

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EAST ST. LOUIS DIVISION**

JANIAH MONROE, MARILYN MELENDEZ,)
LYDIA HELENA VISION,)
SORA KUYKENDALL, and SASHA REED,)

Plaintiffs,)

- vs-)

No. 18-156-NJR-MAB

MELVIN HINTON, ROB JEFFREYS,)
and STEVE MEEKS,)

Defendants.)

**DEFENDANTS’ RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS’ MOTION
FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION**

The Defendants, MELVIN HINTON, ROB JEFFREYS, and STEVE MEEKS, by and through their attorney, Kwame Raoul, Attorney General for the State of Illinois, provide the following response in opposition to Plaintiffs’ motion for class certification [d/e 124]:

Introduction

Plaintiffs are inmates in the custody of the Illinois Department of Corrections. The named Plaintiffs are transgender women, who seek to represent “*all* prisoners in the custody of IDOC who have requested from IDOC evaluation [or] treatment for gender dysphoria.” [d/e 124, p. 38, emphasis added in italics].

The Plaintiffs have moved to certify a class that would be defined as quoted above. [d/e 124]. Plaintiffs’ motion for class certification should be denied. Plaintiffs’ motion is long, but fails to meet the prerequisites set forth in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23. Plaintiffs seek only equitable relief in this action. In their complaint, Plaintiffs requested injunctive relief to enjoin Defendants “from subjecting Plaintiffs and the Plaintiff Class to the illegal and

unconstitutional conditions, acts, omissions, policies, and practices” set forth in the complaint. [d/e 1, p. 37, ¶ c.]. Plaintiffs also requested relief in the form of “a plan to eliminate the substantial risk of serious harm” that Plaintiffs and putative class members suffer. [d/e 1, p. 37, ¶ d.]. They have also sought a preliminary injunction, which also seeks broad relief as discussed in separate filings. [d/e 123 & 143]. But, no injunction entered against IDOC may be entered in a fair manner to bind all inmates who would be part of the proposed class. There is significant overlap between the motion at hand and Plaintiffs’ motion for preliminary injunction. [*Compare* d/e 123 *with* d/e 124]. Defendants will not restate the facts presented in their response to Plaintiffs’ motion for preliminary injunction, but will incorporate those facts for general background [*see* d/e 143, pp. 3-7], and will provide specific citations where appropriate.

For the reasons argued below, Plaintiffs’ motion for class certification should be denied.

Argument

A class action is an exception to the usual rule that only a named party can have his or her claims adjudicated. *Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Dukes*, 564 U.S. 338, 348-49 (2011), *quoting Califano v. Yamasaki*, 442 U.S. 682, 700-701 (1979). A party seeking to certify a class action must meet all of the necessary elements of Rule 23. Fed. R. Civ. P. 23. First, the movant must show the putative class satisfies the four prerequisites of Rule 23(a). *Oshana v. Coca-Cola Co.*, 472 F.3d 506, 513 (7th Cir. 2006); *Rosario v. Livaditis*, 963 F.2d 1013, 1017 (7th Cir. 1992). Then, the action must qualify under at least one of the three subsections of Rule 23(b). Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b); *Rosario*, 963 F.2d at 1017.

A party seeking class certification bears the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that each of these requirements under Rule 23 has been met. *Gen. Tel. Co. of the Sw. v. Falcon*, 457 U.S. 147, 162 (1982); *Bell v. PNC Bank, Nat’l Ass’n*, 800 F.3d 360, 373 (7th Cir.

2015). “Before deciding whether to allow a case to proceed as a class action, therefore, a judge should make whatever factual and legal inquiries are necessary under Rule 23.” *Szabo v. Bridgeport Mach., Inc.*, 249 F.3d 672, 676 (7th Cir. 2001).

I. Plaintiffs fail to meet the prerequisites listed in Rule 23(a).

Rule 23(a) lists four prerequisites that must be met: (1) numerosity, (2) commonality, (3) typicality, and (4) adequacy of representation. Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a). Plaintiffs cannot meet all of these prerequisites. As argued below, Plaintiffs will be unable to establish that there is sufficient commonality, because any assessment of the facts or liability will necessarily involve individualized review. Plaintiffs do not meet their burden with respect to the numerosity prong. Plaintiffs also fail to establish that their claims are typical of that of the proposed class. Finally, Plaintiffs cannot establish that they are adequate representatives for the proposed class.

A. The class claims fail the commonality analysis because there is no single answer that will resolve a central issue to all class members’ claims.

Plaintiffs cannot meet the crucial commonality prong. To assess whether the class is sufficiently cohesive to satisfy the commonality prong under Rule 23(a)(2), a court must conduct a ‘rigorous analysis’ to determine whether the evidence and law support plaintiffs’ theory. *Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*, 564 U.S. at 349, n. 5. The commonality analysis will often overlap with plaintiffs’ merits contentions. *Id.* at 349-50. Courts are not simply applying a pleading standard; instead a prospective class must be prepared to prove that there are *in fact* common questions of law or fact. *Id.* at 350-51 (emphasis in original text). Because the purpose of Rule 23 is efficiency, class certification under Rule 23 is appropriate only when a large number of plaintiffs share similar potentially viable claims whose “truth or falsity” can be resolved one way or another “in one stroke,” making a single suit more efficient than multiple ones *Id.* at 350.

The Seventh Circuit, following the decision in *Wal-Mart*, has stated that to satisfy the Rule 23(a)(2) prong, all class members' claims must "share some question of law or fact that can be answered *all at once* and that the *single answer* to that question will resolve a central issue in all class members' claims." *Jaime S. v. Milwaukee Public Schools*, 668 F.3d 481, 497 (7th Cir. 2012); *see also Suchanek v. Sturm Foods, Inc.*, 764 F.3d 750, 756 (7th Cir. 2014), *quoting Wal-Mart*, 564 U.S. at 350 ("What matters to class certification is the capacity of a class wide proceeding to generate common answers apt to drive the resolution of the litigation.").

For Eighth Amendment deliberate indifference claims, the Seventh Circuit has recognized two categories: (1) isolated instances of indifference to a particular inmate's needs, or (2) claims of systemic deficiencies rendering the treatment constitutionally inadequate for all. *Phillips v. Sheriff of Cook County*, 828 F.3d 541, 554 (7th Cir. 2016). In *Phillips*, current and former detainees of Cook County Jail filed a putative class action claiming that the dental treatment they received at the jail violated their rights under the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments. 828 F.3d at 543. The district court originally certified two classes of plaintiffs, but then decertified one of the classes and subsequently determined the motion for injunctive relief was moot. *Id.* The Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals upheld the class decertification based on the "lack of a common issue of fact or law." *Id.* at 543-44. This was based on a finding that the claims at issue there were best characterized as claims of isolated instances of indifference to a particular detainee's medical needs. *Id.* at 554. Although dental treatment for all detainees was at issue, the detainees each presented a different situation, involving different types of dental issues, over different periods of time, involving different medical professionals and prison staff, and concerning different alleged deficiencies in the treatment process. *Id.* at 555. The Seventh Circuit Court was unwilling to agree that delay claims could be appropriate for a class

determination. *Id.* at 555-56. Because the assessment of a delay claim varies depending on each individual's circumstances, liability must be determined on an individual basis. *Id.* (“These questions can only be answered by looking at the unique facts of each detainee’s case”).

Similarly, in this matter as in *Phillips*, much of the Plaintiffs’ case focuses on delay of treatment. The named Plaintiffs complain of delays in receiving hormone therapy, delays in receiving gender-affirming clothing, etc.¹ But, each alleged delay must be reviewed in the context of the individual claims. Delay that is tolerable in one context may not be tolerable in another. *See Phillips*, 828 F.3d at 554, *quoting McGowan v. Hulick*, 612 F.3d 636, 640 (7th Cir. 2010) (“We have previously held that when assessing deliberate indifference claims, a delay in medical treatment ‘is not a factor that is either always, or never, significant. Instead, the length of delay that is tolerable depends on the seriousness of the condition and the ease of providing treatment.’”) As noted in a separately filed response, the delays at issue with these Plaintiffs may not be sufficient alone to rise to the level of an Eighth Amendment violation. [d/e 143, pp. 10-11]. It is even more difficult to tell based on putative class members’ experiences. The evidence cited in Plaintiffs’ motion and exhibits is very general, referencing “many” or “vast majority” without specific factual bases or numbers. [d/e 124]. Yet, each patient is different, and questions about the way hormones are administered or whether surgery is appropriate for a given patient are fact-dependent and may not be answered in one fell swoop.

This matter is distinguishable from that presented in *Lacy v. Cook County*, 897 F.3d 847 (7th Cir. 2018). There, the Seventh Circuit found that there was sufficient commonality for a class of wheelchair-bound inmates to proceed. *Id.* at 865-66. The Court noted that the class members shared a common physical impairment—one that was obvious (they were all confined

¹ As Defendants point out in their response to Plaintiffs’ motion for preliminary injunction, the named Plaintiffs all receive hormone therapy and some gender-affirming clothing. [d/e 143, pp. 17-18].

in wheelchairs when attending court); they faced common physical barriers and noncompliant bathroom facilities, and they sought common modifications in the form of mandatory policies for assistance going up steep ramps and escorting them to ADA-compliant restrooms. *Id.* at 865-66. By contrast, this case involves matters that are individualized and specific to each Plaintiff and each putative class member. The circumstances presented here are deeply personal and not at all obvious or easily fixed by bright-line rules.

Plaintiffs contend that “[g]ender dysphoria is not a novel medical condition, nor its treatment unknown or untested.” [d/e 124, p. 7]. Such an argument ignores the evolving nature of gender dysphoria and potential treatments. “Gender identity” may be a “well-established concept in medicine,” *see* Decl. of Ettner at d/e 124-1, p. 5, ¶ 13; but “Gender Dysphoria” has not always been an established diagnosis. Plaintiffs’ proffered expert, Dr. Randi Ettner, provides some historical background in her declaration, filed along with the Plaintiffs’ motion. [d/e 124-1, pp. 5-9]. According to Dr. Ettner, the diagnosis of “Gender Identity Disorder” was “introduced” by the American Psychiatric Association in 1980. [de 124-1, p. 5, ¶ 16]. That diagnosis was later removed (in 2013) and replaced with Gender Dysphoria. [de 124-1, p. 5, ¶ 17]. This was not simply a change in name, but the “new diagnostic term was based on *significant changes* in the understanding of the condition of individuals whose birth-assigned sex differs from their gender identity.” [de 124-1, p. 5, ¶ 17, emphasis in italics added]. Dr. Ettner also states that “the medical research that supports the Gender Dysphoria diagnosis has evolved.” [de 124-1, p. 7, ¶ 20]. This is echoed by IDOC 30(b)(6) representative, Dr. Puga, who testified: “This is an evolving topic and evolving issue in our department.” [d/e 143-4, at dep. pp., 76-77]. At this point, it has not been clear that there is one right answer or correct manner of treatment for gender dysphoria.

An “illegal policy might provide the ‘glue’ necessary to litigate otherwise highly individualized claims as a class.” *Phillips*, 828 F.3d at 551, *quoting Jamie S v. Milwaukee Public Schools.*, 668 F.3d 481, 498 (7th Cir. 2012). But, an illegal policy is different from complaints of systemic failures. *Jamie S.*, 668 F.3d at 498. Here, there is no illegal policy in place. [See d/e 143]. Plaintiffs contend that the policy concerning sex reassignment surgery amounts to a *de facto* rule of refusing to permit surgical treatment [d/e 124, p. 20]; however, as noted previously by Defendants, it is neither medically nor legally established that surgery is a necessary or effective treatment for gender dysphoria. [d/e 143, pp. 17-18, *quoting Gibson v. Collier*, 920 F.3d 212, 222-23 (5th Cir. 2019)]. It is clear that there is no illegal policy in place within IDOC. Plaintiffs’ complaints in this suit necessarily involve individualized determinations that are not appropriate for class certification.

B. Plaintiffs do not meet their burden with respect to the numerosity requirement.

The Northern District of Illinois has stated: “Numerosity does not rest on any magic number.” *Arenson v. Whitehall Convalescent & Nursing Home, Inc.*, 164 F.R.D. 659, 663 (N.D. Ill. Feb. 28, 1996). Numerosity cannot be established by relying solely on numbers, there must also be some showing that the numbers estimated for the class would be backed by legitimate claims. *Marcial v. Coronet Ins. Co.*, 880 F.2d 954, 957 (7th Cir. 1989) (plaintiffs failed to prove numerosity where they only speculated as to who would have legitimate claims against defendant). Because Plaintiffs fail to establish that there are sufficient members with legitimate claims, and for whom joinder would be impractical, Plaintiffs do not meet their burden with respect to the numerosity requirement.

IDOC tracks “Transgender Population Totals By Facility.” (See attached Exhibit 1, with inmate names and numbers redacted for filing). As of March 28, 2019, IDOC identified a total

of 89 inmates who were confirmed to fall under the definition of “transgender,” and 26 inmates who were identified as “pending.” (Ex. 1). This amounts to a total of 115 transgender inmates in IDOC as of the end of March 2019. Seventy of those were receiving hormones. (Ex. 1). But, this does not mean that 115 inmates would necessarily have claims to bring individual suits related to their own treatment. A great number of the transgender inmates receive hormone therapy (70), so it would only be the remaining inmates who could challenge a continuing denial for prescription of hormones. Thus, this Court cannot presume that a number of 100+ inmates necessarily means that joinder of suits would be impractical. Further, there is no indication on the record that that many inmates would want to join in *this* suit particular suit.

Based on the relief sought, and the particularities of each individual, it cannot be presumed that numerosity is met here. Moreover, because these Plaintiffs seek only equitable relief in this action, it could be possible that any Plaintiffs and/or class members could file separate damages actions. Proceeding as a class here would not preclude separate actions. For the reasons, explained here and elsewhere in this response, class certification is inappropriate.

C. The class claims fail to meet the typicality requirement because the named Plaintiffs cannot show their claims share the essential characteristics of the group at large.

The typicality requirement of Rule 23(a)(3) focuses on whether the named representatives' claims have the same essential characteristics as the claims of the class at large. It is not correct for Plaintiffs to argue that the typicality is “presumed also to be met” if the commonality requirement is met. [d/e 124, p. 24]. Although the commonality and typicality prongs tend to merge, they are still separate elements that must be met under Rule 23.

“A plaintiff's claim is typical if it arises from the same event or practice or course of conduct that gives rise to the claims of other class members and his or her claims are based on

the same legal theory.” *Retired Chicago Police Ass'n v. City of Chicago*, 7 F.3d 584, 596–97 (7th Cir. 1993); *De La Fuente v. Stokely–Van Camp, Inc.*, 713 F.2d 225, 232 (7th Cir. 1983). In other words, proof of the named plaintiffs’ claims must prove the claims of any other class member. *Id.* “Even though some factual variations may not defeat typicality, the requirement is meant to ensure that the named representative’s claims have the same essential characteristics as the claims of the class at large.” *Oshana*, 472 F.3d at 514 (internal quotations omitted); *see also Arreola v. Godinez*, 546 F.3d 788, 798 (7th Cir. 2008).

These named Plaintiffs appear to have shared experiences; however, that does not mean that their background or treatment within IDOC is typical of that of all IDOC prisoners. The comparisons in the evidence submitted by Plaintiffs lack the type of specificity needed to establish that these Plaintiffs have suffered experiences typical of the group at large. Plaintiffs make only generalizations about putative class members, using terms like “many” or “vast majority” without giving specific data to compare the typicality of their claims. [*See, e.g.*, d/e 124, p. 40 & Ettner Decl. at d/e 124-1, p. 37, ¶ 126]. It cannot be assumed that every inmate diagnosed with, or otherwise falling under the definition of, gender dysphoria wants to have sex reassignment surgery or the other items sought by these Plaintiffs. Accordingly, Plaintiffs cannot show that their claims are typical of the group at large.

D. Plaintiffs fail to establish that the representative parties will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class.

Rule 23(a)(4) requires a showing that “the representative parties will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(4). In many cases, “the typicality requirement “merges with the further requirement that the class representative ‘will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class.’” *CE Design Ltd. v. King Architectural Metals, Inc.*, 637 F.3d 721, 724 (7th Cir. 2011).

This suit presently involves five named Plaintiffs who were born biologically male but identify as female. Based on the declarations, complaint, and motions filed on their behalf, the named Plaintiffs all appear to want the same or similar relief. As Defendants addressed in their response to Plaintiffs’ motion for preliminary injunction, they are actually barred by the Eleventh Amendment and Prison Litigation Reform Act from seeking much of the relief they request. [d/e 143, pp. 14-19].

It is logical that these five Plaintiffs could proceed as a group; however, they do not represent the views of all other potential class members. The named Plaintiffs are compared to each other—not to other putative class members. This ignores a wide range of variation. They completely disregard and have no named representative who was born female but identifies as male. They have presented no putative class member who has gender dysphoria but chooses not to receive hormone treatment. Absent a representative with a differing viewpoint, they cannot fairly and adequately represent those interests. This means that these particular representatives cannot adequately protect the interests of “*all* prisoners in the custody of IDOC who have requested from IDOC evaluation [or] treatment for gender dysphoria” as they wish to define the class.

For these reasons, Plaintiffs fail to meet the prerequisites mandated by Rule 23(a).

II. There is no action or refusal to act that warrants the imposition of a class, nor is there adequate basis for class-wide relief, pursuant to Rule 23(b)(2).

A case may be certified as a class action for equitable relief under rule 23(b)(2) where “the party opposing the class has acted or refused to act on grounds that apply generally to the class, so that final injunctive relief or corresponding declaratory relief is appropriate respecting the class as a whole.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(2). Defendants have already argued that there is no basis for injunctive relief, because there is no unlawful act by these Defendants. [d/e 143].

Yet, there is an additional component to this analysis. Because the injunctive relief sought must be final to the whole class, there can be no variation in any injunction called for to the class. As the Supreme Court explained:

claims for *individualized* relief . . . do not satisfy the Rule. The key to the (b)(2) class is the indivisible nature of the injunctive or declaratory remedy warranted—the notion that the conduct is such that it can be enjoined or declared unlawful only as to all of the class members or as to none of them. In other words, Rule 23(b)(2) applies only when a single injunction or declaratory judgment would provide relief to each member of the class. It does not authorize class certification when each individual class member would be entitled to a *different* injunction or declaratory judgment against the defendant.

Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., 564 U.S. at 360-61 (emphasis in original, internal quotation and citation omitted).

In their complaint, Plaintiffs have sought general injunctive relief. This has been expressed a little more in-depth through Plaintiffs’ motion for preliminary injunction. [d/e 123]. However, there is still nothing specific that could be imposed that would provide relief to each member of the class—nothing that could provide relief to “all of the class members or as to none of them.” *See, supra*. This results, in part, from the individualized nature of each claim that could be presented; but also because of the necessarily individualized relief that should be given to any individual patient. In asking for generic, one-size-fits-all relief, Plaintiffs ignore the obvious fact that difficult medical decisions cannot be made in such a manner without greater risk of harming any one patient.

Under controlling law, Plaintiffs’ claims are not amenable to class-wide injunctive relief. For these reasons, these named Plaintiffs cannot represent a class for injunctive relief.

Conclusion

In summary, Plaintiffs fail to meet the requirements for a class action under Rule 23. Plaintiffs do not meet the four prerequisites listed under Rule 23(a). There is no commonality in this case, because it necessarily requires individualized assessment. There is also insufficient evidence of numerosity, typicality, and commonality. Moreover, this is not the type of action contemplated as a class under Rule 23(b)(2).

WHEREFORE, Defendants respectfully request that this Court deny Plaintiffs' motion for class certification.

Respectfully submitted,

ROB JEFFREYS, MELVIN HINTON, and
STEVE MEEKS,

Defendants,

KWAME RAOUL, Attorney General
State of Illinois

Attorney for Defendants,

By: s/Lisa A. Cook
Lisa A. Cook

Christopher Higgerson, #6256085
Lisa A. Cook, #6298233
Assistant Attorney General
500 South Second Street
Springfield, Illinois 62701
(217) 557-0261 Phone
(217) 524-5091 Fax
Email: lcook@atg.state.il.us

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EAST ST. LOUIS DIVISION**

JANIAH MONROE, MARILYN MELENDEZ,)
EBONY STAMPS, LYDIA HELENA VISION,)
SORA KUYKENDALL, and SASHA REED,)

Plaintiffs,)

- vs-)

No. 18-156-NJR-MAB

MELVIN HINTON, ROB JEFFREYS,)
and STEVE MEEKS,)

Defendants.)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on June 14, 2019, the foregoing document, **Defendants' Response to Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification**, was electronically filed with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to the following:

John A. Knight	jknight@aclu.il.org
Catherine L. Fitzpatrick	cfitzpatrick@kirkland.com
Erica B. Zolner	ezolner@kirkland.com
Ghirlandi Guidetti	gguidetti@aclu.il.org
Megan M. New	mnew@kirkland.com
Sydney L. Schneider	Sydney.schneider@kirkland.com
Jordan M. Heinz	jheinz@kirkland.com
Cameron N. Custard	cameron.custard@kirkland.com
Sarah Jane Hunt	sarahjane@tkennedylaw.com
Thomas E. Kennedy, III	tkennedy@tkennedylaw.com
Brent P. Ray	brent.ray@kirkland.com
Samantha G. Rose	sam.rose@kirkland.com
Austin B. Stephenson	austin.stephenson@kirkland.com
Carolyn M. Wald	cwald@aclu-il.org

s/ Lisa A. Cook

Lisa A. Cook, #6298233
Assistant Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General
500 South Second Street
Springfield, Illinois 62701
(217) 557-0261 Phone
(217) 524-5091 Fax
Email: lcCook@atg.state.il.us

EXHIBIT 1

Illinois Department of Corrections
Transgender Population Totals By Facility
March 28, 2019

	Confirmed	Pending	Receiving Hormones
Dixon	12	2	9
East Moline	2	1	1
Hill	2	0	2
Sheridan	0	0	0
Stateville	2	0	2
Stateville NRC	0	1	0
Danville	5	0	3
Decatur	0	0	0
Graham	1	0	1
Illinois River	6	0	5
Jacksonville	1	0	1
Lincoln	1	0	1
Logan	5	2	4
Pontiac	14	1	9
Taylorville	0	0	0
Western Illinois	6	1	5
Big Muddy	4	1	3
Centralia	5	0	4
Lawrence	9	0	8
Menard	3	0	2
Pinckneyville	4	15	4
Robinson	3	2	3
Shawnee	4	0	3
Southwestern IL	0	0	0
Vandalia	0	0	0
Vienna	0	0	0
Murphysboro	0	0	0
Kewanee	0	0	0
Total:	89	26	70

Dixon Correctional Center
Transgender Population
March 28, 2019

<u>Offender Name</u>	<u>IDOC #</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Race</u>	<u>Confirmation Status</u>	<u>Receiving Hormones</u>	<u>Date Started Hormones</u>	<u>Parent Facility/Status</u>	<u>Restrictive Housing</u>	<u>Housing Assignment</u>	<u>Additional Comments</u>	<u>MSR</u>
██████████	██████	9/11/1981	Black	unconfirmed	No	NA	Dixon	No	DXP		8/23/2046
██████████	██████	3/2/1978	Caucasian	Confirmed	Yes	Prior to incarceration	Dixon	Yes	GP		11/25/2026
██████████	██████	9/16/1989	Black	Confirmed	Yes	approved 2/4/19	Dixon	Yes	GP		5/21/2020
██████████	██████	5/16/1985	Black	Confirmed	Yes	3/6/2018	Dixon	No	GP		7/6/2020
██████████	██████	#####	Black	Confirmed	Yes	1/23/2019	Dixon	No	GP		5/29/2020
██████████	██████	6/22/1990	Caucasian	Confirmed	Yes	Prior to incarceration	Dixon	No	GP		4/26/2019
██████████	██████	2/25/1968	Black	Confirmed	Yes	approved 9/18/18	Dixon	No	STC		10/23/2035
██████████	██████	2/7/1975	Caucasian	Confirmed	Yes	approved 9/18/18	Dixon	Yes	GP		8/17/2022
██████████	██████	2/21/1992	Black	Confirmed	Yes	Prior to incarceration	Dixon	No	GP		2/5/2021
██████████	██████	7/8/1975	Black	Confirmed			Dixon	No	STC		3/24/2021
██████████	██████	6/16/1975	Black	Confirmed	Previously	D/C	Dixon	No	DPU		9/4/2048
██████████	██████	8/28/1995	Black	Unconfirmed	No	NA	Dixon	Yes	DXP		1/13/2021
██████████	██████1	2/5/1997	Black	Confirmed	No	NA	Dixon	Yes	STC		2/22/2023
██████████	██████	8/7/1983	Caucasian	Confirmed	Yes	approved 8/7/18	Dixon	Yes	DPU		2/14/2020

East Moline Correctional Center

Transgender Population

March 28, 2019

<u>Offender Name</u>	<u>IDOC #</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Race</u>	<u>Confirmation Status</u>	<u>Receiving Hormones</u>	<u>Date Started Hormones</u>	<u>Parent Facility/Status</u>	<u>Restrictive Housing</u>	<u>Housing Assignment</u>	<u>Additional Comments</u>
██████████	██████████	#####	White	Confirmed	No	N/A	East Moline	No	General Population	None
██████████	██████████	1/25/1979	Black	Pending	No	N/A	East Moline	No	General Population	Case being presented 4/2/2019
██████████	██████████	#####	White	Confirmed	Yes	1/25/2019	East Moline	No	General Population	None

Hill CC
Transgender Population
March 28, 2019

<u>Offender Name</u>	<u>IDOC #</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Race</u>	<u>Confirmation Status</u>	<u>Receiving Hormones</u>	<u>Date Started Hormones</u>	<u>Parent Facility/Status</u>	<u>Restrictive Housing</u>	<u>Housing Assignment</u>	<u>Additional Comments</u>
██████████	██████	##	White	Confirmed	Yes	10/31/2018	Hill	None	General Population	None
██████████	██████	#####	Black	Confirmed	Yes	12/3/2018	Hill	None	General Population	None

Sheridan CC
Transgender Population
March 28, 2018

<u>Offender Name</u>	<u>IDOC #</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Race</u>	<u>Confirmation Status</u>	<u>Receiving Hormones</u>	<u>Date Started Hormone</u>	<u>Parent Facility/Status</u>	<u>Restrictive Housing</u>	<u>Housing Assignment</u>	<u>Additional Comments</u>
None										

Stateville Correctional Center

Transgender Population

March 28, 2019

<u>Offender Name</u>	<u>IDOC #</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Race</u>	<u>Confirmation Status</u>	<u>Receiving Hormones</u>	<u>Date Started Hormone</u>	<u>Parent Facility/Status</u>	<u>Restrictive Housing</u>	<u>Housing A</u>	<u>Additional Comments</u>
██████████	██████████	#####	Caucasian	Approved	yes	9/4/2018	Stateville	Yes	X LE 07	
██████████	██████████	7/9/1967	African American	Approved	yes	12/25/2018	Stateville	No	X LW 06	Protective Custody

Stateville **NRC**
Transgender Population
March 28, 2019

<u>Offender Name</u>	<u>IDOC #</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Race</u>	<u>Confirmation Status</u>	<u>Receiving Hormones</u>	<u>Date Started Hormones</u>	<u>Parent Facility/Status</u>	<u>Restrictive Housing</u>	<u>Housing Assignment</u>	<u>Additional Comments</u>
██████████	██████████	#####	black	pending	no	N/A	STA-NRC/parole violator	Yes	Administrative Detenti	O360 vulnerable

Danville Correctional Center
Transgender Population
March 28, 2019

<u>Offender Name</u>	<u>IDOC #</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Race</u>	<u>Confirmation Status</u>	<u>Receiving Hormones</u>	<u>Date Started Hormones</u>	<u>Parent Facility/Status</u>	<u>Restrictive Housing</u>	<u>Housing Assignment</u>	<u>Additional Comments</u>
Ball, Xavier	887475	#	African American	confirmed	yes	12/11/2018	Danville Correctional Center	N	General Population	Was refusing housing. Now back in GP
██████████	██████████	#####	African American	confirmed	yes	8/3/2018	Danville Correctional Center	N	General Population	Not yet presented since transfer
██████████	██████████	#####	Caucasian	confirmed	no	n/a	Danville Correctional Center	N	General Population	Not yet presented since transfer
██████████	██████████	#####	Caucasian	confirmed	yes	6/12/2018	Danville Correctional Center	N	General Population	Not yet presented since transfer
██████████	██████████	#####	African American	confirmed	no	n/a	Danville Correctional Center	N	General Population	Not yet presented since transfer; Recently on crisis watch

Decatur Correctional Facility
Transgender Population
March 28, 2019

<u>Offender Name</u>	<u>IDOC #</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Race</u>	<u>Confirmation Status</u>	<u>Parent Facility/Status</u>	<u>Restrictive Housing</u>	<u>Housing Assignment</u>	<u>Additional Comments</u>
None								

Graham Correctional Center
Transgender Population
March 28, 2019

<u>Offender Name</u>	<u>IDOC #</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Race</u>	<u>Confirmation Status</u>	<u>Receiving Hormones</u>	<u>Date Started Hormones</u>	<u>Parent Facility/Status</u>	<u>Restrictive Housing</u>	<u>Housing Assignment</u>	<u>Additional Comments</u>
G		#####	Black	Confirmed	Yes	8/4/2018	Graham	No	General Population	

ILLINOIS RIVER CORRECTIONAL CENTER

Transgender Population

March 28, 2019

Offender Name	IDOC #	Date of Birth	Race	Confirmation Status	Receiving Hormones	Date Started Hormones	Parent Facility/Status	Restrictive Housing	Housing Assignment	Additional Comments
██████████	██████	#####	AA	confirmed	no		Illinois River	No	General Population	
██████████	██████	#####	AA	confirmed	yes	8/10/2018	Illinois River	No	General Population	
██████████	██████	#####	AA	confirmed	yes	4/7/2015	Illinois River	No	General Population	
██████████	██████	#####	AA	confirmed	yes	8/20/2018	Illinois River	No	General Population	
██████████	██████	#####	AA	confirmed	yes	1/1/2018	Illinois River	No	General Population	
██████████	██████	#####	AA	confirmed	yes	5/8/2018	Illinois River	Yes	Crisis Placement	Attempted Suicide 4/4/19

Jacksonville Correctional Center
Transgender Population
March 28, 2019

<u>Offender Name</u>	<u>IDOC #</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Race</u>	<u>Confirmation Status</u>	<u>Receiving Hormones</u>	<u>Date Started Hormones</u>	<u>Parent Facility/Status</u>	<u>Restrictive Housing</u>	<u>Housing Assignment</u>	<u>Additional Comments</u>
██████████	██████████	####	white	confirmed	yes	1/27/2019	Jacksonville CC	No	General Population	none

Lincoln Correctional Center
Transgender Population
March 28, 2019

<u>Offender Name</u>	<u>IDOC #</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Race</u>	<u>Confirmation Status</u>	<u>Receiving Hormones</u>	<u>Date Started Hormones</u>	<u>Parent Facility/Status</u>	<u>Restrictive Housing</u>	<u>Housing Assignment</u>	<u>Additional Comments</u>
██████████	██████	4/11/1981	black	confirmed	yes	1/27/2016	Lincoln CC	No	General Population	none

LOGAN CORRECTIONAL CENTER
Transgender Population
March 28, 2019

Offender Name	IDOC #	Date of Birth	Race	Confirmation Status	Receiving Hormones	Date Started Hormones	Parent Facility/Status	Restrictive Housing	Housing Assignment	Additional Comments
		#								
		#	African-American,							
		#	Polynesian	confirmed	yes	2/20/2018	Logan	No	General Population	Psychiatrically stable
		#####	African-American	confirmed	yes	pt. 2017 (in Cook Co. Jail)	Logan	No	General Population	Psychiatrically stable
		#####	African-American	not confirmed	no	N/A	Logan	No	General Population	Psychiatrically stable
		#####	African-American	confirmed	no	N/A	Logan	No	General Population	Too uncooperative w/ tx for hormones
		#####	African-American	not confirmed	no	N/A	Logan	No	General Population	Represent to GD Committee 3-5-19
		#####	African-American	confirmed	yes	Aug. 2016 (in Lawrence)	Stateville	Yes	Restricted Housing	Transferred from Dixon 12/21/18
		#####	African-American	confirmed	yes	Nov., 2018	Logan	No	General Population	Psychiatrically stable

PONTIAC CORRECTIONAL CENTER

Transgender Population

March 28, 2019

<u>Offender Name</u>	<u>IDOC #</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Race</u>	<u>Confirmation Status</u>	<u>Receiving Hormones</u>	<u>Date Started Hormones</u>	<u>Parent Facility/Status</u>	<u>Restrictive Housing</u>	<u>Housing Assignment</u>	<u>Additional Comments</u>
██████████	██████████	9/11/1981	Black	Confirmed	Yes	11/5/2016	Pontiac	No	PC	
██████████	██████████	10/30/1978	Black	Confirmed	No	N/A	Pontiac	No	PC	
██████████	██████████	12/28/1985	Black	confirmed	No	N/A	Pontiac	Yes	PC	
██████████	██████████	5/11/1994	Hispanic	Confirmed	Yes	2/3/2017	Pontiac	Yes	PC	
██████████	██████████	10/26/1991	Black	Confirmed	No	N/A	Pontiac	Yes	PC	
██████████	██████████	9/4/1986	White	Confirmed	Yes	12/2/2016	Pontiac	Yes	PC	
██████████	██████████	5/22/1989	Black	Confirmed	yes		Pontiac	yes	West Seg	
██████████	██████████	6/30/1993	Black	Confirmed	Yes	6/17/2016	Pontiac	Yes	PC	
██████████	██████████	4/29/1961	Black	confirmed	Yes	4/28/2018	Pontiac	No	PC	
██████████	██████████	#####	Black	Confirmed	Yes		Pontiac	Yes	West Seg	
██████████	██████████	#####	Black	Confirmed	yes		Pontiac	Yes	West Seg	
██████████	██████████	#####	White	Confirmed	No	N/A	Pontiac	Yes	West Seg	
██████████	██████████	#####	Black	pending	No	NA	Pontiac	No	PC	
██████████	██████████	#####	Black	Confirmed	No	N/A	Pontiac	Yes	PMH	
██████████	██████████	#####	Black	Confirmed	Yes		Pontiac	No	PC	

Taylorville
Transgender Population
March 28, 2019

<u>Offender Name</u>	<u>IDOC #</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Race</u>	<u>Confirmation Status</u>	<u>Receiving Hormones</u>	<u>Date Started Hormones</u>	<u>Parent Facility/Status</u>	<u>Restrictive Housing</u>	<u>Housing Assignment</u>	<u>Additional Comments</u>
None										

Western Illinois Correctional Center

Transgender Population

March 28, 2019

<u>Offender Name</u>	<u>IDOC #</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Race</u>	<u>Confirmation Status</u>	<u>Receiving Hormones</u>	<u>Date Started Hormones</u>	<u>Parent Facility/Status</u>	<u>Restrictive Housing</u>	<u>Housing Assignment</u>	<u>Additional Comments</u>
██████████	██████	###	black	confirmed	yes	4/9/2015	Western	No	General Population	case review pres 4/2/19
██████████	██████	4/8/1993	black	confirmed	yes	1/29/2019	Western	No	General Population	case review pres 4/2/19
██████████	██████	#####	black	confirmed	yes	12/19/2018	Western	No	General Population	none
██████████	██████	#####	black	confirmed	no	n/a	Western	No	General Population	GID conf & HRT app 6/12/18 (seiz comp)
██████████	██████	#####	black	pending	no	n/a	Western	Yes	General Population	case review pres 4/2/19; req bra
██████████	██████	#####	black	confirmed	yes	9/20/2018	Western	Yes	General Population	wants to wear a bra/present to TGC 4/2/19
██████████	██████	9/4/1986	white	confirmed	yes	11/8/2017	Western	No	General Population	none

BIG MUDDY RIVER CORRECTIONAL CENTER (BMRCC)

Transgender Population

March 28, 2019

<u>Offender Name</u>	<u>IDOC #</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Race</u>	<u>Confirmation Status</u>	<u>Receiving Hormones</u>	<u>Date Started Hormones</u>	<u>Parent Facility/Status</u>	<u>Restrictive Housing</u>	<u>Housing Assignment</u>	<u>Additional Comments</u>
██████████	██████	#####	African American	Confirmed	Yes	8/29/2014	BMRCC	No	General Population	None
██████████	██████	9/2/1981	African American	Confirmed	Yes	5/30/2018	BMRCC	No	General Population	None
██████████	██████	#####	Caucasion	Pending	No	Pending	BMRCC	No	General Population	Scheduled for presentation to Transgender Care Committee on 04/02/19
██████████	██████	#####	Caucasion	Confirmed	Yes	9/21/2018 Committee approved HRT on 10/30/18 however there are issues with lab levels related to his liver; referral has been made to liver specialist. This issue must be resolved before HRT can be started	BMRCC	No	General Population	Has requested transfer to female facility and reassignment surgery. Was presented to the Transgender Care Committee on 03/05/19; awaiting decision.
██████████	██████	#####	African American	Confirmed	No	started	BMRCC	No	General Population	None

Centralia Correctional Center
Transgender Population
March 28, 2019

<u>Offender Name</u>	<u>IDOC #</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Race</u>	<u>Confirmation Status</u>	<u>Receiving Hormones</u>	<u>Date Started Hormone</u>	<u>Parent Facility/Status</u>	<u>Restrictive Housing</u>	<u>Housing Assignment</u>	<u>Additional Comments</u>
██████████	██████	7/7/1990	Black	Confirmed	Yes		Centralia Correctional Center	No	General Population	
██████████	██████	2/18/1967	Black	Confirmed	No	N/A	Centralia Correctional Center	No	General Population	None
██████████	██████	12/2/1978	White	Confirmed	Yes	4/26/2017	Centralia Correctional Center	No	General Population	None
██████████	██████	7/9/1984	Black	Confirmed	Yes	2013	Centralia Correctional Center	No	General Population	None
██████████	██████	7/15/1979	Hispanic	Confirmed	Yes	11/12/2018	Centralia Correctional Center	No	General Population	None

Lawrence CC										
Transgender Population										
March 28, 2019										
Offender Name	DOC #	Date of Birth	Race	Confirmation Status	Receiving Hormones	Dated Started Hormones	Parent Facility/Status	Restrictive Housing	Housing Assignment	Additional Comments
██████████	██████████	██████████	Caucasian	Confirmed/GD	Y	1/26/2018	LAW	N	GP	2nd TG Committee Presentation 1-26-18. Hormones approved 1-26-18. TG Committee Initial Presentation completed 9-8-17. Committee denied hormone therapy, requesting at least 3 months contact with MHP (1st contact was 6-27-17) and a collateral contact with family. Patient currently interested in hormone therapy. Currently in group and individual therapy.
██████████	██████████	██████████	AA	Confirmed/GD	Y	7/10/2017	LAW	N	GP	TG Committee Update completed 7-28-17. Hormone therapy started 4-10-17. Currently in group and individual therapy. Requesting an increase in hormone dose and requesting injections instead of pills. Has been referred to medical.
██████████	██████████	██████████	AA	Confirmed/GD	N	N/A	LAW	N	GP	New request for TG. Requested to committee on 7/10/18. Approved for TG services.
██████████	██████████	██████████	Caucasian	Confirmed/GD	Y	8/11/2014	LAW	N	GP	Medical file shows "Hiking approval." Transferred to LAW 5/24/2018
██████████	██████████	██████████	AA	Confirmed/GD	Y	4/10/2018	LAW	N	GP	3rd time submitted to committee on 4/10/18 and approved for hormones.
██████████	██████████	██████████	Hispanic	Confirmed/GD	Y	8/27/2018	LAW	N	GP	submitted to committee on 7/10/18. Hormones approved.
██████████	██████████	██████████	Hispanic	Confirmed/GD	Y	6/29/2018	LAW	N	GP	TG committee approved hormones 6/29/18
██████████	██████████	██████████	AA	Confirmed/GD	Y	11/27/2018	LAW	N	GP	
██████████	██████████	██████████	AA	Confirmed/GD	Y	3/5/2019	LAW	N	GP	

Menard Correctional Center
Transgender Population
March 28, 2019

<u>Offender Name</u>	<u>IDOC #</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Race</u>	<u>Confirmation Status</u>	<u>Receiving Hormones</u>	<u>Date Started Hormones</u>	<u>Parent Facility/Status</u>	<u>Restrictive Housing</u>	<u>Housing Assignment</u>	<u>Additional Comments</u>
██████████	██████	#####	White	confirmed	yes	3/2/2016	Menard	Yes	Segregation	none
██████████	██████	#####	Black	confirmed - no hormo	no-not approved at GIL	NA	Menard	Yes	Seg	Presented and denied hormone treatment at this time
██████████	██████	6/6/1989	Black	confirmed	yes	Approved in County	Menard	Yes	PC	none

Pinckneyville Correctional Center
Transgender Population
March 28, 2019

Offender Name	IDOC #	Date of Birth	Race	Confirmation Status	Receiving Hormones	Date Started Hormones	Parent Facility/Status	Restrictive Housing	Housing Assignment	Additional Comments
██████████	██████████	#####	AA	Pending	No	N/A	Pinckneyville	No	4C-13	shower permit
██████████	██████████	#####	AA	Pending	No	N/A	Pinckneyville	Yes	5C-58	shower permit
██████████	██████████	#####	AA	Pending	No	N/A	Pinckneyville	No	5B-24	shower permit
██████████	██████████	#####	AA	Pending	No	N/A	Pinckneyville	No	5D-19	shower permit
██████████	██████████	#####	AA	Pending	No	N/A	Pinckneyville	No	1B-63	
██████████	██████████	2/2/1994	AA	Pending	No	N/A	Pinckneyville	No	1B-63	shower permit
██████████	██████████	4/3/1974	White	Pending	No	N/A	Pinckneyville	No	3D-20	
██████████	██████████	#####	AA	Pending	No	N/A	Pinckneyville	No	5B-70	
██████████	██████████	#####	AA	Pending	No	N/A	Pinckneyville	No	5B-67	shower permit
██████████	██████████	#####	White	Pending	No	N/A	Pinckneyville	No	5B-66	shower permit
██████████	██████████	1/3/1988	AA	Pending	No	N/A	Pinckneyville	No	3B-60	
██████████	██████████	#####	AA	Pending	No	N/A	Pinckneyville	No	5B-69	
██████████	██████████	#####	AA	Confirmed	Yes	11/9/2018	Pinckneyville	Yes	5C-27	shower permit, bra permit
██████████	██████████	#####	AA	Confirmed	Yes	1/15/2019	Pinckneyville	No	4D-76	shower permit, bra permit; new referral
██████████	██████████	#####	AA	Pending	No	N/A	Pinckneyville	No	4B-68	shower permit, new referral
██████████	██████████	3/4/1982	AA	Pending	No	N/A	Pinckneyville	No	3A-38	
██████████	██████████	#####	White	Confirmed	Yes	11/16/2018	Pinckneyville	No	2C-69	shower permit, bra permit
██████████	██████████	#####	AA	Confirmed	Yes	2/10/2019	Pinckneyville	Yes	6B-6	new referral , shower permit, bra permit
██████████	██████████	#####	AA	Pending	No	N/A	Pinckneyville	No	3A-52	new referral

Robinson										
Transgender Population										
March 28, 2019										
Offender Name	IDOC #	Date of Birth	Race	Confirmation Status	Receiving Hormones	Date Started Hormones	Parent Facility/Status	Restrictive Housing	Housing Assignment	Additional Comments
██████████	██████████	██████████	White	Pending	No	N/A	Robinson	No	General Population	Submitted to Committee 12-12-17 - recommended continued assessment and FU with MHP to help educate and assess coping skills - Pt still considerine HRT - was soine to request HRT in Aor 2019 but Pt still does not feel ready at this time.
██████████	██████████	██████████	AA	Confirmed	Yes	7/27/2018	Robinson	No	General Population	Approved for Hormones by Committee on 7-23-18. submitted to committee for transfer update for ROB on 9-18-18. cont. hormone therav. MD appt on 8-3-18. Psych seen Aug 2018
██████████	██████████	██████████	AA	Confirmed	Yes	7/16/2018	Robinson	No	General Population	Submitted to committee for transfer update by ROB on 9-18-18. Continue hormone therapy, with doctor care. Already had rx for hormones when arrived at ROB. Seen by MD on 8-21-18 and psych
██████████	██████████	██████████	AA	Pending	No	N/A	Robinson	No	General Population	R/O Gender Dysphoria - PT Requested TG services. History of HRT. No interest in HRT at this time. Patient is not sure if wants to identify as transgender woman or gay man. Individual services only at this time focusing on identity clarification. Seen by MD 1-22-18and Psych 1-28-19.
██████████	██████████	██████████	AA	Confirmed	Yes	10/19/2018	Robinson	No	General Population	Initial presentation to Transgender Committee 3-5-19. HRT initiated 10-19-18. Transfer to ROB2-27-19. Will schedule for MHE, Psych Appt, MD Appt, and May 2019 Transgender Committee for transfer update

Shanwee Correctional Center
Transgender Population
March 28, 2019

<u>Offender Name</u>	<u>IDOC #</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Race</u>	<u>Confirmation Status</u>	<u>Receiving Hormones</u>	<u>Date Started Hormones</u>	<u>Parent Facility/Status</u>	<u>Restrictive Housing</u>	<u>Housing Assignment</u>	<u>Additional Comments</u>
██████	██████	###	Black	Confirmed	Yes	9/16/2016	Shawnee/ In Custody	N/A	General Population	
██████	██████	#####	Black	Confirmed	Yes	1/4/2019	Shawnee/ In Custody	N/A	General Population	
██████	██████	#####	Black	Confirmed	Yes	2/20/2019	Shawnee/ In Custody	N/A	General Population	
██████	██████	#####	Black	Confirmed	No	N/A	Shawnee/ In Custody	N/A	General Population	

Southwestern Illinois Correctional Center

Transgender Population

March 28, 2019

<u>Offender Name</u>	<u>IDOC #</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Race</u>	<u>Confirmation Status</u>	<u>Receiving Hormones</u>	<u>Date Started Hormones</u>	<u>Parent Facility/Status</u>	<u>Restrictive Housing</u>	<u>Housing Assignment</u>	<u>Additional Comments</u>
None										

Vandalia
Transgender Population
March 28, 2019

<u>Offender Name</u>	<u>IDOC #</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Race</u>	<u>Confirmation Status</u>	<u>Receiving Hormones</u>	<u>Date Started Hormones</u>	<u>Parent Facility/Status</u>	<u>Restrictive Housing</u>	<u>Housing Assignment</u>	<u>Additional Comments</u>
None										

Vienna Correctional Center
Transgender Population
March 28, 2019

<u>Offender Name</u>	<u>IDOC #</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Race</u>	<u>Confirmation Status</u>	<u>Receiving Hormones</u>	<u>Date Started Hormones</u>	<u>Parent Facility/Status</u>	<u>Restrictive Housing</u>	<u>Housing A</u>	<u>Additional Comments</u>
None										

Murphysboro Life Skills Re-Entry Center
Transgender Population
March 28, 2019

<u>Offender Name</u>	<u>IDOC #</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Race</u>	<u>Confirmation Status</u>	<u>Receiving Hormones</u>	<u>Date Started Hormones</u>	<u>Parent Facility/Status</u>	<u>Restrictive Housing</u>	<u>Housing Assignment</u>	<u>Additional Comments</u>
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Kewanee Life Skills Re-Entry Center
Transgender Population
March 28, 2019

<u>Offender Name</u>	<u>IDOC #</u>	<u>Date of Birth</u>	<u>Race</u>	<u>Confirmation Status</u>	<u>Receiving Hormones</u>	<u>Date Started Hormones</u>	<u>Parent Facility/Status</u>	<u>Restrictive Housing</u>	<u>Housing Assignment</u>	<u>Additional Comments</u>
----------------------	---------------	----------------------	-------------	----------------------------	---------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------	----------------------------