

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
BOARD OF CORRECTIONS

Regular Meeting	March 18, 2009
Location.....	6900 Atmore Drive Richmond, Virginia
Presiding.....	Sterling C. Proffitt, Chairman
Present.....	James H. Burrell Peter G. Decker, III Jacqueline F. Fraser Gregory M. Kallen Raymond W. Mitchell B. A. Washington, Sr.
Absent.....	James R. Socas W. Randy Wright

1:00 p.m., Wednesday, March 18, 2009
6900 Atmore Drive, Richmond, Virginia 23225

The meeting was called to order. The roll was called by Mrs. Woodhouse. Mr. Proffitt noted a quorum was present. Two members were absent, as indicated during the verbal roll call and as noted above.

I. Board Chairman (Mr. Proffitt)

1) **Recognizing Mr. Christopher R. Webb; Board Motion to Include Resolution to Mr. Webb in the Minutes of the Board**

Mr. Proffitt thanked Mr. Webb for his years of service to the Liaison Committee and the Board and wished him well in his retirement. Mr. Webb indicated he did not want to wax philosophical but did want to thank the Board for the honor and the privilege of serving on the Liaison Committee.

The Chairman then read the Resolution recognizing Mr. Webb into the record:

***RECOGNIZING CHRISTOPHER R. WEBB
UPON HIS DEPARTURE FROM THE LIAISON COMMITTEE
OF THE VIRGINIA BOARD OF CORRECTIONS***

On *MOTION* of the Virginia Board of Corrections, duly made and seconded, the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, Christopher R. Webb has served the Commonwealth faithfully since April 23, 1999, when he was selected for appointment to the Liaison Committee of the Virginia Board of Corrections from then Board Chairman Andrew J. Winston. Christopher R. Webb attended his first meeting as a member of the Liaison Committee on June 17, 1999; and

WHEREAS, Christopher R. Webb has served the Board, the Committee and the citizens of the Commonwealth in a non-partisan manner since that time under three Governors and six Board Chairmen with marked integrity, pursuing the letter and intent of the law; and

WHEREAS, during his almost 10 years as a member in good standing of the Liaison Committee, Christopher R. Webb attended and actively participated in as many scheduled meetings as practicable, all the while actively administering the duties of the office of Superintendent of the Blue Ridge Regional Jail until his anticipated retirement in February of 2009; and

WHEREAS, during his many years as a member of the Board's Liaison Committee, Christopher R. Webb participated in many frank discussions regarding the treatment of inmates in local jails, understood the importance of his professional responsibility beyond the Liaison Committee and in so doing, became an active proponent of issues important to the Commonwealth, to the Board and to his fellow Committee members; and

WHEREAS, Christopher R. Webb announced his resignation from the Virginia Board of Corrections' Liaison Committee as a member in good standing in November, 2008.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Virginia Board of Corrections, this 18th day of March, 2009, publicly recognizes the contributions of Christopher R. Webb to the Virginia Board of Corrections, the Virginia Department of Corrections and the citizens of the Commonwealth of Virginia;

AND, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board thanks him for his commitment to the Commonwealth and extends best wishes on his retirement;

AND, BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution be presented to Christopher R. Webb and that this resolution be permanently recorded and retained in the papers of the Board of Corrections, Commonwealth of Virginia.

/s/

James H. Burrell; Peter G. Decker, III; Jacqueline F. Fraser; Gregory M. Kallen; Raymond W. Mitchell; Sterling C. Proffitt; James R. Socas; B. A. Washington, Sr., and W. Randy Wright.

The **MOTION** was duly made by Mr. Burrell and seconded by Mr. Kallen. The Resolution was **APPROVED** as presented by verbally responding in the affirmative (Burrell, Decker, Fraser, Kallen, Mitchell, Washington). There were no questions and there was no discussion. There were no opposing votes. The Chairman then voted his approval of the Motion. Two members were absent. The Motion carried.

2) **Motion to Approve October Board Minutes**

The Chairman indicated there would be no vote on the proposed October Minutes as there must be a quorum of members present and voting at the current meeting who were present at the meeting whose activity is being voted on and this was not the case. This item will be revisited at the May, 2009, meeting.

3) **Motion to Approve November Board Minutes**

The Chairman called for a Motion to approve the November Board Minutes.

By **MOTION** duly made by Ms. Fraser and seconded by Mr. Burrell, the minutes were **APPROVED** as presented by verbally responding in the affirmative (Burrell, Decker, Fraser, Kallen, Mitchell, Washington). There were no questions and there was no discussion. There were no opposing votes. The Chairman then voted his approval of the Motion. Two members were absent. The Motion carried.

II. Public/Other Comment (Mr. Proffitt)

There were members of the public present at the meeting; however, when offered the opportunity, none indicated a desire to speak to the Board.

III. Presentation to the Board (Ms. Scott)

At the November, 2008, Administration Committee meeting, a *Washington Post* article entitled “*Cutting the Prison Rate Safely*” (below) was presented for discussion. Ms. Scott had Research and Budget staff present at that meeting to provide their input on the article. During their discussion, it was agreed that Virginia is doing a good job but could do more if alternatives were available. Further discussion ensued and it was suggested a presentation elaborating on the subject could be made during the March Board meeting.

Therefore, at today’s meeting, Mr. John Britton, head of the Research Management Forecast Unit, presented staff members Mrs. Helen Hinshaw and Dr. Donna Boone to speak about the article. Both presenters had prepared handouts, a copy of each of which is included in the Board file.

John Vratil and John Whitmire

Cutting the Prison Rate Safely

The news that more than 1 in 100 adults in our country are behind bars shocked many Americans, but it shouldn't have come as a surprise.

The U.S. incarceration rate has been marching toward this milestone for three decades, a result of policy choices that put more offenders in prison and keep them there longer. Harsher sentencing laws, more restrictive parole policies and the practice of locking up people who have violated the rules of their probation or parole have been driving up the inmate population since the early 1980s.

What is remarkable, and has been highlighted alongside the incarceration figures in a recent report from the Pew Center on the States, is that our states, Kansas and Texas, and others are finding effective ways to fight crime and punish criminals without breaking the bank on prisons.

Locking up 2.3 million people has undoubtedly helped reduce the nation's crime rate. And we certainly believe that violent and chronic criminals deserve a good, long term behind bars.

Yet high numbers of nonviolent, lower-risk criminals have been swept up in the prison boom. Getting tough on them has gotten tough on taxpayers, without an adequate public safety benefit. A prison cell costs about \$65,000 to build and \$24,000 a year to operate. States spend nearly \$50 billion a year on corrections, more than four times the amount from 20 years ago, and they are projected to spend an additional \$25 billion over the next five years to accommodate more inmates.

For this much money the public expects lower recidivism rates and safer communities. Yet crime rates are still too high. Recidivism rates are still too high. And corrections spending is crowding out dollars for other pressing priorities such as health care and education.

Like many of our performance-minded colleagues across the country, we have wondered whether we are getting our money's worth out of prisons. For violent offenders and sex offenders, the answer is yes. For many nonviolent offenders and

Defying the Trend

In 2007, state prison populations increased by 509 on average. In both Kansas and Texas, they fell.

	PRISON POPULATION			CHANGE
	2006 (Dec. 31)	2008 (Jan. 1)		
U.S. TOTAL	1,570,644	1,596,127	25,483	1.6%
KANSAS	8,816	8,756	-60	-0.7%
TEXAS	172,116	171,790	-326	-0.2%
VIRGINIA	36,688	38,555	1,867	5.1%
MARYLAND	22,945	23,342	397	1.7%

The District was not included in Pew's study. SOURCE: Pew Center on the States

THE WASHINGTON POST

probation violators, the answer is no. We've got to find a better way.

Many states are doing just that. In law-and-order Texas, we expanded a network of residential treatment centers for low-risk, substance-abusing offenders in prison and under community supervision, as well as intermediate-sanction facilities for probation and parole violators. Texas might avoid increased incarceration costs for the next five years, saving taxpayers millions of dollars, according to the latest projections.

After Kansas found that nearly two-thirds of its prison admissions were probation and parole violators, the legislature set up an incentive program for community corrections programs. Counties that cut their revocation rates by 20 percent will get a share of new state funding — money made available because of averted prison construction — to help them hold violators accountable without using up prison cells.

Other states are taking similar steps. We aren't going soft on crime; we're getting smart on crime.

Our country has a million more prison beds today than it did just 20 years ago, yet the average time served behind bars has increased by only six months, to about three years. Holding inmates an extra six

months costs a bundle, but greater reductions in recidivism may be achieved by the alternative treatment and sanctioning programs that have begun to be funded.

For the same price, we can put four offenders through a drug court or reentry program and actually alter the course of their criminal careers. Research has shown that by using new technologies and treatment strategies, community corrections programs can cut rates of repeat offenses by 25 percent. Rather than claiming new victims, these offenders have a decent shot at rejoining society, paying taxes and supporting their children.

Public safety spending, like other areas of government responsibility, is not exempt from the test of cost-benefit analysis. Taxpayers want the job done as effectively as possible. It's up to us as policymakers to consider all of the options and create an array of punishments and programs that deliver the biggest public safety bang for the buck.

John Vratil, a Republican from Kansas, is vice president of the state Senate and chairs its Judiciary Committee. John Whitmire, a Democrat from Texas, is the senior member of the state Senate and chairs its Criminal Justice Committee.

Robert D. Noyes

In reviewing the article, Mrs. Hinshaw noted: (1) Virginia is shown with the highest number and percent change among states presented for prison population growth - figures used do not account for growth in state populations; (2) the article does not reflect Virginia's trends; (3) the article does not mention Justice Reinvestment Initiatives (re-entry

strategies); (4) nor does the article mention the fact that Virginia is reducing recidivist activity through its Evidence Based Practices approach, programs and treatment options.

In 2006, Virginia's prison population was 36,688; in 2008, Virginia's prison population was 38,555. The number and percent change is as indicated in the article; however, raw figures and percent growth provided in the article do not provide a good comparison of prison population growth among states (Texas has a larger and Kansas has a much smaller prison population than Virginia) so one needs to normalize the number incarcerated per 100,000 to compare growth; therefore, Virginia had 492 residents incarcerated per 100,000 in 2000; that number fell to 431 in 2002 and increased to 472 in 2006 indicating a decrease of 20 or -4.2%. Using normalized figures then, there is little change in Kansas, there is a decrease in Texas and Virginia and an increase in Maryland. It was noted that the Texas per capita incarceration rate is nearly 1.5 times higher than Virginia's; and Texas' prison population is 4.5 times the size of Virginia's, and Kansas is one quarter of Virginia's prison population.

The article does not reflect Virginia's trends: Virginia is the leader among states in developing and utilizing a NonViolent (NV) Risk Assessment instrument to divert the NV offender from prison to alternative sanctions. Legislation stipulated to divert 25% of NV offenders. The Commonwealth continues to meet that goal. In 1995, Virginia also started sentence enhancements for offenders with current or prior violent offenses. The article references that systems that keep violent and sex offenders in prisons, are "getting our money's worth." In Virginia, they are now the majority of state inmates. While the article cites that NV, low-risk offenders are causing the growth in prison populations, Virginia's trends show that violent offenders have gone from 49.0% of the population in FY96 to 56.3% in FY08. And probation violators are almost half (49.7% of FY07) of the Department's annual new commitments; however, only 8% are technical violators. Most (92%) commit a new crime. Technical violators do not get new sentences but have Judges impose part of their original sentence that was suspended. Diversion of the technical violator population is being discussed; but not all technical violators are "lightweight" cases. Approximately 47% have serious prior offenses, mental or medical issues that likely require closer supervision.

The Justice Reinvestment Initiative is a collaborative approach to increase public safety and save money and is used in Kansas and Texas. Presentations on this approach have been made in Virginia. Investigation into the Justice Reinvestment Initiative can be beneficial to Virginia. The strategy is to get all three branches of state government involved, supported by the U.S. Department of Justice and private grant makers to talk about a new way of doing business other than "bricks and mortar." It involves analyzing the prison population and spending in the communities to which people in prison often return; provide policy makers with options to generate savings and increase public safety; quantify savings and reinvest in selected communities; and measure the impact and enhance accountability.

The article suggests that states are not getting soft on crime; but getting smart on crime. Recidivism rates in Virginia (re-incarceration within 3 years of release) have remained stable (around 29%) despite a growing population and resource pressures. Still, Virginia

has actively taken steps towards reducing recidivist activity in the future through its Evidence Based Practices approach, pro-social programs and treatment options. Alternatives for cutting the prison rate safely have been foremost in the minds of Virginia DOC administrators and policy makers. In addition to actions already taken toward expanding Evidence Based Practices, other options discussed have included expanding therapeutic incarceration, increasing the good time earning rate for nonviolent offenders, increasing the larceny threshold level and expanding the early release policy from 30 to 90 days. The Legislature has not adopted these options but has considered them.

Mrs. Hinshaw concluded her remarks and turned the podium over to Dr. Boone.

Dr. Boone indicated most of the information in the *Washington Post* article came from the PEW Report entitled "1 in 31," which shows some disturbing trends. To help alleviate those trends, Virginia has implemented Evidence Based Practices (EBP), "the application of science into operational practice for services and programs for offenders." The goal is to use practices that have been tested and have shown to reduce recidivism. Research has demonstrated that certain programs, interventions and supervision strategies, delivered in specific ways to offenders, can effectively reduce probation or parole revocations. We no longer have the resources to handle offenders in the same way. The need for EBP is evident; there has been a 203 percent increase in the prison population and 154 percent increase in the probation population from 1987 to 2007. Even with 4,437 new prison beds added by 2010, the Department will have a 3,300 bed shortfall by 2012.

The EBP target population is probationers and parolees who are likely to be committed or re-committed to prison for new crimes or technical offenses. In calendar year 2006, almost half (47 percent) of the 13,000 (or approximately 6,000) new court prison commitments were formerly or currently on probation. The potential impact of EBP is the Department may see reduced recidivism and resulting cost savings; recommitment reductions will be gradual; and EBP is a long-term solution. According to Probation Officers at P&P pilot sites statewide, positive results have been achieved. Offenders spend more time with Probation Officers; are more open and communicative with POs; take more responsibility and ownership for their actions; are more successful and motivated; they take pride in their accomplishments; are more goal-oriented; they think on a deeper level; and they feel the office environment is calmer and less hostile.

Dr. Boone concluded her remarks.

The Chairman thanked Mrs. Hinshaw and Dr. Boone for their presentations. There was little discussion. No Board action on the presentation is required.

IV. Liaison Committee (Mr. Burrell)

Mr. Burrell gave a brief overview of the Committee meeting. Mr. Chris Ramos and other representatives from the Virginia Catholic Conference were present to discuss challenges faced by their prison ministry at local and regional jails where they are encountering accessibility problems. It appears more consistent rules may need to be effected statewide. Mr. Bill Wilson and Sheriff Draper will look into the issue.

Mr. Bill Nicholson with the Department's Pharmacy spoke generally about the issue of drugs and education and the need to allow for inmates to consistently have their medicines transferred with them so the inmate will have their meds when needed.

Mr. Wilson reported the Compensation Board's Tuesday Report is now issued on a monthly basis. He also indicated he will be presenting a Motion to the Board at its next meeting to revise the applicable medical services and suggested fees as outlined in the *Model Plan for Jail Prisoner Medical Treatment Programs (March, 2003)*. And, Mr. Wilson reported the Department's out-of-compliance figure at approximately 2,500.

There was no discussion or comment. No Board action is required. Mr. Proffitt thanked Mr. Burrell for his report.

V. **Administration Committee (Mr. Kallen)**

Mr. Kallen indicated the Committee reviewed the request to transfer two pieces of surplus property, as follows:

1) **Board Motion to Approve Resolution to Transfer 38.1 Acres, More or Less, at the Former Haymarket Correctional Unit #26 in Prince William County**

The Department requests to transfer 38.1 acres of land as surplus property at the former Haymarket Correctional Unit #26 in Prince William County to the Department of General Services. Prior to submission to the Board, this proposed transfer was reviewed and approved as to form by Mr. Alan Katz, Senior Assistant Attorney General.

Therefore, the following *MOTION*, duly made by Mr. Kallen and seconded by Mr. Burrell, was *APPROVED* as presented by verbally responding in the affirmative (Burrell, Fraser, Decker, Kallen, Mitchell, Washington):

“Pursuant to Section 53.1-18 and as requested by the Department of Corrections, the Board of Corrections approves the transfer of 38.1 acres, more or less, as surplus property at the Haymarket Correctional Unit #26 in Prince William County to the Department of General Services. This transfer is being effected as part of the Governor's FY 2009 Reduction Plan. The Director of the Department of Corrections may execute all documents in furtherance of the transfer of this property.”

There were no questions and there was no discussion. There were no opposing votes. The Chairman then voted his approval of the Motion. Two members were absent. The Motion carried.

2) **Board Motion to Approve Resolution to Transfer Surplus Property Located at 7 North 2nd Street in Richmond, Virginia**

The Department requests to transfer property located at 7 North 2nd Street in Richmond, Virginia, as surplus property to the Department of General Services. Prior to submission to the Board, this transfer was reviewed and approved as to form by Mr. Alan Katz, Senior Assistant Attorney General.

Therefore, the following *MOTION*, duly made by Mr. Kallen and seconded by Ms. Fraser, was *APPROVED* as presented by verbally responding in the affirmative (Burrell, Fraser, Decker, Kallen, Mitchell, Washington):

“Pursuant to Section 53.1-18 and as requested by the Department of Corrections, the Board of Corrections approves the transfer of surplus property located at 7 North 2nd Street in Richmond, Virginia, to the Department of General Services. This transfer is being effected as part of the Governor’s FY 2009 Reduction Plan. The Director of the Department of Corrections may execute all documents in furtherance of the transfer of this property.”

There were no questions and there was no discussion. There were no opposing votes. The Chairman then voted his approval of the Motion. Two members were absent. The Motion carried.

3) Mr. Kallen reported the **Overtime Report for 2Q 2009 Ended December 31, 2008** was reviewed and discussed by the Committee. Compared to the same period last year, the Department experienced a 39% decrease in overtime expenditures or \$2,187,132. It was remarked the Department is doing very well in its efforts to reduce overtime, and the Committee is very pleased.

There was no discussion or comment. No Board action is required for this item.

Mr. Proffitt thanked Messrs. Decker and Kallen for their report. No further action by the Board was required.

VI. Correctional Services Committee Report/Policy & Regulations (Ms. Fraser)

With Board members Burrell, Fraser, Mitchell, Washington and Proffitt and several guests present, the Committee met to discuss several items:

1) **Follow Up Discussion Regarding Financial Audits of Community Residential Programs**

In November, Secor/Lebanon, a community residential program in Southwest Virginia, appeared before the Committee to express concern about the cost of annual financial audits as required by the **Standards for Community Residential Programs** (6 VAC 15-70). Inspector General June Jennings was present during the discussion and agreed to research the possibility of having her Internal Audit staff conduct some of the financial

audits for a fee in order to help alleviate their concern. Subsequently it was determined by Mrs. Jennings that due to current limited resources, her staff would not be able to assist with such audits. Therefore, in February the facility was advised in writing that the annual independent financial audit would have to be performed by Secor/Lebanon. Since that time, Secor/Lebanon has been in the process of completing its audit and the discussion is now moot. No further action by the Board is required.

2) **Discussion with Mr. Chris Ramos, Associate Director of the Virginia Catholic Conference**

Mr. Ramos appeared before the Liaison Committee to state his case regarding faith-based services at local and regional jails and accessibility issues which his organization has faced. After discussion during the Liaison Committee, it was determined that reasonable efforts will be made to ensure his organization does not experience further problems. Liaison Committee member Sheriff Draper and Mr. Bill Wilson will be working with Virginia Catholic Conference representatives to ensure the issue is being addressed. No action by the Board is required.

3) **Medical Copayment; Set Fees Required, 6VAC15-40-470 and 480, Respectively**

The Board has a *Model Plan for Jail Prisoner and Medical Treatment Programs* in place. The *Model Plan* was established in September of 1994 and incorporated into the *Standards for Jails and Lockups* in August of 1995.

The *Model Plan* was established as a guide to assist Sheriffs and Superintendents with developing medical services programs in which inmates may be charged fees. Included in the *Model Plan* is a listing of applicable medical services and suggested fees, which is used as a guide for compliance by local jails and lockups.

Each of the above Standards includes the verbiage “a portion of the costs,” and individual facilities have instituted *Model Plan* fees in support of the Standard. However, because of the lack of definition for “portion,” and the fact the fees were only suggested and this was back in 1994, it is now difficult for the certification auditors to interpret compliance with the Standards.

In order to alleviate further confusion, Mr. Wilson suggested that the Standard should include a limit on the amount that may be charged for medical fees and amend the fees to reflect 2009 prices. The Committee suggested perhaps such verbiage as “medical services may be charged” or “a portion of the costs *not to exceed...*” be included. Mr. Wilson will revise the *Model Plan* for consideration at the next Board meeting.

4) **Compliance and Accreditation
Certifications Section**

Ms. Fraser presented the following certification recommendations for consideration on behalf of the Committee:

Unconditional Certification for VCCW to include variances to Standards 4-4133, 4-4137, 4-4138, 4-4139 and 4-4141;

Unconditional Certification as a result of 100% compliance for Southside Regional Jail, Accomack County Jail, Botetourt/Craig Regional Jail and Southwest Virginia Regional Jail (Duffield);

Unconditional Certification for Sussex County and Lancaster County Jails and Virginia Beach Lockup #4 to include male and female juveniles in accordance with Section 16.1-249.G of the Code of Virginia;

Unconditional Certification for Patrick County and Mecklenburg County Jails;

Unconditional Certification as a result of 100% compliance for Probation & Parole District #38 (Emporia);

Unconditional Certification for Probation & Parole District #27 (Chesterfield) with a variance to Standard 6VAC15-62-50A;

And Unconditional Certification as a result of 100% compliance for Chesterfield Women's Detention and Diversion Center and Stafford Diversion Center.

By **MOTION** duly made by Ms. Fraser and seconded by Mr. Burrell, the Board **APPROVED** the above recommendations by verbally responding in the affirmative (Burrell, Decker, Fraser, Kallen, Mitchell, Washington). There were no questions, comments or discussion. There were no opposing votes. The Chairman then voted his approval of the Motion. Two members were absent. The Motion carried.

6) **Policy & Regulations**

As requested, the Department is in the process of drafting a Department Operating Procedure to support §53.1-7 of the Code of Virginia, which states: *"The Board may authorize payment of medical expenses incurred by a prisoner after his release or discharge from the Department when such expenses are the result of an injury suffered by the prisoner while incarcerated and not caused by the misconduct of the prisoner."*

Several questions have arisen during the draft procedure process, which have not been answered at this time. The Director indicated that in the past inmates have sued after being released for injuries suffered while being held by the Department with the question of liability being answered by the courts. He knew of no instance where such an issue had been sent to the Board for consideration. The draft procedure process will continue.

VII. Closed Session

No Closed Session was held.

VIII. Other Business (Mr. Johnson)

The Director commented generally on the budget situation and stated the Department lost at least \$57.7 million during the course of the last budget reductions: \$15.7 this fiscal year (2009) and \$42+ million next fiscal year (2010) and having closed six facilities. He noted 700 positions were lost, which affected 575 people. Ultimately, 18 people were laid off and 7 people received enhanced retirement or severance packages.

IX. Board Member/Other Comment

The members were polled. Mr. Burrell, Ms. Fraser, Mr. Decker, Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Washington and Mr. Kallen each indicated they had nothing. Mr. Proffitt mentioned he had attended the dedication ceremony on March 6, 2009, for the Western Virginia Regional Jail in Salem. This state-of-the-art facility includes 605 beds, double bunked for an additional 200 beds, at a cost of \$92 million. The structure can be expanded in the future to accommodate 649 additional beds. The property covers 42.7 acres and is 264,000 square feet with 6 acres under roof. Superintendent Poff reported that after the dedication ceremony, between 500 and 600 local citizens toured the facility.

The Chairman stated that while at the dedication ceremony, some members of the Jail Authority expressed to him their appreciation for Brooks Ballard and all of her help during the planning and design of this facility. He also stated he had received a letter in November from the Prince William County Adult Detention Center in the same vein; thanking Brooks Ballard for her responsiveness and willingness to work with the jail during its construction project.

The Chairman remarked he had reviewed the FY08 Management Information Summaries report, which was mailed to each member, and noted that from July 1, 2007, through June 30, 2008, the Board had reduced expenditures by \$5,100, a 39% decrease from the previous fiscal year.

Ms. Sievers from the Virginia Parole Board was present and thanked the Board for being given the opportunity to attend and listen to the very informative presentation.

X. Future Meeting Plans

The May 20, 2009, meetings are scheduled as follows:

Liaison Committee – 9:30 a.m., Board Room, 6900 Atmore Drive, Richmond, Virginia;

Correctional Services/Policy & Regulations Committee – 10:30 a.m., Board Room, 6900 Atmore Drive, Richmond, Virginia;

Administration Committee – 12:30 p.m., Board Room, 6900 Atmore Drive, Richmond, Virginia;

And Board Meeting – 1:00 p.m., Board Room, 6900 Atmore Drive, Richmond, Virginia.

XI. Adjournment

There being nothing further, by **MOTION** duly made by Mr. Mitchell, seconded by Mr. Burrell and unanimously **APPROVED** (Burrell, Decker, Fraser, Kallen, Mitchell, Washington), the meeting was adjourned. There was no discussion. The Chairman voted his approval of the move to adjourn. Two members were absent. The Motion carried.

(Signature copy on file)

STERLING C. PROFFITT, CHAIRMAN

RAYMOND W. MITCHELL, SECRETARY