY WORKSHEET

In order for Creative Corrections to complete its review of your facility, you <u>must</u> complete the following worksheet prior to your scheduled review dates. This worksheet must contain data for the past twelve months. We will use this worksheet in conjunction with the ICE Detention Standards to assess your detention operations with regard to the needs of ICE and its detainee population. Failure to complete this worksheet will result in a delay in processing this report, and may result in a reduction or removal of ICE detainees from your facility.

INCIDENTS	DESCRIPTION	Jan – Mar	Apr – Jun	Jul – Sep	Oct – Dec
Assault:	Types (Sexual ² , Physical, etc.)	0	0	0	0
Offenders on Offenders ¹	With Weapon	0	0	0	0
	Without Weapon	0	. 0	0	0
Assault:	Types (Sexual Physical, etc.)	0	0	0	0
Detainee on Staff	With Weapon	0	0	0	0
	Without Weapon	0	0	0	0
Number of Forced Moves, incl. Forced Cell Moves ³		0	0	0	0
Disturbances ⁴		0	0	0	0
Number of Times Chemical Agents Used		1	0	1	0
Number of Times Special Reaction Team Deployed/Used		, 0	0	0	0
# Times Four/Five Point Restraints Applied/Used	Number/Reason (M=Medical, V=Violent Behavior, O=Other)	0	0	0	0
	Type (C=Chair, B=Bed, BB=Board, O=Other)	0	0	0	0
Offender / Detainee Medical Referrals as a Result of Injuries Sustained.		0	0	0	0
Escapes	Attempted	0	0	0	0
	Actual	0	0	0	0
Grievances:	# Received	0	0	0	0 .
	# Resolved in Favor of Offender/Detainee	0	0	. 0	0
Deaths	Reason (V=Violent, I=Illness, S=Suicide, A=Attempted Suicide, O=Other)	0	0	0	0
	Number	0 .	0	0	0
Psychiatric / Medical Referrals	# Medical Cases Referred for Outside Care	0	1	6	5
	# Psychiatric Cases Referred for Outside Care	0	0	0	0

Routine transportation of detainees/offenders is not considered "forced"

Any attempted physical contact or physical contact that involves two or more offenders

Oral, anal or vaginal penetration or attempted penetration involving at least 2 parties, whether it is consenting or non-consenting

Any incident that involves four or more detainees/offenders, includes gang fights, organized multiple hunger strikes, work stoppages, hostage situations, major fires, or other large scale incidents

DHS/ICE DETENTION STANDARDS REVIEW SUMMARY REPORT

1. ACCEPTABLE	2. DEFICIENT	3. AT-RISK	4. REPEAT FINDING	5. NOT APPLICABLE				
LEGAL ACCESS	STANDARDS				1.	2.	3.	4.
1. Visitation								
2. Telephone	Access							
DETAINEE SERV	VICES							
3. Admission	and Release				\boxtimes			
4. Classificat	tion System				\boxtimes			
5. Detainee I	Handbook				\boxtimes			
6. Food Serv	rice							
7. Funds and	Personal Property		•		\boxtimes			
B. Detainee (Grievance Procedures				\square			
9. Issuance a	nd Exchange of Cloth	ing, Bedding, and To	wels					
10. Religious	Practices			· .				
HEALTH SERVI	CES							
11. Medical C	are							
12. Suicide Pr	evention and Intervent	ion			\boxtimes			
SECURITY AND	CONTROL							
13. Contraban	ıd							
14. Detention	Files							
5. Disciplinary Policy								
16. Emergency Plans								
17. Environmental Health and Safety					\boxtimes			
18. Hold Rooms in Detention Facilities					\boxtimes			
19. Key and Lock Control					\boxtimes			
0. Population Counts					\boxtimes			
21. Security Inspections								
2. Special Management Units (Administrative Detention)								
	Special Management Units (Disciplinary Segregation)				\boxtimes			
24. Tool Cont								
	ation (Land manageme	nt)						
26. Use of For				•			<u> </u>	
							<u> </u>	
28. Detainee	Detainee Transfer (Added September 2004)							
ALL FINDINGS	OF DEFICIENT AN	D AT-RISK REOU	JIRE WRITTEN C	OMMENT DESCR	IBING	THE	FIND	ING A
	SARY TO REACH CO							

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY (LAW ENFORCEMENT SENSITIVE) © 2007 Creative Corrections, LLC (Rev. 12/8/07)

RIC REVIEW ASSURANCE STATEMENT

BY SIGNING BELOW, THE REVIEWER-IN-CHARGE (RIC) CERTIFIES THAT:

ALL FINDINGS OF NON-COMPLIANCE WITH POLICY OR INADEQUATE CONTROLS, AND FINDINGS OF NOTEWORTHY ACCOMPLISHMENTS, CONTAINED IN THIS INSPECTION REPORT, ARE SUPPORTED BY EVIDENCE THAT IS SUFFICIENT AND RELIABLE; AND WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THIS REVIEW, THE FACILITY IS OPERATING IN ACCORDANCE WITH APPLICABLE LAW AND POLICY, AND PROPERTY AND RESOURCES ARE BEING EFFICIENTLY UTILIZED AND ADEQUATELY SAFEGUARDED, EXCEPT FOR ANY DEFICIENCIES NOTED IN THE REPORT.

REVIEW	R-In-Charce				
Reviewer-In-Charge: (Print Name)	Signature				
b6,b7c	for	b6,b7c			
Title & Duty Location	Date				
Reviewer in Charge, Creative Corrections	April 19, 2008	·			
	•				
TEAM	MIDMBORS				
Print Name, Title, & Duty Location	Print Name, Title,	& Duty Location			
b6,b7c , SME-Security, Creative Corrections	SME-Medical, Creative Corrections				
Print Name, Title, & Duty Location	Print Name, Title, & Duty Location				
SME-Food Service, Creative Corrections	b6,b7c	SME-Safety, Creative Corrections			
RECOMMENDED RATING: SUPERIOR					
GOOD					
ACCEPTABLE					

Comments: The Euless City Jail is operated as a relatively small holding facility in support of the Euless Chief of Police. Consequently, the detainees (both local offenders and ICE detainees) are housed for a very short time. The local offenders are typically bonded out within hours or transferred to county facilities in less than 72 hours. The ICE detainees are housed only overnight and rarely exceed a stay of less than 24 hours. Consequently, many of the ICE Standards which apply to longer term incarcerations do not directly relate or apply to this facility. The Disciplinary Policy standard is an example of this. Administrative rules and the hearing process do not exist at this facility. However, for a facility with this short average length of incarceration, a formal process of rules and responsibilities and subsequent administrative review process would not favorably impact the operation. The facility staff has an informal resolution process to intervene, separate, and more highly supervise those who act out until they are relocated to a longer term facility. No evidence or history of this method causing threat or harm to ICE detainees, or others, was apparent during this review. Therefore, the deficiency in the disciplinary standard negatively affected the overall rating, but will not diminish the future safety of ICE detainees.

DEFICIENT AT-RISK

Review Authority The signature below constitutes review of this report and acceptance by the Review Authority. OIC/CEO will have stays from receipt of this report to respond to all findings and recommendations. HODRO EXECUTIVE REVIEW: (Please Print Name) Signature B6.57c Title Acting Chief, Detention Standards Compliance Unit Acceptable Deficient At-Risk Comments: The Review Authority concurs with the "Acceptable" rating. A Plan of Action is required to correct the deficiencies identified in the Emergency Plans, Discipline Policy, Environmental Health and Safety,

Contraband, Security Inspections, and Use of Force standards.