

Parole Guidelines Bill Makes Progress

House Bill 4548, which would make the parole decision-making process fairer and more transparent, was voted out of the House Judiciary Committee on December 5, 2007 with bi-partisan support. Passage was supported by such diverse groups as the NAACP, the Michigan Catholic Conference, the Michigan chapter of the National Association of Social Workers, Evangelical Lutheran Church of America, FAMM, Proaction Behavioral Health Alliance and the American Friends Service Committee. It is expected that the bill will be taken up by the full House in late January or early February.

Sponsored by Rep. Paul Condino (D., Southfield), chair of the Judiciary Committee, the bill would help ensure that the parole board uses its statutorily required decision guidelines as the Legislature intended.

The parole guidelines are designed to assess the risk that, if paroled, a prisoner would commit a new offense. For people who score “high probability of release,” the risk they will commit an assaultive offense is less than five percent. The statute assumes these people will be paroled after serving their minimum sentences unless there is a “substantial and compelling reason” for the board to deny release.

The statutory assumption cannot be enforced because prisoners cannot appeal board decisions. Over the last ten years, the parole board has reduced the proportion of people with high scores who are paroled from 81 to 53 percent. The chances of being paroled are now virtually the same for people who score high and those who score average.

When someone is convicted of a felony, the judge imposes a sentence based on legislatively enacted sentencing guidelines that take into account the facts of the particular crime and the defendant’s prior criminal history. Frequently the sentence is the result of negotiations with the prosecutor. If the sentence is below what the sentencing guidelines recommend, the prosecutor can appeal.

Thus, the sentence the prisoner must serve before becoming eligible for parole has been based on what the legislature, courts and prosecution think is appropriate punishment for that specific offense committed by that specific person. Parole was designed to take into account the person’s progress post-sentencing, often over a long period of years. Yet frequently the parole board denies release to low-risk offenders with excellent institutional records, who have successfully completed treatment programs, citing only the facts of the crime. Since those facts were fully considered in setting the minimum sentence, this is effectively resentencing.

Also commonly given as “substantial and compelling reasons” for denying parole

What’s Inside

- MDOC budget tops \$2 billion; prison conditions worsen; other state services stagnate. Page 3.
- Legislative experts address CAPPS annual meeting, say reducing prison population will be challenging. Page 6.
- Parolable lifers win class action lawsuit. Page 10.

(Continued on the next page)



Ronald Bretz
President

Kathleen Schaefer
President-Elect

Robert Henning
Treasurer

Penny Ryder
Secretary

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Gary Ashby
Antonio Benavides
Robert Brown, Jr.
Robert Grosvenor
Rose Homa
Ronald Jimmerson, Sr.
Michael Kowall
Jacque McDaniel
Penelope M. Pestle
Michael Reagan
Laura Sager
Maxine A. Thome
William Tregoe
Heaster Wheeler

STAFF

Barbara Levine
Executive Director
LeAnn Voigtritter
Administrative Assistant
Gail Light
Communications Specialist
Dena Anderson
Case Researcher

115 W. Allegan St.
Suite 401
Lansing, Michigan 48933
Phone: (517) 482-7753
Fax: (517) 482-7754
capps@capps-mi.org
www.capps-mi.org

Parole guidelines bill progresses

(Continued from page 1)

are the subjective impressions of a single board member after a brief interview. For example, the interviewer may state that, despite an excellent therapy report, the prisoner failed to show adequate remorse at the interview and so is considered an unwarranted risk to the public. The interviews, which are often conducted by videoconference, are not recorded so there is no record of what the prisoner said or tried to say, how the prisoner acted or of the board's line of questioning.

Prisoners who the board has found to be unsafe to release, despite high parole guidelines scores, include people who: have been working in the community on prison crews, are subject to immediate deportation, received minimum terms below the sentencing guidelines recommendation because of unique mitigating factors, received extra points on the parole guidelines because their offense was deemed "situational - unlikely to recur," or had co-defendants with similar records (but different interviewing board members) who were released after serving the same minimum. Some are denied for a year or two and then paroled, at obvious extra cost but with no apparent gain to public safety from the extra time served.

The board no longer even calculates guidelines scores for more than 800 parolable lifers. Although, by statute, they became eligible for parole after serving 10 years and judges sentenced them fully expecting them to receive meaningful parole consideration, these lifers are routinely denied release for five years at a time without any assessment of their current risk to the public.

To address these problems, HB 4548 would:

- Permit appeals to the circuit court by people with high guidelines scores who say the reasons for parole denial are insufficient.
- Require that interviews of people with high guidelines scores be recorded.
- Require the calculation of guidelines scores for parolable lifers.

HB 4548 would not compel the release of any particular prisoner. But apparently arbitrary decisions could be reviewed and a body of law defining "substantial and compelling reasons" for not granting parole would develop. Recording interviews would allow a court to accurately assess the basis for the board's decision. It would also allow non-interviewing board members to hear the interview before voting and permit the public to access a critical component of parole decision-making. The entire parole process would become more transparent and an administrative agency with an enormous impact on prisoners and their families, victims and taxpayers would become more accountable.

The extent to which the bill would impact the size of the prisoner population would depend on the parole board's response. If the cut-off

(Continued on page 9 -- see Parole)

Prisons are jammed; other budgets stagnate

Corrections spending tops \$2 billion

Difficulties in balancing Michigan’s budget didn’t slow the relentless growth in corrections spending. With an increase of \$124 million, or 6.4%, the MDOC appropriation for Fiscal Year 2007-2008 will be nearly \$2.1 billion. Once again corrections will consume more than 20% of all General Fund spending. In the meantime, funding for other state services has stagnated or shrunk and conditions for prisoners have worsened.

Since most of the MDOC budget goes to personnel costs, two-thirds of the increase will go for economic adjustments to salaries and wages, insurances and retirement. The rest will largely go to cover increased costs for medical care. Although prisons were closed, that resulted in transfers, not releases. The addition of beds to numerous other facilities offset much of the savings from the closures and has caused overcrowding to increase significantly.

The 2008 budget (2007 Public Act 127) assumes there will be 51,841 prisoners and 17,637 employees. Compared to last year’s budget, this represents 351 more prisoners and 145 fewer staff.

The budget that was adopted is actually \$42.7 million higher than the one the Governor initially recommended. The legislature had to add dollars when proposed sentencing reforms were not adopted and projected savings did not materialize.

How corrections dollars are spent

About 87% of all MDOC expenditures are for prison operations and related costs. While the actual amount varies by security level, including relevant central office expenses, the average annual cost per prisoner is nearly \$35,000. The average

cost per day is \$4.95 million.

The major expense in prison operations is custody personnel. And, like everyone else, the MDOC must also pay rapidly growing costs for fuel and utilities. Thus the 2008 budget includes nearly \$85 million for economic adjustments and \$4 million to cover fuel and utility increases that were unfunded in 2005 and 2006. Other notable expenditures and their percentage change from the 2007 appropriation include:

Prisoner medical care	\$234,166,300	+23.0%
Prisoner mental health care	78,169,800	+ 5.4%
Academic/vocational programs <i>(now called MPRI education programs)</i>	37,860,400	+ 2.7%
Training for new officers	10,830,700	- 7.0%

Controversy over the elimination of the public works program, which provides low-cost prisoner labor to local communities, was resolved. Prisoner public works crews will eventually be reinstated, but the user fees will be doubled from \$15 to \$30 per day.

New items added to the budget include \$1.69 million for more extensive screening, testing and treatment of prisoners for Hepatitis C and \$400,000 for an independent study of the prevalence of mental illness and substance abuse problems among prisoners.

Another new “cost” is one that prisoner advocates have sought for years. Currently, prisoner telephone calls, whether collect or debit, are extremely expensive in part because of the fees paid to the MDOC. While the department collects about \$10 million to add to its budget, the burden is borne by prisoner families who can ill afford it.

The inability to pay the high rates commonly leads to a reduction in the family contact that experts believe is critical to prison-

(Continued on page 4)

. . . the average annual cost per prisoner is nearly \$35,000. The average cost per day is \$4.95 million.

Corrections spending tops \$2 billion

(Continued from page 2)

ers’ success upon release. Following the lead of a number of other states, the Michigan legislature has stated its intent to eliminate the excess fees when the current telephone contract ends in July 2008. The loss to the MDOC budget for 2008 will be \$1.6 million and, of course, the full impact will be felt starting in 2009. This was a major accomplishment in such a difficult budget year.

The largest MDOC expenditure outside of prisons is \$182 million for the Field Operations Administration (FOA), which includes the parole board, parole officers and circuit court probation officers. FOA also includes nearly \$17 million for community re-entry centers, which house both new parolees and parole violators, and \$7 million for the electronic monitoring center. More than \$4 million in new FOA spending is for adding 33 parole officers and 500 Global Positioning System (GPS) tether units.

The other major area of non-prison expenditures is for community-based programs. Appropriations for the Michigan Prisoner Re-entry Initiative (MPRI), which is intended to keep parolees from returning to prison, grew from \$12.5 million to \$33.2 million to allow for full implementation of community sites statewide. Funding for several community-based programs designed to be alternatives to entering prison in the first place (community corrections, residential services, jail-based treatment programs) stayed flat at \$31.5 million.

The MDOC budget also contains \$20 million for substance abuse testing and treatment of prisoners, probationers and parolees. Of the total, about 90% is spent on treatment.

How corrections dollars are saved

The increases in just three key areas – economic adjustments, prisoner medical care and fuel and utilities – add up to nearly \$133 million. Add to this more than \$22 million in additional MPRI-

related expenses and just these new expenditures equal more than \$155 million.

To keep the total increase “down” to \$124.6 million, the MDOC had to cut other costs. Nearly \$6 million was gained by revising staffing patterns at the facilities. Another \$2.6 million was saved by consolidating various administrative and maintenance functions at the large prison complexes in Kinross, Ionia and Jackson. Each complex includes several prisons and thousands of prisoners. Despite the increased burden on facilities from additional prisoners, each complex will be reduced to a single business office, warehouse, food service director, physical plant superintendent, master electrician and plumber.

Additional reductions include:

Delay reinstating public works program	\$1,500,000
Train 50 fewer new officers	819,000
Eliminate Project Joshua (to locate Wayne Cty. parole violators)	1,300,000
Decrease prisoner food costs	672,500
Discontinue athletic shoes for Level IV & V prisoners	408,100
Reduce parolee loan fund	115,000

The largest and most highly publicized savings come from facility closings. The closure of Southern Michigan Correctional Facility in Jackson, a cellblock at the Egeler Annex in Jackson and Camp Manistique in Munising affected 2,228 prisoners and 583 staff positions and collectively saved \$50.7 million. However, most of these savings were offset by related expenditures. The prisoners were not released; they were simply moved to other prisons where beds and staff had to be added. Similarly, Riverside Correctional Facility in Ionia was closed but the 136 year-old Michigan Reformatory, just a few blocks away, was re-opened. The total net savings from prison closings was 284 staff positions and \$13,845,700. The number of prisoner beds actually increased by 351.

The way in which beds are being added is a matter of concern. Thousands of lower security

prisoners live in open-bay cubicles where each person is supposed to have a bed, a desk and a locker. Originally designed for four people, these cubicles have long housed six. Last year, the number of prisoners per cubicle was raised to seven. This year it is being increased to eight. Furnishings have had to be rearranged and removed; the floor space available for movement within the cubicle has shrunk.

Although beds have been added, there has been no concomitant increase in common areas, such as bathrooms, chow halls, visiting rooms, libraries and recreation areas. Nor has there been any increase in available programs or work assignments. More restrictions on personal property have left prisoners with less access to hobbycraft and art supplies they purchase with their own money in order to spend their time productively.

Serious overcrowding, unrelieved by meaningful activities, inevitably causes tensions that can impact the safety of both prisoners and staff.

How other state budgets compare

Other parts of the state budget, which have their own pressures from increased employee and inflation-related costs, did not see comparable increases. Although the Department of Community Health will spend about \$600,000 more than last year, this is all from increased federal funds. General Fund spending for Community Health will actually decline by \$20 million. No one was eliminated from the Medicaid rolls, but cuts had to be made in other programs, including pregnancy prevention and hearing tests.

The Department of Human Services, with an overall budget increase of just 1.7%, has had to drastically reduce or revise some programs in order to make money available for others. Changes in eligibility requirements for the Family Independence Program are expected to save \$65 million. Welfare recipients have not seen an increase in payments in about 10 years. Nearly \$14 million will be aimed at finding permanent placements for children in foster care, but \$18 million will be cut from recipient allowances for day care services.

Because substantial cuts enacted in 2007 were incorporated in the 2008 budget, the effective funding increase for higher education is only 1%. Excluding payments delayed from 2007, at \$1.62 million, the General Fund appropriation for colleges and universities is \$373 million less than it is for corrections.

Colleges and universities must make up budget shortfalls by charging students. As recently as 1993, tuition and fees comprised 41% of the universities' operating revenues. Today they comprise 65%.

Although per pupil foundation allowances are increasing, the appropriation for K-12 school aid was basically unchanged. Middle school math and science programs will be cut by \$20 million.

Revenue sharing payments to local communities were frozen at last year's level. A steady erosion of revenue sharing has led to 1,600 fewer police on the street.

The Department of Environmental Quality, which exists to protect Michigan's air, water and land resources, had its budget cut 17%. If hunting and fishing license fees aren't raised, the Department of Natural Resources will have to eliminate 79 positions, close two fish hatcheries, cut programs like bovine tuberculosis reporting and close as many as 37 state parks.

The Senate Fiscal Agency analyzed the state's spending priorities over the last five years. Looking only at spending from state resources, it found:

	Dollar Change (in millions)	Percentage Increase from 2003-2008
Community Health	\$1,728.2	53.0%
Corrections	410.6	24.8
Human Services	168.5	14.0
K-12 School Aid	192.1	1.7
Community Colleges	8.0	2.6
Higher Education	49.6	2.7
Revenue Sharing	(177.0)	(14.2)
All other programs	(52.0)	(1.0)
Total State Spending	\$2,328.0	8.9%

(Continued on page 8 -- see Corrections)

Legislative experts tell CAPPs members:

Parole reform, cutting no. of prisoners challenging

About 70 CAPPs members who attended the November 2007 membership dinner in Lansing were urged not to underestimate their power to get laws changed. They were also warned that efforts to reduce the state's prison population will be difficult.

Erin Schor, legislative director for Rep. Paul Condino (D. Southfield), advised members to contact their legislators urging support of bills that would implement CAPPs' recommendations. Condino, who is chairperson of the House Judiciary Committee, is the lead sponsor of HB 4548, which would help enforce parole guidelines. (See story, page 1) He is also sponsoring HB 4964 to recreate the sentencing commission and HB 4402 to prohibit a sentence of life without parole when the crime was committed by someone younger than 18.

Speakers in addition to Schor were Noah



CAPPs Director Barbara Levine addresses annual membership meeting

Smith and Ellen Hoekstra of Capitol Services, Inc., a lobbying firm employed by CAPPs. Hoekstra and Smith worked with legislators to build bi-partisan support for reporting HB 4548 out of committee and will be working to get it voted out of the House in January.

All three speakers warned the membership of the difficulty of changing laws that impact the size of the state's prison system through increased releases.

Hoekstra said there is "increasing agreement in Lansing that the corrections budget is one of the major reasons there are insufficient funds for those kinds of programs that might prevent incarceration, but agreement on how the size of the budget should be reduced has definitely lagged."

Smith said House members seem to agree that changes should be made at the back end of the criminal justice system in order to reduce the prisoner population in the short term, as well as at the front end through sentencing reform and crime prevention efforts. However, Smith said, "The Senate has been saying that parole is not the way to reduce the state's prison population. They believe that people are in prison for a reason and we need to prevent this in the future by loading up the front end programs."



Erin Schor



Noah Smith

Even when they are voted out of the House, getting corrections reform bills through the Senate is difficult, Schor explained. So far, the Senate has chosen not to look at relatively uncontroversial

House-passed bills that would expedite the commutation process for people who are terminally ill (HB 4193) and expand the pool of people eligible for Special Alternative Incarceration [boot camp](HB 4184 and 4272).

Schor told CAPPs members that Condino and his staff “have a lot to do in his last 14 months in the House, but please understand that we would not have come anywhere near as far as we have if

it were not for you and for the information we get from CAPPs and from Capitol Services.”

Barbara Levine, executive director of CAPPs, said that efforts to improve parole objectivity and reduce the state’s prison population are difficult because they generate so much “negative emotion.” Elected officials fear for their jobs if they look soft on crime; residents in communities that depend on prisons fear job losses if facilities close; the public, stirred up by media coverage about high profile cases, fears an increase in crime; and corrections officials fear being blamed for releasing someone who commits a serious offense,” she observed.



Monica Jahner

“No matter how rational it seems to the people in this room...there is not yet an effort to reduce the current prison population significantly,” Levine said. “ ‘Containing prison growth’ means maintaining the status quo. We have to change the fundamental premise that having 51,000 people in prison is acceptable.”

The speakers stressed that resistance to reducing the state’s incarceration rate means CAPPs will have to focus more attention on the programs and services being cut or under-funded because of the growing MDOC budget. Levine asked members to point out the need for services to prevent crime, such as early childhood development, improved foster care, and substance abuse and mental health treatment, when they urge support of legislation such as HB 4548.

Numerous CAPPs members



David Moore, left, with John Perdue

(Continued on page 8 -- see Parole)

Parole reform, cutting no. of prisoners challenging

(Continued from page 7)

asked questions and made comments during a lengthy dialogue with the speakers. Among them were several people currently on parole.

Kennedith Martin, who was released in August 2007, said that many men remain in prison who could be safely released. "Prisoners call the parole board members gods," Martin noted, "because they are not accountable to anyone." He said the prison system's growth has become an economic issue. "Once you build the prison system up, it's going to demand to stay alive; it's going to have to be fed," he said.

Nick Lazin, a lifer who served 41 years before being paroled in July 2004, pointed out that early in his incarceration he had been allowed to drive state vehicles alone outside the security perimeter as part of his job, yet many years later was still considered too dangerous to release.

David Moore, paroled in March 2007, thanked CAPPs for its efforts to reform parole. "One year ago I was in Parnall praying to die because I have terminal cancer; I had four years of flops. If it weren't for you, I'd still be there or dead. CAPPs paved the way for my release," he said.

Monica Jahner, a parolable lifer who was released in April 2007, also praised the "awesome job" done by CAPPs and by prisoner advocacy groups like MI-CURE and the American Friends Service Committee. Thanking CAPPs

for its reports, prisoner profiles and its lifer video, Jahner said, "We just need to educate the public a little more that there really are a lot of people in prison who deserve a second chance."



Kennedith Martin, Valerie Benjamin and CAPPs Executive Director Barbara Levine.



Nick Lazin

Corrections spending tops \$2 billion

(Continued from page 5)

Thus corrections grew at nearly twice the rate of human services, nine times the rate of higher education and nearly 15 times the rate of aid to public schools. The dollar increase in corrections was the equivalent of the increases in human services, school aid and higher education combined. Had the growth in corrections spending been limited to "just" \$181 million, or 11% in five years, no cuts in revenue sharing or other state programs would have been required.

Given the nature of corrections expenditures, the MDOC budget will steadily increase even if the prisoner population stays the same. And under current policies, the population is likely to keep growing. Unless reforms are implemented that reduce the number of prisoners significantly, conditions in Michigan's overtaxed prisons will inevitably continue to worsen and other state services will continue to lose ground.

Parole guidelines bill moved to full House

(Continued from page 2)

point for defining “high probability of release” was set at 6.5 percent and the board returned to an 80% parole grant rate for people in this category, more than 5,000 beds and \$125 million could be saved.

Limited testimony was taken at the Dec. 5th committee hearing. CAPPs executive director Barbara Levine emphasized that HB 4548 is actually very conservative legislation designed to implement the legislature’s intent when parole guidelines were enacted in 1992. “Parole guidelines were designed to constrain the enormous discretion of parole board members, just as sentencing guidelines constrain the discretion of judges,” Levine explained. “The whole point of having a risk assessment tool is to promote objective decisions based on public safety. Failure to adhere to a clearly enforced definition of ‘substantial and compelling reasons’ for departing from the parole guidelines has resulted in decisions that often seem unsupported by the facts.” In addition, Levine said, “the steady decline in the parole rates of low-risk offenders has required thousands of additional beds with no proven benefit to the public.”

John Rubitschun, Deputy Director of Field Operations Administration, spoke on behalf of the Department of Corrections. Rubitschun said that the MDOC does not oppose appeals from parole denials, to the extent permitted by the bill, but does oppose recording parole interviews, citing cost and logistical concerns. The MDOC also opposes scoring the guidelines for parolable lifers.

Eaton County Prosecutor Jeffrey Sauter also testified, expressing general concern about any possibility the proposed amendments would weaken the board’s ability to protect the public against crimes committed by parolees. He also expressed

concern about the cost of appeals, noting that prior to 1999, when prisoners had the right to appeal parole denials, their success rate was very low.

Committee members pointed out that, given the per prisoner cost of incarceration, the cost of appeals could be offset by a relatively small increase in the number of paroles granted. Levine noted that the grounds for appeal would be much narrower than they had been previously, keeping the potential volume of appeals lower. In addition, people who get their first one-year continuances are unlikely to appeal, Levine suggested. She also

“The steady decline in the parole rates of low-risk offenders has required thousands of additional beds with no proven benefit to the public.”

observed that although the number of successful appeals had been small, a body of law had been developing when the right of prisoners to appeal was eliminated. Ultimately, Levine said, it is the parole board’s decision-making patterns that will determine the volume of appeals.

Anyone wishing to support HB 4548 should call, e-mail or write their representatives as soon as possible. More detailed information about contacting legislators is available at the CAPPs website, www.capps-mi.org.

MDOC intends to appeal

Parolable lifers win class action lawsuit

In an opinion and order issued Oct. 23, 2007, U.S. District Judge Marianne O. Battani granted summary judgment to the plaintiff class of parolable lifers and denied summary judgment to the parole board. *Kenneth Foster-Bey, et al v. John S. Rubitschun, et al*, No. 05-71318 (E.D. Mich.). Summary judgment is granted when “there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and...the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.” In plain English, the judge found from the depositions, affidavits, documents and data submitted by both parties that there was no real dispute about the facts that could lead a jury to find for the board. Therefore, a trial was unnecessary.

The Court proceeded to consider each side’s legal arguments and concluded that a combination of factors had resulted in a violation of the *ex post facto* clause of the United States Constitution. The *ex post facto* clause prohibits the enactment of laws that increase the punishment for a crime after its commitment. The Court considered the following changes that occurred after 1992: review every five years instead of every two, file reviews instead of personal interviews, the lack of written reasons for denial, elimination of the opportunity to appeal “no interest” decisions, and the substitution of an appointed board for the former civil service board.

The Court found that the old board treated lifers like people with long indeterminate sentences (LIDs), attempting to ensure that people with similar crimes, prior records and institutional backgrounds served similar amounts of time. Although, unlike lifers, LIDs would eventually pass their minimum sentences and could be paroled without judicial notice and a public hearing, their suitability for release was judged by the same substantive standard. The new board treats parolable lifers more like people serving mandatory life without parole, effectively implementing a “life means life” policy. The Court concluded that the new board failed to exercise its discretion by looking only at the seriousness of the offense and refusing to assess each lifer’s current risk based on post-sentencing factors.

To determine the impact of these changes on the likelihood of release, the court reviewed statistics gathered by CAPPs. [See *When “life” did not mean life: A historical analysis of life sentences imposed in Michigan since 1900*, CAPPs (Lansing, Sept. 2006).] The Court rejected parole board arguments that the raw number of lifers paroled each year had not changed much and considered how, as the pool of eligible lifers had grown over time, the proportion of lifers granted parole shrunk dramatically. From 1942-84, lifers were paroled at “a steady 5-15 percent rate, with the average time served steady at 15-18 years.” Under the new board, the annual rate declined to 0.15 percent and the average number of years served climbed to 23.2.

Although the old board paroled few lifers after 1984, that was due to growth in the prison population that overwhelmed the board’s resources. Lifers were placed on the back burner while people with indeterminate sentences were processed out. Thirty-nine lifers paroled by the new board from 1992-94 were actually “pipeline” cases that were initiated by the old board but not scheduled for public hearing. Based on the data, the Court concluded that the retroactive changes in the law had significantly disadvantaged the plaintiff class.

The Court has not yet ordered a remedy for the constitutional violation. It directed the parties to submit proposals that it will consider in late January. On behalf of the plaintiffs, Attorney Paul D. Reingold of the University of Michigan Clinical Law Program is urging the Court to implement a special lifer review panel to interview and assess all class members, beginning with those who have served the longest, under pre-1992 standards. The parole board maintains that the Court’s decision is incorrect and has said it plans to appeal.

Prints, originals still available

Prisoner art work sale benefits CAPPS

CAPPS is benefiting from the sale of original artwork -- watercolors, oils and pastels – and museum quality Giclee prints. The artist is Michigan prisoner Martin Vargas, who donated more than 30 pieces to CAPPS to raise money for operating expenses.

After an opening reception attended by about 200 people, the pieces were on exhibit throughout November and December at *A Simple Elegance*, an art gallery in Lansing’s Old Town district. Prints on canvas or fine art paper and some originals are still available at the gallery. Prints can also be ordered through CAPPS at its website: www.capps-mi.org. (See the left navigation panel, Art Exhibit Benefit).

The art show was conceived by gallery owner Richard Galosy after some of Vargas’ work was brought to him for reproduction.

In an article about the exhibit in the Lansing-based *City Pulse* newspaper, Galosy was quoted as saying: “I wanted people to realize, in an environment such as prison, there are those pots of gold. There are some people making a positive use of their time.” He said the show was not designed to make any statements but “to show the work of a true artist who happens to be a prisoner.”

Vargas’ works include portraits, highly realistic paintings of wildlife and pets, and a series of imaginative creatures called “Pudgies,” universal figures with no racial, ethnic, national or religious identity which Vargas says he designed to represent “basic human feelings common to us all.”

Vargas regularly exhibits work at the prisoner art show held annually at the University of Michigan by the Prison Creative Arts Program. He has previously donated numerous pieces to raise money for hurricane victims and other charitable causes.

For further information about purchases, contact CAPPS or:

A Simple Elegance Gallery
 317 E. Grand River Avenue
 Lansing, MI
 Hours: Tuesday - Saturday,
 11 a.m. - 6 p.m. & by appointment.
 Phone: 517.719.1913

A broad range of Vargas’ work can be viewed at www.martinvargasart.com

... *A Simple Elegance*
 Presents

Martin Vargas
 oils watercolors pastels

November 2007

Proceeds benefit Citizens Alliance on Prisons & Public Spending (CAPPS)

CAPPS
CITIZENS ALLIANCE ON
PRISONS & PUBLIC SPENDING

115 W. ALLEGAN STREET,
SUITE 401, LANSING, MI 48933

The Citizens Alliance on Prisons and Public Spending, a non-profit public policy organization, is concerned about the social and economic costs of prison expansion. Because policy choices, not crime rates, have caused our prison population to explode, CAPPS advocates re-examining those policies and shifting our resources to public services that prevent crime, rehabilitate offenders, and address the needs of all our citizens in a cost-effective manner.

Nonprofit org
US Postage Paid
Lansing, MI
Permit No. 20

Be part of the solution -- Join CAPPS

Citizens Alliance on Prisons and Public Spending Membership Form

CAPPS, 115 W. Allegan St., Suite 401, Lansing, MI 48933; Phone: (517) 482-7753;
Fax: (517) 482-7754; E-Mail: capps@capps-mi.org; Web site: www.capps-mi.org

My tax deductible contribution, payable to "CAPPS," is enclosed.

My membership category is:

- Prisoner — \$10 Student — \$10 Friend (individual/family) — \$25
 Supporter — \$50 Partner (individual/organization) — \$100
 Patron -- \$250 Benefactor -- \$500

Name: _____ Title: _____

Organization: _____

Address: _____

Phone: _____ Fax: _____ E-Mail: _____