the Director," which provides the heads of various
Federal agencies or initiatives with the opportunity
to communicate directly with the IACP membership. I
believe that an article from you, as Chair of the
National Prison Rape Elimination Commission, outlining
the work and goals of the Commission would be of great
interest to our membership.
I will be happy to answer any questions
that you may have.
CHAIRMAN WALTON: I'll try to get that
to you sometime in the near future, but I'm really
happy to see here -- as you may know, there was a
disconnect early on between -- I guess, as far as
communication was concerned, between our office and
your organization, and I do think that you play -- and
I am glad that you appreciate the fact that your
organization plays a significant role in this entire
issue. So I'm really happy to see you here.
MR. RONALD RUECKER: Yes, sir. Thank
you. We're happy to be here.
CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Brown, other than
individuals who head agencies, because of their
goodwill and their desire to do the right thing, or
for humanitarian reasons, what is the incentive for
organizations to become associated with your effort?
MR. JAMES BROWN: Our surveys found the number one reasons police chiefs do that is to provide the best possible service to their community. The number two reason seems to be being recognized for professional excellence, outstanding efforts. The number three reason seem to be liability reduction. And then you follow other lists of reasons, the Management Preparedness Program, Emergency Management Preparedness, review of policies and procedures, organizational change devices, et cetera. There is a number of those. But the primary first three or four are the reasons.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Is there anything we could do that you could think of that would be an enhanced incentive?

MR. JAMES BROWN: Well, we've been trying that, Your Honor, for about 30 years of trying to get more people involved, and it is a daunting program. And one of the first problems we have is, our program is really not for the small law enforcement agency, and the majority in the United States, the vast majority, numbers in the high 90s probably, are under 25 percent or in that particular area. And for our program to be particularly effective, an agency has to be complex, starts needing
multiple supervisors, different types of duties, responsibilities, so these kinds of things. It needs a certain amount of resources, and it needs, you know, leadership to do that. Do six farmers -- officers in the small Iowa town need this program? No, they don't. That's one of the big problems.

Another problem is, you have to get community support and you're launching a major initiative that really takes several years to accomplish. And a lot of CEOs don't see the risks. No one is pounding me to do that. To say we're going to get into accreditation and start this process off and invest into it and find it fails is not a career enhancer. So we tend, generally, to have the better and the best. We are an organizational change device and we have some that are a little bit troubled that get in the organization that want to use it to improve itself.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Does your organization reach that small police department level?

MR. RONALD RUECKER: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. As Mr. Brown said, the vast majority of police agencies in this country are very small police departments. And out of the 17,000-plus -- well, the IACP has about 21,000 members around the world. The
vast majority of those are in North America and the United States, but I would say that most police chiefs in this country belong to the IACP.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Do you know what percentage that is?

MR. RONALD RUECKER: I don't know, sir.

It -- I don't know.

COMMISSIONER KANEB: Mr. Ruecker or Ruecker?

MR. RONALD RUECKER: Ruecker. Sorry, you'll never get it from looking at the spelling.

COMMISSIONER KANEB: That's okay. My name is similarly difficult. And it's pronounced Kaneb.

You have a couple of paragraphs on strip searches and body cavity searches.

MR. RONALD RUECKER: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER KANEB: Barriers to doing them casually, and it all seems to hang together. But I see nothing in here about cross-sex strip searches and body searches. Is there something I'm missing?

MR. RONALD RUECKER: If I understand your question, is you're asking if this should be done by a same gender officer with the person that's arrested?
COMMISSIONER KANE: Yeah. I'm asking --

MR. RONALD RUECKER: That is our intent. My testimony overlooked it. I apologize.

But, certainly, we would not recommend opposite gender strip or body cavity searches.

COMMISSIONER KANE: Well, your testimony seems to relate to very specific recommendations. I mean, these are all recommendations for how to do it right. Is that correct?

MR. RONALD RUECKER: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER KANE: And, you know, I'll quote you. Articulate in the matter of strip searches, permitted only when there is articulate -- articulable, reasonable suspicion that a detainee or arrestee is concealing contraband that cannot be discovered by a pat down, et cetera, et cetera.

So I would -- I am surprised that when you get into that kind of clear language, you don't explicitly state that cross-gender searches are not to be done.

MR. RONALD RUECKER: Your point is taken. I'll -- I am going to research while we're sitting here the model policy that I attached, which
is the IACP's policy I was quoting from, to see if it
is more specific to your point. But I clearly have no
disagreement with you about that.

COMMISSIONER KANE: Thank you. And I
would ask that you let me know just what the policy
does say. This is -- this matter of -- of,
particularly, men being in charge of incarcerated
women, and also, in some cases, but to a much lesser
extent, women being in charge of incarcerated men, is
proving to be -- or at least it seems to us to be
problematic. And I believe one of the matters we're
going to address in our report and very probably in
standards is -- is this matter, not just in strip and
body cavity searches, but the whole question of
cross-gender supervision of incarcerated folks. So
thank you.

COMMISSIONER SMITH: John, one of the
things that I would add is just that in looking at the
model policy, on page 16, it indicates that a strip or
body cavity search may be performed if criteria for
the search meets the agency's policy and the search is
conducted in accordance with established agency
procedure. And the reality is, is that the procedure
around cross-gender supervision differs from agency to
agency, so this policy doesn't actually provide a
recommendation for same gender strip or pat searches.

MR. RONALD RUECKER: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SMITH: Okay.

COMMISSIONER KANEK: Well, we all go through TSA-operated screening devices in airports and they haven't gotten to strip searches yet, but they are careful about cross-gender pat downs.

MR. RONALD RUECKER: Yes. If I may make a comment back to that. In my -- in 31 years of law enforcement experience, a very great deal of which was as a police officer in the field, and having made hundreds and hundreds of arrests, I have never had occasion to conduct either of those type searches, and nor have I seen anyone else, in my own personal experience, conduct a cross-gender search of the type that you've discussed.

COMMISSIONER FELLNER: I wanted to first ask Mr. Brown, why hasn't CALEA adopted any standards with regard to rape? Prison rape, holding cell rape?

MR. JAMES BROWN: Well, we didn't even realize that it was, one, an issue, or that this Commission even existed until probably about a year ago. So what I anticipate is, once the Commission comes up with some types of guidelines, that CALEA
probably would do that. It probably would be a standard -- it might say something like, agency has a written directive regarding prison rape and policies and procedures that address training, supervision, and review. But I have to see what you come out with before we can draft up a standard. And in many cases in law enforcement -- and I spent 30 years on the road and in time 12 years, 13 years with CALEA, it's not an issue to most law enforcement folks. I was never really aware of any kinds of problems myself personally. There is the Bubba jokes, you know, about going to the state penitentiary type things, but the most that -- the cop on the field, with some shameful exceptions, I think it was -- in the early videotape here, is not an issue that was a priority. And now it's being brought forward and we will address it as appropriate.

COMMISSIONER FELLNER: Well, I am surprised and saddened to hear that your organization, one, didn't even know about the legislation for a year; but, two, that you didn't realize that inappropriate sexual activity by police is far more prevalent than just a few isolated cases and that you haven't taken steps. But I am glad to hear that you are planning to, and I hope you will be very proactive
in the future with your membership about this.

Remembering that it's not just inmate on inmate, but
it's also staff on inmate. And I think our view is
that it starts at the moment of arrest, somebody is in
the custody of the police.

I wanted to turn to you, Mr. Ruecker,
and ask, I noticed in your statement that you said
that Oregon has instituted a policy by which
investigations of allegations of assault are done by
the police and not the department. And I wonder --
for various reasons, to assure objectivity,
transparency, and I wondered if you could -- I think
we're probably going to have some hearings on
oversight and mechanisms, but since you're here, if
you could share with us a little bit about what have
been some of the -- how has that worked? What have
been some of the challenges, what are some of the
problems, what are some of the -- you've had some
experience with that now, so --

MR. RONALD RUECKER: Yes. Thank you.

Well, in the beginning, it basically was the police,
the state police, which in our state has
responsibility for investigating all crimes that occur
within state institutions, correctional institutions,
the state mental hospital, et cetera.
But it was a partnership of -- where people from the Department of Corrections, the state police, local prosecutors, and the department -- the Oregon Department of Justice came together to talk about, let's figure out how to set up some protocols that work for everybody. And things have changed over time as a result of prosecutor capacity to prosecute cases, not just inmate cases or institution cases, but all cases. There is a line under which the prosecutor says, I just don't have the resources to prosecute this crime. It's a crime, we all get that, but we can't go there. So that was obviously going to need to be part of the equation as we set up these protocols for investigating institution crimes, trying to make sure that, A, when an inmate or a staff member, for that matter, when a crime was alleged to have occurred inside the institution, what would be the procedures for making sure that that case gets reviewed promptly, that if there is an urgency where someone needs to be moved, that we get to that, that a detective gets assigned if that's the way it's going to go, or if it's not going to be investigated criminally and subsequently prosecuted criminally, then it gets promptly returned back to the Department of Corrections for them to deal with it in the best
way that they can, knowing that it's not going to be prosecuted. 
And it has worked really -- I think everybody involved would say it has worked very well. Probably the people -- the people I was closest to, we didn't get any more resources with which to conduct the investigations, so that's -- case management is a continuing problem. But I think in terms of evaluating the effectiveness of the protocols, it has worked very well. And I would be happy to -- I asked for -- I have a request in for a copy of the most recent version of those protocols, and I would be happy to supply it to the Commission when I get my hands on it when I get back home.

COMMISSIONER FELLNER: These are the model policies?

MR. RONALD RUECKER: No. This is the actual investigative protocol between the Oregon Department of Corrections, the State Police, and in the case of our only maximum security penitentiary is located in Salem, which is Marion County, it's the Marion County District Attorney, State Police, and DOC kind of three-legged protocol for how to investigate or how to handle these cases.

COMMISSIONER FELLNER: And are these
model policies used for prison investigations, for
example, of sexual assault if it's alleged in prison
as well as in other contexts?

MR. RONALD RUECKER: Yes, but I
think -- I'm not sure if I'm being clear. The model
policies that I've referred to in my packet are IACP
model policies.

COMMISSIONER FELLNER: Right. Right.

MR. RONALD RUECKER: I'm talking about
local protocols back home which --

COMMISSIONER FELLNER: Right. No, no,
no, I understood that. But would you use -- if you
were doing an investigation of a sexual assault in
Oregon, pursuant to that protocol, would you use the
IACP model policy and --

MR. RONALD RUECKER: You know -- I
think the answer to that is, no, only because, when
these protocols were developed, I don't think the
IACP's model policy existed and may not -- they may
not mesh exactly today. But I can -- that's something
I'm happy to make available to the people that are
working with those protocols now.

COMMISSIONER FELLNER: Well, if you --
I will exceed my time, but I think we would all
welcome if you felt like opining a bit more, perhaps
in written -- if you looked at the -- these are quite
detailed and, at first glance, seem to be quite
thorough. I would welcome your sense, as someone who
has done investigations in prisons, whether you think
these policies would work for prison investigations,
would you recommend them to be used in prison
investigations, or in what way might they need to be
tinkered with.

MR. RONALD RUECKER: Do you want me to
do that now?

COMMISSIONER FELLNER: If you know off
the top of your head --

MR. RONALD RUECKER: I really -- I
really have not considered the detail of these model
policies versus those protocols, and I hate to take
your time speculating.

COMMISSIONER FELLNER: Right. But
maybe you could send something in writing afterwards
and we could -- staff could follow up and talk with
you to get more information, because I think --

MR. RONALD RUECKER: Yes, I would be
more than happy to do that.

COMMISSIONER FELLNER: Great. Thank
you.

COMMISSIONER NOLAN: Thank you very
Mr. Ruecker, as -- in your role at the State Police, as you came up with investigations, to the prosecutors, certainly their resources and limitations is a significant factor. Did you also find a reluctance, I guess, to say, well, you know, they're in prison. What -- I mean, that theme sort of runs through some of the reluctance. Can you talk about some of the reluctance you had of spending resources prosecuting people that are already in prison?

MR. RONALD RUECKER: Yes. I'd be happy to comment on that. And my answer may surprise you. When -- given the history that -- that had been in Oregon prior to the time that I had a role in that part of the State Police's operation, I came into that job about 1990, or '91, really right on the heels of this Commission's report where there had been some work done and people were very sensitive to exactly that type of attitude. And when I came in, there was a very refreshing and very energized approach by all the parties involved, to say, you know, these -- that you're in prison doesn't mean that you should be subjected to criminal activity. That you're a prison official doesn't mean that you have any prerogative
whatever to take advantage of people. That you're a
prison employee doesn't mean that you have to be
subjected to -- a condition of your work shouldn't
mean that you have to get -- tolerate, you know, being
insulted by people or -- so we really went at it from
the standpoint of, look. Yes, it's a closed custody
situation, but if a crime occurs in there, it ought to
be investigated the same as any other crime, subject
to the limitations of resources that frustrate us all
inside and outside of the institution setting. And I
didn't really sense that. The prosecutor's office did
a wonderful job of taking the cases that really should
be prosecuted, in my view. They were prosecuted.
Including people that, you know, were already in
there, with occasionally someone that -- you know,
what are you going to do to somebody who is already
serving a mandatory life sentence? Well, if you're
the victim of a crime, you still want your justice.
And so I saw a couple of those cases get prosecuted.

So I think it was a very -- a very
healthy, very collaborative, and very respectful
environment. I was -- I was younger, pretty naive
about the whole thing. I didn't understand why
anybody would be treated any differently --

COMMISSIONER NOLAN: Right. They
wouldn't -- yeah.

MR. RONALD RUECKER: And I think I'm probably -- there are many others who would have a different experience than I had. But it was exactly what I thought it should have been.

COMMISSIONER NOLAN: Well, that's really encouraging. Was it the same district attorney the whole time while you were --

MR. RONALD RUECKER: All the time while I was there. He is no longer the D.A. now, but many of his senior staff -- I think that the current District Attorney is the senior member of the prior D.A.'s support staff and I have a -- I'm confident that things are --

COMMISSIONER NOLAN: And which county is that?

MR. RONALD RUECKER: Marion County.

COMMISSIONER NOLAN: Marion County.

Okay.

Thank you very much. That's really encouraging.

MR. RONALD RUECKER: You're welcome.

COMMISSIONER SMITH: Just -- I'm going to ask you a follow-up on Jamie's question about sort of the role of State Police in investigating incidents
in other institutional settings, so I want to focus on that.

Do you have any -- I understand that Oregon has a particularly kind of evolved relationship. Do you have any information about the experience or challenges in other jurisdictions where this occurs, where this arrangement occurs?

MR. RONALD RUECKER: I think I can only say that there is probably a great diversity of experiences. In most other things that I have come across in -- as a police chief or police executive, I've found that things are -- you know, they're not the same anywhere on just about any subject. So I don't have personal knowledge of whether this -- whether our situation in Oregon was particularly better than others or particularly worse. I can't imagine it was worse, but --

COMMISSIONER SMITH: Is that -- is that sort of undertaking to sort of look at the experience of other state police agencies in doing this kind of work a project that the International Association of Chiefs of Police might undertake or might think might be a useful thing to undertake?

MR. RONALD RUECKER: It's possible. It's also important to note that even the structure of
policing at the state level, law enforcement at the
state level around the country is not the same. In
Oregon, we have a State Police, which is Highway
Patrol, of course, but also of criminal investigations
and a great diversity of other services, the Emergency
Management, the Medical Examiner, et cetera. And
that's, by far, the anomaly in the West, where most
State Police functions are actually Highway Patrol,
and then you've got a Department of Public Safety that
oversees other things.

So there is a division of the IACP
called the State and Provincial Police Division, which
is the State Police and Highway Patrol administrators
throughout the U.S. and Canada. Actually, I'm going
there tonight to meet with those folks tomorrow and
the next day. Some of those people, and probably only
some of those people, would have similar investigative
responsibilities as I had as -- over the Oregon State
Police. There may be 20 or so states in the country
that could undertake such a thing. The rest of them
are not structured in such a way as to make it maybe
the best way to go about it.

COMMISSIONER SMITH: The reason that I
asked is because it would be very useful for the
Commission to kind of have that information. We have
information both from what we have received in terms
of testimony, but from our own experience working in
this area that that relationship is actually a really
useful relationship to many state DOCs in
investigating, and I have heard some sense that there
is some interest in sort of strengthening that and
trying to overcome some of those barriers, in
particular, some of the ones around resources that the
state police have in terms of investigating those
things.

MR. RONALD RUECKER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SMITH: Because,
certainly, we've heard from state DOCs that often
investigations in the institutional settings are not a
priority for state police.

MR. RONALD RUECKER: That's right. I'm
certain you've heard some of that. And I -- and to
respond, I would be happy -- and will -- I am going to
address them tomorrow morning. I will make your
comments known to them and see what kind of response I
get.

COMMISSIONER SMITH: Perfect.

COMMISSIONER AIKEN: Just a brief
comment, as well as a question. Yes, I have some
firsthand knowledge of the Oregon Department of
Corrections and their handling those issues that happen within the correctional environment and their dedication to ensure transparency in relationship to, this is what went wrong and this is what we did about it. And they were very forthwith in sharing that with other correctional agencies throughout the United States. And I had the occasion to come in and make an assessment in relationship to a critical event and it was very, very helpful. There was a successful prosecution, and I'm sure your office had something to do with that. It did not have a sexual connotation, however, but I was very well impressed.

The specific question, and this is to both of you, investigating in a correctional environment, I'm making an assumption that it is different than conducting an investigation in the community. And what, in your opinion, are some nuances or some issues that you would not normally be confronted with in the community that you are confronted with within the prison environment?

MR. JAMES BROWN: I can probably go first, Ron.

The CALEA part of this thing would be a relatively short-term thing. Something occurred with somebody who was just at the agency or the facility
for a couple of hours or two or three kind -- a day
type thing. So you don't have that normal prison
population, gang intimidation, we're going to get you
type thing. It would be an incident probably just
very specific. It would be a fairly straight up,
police kind of investigation, if the person would come
forward and what other people could testify to it. So
ours would be much less complicated.

MR. RONALD RUECKER: In my experience,
the biggest factor is -- is getting -- actually, you
know, getting witnesses to come forward is really
tough. When we go -- when the police officer goes
into the institution to conduct an investigation,
there is an amazing awareness throughout that facility
of -- that the police are in the building some place,
who they're talking to, how long they talked to this
person, how long they talked to that person. These
are real obstacles because people are concerned for
their safety after the interview. And it's tough.
It's real tough.

I had occasion -- a very notable
investigation where a murder actually occurred inside
the penitentiary, and in the circumstances in which it
occurred, it -- there were 70 or 80 people in the same
room --
COMMISSIONER FELLNER: And nobody saw --

MR. RON RUECKER: -- a room twice the size of this room, 70 or 80 people in there, and it took us a month to start figuring out who actually saw something -- I mean, obviously, they all didn't -- everyone didn't see it. But the idea that nobody saw it didn't flush either. So that's the biggest challenge, and other dynamics that spin off of that.

COMMISSIONER AIKEN: And just one quick follow up. And I'm assuming that barrier or obstacle, to which I concur with you, is evident when you're conducting, for example, a murder of a fellow inmate. Now, is it more intense or less intense when there are inquiries related to practices of staff?

MR. RONALD RUECKER: I'm not sure if I could quantify more or less intense. It's a different dynamic. But, again, I think that -- and I have to also say that my role in the investigation of these crimes was from an oversight role. I was a lieutenant with squads of people going to do this and that, so I didn't personally conduct the interviews of the people. But we have prosecuted staff from the institution, in both the correctional institution and from a mental health institution, and that -- the
dynamic then switches to sort of the -- within the peer group of the staff, labor organizations and others that want to step forward and have some say in how the investigation occurs. But it can be successfully done, it has been successfully done. And in the case, I -- my investigative team, in the case of this mental health institution, called a training center, ultimately resulted in -- this was -- just staff -- it wasn't -- well, I guess on a couple of occasions it was sexual. Mostly not. Just mistreatment of these clients. We ultimately prosecuted 11 people, 11 staff members out of this training facility, which no longer operates, by the way. So it's a different dynamic. I'm not sure about how -- if there was any -- I would suspect there would be less reluctance of the witnesses to come forward where the staff was the accused, but I don't exactly know that.

COMMISSIONER FELLNER: Just a quick follow up on, given the difficulty, people don't like to come forward. Our experience is that you have problems -- I mean, a lot of obstacles to good investigations, whether the alleged perpetrator is staff or another inmate. I wondered what both of you think in terms of requiring or strongly pushing for
more surveillance cameras? If, in that room, you
would have had surveillance cameras all around, some
of your investigation would have been a lot easier.

MR. RONALD RUECKER: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER FELLNER: Or at least you
could say, you were sitting next to the guy, how could
you not have seen something. And similarly, in
lock-ups, where you have such a mobile population,
what is your thought, what is your experience with
surveillance cameras, and is it something you think we
as Commissioners should be pressing for more of them
everywhere?

MR. RONALD RUECKER: I'll do it quickly
first and then defer to Jim.

The camera technology today, whether
in-car cameras, you know, within a police car, in a
police facility, in a correctional facility, this
technology is very, very good for everybody. I think
more of it is better. I'm not going to go to, you
know, inviting, you know, more requirements, but I
think that -- I think that this technology is great
stuff. It certainly would have made a lot of these
investigations a lot more efficient if we had had some
of that technology in those days, but we did not.

MR. JAMES BROWN: The camera is a great
idea. Many places already have it, to kind of do an 
extra visual on the cell range or what is going on in 
there, and we allow that as a partial supervision 
device. More cameras, I think, would be effective, 
especially if there is a requirement that they take 
recordings, and these recordings be held for something 
like 30 days. Otherwise, it's not. I also hold a 
certification with ASIS, a private -- the American 
Society for Industrial Security. And they have found 
that the placement of cameras -- I'm talking about in 
lobbies and on street corners -- has a great impact in 
reducing crime, but up to a point. And then when all 
of a sudden you get too many people, they don't seem 
to care that the cameras are there. You can still use 
them later as an investigative aid, but for somehow -- 
a few people, cameras really cut it down; a lot of 
people, they'll still do it, but you're able to figure 
out what happened.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Any other questions?

If not, again, we thank both of you for 
your presence and your testimony. And we can -- we 
look forward to continuing to work with you. Thank 
you.

The next panel starts at 11:30, so 
we'll take a short break.
COMMISSIONER FELLNER: Mr. Ruecker,

before you go, I just -- some of the Commission --
some of the members of the Commission and some of the
staff will be going to Oregon in a few weeks to go to
some facilities. And, actually, I am sufficiently
intrigued by -- I hope, if you're in town, we might be
able to schedule a time to talk with you to follow up
on some of the -- your Oregon-specific work that you
have done.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Let's take about a
seven-minute recess.

MR. RONALD RUECKER: I look forward to
that and I know you all have my contact information.

(RECESS.)

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We'll start with our
next panel. We have two witnesses, Mr. Jamie Fields,
and Ms. Andrea Richter -- I'm sorry -- Ritchie. This
panel will focus on the operations, again, of police
lock-ups and, also, conditions of confinement.

I would ask the two witnesses to please
stand and take the oath.

(Witnesses sworn in.)

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Fields, if you
could just indicate who you are, and then we'll have
Ms. Ritchie do the same thing.
MR. JAMIE FIELDS: Yes. My name is Jamie Fields. I'm a Deputy Chief with the Detroit Police Department. I'm responsible for Risk Management Bureau, which includes the Training Bureau, it includes the Office of Civil Rights, and Legal Department, and Holding Cell Compliance Committee.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Thank you for being here.

MS. ANDREA RITCHIE: Good morning, Commissioners. My name is Andrea Ritchie and I've been asked to testify today about women's experiences of sexual violence in police department lock-ups. And my testimony is based on my experience as research expert and co-author for Amnesty International's report "Stonewalled - The Police Abuse and Misconduct Against Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender People in the U.S."; my preparation of a report on torture and other human rights violations by law enforcement agents in the U.S.; the U.N. Committee Against Torture and the U.N. Human Rights Committee; my own experiences as a police misconduct attorney in New York City; and my own research over the past decade on physical and sexual abuse of women by law enforcement agents.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Thank you for your
Mr. Fields.

MR. JAMIE FIELDS: Yes. I would like to thank you for the opportunity to appear today on behalf of the Detroit Police Department and Chief of Police Ella Bully-Cummings. The Detroit Police Department is heartened that the Prison Rape Elimination Act shows a high level government recognition of the problem of prison rape. We applaud the development of national uniform standards and guidelines addressing the prevention, reduction and punishment of rape or sexual assault occurring to persons within a correctional setting. Although the Act limits the Attorney General's discretion in issuing standards by requiring that the final rule not "impose substantial additional costs" on prison systems, we are hopeful that any additional standards or guidelines would be accompanied by corresponding funding and/or resources required.

It appears that the main focus of the Act is the collection of data. That, in and of itself, is a laudable and worthwhile goal because the lack of quantifiable data and research as to the depth and the scope of the problem in police lock-ups leads to difficulty for local jurisdictions in designing