

SANTA BARBARA COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT
RESPONSE TO THE SANTA BARBARA COUNTY
GRAND JURY 2000-2001 FINAL REPORT
"DETENTION FACILITIES AND SHERIFF'S
DEPARTMENT ISSUES"

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Finding 1a: *Aggressive utilization of all four Santa Barbara County adult detention facilities has become necessary because voters failed to approve the November 1999 bond measure to construct a North County Jail.*

Response to Finding 1a: The Sheriff's Department disagrees partially with the finding.

This statement is misleading. Jail overcrowding is an issue that continues to plague the Santa Barbara jail system. Aggressive utilization of the adult detention facilities did not become necessary due to the failed bond measure. Aggressive utilization of the adult detention facilities and programs became necessary many years ago in order to manage the court ordered jail cap and operate a safe and secure facility.

Finding 1b: *The County jail facilities, excluding the Main Jail, are not utilized to capacity, with an Average Daily Population (ADP) for the past five years of 66%. The utilization of all County jail facilities has decreased from an average of 68% to 64% during the time that the Main Jail population cap has been in effect.*

Response to Finding 1b: The Sheriff's Department disagrees wholly with the finding.

The California Board of Corrections sets the rated capacity of a facility. Rated capacity is defined as "The number of inmate occupants for which a facility's single and double occupancy cells or dormitories, except those dedicated for health care or disciplinary isolation, were planned and designed in conformity to the standards and requirements of Title 15 and Title 24 California Code of Regulations (CCR)."

The rated capacity for the Main Jail is 617 inmates (543 males and 74 females). Although there is a court order cap of 706 (605 males / 101 females), this cap does not eliminate jail overcrowding. The court ordered cap allows the Sheriff's Department to safely manage an already overcrowded system by reducing the number of inmates to a level consistent with the ability to staff the facility and maintain the standards set forth in Title 15 CCR.

The Grand Jury report has based its averages on the available beds at the male Honor Farm and not the rated capacity. Currently there are 246 beds at the Honor Farm. However, the rated capacity of the Honor Farm is 120. This means that 126 of the

available beds are not rated. They exist so that the conditions in the facility do not fall below standards of health and sanitation. Given the average daily populations shown in Table 3 and applying them to the rated capacity, the male Honor Farm continuously operates well above capacity.

The Santa Maria Branch Jail is a Type I Facility. Using the Title 15 CCR Standards, this facility is operated to its capacity as well.

La Morada (female honor farm) is the only adult correction facility not used to capacity. (Refer to Response to Recommendation 1a).

Recommendation 1a: *County-Wide full utilization of jail capacity should become a Santa Barbara Detention policy.*

Response to Recommendation 1a: The recommendation has been implemented.

Full utilization of jail capacity has long been a priority of Sheriff's Custody Operations. As stated in Response to Finding 1b, the Main Jail, male Honor Farm and the Santa Maria Branch Jail facilities are utilized at or beyond their rated capacities.

In September 2000, upon the suggestion of a staff member, Custody Operations assigned a work group to study the feasibility of relocating La Morada (female) inmates to the male Honor Farm. The work group determined the concept was feasible and Sheriff's administration approved the plan. The relocation is expected to be complete by September 30, 2001. Once the relocation is complete, under-utilization of beds at La Morada will no longer be an issue.

Recommendation 1b: *Every effort should be made to prevent the necessity for early release of inmates due to overcrowding.*

Response to Recommendation 1b: The recommendation has been implemented.

Since the implementation of the court ordered caps, every effort continues to be made to prevent the necessity for early release of inmates due to overcrowding.

If the flex cap of 520 has been reached and there are any reported "floor-sleepers" (inmates who are sleeping on a mattress on the floor because of no available bunks in the housing unit), several actions occur.

First, we attempt to re-house any inmates sleeping on the floor to a housing unit with an available bunk. This can only be done if the classification of the inmate can be maintained. It would not be responsible to house a general population inmate with high security inmates. Nor is it suitable to house a high security inmate in a lesser secure housing.

Once all attempts to alleviate the "floor-sleepers" have been exhausted, eligible inmates are processed for early release into supervised programs. The Population Control Officer maintains a list of inmates that may be eligible. This list is prioritized by the earliest release date, not by where the inmate is housed.

All inmates released pursuant to the court order have either volunteered or been selected for release into a program such as Work Furlough, SWAP, or Electronic Monitoring. The approval for release is based upon qualified charges and in-custody behavior. Inmates housed at the Main Jail and male Honor Farm are given the same consideration. An inmate housed at the Main Jail who has completed an application for release into a program and whose time remaining falls within the period of selection would be processed prior to an inmate housed at the Honor Farm who did not complete an application. Any qualified inmate refusing to participate in the early release program becomes ineligible for early release.

It is important to note that the Main Jail population has, on occasion, reached as high as 568 without triggering any early releases. This was due to not having "floor-sleepers."

Recommendation 1c: *The Sheriff's Department should analyze the utilization of the other County jail facilities. The Santa Maria Jail, in particular, should be considered as an alternative to the early releasing of inmates at the Main Jail as a result of the Main Jail population cap.*

Response to Recommendation 1c: This is a two-part recommendation, the first of which has been implemented. The second part of this recommendation will not be implemented because it is not reasonable.

The Sheriff's Department has analyzed the utilization of all its custody facilities many times over the past thirteen years. As a result, we have made many changes over the years in our utilization and expansion of minimum-security facilities and alternative sentencing programs. The most recent change being the impending move of La Morada inmate to the male Honor Farm. (See Response to Finding 1a).

It is unreasonable, and in fact illegal, to utilize the Santa Maria facility for housing Main Jail overflow. The expense of construction and remodel to change the facility classification is not warranted and is not cost effective. Further, the beds gained would be way too few to eliminate early release.

Recommendation 1d: *If an inmate's bed is needed at the Main Jail, jail-transfer to one of the other County jail facilities should be considered for inmates, in order that they complete their original court sentences.*

Response to Recommendation 1d: The recommendation has been implemented.

This recommendation appears to be a restatement of Recommendations 1a, and 1b. To further clarify our response:

Housing changes (jail transfer) of inmates to our minimum-security facilities occur on a daily basis. These housing changes are based upon the available beds and an inmate's classification. Qualifications for classification to a minimum-security facility must be adhered to in order to manage the population and prevent increased risk of jail incidents (assaults, escapes, mutual combat, contraband, etc.), thus limiting liability to the County.

Recommendation 1e: *Only Main Jail housed inmates should be subject to early release when that facility's population exceeds the jail cap. A remedy should be found that excludes inmates housed in other County detention facilities from being released when the jail cap necessitates inmate release from the Main Jail.*

Response to Recommendation 1e: The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted.

This concept was considered, studied, and ultimately rejected by the Jail Overcrowding Task Force prior to the court-ordered male cap. This task force was comprised of representatives from various Santa Barbara County agencies including the Sheriff's Department, County Counsel, Public Defender, Office of the County Administrator, District Attorney, Mental Health, the Courts, Board of Supervisors and Probation, as well as the Lompoc Police Department and a representative from the ACLU. The Task Force concluded that a "facility specific cap" was counterproductive in that it would undoubtedly result in inmates refusing to be sent to the Honor Farm or purposely being disqualified by violating jail rules in the hope of being released early due to overcrowding. This would violate one of the primary elements of the current early release program, which is designed to safeguard the community by releasing the least serious offenders first. Necessarily, those same inmates are the ones that typically qualify for housing at the minimum-security facilities.

Finding 2a: *The current remedy for the Main Jail overcrowding is a jail cap, taking into account an inmate's time of sentence remaining when determining who is to be released first from all of the County's detention facilities.*

Response to Finding 2a: The Sheriff's Department disagrees partially with the finding.

There are other factors that are considered when determining which inmates will be released early. Length of sentence remaining is just one factor. For example, all felony charges and certain misdemeanor charges disqualify an inmate for early release. In addition, all inmates must serve a minimum of seven days in jail to qualify for early release.

Finding 2b: *A facilities cap, in combination with the recommendations of:*

- *jail-transfer to underutilized County jail facilities, and*
- *policy changes that are listed below for the Santa Maria Jail, should net fewer early releases than the current system of a jail cap.*

Response to Finding 2b: The Sheriff's Department disagrees wholly with the finding.

This is an unsupported opinion and not a finding. (Refer to our Responses to Findings 1a, 1b, 2a and Responses to Recommendations 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, and 1e.)

Recommendation 2: *A facilities cap, which considers beds in each jail and jail section separately, should be analyzed as an alternative to the jail cap policy, which considers all inmates in all County jail facilities to determine the pool of inmates for early-release when effecting control over the Main Jail population. The analysis and its conclusion should be considered for presentation to the Board of Supervisors and for community input.*

Response to Recommendation 2: The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not reasonable.

This recommendation is virtually the same as Recommendation 1e, which calls for the same "facility specific cap" system for early releases. Refer to our Response to Recommendation 1e.

Finding 3: *Of the 2,261 male and female inmates early released in 1999 and 2000 due to the jail cap, only 1,242 (or 55%) were released into either a Sheriff-run program or a Probation-run program. While the Probation Department arranges for community coordination of medical, mental health, social services, housing, and oversight benefits for the inmates who are released into Probation-run programs (including Sheriff's Parole), not all inmates are released into Probation-run programs.*

Response to Finding 3: **The Sheriff's Department agrees partially with the finding.**

There were actually 2,556 inmates released early during 1999 and 2000. It is true that 1,242 (49%) were released to programs administered by either the Sheriff or Probation. There is an implication in this Finding that the other inmates were simply released to the street, which is not the case.

During 2000, which is the first full year of operating under the court-ordered male cap, 54% of the 1,137 male inmates released early were placed in Sheriff's and Probation's alternative programs. The remaining 46% were all released to another agency or institution (INS, State Parole, other County). No male inmates were early released "to the street."

The female inmate cap is governed by an earlier and separate court order. During 2000, 83 female inmates were early released into alternative sentencing programs, while 60 were released "to the street."

Although the Sheriff's Department mission does not include providing social services to inmates who are living in their own homes and serving their sentences in community release programs, such inmates may avail themselves of any of the same services for which they are eligible that are provided by various county, state, and federal agencies or non-profit organizations to any other eligible person living within the community.

Recommendation 3: *The Sheriff's Department should model early release decisions, when they are necessary, on the Sheriff's Parole process. This will take significantly more personnel resources than the current early release procedures but may ultimately result in less social and economic costs to the County.*

Response to Recommendation 3: The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted.

To utilize the Sheriff's Parole assessment procedure for all inmates eligible for early release would be an unnecessary use of valuable staff resources. Any supposed "social and economic costs to the County" in not implementing this recommendation have not been defined, specified or documented.

One of the priorities of the current early release program is not just to reduce Main Jail population, but also to insure to the extent possible that those inmates released early from their sentences are not a significant risk to the community. The Sheriff's Parole process is essentially focused on only those inmates who do not meet the established criteria for other alternative programs. Basically this means those with a history of felony charges and elements of violence in their criminal histories.

The purpose of the parole process is to subject these inmates to closer scrutiny and review to determine if, in spite of their history, they would constitute a continued risk to the community if released early. This degree of review is redundant and wasteful if applied to those inmates who already meet the current criteria for alternative sentencing programs and thus have already been determined to be a lower risk to the community.

Finding 4: *Inmates when released from the Main Jail, even during hours when MTD bus service is available, are often without resources to return to their original, and perhaps distant, communities. Many inmates are from other County locations and are often unfamiliar with the City of Santa Barbara, making family reunification efforts difficult to achieve quickly.*

Response to Finding 4: The Sheriff's Department disagrees partially with the finding.

This appears to be another theory and not a finding. There was no data presented to support this "finding." The Sheriff's Department agrees that approximately half of the inmates in our facilities are from the northern Santa Barbara County. However, upon release, all inmates without a ride home or funds to obtain one are provided MTD bus tokens for travel within the South Coast. If inmates reside in the northern parts of the County, they are also provided Greyhound bus ticket vouchers to return to their hometowns. These tokens and vouchers are paid for by the Inmate Welfare Fund at no expense to county taxpayers. Over a year ago, jail release procedures were changed so that inmates released upon expiration of their sentence are released during hours of operation of bus service.

Recommendation 4: *Every effort should be made to preclude the early release of inmates without arranging short-term community resources, which benefits the inmate and the community.*

Response to Recommendation 4: The recommendation has been implemented.

The Sheriff's Department routinely transports North County inmates released to supervised programs to the Santa Maria Branch Jail for release. (Refer to Response to Finding 4 for more information about transportation services provided.)

Inmate Services is currently in the process of screening applicants for a yet untitled community services liaison position. This position will be a bridge to all available community resources not limited to only those issues related to early release.

Santa Maria Branch Jail

Finding 5: *All inmates held for extradition to another jurisdiction are immediately transported from the Santa Maria Jail to the Main Jail because it cannot be assured that extradition can be completed in the 96 hours that an inmate can legally be held in the Type I Santa Maria Jail.*

Again, each admission to the Main Jail forces the premature release of a Main Jail inmate if the jail cap is in effect.

Response to Finding 5: The Sheriff's Department disagrees wholly with the finding.

All inmates held for extradition are not immediately transported to the Main Jail. A transport is determined by evaluating several factors, such as the medical needs of the inmate, the destination of extradition and the availability and scheduling of transportation. In many instances it is very likely that an inmate booked at the Santa Maria Branch Jail and awaiting extradition may be held at this facility up to 96 hours prior to being transported.

We would like to clarify that the Main Jail Cap is always in effect. However, unless the Main Jail population is at or above the court ordered cap and /or flex cap, early release mechanisms are not implemented. Refer to Response to Recommendation 1b for explanation.

Recommendation 5: *The Sheriff's Department should accommodate agency pick-ups and arrange for extraditions directly from the Santa Maria Jail.*

Response to Recommendation 5: The recommendation has been implemented.

This recommendation has long been a practice of the Sheriff's Department. In many instances inmates are picked up from the Santa Maria Jail. In fact, in some cases inmates are transported to the Santa Maria Branch Jail from the Main Jail to await extradition.

Finding 6a: *A Special Medical Transport to the Main Jail is required if the inmate has medical issues, regardless of the length of detention the offense requires (e.g., DUI with pacemaker, public intoxicant with asthma).*

Response to Finding 6a: The Sheriff's Department disagrees partially with the finding.

While the Sheriff's Department concurs that inmates with health problems requiring medical treatment may be transported to the Main Jail, the finding as stated is misleading.

A Special Medical Transport to the Main Jail is determined only after the inmate has been assessed by local hospital staff and/or it was further determined by a phone consultation with Main Jail medical staff that the inmate will require continued medical monitoring.

Finding 6b: *Regardless of the brevity of an inmate's sentence or pre-sentence booking, a transported inmate from Santa Maria into the Main Jail for medical reasons triggers the release of an inmate from the Main Jail if the cap is in effect.*

Response to Finding 6b: The Sheriff's Department disagrees partially with the finding.

Although the Sheriff's Department concurs that early release of inmates at the Main Jail may be triggered by the transport of an inmate from the Santa Maria Branch Jail to the Main Jail, again, we would like to clarify that the Main Jail Cap is always in effect. However, unless the Main Jail population is at or above the court ordered cap and /or flex cap, early release mechanisms are not implemented.

Finding 6c: *Special Medical Transported inmates put an additional strain on the population control and management at the Main Jail because their arrival cannot be anticipated nor their beds arranged for during daylight hours. This transport of a*

medically needy detainee to the Main Jail during a jail cap often triggers the concurrent release of inmates with earlier release dates from the Male and Female Honor Farms.

Response to Finding 6c: The Sheriff's Department disagrees partially with the finding.

This finding appears to be a restatement of Findings 6a and 6b. The Sheriff's Department concurs that any inmate booked into the Main Jail, when the Main Jail population is at the court ordered capacity, will trigger the implementation of early release procedures.

Regardless of a jail cap, the arrival of any inmate cannot be anticipated. However, the Main Jail is always given advance notice from the Santa Maria Branch Jail staff of the number of inmates being transported. Whether or not an inmate is booked into a facility during daylight hours has no relevance as we operate 24 hours a day, seven days a week, as does our contract medical provider.

Recommendation 6: *Hire medically trained professionals at the Santa Maria Jail to allow medically needy inmates to stay up to 96 hours in the Santa Maria Jail.*

Response to Recommendation 6: The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not reasonable.

This issue was addressed during the negotiations for the current medical contract with PHS (the medical provider for Sheriff's Custody). We determined such service to be cost prohibitive.

Finding 7a: *Special Medical Transports between the Santa Maria Jail and the Main Jail, for inmates that have any non-critical medical need, take up to four hours for the round-trip, and might occur more than once a day. These Special Medical Transports are in addition to the regular daily transports from the Santa Maria Jail to the Main Jail.*

Response to Finding 7a: The Sheriff's Department agrees partially with the finding.

Seldom does it take four hours to complete a special medical transport. The normal transport time is three hours. Rarely has there been more than one special medical transport during the same day. It is not unusual to have more than one inmate transported at a time, however. Regular daily transports occur only on court days, normally Monday through Friday, and never on weekends. Whereas, special medical transports often occur on weekends.

Finding 7b: *These Special Medical Transports are usually accomplished with Sheriff's Department personnel on overtime pay.*

Response to Finding 7b: The Sheriff's Department disagrees wholly with the finding.

All attempts are made to complete a special medical transport without the use of overtime. The majority of these transports are made with regular on-duty personnel. At the request of the Grand Jury, a log recording the number of special medical transports was established at the Santa Maria Branch Jail. This log was kept for a period of 34 days (November 8, 2000 to December 11, 2000). During this period, 64 inmates were reviewed for special transport consideration. Forty of these inmates were transported to the Main Jail. Twenty-three remained at the Santa Maria Branch Jail and one was transported to the hospital.

This log shows that special transports occurred on 21 days of the 34-day review period. During this review period, a total of seven hours of overtime was used to accomplish the special transports.

Finding 7c: *The average cost of these Special Medical Transports is approximately \$700 per trip (or roughly the cost for a registered nurse for 24 hours). This calculation includes Sheriff's deputy time in transport, double booking, gas, etc., but does not include in-transport liability protection, or estimated liability for delay of medical care.*

Response to Finding 7c: The Sheriff's Department disagrees wholly with the finding.

Since most of these transports are done using on-duty correction officers, there is no additional cost for the officer's time. There is no cost associated with booking, as the inmate was already booked at the Santa Maria Branch Jail. There is no such thing as a "double booking." The only real cost of most of these special transports is the vehicle usage cost of \$63.36 per trip. On the rare occasion that overtime is used to accomplish the transport, the cost of the trip is approximately \$200 per trip, including overtime and vehicle costs. Furthermore, any costs associated with special medical transports are far outweighed by the potential liability of not transporting the inmate to a facility that can provide necessary medical care.

Finding 7d: *The estimated average annual cost for Special Medical Transport in 2000 was \$277,200 (396 x \$700), based on the 28-day log that was kept.*

Response to Finding 7d: The Sheriff's Department disagrees wholly with the finding.

The Grand Jury's interpretation of the special medical transport log was inaccurate. The Grand Jury reported the log was kept for a period of 28 days when in actuality the log was kept for a period of 34 days. In addition, the log contained several duplicate entries. This 34-day review period is not an adequate indication of annual averages.

The cost of Special Medical Transports cannot be calculated based upon the number of inmates transported. The cost must be calculated based upon the number of round-trips made which may include more than one inmate per trip (Refer to Response to Finding 7c for discussion of costs). The Sheriff's Department does not track costs of each transport

and therefore cannot provide an accurate annual cost. As stated previously, most of these special medical transports are accomplished with on-duty correction officers.

Recommendation 7: *Special Medical Transports should be minimized to save County expense.*

Response to Recommendation 7: The recommendation has been implemented.

The Sheriff's Department has always minimized the use of special transports and makes every attempt to complete the required special transports in the most cost-effective manner. However, when it comes to prioritizing the safety of the inmate in our care and the cost of transportation, we choose to err in favor of the safe care of the inmate.

Finding 8a: *Even if the subsequent emergency medical treatment of the inmate moved after the 911 calls is deemed to be unnecessary by the medical staff at Marian Hospital, emergency medical costs are borne by the Sheriff's Department, and, ultimately, the taxpayers of Santa Barbara County.*

Response to Finding 8a: The Sheriff's Department disagrees wholly with the finding.

This finding is an inaccurate and misleading statement. There are no unnecessary emergency medical calls to 9-1-1. The responding medical personnel (County Fire and AMR), not jail staff, determine whether an inmate must be transported to a hospital via ambulance. Inmates whose medical needs have been reviewed via phone calls to PHS and are deemed to be in need of immediate but non life-threatening medical treatment are transported to the hospital for further review using Sheriff's personnel. Again, cost is not an overriding consideration for determining appropriate medical care for inmates.

Finding 8b: *Medically untrained personnel cannot discern many inmate health issues (for example, HIV, TB, lice, etc.). These undetected medical conditions are a potential hazard to the health of Sheriff's personnel and other inmates. In addition to the Jail Deputies, all persons involved in all the Sheriff's Transports (regular and Special) from the Santa Maria Jail to the Main Jail are exposed to the detected and undetected health issues of inmates during the hours in transport.*

Response to Finding 8b: The Sheriff's Department disagrees partially with the finding.

We agree that undetected medical conditions may be a potential hazard to the health of Sheriff's personnel and other inmates. However, the risk of exposure to communicable diseases is not limited to transports from the Santa Maria Branch Jail to the Main Jail. This risk occurs on a daily basis for each and every officer involved in the detention of inmates.

In compliance with Title 15 of the California Code of Regulations Section 1207, trained correction officers medically screen all inmates booked into the Santa Barbara County Jail. This screening includes, but is not limited to, medical and mental health problems, developmental disabilities, and communicable diseases. Although, inmates may occasionally withhold information during the screening process, every effort is made to assess the medical/mental health needs of the inmate and provide for appropriate care, as well as appropriate cautionary measures to prevent spread of communicable disease.

Finding 8c: *There is potential financial liability to the County for inmate health issues that are unrecognized and, hence, untreated.*

Response to Finding 8c: The Sheriff's Department agrees with the finding.

In fact, every aspect of the care and custody of inmates involves potential financial liability.

Recommendation 8: *Nursing staff should be hired and stationed in the Santa Maria Jail, on a schedule compliant with the California Medical Association standards for Type II Jail Facilities. The nursing staff could administer pharmaceuticals and identify and treat non-critical medical needs, for the health of all professionals and detainees at the Santa Maria Jail.*

Response to Recommendation 8: The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted and not reasonable.

The Santa Maria Branch Jail is not a Type II Jail Facility. The Sheriff's Department is in full compliance with Title 15 CCR Section 1200 (Responsibility for Health Care Services). The issue of on-site medical care at this facility has been addressed (see Response to Recommendation 6).

Finding 9: *The Santa Maria facility has sufficient space for a nurse's station.*

Response to Finding 9: The Sheriff's Department disagrees wholly with the finding.

The Sheriff's Department is unable to determine the criteria the Grand Jury used in determining there is sufficient space at the Santa Maria Branch Jail for a nurse's station. Title 24 CCR Section 470A.2.12 regulates space requirements for Medical Examination Rooms. The Santa Maria Branch Jail is so crowded that a closet had to be remodeled so that the Corrections Lieutenant could have a small private office to conduct confidential business and counseling without being overheard by inmates or the public.

Recommendation 9: *The cost of providing nursing capability at the Santa Maria Jail should be analyzed against the costs of the Special Medical Transports, AMR responses, and Marian Hospital emergency visits. The potential health risks to inmates and staff and the possibility of financial liability should also be factored into this analysis.*

Response to Recommendation 9: The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted.

As stated in Response to Recommendation 6, this issue was addressed during the negotiations for the current medical contract with PHS (the medical provider for Sheriff's Department Custody), and it was determined to be cost prohibitive.

Finding 10: *Full utilization of the Santa Maria Jail facility would relieve the Main Jail of some of its population restriction problems, and so most, if not all, County inmates could serve their full sentences.*

Response to Finding 10: The Sheriff's Department disagrees wholly with the finding.

This is an unsupported theory, not based in fact. The Santa Maria Branch Jail is operated in full compliance with the California Penal Code and the Minimum Standards for Local Adult Detention Facilities (Title 15 and Title 24 California Code of Regulations). This facility is utilized to the fullest extent allowed by law, as discussed earlier in this document.

Recommendation 10: *If deemed cost effective by the outcome of the analyses proposed in Recommendation 9, the current Santa Maria Jail Type I facility should be used to capacity.*

Response to Recommendation 10: The recommendation has been implemented.

As stated in Response to Finding 10, the Santa Maria Branch Jail is used to its fullest extent.

Finding 11: *To hold sentenced and unsentenced jail inmates longer than 96 hours (as Type II facilities do), the Santa Maria Jail would need to take the following actions:*

- *increase the security of the existing exercise yard (at an approximate cost of \$10,000),*
- *provide meal service appropriate for a Type II facility (at no additional cost), and*
- *provide certified medical staff at the facility. (The approximate cost for an on-site Registered Nurse is \$30/hour).*

Response to Finding 11: The Sheriff's Department disagrees wholly with the finding.

The Grand Jury has failed to provide a review of all applicable standards for the operation of a Type II facility. These can be found in the Minimum Standards for Local Adult Detention Facilities (Title 15 and Title 24 California Code of Regulations). For example, this Finding completely ignored the requirement to provide dayrooms and

program space, visitation space, staffing for recreation and programs, and provision of other support services required for Type II facilities.

The cost estimates provided by the Grand Jury are once again unsubstantiated. In order to comply with standards, the exercise yard would need to be re-constructed to prevent escapes, such as the exercise yards that have been reconstructed at the Main Jail. Any such design would have to be approved by the Board of Corrections and meet all standards for Type II facilities. The \$10,000 suggested might cover the architectural and engineering costs, but would not come close to covering construction costs.

It is simply untrue that meal service appropriate for a Type II facility could be provided at no additional cost. The existing food preparation area in the Santa Maria facility does not have the necessary space or equipment to support the frequency and variety of meals that would be required for a Type II facility. Nor, does it take into consideration the space requirements of inmate dining in a Type II facility.

The cost estimate for providing certified medical staff at the facility does not include the cost of construction or renovation to provide the required space for medical treatment rooms, pharmaceutical storage, medical offices and medical records storage. There are far more costs involved in providing on-site medical care than an approximate hourly wage of a nurse.

Recommendation 11: *Reclassification of the Santa Maria Jail as a Type II facility should be analyzed by the Sheriff's Department in order to be able to house appropriate inmates longer than 96 hours at the facility. This analysis should be based on the social and financial costs of premature release of inmates from the County jails versus the cost to fence the yard and hire a nurse at the Santa Maria Jail. Cost savings (regular and Special Medical Transports, extradition transfers, and health liability issues, as listed in Recommendation 9) should also be considered.*

Response to Recommendation 11: The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable.

The corrections facility needs of Santa Barbara County has been analyzed in the Community Based Punishment Options Planning for the County of Santa Barbara (1996), the North County Santa Barbara Correctional Planning (Needs Assessment, 1992, and updated in June of 2000). Each of these documents recommends the construction of a North County Jail facility. The most recent study indicated that we need a minimum of 400 beds in North County just to meet today's need, not taking into consideration the bed space requirement for future needs. In addition, every other Grand Jury dating back to 1993-94 recommended the construction of a new North County Jail facility.

It would be fiscally irresponsible to conduct a study to convert the 32-bed Santa Maria Branch Jail to a Type II facility. The construction costs alone to re-build this facility to

Type II standards would be cost prohibitive. Furthermore, the costs of operating a 32-bed facility as a Type II facility would be an irresponsible waste of the taxpayers' money. The handful of beds that could potentially be used to hold longer-term inmates would not make a dent in the overcrowding at the Main Jail. Currently, the Santa Maria Branch Jail is full on most weekends. It is only during the week that extra beds are available. If inmates were held there longer than 96 hours, we would be faced with severe overcrowding in that facility every weekend, thus defeating the whole purpose of using that facility to prevent early releases.

Male Honor Farm

Finding 12a: *The Male Honor Farm is not used to capacity because of the unintended consequences of the current jail cap order, since the release of a Main Jail inmate due to the application of the jail cap triggers the release of all Honor Farm trustees with earlier release dates.*

Response to Finding 12a: The Sheriff's Department disagrees wholly with the finding.

The California Board of Corrections sets the rated capacity of a facility. Rated capacity is defined as "the number of inmate occupants for which a facility's single and double occupancy cells or dormitories, except those dedicated for health care or disciplinary isolation, were planned and designed in conformity to the standards and requirements of Title 15 and Title 24 CCR."

The rated capacity of the male Honor Farm is 120 beds. We have continually for many years housed more than that number of inmates at the Honor Farm. Over the years, Custody staff, with concurrence from the Jail Overcrowding Task Force and the court, has modified criteria for assignment to the Honor Farm in order to alleviate overcrowding at the Main Jail.

Table 9 of the Grand Jury report is misleading. The percentage of capacity in Table 9 is based upon the number of total beds at the male Honor Farm. Since the Honor Farm has been double-bunked and subsequently triple-bunked over the past few years, there are far more beds in the facility than are allowed under Title 24 standards. In addition, the Grand Jury failed to include the number of inmates on the Work Furlough program that occupy beds in the Honor Farm. Using the California Board of Corrections standards (rated bed capacity), the percentage capacity at the Honor Farm has varied between 151% and 178% capacity over the last five years. Obviously, the Honor Farm is being used well above its maximum rated capacity.

As stated in Response to Finding 5, the Main jail application of the cap does not trigger the release of all Honor Farm inmates with earlier release dates. Refer to our Response to Recommendation 1b for explanation of early release procedures.

Finding 12b: *Multiple releases for the Male Honor Farm can result from the early release policy, even though the jail cap is triggered by a need for only a single bed at the Main Jail.*

Response to Finding 12b: The Sheriff's Department agrees with the finding.

Recommendation 12: *The Male Honor Farm should be used fully to serve County citizens at the least social and economic cost.*

Response to Recommendation 12: The recommendation has been implemented.

As of January 2001, two-thirds of the sentenced population were housed in minimum security/alternative sentencing programs. A full forty percent of the entire population (sentenced and unsentenced) were housed in minimum-security facilities or alternative sentencing programs. As stated in our Response to Finding 12a, we have operated the Honor Farm at 151% to 178% of maximum rated capacity for each of the past five years.

Finding 13a: *A trustee's rehabilitation and training might not be completed if he is early released. Incomplete training can negate the purpose of the sentence and compromise the rehabilitation of the offender. This wastes the County's money.*

Response to Finding 13a: The Sheriff's Department disagrees wholly with the finding.

This finding is a statement that makes the assumption that inmates are committed to the county jail for the purpose of rehabilitation. Inmates are sentenced by the courts based upon the crimes they committed and the sentencing requirements in California Penal Code Section 1170 sentencing guidelines. This section states, "The Legislature finds and declares that the purpose of imprisonment for crime is punishment."

Inmates housed at the male Honor Farm volunteer to participate in a variety of vocational and educational programs provided by Inmate Services. The courts may recommend that an inmate be considered for participation in these programs. However, they are not mandated to participate. These programs are not designed for "specific and firm" time periods. Inmate Services, in conjunction with Santa Barbara City College, has designed these programs to benefit even those inmates who were able to attend only one session.

Participation in the Sheriff's Treatment Program may be voluntary or mandated by the courts as a part of a sentence. Inmates who are mandated into the program are not released pursuant to the jail cap, unless they have been placed into an approved outside program such as Newhouse.

As stated before, the Sheriff's Department is dedicated to providing the inmate population with education, vocation and counseling programs designed to enhance their life skills. These programs work in conjunction with community resource programs available to

persons not in custody. Every inmate, upon release, has the option to avail himself or herself of the many training and rehabilitation programs available to all other members of the community who are not in custody.

Finding 13b: *A Male Honor Farm trustee's early release and incomplete training renders that trustee's reentry into the community less successful. A less successful reentry into the community may cause trustees to recidivate and again become a financial and social expense of the County.*

Response to Finding 13b: The Sheriff's Department disagrees wholly with the finding.

Again, this is not a finding, but an unsupported theory. There are no statistics to back up the assertion that early release renders reentry into the community less successful or that recidivism is directly related to an inmate's early release. As a matter of fact, the majority (57%) of all inmates released early were placed into alternative sentencing programs, which involved monitored reentry into the community. A much higher percentage of early releases from the Honor Farm went into alternative programs because early release inmates who were released to out-of-county agencies and State Parole are ineligible for assignment to the Honor Farm.

Recommendation 13: *Determine how the current jail cap order can be reinterpreted (e.g., facility cap, higher utilization of branch jails, etc.) to preclude Male Honor Farm trustees from being affected by the Main Jail early releases.*

Response to Recommendation 13: The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted.

This is a restatement of Recommendation 1e. Refer to our Response to Recommendation 1e.

Finding 14a: *Restating the finding of the 1999-2000 Grand Jury, the roof of the latrine at the Male Honor Farm is termite-infested and has dry rot.*

Response to Finding 14a: The Sheriff's Department disagrees partially with the finding. This was true six months ago. However, the old latrine has been torn down, construction of the new latrine is nearly complete, and the new roof is already in place.

Finding 14b: *There is frequent and heavy condensation on the interior of windows of the Male Honor Farm.*

Response to Finding 14b: The Sheriff's Department disagrees partially with the finding.

The frequent and heavy condensation occurred only in the old latrine portion of the Honor Farm. That latrine has been demolished and construction is nearly complete on the replacement.

Finding 14c: *The tunnel between the Male Honor Farm and the Main Jail is inadequately ventilated.*

Response to Finding 14c: The Sheriff's Department disagrees partially with the finding.

While this was true six months ago, General Services Maintenance personnel fixed the ventilation problem earlier this year.

Finding 14d: *The passive solar panels used to heat water at the Male Honor Farm are in need of restoration or replacement.*

Response to Finding 14d: The Sheriff's Department agrees with the finding.

It should be noted, however, that the solar panels were removed as a result of the latrine reconstruction. The Sheriff's Department does not know if the solar panels will again be reconnected at some point.

Recommendation 14: *Correct by repair, retrofitting, or replacement all of the facility problems listed in Findings 14a, 14b, 14c, and 14d.*

Response to Recommendation 14: The recommendation has been partially implemented and will be fully implemented by August 8, 2001.

The County is currently doing a total reconstruction of the Honor Farm latrine. This includes replacing the roof and ventilation system. This repair is expected to be complete by August 8, 2001.

General Services fixed the ventilation fan in the tunnel early this year.

The solar panels have been removed for reconstruction. The Sheriff's Department has been told by General Services that the contract for the solar panels is due to expire in five years. The vendor owning the panels conducts monthly inspections and all requests for repair are reported to the vendor. At the end of the lease/purchase the County will evaluate the panels for adequacy and determine whether the continued use, replacement or abandonment of the panels is the best course of action.

Female Honor Farm (at La Morada)

Finding 15a: *As is the case with the Male Honor Farm, the Main Jail population cap causes women at the Female Honor Farm to be released earlier than their sentenced (planned) release date. This inadvertently occurs if*

- 1) *A female inmate bed is needed at the Main Jail,*
- 2) *an Honor Farm trustee has an earlier release date than the inmate in the needed Main Jail bed, and*
- 3) *The jail cap is in effect.*

Response to Finding 15a: The Sheriff's Department agrees with the finding.

Finding 15b: *As with the Male Honor Farm, Female Honor Farm remediation programs for behavior modification need specific and firm time periods to be most effective in changing harmful behavior patterns. The effectiveness of these remediation programs is compromised by unplanned early release dates for trustees.*

Response Finding 15b: The Sheriff's Department disagrees wholly with the finding.

This finding is essentially the same as Finding 13a. Refer to Response to Finding 13a.

Recommendation 15: *Determine whether the current jail cap order can be reinterpreted to preclude Female Honor Farm trustees from being penalized by Main Jail early releases that disrupt the time-specific behavior modification programs.*

Response to Recommendation 15: The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted.

This is again a restatement of Recommendation 1e. Refer to Response to Recommendation 1e.

Finding 16a: *Substance abuse often results in physiological medical conditions, in addition to psychological conditions, and so requires the professional services of a medical doctor as well as a psychologist.*

Response to Finding 16a: The Sheriff's Department agrees with the finding.

Although we are hesitant to agree with such a general statement, we concur that this is often the case. However, this is true for all inmates, not just those housed at La Morada. Inmates at La Morada, while not having on-site medical care, have equivalent access to doctors and psychologists that other inmates have. They are transported to the Main Jail for non-emergency physician visits and sick call.

Finding 16b: *The La Morada Facility is located some distance from the centralized medical facilities at the Main Jail and there are no medical services available at the La*

Morada Female Honor Farm. Because of the lack of medical care at La Morada, no woman with any medical conditions (e.g., asthma, diabetes, allergies, sensitivity to bee stings, etc.) is eligible for placement at the La Morada Female Honor Farm facility even though she might otherwise qualify for, and benefit from, such classification and therapeutic programming.

Response to Finding 16b: The Sheriff's Department disagrees partially with the finding.

We would like to clarify that the medical restrictions placed on inmates housed at the La Morada facility only include medical conditions that are potentially life-threatening if not treated immediately. For example, an inmate diagnosed with diabetes could be housed at La Morada if her condition did not require regular insulin injection.

Finding 16c: *As a result of La Morada's distance from the medical facilities at the Main Jail, a smaller percentage of County women detainees have the option of Honor Farm placement and therapeutic programming than do their male counterparts.*

Response to Finding 16c: The Sheriff's Department agrees partially with the finding.

It is true that, due to the distance from medical facilities at the Main Jail, a smaller percentage of sentenced female inmates qualify for housing at the female honor farm. However, neither of the minimum-security facilities is considered to be a therapeutic programming facility. Inmate Services also offers a variety of vocational, educational, and counseling programs to inmates housed at the Main Jail.

Finding 16d: *Federal legislation mandates equality in the administration of male and female honor farm detention facilities in the same county.*

Response to Finding 16d: The Sheriff's Department disagrees partially with the finding.

Actually, state legislation regulates county detention facilities. The Sheriff's Department is in compliance with California Penal Code Section 4029 (equal facilities and programs for prisoners of both sexes).

Recommendation 16: *The stringent medical qualifications for females should be removed for Female Honor Farm classification. This would result in more placements into the Female Honor Farm, allow for more therapeutic rehabilitation of County female substance abusers and, at the same time, release beds in the Main Jail for other women detainees. This may mean identifying a separate facility. (See Recommendation 19b)*

Response to Recommendation 16: The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented by September 30, 2001.

In September 2000, upon the suggestion of a staff member, Custody Operations assigned a work group to study the feasibility of relocating La Morada (female) inmates to the male Honor Farm. The work group determined the concept was feasible and Sheriff's administration approved the plan. The relocation is expected to be complete by September 30, 2001. Once the relocation is complete, the qualifications for housing at the Female Honor Farm will be the same as the qualifications for housing at the Male Honor Farm. Throughout their visits to custody facilities, the Grand Jury was made aware of these plans.

Finding 17: *This early release policy is negating the intended beneficial objectives of the Female Honor Farm programming by reducing the average stay at La Morada from 12 months to less than two months.*

Response to Finding 17: The Sheriff's Department disagrees wholly with the finding.

As stated previously in Responses to Findings 13a and 13b, the programs administered by Inmate Services are not designed for "specific and firm time periods." There are no studies supporting the assertion that the early release procedures established to manage the court ordered population cap result in negating the benefits of the available programs. These programs are designed to benefit even those inmates able to attend only one session.

The Sheriff's Department does not keep statistical records on "average length of stay" at La Morada or any other custody facility. However, we do know that the average length of stay for inmates at La Morada has never been 12 months as indicated in the Grand Jury's Table 11 from 1996 - 1999. An inmate is rarely ever sentenced to a year in County Jail. Even on the rare instance that an inmate is sentenced to a year, she would never serve 12 months at La Morada. First, she would be given credit for time served prior to sentencing (all of which would have been served at the Main Jail) and she would be given credits for work and good time, which further reduces her time served by four months. We also noted that the figures represented in Table 4 (page 6 of the Grand Jury Report) contradict Table 11 (page 14 of the same Report).

Recommendation 17: *The Sheriff's Department should restore the integrity of time necessary for behavior modification therapy to be effective for women trustees at the Female Honor Farm.*

Response to Recommendation 17: The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted.

As stated in our Response to Finding 17, the programs administered by Inmate Services are not designed for "specific and firm time periods." Also refer to our Responses to Findings 13a and 13b. Furthermore, we do not provide "behavior modification therapy" to inmates at any of our facilities. In all our facilities, we do expect inmates to follow the

rules while in custody and we have a disciplinary system in place consistent with Title 15 of the California Code of Regulations for inmates that violate the rules. However, it is not "therapy" in any sense of the word.

Finding 18: *More County women qualify for the honor farm classification than can be housed at the current Female Honor Farm Site, and La Morada facility.*

Response to Finding 18: The Sheriff's Department disagrees wholly with the finding. If this finding were true, all beds at the female honor farm would be occupied and there would be a waiting list for transfers from the Main Jail to La Morada.

Recommendation 18: *All qualified inmates should have the opportunity to be classified as Female Honor Farm trustees. This would serve the community appropriately, reduce the per-trustee cost, and save taxpayer's money.*

Response to Recommendation 18: The recommendation has been implemented.

Policies and procedures are in place with the intention of classifying all female inmates who qualify under our current criteria for housing at the female honor farm.

Finding 19: *The La Morada facility is underutilized because of the stringent medical qualification for women trustees, and rehabilitation and therapy are compromised by the Main Jail early release (Jail Cap) program.*

Response to Finding 19: The Sheriff's Department disagrees partially with the finding.

This finding is a restatement of Findings 16b, 16c, 17 and 18. Please refer to our responses on those findings.

Recommendation 19a: *As the La Morada facility is restricted to only healthy Female Honor Farm trustees, a new facility should be identified and the Female Honor Farm should be relocated away from La Morada to serve the maximum number of County women qualifying for honor farm detention.*

Response to Recommendation 19a: The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future with an expected implementation date prior to September 30, 2001.

This recommendation is a restatement of Recommendation 16. Refer to our Response to Recommendation 16.

Recommendation 19b: *Adapt presently underutilized facilities at the Male Honor Farm (adjacent to the Main Jail and its medical facilities) for the use of women who qualify for,*

but are denied Female Honor Farm status. This would enable more qualified women to be classified as Female Honor Farm trustees.

Response to Recommendation 19b: The recommendation has been implemented.

As the Grand Jury was well aware, plans are in place to relocate the La Morada inmates to the male Honor Farm. Please refer to Response to Recommendation 16.

Carpinteria Sheriff's Sub-Station

Finding 22: *Office Efficiency of the sub-station is compromised by the inefficient design of the facility.*

Response to Finding 22: We disagree partially with this finding. We agree that additional improvements can be made which will improve the efficient use of the workspace, however we do not agree that efficiency has been compromised by the current design. The interior space of the station, although certainly not ideal, does allow for the efficient running of the station.

Recommendation 22: *Management should act on its many ideas to improve office efficiency, which can be implemented at reasonable cost by better partitioning of space.*

Response to Recommendation 22: The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented to the best of our ability within the next fiscal year.

The Sheriff's Department leases the Carpinteria Station from the City of Carpinteria as part our contract for law enforcement services. Changes to the building must be approved by the City of Carpinteria. Since 1992, we have made several improvements to the interior space of the building.

We have spent the last several months analyzing the workspace in the station and several changes and improvements are already planned which will expand some office space, relieve some of the congestion in the booking area, and create additional storage. However, our ability to implement certain improvements are limited by several factors. The physical plant structure prohibits certain changes without incurring extraordinary costs. For example, we have already examined the possibility of reducing the size of the interview room and we have decided this is not a viable option due to the placement of the multiple doors and air conditioning/venting systems.

Our ability to remodel the interior space of the building is limited by the costs associated with the labor and materials needed to make the improvements. We must carefully examine each suggested improvement for its cost effectiveness and feasibility. We intend to implement some reasonable changes during FY 2001-2002 as our resources and funding allow.

New Cuyama Sheriff's Sub-Station

Finding 23a: *Both emergency and non-emergency Sheriff's Department back-up personnel are dispatched by helicopter from Santa Ynez, and land at the New Cuyama airstrip.*

Response to Finding 23a: The Sheriff's Department agrees with the finding. However, the dispatching of emergency personnel via helicopter to the Cuyama area occurs infrequently.

Finding 23b: *At the New Cuyama airstrip, there are no facilities to refuel or even a safe place to store a cache of emergency aircraft fuel. Pilots low on fuel after a long mountain patrol have to go to Santa Maria or Santa Ynez, a distant and possibly dangerous diversion that limits patrol time and increases operational costs. A small concrete helipad can easily be built on ample County property.*

Response to Finding 23b: The Sheriff's Department partially disagrees with this finding. While having a refueling and landing site near the Cuyama sub-station would be an asset to our air operations, the placement and construction of such assets will have to go through State and local permitting processes.

Recommendation 23a: *A simple 20X20 ft. (or smaller) concrete pad, requiring approximately \$1000 for materials (a frame is already in place), should be built."*

Response to Recommendation 23a: This recommendation requires further analysis. The construction of a designated landing area for our helicopters would be a benefit to our air operations. However, a permitting process is required through Caltrans. A cost analysis and permitting process will be conducted within six months.

The framed area referred to in the report is not for a designated landing area.

Recommendation 23b: *Fuel should be stored at the Sheriff's Department facility, in an existing small above-ground tank located near the proposed pad, hosed to the helicopter as needed. It can be replenished occasionally from jerrycans brought from the Santa Ynez home base.*

Response to Recommendation 23b: This recommendation requires further analysis. The Sheriff's Department is in possession of a 300 gallon fuel tank that could be placed at the Cuyama Station. However, prior to storing jet fuel at this location, approval and permitting from County Fire will be required. The Sheriff's Department will conduct a needs assessment and site survey on this recommendation and recommendation 23a, and report back to the Grand Jury within six months, as required.

Isla Vista Foot Patrol

Finding 25: *The Isla Vista Foot Patrol is a very well managed part of the Sheriff's Department operating effectively in a difficult and special environment.*

Response to Finding 25: We agree with this finding.

Recommendation 25a: *The Sheriff's Department should increase its efforts to obtain more cooperation with UCSB campus police and administration. UCSB provides most of the campus policing needs, but tends to treat problems off-campus as outside of its responsibility, especially when a UCSB student is involved in an illegal activity and is not a victim.*

Response to Recommendation 25a: This recommendation has been partially implemented.

The Sheriff's Department, UCSB Police, and Administration have worked together very effectively since the Isla Vista Foot Patrol was created in 1970 and in general, cooperation has been excellent. Representatives from both agencies sit on several common committees dealing with public safety issues in Isla Vista. We enjoy frequent support from University officials for our efforts in Isla Vista, and they played an integral role in effectively reducing the violence and other problems which has been associated with the annual Halloween festivities.

During the last year, we have expanded our activities with the University. We have been jointly participating in a research project concerning alcohol-related incidents in Isla Vista, and we sit on several joint committees related to public safety issues in Isla Vista.

The issue of extending University jurisdiction for crimes committed off-campus by UCSB students is difficult and complex. UCSB is actively working on this issue, and we will continue to work with and encourage UCSB officials to hold students responsible for crimes they commit off-campus.

One area in which we will continue our efforts is in the development of a Cooperative Law Enforcement Agreement with UCSB. Since 1970, we have made several attempts to execute a written agreement with UCSB for staffing and operating the Isla Vista Foot Patrol, however UCSB has not acted on our requests. We will submit another draft of a written agreement to UCSB during FY 2001/2002.

Recommendation 25b: *A sobering center, similar to the one in downtown Santa Barbara, would be a more cost-effective way of detaining alcohol-challenged students rather than routinely taking them to the Main Jail. Such a location should be established in this densely populated area.*

Response to Recommendation 25b: This recommendation will be studied further.

Although the Sobering Center in downtown Santa Barbara is functioning well, we have some concerns about the feasibility of such a facility in Isla Vista. Many of the individuals arrested for public intoxication in Isla Vista are not appropriate candidates for a sobering center environment. Some are so intoxicated that they require medical treatment and hospital clearance prior to any incarceration. Others are arrested after also being involved in physical confrontations or other crimes. In addition, we are concerned about the security of a sobering center in Isla Vista, especially when associates may attempt to remove an intoxicated individual, or when a detainee chooses to walk away, causing a greater drain on our already limited law enforcement resources in Isla Vista.

Unlike the City of Santa Barbara, a sobering center would probably not be cost effective for the Sheriff's Department or the County. Since we do not pay booking fees to ourselves, the only financial benefit would possibly be in the time saved by Deputies by reduced jail transports. This time savings may be offset by the additional workload involved in maintaining security at the sobering center and locating intoxicated individuals who walk away. Capital and operating costs of a sobering center in Isla Vista are also a concern.

The concept of a sobering center in Isla Vista warrants further study, including an examination of the arrests for public intoxication to determine what percentage of these individuals may be eligible for a sobering center and what impact this would have financially and on jail overcrowding.

Figueroa Street Court Holding Facility

Finding 30a: *Security issues at the Figueroa Street Court Holding facility, particularly in the sallyport area, continue.*

Response to Finding 30a: The Sheriff's Department agrees with the finding.

Construction of an enclosed off-loading area at the Figueroa Court Holding facility is scheduled to begin in mid-July and should be completed by the first of August. Inmates will then step off a bus or van into a covered passageway. The passageway will secure the entrance and exit of the court compound and prevent the public from seeing the inmates.

Finding 30b: *There is no emergency generator backing up the electrical systems (hence ventilation system) in the facility.*

Response to Finding 30b: The Sheriff's Department agrees with the finding.

Recommendation 30: *An automatic emergency generator should be installed to serve the Figueroa Street Court Holding facility.*

Response to Recommendation 30: The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted.

There are no plans in the General Services 2000/2005 Five Year Facilities Maintenance Master Plan book to install a generator at the Figueroa Street court compound. General Services, after consulting with the Sheriff's Department, has agreed to install adequate emergency lighting. The lighting will be of the type that is battery operated and activates when there is a power failure. Lighting would be available for at least 1½ hours. General Services will install emergency lighting in the holding facility within 3 months of this response.

Without a generator, there still is no ventilation. Taking this into consideration, the Sheriff's Transportation Unit has a contingency plan. When the source of the outage is determined, we can better estimate how long we will be without power. At that time we will decide whether to keep the inmates at the compound or return them to the Main Jail.

It should be noted that any power outage affecting the holding facility would likely affect the courts, causing the courts to close operation. In that case, all inmates would be transferred back to the Main Jail, rather than retained in the holding facility.

Finding 31a: *Transporting the majority of County inmates into the downtown area of the largest city in the County for arraignments, sentencing, and court hearings makes security concerns (inmate escapes, public access, privacy from media) more acute.*

Response to Finding 31a: The Sheriff's Department agrees with the finding.

It should be noted, however, than any movement of inmates outside of a secure jail facility creates security concerns. This concern is not confined to "the largest city in the County."

Finding 31b: *Escorting chained inmates (many of whom have limited English language skills) through the non-English-speaking tourists and visitors at the Courthouse renders the Sheriff's deputies oral directives less effective, and could endanger the public, the inmates, or the Sheriff's personnel.*

Response to Finding 31b: The Sheriff's Department agrees with the finding.

As stated above, any movement of inmates outside of a secure jail facility, particularly into non-secure public areas, is inherently risky.

Recommendation 31: *An alternate system of video arraignment, based on models adopted in other counties, between the Main Jail and the Judges should be considered to reduce the volume of inmates transported to the downtown Santa Barbara facility.*

Response to Recommendation 31: The recommendation requires further study.

In January 1999, Custody Operations formed a work group to study video arraignment and make recommendations for implementation. The group was comprised of senior officers from the jail and the Bail Review Unit Supervisor. The group visited jails that were using the system and contacted vendors to get an estimate of the equipment cost and installation charges. At that time, purchasing units for Santa Barbara, Santa Maria and Lompoc was approximately \$150,000. When the information was presented to representatives from Superior Court and the Public Defender's Office, they expressed little support for the system. The Sheriff's Department is in favor of video arraignment and has been for years. We will continue to research this concept and work with the courts and the Public Defender to gain acceptance for such a system.

Aviation Bureau

Finding 33a: *The four-seat helicopters currently in operation by the Santa Barbara Sheriff's Department cannot accommodate a stretcher, or a rescue of more than two ambulatory people. They do not have a second engine to assure safe transport of a heavy load for any distance, or to fly safely over water to the Channel Islands.*

Response to Finding 33a: The Sheriff's Department agrees with the finding.

Finding 33b: *"The smaller helicopters carry only a small amount of fuel and refueling locations in the County are limited."*

Response to Finding 33b: Respondent agrees with the finding, but would like to include the following information: The fuel capacity of the current helicopters is adequate when the pilot and observer are the only passengers, on routine observer missions. When additional persons or loads are in the aircraft, then loss of range due to weight becomes an issue. A helicopter designed to carry more passengers and/or larger loads would extend the time between refueling, as it could carry the weight of additional fuel.

In regards to limited refueling locations in the County, there is fuel available at Santa Barbara, Santa Ynez, and Santa Maria airports. When operations occur in the Cuyama Valley, the nearest refueling location is in Santa Maria. This requires a 40-minute flight. The flight crews are very cognizant of fuel consumption, and plan their operations accordingly.

Recommendation 33: *The County should analyze the feasibility of purchasing and operating a larger helicopter. This would enhance the Aviation Bureau's ability to*

deliver emergency responders and equipment to back County rescues, as well as increase the range and carrying capacity of the helicopters.

Response to Recommendation 33: The Sheriff's Department agrees with the recommendation for the County to analyze the feasibility of purchasing and operating a larger helicopter. The Sheriff's Department has identified an Eurocopter EC135 helicopter as meeting the needs of our department and the citizens of Santa Barbara County. A helicopter of this type would be a true rescue helicopter that could carry 7-8 persons, and hoist rescuers and injured personnel. It would be able to safely fly water rescues, and could accommodate stretchers for injured persons. This would be of value operationally as a tactical team or group of rescuers could be flown to anywhere in the County, including the Channel Islands. The cost of this helicopter is \$ 3.8 million. Efforts have been underway for six months to identify potential funding sources.

Finding 34a: *The location of the hangar at the Santa Ynez Airport is in a congested area. Emergency dispatch is compromised in the present location.*

Response to Finding 34a: The Sheriff's Department agrees with the finding, except that while the emergency dispatch of helicopters from this location is not optimum, it does not compromise our abilities to respond.

Finding 34b: *The County owns land at an uncongested area at the east end of the Santa Ynez airport.*

Response to Finding 34b: The Sheriff's Department agrees with the finding.

Recommendation 34: *The County should consider building a hangar on the County-owned land at the end of the airport. This may reduce response time to a critical emergency. Compare the cost of leased facility now used with inexpensive Quonset hut construction.*

Response to Recommendation 34b: The recommendation for the County of Santa Barbara to build a hangar at the east end of the Santa Ynez Airport requires further analysis.

The Sheriff's Department agrees that having our hangar in close proximity to the launching area for helicopters would decrease the time it takes to get the helicopter airborne in an emergency situation.

However, the manner in which this hangar is built requires further analysis. A study to determine the most cost effective means of constructing the hangar in a timely manner needs to be conducted. It is possible that it may be more fiscally attractive to have a private vendor or the Airport Authority construct and/or manage the hangars. These are issues that will require fiscal review.

Finding 35: *The Sheriff's Department communications at the Santa Ynez Airport are not cabled to the County system, limiting the data exchange of the Aviation Bureau with Sheriff's and other departments of the County government.*

Response to Finding 35: The Sheriff's Department agrees with the finding.

Recommendation 35: *The Sheriff's computers at the Santa Ynez Airport should be linked to the County system. This should be done after a decision is made about relocating the hanger.*

Response to Recommendation 35: The Sheriff's Department agrees with the recommendation that the computers at the Aviation Bureau at the Santa Ynez Airport should be linked to the Sheriff's Department and County computer networks. However, this recommendation will not be implemented due to the high cost. The current estimate to link these computers as recommended is \$22,000, with an on-going annual fee of \$15,000 per year. With the rapid technological advances in the area of computers and communications, it is hoped that a lower cost alternative will be available in the not too distant future. Until that time, the benefit of linking these computers does not justify the expense.

Coroner Bureau

Finding 36: *The autopsies performed for the Federal Bureau of Prisons facilities in Lompoc require substantial Sheriff-Coroner time in investigating, transporting, and clearance.*

Response to Finding 36: The Sheriff's Department agrees with the finding.

Recommendation 36: *Federal Bureau of Prisons officials should be made aware of all costs associated with these Prison autopsy services, and agreement should be reached to provide full reimbursement to the County for all costs incurred in these services.*

Response to Recommendation 36: The Santa Barbara Sheriff's Department agrees with the Recommendation and has already taken steps to improve this situation. We have prepared an agreement between the Federal Bureau of Prisons and the Santa Barbara Sheriff's Department for autopsy services. This agreement was recently submitted to the Bureau of Prisons for review by their attorneys. Until such time that they approve this agreement, they have informally agreed to timely reimburse the County for all costs incurred in performing any autopsies involving any deaths occurring at the FCI-Lompoc facility.

Finding 37: *Staff members are processing an ever-increasing number of drug tests with an extremely good turn-around time.*

Response to Finding 37: The Sheriff's Department agrees with the Finding.

Recommendation 37: *The Sheriff-Coroner should consider the addition of a third toxicologist to accommodate the County's drug-testing needs, so that there is no compromise of the accuracy, efficiency, and timeliness of the test results.*

Response to Finding 37: The Sheriff's Department disagrees with the recommendation. The responsibility for the County Toxicology lab was taken over by the Sheriff's Department in 1991. Its sole purpose was to provide services primarily for toxicology analysis for Coroner Investigations. Based on the qualifications of our past and present Forensic Toxicologists, as well as the capabilities of our lab equipment to handle a larger work load, our mission traversed into handling drug toxicology analysis' for our own Operations Division as well as for the needs of the Probation Department. However, with the quality of our analysis, coupled with quick turn around times, below competitive costs and no charges incurred for court time, several other law enforcement agencies sought us out to handle their drug testing needs as well. Needless to say our small little lab became overrun with requests for their services, stressing the limits of our employees and adversely effecting our budget. An additional concern developed when it became apparent that we would have problems competitively recruiting for an additional Forensic Toxicologist based on salary compared with living conditions within Santa Barbara County.

Because of our ongoing costs, staffing problems, and facility limitations, we feel that the County of Santa Barbara and its Sheriff's Department would be better served by limiting the number of requests for services to our Toxicology lab. Effective July 1, 2001, the Santa Barbara Sheriff's Department is discontinuing our Toxicology Laboratory Services to all local law enforcement agencies, as well as for other non-government affiliates. We will continue to provide quality services to Departments of the County of Santa Barbara.

We believe that this action will ensure that there is no compromise to the accuracy, efficiency and timeliness of any test results.

Finding 38: *Few visitors come to the facility to identify bodies. For those who have cause to visit the center, however, there is no private room or space for consolation.*

Response to Finding 38: The Sheriff's Department agrees with the finding.

Recommendation 38: *Build a reception area in the Coroner's office.*

Response to Recommendation 38: The Sheriff's Department agrees with the Recommendation. Currently the Department is discussing plans to move the current location of the Toxicology Lab to a building directly behind the County Morgue by the

end of FY2001/2002. This building is currently being used by the La Morada Women's Honor Farm. Plans have been made to move these inmates over to the Main Jail Honor Farm facility, thus freeing up county buildings for other purposes. The building in question would double the size of our current lab. This would allow the lab employees a larger work space environment complete with a locker room and computer work stations. Once the lab is moved we plan on renovating the current Coroner facility. This renovation will include doubling the size of the investigators work space, a reception area for visitors, a conference/break room for employees and a bereavement room for families to spend time with their loved ones if they choose.