

Comment No.	Last Name	First Name	Organization	PRA related comments	Justice Department responses
0516.1	Judd	Grady	Sheriff of Polk Co., FL	<p>Finds several provisions of PREA over burdensome and economically impossible for agencies. Asks that these provisions be removed so agencies can fulfill PREA’s intent. Explains that if adopted in its current form the standard would impose substantial additional costs on prison authorities. Considers the following PREA requirements too costly and burdensome: screening and the associated documentation, reevaluation of at risk inmates, data keeping, training, counseling, and additional local government responsibilities. Believes it is preposterous to trigger PREA every time a person is placed in a squad car or questioned at a law enforcement agency because this requires every agency law enforcement officer who transports an arrestee or detainee to jail or an agency for questioning to undergo PREA training and other requirements. Any law enforcement officers in charge of inmate labor including “trusties” would also have to follow PREA requirements. If trusties are used for labor to assist the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC), then the BOCC would also have to undergo PREA training.</p>	<p>The Department has decided to make significant changes to the screening standard. (§§ 115.41, 115.141 115.241, 115.341) (See pp. 140-151.)</p> <p>Rather than require a screening during intake and again during an initial classification process, the final standard requires an initial intake screening to occur ordinarily within 72 hours of intake in prisons, jails, and community confinement facilities, and requires that the facility reassess the inmate’s risk of victimization or abusiveness within a set time period, not to exceed 30 days from the inmate’s arrival at the facility, based upon any additional, relevant information received by the facility subsequent to the intake screening.</p> <p>The final standard eliminates the requirement that a facility’s screening instrument be made publicly available. For lockups, the final standard adds an abbreviated risk screening process for facilities that do not hold detainees overnight, and a more extensive risk screening process for detainees in lockups that do hold inmates overnight.</p> <p>In order to protect all inmates regardless of when they arrived at a facility or where they are located within the facility, at least minimal information must be collected quickly to inform decisions about where the arrestee should be held awaiting the intake procedure and where he or she will be</p>

					<p>housed initially.</p> <p>The Department recognizes that some jail inmates spend limited time in the booking area, at a time when certain information needed for appropriate classification may not be immediately available. However, the length of the booking process and/or the lack of background information does not eliminate the need to identify potentially vulnerable or abusive individuals, and ensure they do not become victims or perpetrators. The final standard addresses jails' concerns by making a clearer distinction between the initial process of collecting risk information upon intake to make provisional decisions about protection and placement, and the subsequent reassessment of the individual's risk after receiving fuller information.</p>
0759.1	Gardner	Brian	Linn Co. Sheriff's Ofc.	<p>As with some of the other sections, our concern with this particular rule is that of staffing and cost. A county jail is not equipped to provide education to the inmates. We do not have the classrooms available, or the staff to provide the education. It is possible for us to give the inmates written information at booking and also to provide media based information through our satellite TV system. The requirement to maintain documentation of those participating will be difficult as we would show the information on the satellite system at regular times, but being able to document who watched it and who didn't is not something we see as practical. If we could play the information at regular intervals, provide written information at booking and when requested, this would most likely be possible.</p>	<p>The Department recognizes that jails have a unique population and rapid turnover rate. The Department has revised this standard to clarify that information can be provided at intake via a handout or other written material. The Department did not remove or alter the documentation requirement, as this can be easily added to an intake/admission checklist or other form of documentation. Indeed, several agency commenters, including jails, stated that they already do so. (p. 133)</p>
1294.1	Pazin	Mark	CA State Sheriff's	<p>CSSA remains concerned that these proposed regulations will be overly burdensome and too costly</p>	<p>Same as response to comment 0759.1.</p>

			Assn.	for Sheriffs and jail administrators to implement. Our major concerns remain the increased costs incurred for surveillance equipment; personal and training costs; data collection; analysis storage; and dissemination. The standard for Inmate Education remains very vague and would be difficult to conduct in local jails due to the turnover of inmates. While such a program may make sense for a prison, jails have a rapid turnover rate. The presentation of "comprehensive" education to a continuously rotating inmate population carries the potential for considerable costs, particularly in tracking and documenting which inmates have attended the training.	
--	--	--	-------	--	--