

SANTA BARBARA COUNTY BOARD AGENDA LETTER



Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
105 E. Anapamu Street, Suite 407
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
(805) 568-2240

Agenda Number:

Prepared on: Thursday, July 29, 2004
Department: County Administrator
Budget Unit: 012
Agenda Date: Tuesday, August 10, 2004
Placement: Departmental
Estimate Time: 30 minutes
Continued Item: NO
If Yes, date from:

TO: Board of Supervisors

FROM: Michael F. Brown, County Administrator

STAFF: Jim Laponis, Deputy County Administrator, (805) 568-3404
John Jayasinghe, Administrative Analyst, (805) 568-2246

SUBJECT: Board of Supervisors' Response to the 2003-04 Grand Jury Report on "Criminal Justice Committee and Detention Facilities"

Recommendation:

That the Board of Supervisors:

- A. Adopt the responses in Attachment (1) as the Board of Supervisors' responses to the 2003-04 Grand Jury Report on "Criminal Justice and Detention Facilities", and
- B. Authorize the Chair to sign the letter included in Attachment (1) forwarding the responses to the Presiding Judge.

Alignment with Board Strategic Plan:

The recommendations are primarily aligned with Goal #7: A County Government that is Accessible, Open, and Citizen-Friendly.

Executive Summary and Discussion:

The Grand Jury Report requires responses from 6 of the County's departments: Sheriff, Probation, Public Defender, District Attorney, General Services, and the Board of Supervisors. It also requires that the Superior Court of California, Santa Barbara County to respond.

The Grand Jury Report on Criminal Justice and Detention Facilities is issued each year with findings and recommendations regarding detention facilities within the County. The report contains a total of 8 findings and 8 recommendations that affect the County. It is recommended that the Board agree with 7 of the 8 Findings and implement 3 of the 8 Recommendations. Three

other recommendations, one regarding video arraignment and two for the Coroner's Bureau will be studied and a report made to the Grand Jury via the Board, before the statutory deadline to implement Grand jury recommendations of November 25, 2004. Details are outlined in Attachment (1). The recommended board actions are aligned with the departments' responses.

Mandates and Service Levels:

The grand jury report was released on May 28, 2004. In accordance with California Penal Code Section 933(b), the governing body of the agency (Board of Supervisors) must respond within 90 days after issuance of the Grand Jury report. Consequently, the Board of Supervisors' responses must be finalized and transmitted to the Presiding Judge of the Courts no later than Friday, August 27, 2004. Section 933c requires that comments to Grand Jury Findings and Recommendations be made in writing.

Fiscal and Facilities Impacts:

The estimated cost to implement the 3 recommendations in the grand jury report is approximately \$2,000 and consists of the following:

- An early release recommendation to eliminate the disparity between the male and female early release criteria. This will not have a cost and consist of the Sheriff's Department requesting the Superior Court to modify the Court Order for female inmates in the main jail to mirror the release criteria for the male inmates in the main jail.
- A Carpinteria Station recommendation to expand or relocate. This was partially implemented in 2003-04 and will be further developed in 2004-05. A plan for additional locker room space and remodel plan for the report and evidence area is budgeted in Fiscal year 2004-05 at approximately \$2000. These are General Fund discretionary dollars.
- A Coroner's Bureau recommendation to place a county sign on Hollister Avenue at San Antonio Road, indicating "Coroner's Bureau," and another at the driveway entrance to the office. These signs will be posted before November 25, 2004 (statutory deadline to implement Grand Jury recommendations). The cost for this will be minimal and absorbed by the Sheriff's budget.

Special Instructions:

The response of the Board of Supervisors must be transmitted to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court no later than Friday, August 27, 2004. The Clerk of the Board is requested to return the signed letter to Jennie Esquer, County Administrator's Office, for distribution to the Superior Court. The signed letter, written responses and a 3 1/2" computer disc with the response in a Microsoft Word file must be forwarded to the grand jury.

- Attachments:**
- (1) Letter to the Presiding Judge with Board of Supervisors Responses
 - (2) Sheriff Department's Responses
 - (3) Probation Department's Responses
 - (4) Public Defender Department's Responses (A & B)
 - (5) District Attorney Department's Responses

- (6) General Services Department's Responses
- (7) Copy of 2002-04 Grand Jury Report on "Criminal Justice and Detention Facilities"

CC: Jim Anderson, Sheriff
Sue Gionfriddo, Chief Probation Officer
Jim Egar, Public Defender
Tom Sneddon, District Attorney
Dennis Kirby, Assistant General Services Director
Gary Blair, Executive Officer Superior Court

Tuesday, August 10, 2004

Honorable Clifford R. Anderson, III
Presiding Judge
Santa Barbara County Superior Court
P.O. Box 21107
Santa Barbara, California 93121-1107

**Board of Supervisors' Response to the 2003-04 Grand Jury Report on:
*"Criminal Justice and Detention Facilities"***

Dear Judge Anderson:

During its regular meeting of Tuesday, August 10, 2004, the Board of Supervisors adopted the following responses as their responses to the 2003-04 Grand Jury's report on "Criminal Justice and Detention Facilities". The Board of Supervisors thanks the Grand Jury for its findings and recommendations.

Special Report: Video Arraignment

(1) FINDING 1: The installation of a video arraignment system would be a cost cutting and safety enhancing method of conducting the arraignment of prisoners in Santa Barbara County.

Response: Partially agrees with the finding. While the Board agrees that safety would be enhanced, by the use of a video arraignment system per the Sheriff's response, the actual cost savings of such a system is yet to be determined.

RECOMMENDATION 1: The Grand Jury recommends that a video arraignment system be installed in both North and South Santa Barbara County.

Response: The Board adopted the Sheriff Department's response as its response, with the additional comment:

A study and a report will be made to the Grand Jury via the Board as to whether or not a video arraignment system should be installed in both North and South Santa Barbara County, before November 25, 2004 (statutory deadline to implement Grand Jury recommendations).

(This recommendation requires further analysis. Until a north county jail is constructed, transportation will still be required on a daily basis to the North and South County for other criminal hearings and arraignments that require mandatory appearances. The reduction of the number of inmates transported to and from an arraignment court will probably not result in the relief of an entire transport vehicle or the personnel needed to perform this duty. The definite benefit of this program would be the reduced ratio of inmates to officers. This will increase safety and security for both the inmates and staff.

In addition to the concept of a video arraignment system, a combination of an "on-campus" arraignment court with video arraignment capabilities is being considered on the property of the main jail.

Through collaboration with the Superior Court, Public Defender, District Attorney and the Sheriff's Department, this project will need to be developed with all of these interests considered. A committee of members from the criminal justice system has been formed to research the cost/benefit analysis and the procedural aspects of this system.)

Special Report: Early Release

(2) FINDING 1: Different criteria are used to release male and female inmates when overcrowded conditions exist at the Main Jail in Santa Barbara County. Males are released based on the seriousness of the crime committed; females are released on time served only – "first in, first out."

Response: The Board adopted the Sheriff Department's response as its response. (Agrees with the finding).

(2) RECOMMENDATION 1: The disparity between the male and female early release criteria should be eliminated for the sake of equality and public safety.

Response: The Board adopted the Sheriff Department's response as its response. (Has not yet been implemented), with the additional comment:

The Sheriff's Department will request from the Superior Court a modification to

the court order regarding the early release criteria for female inmates in the main jail to mirror the release criteria for the male inmates in the main jail.

Santa Barbara Juvenile Hall

(3) FINDING 1: The furlough program, which has been discontinued, was a positive activity that offered juveniles a positive work experience and provided a valuable community service.

Response: The Board adopted the Probation Department's response as its response. (Agrees with the finding)

(3) RECOMMENDATION 1: This valuable program should be reinstated when funds become available.

Response: The Board adopted the Probation Department's response as its response, with the additional comment:
The Furlough program will not be implemented at this time but will be considered if or when additional funds become available.

(Will not be implemented. The recommendation will not be implemented at the present time due to ongoing departmental budget reductions. Although realizing the overall value of this community-wide weekend work program to the youth and to the community, the Probation Department had to curtail its operation in July of 2002 due to budget constraints. It is the intention of the Probation Department to reinstate this non-mandated work program when the local and state budget environments improve.)

Los Prietos Boys Camp/Tri-Counties Boot Camp

(4) FINDING 1: The facilities at the Boot Camp and Boys Camp are underutilized due to a lack of sufficient staffing. Beds remain empty.

Response: The Board adopted the Probation Department's response as its response. (Disagrees with the finding. It is noted that at the time of the referenced Grand Jury inspection of the Boys Camp facilities, the programs were subject to waiting lists delaying the transfer of wards from the Juvenile Halls to the Camp. Although the Camp facilities are utilized less than in previous years and the populations are now less than the Board of Corrections rated bed capacity, the primary reason for this reduction was the discontinuation of the Memorandums of Agreement between Santa Barbara, Ventura, and San Luis Obispo Counties in Fiscal Year 2003 – 2004 for the operation of the Tri-Counties Boot Camp. Historically Ventura County leased 20 beds and San Luis Obispo County reserved 5 beds for out of County wards. These revenues significantly offset general operating expenses for the Camp facilities that were maintained at

maximum capacity.

Camp operations were reorganized and the facility downsized as of January 1, 2004, from 96 beds (Los Prietos Boys Camp - 56 beds/Los Prietos Boys Academy - 40 beds) to 75 beds (Los Prietos Boys Camp - 40 beds/Los Prietos Boys Academy - 35 beds). However, it should be noted that when the facility was at a maximum capacity of 96 beds, only 71 of the beds were utilized for wards from Santa Barbara County. After the downsizing and the withdrawal of Ventura and San Luis Obispo Counties as fiscal partners, there was actually a net increase of four additional beds, since all of the current 75 Camp beds are available for wards from Santa Barbara County.

(4) RECOMMENDATION 1: Funds should be made available to increase the staff at the Camps so that the additional placements can be made.

Response: The Board adopted the Probation Department's response as its response. (The recommendation will not be implemented at this time. Budget reductions within the Probation Department do not presently allow for the addition of more staff to the Camp programs. Should the need arise to house more than 75 wards at the Camp, then additional staffing will be required. With the reduction of aftercare services, the loss of low-level sentencing options like the Weekend Work Project, a well-documented increase in gang activity countywide, and the potential reduction of other local treatment alternatives, there is an imposing potential need for more Camp beds than the present total of 75.

To date, staffing reductions have included two Supervising Juvenile Institutions Officers and seven Juvenile Institutions Officers. Although the Probation Department would welcome additional staffing at the Camp to enhance services, treatment, supervision, community service, and aftercare services, staffing levels for the current 75 bed occupancy at Los Prietos Boys Camp and Los Prietos Boys Academy meet the minimum standards set by the State Board of Corrections for staff-to-ward ratios within juvenile camp facilities. In the event that the use of private placements increase, or sizeable and long-term waiting lists develop for wards awaiting placement in the Camp programs, the reallocation of Institutions Division personnel will be reviewed, or a formal request will be submitted to the Board of Supervisors for consideration of funding for the allocation of additional Camp staff.).

Carpinteria Station

(5) FINDING 1: The Carpinteria Police Department/Sheriff's Coastal Station is outgrowing the existing facility.

Response: The Board adopted the Sheriff Department's response as its response. (Agrees with the finding.)

(5) RECOMMENDATION 1: Expansion or relocation, if not already under consideration, should be taken under advisement.

Response: The Board adopted the Sheriff Department's response as its response. (Has been implemented. The issue of adequate space for the Coastal Bureau Station is and has been addressed since the past visit by the Grand Jury. The current Bureau Lieutenant has developed a plan for additional locker room space. Cost estimates have already been obtained and we hope to proceed with the project in the new budget year. This remodel was included in the budget request for FY 2004-05.

A remodel plan for the report/evidence area and is waiting for the new fiscal year to proceed. We expect to complete this modification within the 2004-05 Fiscal Year.

The Department has arranged for a storefront office in the Montecito area. The Montecito Association has dedicated a desk, computer and phone for deputies to use 24 hours a day, seven days a week. This alleviates some of the space needs at the Coastal Station and provides a visible presence of Sheriff's personnel in the Montecito area as well and greater community interaction.)

Coroner's Bureau

(6) FINDING 1: There is no signage on Hollister Avenue at San Antonio Road, indicating the Coroner's Bureau location further down San Antonio Road (especially needed for bereaved clientele). The signage at the Bureau's driveway is also inadequate.

Response: The Board adopted the Sheriff Department's response as its response. (Agrees with the finding).

(6) RECOMMENDATION 1: Place a county sign on Hollister Avenue at San Antonio Road, indicating "Coroner's Bureau," and another at the driveway entrance to the office.

Response: The Board adopted the Sheriff Department's response as its response, with the additional comment:

The signs will be posted before November 25, 2004 (statutory deadline to implement Grand Jury recommendations).

(Will be implemented. The Coroners Bureau supervisor will contact the County Roads Department and research the feasibility of placing a sign on Hollister Avenue at San Antonio Road. The Coroners Bureau can also replace the current sign, at its driveway, with a larger sign).

(7) FINDING 2: Staff time is not used efficiently while autopsies are performed at Cottage Hospital and there is a possibility of worker's compensation issues due to the current system of transporting corpses from the Coroner's Bureau.

Response: The Board adopted the Sheriff Department's responses as its

response, with the additional comments:

Although there may be a possibility of worker's compensation issues due to transporting corpses there still would be additional workers compensation costs for an additional Sheriff's Department part-time Morgue Technician. In addition, the level of efficiency of staff time used will be verified.

(Partially agrees with the finding).

(7) RECOMMENDATION 2: All autopsies should be performed at the Coroner's Bureau.

Response: The Board adopted the Sheriff Department's response as its response, with the additional comment:

A study and a report will be made to the Grand Jury via the Board as to whether or not all autopsies will be performed at the Coroner's Bureau, before November 25, 2004 (statutory deadline to implement Grand Jury recommendations).

(This recommendation requires further analysis. In reviewing the Grand Jury's report, we discovered that the issue of conducting autopsies at the Coroners Bureau, instead of Cottage Hospital, may not just be an efficient operation. At the present time, the \$175.00 cost to use Cottage Hospital includes the salary of a Cottage Hospital Morgue Technician and all other necessary equipment and supplies such as needles, tubes and medical gowns. This fee does not cover the cost of tissue slides, which Cottage Hospital supplies to us for a fee that ranges between \$15.00-\$25.00 per autopsy. Even though the trip to Cottage Hospital takes an investigators time, an evaluation would have to be made to see if we would truly save money. The salary for the Morgue Technician and the other additional supplies would have to be factored into our budget, as well as the additional Workers Compensation costs for the additional Sheriff's Department part-time employee. We would also have to check and verify if there are any State Health requirements, which we would need to adhere to, prior to conducting autopsies at our facility on a full time basis. We believe that a full study should be made prior to any change in our current procedure).

(8) FINDING 3: The toxicology laboratory is only able to run a limited range of tests.

Response: The Board adopted the Sheriff Department's response as its response. (Agrees with the finding.)

(8) RECOMMENDATION 3: All laboratory testing can be outsourced to a contracted facility at a savings to the county.

Response: The Board adopted the Sheriff Department's response as its response, with the additional comment:

A study and a report will be made to the Grand Jury via the Board as to whether or not laboratory testing can be outsourced to a contracted facility at a savings to

the County, before November 25, 2004 (statutory deadline to implement Grand Jury recommendations).

(This recommendation requires further analysis. The Grand Jury is correct in their finding that the Toxicology Laboratory currently can only run a limited range of tests. Currently 79% of the tests that the Toxicology Laboratory conducts are for County Probation. The other 21% is for the Sheriff's Department. A current study of our laboratory's efficiency is in progress.

The use of the laboratory affects two County Departments, the Sheriff's Department and the Probation Department. Part of the study is to verify how the laboratory should operate and what its capabilities are; the other part of the study is to research the financial benefits of having a County laboratory versus sending all required tests to an outside contract laboratory. At the conclusion of the study, a recommendation will be made to either keep the laboratory, give it to another county department, or close it and send all required tests to an outside laboratory. We believe that this study will be completed and submitted for Sheriff's Department staff review within the next fiscal year).

Sincerely,

Joe Centeno
Chair, Board of Supervisors

cc: David Clous, Grand Jury Foreperson 2003-04, Grand Jury room, County Courthouse, Santa Barbara, Ca 93101

SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT RESPONSE
SANTA BARBARA COUNTY 2003-2004 GRAND JURY
CRIMINAL JUSTICE DETENTION FACILITIES REPORT

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SPECIAL REPORT: VIDEO ARRAIGNMENT

FINDING 1

The installation of a video arraignment system would be a cost cutting and safety enhancing method of conducting the arraignment of prisoners in Santa Barbara County.

Response to Finding 1

The Sheriff's Department partially disagrees with the finding. While the department strongly agrees that safety would be greatly enhanced by the use of a video arraignment system, the actual cost savings of such a system is yet to be determined.

RECOMMENDATION 1

The Grand Jury recommends that a video arraignment system be installed in both North and South Santa Barbara County.

Response to Recommendation 1

This recommendation requires further analysis. Until a north county jail is constructed, transportation will still be required on a daily basis to the north and south county for other criminal hearings and arraignments that require mandatory appearances. The reduction of the number of inmates transported to and from an arraignment court will probably not result in the relief of an entire transport vehicle or the personnel needed to perform this duty. The definite benefit of this program would be the reduced ratio of inmates to officers. This will increase safety and security for both the inmates and staff.

In addition to the concept of a video arraignment system, a combination of an "on-campus" arraignment court with video arraignment capabilities is being considered on the property of the main jail.

Through collaboration with the Superior Court, Public Defender, District Attorney and the Sheriff's Department, this project will need to be developed with all of these interests considered. A committee of members from the criminal justice system has been formed to research the cost/benefit analysis and the procedural aspects of this system.

We expect a staff report with this analysis to be completed by November 1, 2004.

SPECIAL REPORT: EARLY RELEASE

FINDING 1

Different criteria are used to release male and female inmates when overcrowded conditions exist at the Main Jail in Santa Barbara County. Males are released based on the seriousness of the crime committed; females are released on time served only – "first in, first out."

Response to Finding 1

The Sheriff's department agrees with this finding.

RECOMMENDATION 1

The disparity between the male and female early release criteria should be eliminated for the sake of equality and public safety.

Response to Recommendation 1

The Sheriff's Department will request from the Superior Court a modification to the court order regarding the early release criteria for female inmates in the main jail to mirror the release criteria for the male inmates in the main jail.

CARPINTERIA STATION

FINDING 1

The Carpinteria Police Department/Sheriff's Coastal Station is outgrowing the existing facility.

Response to Finding 1

The Sheriff's Department agrees with this finding.

RECOMMENDATION 1

Expansion or relocation, if not already under consideration, should be taken under advisement.

Response to Recommendation 1

The issue of adequate space for the Coastal Bureau Station is and has been addressed since the past visit by the Grand Jury. The current Bureau Lieutenant has developed a plan for additional locker room space. Cost estimates have already been obtained and we hope to proceed with the project in the new budget year. This remodel was included in the budget request for FY 2004-05.

A remodel plan for the report/evidence area and is waiting for the new fiscal year to proceed. We expect to complete this modification within the 2004-05 Fiscal Year.

The Department has arranged for a storefront office in the Montecito area. The Montecito Association has dedicated a desk, computer and phone for deputies to use 24 hours a day, seven days a week. This alleviates some of the space needs at the Coastal Station and provides a visible presence of Sheriff's personnel in the Montecito area as well and greater community interaction.

CORONERS OFFICE

FINDING 1

There is no signage on Hollister Avenue at San Antonio Road, indicating the Coroner's Bureau location further down San Antonio Road (especially needed for bereaved clientele). The signage at the Bureau's driveway is also inadequate.

Response to Finding 1

The Sheriff's Department agrees with the finding.

RECOMMENDATION 1

Place a county sign on Hollister Avenue at San Antonio Road, indicating "Coroner's Bureau," and another at the driveway entrance to the office.

Response to Recommendation 1

The Coroners Bureau supervisor will contact the County Roads Department and research the feasibility of placing a sign on Hollister Avenue at San Antonio Road. The Coroners Bureau can also replace the current sign, at its driveway, with a larger sign.

FINDING 2

Staff time is not used efficiently while autopsies are performed at Cottage Hospital and there is a possibility of worker's compensation issues due to the current system of transporting corpses from the Coroner's Bureau.

Response to Finding 2

The Sheriff's Department agrees, in part, with the findings.

RECOMMENDATION 2

All autopsies should be performed at the Coroner's Bureau.

Response to Recommendation 2

In researching the Coroners information we found the following number of autopsies and total number of cases that were handled throughout the last 12 months.

June 03	9 autopsies out of 115 cases	
July 03	8 autopsies out of 110 cases	
August 03	11 autopsies out of 118 cases	
September 03	11 autopsies out of 92 cases	
October 03	12 autopsies out of 125 cases	
November 03	10 autopsies out of 114 cases	
December 03	6 autopsies out of 127 cases	
January 04	9 autopsies out of 141 cases	
February 04	5 autopsies out of 108 cases	
March 04	9 autopsies out of 125 cases	
April 04	6 autopsies out of 90 cases	
May 04	10 autopsies out of 110 cases	
Totals	106 autopsies @ \$175.00 ea. = \$18,550.00	Total cases = 1375

In reviewing the Grand Jury's report we discovered that the issue of conducting autopsies at the Coroners Bureau, instead of Cottage Hospital, may not just be an efficient operation. At the present time, the \$175.00 cost to use Cottage Hospital includes the salary of a Cottage Hospital Morgue Technician and all other necessary equipment and supplies such as needles, tubes and medical gowns. This fee does not cover the cost of tissue slides, which Cottage Hospital supplies to us for a fee that ranges between \$15.00-\$25.00 per autopsy. Even though the trip to Cottage Hospital takes an investigator's time, an evaluation would have to be made to see if we would truly save money. The salary for the Morgue Technician and the other additional supplies would have to be factored into our budget, as well as the additional Workers Compensation costs for the additional Sheriff's Department part-time employee. We would also have to check and verify if there are any State Health requirements, which we would need to adhere to, prior to conducting autopsies at our facility on a full time basis. We believe that a full study should be made prior to any change in our current procedure.

FINDING 3

The toxicology laboratory is only able to run a limited range of tests.

Response to Finding 3

The Sheriff's Department agrees with the finding.

RECOMMENDATION 3

All laboratory testing can be outsourced to a contracted facility at a savings to the county.

Response to Recommendation 3

The Grand Jury is correct in their finding that the Toxicology Laboratory currently can only run a limited range of tests. Currently 79% of the tests that the Toxicology Laboratory conducts are for County Probation. The other 21% is for the Sheriff's Department. A current study of our laboratory's efficiency is in progress.

The use of the laboratory affects two County Departments, the Sheriff's Department and the Probation Department. Part of the study is to verify how the laboratory should operate and what its capabilities are; the other part of the study is to research the financial benefits of having a County laboratory versus sending all required tests to an outside contract laboratory. At the conclusion of the study, a recommendation will be made to either keep the laboratory, give it to another county department, or close it and send all required tests to an outside laboratory. We believe that this study will be completed and submitted for Sheriff's Department staff review within the next fiscal year.

Memorandum



Date: July 26, 2004

To: Honorable Clifford R. Anderson III
Presiding Judge of Santa Barbara County Superior Court

Susan J. Gionfriddo

From: Susan J. Gionfriddo, Chief Probation Officer

Subject: Response to 2003-2004 Santa Barbara County Grand Jury Report on
"Criminal Justice and Detention Facilities"

CC: David Clous, Foreperson, 2003-2004 Santa Barbara County Grand Jury
Honorable Rodney S. Melville, Assistant Presiding Judge
Honorable Barbara J. Beck, Presiding Juvenile Court Judge
Michael F. Brown, Santa Barbara County Administrator
Juvenile Justice/Delinquency Prevention Commission
Probation Department Administrative Staff

I would like to express my appreciation to the 2003-2004 Grand Jury for recognizing and commending staff in our Juvenile Detention Facilities. Their input and observations are always appreciated.

Please find attached our responses to the Grand Jury's findings and recommendations.

Attachment a/s

Santa Barbara Juvenile Hall Finding and Recommendation

FINDING 1: *The furlough program, which has been discontinued, was a positive activity that offered juveniles a positive work experience and provided a valuable community service.*

Response: The respondent agrees with the finding.

RECOMMENDATION 1: *This valuable program should be reinstated when funds become available.*

Response: The recommendation will not be implemented at the present time due to ongoing departmental budget reductions. Although realizing the overall value of this community-wide weekend work program to the youth and to the community, the Probation Department had to curtail its operation in July of 2002 due to budget constraints. It is the intention of the Probation Department to reinstate this nonmandated work program when the local and state budget environments improve. When in operation the Juvenile Hall Weekend Work Project program was a valued low-level sanction for use by the Juvenile Court and Deputy Probation Officers. While learning the basic foundation of a work ethic the youth were provided the opportunity to give something back to the community through their efforts at graffiti removal, trash pickup and park maintenance.

Los Prietos Boys Camp/Tri-Counties Boot Camp Finding and Recommendation

FINDING 1: *The facilities at the Boot Camp and Boys Camp are underutilized due to a lack of sufficient staffing. Beds Remain empty.*

Response: The respondent disagrees with the finding. It is noted that at the time of the referenced Grand Jury inspection of the Boys Camp facilities, the programs were subject to waiting lists delaying the transfer of wards from the Juvenile Halls to the Camp. Although the Camp facilities are utilized less than in previous years and the populations are now less than the Board of Corrections rated bed capacity, the primary reason for this reduction was the discontinuation of the Memorandums of Agreement between Santa Barbara, Ventura, and San Luis Obispo Counties in Fiscal Year 2003 – 2004 for the operation of the Tri-Counties Boot Camp. Historically Ventura County leased 20 beds and San Luis Obispo County reserved 5 beds for out of County wards. These revenues significantly offset general operating expenses for the Camp facilities that were maintained at maximum capacity. Camp operations were reorganized and the facility downsized as of January 1, 2004, from 96 beds (Los Prietos Boys Camp - 56 beds/Los Prietos Boys Academy - 40 beds) to 75 beds (Los Prietos Boys

Camp - 40 beds/Los Prietos Boys Academy - 35 beds). However, it should be noted that when the facility was at a maximum capacity of 96 beds, only 71 of the beds were utilized for wards from Santa Barbara County. After the downsizing and the withdrawal of Ventura and San Luis Obispo Counties as fiscal partners, there was actually a net increase of four additional beds, since all of the current 75 Camp beds are available for wards from Santa Barbara County.

RECOMMENDATION 1: *Funds should be made available to increase the staff at the Camps so that the additional placements can be made.*

Response: The recommendation will not be implemented. Budget reductions within the Probation Department do not presently allow for the addition of more staff to the Camp programs. Should the need arise to house more than 75 wards at the Camp, then additional staffing will be required. With the reduction of aftercare services, the loss of low-level sentencing options like the Weekend Work Project, a well-documented increase in gang activity countywide, and the potential reduction of other local treatment alternatives, there is an imposing potential need for more Camp beds than the present total of 75. To date, staffing reductions have included two Supervising Juvenile Institutions Officers and seven Juvenile Institutions Officers. Although the Probation Department would welcome additional staffing at the Camp to enhance services, treatment, supervision, community service, and aftercare services, staffing levels for the current 75 bed occupancy at Los Prietos Boys Camp and Los Prietos Boys Academy meet the minimum standards set by the State Board of Corrections for staff-to-ward ratios within juvenile camp facilities. In the event that the use of private placements increase, or sizeable and long-term waiting lists develop for wards awaiting placement in the Camp programs, the reallocation of Institutions Division personnel will be reviewed, or a formal request will be submitted to the Board of Supervisors for consideration of funding for the allocation of additional Camp staff.

July 26, 2004

Honorable Clifford R. Anderson III
Presiding Superior Court Judge
118 East Figueroa Street
Santa Barbara, California 93101

Dear Judge Anderson:

The Law Office of the Public Defender has had the opportunity to review the 2003-2004 Santa Barbara County Grand Jury report "Criminal Justice and Detention Facilities."

The Public Defender has been asked to respond to the finding and recommendation of the Grand Jury as it relates to video arraignments. Specifically, they are;

Finding One:

The installation of a video arraignment system would be a cost cutting and safety enhancing method of conducting the arraignment of prisoners in Santa Barbara County.

The Public Defender agrees in part and disagrees in part with Finding 1.

Recommendation 1:

The Grand Jury recommends that a video arraignment system be installed in both North and South Santa Barbara County.

The Public Defender disagrees with Recommendation 1.

Honorable Clifford R. Anderson III
July 26, 2004
Page Two

The 2003-2004 Grand Jury neither sought nor received any input from the Public Defender regarding this proposed fundamental change of a critical stage of the criminal justice process. This is ironic since the Public Defender is the entity charged by law with safeguarding the rights of persons most adversely affected by the Recommendation.

“Cost cutting and safety enhancing” are both appropriate concerns of the criminal justice system. However, they are not the only appropriate concerns. Interests such as Due Process, fundamental fairness, attorney client privilege, adequacy of counsel and legal confidentiality are among many additional appropriate concerns. If cost cutting and safety enhancing were the only goals to be pursued we might eliminate juries, permit hearsay at trials or even have virtual trials where witnesses could provide video testimony and be cross-examined on camera rather than on the stand. Cost savings resulting from video arraignments are yet to be determined. The Santa Barbara Court system must encourage efficiency and provide safety while providing justice and fairness for all accused persons.

Costly transportation and security concerns drain significant resources from other necessary functions. However, other more appropriate alternatives than video arraignments exist to harmonize these interests.

For example, a single arraignment court located at the existing jail could provide the desired savings and safety while maintaining actual human interaction between necessary parties. This alternative was neither considered nor evaluated in the Grand Jury’s finding or recommendation.

The Public Defender has visited Courts and Jails where video arraignments are utilized. The concerns and opposition are not born of uninformed reaction. Large percentages of cases can and should be resolved at the arraignment stage. Video arraignments hinder rather than facilitate this process. To this extent, costs for housing and case processing are increased by the use of video procedures.

Honorable Clifford R. Anderson III
July 26, 2004
Page Three

In an era of reality video and MTV programming it is a natural human response to be de-sensitized by video images rather than direct in person interaction. Case resolution and processing are enhanced not deterred by in person proceedings. These are consistent with cost savings and safety concerns which would be met by an arraignment court at the jail. In addition, out of custody arraignments which would still need to be heard could be consolidated on designated days in dedicated court rooms thereby freeing up strained judicial resources.

The Grand Jury's report focuses on cost and safety concerns. These values, while important cannot outweigh concerns for accuracy in communication, fact finding, bail determinations and legal representation. These would be met by an arraignment Court at the jail.

Hence, the Law Office of the Public Defender affirms and dissents from the Grand Jury's finding and dissents from the proposed recommendation.

Respectfully submitted,

JAMES S. EGAR
Public Defender

JSE:nmr

cc: Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors via
Michael Brown, County Administrator
David Clous, Foreperson
2003-2004 Santa Barbara County Grand Jury

July 29, 2004

Honorable Clifford R. Anderson III
Presiding Superior Court Judge
118 East Figueroa Street
Santa Barbara, California 93101

Dear Judge Anderson:

The Law Office of the Public Defender has been requested to respond to the Finding and Recommendation of the 2003-2004 Santa Barbara County Civil Grand Jury as it relates to Early Releases of Inmates from the Main Jail.

Finding 1: Different criteria are used to release male and female inmates when overcrowded conditions exist at the Main Jail in Santa Barbara County. Males are released based on the seriousness of the crime committed; females are released on time served only – “first in, first out.”

The information provided to the Public Defender indicates that this Finding is accurate and reflects the current practice.

Recommendation 1: The disparity between the male and female early release criteria should be eliminated for the sake of equality and public safety.

The Law Office of the Public Defender agrees in concept with the recommendation of the Grand Jury. Equal protection under the law for all persons is a fundamental right under both the Federal and State Constitutions. It also conforms with California Penal Code section 4029 which relates to equal availability of facilities, programs, services, etc., to male and female prisoners. The question which remains is one of implementation.

Honorable Clifford R. Anderson III
July 29, 2004
Page Two

The Sheriff's Department would be the initial agency with responsibility for devising a system based on equal treatment for custody and release of inmates. In addition, the Jail Over-Crowding Task Force made up of key agencies and participants in the criminal justice system is an appropriate group to offer input and suggestions for the implementation of a release program based on Equal Protection.

Lastly, the Courts can assume ultimate jurisdiction of this issue if no other appropriate remedy can be found. They have previously done so in the form of a Jail Consent Decree.

Respectfully submitted,

JAMES S. EGAR
Public Defender

JSE:nmr

cc: Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors via
Michael Brown, County Administrator
David Clous, Foreperson
2003-2004 Santa Barbara County Grand Jury

June 2, 2004

Clifford R. Anderson, III
Presiding Judge
Santa Barbara County Superior Court
P. O. Box 21107
Santa Barbara, CA 93121-1107

Re: Response to Grand Jury Report on Criminal Justice and Detention Facilities

Dear Judge Anderson:

I have reviewed the Grand Jury's Criminal Justice and Detention Facilities report for 2003-2004. We have been requested to respond to the section dealing with "Overcrowding Obstacles and Looking to the Future." Specifically, the Grand Jury recommended that a video arraignment system be installed in both the North and South Santa Barbara Counties.

The Santa Barbara County District Attorney's Office agrees with the finding. As the report notes, evaluation and feasibility of installing this technology will require further analysis and following the pattern of other counties, some type of Criminal Justice Coordinating Council to implement the recommendation. This office is prepared to immediately join in the formation of such a Council and to actively participate in making this recommendation a reality.

Very truly yours,

Thomas W. Sneddon, Jr.
District Attorney

TWS:rm

cc: Naomi Schwartz, 1st District
Susan Rose, Vice Chair, 2nd District
Gail Marshall, 3rd District
Joni Gray, 4th District
Joseph Centeno, Chair, 5th District
Joseph E. Holland, County Clerk, Recorder and Assessor
David Clous, Foreperson, 2003-2004 Santa Barbara County Grand Jury

June 21, 2004

Honorable Clifford R Anderson, III
Presiding Judge
Santa Barbara Superior Court
P.O. Box 21107
Santa Barbara, CA 93121-1107

RE: Response to 2004 Grand Jury Report

Dear Judge Anderson:

The County of Santa Barbara, General Services/Information Technology Division was named as an Affected Agency to the to “The Electronic Courtroom” report, contained in the 2003-2004 Grand Jury report on Criminal Justice and Detention Facilities. The following is the General Services’ response to the finding and recommendation:

Finding 1: The installation of a video arraignment system would be a cost cutting and safety enhancing method of conducting the arraignment of prisoners in Santa Barbara County.

GS/ITS response to finding 1: As an internal technology services support agency, General Services’ only potential role in video arraignment would be limited to providing and maintaining a system that was requisitioned by the video arraignment user community. General Services is therefore not in a position to expertly assess the cost cutting or safety benefits of video arraignment.

General Services/ITS Response to 2004 Grand Jury Report (continued)

Recommendation 1: The Grand Jury recommends that a video arraignment system be installed in both North and South Santa Barbara County.

GS/ITS response to recommendation 1: The General Services ITS division has extensive experience with video conferencing systems and is fully capable and willing to support a video arraignment system. In addition, the county's fiber optic based network infrastructure is well positioned to support high quality video transmission between campuses. However, General Services is not in a position to implement a video arraignment system without a project request and appropriate funding. The users of a video arraignment system would also have the option of contracting the project to an outside vendor such as Court Vision, in which case the General Services' role might only be to provide network transport. In conclusion, General Services is available to support video arraignment in any capacity that is requested.

This response was written by Dennis Kirby, Assistant General Services Director, Technical Services.

Sincerely,

Dennis Kirby
568-2671

**CRIMINAL JUSTICE
AND
DETENTION FACILITIES**

TABLE OF CONTENTS**SPECIAL REPORTS**

THE ELECTRONIC COURTROOM: Video Arraignment Saves Time and \$\$\$\$\$	PAGE A 3
EARLY RELEASE: Who's Out First ?	PAGE A 9

DETENTION FACILITIES

OBJECTIVE	PAGE A 11
INTRODUCTION	PAGE A 11
PROCEDURE	PAGE A 12
MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS	
Guadalupe Police Department	PAGE A 12
Lompoc Police Department	PAGE A 13
Santa Barbara Police Department	PAGE A 14
Santa Maria Police Department	PAGE A 16
PROBATION DEPARTMENT	
Santa Barbara Juvenile Hall	PAGE A 17
Santa Maria Juvenile Hall	PAGE A 19
Los Prietos/Tri-Counties Boot Camp	PAGE A 20
SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT	
Carpinteria Station	PAGE A 22
Coroner's Bureau	PAGE A 24
Figueroa St. Court Holding Facility	PAGE A 26
Isla Vista Station	PAGE A 27
Main Jail	PAGE A 28
Men's Honor Farm	PAGE A 29
Santa Ynez and Buellton Stations	PAGE A 30
Santa Maria Station	PAGE A 31
Women's Honor Farm	PAGE A 33
SANTA BARBARA COUNTY INMATE DEATHS	PAGE A 34

SPECIAL REPORTS

THE ELECTRONIC COURTROOM

Video Arraignment Saves Time and \$\$\$\$\$

The use of video to conduct arraignments between courtrooms and incarceration facilities has grown steadily since its introduction in the early 1980's. This increase is largely due to the hefty financial savings for the jurisdictions that have adopted *video arraignment*. In addition, courts adopting video systems are finding not just cost savings, but increased efficiency in processing prisoners, ease of implementation, and increased safety to the public.

Introduction

Arraignment is the appearance of a prisoner in front of a judge within 72 hours of arrest. At that time, a charge is brought and a pleading of guilt or innocence entered. The majority of cases are settled at arraignment, usually with a sentence entered on a lesser charge.

In Santa Barbara County, arraignments are currently conducted in person: A prisoner is transported to a courtroom in North or South County from the Santa Barbara County Main Jail by the Sheriff's Department Transportation Unit.

With video links installed at the Main Jail and both North and South County courts, prisoners would no longer need to be transported from the jail to be arraigned. They would instead be escorted to a site within the jail for secure video link with the appropriate court.

The Grand Jury believes that the installation of a video arraignment system in Santa Barbara County would:

- Eliminate the need to transport prisoners for arraignment, thereby improving public safety
- Reduce the fleet of Sheriff's Department vehicles and/or their use and maintenance
- Improve the efficiency of prisoner processing
- Save the county substantial funds

Background of Video Arraignment

Video links between courts and jail facilities began in 1982 with misdemeanor first appearances. Since that time, the use of court video has expanded in application and been adopted by 17 states. Several additional states and many more municipalities are currently considering implementing video in their courts.

In California, use of video in the courtroom began in 1983 when the California Legislature added section 977.2 to the Penal Code establishing pilot projects for video in the court system. In 1991, the Judicial Council reported to the Legislature on these pilot projects. The report concluded that the 14 participating courts enthusiastically supported video arraignment.

Though most courts expressed enthusiasm for the technology, there were some jurisdictions that were unable to successfully implement it. Consequently, in 1995 a study was conducted by the National Center for State Courts to explain why some courts had been unable to use this new technology.

This study determined that some jurisdictions were resistant to changing the way business had been conducted and were not convinced that installation of video would be a significant cost savings. Further, some jurisdictions were unable to overcome some of the inter-agency conflicts that arose during preliminary talks and therefore never moved past the discussion stage.

Since 1995 video technology has improved dramatically. The purchase of a video arraignment system has come down in cost and the system has increased in functionality. In addition, the economic landscape of California has changed drastically in these intervening eight years. Many jurisdictions face significant budget shortfalls and this new reality has fostered a spirit of cooperation among the various affected agencies in reducing county budgets throughout the state.

Despite some of the hurdles to implementing video technology, the majority of California counties using court video are pleased with it. These counties include San Diego County, Del Norte County, Madera County, Kings County, Los Angeles County, San Bernardino County, Alameda County and Imperial County. All report cost savings and improved safety.

Observations

The Santa Barbara County Sheriff's Department maintains a Transportation Unit for the transport of prisoners within Santa Barbara County. This unit has prepared financial reports since 1991 on the costs incurred by the department for transporting prisoners from the Main Jail on Calle Real in Santa Barbara to arraignment and trial in both North and South Santa Barbara County. The reports also detail the costs of

maintaining a fleet of vehicles for this transport. The Transportation Unit's costs include man hours and vehicle maintenance. These combined costs in each of the last three years, 2001, 2002 and 2003, exceeded \$203,000.

Figures on what percentage of this \$203,000 annual cost is attributable to arraignments have not been kept. However, Sheriff's Department sources maintain that it is well over half of this amount. In addition, a majority of inmates scheduled for arraignment are transported to North County from the Main Jail, which costs substantially more than trips to the South County court. The Sheriff's Department Transportation Unit estimates that the costs of moving inmates to courts in north or south county are between \$120,000 and \$150,000 annually for arraignments alone.

What these costs do not reflect, however, is the potential danger to public safety of transporting prisoners on public thoroughfares, wear and tear on roads, increased traffic and vehicle emissions.

Costs/Benefits of Installing Video in Santa Barbara County

This Grand Jury conducted a preliminary examination of the costs of purchasing the equipment necessary to conduct video arraignments. Research was done on-line, in the marketplace and through conversations with jurisdictions already using video arraignment. The Jury determined that the costs of installing a video arraignment system in Santa Barbara County would be less than the Sheriff's Department transportation unit's annual budget attributable to arraignments.

The Santa Barbara County government infrastructure already has fiber optic cable installed which can carry the necessary signal, so costs would be limited to the purchase of cameras and some additional equipment at each site as well as the costs of installation. A preliminary cost estimate, supplied by Court Vision in Thousand Oaks indicates a minimum of \$5,500 per site or \$16,500 for three, to a high of \$20,000 per site, or a total of \$60,000. With both these high and low estimates, costs for installing a video system at the Main Jail and both North and South County courts hearing arraignments, are substantially lower than even half of the Sheriff's Department Transportation Unit annual budget of \$203,000.

In jurisdictions from Ohio, to North Carolina, to California, substantial budgetary savings are cited as the biggest feature for installing a video arraignment system. However, as mentioned above, there will be additional benefits, such as the reduced flight risk of prisoners and increased efficiency of prisoner processing, which are hard to quantify but which should still be factored into the cost/benefit analysis.

It is beyond the purview of this Grand Jury report to discuss the type of video system to be installed or to recommend exactly how it should be used, but only to show that such a system would be a cost effective reallocation of county funds.

Overcoming Obstacles and Looking to the Future

There has been some resistance to using video arraignment in Santa Barbara County. For example, public defenders have felt that face to face meetings with clients are critical to a prisoner's right to a fair trial. This criticism has been addressed in other jurisdictions by assigning a public defender to be present at the jail while the client's assigned lawyer is in court with the judge during video arraignment.

Most jurisdictions successfully using video arraignment initially set up investigatory committees or Criminal Justice Coordinating Councils to explore the purchase of video arraignment systems. These committees and councils are set up using staff from agencies within existing government structures, at no additional cost to county or city budgets. These committees and councils consist of Judges, Public Defenders, Assistant District Attorneys, Sheriff's Department personnel and other interested parties. Santa Barbara County has an Information Technology Expert on staff who might make a good addition to such a council.

The immediate cost savings will most likely impact the Sheriff's Department Transportation Budget. However, according to some members of the Santa Barbara County Judiciary, reallocation of funds may need to occur. For example, as manpower and vehicle maintenance expenses are saved by the Sheriff's Department, the maintenance of a video conferencing and arraignment system will need to be added to the county's overall budget.

If there is difficulty with reallocating existing budgetary expenditures, other jurisdictions currently using video in the arraignment process have installed the systems with the assistance of one or more of the following sources:

- Criminal justice facilities construction funds
- County general funds
- Court and agency budgets
- Cable franchise funds
- Administrative office of the courts
- Grants through air quality management districts, state justice institutes, and other grant sources

Finally, coordinating councils have created efficient new ways to handle court business, such as the signing of pleas at arraignment. Other changes include the reassignment of Sheriff's Department personnel and the potential hiring of an additional public defender to handle pleas at the jail. These are the kinds of details that each jurisdiction works out for itself.

Conclusion

As more states, counties and localities adopt video technology, more uses will be found for it. In addition, lawmakers, public defenders, district attorneys and judges need to cut costs along with other agencies and departments in County government.

There will always be the need for a transportation unit in Santa Barbara County and the means by which to move prisoners (e.g., for trial and medical attention). However, the installation of court video will reduce both transportation costs and the costs of the current arraignment process substantially, making video arraignment a change for the better in Santa Barbara County.

Finding 1

The installation of a video arraignment system would be a cost cutting and safety enhancing method of conducting the arraignment of prisoners in Santa Barbara County.

Recommendation 1

The Grand Jury recommends that a video arraignment system be installed in both North and South Santa Barbara County.

Affected Agencies

Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors

Finding	1
Recommendation	1

Santa Barbara County District Attorney

Finding	1
Recommendation	1

Santa Barbara County Sheriff's Department

Finding	1
Recommendation	1

Santa Barbara County Superior Court

Finding	1
Recommendation	1

Santa Barbara County Information Technology Services

Finding	1
Recommendation	1

Office of the Public Defender

Finding	1
Recommendation	1

EARLY RELEASE

Who's Out First?

The Santa Barbara County Main Jail houses 650 male and 101 female inmates. When the population of the Main Jail reaches its capacity, prisoners are released early by a process known as “capping out.” However, the criteria for this procedure is not the same for males and females.

Capping out began in the early 1980's to relieve overcrowding, which resulted in “floor sleeping” conditions among the male population. A multi-jurisdictional task force was formed to address this issue. The committee consisted of representatives from the Courts, Public Defender, County Counsel, District Attorney, Sheriff's Department, local police agencies, and Mental Health and Probation Departments. A directive was written in February 1989 that specified criteria for early release of male inmates. The requirements do not allow for release of prisoners who have committed felony crimes, have other warrants or who are repeat offenders.

The Task Force continued to meet through the 1990's. The program has proven to be reasonably successful in handling male inmate overcrowding. However, in the most recent report issued by the California Board of Corrections, overcrowding resulting in “floor sleeping” was noted as still occurring.

Early release was not instituted for the female population until 1996, and female inmates are released under different criteria than male inmates. Seriousness of crime is not considered when releasing female inmates. Only time served is considered. Those who have served the longest time are released first. These criteria have not changed since their inception. The Grand Jury questioned why there are different criteria. Is this equality?

There are approximately one fifth as many women prisoners as men, but the severity of crimes committed by females has been increasing over the last decade. A December 2003 New York Times article entitled, *Women Find a New Arena for Equality: Prison*, documented a sharp rise nationally in the arrest rate of women in most crime categories since the early 1990's. Since there has been overcrowding among the female inmate population, necessitating an early release program in Santa Barbara County, it can be concluded that female crime is on the rise here as well.

In 2003, over 1,000 women were booked into the Main Jail. Of those, over 600 were booked on felony charges. In a recent analysis, 36 women were qualified for early release. Four of these women would not have been eligible if the same criteria used for male inmates had been applied.

Finding 1

Different criteria are used to release male and female inmates when overcrowded conditions exist at the Main Jail in Santa Barbara County. Males are released based on the seriousness of the crime committed; females are released on time served only - "first in, first out."

Recommendation 1

The disparity between the male and female early release criteria should be eliminated for the sake of equality and public safety.

Affected Agencies**Santa Barbara County Sheriff's Department**

Finding 1

Recommendation 1

Office of the Public Defender

Finding 1

Recommendation 1

DETENTION FACILITIES

The 2003-2004 Grand Jury wishes to express its thanks to the officers and support personnel for their service to Santa Barbara County. The Jury finds that Santa Barbara detention facilities are staffed with professional and dedicated personnel.

OBJECTIVE

To comply with California Penal Code 919(b) which mandates that each year members of the Grand Jury inquire into the condition and management of public prisons within the County.

INTRODUCTION

The following report covers detention facilities within the county of Santa Barbara. These facilities fall into three categories, as follows:

- Facilities operated by the Santa Barbara County Sheriff's Department:
 - Carpinteria Station
 - Coroner's Bureau
 - Figueroa St. Court Holding Facility
 - Isla Vista Station
 - Main Jail
 - Men's Honor Farm
 - Santa Ynez and Buellton Stations
 - Santa Maria Station
 - Women's Honor Farm

- Facilities operated by municipal police departments:
 - Guadalupe Police Department
 - Lompoc Police Department
 - Santa Barbara Police Department
 - Santa Maria Police Department

- Facilities under the control of the County Probation Department:
 - Santa Barbara Juvenile Hall
 - Santa Maria Juvenile Hall
 - Los Prietos Boys' Camp/Tri-Counties Boot Camp

PROCEDURE

This Grand Jury visited each of the facilities listed in this report. Deputies and staff members who were on duty at the time of each visit were interviewed. All facilities were inspected at least once and some sites were visited two or more times.

MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

Guadalupe Police Department

The Guadalupe Police Department is housed in an historic building built in 1920 that has not been well-maintained. The Department serves the city population of approximately 5,800. All other city services operate from this location as well.

The Police Department processes adult suspects at this site and then transports them to the Santa Maria Sheriff's Station. Juveniles committing misdemeanor offenses are cited and released to their parents. Juveniles committing felonies are booked into Santa Maria Juvenile Hall.

The Police Department's annual operating budget is \$893,000, plus a yearly grant of \$102,000 from the State. This grant pays the salary of two officers and a portion of the salary of a community service officer. In addition to the Chief of Police, the Police Department employs 12 full-time officers, one canine team, two reserve officers, two sergeants, one community service officer, and one evidence technician. There are no lieutenants or detectives. One officer's position is designated for SABERNET, which is a drug enforcement task force operated by the Drug Enforcement Agency. Half the salary for this position is paid for by the State.

Lompoc Police Department

The Lompoc Police Department is located at the Civic Center Plaza in the City of Lompoc. In addition to the Chief of Police, there are 40 sworn officers as well as support staff. The facility is well maintained and equipped to provide effective and professional police service.

The Jury was impressed with the Department's role of leadership evidenced by a high level of community input and participation. Two programs that particularly exemplified this leadership role are the Lompoc Citizens' Police Academy and the Drug Abuse Resistance Program (DARE). The Lompoc Police Department remains the only agency in Santa Barbara County offering the DARE program at the middle school and senior high school levels. Other DARE programs end at the 7th grade level. In addition, the Citizens' Police Academy offers participants a 15-week training program designed to provide an inside look into all aspects of law enforcement in Lompoc. Graduates are used in a variety of non-peace officer assignments on a volunteer basis.

The Lompoc Police Department also provides assistance when needed to the Lompoc Federal Prison. Officers help at times with crowd control in the event of demonstrations or escape of prisoners. They do not become involved in situations which may occur inside the prison itself.

Like most agencies in Santa Barbara County, the Department has budget constraints. Lompoc's crime rate, however, is less than would be expected for similarly sized cities.

Santa Barbara Police Department

The Santa Barbara Police Department (SBPD), on East Figueroa Street, operates out of two facilities at that location.

The main facility serves as a detention and operational center. The street level of the main facility has two holding cells and three interrogation rooms, with remaining rooms for writing reports, entering evidence, and servicing the public. The second floor holds the offices of the Chief of Police and his assistants. The basement houses the Combined Communication Center (CCC), which is the Dispatch Center for the Police Department as well as the Fire Department. Police personnel with special training monitor the CCC computers constantly. During emergency situations, the CCC has the capability of coordinating police and fire department deployment in conjunction with the County Sheriff's Department. The basement also houses a briefing room, SWAT Team storage room, locker room with showers, emergency generator, and a shooting range. The Harbor Patrol, Airport Security, as well as the SBPD, use the shooting range.

The second facility is a rented annex at the rear of the main facility, which is used primarily for additional administration office space. The motorcycle component of the Department also operates out of this location.

The Department has a fleet of over 50 patrol and unmarked vehicles, plus eight motorcycles. The parking lot for officers and support staff is located between the main facility and the rented annex. The size of the parking lot is inadequate. Many patrol cars are parked on Figueroa Street and unmarked cars are parked farther away, some of which are subject to occasional vandalism. Officers and support staff, as well as visitors, must often park blocks away.

The Department employs 150 sworn officers, an additional 18 reserve officers, and 75 support staff. Work shifts are 10 hours per day, Monday through Thursday, and 12 hours per day, Friday through Sunday. In 2003, 2,288 detainees passed through the holding cells at the facility. Most detainees under arrest are held for less than four hours before being transported to the Santa Barbara County for booking, pre-arraignment, and/or pre-trial detention.

The Department operates under a policy of community-oriented policing. A significant feature of this policy is that police officers make every attempt to meet face-to-face with any person who files a crime report, especially if it is a felony. It runs a Community Police Academy to further the cause of community involvement. Three times a year the Academy offers a 12-week course to instruct interested citizens about all facets of community policing. One of these courses is offered in Spanish. During the summer the Academy offers a daytime program for teens. The Police Activities League (PAL) for youth is another successful program. These programs are all part of SBPD's Community-Oriented Problem Solving (COPS), which has been successfully initiated by the current Chief of Police.

Santa Maria Police Department

The Santa Maria Police department is located on Cook Street in the city of Santa Maria. Overcrowding due to space and budget constraints at the Santa Maria Police Department continues to be a major problem. However, an adjacent facility, formerly a Santa Maria Fire Department, is being remodeled for use by the Police Department. When completed, the new facility will provide additional space for training, a men's locker room, and those administrative activities which can be physically transferred to the new location.

The current facility also lacks incarceration space. One holding cell situated in a main hallway is designed to be temporary and is normally occupied for only a few hours. A secured railing anchored just outside the cell in the hallway is used to handcuff prisoners when multiple arrests require additional detainment. This practice has the potential for security problems, since the hallway is a main thoroughfare for officers and staff in the Department. Moreover, there is no separate facility for housing juvenile detainees or for any medical unit to attend to medical problems. Prisoners are transported to the Santa Maria Sheriff's Station as soon as police are available to do so.

Operationally, the Department functions very efficiently given the limited space available. Fourteen officers work on patrol, in addition to an Investigation Division comprised of ten detectives, a Sergeant and Lieutenant. There is an adequate laboratory for fingerprinting and drug testing.

The jurisdiction of the Police Department officially ends at the city limits; however, a well-organized and cooperative relationship exists with the Highway Patrol and the County Sheriff's Department during crisis situations.

Volunteers are used to enforce minor violations such as parking, abandoned vehicles and other municipal infractions. This program works very well, and the Department should be commended for its innovative approach in relieving officers for other more serious duties.

PROBATION DEPARTMENT

Santa Barbara Juvenile Hall

Santa Barbara Juvenile Hall, located on Hollister Avenue, consists of a 56-bed detention facility, Santa Barbara Juvenile Probation Services and Juvenile Court. There are 25 paid staff at the facility. A nurse is on duty full-time during the week.

Juvenile Hall is used to temporarily detain minors up to 18 years of age before and after arraignment. The average stay is two weeks; however, it can be as long as ten months for those awaiting placement due to special circumstances.

The facility houses both male and female youth offenders in cells that are private and secure. Seventy percent of the youths in Juvenile Hall come from North County. Increased numbers can cause overcrowding though this condition should be eased when an expanded facility in Santa Maria is opened in late 2004.

Two well-equipped classrooms are used to provide juvenile detainees the mandated four and a half hours of daily academic education. Each classroom has a teacher and a classroom aide, with a special educational resource specialist available on an "as needed" basis. There is also a well-stocked library and a reading program offered. Drug and alcohol education is provided, as well as courses in childcare and anger management. Moreover, numerous volunteer organizations help with a variety of outreach programs.

Recently a work furlough program was cut due to County budget constraints. This program allowed youths to leave the facility and work in the community under Juvenile Hall staff supervision. This valuable program helped the youth develop a work ethic and a sense of responsibility. It is sorely missed.

Volleyball, basketball, jogging, weightlifting and other types of physical activity are offered in a large outdoor area. A small swimming pool is also on site. All programs at Juvenile Hall emphasize organization, discipline and structure.

Those in charge at the Santa Barbara Juvenile Hall expressed a true commitment to helping troubled juveniles.

Finding 1

The furlough program which has been discontinued was a positive activity that offered juveniles a positive work experience and provided a valuable community service.

Recommendation 1

This valuable program should be reinstated when funds become available.

Affected Agencies

Santa Barbara County Probation Department

Finding	1
Recommendation	1

Santa Maria Juvenile Hall

The Santa Maria Juvenile Hall is located next to the Sheriff's Station on Foster Road in Santa Maria. A new facility is in the process of being built adjacent to the current building, with an expected completion date of October, 2004. At that time the North County Juvenile Court will be transferred to the new facility.

The new facility will be able to handle 90 minors. The design features two-story, self-contained housing units, or "pods," each of which will house a maximum of 30 juveniles. These pods will include classrooms, a recreation area, food service and sleeping dormitories.

Juveniles housed at this facility have committed misdemeanor or felony offenses. Those arrested usually appear in court within 48 hours. Ages range from 13 to 19 years, but some are as young as nine years old. Juveniles convicted of offenses such as truancy, running away from home, or incorrigible behavior are not incarcerated.

A nurse is on duty for 40 hours a week, and a doctor for four hours two days a week. There is no medical care on weekends, but a doctor is on call. If an emergency medical situation arises on a weekend involving a juvenile, he/she must be transported to a local hospital by a staff member for appropriate medical care. This potentially leaves the facility short-handed.

The Juvenile Hall is currently staffed with 39 employees servicing a maximum of 50 juveniles. These positions include institutional officers, clerical support and food service workers. There is electronic surveillance in most cells and hallways to monitor activity.

Staffing will increase to a proposed 68 positions which will include several positions unique to the expanded facility. These will include 24/7 coverage in the control center, staff to supervise minors prior to court appearance, staff to handle transportation, and the addition of a utility clerk and a receptionist.

With the downsizing of the Santa Barbara Juvenile Hall, some staff positions from that facility may be transferred to accommodate staffing needs at the Santa Maria Facility.

Los Prietos Boy's Camp/Tri-Counties Boot Camp

The Los Prietos Boys Camp and Tri-Counties Boot Camp are County owned and part of the Probation Department. The camps are located on 17 acres of beautiful, wooded forest land leased from the Los Padres National Forest. Both camps are twenty-four hour residential, correction and treatment facilities for male court wards between the ages of 13 and 17 years old.

Boys assigned to the Camps by order of the Juvenile Court have evidenced critical gaps in their upbringing. Combined with the pressures of adult society, school and peer relationships, this has led to anti-social and illegal behavior. At no time, however, according to Camp officials, are these juveniles considered "throw away kids."

Juveniles placed in these programs must possess the necessary self-control to benefit from a varied, challenging program in an open residential setting. The educational needs of the boys are provided by Los Robles High School (Los Prietos) and Academy High School (Boot Camp). These schools are on site and operated by the Santa Barbara County Education Office.

Los Prietos Boys Camp (fifty-six beds, all in use) was established in 1944 as a residential treatment center for juveniles convicted of misdemeanors or felonies.

Tri-Counties Boot Camp (forty beds, nineteen in use at the time of the Jury's visit) was established in 1997 as a 4-month early intervention program for wards from Santa Barbara, Ventura and San Luis Obispo Counties. Historically, this program was designed to meet the needs of non-violent, non-felony juveniles. In the future, this facility will no longer be a Tri-County camp. Ventura now has its own juvenile residential treatment center; San Luis Obispo will no longer send juveniles in 2004 due to budget constraints. There are currently empty beds in the Boot Camp, although the Court has mandated placement for specific juveniles. Assignments are not being made due to lack of funds in the Probation Department for the additional staffing required.

Also due to budget constraints, plans are currently underway to restructure the programs in both camps.

The Jury was pleased to see the high level of mutual respect and commitment among the Director, staff and the boys in residence. There is an atmosphere of motivation and cooperation among the youth. Follow-up programs created during the incarceration period and continued following juveniles' release are an important component of the Camps' apparent success.

Finding 1

The facilities at the Boot Camp and Boys' Camp are underutilized due to a lack of sufficient staffing. Beds remain empty.

Recommendation 1

Funds should be made available to increase the staff at the Camps so that the additional placements can be made.

Affected Agencies**Santa Barbara County Probation Department**

Finding 1
Recommendation 1

SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

Carpinteria Station

The Carpinteria Station is located in the City Hall building on Carpinteria Avenue. Police services are provided under a renewable five-year contract between the City of Carpinteria and the County Sheriff's Department. From this station the Sheriff's Department also provides service for the unincorporated areas of Montecito, Summerland and the Carpinteria Valley. Included at the site are a lobby/reception area, offices, holding cells, a report writing room, evidence and locker rooms. Approximately thirty-five staff members are employed at the station, consisting of records specialists, officers, and one lieutenant.

In accordance with a 2002-2003 Grand Jury recommendation, the facility has been remodeled and updated, using funds allocated by the City Manager and from grants. Additional improvements are planned, including an adjacent physical fitness room, expansion and reconfiguration of the locker room, and new equipment in the evidence room, all critical needs at the facility. A Community Response Vehicle has been purchased and is used for a variety of police outreach programs. The Department also has an eye catching Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE) vehicle.

The Department is to be commended for reaching out to the community in many ways, such as:

- The Safeguard program for educating children
- The DARE program in local schools
- Neighborhood and vacation watch services
- A pro-active gang program
- Participation in town hall meetings to address concerns of citizens

Housing costs on the South Coast make it difficult for the police officers to live in and be part of the community they serve. Nonetheless, the Carpinteria Station has superior staff longevity.

Finding 1

The Carpinteria Police Department/Sheriff's Coastal Station is outgrowing the existing facility.

Recommendation 1

Expansion or relocation, if not already under consideration, should be taken under advisement.

Affected Agencies

Santa Barbara County Sheriff's Department

Finding	1
Recommendation	1

Coroner's Bureau

The Santa Barbara County Coroner's Bureau is located on San Antonio Road off Hollister Avenue in Santa Barbara. The facility is difficult to locate because of inadequate signage on Hollister Avenue.

Since last year, there have been several physical changes which have improved the operational function of the complex as well as its physical appearance. These changes were implemented following last year's Grand Jury recommendations and the Sheriff's Department upgrade recommendations.

The main office has a small reception area and two newly renovated office areas. One serves as the sergeant's office and the other as a meeting, break or occasional bereavement room. The area is clean, well lit and serviceable. A large, modular building at the back of the property houses the office of the medical examiner and deputy investigators' work area. The room is spacious and lends itself to team operations. The facility was found to be compact yet efficient.

With eight full-time employees at this location, the Bureau investigates an estimated 1300 deaths each year, and an average of 175 autopsies are performed. Approximately half of the bodies requiring autopsies are transported from North County. A full-time forensic pathologist, whose position was created in 2002-2003, leaves the Coroner's Bureau to perform autopsies at Santa Barbara Cottage Hospital. The hospital currently charges the county a \$175 facility use fee. Due to the installation of budgeted equipment, the autopsy suite at the Coroner's Bureau now has the capability to perform all autopsies on site. On site autopsies would eliminate the need to transport bodies to and from Cottage Hospital, thus avoiding potential damage to a corpse and/or injury to the technicians who are doing heavy lifting. Furthermore, the assigned investigating deputy who stays at Cottage Hospital during each autopsy would be able to remain at the Coroner's Bureau and work on cases in his/her office. Staff time would be used more efficiently, thus saving the county money.

The morgue holds up to 25 bodies awaiting autopsy or transfer to appropriate funeral facilities. The Santa Maria Sheriff's Station also has a facility for holding bodies awaiting transport to the Coroner's Bureau. Bodies that remain unclaimed are turned over to the Public Administrator after all attempts to locate a family or a responsible party are exhausted by the Sheriff's investigators.

The toxicology laboratory, adjacent to the autopsy room, is small and somewhat cramped. There is an old generator on site that is used during power outages. It is serviceable, but it is not an automatic system, sometimes resulting in delayed or lost testing. The Coroner's Bureau contracts with National Medical Services (NMS) to

provide tests that are out of the scope of the on site toxicology laboratory, which is only equipped to process tests for street drugs and alcohol substances. The budgeted costs for the use of the National Medical Services are minimal compared with the operating costs of the on site toxicology laboratory. The county could greatly reduce costs by eliminating the Coroner's Bureau toxicology lab and sending all blood and tissue samples to a contracted facility such as NMS.

Finding 1

There is no signage on Hollister Avenue at San Antonio Road, indicating the Coroner's Bureau location further down San Antonio Road (especially needed for bereaved clientele). The signage at the Bureau's driveway is also inadequate.

Recommendation 1

Place a county sign on Hollister Avenue at San Antonio Road, indicating "Coroner's Bureau," and another at the driveway entrance to the office.

Finding 2

Staff time is not used efficiently while autopsies are performed at Cottage Hospital and there is a possibility of worker's compensation issues due to the current system of transporting corpses from the Coroner's Bureau.

Recommendation 2

All autopsies should be performed at the Coroner's Bureau.

Finding 3

The toxicology laboratory is only able to run a limited range of tests.

Recommendation 3

All laboratory testing can be outsourced to a contracted facility at a savings to the county.

Affected Agencies**Santa Barbara County Sheriff's Department**

Findings 1, 2, 3

Recommendations 1, 2, 3

Figueroa St. Court Holding Facility

The Santa Barbara County Courts Holding Facility, located within the Superior Court building on Figueroa Street, consists of both a secure outdoor area and inside holding cells for prisoners transported to and from the facility on court business.

The outside area, for loading and unloading of prisoners, is secure. Locking gates close in front of and behind any vehicle transporting prisoners. Control of the gates is from inside the facility and is inaccessible from the outside. This outdoor area is also monitored by closed circuit cameras from inside the facility. When this outdoor area is "locked down," access to the parking lot behind the court building is impassable, although there is alternative access to the lot.

Prisoners are escorted to one of eight holding cells. Their arrivals are planned in advance in accordance with their scheduled court appearances. For the prisoners' own safety, they are assigned to cells based on their personality profile, capacity to get along with others, nature of the crimes committed, and mental state. If they are in protective custody, they are assigned to a separate cell.

The holding facility can hold a maximum of 80 prisoners. On the day of this year's Grand Jury tour, there were approximately 20 prisoners in five to six of the cells. The facility was clean and inmates appeared well-cared for. Neither prisoners nor correctional staff appeared under stress. The minimum staff requirement at the facility is three officers. There is no set ratio of prisoners to staff, though at times of high-profile inmates, staff numbers may be increased. Staff is satisfied with the current policy and budget cuts will not affect security.

Isla Vista Station

The Sheriff's Isla Vista Station is located on Pardall Avenue in the heart of Isla Vista. It is staffed by the Isla Vista Foot Patrol and is under the direction of a Lieutenant. It is augmented by security personnel from the Police Department of the University of California, Santa Barbara (UCSB), and members of the Highway Patrol.

Normal coverage is usually six deputies, increasing to as many as twelve on the weekends. From the opening of the school year until Halloween, weekend staffing increases to 25 deputies, including several undercover officers. Due to large crowds on Halloween, 95 officers are in place, together with 15 correctional officers with mobile booking capability, plus 10 representatives from the Highway Patrol. In addition, there are six vehicle checkpoints for alcohol control, five horse-mounted Sheriff's Deputies and six mounted officers from Ventura County for the Halloween weekend.

The Isla Vista Foot Patrol is in the difficult position of enforcing the law and protecting the residents of Isla Vista while maintaining quality relationships within the college community. Isla Vista has a long history of being a party destination for the region. Students and visitors drink to excess, some becoming victims of sexual assault, violence or robbery, and others becoming predators. In all instances that the Jury observed, the deputies were courteous and respectful, but firm, when citing party goers or making arrests. Of concern is the growing violence relating directly to alcohol abuse. Serious injuries and even deaths are occurring more frequently and there are increasing numbers of sexual assaults.

The Foot Patrol is involved in community outreach and programs directed against alcohol abuse. They work with Alcohol Beverage Control to maintain diligent prevention of liquor sale violations within the surrounding community. In conjunction with UCSB and other groups, the Foot Patrol has developed a Parental Notification Program to notify parents of student alcohol violations. The Foot Patrol also recently began a Landlord Notification Program to inform property owners and property management companies when tenants continually defy lease regulations pertaining to loud or unruly parties. Both programs are an attempt to reduce problems of alcohol-related behavior in Isla Vista.

Main Jail Facility

The Santa Barbara County Jail is located off Calle Real between El Sueno and Turnpike Roads in Santa Barbara. The facility houses men and women awaiting arraignment and during trial, and those sentenced to county detention.

Upon arrival, all inmates are given a mental and physical evaluation and provided clothing, food and medical care as needed. At this time the jail has three full-time therapists, three full-time Registered Nurses and one half-time psychiatrist. A medical doctor is available every day for sick call as needed and is on-call 24 hours a day.

Most inmates are housed in communal cell with bunks and a toilet. These cells are adjacent to a "day room" which includes tables and a shower room. Inmates spend most of their free time in this area, reading, drawing and conversing. The law provides that each inmate be given three hours of physical activity in a seven-day period.

Inmates have access to telephones, legal services and visitation with friends and relatives. They have a commissary account that can be supplemented by family members or friends. This account can be used for food or personal items. The money from concession sales is used for inmate education programs. The Main Jail is a non-smoking facility.

The severity of inmate crimes is designated by the color of the jumpsuit they are issued. For example, bright orange and red suits are worn by those committing the most serious crimes. The lighter the color, the lesser the crime.

Great care is taken by the correctional officers to secure the safety and well-being of every inmate. Those inmates who are a danger to themselves or others are isolated in separate, single cells. A status board is maintained and updated daily to identify problem inmates and possible aggressive interaction among various factions within the jail. This practice allows for better management of the inmate population.

Sheriff deputies, correctional officers and staff at the Santa Barbara County Jail should be commended for their dedication and professionalism. They organize and oversee a diverse and potentially dangerous group of inmates in an area characterized by overcrowding and continual movement of prisoners between North and South County. More than 1200 prisoners are released annually because of overcrowded conditions. Overcrowding and the need for a North County jail facility remain major issues and should not be overlooked or go unmentioned. (See **Early Release** report.)

Men's Honor Farm

The Men's Honor Farm is located behind the Main Jail on Calle Real in Santa Barbara. The Honor Farm is a minimum-security environment, with work programs designed to support the operation of the custody facilities and provide inmates with alternative ways to serve their sentences. Placement in the Honor Farm requires a minimum of 30 days of good behavior in other detention facilities and no charges of assault or sex crime violations. The Honor Farm can house up to 245 inmates who have been sentenced or are awaiting trial.

Being assigned to this facility provides incentives for positive inmate behavior. This is a dormitory-like setting, where inmates may use exercise facilities, play pool, or visit the library during their free time. Inmates share group responsibility. Each member is responsible for his own actions as well as the actions of others.

In addition, the incentive programs require inmates to perform work at the Honor Farm and other detention facilities. The Sheriff's Department estimates that these programs save the County over a million dollars annually. They also provide work-related education and experience. Inmates doing work outside the facility are picked up and dropped off by the organization employing them, thus saving taxpayers any transportation cost.

Inmates are encouraged to participate in educational and treatment programs. A multi-purpose training lab with computer stations was observed to be under construction.

Santa Ynez and Buellton Stations

Santa Ynez and Buellton Stations represent two of the four contract facilities within Santa Barbara County, the other two being Goleta and Carpinteria. Contract facilities occur when a city chooses to enter into an agreement for police protection from the County Sheriff's office, rather than maintaining their own police force. The Santa Ynez and Buellton stations cover the entire Santa Ynez Valley.

The Santa Ynez Station, located on Mission Drive in Solvang, provides police services for Solvang, Ballard, Los Olivos, Santa Ynez, and the surrounding unincorporated areas. When needed, police services from the Santa Ynez Station are also provided **at no cost** to the Chumash Reservation and Casino. This is a concern to the Jury, since during the years 2000 through 2003, 11% of all the reports taken in the Santa Ynez Valley occurred at the Chumash Casino.

The Buellton Station, located on Highway 246 in Buellton, provides law enforcement services to that city on a 24-hour basis. The Buellton Station also oversees service to the unincorporated areas of Lompoc through the Lompoc Station, located on Burton-Mesa Road in Lompoc.

The Stations share 29 deputies who rotate among Buellton, Solvang, and Lompoc. The Santa Ynez and Buellton Stations are each run by a Sergeant and Senior Deputy, with a Lieutenant in charge of the full operation at each facility. Deputies assigned to these facilities are trained in conducting crime investigations. In cases of a more serious crime, County Sheriff's Detectives are available and on call.

The Santa Ynez Station has a holding facility. The Buellton Station does not. Suspects held in the facility in Solvang normally remain for no more than four to six hours. After that time, they are either released or transported to Los Alamos, where they are met by a deputy from Santa Maria, and taken to the station there. Whenever prisoners are transported to Santa Maria from Solvang, two deputies are required for the transfer, making them unavailable for patrol or other duties. If suspects are to be incarcerated for any period of time, they are then transported to the Main Jail in Santa Barbara. When serious injury or health problems are present, suspects are transported directly to Santa Barbara, where medical care is available.

The stations visited by the Grand Jury were clean and well-organized. The officers in charge were responsive and anxious to provide complete information regarding their respective operations.

Santa Maria Station

The Santa Maria Sheriff's Station, located off Foster Road is part of the North County Operations Division of the Santa Barbara Sheriff's Department. The facility appears to be well maintained and has electronic surveillance throughout. This Station houses patrol operations & law enforcement services for the unincorporated areas surrounding the city of Santa Maria, including Orcutt, Gary, Sisquoc, Tanglewood, and Los Alamos. The station serves as backup to local police departments when needed.

Custody operations and jail operations, including support services, are at this station. It is a 38 bed holding facility where inmates are held for a maximum of 96 hours. Inmates are brought here from Guadalupe, Santa Maria, Buellton, Solvang, Lompoc, Los Alamos and Cuyama. It handles about 32% of total county bookings. Deputies and other support personnel perform the administrative functions of the facility. No meals are prepared for inmates at the facility. Box lunches and TV dinners are purchased from outside vendors.

Inmates are sentenced by the courts to serve time in the Santa Barbara County Main Jail. Unless the court determines an inmate ineligible, he may be assigned to one of two alternative work programs by jail administration. Those inmates who do not qualify for these programs are then transported to the Santa Barbara Main Jail.

The Santa Maria Station serves as a holding facility for inmates awaiting arraignment, (or pre-trial detention) and administers the two alternative work programs, Electronic Monitoring/Work Furlough or Sheriffs Work Alternative Program (SWAP):

- Electronic Monitoring/Work Furlough inmates are those sentenced from 61 days to a year. They may apply for this program as an alternative to jail. Inmates continue their jobs within the community while serving their court imposed sentences at home. Participants are monitored via an electronic ankle bracelet and are restricted to a rigid schedule. Inmates pay a portion of the incarceration cost through a daily fee assessment.
- SWAP is for those inmates who are sentenced from three to sixty days. They continue their jobs within the community and are assigned to one of several work sites throughout the county. Participants may serve their sentences in increments such as on weekends without adversely affecting their full-time jobs. They pay a daily fee to offset the cost of the program.

Trustees (low risk inmates) from the Men's Honor Farm in Santa Barbara are assigned to the Station when there is a need. They perform work-related tasks at the Station. They reside on site and have access to a small kitchen space and prepare their own meals.

A previous Grand Jury report commented on the inadequate women's locker room/restroom facility, which is utilized by 25 female employees. This problem is recognized by the Station, but space and funding continue to be an issue.

Women's Honor Farm

The Women's Honor Farm occupies one wing of the Honor Farm facility located on the grounds of the Santa Barbara Main Jail. The women's wing is not accessible to the male Honor Farm inmates. One deputy is on duty at all times, and cameras provide additional security monitoring.

At the time of the Jury's visit, there were 11 females housed at the Honor Farm; however, the facility can accommodate 39 inmates. The low number of female inmates was due to a recent "capping out," or release, of women inmates. (See **Early Release** report.)

The facility is spacious and clean. The sleeping area is dormitory style with bunk beds spaced several feet apart. Inmates are permitted small decorative touches in their individual spaces. A library, cafeteria with microwave ovens and vending machines, and a lounge with telephones, a TV and VCR are provided. There is a walled outdoor area for exercising, eating, or relaxing. Trees and plants in this area contrast with the stark outdoor areas of the Main Jail.

Contributions to inmates' commissary accounts are made by friends and family. These accounts can be used to purchase snacks and discretionary personal items. Inmates are given hygiene kits weekly to meet minimum cleanliness standards. Visitations for Honor Farm inmates occur in the Main Jail.

Inmates housed at the Honor Farm are required to work either at county public agencies or on site. Transportation is provided to jobs outside the facility. Inmates earn work credit towards a reduced sentence. Inmates are also encouraged to participate in educational and treatment programs.

It is considered a privilege by inmates to be housed at the Honor Farm and most do what they can to earn the right to serve sentences there.

SANTA BARBARA COUNTY INMATE DEATHS

Each year a Civil Grand Jury is mandated by the State of California to review circumstances surrounding all deaths that occur during incarceration in any of the County detention facilities. In accordance with Penal Code requirements, the 2003-2004 Jury investigated all deaths occurring during its term. The Jury reviewed two cases, both occurring while the detainees were incarcerated in the Main Jail. The Jury looked at the Santa Barbara County Sheriff's Department Major Crimes Reports, the Coroner's Reports, the Autopsy Reports in both cases, and the Santa Barbara County Jail Medical Department's Policy and Procedure Manual.

After reviewing the above documentation related to both cases, the Jury concluded that the deaths were due to natural causes and no further investigation was necessary. The Jury found the jail staff, the Coroner's Bureau, and the Sheriff to be cooperative in furnishing relevant materials and information for the Jury's review.