MR. MAYNARD: I'm pleased to introduce our next set of witnesses; Dr. James Byrne on my right, Mr. Daniel Alejandrez, and Mr. Tony Delgado, who will examine the role of gang affiliation and drug trafficking and the prevalence of violence in prisons and jails.

The link between gangs and violence in prisons and jails is complicated. Some claim that

prison gangs use violence to maintain control and coerce participation. Others contend that prison gangs provide inmates with protection from other inmates as well as staff. Still others argue that gangs in prisons operate like businesses seeking to control drug markets and therefore have little incentive to increase violence in the facilities. Our panel will explore gang violence by looking at how the problem has been defined, what reasons prisoners have to join gangs in correctional systems, and some of the ways community-based organization can preempt and respond to gang activity.

Dr. James Byrne is a professor of the Department of Criminal Justice at the University of Massachusetts-Lowell and has conducted research on the cause, prevention and control of institutional violence and disorder. Daniel Alejandrez is the executive director of Barrios Unidos, a community-based peace movement targeting at-risk youth involved with gangs. Anthony Delgado is the Security Threat Group Investigation Coordinator at the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction.

I would like to extend my thanks to each of our panelists for being here today and we will begin with Dr. Byrne.

DR. BYRNE: Thank you.

I want to start with just kind of picking up on one of the comments earlier about gangs being -- whether they were inevitable or not and start my comments there.

My view is that I would not use that sentence gangs are inevitable, but I would say they're an inevitable consequence of a myriad of problems individuals face in community settings and to the extent that we have a prison gang violence problem more at one institution than another, I think it is a reflection of the extent of gang involvement in those communities and so I just want to start with that because that would be my take on it. An interesting way to think about it is from where I take it, start off from, is to think about what exactly do gangs provide to individuals, both in institutional and community settings; why do you join a gang in the first place. I think you heard a little of that in some of the earlier presentation, and I have a by line by Mark Rydell and one of his colleagues that I think highlights it.

Basically he argues that gangs' most important role is to provide a source of identity to young males and to a less extent female. Traveling

to high-crime neighborhoods, attending poor schools, victims of racial and ethnic discrimination, gangs provide a source of identity and pride to young people who believe there are few other alternatives.

And the reason I start with that little quote is I think we sometimes miss the most important aspect of gang involvement and that is to provide something very positive to individuals. We're obviously talking about consequences of gang violence in terms of prison violence and disorder, but I think we need to think about that because if we talk about solving the problem, we can think about alternatives that can be provided and provide the same kind of things that gangs do, so I would like to focus on three things and one is just kind of inmate-centered response. To what extent can we do different things and organize different programs in prisons that will focus on inmate issues. And I highlight some of the work that's been done, you probably read some of it, on the inmate-centered programs that focus on restorative justice models and the idea that what we need to think about is giving alternative mechanisms to the formal system whereby people can bring complaints to a group. And I like that conflict resolution strategy, I like it in community settings,

a lot of community research into restorative justice, I think it is fairly positive, and I would like to see that kind of approach considered. It is one that empowers inmates in terms of alternative problem-solving mechanisms, alternative to either giving into gang threats or harassments or challenging that situation directly as you heard earlier today, so that's kind of an inmate-centered response that I think should be put on the table when we talk about this.

The second is the staff-centered response and I'm involved as an evaluator for the National Institute of Corrections of the program that they have been running for several years now, but certainly they have taken off in the last two or three trying to change staff culture. Based on an assumption that I put in the testimony I gave to you, if you change staff culture, inmate culture will follow. When you cut to the chase on this, you say what are you trying to change about staff, I think you are talking about not only staff attitudes but staff behavior towards inmates, and that's a very difficult thing to change and we're trying it in community settings with a variety of strategies like proactive supervision models that emphasize the

importance of the relationship between line probation staff and offenders as a change mechanism, and I think that same strategy can be applied in institutional settings as well. That requires essentially a relationship to be developed between staff and inmates in institutions. It is different than the type of relationship that's typically power and control oriented that you will see in many institutions today. That's a redefinition of the role of corrections officers that I'm talking about, but I think it is consistent with what we're talking about in the community corrections, so that's kind of the second approach. But I think the staff-centered response, in particular this notion that we change staff culture, really is talking about how to change the interaction between staff and inmates in facilities.

The third approach, one that we probably have the most empirical research on, are management-based strategies that talk about things the type of people that are in this room today deal with every day, what kind of things can the commissioners, the wardens of the prisons do to reduce violence and disorder. And we're starting to get data on that, I wish we had even better empirical research, but we're

starting to get that right now and that research suggests very specific things managers can do. One of the most obvious is to reduce the scale of the institutional system. People a lot smarter than me have suggested this. "If you want to deal with the drug problem in prison, one thing you can do is do is stop putting drug users in prison," kind of basic. And that's a quote from Jim Austin, I wish it was mine, but it is his, and he thinks I'm wasting my time on this evaluation research, why don't I focus on essentially sentencing alternatives, put your energies where we really need to. If you did that, then you would be talking about drug users, the mentally ill, and probably the biggest problem in terms of the churning of offenders in and out of the institutions and that's probation and parole failures.

The reason I mention that scale as a management strategy is that when you compare the United States to other countries, particularly the size of the staff and institutions, say, to England, you can do very different things with restorative justice and informal social controls when your staff-to-inmate ratio is 10 to one. When it is a hundred to one, it is a whole different ball game.

It is not surprising that we rely on the technology of control, formal control mechanisms in institutional settings with that type of strategy. So this scale issue is one that I think can be addressed, should be. If you say what kind of things would really reduce violence and disorder in prison, I think you would see that fairly quickly if you did the kind of things that people have talked about in the area of sentencing reform and also probation for the violators. So obviously institutional and community control are inexorably linked, I guess that is the point I would make.

The other management strategies, the important one to talk about in my last minute here, are programs for offenders, rehabilitation programs for offenders, and that kind of finishes with the theme I would have in terms of looking at reducing prison violence and disorder. I think we need an open discussion of what we think the purpose of prison is and I think we need to put the words "offender change" back into the discussion. Certainly we can talk about offender control and certainly offender punishment, but we need to think about offender change because you can do very different things with offenders on a daily basis,

daily routines, if you believe in offender change, and I think that's an alternative to gangs that you talk about in both institutional and community settings. Give them something different that will make them have a different view of their lives and their life course changes.

To finish with the comments that I read in the community corrections literature, when do people desist from crime. Basically if you read the desistance literature you hear about four things. One is jobs, so employment. We certainly can do things in both institutional and community settings that have an impact there.

The second is marriage in the desistance process, and you might think, well, why would he mention marriage. Well, a lot of things have to come into place before somebody can start talking about stable relationships and you are probably talking about dealing with a myriad of individual and community-level problems there.

And the third and fourth that are related to in terms of the research on life course criminology is military involvement and relocation. Leave the military out for a moment here and focus on the relocation and that's something to think about

because offenders are typically leaving some of the worst communities in this country and they're returning to those same communities. They're not evenly distributed around the country. 600,000 offenders coming out of the prison systems last year, the majority of them returned to five states. Within those five states, they literally returned to a handful of communities. And when you start thinking about relocation as an aspect of it, you need to think about how, if we cannot change the communities in which offenders reside, we need to think about this whole issue of when they're reentering that community, how we can move them, perhaps, to different locations. The research on that is mixed, but that's certainly where we're headed at this point. Thanks.

MR. MAYNARD: Dr. Byrne, down to the last minute.

Mr. Alejandrez.

MR. ALEJANDREZ: Good morning. Buenos dios.

I want to thank the commission for giving me this opportunity to address you because, as I wrote, this issue is very personal to me. It has definitely affected my family and I feel for the

individuals that were in the last panel. I have seen that scene over and over again throughout my life and it really has destroyed my family. I come from a large family of over 250 family members and in the last, since 1975, my family has had so many imprisoned that we're going on three generations of incarceration in our family; grandfathers who did time with their grandsons, so the prison system has really affected a typical farm worker family that is now spread out throughout the Department of Corrections, not only in California, but throughout this country.

So when we look at the issue of prisons and gangs and the variety of reasons that individuals in my family have been incarcerated -- at this time I have about 20 members of my family in prison, the highest has been 35 at one time -- and if you turn it around, right now I have two in college and I have possibly maybe three or four that are on their way to getting a high school diploma if everything goes well. So what he just said about in terms of the communities that we come from and how we -- you take who is in these prisons, who is -- you take in New York City, most prisoners in New York City come from a certain area and in California the majority of

the prisoners come from right here, Southern California. I happen to live in Northern California and we're pretty much catching up to Southern California.

And so trying to deal with the madness, what we call the madness, it is what Barrios Unidos is about, Barrios Unidos, United Neighborhoods, trying to look at the violence in our communities. We started in 1977 trying to approach it and here we are in 2006 and still the gang problem is totally out of control and we have not found any major solutions.

We had found some things by forming organizations, community-based organizations that can deal with these problems. We understand that the gangs exist, we don't deny that they exist, we must not deny it, we must face it, but it is also a hard situation to deal with. A couple weeks ago there was a murder in my area and I went to the funeral. And I knew that there was going to be retaliation that night so I went out to the local downtown and I was standing on the street corner, just being there. A lot of people know me in the community and they pass me by. And I turned around and I looked and I said, "How many 56-year-old men are out here?" We have abandoned our children. We have abandoned our

children. And I looked around and I said, "There's no" -- you know, I couldn't even find a 40-year-old to stand with me on the corner. So as communities we have become afraid of our children and so we let the state take care of them, we turn them over to the state, and when they get to the state, we have lost generations. For my family, we lost generations. So when I say it is personal for me, I'm trying to capture my relatives. And I call all the folks that I have been working with in institutions for the last 15 years are my relatives, these are brothers and sisters that are incarcerated. And when we're afraid to walk by our relatives, to go hug our relatives, I don't know. When we are going into the institutions, the first thing they call, they say, "Her comes the hug-a-thug day." "Here comes the do-gooders." Well, you know, if I'm a do-gooder, I'm a do-gooder, but those are human beings, they're locked up. For whatever reason, they're locked up.

And I don't have much amount of time, but I was able to generate some letters from individuals that I worked with, individuals that I have seen change their lives around completely, and I am blessed, I am blessed to be part of that, to see that men, and I'm going to talk specifically men because

that's the group that I work with, men of all races have changed when we go into these institutions.

To talk about gangs and why people join gangs, and Willie, Willie says, "When I first went to Pelican Bay, you are so fascinated by, oh, here is all these guys you've always heard about, all these guys running everything, just fascinating." All you hear is the way they talk, Aztec language, all this knowledge, philosophy from reading all this stuff. "I want to be like that, I want to be smart and educated like he sounds." Well, unfortunately, some of the individuals that get grabbed by that don't make it outside or some of them realize that's not really what they were looking for in the first place, you know.

So when we talk about alternatives and we talk about what it is we're going to do to bring our relatives back home, what we found in working in several institutions in California is the culture of spiritual transformation. What I mean by that is if I know where I come from, who I am, who Nane is, Nane will not return to prison, Nane will try to take himself, transform himself to be a better human being; that I as a man have a responsibility back in my community, but also in that community I ask that

community for forgiveness and I ask the community to take me back and to allow me to be a productive citizen in that community. But this all starts within the institutions.

We knew from the get-go in 1977 that if we were not in these institutions, we would not have peace out in the streets. Peace can come from within these institutions. There are so many, so many peace warriors inside these institutions that we have never reached out to to help us to deal with the gang problem, to deal with those individuals that are going in and out.

And lastly I just want to say that my work in the institutions has brought me great satisfaction because I have seen the change in these human beings and for the prisoners that I work with who help organize the Cinco de Mayo, Juneteenth and Native American Pow Wow and all the cultural ceremonies that go on inside these institutions. I speak for them because on Friday I was with them and I said that I would be here and I would try to speak the truth. I would speak the truth to the best I can because they're coming back to their communities. We want them to be better fathers, better brothers.

And I brought also some photographs that I

would like to later on leave with the commission where you see black men, brown men holding hands, dancing, you know. When you bring a culture and a spirit and the drum, when you bring that drum into that prison and you start, we all relate to that. And brothers start coming; black brothers start coming, white brothers start coming, and all form a circle and we lead and we dance. Nobody ever thought we could do that. We have been doing that for 15 years now. And I think that we can change things, we must change the restorative justice, we must change the way we look at our relatives. And thank you very much.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Delgado.

MR. DELGADO: Yes. Good morning and thank you to the commission on allowing me to speak to you today.

The gang issue is a very serious one that not only affects our communities, but our prison communities as well. And I think oftentimes the reason I use "prison communities" is because they are in themselves their own little cities and neighborhoods within those fences.

Today's gangs are growing stronger as their membership increases and through alliances they are

strengthened also. Gangs today, in my opinion, have basically replaced the Mafia of yesteryear, that old Mafia that we had seen before with the Costa Nostra and the alliances and basically working together at times in order to accomplish things even though they may have actual differences within their particular groups and we see that. However, the problem is that we as a society, in my opinion, haven't recognized that shift, the change in the attitude, and we tend to look at gangs as neighborhood groups and we tend to look at gang activity as something that is juvenile.

The challenges we face today are extremely complex. For example, popular culture through music, television and video games often glamorizes gang membership and gang activity. The media, you know, is continually reporting the gang activity that is plaguing our communities and as a result, the benefit to the gang is that they get the notoriety that they're looking for. A common example that you could see today, probably one of the most publicized gangs there is would be the MS 13. However, probably one of the biggest problems that we see today is, that we face, is the general view that gangs are youth-oriented and that we don't look beyond the fact that

adults do participate within gangs and that they do continue and it becomes generational in a matter of speaking.

Gangs inside prisons, as well as outside prisons, also tend to take the form of a criminal enterprise that focuses on business growth and operations. This has been seen, for example, in the Black Gangster Disciples, the Growth & Development. And you look at a lot of different gangs that have been established in 20, 30, 40 years, you start to see a shift in actually creating political action committees and things of that nature.

In Ohio, our approach was basically reactive in the past and what we chose to do is we chose to look at creating more of a proactive type of approach to two main issues; one being the investigative enforcement side and then on the other side, the inmate programming component to be able to deal with the problems that we face. Now, Ohio is a large correctional agency with approximately 45,000 inmates, 32 correctional facilities, and our department also is responsible for parole supervision which has probably 35,000 offenders on parole. And in the past, as I said, they're basically reactive. We approach the things reactively. We profile, we

conduct an investigation, things that are at the local level, and through our new proactive approaches we decide to basically refine some of the elements of our STG program. These added goals are defined as reducing the flow of drugs in the correctional facilities, because it is our belief that the gang activity is responsible for the drugs coming into the prison as a part of gangs controlling the prison economy. And, you know, people tend to argue saying well, it is not all gangs that are actually bringing those drugs into our facilities. However, if you look at the amount of people that it takes to actually accomplish that, whether they actually have a gang name or colors or not is really kind of irrelevant when you look at the problems themselves.

Two. Offer programming and assistance to offenders with affiliation issues. One of the things that we want to make sure that we're looking at is that we're not just leaving out those people that do have affiliation issues and to just solely concentrate on those inmates that have come out and self-admitted that I'm a member of a particular group. And as a result, we want to create better, safer prisons and also that relates back out to the community.

Briefly speaking, on the refined investigations, when we did our research and we looked at an investigator process we realized that one of the elements that we were missing was the parolee on community piece. One of the panel people said earlier, people are often afraid to speak, they're often afraid to say anything, especially when they're incarcerated. If you've got drugs coming into your prison, you've got different types of activity coming in there, you tend to run into problems with people saying anything. We found it was easier to actually approach it from the outside, work the investigation from the outside in, to be able to gather the information and then also identify the players on the street that are involved in the drug trafficking that's going on inside. Our unit, which we call the enforcement unit, has been established for approximately three years now and has been extremely successful.

On the programming side, we want to provide education showing the negative effects of gang memberships, strengthening family bounds, and provide continuing support through incarceration into the community. That's one of the components that through our research we found that we couldn't find.

Those people that -- we want to make sure that this is a voluntary program so that we're not taking the reactive approach and just forcing the program on them to do their time in segregation. We want to be able to focus on programming such as cultural diversity, anger management, how it relates to hate, life choices, and also some limited drug and alcohol education, not just as a user, but also from a seller perspective, and also some include some other vocational skills.

Our program which we call COPE, which stands for Creating Opportunities for Positive Endeavors, is basically currently developed as far as the prison side of it. We're still working on community piece.

When we started this process of creating the COPE program we realized that it was necessary that we include many community partners and also look at other state agencies. We worked with the Ohio Department of Youth Services which controls the juvenile facilities within the state to work on the process with us, we have a seamless program that runs between youth and adult facilities, and also the Adult Parole Authority in conjunction with the Ohio Attorney General's office. We are currently looking

at different vendors to be able to, and community groups to be able to provide some of the services not just on the community piece, but to also bring the community into our facilities and to help with strengthening family ties through our visiting component to be able to reintegrate the offender back into the family.

In closing, we feel that we put together a comprehensive program to combat gangs on many levels. Of course, it is going to be a difficult task. And as our enforcement unit project has proved to be successful, we hope that our gang program is also, the COPE program is also going to be beneficial. Thank you.

MR. MAYNARD: Thank you. And I want to thank each of you for your testimony and we will certainly have three different perspectives on the gang problem.

And I have, just to start the questioning, a question that was alluded to earlier about gangs being, gangs in prison being related to the intensity of the gangs in the community. And do you think it is possible that in an area where gangs are dominant in the community, you have gangs in the prisons, to reduce the impact of those gangs in the prison, each

one of you, if you don't mind?

Dr. Byrne.

DR. BYRNE: You say programs to reduce the impact of gangs?

MR. MAYNARD: Yes. Can you reduce the impact of the gangs in the prisons if they're in a community where or in a state where gangs are predominant.

DR. BYRNE: I mean, that's obviously going to be the $64,000 question.

I think you need to look at some of the gang intervention programs that everybody is talking about at the community level. The most obvious one is Operation Ceasefire. A criminologist by the name of James Q. Wilson calls it the most significant intervention program developed in the last hundred years. Others have taken a more pessimistic view of what it is about, but it is interesting to think about in terms of what this panel is doing because essentially what Operation Ceasefire is, is the carrot and stick program. The carrot is to offer incentives to gang members and gang leaders not to be involved in violence in those areas. The incentives include taking the marks off, the gang affiliation marks, access to programs that they wouldn't have

access to, job, employment, things like that. The disincentives, or the stick part of it in terms of carrot and stick, is to utilize zero tolerance, policing strategies in those areas which will disrupt the various types of criminal enterprises those gangs might be involved in. So essentially what you are saying, I think I heard at the beginning, is you are saying to the gangs as long as the stuff doesn't get bad in terms of serious violence, particularly homicides in areas, we will let you do the little stuff, and it is essentially an exchange relationship between gang leaders and community leaders in those areas.

If you take that same approach and apply it to prisons, you have essentially handed over some of the control of the prisons to the dominant gangs, right? If you say, "Look," you go to a leader of a gang and say, "We're having problems here, Jim, and we don't want these problems and if they keep happening you probably know we're going to come down here very hard and that might affect things that you do." It could be something -- so that, to me that might not translate. I get nervous with Operation Ceasefire strategies, with carrot and sticks, not because I don't like this combination of carrot and

sticks, as much as typically what I find is we leave out the carrots and we haven't figured out what people really get in terms of their involvement in gangs, that's my original comment. We don't underestimate the importance of gang affiliations to these individuals and I think I answered some of that here.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Alejandrez.

MR. ALEJANDREZ: I think that you can have an impact but it is something that has to be unrooted because it has been in there for many years. When you have generations of involvement, you see the same thing over and over again, so why change if you don't have nothing happening in the community.

I was at the Hollenbeck area yesterday and Father Greg Boyle is running a great program, all kinds of young people involved in it, but that's one organization in the sea of thousands that are needed. You know, I think that if we can provide jobs, we can provide those programs within the prisons that people have talked about and direct it to the community, I think that we could start to make a dent on it.

Also I just want to mention to you, I have been involved in several national peace summits throughout the country and we brought some of the

biggest gangs in the country together to talk about peace and economic justice and we asked this government for support, we asked President Clinton at that time, we have asked other governments, to help us to bring economic justice to these communities. And the good example is the Bloods and Crips peace treaty that happened. That was a historic thing that this country I think failed to take advantage of and to look at and how they could support such a movement. I held that to the accord of any peace treaty throughout the world because if you look at the individuals that have died in wars and individuals that died in the war between Bloods and Crips and for them to come up with a treaty to ceasefire and look at economic justice, we do this in every country where we take the courts to every country, we provide them economic sustainability, but yet here in L.A. where we could have, we had an opportunity to create a positive impact on gangs throughout this country, so now we find ourselves on the other side, looking from the East Coast this way, they came this way.

And, again, I think just in terms of how the media plays out on this gang thing, one is MS, you know. There's gangs that have been involved and

bigger than MS for a long time, yet I think that the media itself is making a great recruitment for MS members, so we have to be aware how the media is playing and how our communities have been betrayed.

MR. DELGADO: I think that the relationship between the prison and the community as far as the gang relationship stems from a couple different issues. I think that the family dynamic has broke down within the actual inmate's family, organic members family, I'm not talking about the gang family. It gets confusing at times. And I think one of the components that we were looking at is actually the family strengthening component to the COPE program where we actually through supervised visitation actually tried to reintegrate the family back into the inmate's life to provide the support. And then also in the community piece, one of the things that we're looking at is being able to offer assistance through independent housing which currently exists within the department to be able to basically relocate them to a non-gang area because part of the recidivism that happens with the gang activity tends to go back to -- I mean, you have a guy that goes into a prison who is a gang member on the street, he may have done nothing while he was

incarcerated, and then upon release he is going back to the same gang neighborhood and he has got the peer pressures in participating. And it doesn't start off let's go out and do this or that that may be a criminal act, it goes to hanging out with his friends. And really the entire culture -- I remember years ago when I started off as a corrections officer and I used to bring guys in that were new loads that were coming into the prison and there were guys that this was the first they were in prison and as we walked up from Point A, B, C as you are going through the process, guys knew half the population. I mean, it is just the culture that's ingrained. So one of the things that we really tried to focus on in developing the program was actually to get into the cognitive behavioral therapy of actually trying to change values and change how they process and look at other people and to break down some of those barriers that have been established for years and, you know, generations in some cases. So I think that it is important that you look at both together when you are looking at prisons and community because if you are only working on one side of the issue, you are not going to be able to accomplish it from a holistic approach.

MR. MAYNARD: Thank you.

MS. ROBINSON: Professor Byrne, I was pleased to hear you raise the idea of restorative justice programs because we have certainly seen their success and seen the research that has shown their success in settings outside of prison. Do you have examples where there have been models tried in prison settings?

DR. BYRNE: Yes. The current example is the research in the British prison system right now and the results of that evaluation of his model, which is what I just very briefly described in my statement, I will describe it to you in a little more detail, an inmate-focused restorative justice model, that research hopefully will be available fairly soon, but right now this is the problem you have in our field where there's really just a need for a whole evidence-based practice approach. We typically don't do Level 3 or above evaluations, we don't do experiments or quasi-experiments in institutional settings, so what you are left with is a lot of observational research, a lot of what is considered fairly low-level, non-experimental research. So even if you have a good program and there is a nice description of it, we don't know if that program

really has the effect people are saying it does and that's typical in our field and that's why the push in community corrections right now is towards evidence-based practice. People will say the words "evidence-based practice," by the way, but they don't have any evidence, they just say it. It is kind of nice to say, based on evidence. They're making it up, there's not a body of research, and I'm doing a systematic review right now on the prison-based literature.

We have some pretty good research I think on management strategies, crowd reduction strategies, essentially situational prison control strategies that relate to movement of offenders from one place to the other. We don't have good evaluation research yet on either the staff strategies that we're evaluating for NIC or the inmate-focused approaches, but I think those are the promising strategies and we have literature from the community, so that's kind of where people are going right now. I think the real key is to open up the doors of the prisons and the transparency part of it is related to performance measures, but it is also letting evaluators in, and I think we are right now in the prisons where we were, community corrections, about 20 years ago. The only

people they let in were the people that were going to do positive, non-critical evaluations because they were afraid of what they heard and there's a lot of reasons they should. Think about your job as a corrections commissioner. Three and a half, four years if you are lucky. It is not tenure like me, I'm 22 years at one university. They don't have that. So they fear me when I come in because I might produce a negative evaluation and what's the typical thing you do when you are faced with a crisis, somebody dies? Obviously that's a crisis situation. Or a negative evaluation saying the place is poorly managed. You replace a manager, right? So that's the danger, of course, of the evidence-based approach, but I think we're heading in that direction slowly and I think that's kind of -- if I could suggest to the commission a recommendation, that would be the one certainly that you should consider.

MS. ROBINSON: Actually that's a very good suggestion and we are very interested in evidence-based approaches for programs and are very keenly aware of the levels of that. In the restorative justice area outside prison, the program evaluations that are available are randomized, controlled trials so they are Level 5, the highest.

DR. BYRNE: That's what you need.

MS. ROBINSON: Exactly. Thank you.

MR. MAYNARD: Any other questions from the commissioners?

MR. KRONE: It seems that you have academic background, street level background looking into these problems, you are trying to change a system. You have to work with political entities I would think, problem prison entities. How much resistance are you getting from them to implement the change or at least accept the information that you have acquired and learned and how can we overcome some of those obstacles if they are receptive to those suggestions?

DR. BYRNE: That's an excellent question. I think a lot of what NIC is trying to do right now on a very small scale in terms of changing staff and management culture is about resistance to change. Everybody says it all comes down to culture. They said it 30 years ago about policing and we did our whole watershed change in terms of now we talk about community-oriented policing and now we use the term generally "culture." We're really talking about resistance to change in organizations and how we get people to start thinking differently about it. Part

of it is the transparency. I think the Prison Rape Elimination Act, opening the doors to institutions, having to provide information, opening the discussion on how extensive the violence and disorder problem is in prison, that helps, that's the -- I think information is empowering. It is not only information, but certainly that's one aspect of it. But, you know, it is not easy and I think just developing initiatives that focus specifically on why people think the way they do about offenders helps.

You are all excellent active listeners up here, I'm looking at you, for the most part you are active listening. A lot of prisoners, when they walk into a prison they're not facing a group of people that are saying hey, let's figure out how to change you, they're saying there goes Jimmy the sex offender, the pedophile, the guy who murdered Joe, the corrections workers, they can't stand those people, and you have to put that on the table in terms of talking about how you are going to change an institution. There is a lot of resistance in part because of attitudes about certain offenders groups so if we can't change it in the general society, how do we expect to change it within line staff and midlevel management in corrections facilities. So

part of it is getting the information out there about who the offender is and what's really involved, who is in prison, who should be there, who shouldn't be there, so that would be my response about how you break down the resistance to change, and part of it is just putting it on the table where people are actually talking about their own attitudes about offender groups, that helps. I don't know if that answers it.

MR. ALEJANDREZ: Some part of that resistance, and there is resistance, part of the resistance is that fear of change, that fear of maybe something is wrong. And what we noticed, it takes us a long time to move into a facility where we meet the warden, we meet the assistant warden down the line, and so it takes up quite a bit of time to develop that trust, but our relatives trust us already, relatives in there, and so if we can develop that trust. And what I see also in the resistance is that a lot of people are saying you are helping all these gang members, you are giving them credibility, and I always kind of -- it puzzles me in California in terms of how we say credibility of gang members when, you know, the State of California gave them that credibility a long time ago when they built Pelican

Bay Prison specifically to deal with gang membership. So you look at the millions of dollars that are spent yearly on the institution specifically to deal with gang membership. So we have to look at that and say is that really where we want our resources to go, so we have to look -- and the resistance to change. We have to have the laws come in there to change some of that resistance.

I'm hopeful that at some point we would definitely be looking at restorative justice. We have gone into the juvenile justice facilities and looking at that in terms of the county where I'm from, Santa Cruz County, through the Annie Casey Foundation looking at restorative justice and other community organizations, but there's always resistance with these institutions.

MR. GREEN: Just a followup on the resistance issue.

Dr. Byrne, you said that the acceptance of evidence-based research is showing some progress, it is growing slowly. What has caused that to be more acceptable to prisons, to allow persons like yourself to come in and to get data and to develop programs or positions?

DR. BYRNE: Typically they will be --

what I found in community corrections is that nobody wants to be the last one on the bus but typically, particularly, for example, a lot of the reentry initiatives that happened over the last several years, you were tied into an evaluation component and I think initiatives that are developed and built in in external, objective evaluation are a key. There's a lot of resistance even within organizations that provide the money now of doing that and that's what you need. You don't need -- and I like doing it. Jim Burn, who is a newspaper reporter, wrote a nice profile on such and such a program. I did that on reentry programs and they're out there on the web, you can read them. I like doing that work. But to do the objective, external evaluations is more difficult, it hurts your relationship with those people, right? If you are my friend and I write a negative evaluation, you think you are my friend and Byrne burns me, it is a problem with having a name like Byrne as an evaluator, obviously you might not want to let me in again, and that's one of the issues that you have to put on the table with this. But I think the way you do it is you tie initiatives and incentive money to programs to try new programs with an external evaluation component. You can't do it

internal, you can't let the people running the programs do the evaluation, and we have that in the rehabilitation literature right now. It is a question of whether some of the programs really show the effects they're supposed to show because the people who ran the programs are the people who evaluated them and we know what the problem will be there, so that's an excellent question. I mean, I think you do it by tying the initiatives, new money initiatives in particular. There's going to be support for new model program development with external evaluation and funding.

MR. RYAN: I tend every now and then to have a whole naive side to myself that I worry about, but we can't necessarily fix the community that the people came from. They came from the community and we have this whole society out here that says be tough on crime so give them time, 10, 20, life, all of those types of things, and put them in prison, and we don't necessarily have a good connection, although we probably should have, to the community on the outside. So I ran a jail and I get people for 23 days is my average. I'm not sure what prisons are but let's give them a couple of years that they have people in there.

What do you want us to do between the time they walk in and the time they walk out to change what is perceived as a gang culture that is there, and why as a culture or a prison culture or administrators do we tolerate gangs being allowed in our jails and prisons. Why can't we sit down when individuals walk in and say, and this is my naive side now, why can't we sit down and say that activity is not tolerated in this facility, this prison, this process that you are in; stop it, don't have your flag hanging out of your pants, don't have all of those types of things, we will not tolerate that and, in fact, if you proliferate in some fashion some sort of gang activity you will end up in the special dorm down south and you will stay there for your entire period of time because we do not tolerate that behavior here. We can't fix the before and sometimes we can't fix the after, but we do have some control in between the walls. What should we be doing to make it safe, secure if gangs are considered bad, which it sounds like they're bad, what do we need to do to fix it?

DR. BYRNE: Well, I don't think more control and segregation and those type of stick approach strategies work real well and they just put

an incredible strain on resources of institutions because it is harder to manage offenders like that, but the short answer to what you said is to do what you and I are doing now, we're looking at each other one-on-one, and I think relationships that are developed within institutions are probably the best way of reducing the power of gangs in the sense that you develop a relationship with a staff worker or a counselor or whatever that essentially provides an alternative to that person to what he gets which is positive within the gang which is support, identity. So the first thing you ask what you would do. I guess it is this, it is that interaction, trying to make a connection to somebody, and I don't think we do that just by reading me the rules and telling me where I might go if I do something, that's probably not going to do it. What would make more sense, I think, is to improve informal social control mechanisms and think about how you might do that, that's where restorative justice models come in, and that's certainly where culture change models come in because you are talking about changing the staff's approach to offenders as opposed to one where I'm simply telling you what to do and another where I'm essentially using motivational interviewing

techniques and a variety of other strategies to get you to think about what you heard today which is transformation; that you can do something with your life differently. How do you do it in 22 days I'm not sure, but I think the starting point would be this as opposed to trying to read you a statement this is what will happen with this commission, it is not. It is this. I think that's not the right approach.

MR. RYAN: Nane, what do we need to do?

MR. ALEJANDREZ: In 22 days it is hard but, you know, but I believe in miracles.

MR. RYAN: We have faith, we can do that.

MR. ALEJANDREZ: One is what I mentioned earlier. If you don't -- if little Joe doesn't do what he is supposed to do in this institution, we're going we send you up to -- I call it send it up state because they usually wind up in Pelican Bay, you know. We have seen what happens in Pelican Bay, we see how people are running the show from Pelican Bay. No matter how secure you make it, it is going to operate.

Let me take what just recently happened in L.A. County, the last uprising that happened there.

They had a program there called AmeriCan run by some brothers on the street and stuff, and all those individuals that were there, it was mixed, multicultural, all those individuals that were in that AmeriCan program did not participate in the riots. Now, to my knowledge, that program is not there anymore. So sometimes we have effective programs. Take Tracy Prison. Tracy Prison had tremendous vocational programs that allowed the lifers there to manage the gang situations, to bring the youngsters into the vocational and guide them and instead of being out in the yards, let's go to vocational, let's go to this, get involved in this, preparing them to leave the institution. I mean, that's working within, that's what I was saying earlier about utilizing the resources that we have in there. Those programs are all closed now and that side of the prison is like a ghost town. So I think that we have eliminated some of the programs that have worked. The word "Rehabilitation" is back now in the corrections system, we'll see what that means. One of the reasons that I really wanted to be here is because I really would like to push that we look at restorative justice, we look at rehabilitation and what rehabilitation really means.

And on a personal, you know, all those relatives of mine, somebody has to deal with their children that are left behind. How many of you commissioners have relatives in prison? I'm pretty sure you'd probably have a whole different take if you had to go stand up like the lady said when she was standing outside that prison yard waiting to see her husband and seeing that.

You know, when I see elders, the way they're treated in the visiting room in Pelican Bay Prison and make them walk like a duck sideways and their elders holding their pants up, it is the most humiliating thing that I have ever seen. We got to change that system. When individuals are treated with human dignity, they themselves start to change. The reason there is rioting, we have not -- we have not done that in these institutions and I think everybody knows it. We just go around in circles.

MR. RYAN: Thank you, Nane.

Mr. Delgado.

MR. DELGADO: When we talk about kind of the lock-them-up-in-segregation-throw-away-the-key-type mentalities, I think the important thing in that respect is that is reactive. That's actually pretty common throughout the country through the

research that we have done and that's basically how correctional systems manage their inmates. Now do those systems have programming during the incarceration and segregation for their gang members, yes. And a lot of it is good programming. It focuses on the issues of looking at different diversity issues, it focuses on rage, it focuses on hate and things like that. However, when you present that in that type of environment, you know, really is the end result, is the end result, are you getting that end result because of the programming or are you getting that end result because you have locked them up for 10 years, and I think that that's the thing you look at. Through our research we've looked at some of the prison systems where they will, a guy will end up in segregation for a number of years, be offered the program, and then say we've got a hundred percent success rate. Is it because of your program or because you locked him up for 10, 14 years before you even allowed him to go through the program to be able to get out of segregation? That's a completely reactive approach. To really change things you need to get to them before they do something that is detrimental to themselves and you really need to take the proactive approach which starts with when they

come in through reception identifying if they are a gang member.

One of the things that we do, and our average stay in Ohio is 2.7 years, and for inmates in general, the one thing that we do at our reception center is inmates that -- we have a team of people that are trained to look for signs, for identification, and they sit down and talk to the STG person at that institution and they tell them what the rules are and they tell them what won't be tolerated and then we deal with it from there. That mainly in the past, that was for the process of being able to track and monitor. What we're moving into is identification for the purpose of programming needs through reentry, identifying the needs that they have and then being able to address it in that short timeframe.

You know, 2.7 years may seem like a long time, and I'm sure that it is for the guys that are locked up, but when you talk about 15, 20, 30 years of ingrained behavior and thought process, that 2.7 years is a fairly short period of time.

And one of the things that we wanted to address within our program was not just -- one of the things you run into when you look at correctional

programming is that, okay, here you go through this program, and at the end of however long time period it is, here is your certificate. And, of course, that certificate is as good as whatever the parole board wants to make of it and that goes into their file folder and then they present that to the parole board when they come up. But the problem with that is that there's very little aftercare, very little followup, and being able to help them manage that change. You know, the fact is they're going to have to make that decision if they want to do the right thing or not, but what the system should be doing is be able to foster it and allow that change to occur and then to be able to support those positive decisions and that's the reason why we want to take the approach from not only having the six-month program end with three-month step-down and then continuing type of aftercare, kind of like what is seen with the models of drug and alcohol counseling, to be able to go to those meetings, kind of have your A.A.-type meeting where you are going to something on a regular basis, you are seeing your counselor, and then you are working through and even upon release you've also got community support there as well.

I think that that is -- you know, the

downside is it is so easy to lock them up but the resources that you expend as far as keeping them in a segregated environment, not just with the actual cost of building the facilities, staffing those facilities, but, you know, on the other side you are actually giving them something to put on their gang resume. What brings more to the table, for example, for an inmate that is a gang member in California if they can say they have been to Pelican Bay and they have been around all these different people? I mean, if they're not wanting to change their mind set, that's the core. You've got to change their mind set. Locking them up does nothing unless you do something that's proactive, you now make that positive change.

MR. BRIGHT: Could I just be sure I understand this. When the person comes into a facility in Ohio, you say people are trained, even if they don't say, they identify them as a gang member?

MR. DELGADO: Correct.

MR. BRIGHT: What happens then? What is the person told at that point about gang affiliation, what they can do and then where are they housed and all that?

MR. DELGADO: You are talking about the

tracking processes?

MR. BRIGHT: Yes. What do you tell the person, you can't anymore? What Mr. Ryan said here, you can't wear any insignia, blah, blah, blah, or what do you do?

MR. DELGADO: Well, basically when they come in -- and the easiest form of identification is usually their tattoos and also through self-admission, you know -- they're asked the question are you a gang member, have you been part of any type of organization, and we kind of break it down from there.

On the profiling portion of that, what ends up happening is that they get profiled as being a member of a security threat group or an unauthorized group, and what we do from that standpoint is that we check up on them, and by policy we have to check up on them at least every two years and that may include shaking their property down, making sure that they're not possessing gang-related materials, and that would also include within that two-year review talking to the security threat group investigator at that facility just to interview them to find out what's going on, allow them to look back through their record, try to look at what their behavior has been,

and then just to see what's going on with them so we can make sure at what level. We utilize a participation-based system as far as STG identification. Some systems use a validation system. California, my understanding, uses validation where they have to acquire a certain amount of points to even be validated. Anybody that exhibits any type of behavior, participating in an unauthorized group through whatever means, mainly through self-admission, we profile them and we track them. And this is to kind of give them the, you know, the belief that we're continually watching them and to help them kind of correct their behavior.

MR. KRONE: Excuse me. You are familiar with the term "blood in, blood out"?

MR. DELGADO: Yes.

MR. KRONE: If you would, explain that to the group panel what that means and then explain to me how, if those gang members want to get out, take advantage of the programs you are offering, how do you protect them then from the rest of the inmates?

MR. DELGADO: The term "blood in, blood out" generally means that you shed somebody's blood to get into the gang and they shed your blood to get

out of the gang, so basically you are kind of in for life-type mentality. We looked at that issue when we were developing our program because we wanted to make sure. And one of the reasons that we were also looking at other inmates that have affiliation-type issues, those people that when they commit those crimes, they are doing it with others, they tend to be followers. We want to be able to hit them too because later on down the road they could also be a more full-fledged gang member.

But we wanted to take some of the emphasis off it being called a gang program and for particular reason. Because if Inmate Smith is going through this program and it is the gang program, well, then, the entire population is a gang member. And then, also, they also get the outside pressures from inside the facility for even taking the program.

You know, one of the things that we wanted to kind of safeguard against is, one, having disruption within the program which is why we screen, which we will be screening the inmates that go through there, but we wanted to at least during the initial six months, that step-down phase that I talked about, was actually to be able to reintegrate them somewhat into population on a full-time basis.

Within the early stages they're not necessarily, they're not segregated, they just have different recreation time and things like that to kind of allow them to clear their heads, see where they're at, they're not dealing with the outside pressures. They're not locked in their cells or anything, they're within the housing unit, they're going out, they are going to recreation, going to commissary, food service, all that. We just wanted to be able to kind of segregate them a little bit from the population, from the pressures, and then slowly reintegrate them back into GP because they're going to have to go there at some point, you can't keep them completely. And the important part of that is that when they have -- if integration is successful they will be able to deal with the pressures that are coming at them when they finally do get released, so to speak, and they do have to deal with those people that are coming out, and that's the reason why we thought aftercare was extremely important because if you are dealing with the challenge, you know, and the inmate goes out in the population and he is getting these pressures to do certain things or be hanging out with certain groups of people, then this way the aftercare portion where they have to see their

counselor in their peer support group, which I think is an important understanding, peer support is important to be able to help them, you know, overcome those challenges that they have.

MR. KRONE: Thank you.

MS. SCHLANGER: I have a question that comes from a couple of conversations with folks who run different kinds of facilities, and one of them from a person running a pretty tough jail said, "If I separate inmates based on what gangs they're in on the outside, I've just declared one housing unit for this gang and one housing unit for that gang, I have created a gang problem in my jail." He said, "I would never do that. I manage the inmates in housing where that's not one of the principles."

And then a guy who ran a prison, "Of course I separate them by gang, otherwise they're going to kill each other."

These are both pretty well-intentioned, experienced corrections guys, and I wonder your perspective on that issue, the separation of folks when they're incarcerated based on you don't mix gangs that don't get along or whether that actually facilitates gang activity and control over the facility.

MR. DELGADO: We don't segregate as far as separating --

MS. SCHLANGER: I don't mean segregate, isolating, I just mean separate the one gang from the other gang.

MR. DELGADO: Yes. We don't do that, and the reason for that is, again, it gives -- if you are going to have activity going on and you've got all the players together, then that's not going to create, in my opinion, it is not going to create a safer prison.

One of the things that we do as an administrative function is that we actually every other month print out a list of the facilities, facilities are responsible for this, looking at the list and seeing where the groupings are in housing and also in jobs. We want to make sure that you don't have too many Crips working in a particular area or too many White Supremacist or Arian Brotherhood members working in a particular area, living in a particular area, because gang members by far are probably the most manipulative type of inmates that you have because they're working together as opposed to the lone inmate out there trying to get a bed moved somewhere. And they tend

to manipulate the staff into getting moved to different things, non-smoking program or this program, whatever the case may be. And the thing is, when you group them together you give them power, and the thing that you don't want to do -- that's negative power, you know. As far as when you are dealing, you want to give them a positive approach as opposed to segregating them.

The biggest thing that we get are racial separation requests and basically from White Supremacist-type inmates that don't want to cell with anybody other than another white person and we deny them on a regular basis because we don't believe in that approach.

MS. SCHLANGER: Do either of you have a different perspective on that or does that pretty much sound like what you think is the way to approach it?

DR. BYRNE: I would like the proactive orientation. I guess my view would be to think more about incidents in prisons, not only in the community, hotspots for crime, maybe looking at incidents in that respect in particular to see which subgroup of the population seems to be responsible for the majority of the incidents that come to light

and maybe develop some type of strategy. It is a conflict resolution strategy that deals with what these underlying problems are that lead to the conflict, so that's kind of a variation of a restorative justice model and it is a conflict-centered approach they're trying in at least one British prison right now, and so my orientation would be to look at hotspots like we do in the communities and try to figure out why we seem to be getting the pattern of behavior we do in certain areas of certain facilities and then to apply a problem-oriented response to those areas and sometimes which might break down to this. Well, gee, let's take a look. We have 15 people responsible for 20 percent of the incidents last month. Okay. These 15, we profiled them all, have significant mental illness problems; what does that suggest. Maybe we need to deal with the underlying mental illness problem here, maybe there will be a gang affiliation. I think more likely you are going to see more general categories of conflict in the areas. You are probably going to talk about conflict resolution. Obviously gangs could part of it but I think it could be something like looking at underlying problems like mental health problems, for example, that might explain why

you get the pattern of behavior. It is a little different.

JUDGE GIBBONS: The inmates you are dealing with are, the men and women, are social creatures who need social interaction and maybe belonging to groups that they can interact with. Has anybody in the corrections profession considered making available alternative organizations that might be a competing force for gang membership?

DR. BYRNE: I think if you look at the work at Graterford Prison, for example, the lifers' programs that have been set up in many institutions, that's the obvious example that comes to my mind for me and this whole idea of the transformation they talk about, so I know at least a few people that are on this commission went to Graterford I think last summer and they did the World Congress on Criminology in Philadelphia, so to me that's one obvious solution to negative gangs, is put together essentially a positive gang, right?

When I was a kid it was the Junior Police, don't ask me exactly what they were, but Junior Police, and when my kids were in high school I ran a program that was the AU basketball program that old Professor Byrne here funded through his pocket and

definitely spent too money, but that highlighted this whole notion if you want to be part of this program you had to stay in school, at least pass your classes, and that is an alternative to a gang, it is another gang because they were with us all the time and we traveled all over the place. So I agree, that's the kind of thing you do. The examples are few and far between, unfortunately, and certainly the Graterford is one example, I think.

MR. ALEJANDREZ: I think also we've had examples already like the Impact Program in Soledad Prison, POPS in Solano, Straight Life in Tracy, there are those programs already in place but they need support, they need to be able to survive. Friends Outside definitely is a group, and then there's cultural and spiritual groups inside the institutions that the individuals themselves try to look out for the youngsters that are coming in so they can direct them to these cultural groups, spiritual groups or vocational groups.

I just want to say a little bit in terms of when they want to get out, when they want to get out of the gang. In California, you know, we created a whole special needs yard just for those that are dropping out, getting out of the gangs and stuff, and

the population is really, really high. I was at a meeting a couple weeks ago with the sheriff of Salinas in Monterey County and he was saying something that there's been a stronghold for a particular gang there and that he was almost trying to open up a whole unit because there are so many dropouts coming out of that particular gang there and so there is happenings. My concern with that is, and then the briefing process, is the followup. The followup to that is how are those individuals going to be supported to be able to continue. We don't have a very good track record in supporting those programs, so, again I would support a lot of inmate programs that are in there now.

JUDGE GIBBONS: Mr. Delgado.

MR. DELGADO: I think that when you look at the social grouping, that's important and that's one of the usually things I address when I do training myself. When you are looking at a gang member, you are looking at a social group kind of gone awry, you know, as far as entering into the criminal elements and the activity that goes on with that. In our facilities, each facility has social groupings, organizations, per se. For example, we have Red Cross Chapters, EDA Chapters and different

types of chapters within each of our facilities allowing them to participate, do fundraisers, do community service and things like that. One facility I worked at, for example, at Marion has a large focus on faith-based programming and actually where they have created an interfaith dorm where you have Christians living in families and you have Jews living in families, with Muslims living in families, and they practice their faith-based approach, and where you've got Promise Keepers going in there and inmates being able to participate in good social groups, I think that's the important thing. You can't take somebody away from a gang membership without offering them something else. I mean, you know, if you take somebody's car away because it doesn't work, they still need to get to work. So it is important that you give them something else to be able to satisfy whatever that fix is that they need.

DR. DUDLEY: Along that line, my question is based in part upon Professor Byrne's comments about identity as being a central issue. Certainly the comments that we have heard today from those who have been previously in gangs and talked about transformation in a variety of ways, from my own experiences with gangs that goes back 30 plus

years or so, I want to ask a more basic question.

Do we really, do you really think that gangs, or maybe if we are using the word "affiliation" as opposed to "gangs" it doesn't sound so horrible, is bad or is it that the gangs that we're talking about as opposed to other affiliated groups have such a limited sort of set of options for feeling some sort of strength or some sort of identity, and are the programs that we are really talking about those that provide other options, that introduce people to other ways to grow and feel good themselves. What Mr. Brown was talking about earlier, coming into contact with other mature guys, mentors, people who give you another sort of view of things, what you were talking about with regard to cultural transformation, those sorts of things, options that weren't available before that people are introduced to. So is it affiliation that's bad or is it having too limited a set of options for feeling good about yourself that is bad and if you change that, that that matters, that makes a difference.

DR. BYRNE: Well, affiliation it itself isn't bad for the individual gang member because for them it is giving them a sense of identity that he didn't otherwise have. And in these worst, the

poverty pocket areas that Sampson and some of the other people have been writing about so much recently, these are seriously impoverished areas where there's not a lot of hope and the gangs, in a sense, provide a sense of identity that is not provided in those settings, so the affiliation is giving them something.

Now the second part of it is can we do something about that. Someone made the comment earlier we can't solve the problems of the community within the prison setting but I think they're linked and you have to talk about providing alternatives, not just within prisons, and I think you heard some good examples of that, but also in the community as well, and that's difficult and that's where people writing about how to improve collective advocacy at the community level, improve informal social controls, I think you can take some of those lessons learned and apply them to institutional settings as well. That's where having some type of conflict resolution panel mechanism that's inmate-empowered and run provides that type of informal social control mechanism within the setting. But, you know, you are right, it is a difficult problem, but I don't know if I want to use good or bad in terms of the affiliation

because for the individual, if you are seeing it through their eyes, they're gaining something that we're not giving them.

DR. DUDLEY: I'm responding to some of our discussion that was suggesting that gangs in and of themselves were bad. I wanted to ask that question. And part of I guess what's going through my head too is that if that sort of transformation can happen, if the program is designed to foster that sort of transformation inside institutions, when people do return and can bring that back to the community, and that contributes to change there as well if that kind of transformation is possible, people can change, which some of our speakers seemed to be suggesting is possible.

DR. BYRNE: But part of affiliation is how long are you going to stay in the gang. I think if you look at the research on desistance through a life course, what they are saying is people essentially grow out of gangs. I don't know if you want to comment on that, but they get married, they have things, they get relationships, so they can't go out over here tonight, they have to be at home here, and that's a change in terms of just basic activities that relates to stability. So to the extent that we

can work on things in institutions that will lead to a more stable person leaving the institution, then you might have an impact on desistance down the road independent of what's going on in the community because maybe they will get involved in more stable relationships as a result of some of the things you work on in an institutional setting.

MR. MAYNARD: We have time for one more question, Mr. Nolan.

MR. NOLAN: I have heard about a program in Ohio called Opening Doors that started at in Marion and apparently has gone to others that teaches conflict resolution skills to the inmates and I'm even told the COs saw the change so much that they wanted it themselves. Could you tell us about that, are you familiar with Opening Doors?

MR. DELGADO: Yes, a little bit. Actually when I left that prison is when they were starting to work on that. They've got other programs there such as Kairos, Kairos programming goes into that facility on a regular basis, Opening Doors. And actually what I saw at that prison was an actual culture change with the staff and, in return, that also affected the inmates that were at that facility too, and to the point where they were, people were

changing and trying to do some positive things. That's not to say the entire population bought into it staff and inmate wise, but they have offered some different things to staff. Actually Marion is one of the more progressive institutions that actually takes a look at their staff and tries to provide additional assistance through employee activities and things like that that other institutions do not.

I can tell you, that wasn't the first prison I worked at, that was the second one, and the difference in mind set of the facility, you can feel when you go to the prison kind of the culture, and it was completely different from the prison I worked at before. And one of the things that they do focus on there is staff and as far as conflict resolution and things like that. And I think when you get the staff on board there, that will translate down to the inmates. Somebody commented about that earlier, it is actually changing the entire culture, and that's a good example of a prison that has done that.

MR. MAYNARD: I want to thank all of you for your testimony today, it has been very helpful, and we are going to break now for lunch and we will come back at 1:15. Thank you very much.