



U.S. Department of Justice

Office of the Deputy Attorney General

Associate Deputy Attorney General

Washington, D.C. 20530

December 14, 2012

The Honorable Carolyn N. Lerner  
Special Counsel  
Office of the Special Counsel  
1730 M Street, N.W., Suite 218  
Washington, D.C. 20036-4505

Re: OSC File No. DI-12-2577; ALLEGED VIOLATION OF FEDERAL STATUTE BY BUREAU OF PRISONS EMPLOYEES ENGAGING IN CONDUCT WHICH MAY VIOLATE LAWS, RULES AND REGULATIONS, GROSS MISMANAGEMENT, AND A SUBSTANTIAL AND SPECIFIC DANGER TO PUBLIC SAFETY.

Dear Ms. Lerner:

I am in receipt of your correspondence wherein you conclude that allegations raised by an employee of the United States Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Prisons, constitute a substantial likelihood that a violation of law, rule, or regulation has occurred. Specifically, Case Manager Michael Spradling, an employee at the Federal Correctional Institution (FCI) McDowell, WV, alleged that FCI McDowell employees repeatedly and knowingly falsified records to indicate that inmates had participated in the Release Preparation Program (RPP) when there was no evidence of their participation. Mr. Spradling alleged the goal of the falsification was to inflate program participation statistics and give the appearance that FCI McDowell offered a robust RPP when in fact RPP related classes had only been offered twice in the preceding two years. Mr. Spradling stated that the actions of FCI McDowell employees violated federal regulation and violated Bureau of Prisons Program Statement 5325.07, Release Preparation Program.

The Office of Special Counsel requested an investigation and report on the allegations. Please accept this correspondence as a summary of our investigation and findings. It should be noted that the Attorney General has delegated to me authority to review and sign the report, in accordance with 5 U.S.C. § 1213 (d).

Sincerely,

Scott N. Schools  
Associate Deputy Attorney General

Enclosure

## Report of Investigation

OIA Case No. 2012-06720

OSC Case No. DI-12-2577

**Subject:** ALLEGED VIOLATION OF FEDERAL STATUTE BY BUREAU OF PRISONS EMPLOYEES ENGAGING IN CONDUCT WHICH MAY VIOLATE LAWS, RULES AND REGULATIONS, GROSS MISMANAGEMENT, AND A SUBSTANTIAL AND SPECIFIC DANGER TO PUBLIC SAFETY.

### (1) Summary of the Information with Respect to Which the Investigation was Initiated

This investigation was initiated based upon a whistleblower disclosure that Bureau of Prisons (BOP) employees at the Federal Correctional Institution (FCI), McDowell, WV, knowingly falsified records regarding inmates' participation in the BOP Release Preparation Program (RPP). The whistleblower, Case Manager Michael Spradling, alleged that FCI McDowell employees have falsified pre-release records to indicate that inmates had participated in the RPP in order to make it appear that FCI McDowell supports and participates in the program and that the institution only offered the RPP programs twice in the past two years, increasing the chances of inmate recidivism and thwarting the BOP's efforts to implement the RPP as outlined by Program Statement (PS) 5325.07, Release Preparation Program.

The purpose of the RPP is to prepare each inmate to successfully re-enter the community and the work force. Inmate participation in the program is mandatory for inmates who have less than 30 months remaining on their sentences and voluntary for other inmates. The RPP has two components: the Institutional Release Preparation Program (Institution RPP) and the Unit Release Preparation Phase (Unit RPP).

The Institution RPP is structured around attendance and completion of formalized classroom instruction in six core topic areas. The six core topics are:

- (1) Health and nutrition.
- (2) Employment.
- (3) Personal finance/consumer skills.
- (4) Information/community resources.
- (5) Release requirements and procedures.
- (6) Personal growth and development.

The Unit RPP is a separate component of the RPP and usually begins in earnest when the inmate is between 11 and 13 months from final release. The Unit RPP is essentially a dialogue between the inmate and BOP staff responsible for administering this component. During this phase the inmate is afforded the opportunity to discuss individual concerns prior to release and for final release plans to be developed in accordance with the inmate's individualized needs.

The RPP is administered and managed by groups of BOP employees called Unit Teams.<sup>1</sup> These teams consist of a Unit Manager, Case Managers, Correctional Counselors and a Unit Secretary. Case Managers track inmate participation in RPP (both Institution and Unit) using the SENTRY national database.<sup>2</sup> SENTRY contains many preset codes referred to as Case Management Activity (CMA) codes. CMA codes are entered by Case Managers to reflect and monitor inmate participation in various programs and activities within the institution. Among the several CMA codes related to RPP, the following are relevant to this investigation:

- "RPP NEEDS" is entered for any inmate who needs to participate in the Institution RPP prior to release, but whose release date is so far into the future that to place him/her into that status at the present time would be premature.
- "RPP PART" is entered for any inmate participating in a program related to any of the six core topic areas of the Institution RPP. When an inmate completes one course or category and enrolls or is awaiting enrollment in another course or category, the CMA code remains RPP PART.
- "RPP UNIT C" is entered when all Unit RPP requirements have been completed.
- "RPP COMPLT" is entered when all Institution RPP components have been completed.
- "RPP REFUSED" is entered for any inmate who refuses to participate in any RPP course the unit team recommended.

Mr. Spradling stated that during the time period covered in his complaint, his progress reports<sup>3</sup> on inmates were rejected by Mr. Michael Chamblee, "C" Unit Manager, because inmates on his caseload were coded as "RPP NEEDS." Mr. Spradling alleged that Mr. Chamblee improperly directed employees to falsify CMA codes to indicate that inmates had participated in the Institution RPP. Mr. Spradling stated that, although he refused to misrepresent inmate SENTRY records by changing the RPP codes from RPP NEEDS to RPP PART, other employees did change inmate SENTRY codes as directed by Mr. Chamblee. Mr. Spradling estimated that more than 80 inmate RPP codes were altered by employees at FCI McDowell. Mr. Spradling stated that despite his objections, Mr. Chamblee continues to instruct FCI McDowell unit team staff to change CMA codes to make it appear as though inmates participated in the RPP when, in fact, they had not.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Bureau of Prisons uses the Unit Management approach to inmate management. The mission of Unit Management is to determine inmate program needs and monitor participation to encourage pro-social institution and community behaviors that benefit inmates, staff, victims and society. Inmates are placed in close physical proximity to Unit Management staff working with them so that staff and inmates are easily accessible to one another daily. The goal of this proximity is to enhance the quality of relationships between staff and inmates by providing: increased frequency of contact, direct observation of inmate behavior and potential problems, and increased inmate access to the staff who make primary decisions about them. Unit Management emphasizes decentralization and delegated authority to a multi-disciplinary unit team.

<sup>2</sup> SENTRY is a real-time information system consisting of various applications for processing sensitive but unclassified (SBU) inmate information relating to the care, classification, subsistence, protection, discipline, and programs of federal inmates. The information is used to manage the BOP inmate population including housing and work assignments, sentence computation and implementation, discipline, security classification, and program needs.

<sup>3</sup> BOP policies refer to SENTRY Program Review Reports as both progress reports and program review reports. Insofar as Mr. Spradling referred to "progress reports" in his complaint and throughout his interview, this term will be used in this report. Note that such reports only contain information about codes entered into SENTRY.

## **(2) Conduct of the Investigation**

This investigation commenced upon receipt of an Office of Special Counsel (OSC) letter tasking the Attorney General to conduct an investigation pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 1213. During the week of August 27, 2012, an investigator from the Department of Justice (DOJ), BOP, Office of Internal Affairs (OIA), conducted an investigation at FCI McDowell, WV. The OIA conducted eight interviews of BOP employees, collected and examined various memoranda and other records pertaining to the allegations, and researched applicable agency rules and regulations. The OIA conducted six additional interviews with subject matter experts and performed further research subsequent to the week of August 27, 2012.

## **(3) Summary of Evidence Obtained from the Investigation**

FCI McDowell is a medium security correctional institution, with an adjacent satellite camp, which houses approximately 1,712 male inmates supervised by approximately 293 employees. The institution was activated and received its first inmates in September 2010.

The investigation included a review of employment data for staff assigned to unit management duties at FCI McDowell. Of the ten assigned to the facility none had more than three years of experience as a Case Manager and only one had previously been assigned as a Case Manager at another facility in the BOP. During a portion of the time covered in Mr. Spradling's complaint, Mr. Chamblee was the Case Management Coordinator (CMC). As such, Mr. Chamblee was responsible for staff training and quality control of unit management activities within the institution.<sup>4</sup> The CMC assists the institution administration by providing technical assistance and serving as a resource for institution staff in unit management and related areas. The CMC also holds regular meetings with Case Managers and unit support staff to present the position of the institution administration regarding Bureau of Prisons policy and institution procedures. A portion of the CMC's duties involve the routine review of inmate progress reports and other inmate release related documents prepared by Case Managers.

Mr. Spradling explained that during the time period covered in the complaint, Mr. Chamblee routinely rejected progress reports submitted by Mr. Spradling.<sup>5</sup> Mr. Spradling said that many of his progress reports were rejected because the CMA code RPP NEEDS appeared on the progress reports. Mr. Spradling stated he had numerous discussions with Mr. Chamblee related to the rejected progress reports. Mr. Spradling said that during those discussions Mr. Chamblee insisted that inmate progress reports forwarded to him must reflect that inmates had participated in, or completed, Institution RPP, whether or not there was evidence to support those entries. Other Case Managers from FCI McDowell also reported that their progress reports were rejected by Mr. Chamblee because the inmates were not coded as RPP PART, RPP COMPLT, or RPP REFUSED.

---

<sup>4</sup> Mr. Chamblee and another employee have rotated in and out of the CMC position twice since June 2010.

<sup>5</sup> Program Statement (PS) 5322.12, Inmate Classification and Program Review states in part, "The SENTRY-generated Program Review Report will document the inmate's Release Preparation Program CMA assignments and staff will identify specific courses recommended and/or courses that the inmate is currently enrolled in."

The investigation revealed that most discussions and training regarding CMA coding related to the RPP occurred while Mr. Chamblee was the CMC at FCI McDowell. Mr. Chamblee stated that as CMC he was responsible for the review of Residential Re-Entry Center (RRC) packets for later approval by the Warden. RRC packet processing is the process by which unit team staff forward recommendations for inmate placement in RRCs, or halfway houses. Program Statement 7310.04, Community Corrections Center (CCC) Utilization and Transfer Procedure, describes the purpose of halfway houses and also mandates that recommendations for RRC placements are to be based on assessments which include, "A current progress report (less than 180 days old at time of referral)." Program Statement 7310.04 describes halfway houses as transitional environments for inmates who can benefit from serving the final months of their sentences in communities which provide suitable residence, structured programs, job placement, and counseling. Since inmates who reside in halfway houses are still technically in federal custody and have not completed their full sentences, their activities are closely monitored.

Mr. Chamblee stated that packets forwarded to him by unit team staff contained inmate progress report data that he believed was inconsistent with policy. According to Mr. Chamblee he returned RRC packets for a myriad of reasons, but the majority were returned for improper CMA codes related to the Institution RPP. Mr. Chamblee noted that most progress reports accompanying RRC packets at FCI McDowell did not contain CMA codes RPP PART, RPP COMPLT, or RPP REFUSED. Mr. Chamblee stated he believed BOP policy required that progress reports reflect that an inmate participated in the Institution RPP. Mr. Chamblee said he returned the RRC packets to the respective units with instructions to correct the progress reports to reflect RPP PART, RPP COMPLT, or RPP REFUSED as appropriate. Consistent with his statement, the evidence indicates that Mr. Chamblee only instructed unit team staff to change Institution RPP CMA codes in progress reports forwarded to him for RRC packet processing.

Subject matter experts at BOP headquarters in the Correctional Programs Division (CPD) were consulted regarding the validity of Mr. Chamblee's rejection of RRC packets. The CPD experts stated that although CMA codes RPP PART, RPP COMPLT, or RPP REFUSED were preferred entries for progress reports accompanying RRC packets, there was no policy requirement to that effect.

In addition to the issues surrounding RRC packets, Case Managers told the investigator that in January 2012, employees at FCI McDowell prepared for the first Institution RPP session scheduled to commence in April 2012.<sup>6</sup> As a part of the preparations, Case Managers screened inmate records for evidence of previous RPP participation by inmates assigned to FCI McDowell. The Case Managers stated that many of the inmates assigned to the facility had no CMA code reflecting RPP participation, and in many cases the inmates' Education Data Transcript<sup>7</sup> contained insufficient creditable education for Institution RPP purposes. The Case

---

<sup>6</sup> The complaint accurately reported that FCI McDowell has only offered Institution RPP training programs twice (April 2012 and July 2012) in the two years preceding the complaint.

<sup>7</sup> The Education Data Transcript is a part of the SENTRY database which reflects inmate educational data. Education department staff enter data (e.g., GED completion) so they and others have ready access to inmate educational records. The Transcript is also used to verify inmate participation in courses that may be creditable toward Institution RPP participation.

Managers said that Mr. Chamblee's instructions to them regarding RPP coding were impossible to reconcile with the evidence they each discovered in inmate educational records.

Mr. Spradling was accurate when he stated that Mr. Chamblee instructed all Case Managers at FCI McDowell to enter the CMA code RPP PART (indicating RPP participation) for all inmates with sentences of 30 months or less. In an e-mail dated March 26, 2012, Mr. Chamblee stated, "Any inmate 30 months or less goes into RPP Part. Anything over 30 months is on a case by case basis. However, if they complete at least one RPP Class over 30 months, they can be placed in RPP PART." Mr. Chamblee said that he sent the e-mail to staff as a result of his discussions with Mr. Spradling and general confusion voiced by other Case Managers regarding his rejection of RRC packets. Mr. Chamblee stated that he conducted training sessions with unit team staff during which he informed them that a CMA code of RPP PART should be entered for all inmates with 30 months or less remaining on their sentences. Mr. Chamblee informed staff that if no previous RPP participation could be verified through education records, staff could conduct the Unit RPP (described above) as an alternative, and then enter the CMA code RPP UNIT C to reflect completion of the Unit RPP. Chamblee said that he told staff, and repeated to the investigator, that completion of the Unit RPP was sufficient as an alternative and thus permitted them to then enter the CMA code RPP PART.

All of the Case Managers and Unit Managers questioned the validity of Mr. Chamblee's instructions. Each Case Manager (with the exception of Mr. Spradling) said they sought advice regarding RPP CMA codes from more experienced BOP unit team staff from various other facilities throughout the BOP. In each instance the Case Managers interviewed said the guidance they received from other more experienced employees supported Mr. Chamblee's instructions. Each of the Case Managers said that despite their reservations, Mr. Chamblee's instructions were followed.

Mr. Chamblee said that his instructions to staff at FCI McDowell were consistent with the methods he had been taught during his 13 years of experience in Unit Management. Mr. Chamblee said that based on this experience he felt no need to validate his instructions with subject matter experts at higher levels within the BOP.

One of the Unit Managers interviewed stated a Correctional Program Specialist from the BOP Mid-Atlantic Regional Office (MARO) "verified" that an inmate's completion of the Unit RPP supported a subsequent CMA code entry of RPP PART and that this practice was acceptable.<sup>8</sup> In an e-mail dated July 9, 2012, the Unit Manager asked, "If an inmate is loaded as UNIT RPP C, should their RPP NEEDS change to PART if they have not completed one of the six core topics?" The MARO Correctional Program Specialist responded, "I would place him in PART status because Unit RPP is still a part of the RPP program." The Unit Manager stated that the information regarding RPP provided by the MARO Correctional Program Specialist was provided to all unit management staff at FCI McDowell in late August 2012.

---

<sup>8</sup> The BOP maintains several regional offices throughout the country whose purpose is to provide expert guidance and administrative support (including review and approval of local institution supplements to BOP national policies) to institutions within the respective regions. FCI McDowell receives support from the Mid-Atlantic Regional Office.

The MARO Correctional Program Specialist confirmed that she gave the guidance described above to staff at FCI McDowell in July 2012. She added that this was the only time that staff at FCI McDowell contacted her regarding the acceptability of using an inmate's completion of the Unit RPP to support a subsequent CMA code entry of RPP PART. The Specialist explained that, when employees conduct discussions with inmates during the Unit RPP the intent of the discussion is to engage the inmate in meaningful, in depth dialogue and assistance. The MARO Specialist said these discussions often cover the same material addressed in the six core course topics of the Institution RPP. She said that after completing the Unit RPP the inmate has received information and participated in one of the Institution RPP program mandatory phases, thus the inmate is deemed to have participated in the Institution RPP and an entry of the CMA code RPP PART is appropriate.

The investigation revealed that the practice of entering a CMA code of RPP PART upon completion of only the Unit RPP existed at facilities other than FCI McDowell. For example, a local policy supplement at the Federal Medical Center (FMC) at Butner, North Carolina, condoned a very similar practice. Institution Supplement BUH 5325.07B, Institution Release Preparation Program, states in pertinent part, "Alternative programming may include more intensive Unit Release Preparation where (*sic*) inmates are provided more extensive information regarding important release related topics. Inmates eligible for this type of participation will be identified by the Unit Manager." This particular reference appears in a section of BUH 5325.07B that relates to inmates who have missed certain RPP courses or cannot otherwise participate fully through no fault of their own. FMC Butner, like FCI McDowell, is supported and guided by MARO regional staff. The MARO Specialist interviewed was asked for an opinion of the excerpt quoted from BUH 5325.07B above. She stated that after completing the "intensive" Unit RPP described in the BUH Institution Supplement the inmate would be deemed to have participated in the Institution RPP and a CMA code RPP PART could be entered.

Subject matter experts at BOP Headquarters in the CPD reviewed the practice described by Mr. Chamblee, the advice provided by the MARO Specialist, and BUH 5325.07B. They concluded that none comport with the intent of PS 5325.07. The CPD experts stated that although Unit RPP is a phase of the RPP, it is not one of the six core topic areas comprising inmate participation in the Institution RPP. As such, completion of the Unit RPP does not support the conclusion that an inmate has participated in the Institution RPP and, in and of itself, does not justify an entry of the CMA code RPP PART in an inmate's SENTRY record.

During the week of October 15, 2012, Correctional Programs experts from the BOP Program Review Division (PRD) conducted a routine and previously scheduled program review of unit management functions at FCI McDowell. The overall rating achieved by the institution was "Acceptable."<sup>9</sup> The management of the RPP was one of the targeted areas of that program review. The review revealed two "deficiencies" related to the RPP: 1) there was no published annual RPP course calendar with the month and hours of the classes listed; and 2) inmate RPP CMA assignments are "not always accurate." As evidence for the latter finding, the reviewers

---

<sup>9</sup> An "Acceptable" rating essentially means satisfactory. The five possible ratings achievable during a program review, in descending order of success, are: Superior, Good, Acceptable, Deficient, and At Risk.

cited that the RPP PART statuses for 4 out of 10 inmates reviewed were not supported by RPP program participation (meaning that their records did not reflect attendance/completion of Institution RPP related courses).

Mr. Spradling's claim that the Institution RPP has only been offered twice in two years (in April 2012 and July 2012) is mostly accurate, but he failed to note that a partial offering was provided to inmates in early December 2011. FCI McDowell officials were not prepared to offer all six core topic areas at that time, but they did provide sessions on the core topics of "Release requirements and procedures" and "Information/community resources," core topics they considered to be among the most important. This was accomplished through presentations to inmates by a local United States probation officer and a BOP Community Corrections Manager (not a FCI McDowell employee). A third full Institution RPP occurred in October 2012 in keeping with the plan to offer it every quarter.

It may also be helpful to provide more context with regard to the facts that a limited Institution RPP offering was not held until early December 2011 and a full Institution RPP did not commence until April 2012. FCI McDowell, as a recently "activated" institution, did begin receiving inmates to reside in the satellite camp beginning in September 2010, but additional transfers of inmates to the facility occurred gradually over time, and the inmate population did not reach full capacity until December 2011. Also, inmates who were transferred from other facilities had to have expected release dates no sooner than August 1, 2012 (satellite camp inmates) and September 1, 2012 (FCI medium security inmates). This type of criterion is typically in place for any activating institution so as not to overburden institution unit team staff with the myriad paperwork and other requirements for inmates soon to be released at the same time they are trying to bring the institution into full operation. Indeed, prior to December 31, 2011, only 13 FCI McDowell inmates were released from custody, and 11 of those were released pursuant to changes to the Fair Sentencing Act which required the immediate release of many BOP inmates effective November 1, 2011.

Mr. Spradling stated that inmates whose records reflect participation in or completion of Institution RPP are looked upon favorably by BOP staff making decisions about inmate halfway house placement. Mr. Spradling also stated that as a result of the instructions given by Mr. Chamblee to staff at FCI McDowell, BOP Community Corrections Managers and others might be given the false impression that inmates were making efforts to prepare themselves for release when in fact they were not. Finally, Mr. Spradling stated that the Warden's performance appraisal was based, in part, upon the number of inmates who are referred for placement in halfway houses. During his interview Mr. Spradling said that he was speculating when he made the above statements and that they were his "best guess" as to why Mr. Chamblee would instruct the Case Managers as he had regarding CMA coding.

Mr. Chamblee stated that his only purpose in giving the CMA coding instruction to Case Managers was to ensure that RRC packets reflected information that, to his knowledge, was in accordance with BOP policy.

A subject matter expert at BOP Headquarters in the CPD stated that in more than 20 years he has never observed an instance of an inmate's participation in RPP affecting his/her

placement in a halfway house. The expert stated that since 2008, the BOP has put great emphasis on placing as many inmates as possible into halfway houses. He added that the notion that any inmate's RPP participation code somehow has a direct impact on decision making by Community Corrections Managers or other officials is incorrect. The expert said RPP CMA codes do appear in the RRC paperwork packet, but are not considered in determining whether an inmate is placed in a halfway house. He stated that the "actual RPP status is not relevant in determining whether an inmate is released to a RRC."

It was determined that the Warden's Performance Work Plan (PWP) contains fifty-three performance measures, one of which is related to halfway house referrals. This performance measure does state that she is expected to have a RRC utilization rate of at least seventy percent. However, as noted above, inmates' completion of or participation in the RPP is not relevant when determining RRC eligibility. A review of her PWP revealed that numbers or types of RPP CMA codes entered for inmates never appear as criteria to determine accomplishment of any performance measure.

#### **(4) Violation or Apparent Violation of Law, Rule or Regulation**

Mr. Chamblee and other employees at FCI McDowell violated BOP policy when they credited completion of Unit RPP as evidence of participation in the Institution RPP. Unfortunately, it appears that this misguided practice is not unique to FCI McDowell. Indeed, when FCI McDowell employees called unit team staff at other institutions to inquire about this practice, they were consistently told that it was appropriate. Further, at least one official at the Mid-Atlantic Regional Office, the office responsible for providing guidance and technical assistance to institution staff, verified that she provided such guidance to FCI McDowell employees and others.

Thus, it appears that Mr. Chamblee did instruct Mr. Spradling and other FCI McDowell employees to enter SENTRY CMA codes for inmates which violated the intent of applicable policy. However, this appears to be due, at least in part, to misinformation and inappropriate guidance from a number of sources. There is no evidence to support the allegation that employees who changed the RPP status of inmates to RPP PART based on Mr. Chamblee's instructions engaged in falsification of documents. Rather, any such changes were based on a good faith belief that their actions were supported by accepted practice within the BOP.<sup>10</sup>

#### **(5) Action Taken or Planned as a Result of the Investigation**

Upon determining that this accepted practice existed, CPD officials were notified. On October 10, 2012, the CPD Assistant Director issued a memorandum to all Chief Executive Officers at BOP facilities informing them that inmate participation in, or completion of, the Unit

---

<sup>10</sup> The evidence suggests that the problem raised by Mr. Spradling is limited to the BOP's Mid-Atlantic Region. Although the possibility that employees at BOP institutions outside of the Mid-Atlantic Region engaged in the same misguided practice cannot be ruled out, interviews with officials from other BOP regional offices suggest that the MARO was the only regional office to provide guidance to staff validating the use an inmate's completion of the Unit RPP to support a subsequent CMA code entry of RPP PART.

RPP should not be credited toward Institution RPP participation. The instruction enjoined those staff engaging in this practice to cease immediately. The notice also reminded employees that they are to enter the CMA code RPP PART only when the inmate is actually participating in one or more Institution RPP courses from the six core topic categories as detailed in PS 5325.07. A copy of the October 10, 2012 memorandum is attached to this report. CPD will further ensure that future training on documenting RPP participation will reflect the correct procedures.

As noted in section (3) above, the Correctional Program experts who conducted a program review at FCI McDowell during the week of October 15, 2012, cited inaccurate RPP PART codes as a "deficiency." FCI McDowell officials are obligated to correct all deficiencies cited and report back to the PRD how all deficiencies have been resolved.



U. S. Department of Justice  
Federal Bureau of Prisons

Correctional Programs Division  
Washington, DC 20534

OCT 10 2012

MEMORANDUM FOR WARDENS

FROM:

*Blake R. Davis*  
Blake R. Davis, Assistant Director  
Correctional Programs Division

SUBJECT: Program Statement 5325.07, Release Preparation Program (RPP)

The purpose of this memorandum is to underscore the importance and purpose of the RPP, and to make a clear distinction between the Institution RPP and Unit RPP.

The Institution RPP is administered by the RPP Program Committee which determines which courses will be offered under six broad categories: Health and Nutrition, Employment, Personal Finance/Consumer Skills, Information/Community Resources, Release Requirements and Procedures, and Personal Growth and Development. Inmates should enroll in this program no later than thirty months prior to direct release to the community or through a Residential Reentry Center (RRC). The Case Management Activity (CMA) assignment of "RPP PART" is to be entered for an inmate participating in any of the RPP's six categories.

The Unit RPP provides each inmate the opportunity to receive individual assistance from unit staff and usually begins 11 to 13 months from final release. Each institution is to establish a list of topics to discuss with the inmate during Unit RPP. Suggested topics to be discussed include, but are not limited to: RRC process, Disposition of Personal Property and Inmate Funds, Release Plans and Processing, Release Notification, and Registration, and Release to a Detainer.

It has come to my attention that some staff are entering the CMA assignment of "RPP PART" when the inmate is involved in, or has completed the Unit RPP and is not participating in any of the Institution RPP's six categories. In order to maintain the distinction and integrity of the Institution and Unit RPPs, I am requesting this practice cease immediately. To reiterate, staff should only enter the CMA assignment of "RPP PART" when the inmate is participating in any of the RPP's six categories. Participation in, or completion of the Unit RPP is not justification for entering the CMA assignment of "RPP PART."

If you require further information regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me.

cc: Regional Directors