#### **DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**

**Bureau of Prisons** 

28 CFR Part 524

[BOP-1068-F]

RIN 1120-AA64

# Classification and Program Review: Team Meetings

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Prisons, Justice.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Bureau of Prisons is amending its regulations on classification and program review to discontinue the practice of permitting inmates to waive appearance at classification team meetings for program reviews. The purpose of this change is to ensure that inmates participate in their own program reviews.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 29, 1999. ADDRESSES: Rules Unit, Office of General Counsel, Bureau of Prisons, HOLC Room 754, 320 First Street, NW., Washington, DC 20534.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Roy Nanovic, Office of General Counsel, Bureau of Prisons, phone (202) 514–6655.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Bureau of Prisons is amending its regulations on classification and program review (28 CFR part 524, subpart B). A proposed rule on this subject was published in the **Federal Register** on April 21, 1997 (62 FR 19430).

Program reviews provide the inmate with an opportunity to discuss staff's assessment of the inmate's performance in the institution's programming, conduct, sanitation, release preparation, etc. Regulations in § 524.12(c) permitted an inmate to elect not to attend program reviews subsequent to the initial classification meeting. In order to ensure that the inmate participates in program reviews, the Bureau proposed to eliminate the inmate's option not to attend program reviews. Sanctions for an inmate's unexcused absence, contained in the Bureau's regulations on inmate discipline (see 28 CFR 541.13), remained unchanged.

The Bureau received eight comments on the proposed rule. All of the comments were opposed to the change. Three of the commenters argued that the inmate should not be forced to attend a program review when the inmate did not wish to do so. These commenters stated that the inmate could be more productively occupied in an educational program or in a work assignment. Another commenter questioned the

value of program reviews citing two examples of perfunctory program reviews. Another commenter questioned the value of attending program reviews when the inmate would remain ineligible for camp placement because of the characterization of the inmate's instant offense as violent.

The Bureau is committed to ensuring that all inmates will have the opportunity to communicate directly with staff who make classification decisions. While specific educational programs and work assignments all may have obvious productive benefits, it is shortsighted to argue that the immediate benefit outweighs the benefits that can accrue from attending the program review and interacting with institution staff responsible for assessing the inmate's performance in various areas. The Bureau notes that institution transfers are not the only topics to be considered at program reviews. As to specific complaints about the operation of any particular program review, these complaints can be addressed under the Bureau's Administrative Remedy Program (see 28 CFR part 542).

Another commenter objected in general to rulemaking and requested a copy of all Bureau of Prisons and Department of Justice rules. The general public has access to such rules in the Code of Federal Regulations which can be purchased from Government Printing Office bookstores or found in public or college libraries. Regulations for the Bureau and for the Department are available in inmate law libraries in Bureau institutions.

Another commenter objected to eliminating totally the inmate's option not to attend program reviews. This commenter recommended instead that inmates be expected to attend program reviews within 18 months of their projected release date, and that inmates with Immigration and Naturalization (INS) deportation orders could continue to waive program reviews regardless of the projected release date. This commenter argued that forcing inmates who have INS detainers or distant release dates would cause disruption among the inmate population. In response, the Bureau notes that many other issues or concerns in addition to INS status are discussed at a program review. As noted above, the Bureau is committed to ensuring that inmates have the opportunity to communicate directly with staff making classification decisions in these matters.

Another commenter objected to the regulatory flexibility determination that the proposed rule did not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. This

commenter stated that all rules affect the taxpayer. The Regulatory Flexibility Act is intended to address the economic impact of regulations. As defined in the Regulatory Flexibility Act, the term "small entity" has the same meaning as "small business," "small organization," or "small governmental jurisdiction". As noted in the proposed rule and also in this final rule, the rule does not have a significant impact.

In accordance with the reasons cited above, the Bureau is adopting the proposed rule as final without change. Members of the public may submit further comments concerning this rule by writing to the previously cited address. These comments will be considered but will receive no response in the **Federal Register**.

an the rederal register.

#### **Executive Order 12866**

This rule falls within a category of actions that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has determined not to constitute "significant regulatory actions" under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866 and, accordingly, it was not reviewed by OMB.

#### **Executive Order 12612**

This regulation will not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. Therefore, in accordance with Executive Order 12612, it is determined that this rule does not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

# **Regulatory Flexibility Act**

The Director of the Bureau of Prisons, in accordance with the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 605(b)), has reviewed this regulation and by approving it certifies that this regulation will not have a significant economic impact upon a substantial number of small entities for the following reasons: This rule pertains to the correctional management of offenders committed to the custody of the Attorney General or the Director of the Bureau of Prisons, and its economic impact is limited to the Bureau's appropriated funds.

# **Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of** 1995

This rule will not result in the expenditure by State, local and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of \$100,000,000 or more in any one year, and it will not significantly or uniquely affect small governments. Therefore, no actions were

deemed necessary under the provisions of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act

## **Small Business Regulatory Enforcement** Fairness Act of 1996

This rule is not a major rule as defined by section 804 of the Small **Business Regulatory Enforcement** Fairness Act of 1996. This rule will not result in an annual effect on the economy of \$100,000,000 or more; a major increase in costs or prices; or significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of United States-based companies to compete with foreignbased companies in domestic and export markets.

# Plain Language Instructions

We try to write clearly. If you can suggest how to improve the clarity of these regulations, call or write Roy Nanovic, Rules Unit, Office of General Counsel, Bureau of Prisons, 320 First St., Washington, DC 20534; telephone  $(202)\ 514-6655.$ 

#### List of Subjects in 28 CFR Part 524

Prisoners

#### Kathleen Hawk Sawyer

Director, Bureau of Prisons.

Accordingly, pursuant to the rulemaking authority vested in the Attorney General in 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and delegated to the Director, Bureau of Prisons in 28 CFR 0.96(p), part 524 in subchapter B of 28 CFR, chapter V is amended as set forth below.

## SUBCHAPTER B-INMATE ADMISSION, **CLASSIFICATION, AND TRANSFER**

# PART 524—CLASSIFICATION OF INMATES

1. The authority citation for 28 CFR part 524 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 301; 18 U.S.C. 3521-3528, 3621, 3622, 3624, 4001, 4042, 4046, 4081, 4082 (Repealed in part as to offenses committed on or after November 1, 1987), 5006-5024 (Repealed October 12, 1984 as to offenses committed after that date), 5039; 21 U.S.C. 848; 28 U.S.C. 509, 510; 28 CFR 0.95-0.99.

2. In § 524.12, paragraph (c) is revised to read as follows:

#### § 524.12 Initial classification and program reviews.

(c) Staff shall notify an inmate at least 48 hours prior to that inmate's scheduled appearance before the classification team (whether for the initial classification or subsequent program review). An inmate may waive

in writing the 48-hour notice requirement. The inmate is expected to attend the initial classification and all subsequent program reviews. If the inmate refuses to appear at a scheduled meeting, staff shall document on the Program Review Report the inmate's refusal and, if known, the reasons for refusal. A copy of this report is to be forwarded to the inmate. The inmate is responsible for becoming aware of, and will be held accountable for, the classification team's actions.

[FR Doc. 99-4732 Filed 2-24-99; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4410-05-P

\*

#### **DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**

\*

**Bureau of Prisons** 

28 CFR Part 551

[BOP-1030-F]

RIN 1120-AA31

## Birth Control, Pregnancy, Child Placement, and Abortion

AGENCY: Bureau of Prisons, Justice. **ACTION:** Final Rule.

**SUMMARY:** This document finalizes the interim rule pertaining to birth control, pregnancy, child placement, and abortion regulations for female inmates. The interim rule removed references to restrictions on the Bureau of Prisons' funding of an elective abortion to conform to changes in legislative authority. The interim rule also made various editorial or organizational changes for the sake of clarity. There are no changes necessary to the interim rule.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** February 25, 1999. ADDRESSES: Rules Unit, Office of General Counsel, Bureau of Prisons, HOLC Room 754, 320 First Street, NW.,

Washington, DC 20534.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Roy Nanovic, Office of General Counsel, Bureau of Prisons, phone (202) 514-

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Bureau of Prisons is finalizing its regulations in 28 CFR part 551, Subpart C, on Birth Control, Pregnancy, Child Placement, and Abortion. A final rule on this subject was published in the Federal Register June 29, 1979 (44 FR 38252) and was amended December 30, 1986 (51 FR 47179). An interim rule on this subject was published in the Federal Register on December 6, 1994. The Bureau received comment from two respondents.

Both commenters, writing for public interest organizations, agreed with the general intent of the regulations (28 CFR § 551.23) allowing women prisoners to have elective abortions. However, both stressed that the rule should clearly state that the Bureau of Prisons will assume all medical and transportation costs related to the abortion.

Federal Bureau of Prisons' regulations must conform with current law, and implementing text within Bureau policy instructs staff on the appropriate policies and procedures regarding this matter. Currently, the law states that the Bureau may not use appropriated funds to require any person to perform or facilitate the performance of an abortion. The Bureau may only pay for those abortions in which the life of the mother would be in danger if the fetus was carried to full term or in cases of rape. In all other cases, non-Bureau funds must be obtained to pay for any abortion procedure, or else the planned abortion may not be performed. In all cases, however, the Bureau will expend funds to escort the inmate to an appropriate facility outside the facility to receive the procedure.

While not the subject of the interim rule, both commenters were also concerned with timely access to counseling services for women prisoners seeking abortion. They noted their concern that counseling be provided in an expeditious manner and that any delay in receipt of counseling services not prevent the planned abortion from being performed.

The Bureau believes that counseling services will be provided in a timely manner so that women prisoners will receive adequate counseling before making the decision whether to carry the fetus to full term or to have an elective abortion.

The second commenter was also concerned that the inmates' privacy will be compromised by placement of documentation of counseling sessions in the inmates' central file and by requiring the inmate to submit a written statement to the unit manager rather than directly to medical staff. By placing such documentation only in the inmates' medical file and by requiring the written statement to be submitted only to medical staff, Federal and state confidentiality provisions are invoked. The Bureau believes this concern to be overstated. Bureau staff are required to keep all inmate information, that is not public information, confidential and are guided by the Privacy Act and Bureau of Prisons policy in so doing.

The second commenter further raised concerns regarding child placement provisions. This commenter felt that