

153117

**San Francisco Jail Population
Management Plan:
Solutions to Overcrowding Report**

NCJRS

MAR 8 1995

ACQUISITIONS

April 10, 1991

153117

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by
Institute for Law and Policy
Planning

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

**San Francisco Jail Population
Management Plan:
Solutions to Overcrowding Report**

April 10, 1991

CRIMINAL JUSTICE ADMINISTRATORS' GROUP

Mr. Dennis Aftergut, Chief Assistant City Attorney
Ron Albers, Public Defender's Office
Jeff Brown, Public Defender's Office
Jon Dearman, Presiding Judge, Civil Superior Courts
Peter Goldstein, Director, Budget Staff, Mayor's Office
Tony Hall, Municipal Court Administration
Jim Harrigan, Sheriff's Legal Counsel
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff, San Francisco Sheriff's Department
Newton Lam, Mayor's Office
William Mallen, Presiding Judge, Municipal Court
Tomar Mason, Municipal Court
Lucy Kelley McCabe, Presiding Judge, Criminal Superior Court
Kate Monico-Klein, Forensic Services, San Francisco Dept. of Public Health
Tom Peters, Head of Forensic Services, San Francisco Dept. of Public Health
Robert Podesta, District Attorney's Office
Paul Principe, Assistant Chief District Attorney
Ron Quidachay, Municipal Court
Tony Ribera, Commanding Officer, Fiscal Div., San Francisco Police Dept.
Tanya Saul, Forensic Services, San Francisco Dept. of Public Health
Arlene Sauser, Chief Adult Probation Officer, San Francisco Probation Dept.
Arlo Smith, District Attorney's Office
Arnie Sowell, Mayor's Office

PROJECT TEAM

Dr. Alan S. Kalmanoff, Project Director
Ms. Susan Jensen, Project Manager
Ms. Myla Reyes, Project Coordinator
Dr. David Moulton, Data Specialist
Mr. David Dupree, Courts Specialist
Ms. Jane Yee, Population Analyst
Mr. Palmer Stinson, Law Enforcement Specialist

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	1
Introduction	2
Solutions to Jail Overcrowding	3
Appendix	
A: Contacts	Appendix page 1
B: Bibliography	3
C: Draft Solutions List.....	6

Executive Summary

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This solutions report proposes strategies to regulate jail overcrowding. The solutions are a response to the causes of overcrowding identified in the first phase of this project.

A draft report was submitted to the Criminal Justice Administrators' Group (CJAG) for comments. This solutions report reflects CJAG comments, policy direction and decisions regarding the presented solutions.

The following are the solutions derived from extensive deliberation by CJAG and modified by Consultants. Some solutions presented in the draft report have been deleted, modified or combined. The full array of solutions as listed in the draft report are presented in Appendix C.

- Solution A1: Data Program and Jail Population Manager**
- Solution B1: CJAG Coordinates the Criminal Justice System**
- Solution C1: Improve Timeliness, Quality and Review of Police Reports and Felony Charges**
- Solution C2: Fund Additional Community-Based Detoxification Beds for Public Inebriates**
- Solution D1: Develop a Model OR Program**
- Solution D2: Develop a Model FTA Program**
- Solution D3: Provide Alternatives for the Mentally Ill (three solutions are outlined)**
- Solution D4: Inter-County Pact to Limit the Problem of Traffic Holds**
- Solution F1: Expedited Trial Management Program**
- Solution G1: Improved Use of County Parole**
- Solution G2: Prioritize Presentence Investigation Reports for In-Custody Cases**
- Solution G3: Expand the Use of Electronic Monitoring**
- Solution H1: Construct, Remodel and/or Renovate Facilities**

Introduction

INTRODUCTION

The city and county of San Francisco contracted with the Institute for Law and Policy Planning (ILPP) to develop a Jail Population Management Plan to comply with a federal court order. This Solutions Report is the second of a three-phase planning process to develop a five-year jail population management plan. The study will result in a plan for San Francisco to manage and limit the flow of inmates through its detention facilities and to replace special provisions now employed as a result of a court order.

There are three phases to the project. The first identifies and analyzes factors contributing to jail overcrowding which resulted in a report on causes of overcrowding. The second presents solutions through the development of proposed strategies to regulate jail crowding factors; these factors are set forth herein. The third will be an implementation plan. Each of the three reports begins with a draft which is presented to the Criminal Justice Administrators' Group (CJAG). After their input, a final version is issued.

The solutions have been developed to address the causes identified in the "Causes of Overcrowding Report." They have been organized to follow the same format as the causes report and thus, solutions are presented not by priority or by the greatest impact on bed savings, but according to flow from arrest to sentencing.

Solutions to Jail Overcrowding

SOLUTIONS TO JAIL OVERCROWDING

This section is organized in the same way that the causes of overcrowding report was organized. For each area, causes are repeated; after featuring solutions to system-wide causes, the coverage is by system stage, from arrest to sentencing.

A. Lack of System Management Data

- 1. There is a complete lack of authoritative, readily accessible, system-wide data that are available and useful for jail population management.**

Solution A1: Data Program and Jail Population Manager

San Francisco could provide a personal computer and statistical program and a 0.5 full time employment (FTE) position (for a jail population manager - JPM) to sample jail flow quarterly. The quarterly sample would employ perhaps 400 cases and obtain time of intake and release, method of release, and information on charges and disposition. Information should be reported to the CJAG and then disseminated generally to the criminal justice community. Information should include average length of stay (ALS) by charge and release mode and failure to appear (FTA) and warrants/hold data. Significant population management issues should be noted. This information would enable CJAG to manage overcrowding.

Pros

This approach would be a fast, credible, system- and issues-oriented population management approach. It would provide an inexpensive solution to the data problems previously identified and an ability to manage crowding. The ability to effectively monitor the system would have bed savings impacts system-wide.

Cons

This is not the larger information management system needed, and it might delay that needed system.

Costs

A personal computer at \$2,000; program at \$750; 0.5 FTE (for the JPM) at \$29,000; total = \$31,750/first year.

Options

Could use consultant, but expensive. Could develop larger MIS system, but too expensive and would require delays. Could do nothing, but inability to manage crowding would remain.

B. Lack of Effective Interagency Policy Development and Decision Making About Crowding

- 1. Due to the lack of accessible data, there is almost a complete lack of effective interagency policy development and decision making about crowding.**

Solution B1: CJAG Coordinates the Criminal Justice System

San Francisco could designate CJAG as the entity officially responsible for managing scarce jail beds and programs, and tie the various justice system budgets to a CJAG review at the conclusion of the existing budget process. Employing data (see Solution A1 above), CJAG and a 0.5 FTE manager should organize the agenda for CJAG meetings, monitor results of CJAG recommended changes, and in this manner, manage jail crowding.

The broad discretionary power and influential political position of the court should be enlisted to bring the presiding judge to a position of leadership in helping to formulate and implement a system-wide approach to the problems of jail crowding. Evaluators of the four-year LEAA Jail Overcrowding Program found that the most successful projects were those with strong judicial leadership.

A Population Management System (PMS) should result, in which CJAG, with shared responsibility, regular meetings and authoritative data, prioritizes and manages jail beds as a scarce system resource. This approach would be employed regardless of the number of beds brought on line.

In this PMS, all independent constitutional officers (and "gatekeepers") are responsible for monitoring and guiding the Population Management Plan and the plan replaces the procedures stemming from the existing court order.

The following procedures are recommended:

- CJAG agency heads (e.g., the Sheriff, the Police Chief, the District Attorney, etc.) meet quarterly, chaired by presiding judge;
- CJAG managers (e.g., Undersheriff, Assistant Public Defender, Assistant District Attorney, etc.) meet weekly with the new manager (JPM);
- CJAG agency heads meet in emergencies called by presiding judge; establish a procedure, if and when needed, to recommend emergency releases;
- CJAG makes recommendations to member agencies, allied agencies, city/county, and state.

Pros

Manages overcrowding; saves funds; provides more accountable budgeting. Brings San Francisco from "dark ages" regarding jail population and system management, resulting in a Population Management System (PMS) that will save future funding. Provides system-wide bed savings.

Cons

Creates new agency and staff; crosses bureaucratic lines; difficult to find "right" manager (JPM).

Costs

JPM (0.5 FTE, @ \$29,000) + Clerical (0.5 FTE @ \$7,000) + expenses (\$5,000) + data system noted above (\$31,750) = \$72,750.

Options

A weaker system could be implemented, but it risks more crowding and damaging court intervention. More participants and groups could be involved without any staffing, but the system would be weaker and slower. Consultants could be used for studies and recommendations in future crises, but this would be slower and more expensive.¹

C. Arrest

1. **Police reports are not always made available in a timely manner. Police appear to book many arrestees with inadequately documented charges, and to overcharge.**

Solution C1: Improve Timeliness, Quality and Review of Police Reports and Felony Charges

The San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) should take greater responsibility for helping with overcrowding by making the timing and quality of documentation in police reports a high priority. Resulting improvements in training, supervision and management and an increase in allocated resources will reduce police and system workload and result in more timely reports, better documentation and consistency, and a lower "drop" rate on felonies. (See the Coro Foundation's report, "The Impact of Proposition 115 on the San Francisco Police Department", October 1990.)

At present, an SFPD committee which includes a representative from the District Attorney's Office is conducting meetings to improve their police reports and comply with Proposition 115. In addition, four weeks have been added to academy training, part of which will be used to improve report writing skills. The police committee should submit its findings and recommendations to CJAG. This committee or another designated group should monitor progress and continue to report to CJAG. Input from the District Attorney's Office should be an essential part of this monitoring.

Night District Attorney

A district attorney should be on call at night (from 5 p.m. to 2 a.m.) as a resource to the police inspectors for all felony arrests. The inspectors should call the district attorney as felony cases arise to improve the initial charging decisions (before booking) by receiving a definition of the proper charge. The on-call deputy district attorney would approve many felony charges before booking, all within 24 hours.

¹ Solution B1.2: Quarterly Publication of Jail Crowding Issues, will be incorporated as part of the Population Management System outlined in Solution B1.

Pros

Extends availability of the district attorney as a resource to the inspectors and improves reliability and consistency of information in complex cases. Fewer jail beds days would be wasted on cases dismissed or reduced due to inadequate police reports. Costs would be greatly reduced for police, prosecution, defense, courts and the jail.

Because it is not left to the inspector's discretion as to whether a felony case requires consultation with the district attorney, consultation will occur in all cases needing district attorney input. This is a widely proven approach and an effective solution to crowding.

Cons

Some difficulties can be expected in realigning police and prosecution resources to change an age-old pattern of separate decision making.

Costs

Special stipend for night district attorneys. Funding will probably be made available through police alternative funding. Cost savings should result at each stage in the criminal justice process.

Solution C2: Fund Additional Community-Based Detoxification Beds for Public Inebriates

Public inebriation is generally accepted to be a social problem rather than a criminal justice problem. In June, 1990, Mayor Agnos signed a resolution in favor of expanding the "current system for public inebriates charged with drunk in public" to include "a community-based social model detoxification and treatment program with medical accessibility adequate for the acute and long-term care of these clients."² Public Inebriate Substance Abuse Services (PISAS) and the city-funded Jail Diversion Pilot Project are programs attempting to reduce the number of 647f (public inebriation) arrests in San Francisco. However, San Francisco is still without an adequate number of community-based detoxification and treatment beds.

When available community resources are full, the police hold 647f arrestees at district police stations or at County Jail #1. An average of 23 to 24 such arrests occur per day.³ Although this population is not technically booked and does not have a long average length of stay, scarce jail space must nonetheless be provided and Sheriff's personnel used to process these defendants. Additionally, these public inebriate arrestees are not provided with treatment services.

Pros

Provides a more appropriate response to the problem of public inebriation. Reduces the use of Sheriff's personnel and scarce jail beds.

Cons

Costs for detoxification beds.

² San Francisco Department of Public Health Forensic Services, Final Draft: Jail Alternative Pilot Project Program Evaluation Report for July-December, 1990, p. 6.

³ SF Dept. of Public Health, p. 5.

Costs

Approximately \$45-50 per bed day.

Options

Continue arresting public inebriates when community resource beds are full.

D. Booking

1. **The OR Bail Project is not structured to maximize fast releases by the judges because it uses no objective points or criteria, does not recommend OR release and excludes certain cases. Court OR appears slow.**

Solution D1: Develop a Model OR Program

San Francisco should develop a comprehensive model OR program aimed at lowering jail crowding and improving public safety. The following procedures (and a combined model FTA program) should be implemented.

- a. Reorganize OR to be directly managed and administered by the Sheriff's Department or Probation Department. Encourage greater court reliance by early and continuous court consultation. Combine all OR and pretrial release mechanism operations in a single, well-documented and publicized program, with one budget and one source of direction and control.
- b. Expand the reorganized OR Bail Project and upgrade staffing; tie the program by computer to prior records and police reporting, and develop more formal program documentation of policy and procedures with participation by CJAG, as the policy board for the project.
- c. Interview 100 percent of all bookings, assign weights to objective guidelines for release/propensity to appear and ability to contact, and make recommendations for monitoring, etc. to the bench for all offenders in custody, updating, verifying and renewing daily. To avoid any appearance of advocacy for release, tie all recommendations to a risk-assessment approach, based on the objective guidelines and continue to revise guidelines and weighting to FTA rates and other measures of OR system performance (i.e., employ FTA data to monitor and regulate and vary guidelines and practice).
- d. Institute greater use of the Supervised OR release, other forms of conditional OR, and drug and alcohol testing. As alternatives to incarceration for special populations, employ third-party recognizance release for DUI arrestees, and some mentally ill/disabled defendants and 827(i)s. Employ various graduated means of contact and supervision, including day custody and day reporting, third-party supervision and/or custody, electronic monitoring, etc. Tailor releases to ensuring appearance and minimizing crowding by FTAs.

Pros

Goes far in solving many pretrial delays and resulting release problems; reduces crowding and increases public safety through faster use of objective and verified information; results in more consistency, reliability, and confidence by the bench, and ultimately, significant cost savings system-wide.

Cons

There are start up costs, concerns with a "new agency," possible resistance and the risks of "one bad case" undermining the project at or near the beginning.

Costs

Could cost \$100-200,000 to initially set up. Will be revenue neutral or better if considered with extensive positive impacts on crowding and delay.

Options

Could do only selected program elements (a. through d. above). Could gradually employ various elements rather than implement all at once.

2. San Francisco has a high failure-to-appear rate and few programs to lower it.

Solution D2: Develop a Model FTA Program

San Francisco should develop a model failure to appear (FTA) program as part of the OR program. It should be aimed at increasing the rate of pretrial appearance and decreasing the impact on jail crowding, court delay, etc., of FTAs. The model FTA program should be built on the current efforts of the Sheriff's Supervised Citation Project and the Pretrial Diversion Project, and it should rely heavily on the procedures employed successfully by both these projects in ensuring the defendants do appear in court. The guiding principle should be establishing means of contacting the defendant. These should be gradations in the means of contact in terms of the amount of control employed. These should be based on the objective OR guidelines, the program's FTA rate, and the ongoing input of CJAG as the OR program's policy-making board.

The following procedures should be employed.

- a. Employ an "800" number for missed/changed or rescheduled court dates, using various languages; employ computerized postal and telephonic reminders before scheduled arraignment; and employ a central staffing point in concert with the OR program.
- b. Employ FTA data and CJAG feedback to manage supervised and conditional release, and other graduated forms of control and monitoring.

Pros

Reduces the FTA rate and therefore the resulting impact on bookings and jail crowding. (According to Sheriff Department interviews approximately 20 percent of cite releases fail to appear and approximately 30 percent of inmates have FTAs.)

Cons

There are significant start-up and modest operating costs. There is the possibility that the program could "backfire" with expanded use of OR, increasing FTAs and ultimately, lowering pretrial releases.

Costs

Minor initial costs; is at least revenue neutral or much better when considered with crowding and delay impacts. Seek grant of Pacific Bell equipment to help manage.

Options

Could do only some of the elements itemized above.

3. Bookings of persons who are mentally ill have increased disproportionately to overall jail bookings.

NOTE: Although there is consensus among CJAG members that there should be alternatives to general jail housing for the mentally ill, members have not yet discussed which particular solution(s) should be employed. See Solutions D3.1 to D3.3 below.

Solution D3.1: Provide Training for Law Enforcement and Contract for Alternatives to Jail at Arrest for the Mentally Ill

Provide law enforcement with more training and alternatives. Contract for mental health services and/or shelters as alternatives to jail at arrest and throughout the process.

San Francisco should provide shelter programs as alternatives to jailing. Operated with governmental or private funding, shelter facilities generally provide sleeping space, food and clothing to persons who might otherwise be taken to jails due to drunkenness, mild mental disturbances, trespassing or vagrancy violations.⁴ San Francisco should also contract for some semi-secure and secure beds for the mentally ill.

Pros

Diverts mentally ill prior to booking, freeing up beds and staff. More appropriate handling of the mentally ill in selected cases.

Cons

Problem in determining when to jail and when to "shelter." May be difficult to manage contracted services and ensure protection of the public from further criminal behavior in the short term.

Costs

Payments to contractor(s) on a per bed basis.

Options

See D3.2 and D3.3 below.

Solution D3.2 Provide a Secure Facility for the Mentally Ill

Build a secure facility for pretrial and sentenced inmates identified as mentally ill. Jail Psychiatric Services estimates that approximately 16 percent of the jail population is mentally ill. This amounts to about 300 persons who may be housed in a secure facility. Estimates as to the number of mentally ill in jail vary as do the number who could be transferred to a secure facility. While 300 persons could possibly be housed in a secure facility, this number may be substantially lower.

Pros

Provides a humane and ultimately cost-effective solution to a major jail crowding and management problem.

Cons

Requires significant funds.

⁴ National Institute of Justice, p. 12.

Costs

Millions to build and staff a facility.

Options

See below.

Solution D3.3 Contract for Additional Beds Through Existing Residential Treatment Facilities and for Additional Case Management Slots

At present, Jail Aftercare Services (a subgroup of Jail Psychiatric Services) uses a number of residential treatment programs as alternatives to incarceration for both pretrial and sentenced clients. There is an ongoing shortage of beds for subacute clients and for those needing help with substance abuse problems. Because Jail Aftercare Services (JAS) has no control over the admission and discharge of its clients, beds need to be available at short notice and these beds should be reserved for JAS use.

In addition, there is a need for nonresidential case management of selected clients. The City-Wide Case management Program provides long-term case management for up to 25 clients. This client number should be doubled with the addition of two case managers.

These additional beds and case management slots should be provided through a request for proposal (RFP) process. The county could thereby maintain control over the contracted services. Important in the formula is that these services should be reserved for forensic clients, available at short notice, be managed so as to promote public safety, prevent FTAs and walkaways, and be monitored. Contract services should constitute net new beds rather than the conversion of existing mental health beds.

Jail Psychiatric Services estimates the need for new residential treatment beds as follows:⁵

- 10 subacute beds
- 10 dual substance abuse/mental health beds
- 10 straight substance abuse beds

Pros

Provides an alternative to jail for amenable clients. Helps ensure forensic bed space at residential programs. Provides treatment and case management.

Cons

Would require contract monitoring. Significant costs per bed for residential treatment from approximately \$50 to over \$100 per bed.

Costs

Residential treatment would cost approximately \$50 to over \$100 per bed. Increasing case management slots by 25 would require two additional case managers at approximately \$34,500 FTE each for Jail Psychiatric Services staff (City-Wide Case Management Program positions may be slightly higher).

Options

See D3.1 and D3.2 above.

⁵ This assumes that the ten new Baker Place residential treatment beds remain in place.

4. Many arrestees booked on misdemeanor charges are held in custody for several days due to out-of-county traffic warrants (or vice versa).

Solution D4.1: Inter-County Pact to Limit the Problem of Traffic Holds

San Francisco/CJAG should convene a Bay Area Criminal Justice Conference to arrange an inter-county pact to eliminate the multi-county problem of traffic holds and jail crowding by nonserious offenders. Procedures could be developed to clear holds on minor crimes by phone, citation or conditional citation to the other county's custody, for quick pick-up or release.

Pros

Reduces unnecessary crowding and is a public service in that it reduces the harsh impact of justice system procedures on minor offenders. Can save money, time and energy for all agencies involved.

Cons

Requires cooperation and changed attitudes in jurisdictions.

Costs

Saves money.

Options

These offenders could be released automatically, or to supervised/conditional OR.

E. Arraignment

1. Pretrial release programs are not arrayed or structured in any formal way, nor are they formally coordinated.

NOTE: Some elements of Solution E1, Formal Coordination of Pretrial Release Mechanisms, have been integrated into other solutions; Solution E2, Population Control Managers, has been deleted.

F. Preliminary Hearing

1. There is a need to speed felony case processing of the high percentage of felony bookings and the percentage of pretrial felons remaining in custody. No formal, agreed-upon and uniform system of managing cases through speedy case settlement is now in place.

Solution F1: Expedited Trial Management Program

San Francisco should institute an ambitious program of expedited trial management.

- a. The role, authority and potentials for leadership of the Municipal Court Presiding Judge and Superior Court Presiding Judge for criminal cases should be greatly increased. There should be administrative court rules for increased management and leverage to improve and hasten system case flow.

- b. Cases with in-custody defendants should be identified early for settlement, and those not showing early promise should be calendared on a fast-track basis.
- c. Pretrial case settlement conferences should be employed by judges, using enhanced case management data and case-weighted workloads for judges to increase speed and productivity and lower jail bed days in the county.
- d. Such a program should be based on data, monitoring, reports to CJAG and modifications over time.
- e. The following specific procedures should be pilot tested, revised and if effective, made a central element in system flow:

Municipal Court

Provision should be made for voluntary settlement discussion in Department 20 at a certain time each day, for any and all in-custody cases, to dispose of the longest-held pretrial detainees. The same procedure should be used in all preliminary hearing courts for all in-custody cases where time has been waived, to settle cases prior to preliminary hearing.

Superior Court

The Superior Court should designate one department as a "settlement court" for an hour each day for expedited pleas. Cases should be brought by agreement of counsel, and/or requested on initiative of the judge, to advance matters ready for resolution.

Pros

Expedited trial management procedures would provide major system improvements including reduction of crowding, increase in system efficiency, and reduction of overall system costs. Cases would be settled before preliminary hearing, or after but before arraignment, or before pretrial, etc.

Cons

Friction between agencies and some resistance to change could be expected.

Costs

Costs are modest, and large savings are likely across all agencies.

Options

The suggested changes could be implemented piecemeal, but fewer results can be expected. Individual judges can implement elements in their own court, but this is not as effective and would be inconsistent in comparison with a program under the leadership of presiding judges.

G. Sentencing

- 1. **Sentencing practices and use of county parole are not sensitive to the availability of beds and limits imposed on overcrowding.**

County Parole personnel note that of approximately 600 sentenced inmates system-wide, roughly 55 percent are felons serving county jail terms as a condition of probation. Of these, approximately 80 percent have a "No County Parole" restriction.

It was also noted that the practice of restricting use of county parole in San Francisco is unusual. In Contra Costa and San Mateo Counties, virtually all sentenced inmates are considered eligible for the county parole programs.

Solution G1: Improved Use of County Parole

- a. Judges and prosecution should cease ordering "No County Parole" at sentencing. However, the sentencing judge and a representative of the District Attorney's office should have an opportunity to review the cases of inmates granted County Parole before release. At this time, County Parole could still be denied by the judge, or via prosecutor input, and the inmate informed of the reasons.
- b. All sentenced inmates should be eligible to apply for County Parole, with release subject to the discretion of the County Parole Board, and judicial/prosecutorial review.
- c. County Parole staff could be increased.
- d. Use of day custody programs could be increased.

Pros

Maintains judicial and prosecutorial control while allowing more flexibility and reconsideration later. Reduces crowding and increases public safety for those released on parole who are now released without supervision.

Cons

Some judges may resist the reduction or elimination of their "no county parole" orders.

Costs

Some county parole costs offset by jail savings; revenue neutral.

Options

Sentence modification procedures could be relied upon, but inefficient.

2. **The probation department and courts are not prioritizing presentence investigation reports for in-custody cases.**

Solution G2: Prioritize Presentence Investigation Reports for In-Custody Cases

San Francisco should prioritize presentence investigation reports for all in-custody cases, and also rely heavily on PC 1203c to shorten report and time frame requirements.

Pros

Offers a simple, inexpensive, safe means of saving a significant number of bed-days and would reduce crowding and improve sentencing.

Cons

Requires change in current approach to scheduling and cooperation between courts and probation.

Costs

Should result in substantial savings.

Options

None applicable.

3. **There is no personnel to operate an electronic monitoring program in the probation department.**

Solution G3: Expand the Use of Electronic Monitoring

Electronic monitoring could be expanded beyond County Parole. Electronic monitoring could be employed through the Sheriff's Department and/or Probation Department to supervise all nondangerous offenders eligible for nonsecure custody.

Pros

Reduces crowding by providing a secure, inexpensive alternative to jail. Reduces FTAs, and might result in new revenues.

Cons

Expansion might result in resistance to noncustody sentencing.

Costs

Inexpensive hardware costs and some significant staffing costs. Revenue neutral, overall, especially if fees charged.

Options

Program could be implemented gradually.

Solution G4: Deferred Sentences

Currently, the Sheriff has the authority to release inmates after completion of 70 percent of their sentence. This authority exists because of the crowded situation in the jails. However, should the consent decree be lifted, the Sheriff would lose this authority, and severe crowding could result.

An alternative is to defer service of jail sentences for most minor offenses when the jail is at capacity. A growing number of courts are resorting to this strategy, some dedicating a fixed number of jail beds for sentenced offenders and deferring cases until space becomes available. These are cases in which local confinement is believed the most appropriate sentence, but where the underlying rationale does not require immediate jailing. The probation department can be responsible for the supervision of those on deferred sentence status.⁶

In implementing this program, however, administrative provisions should be made to reduce to the possibility of unnecessary disposition reduction, numerous requests for modification of sentences due to "new circumstances," and courts needing additional calendars.

Pros

Makes for a flexible population control mechanism.

Cons

Further erodes immediacy of sanctions.

⁶ National Institute of justice, p. 29.

Costs
None.

Options
None.

H. Inadequate Physical Facilities

- 1. San Francisco's correctional facilities were not designed to accommodate the numbers and types of inmates currently incarcerated.**

Solution H1: Construct, Remodel and/or Renovate Facilities

More beds could be built, and remodeling and renovation could be attempted to improve management and capacity of current bed groupings. A 360-bed Work Furlough Facility is currently being developed.

Pros

Would reduce short-term crowding, and thus improve inmate and staff safety, and avoid other population management approaches.

Cons

Extremely costly, and takes attention and resources away from system management. The long-term impact would be minimal if other population management approaches are not implemented.

Costs

\$50-100,000/bed, plus similar amount each year in life-cycle costs.

Options

Some beds could be contracted for; while this is expensive, it provides flexibility.

Appendix

APPENDIX A: CONTACTS

Rita Adrian, Director of Neighborhood Programs for Community Boards
Dennis Atergut, Chief Assistant City Attorney
Wayne Anderson, Domestic Violence Diversion, Probation Department
Jim Austen, National Center on Crime and Delinquency
Hon. Lee D. Baxter, Municipal Court
Hon. Jack K. Berman, Criminal Superior Court
Lt. Richard Bignardi, Sheriff's Department
Hon. Anne Bouliane, Municipal Court
Allen Breed, Special Master
Jeff Brown, Public Defender
Carmen Bush, Supervisor, Community Services Division, Probation Department
Hon. Thomas Dandurand, Criminal Superior Court
Hon. John Dearman, Presiding Judge, Civil Superior Courts
Lt. Jan Dempsy, Sheriff's Department
Hon. Joseph A. Desmond, Municipal Court
Capt. Mary Ann deSouza, Sheriff's Department
Hon. Herbert Donaldson, Municipal Court
John Drago, Project 20 /San Francisco Alternative Sentencing Program
Skip Duranczyk, Administrator, San Mateo County Release on Recognizance Program
Sgt. Richard Dyer, Public Information Officer, Sheriff's Department
Sgt. Phil Fairbrother, Investigative Services, Internal Affairs, Sheriff's Department
Kevin Foster, County Parole
Armando Garcia, Drug Diversion Officer, Probation Department
Lt. Richard Garibaldi, Sheriff's Department
Peter Goldstein, Director, Budget Staff, Mayor's Office
Tony Hall, Municipal Court Administration
Deputy Gerald Haran, Sheriff's Department
James Harrigan, Sheriff's Legal Counsel
Sheriff Mike Hennessey, Sheriff's Department
Paula Itaya, Chief Deputy, Criminal Division, Superior Court
Hon. Charles J. James, Municipal Court
Lt. Barry Johnson, San Francisco Police Department
John Kaye, Senior Analyst, San Francisco Police Department
Peter Keane, Chief Assistant Public Defender

Lt. Allen Kennedy, Sheriff's Department
Capt. Carl Koehler, County Jail #3, Sheriff's Department
Newton Lam, Special Assistant to the Mayor in area of Public Safety
Deputy Sheriff Martin Lee, Work Furlough
Will Leong, Pretrial Diversion Project
Derek Lott, Program Coordinator, Jail Psychiatric Services
Hon. Lenard Louie, Criminal Superior Court
Hon. William Mallen, Presiding Judge, Municipal Court
Lt. Dave Maron, San Francisco Police Department
Hon. Tomar Mason, Municipal Court
Hon. Lucy Kelley McCabe, Presiding Judge, Criminal Superior Court
Karen Moen, California Community on Dispute Services
Hon. Mary C. Morgan, Municipal Court
Paul Morse, Inspector, San Francisco Police Department
Hon. Philip J. Moscone, Municipal Court
Hon. J. Dominique Olcomendy, Municipal Court
Gordon Park-Li, Clerk-Administrator, Municipal Courts
Hon. Claude D. Perasso, Criminal Superior Court
Deputy Sheriff John Pesenti, Sheriff's Work Alternative Program
Dr. Tom Peters, Head of Forensic Services, San Francisco Dept. of Public Health
Paul Principe, Assistant Chief District Attorney
Hon. Ronald Evans Quidachay, Assistant Presiding Judge, Municipal Court
Irving Reichert, Director, OR Project
Lt. Tony Ribera, Commanding Officer, Fiscal Division, San Francisco Police Department
Alison Riker, National Center on Institutions and Alternatives
Tanya Saul, Program Evaluator, Department of Public Health
Arlene Sauser, Chief Adult Probation Officer, Probation Department
Kristin Segabarth, National Association of Pretrial Services Agencies
Hon. Lillian K. Sing, Municipal Court
Hon. Dorothy Von Beroldingen, Municipal Court
Sgt. John Walsh, Sheriff's Department
Christine West, Program Director, Jail Psychiatric Services
Carol Wilkins, Deputy Mayor of Finance
Hon. Raymond D. Williamson, Criminal Superior Court
Sam Yockey, Controller, City and County of San Francisco
Robert Zaragosa, Chief Deputy, Sheriff's Department

APPENDIX B: BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen Breed, First Report of Special Master on Defendants' State of Compliance with Consent Decree, September 8, 1986.

- Second Progress Report of Special Master on Defendants' State of Compliance, November 18, 1986.

- Third Progress Report of Special Master on Defendants' State of Compliance, February 15, 1987.

- Fourth Progress Report of Special Master on Defendants' State of Compliance, May 10, 1987.

- Fifth Progress Report of Special Master on Defendants' State of Compliance, August 30, 1987.

- Sixth Progress Report of Special Master on Defendants' State of Compliance, November 23, 1987.

- Seventh Progress Report of Special Master on Defendants' State of Compliance, April 7, 1988.

- Eighth Progress Report of Special Master on Defendants' State of Compliance with Consent Decree, July 15, 1988.

- Ninth Progress Report of Special Master on Defendants' State of Compliance with Consent Decree, October 18, 1988.

- Tenth Progress Report of Special Master on Defendants' State of Compliance with Consent Decree, February 21, 1989.

- Addendum to Tenth Progress Report, April 3, 1989.

- Eleventh Progress Report of Special Master on Defendants' State of Compliance with Consent Decree, December 20, 1989.

- Twelfth Progress Report of Special Master on Defendants' State of Compliance with Consent Decree, August 22, 1990.

California Community Dispute Service, Annual Report 1989-1990, and Pamphlet of general information

Pat Christensen, "Perspective: Resolving Neighborhood Conflicts," San Francisco Independent, 1988

City and County of San Francisco, 1988-89 Civil Grand Jury Reports, California.

Community Boards Pamphlets

CORO Foundation, The Impact of Proposition 115 on the San Francisco Police Department, October, 1990.

Crime Prevention Coalition, "Neighborhood Mediation Dissolves Tensions, Strengthens Community," Catalyst, Vol. 8, No. 8, October, 1988

Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, "Crowding at the Cook County Jail: Historical Perspective and Current Strategies," October, 1989.

Institute for Law and Policy Planning, San Francisco County Minor Jail Needs Assessment, 1983.

Anne Kaartunen, "Neighborhood Notes," Visitacion Valley Grapevine, Vol. III, No. 7, August 1988

Chris Lutes, "Talk Out", Campus Life, April 1988

Howard Messing, "NIC Technical Assistance Report #90-J1316," December, 1990.

National Council on Crime and Delinquency, San Francisco Jail Needs Assessment Final Report, October, 1988.

- "Position Paper on San Francisco Jail Overcrowding Options," August, 1989.

National Institute of Corrections, "Pretrial Release: Concepts, Issues, and Strategies for Improvement," Research in Corrections, October, 1988.

_____, Technical Assistance Report (TA 87-P067). City and County of San Francisco, California, February 17, 1987.

National Institute of Justice, Alleviating Jail Crowding: A Systems Perspective, November, 1985.

_____, Dealing Effectively with Crowded Jails: A Manual for Judges, July, 1986.

Eric Pfeiffer, "Court of Last Resort," San Francisco Examiner, January 25, 1987

Irving Reichert, OR Project data, December, 1990.

Irving Reichert, Memo to OR Board re: Decline in ORs, November 6, 1990.

San Francisco, "SANJIS Joint Application Design Results," September 18, 1990

San Francisco Adult Probation Department, Annual Report 1988-1989, April 27, 1990.

San Francisco County Parole Information

- a. Sample Parole Applicant Investigation Report.
- b. San Francisco County Parole Annual Report, June 30, 1989.
- c. Discretionary Parole Application Procedures, October 12, 1990.
- d. Administrative Fee Computations, November 21, 1990.
- e. Sample Application Denial/Acceptance Form Letter.
- f. Sample Order Granting Parole.
- g. Sample Order Granting Home Detention.
- h. San Francisco Sheriff's Presentence Conditional Release Program Rules and Regulations, December 11, 1990.

San Francisco Jail Population Management Plan: Solutions to Overcrowding Report

- i. San Francisco Sheriff's Home Detention Program Rules and Regulations, November 21, 1990.
- j. San Francisco County Parole Statistical Summary July 1, 1989 to December 7, 1990.
- k. San Francisco County Parole Programs Descriptions, December 12, 1990.

San Francisco Department of Public Health Forensic Services, "(Draft) Preliminary Findings of Client Overlap Study and Jail Population Study," November 7, 1989.

San Francisco Mayor's Office, Mayor's Budget Summary, FY 1990-1991, June 1, 1990.

San Francisco Municipal Court, Misdemeanor - Felony Bail Schedule, September 12, 1990

San Francisco Police Department, "Citation Release Policy and Procedures; Warrant Arrest Procedures," April 24, 1985.

- "Incident Report Writing Manual," October 14, 1987.

San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project, "Eligibility Requirements for Diversion through the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project," March 1990

San Francisco Public Defender's Office, 1989-90 Fiscal Year Annual Report, 1989-1990.
- 1989-90 Fiscal Year Supplement to the Annual Report, 1989-1990.

San Francisco Sheriff's Department, "Analysis of Budget Issues," November, 1989.

- Average Daily Population Data: October, 1987 - December, 1990.

- Bail Schedule, San Francisco County Jail, September 21, 1990.

- "Daily Prisoner Count Summary," November 30, 1990.

- "Daily Prisoner Count Summary," December 3, 1990.

- Proposal to San Francisco Board of Supervisors re: Fiscal/Policy Considerations Related to Sheriff's Department (Prop. 52 proposal of 1/2/90), January 17, 1990.

- Memo brief of S.W.A.P. and Work Furlough Unit, 1990

- San Francisco County Jail #1 Citation Quick Reference Sheet, February, 1988.

Special Program of the Adult Probation Department, Assorted Pamphlets re: Project 20 Community Service Program

Stone v. City and County of San Francisco, C78-2774 WHO

Marilee Strong, "Court of First Resort," San Francisco Focus, January 1985

Robert Zaragoza, Interoffice Memo to Hall of Justice Custody Division re: Overcrowding in Individual Housing Units at CJ #1, June 15, 1989, amended September 27, 1989.

APPENDIX C: DRAFT SOLUTIONS LIST

The following is a full list of the solutions as presented in the draft Solutions to Overcrowding Report. After input from CJAG members, the list was modified and is included in the Executive Summary of this report.

- Solution A1: Jail Population Director and Data Program**
- Solution B1.1: CJAG Manages the Criminal justice System**
- Solution B1.2: Quarterly Publication of Jail Crowding Issues**
- Solution C1: Improve Timeliness and Quality of Police Reports**
- Solution C2: Fund Additional Community-Based Detoxification Beds for Public Inebriates**
- Solution D1: Develop a Model OR Program**
- Solution D2: Develop a Model FTA Program**
- Solution D3: Provide Alternatives for the Mentally Ill**
- Solution D4: Inter-County Pact to Limit the Problem of Traffic Holds**
- Solution D4.2: Consolidate Handling of Multiple Charges**
- Solution E1: Formal Coordination of Pretrial Release Mechanisms**
- Solution E2: Population Control Managers (Trackers)**
- Solution F1: Speedy Trial Management Program**
- Solution G1: Increase Use of County Parole**
- Solution G2: Prioritize Presentence Investigation Reports for In-Custody Cases**
- Solution G3: Expand the Use of Electronic Monitoring**
- Solution G4: Deferred Sentences**
- Solution H1: Construct, Remodel and/or Renovate Facilities**